

**Request by Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory
for an Incidental Harassment Authorization
to Allow the Incidental Take of Marine Mammals
during a Low-Energy Marine Geophysical Survey
by the R/V *Marcus G. Langseth*
in the Central Pacific Ocean,
May 2012**

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

2 December 2011
Revised 12 December 2011

LGL Report TA8098-2

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
SUMMARY	1
I. OPERATIONS TO BE CONDUCTED	1
Overview of the Activity	1
Vessel Specifications.....	3
Airgun Description	4
Predicted Sound Levels.....	4
Description of Operations.....	6
Multibeam Echosounder and Sub-bottom Profiler.....	6
Acoustic Doppler Current Profiler	7
II. DATES, DURATION, AND REGION OF ACTIVITY.....	7
III. SPECIES AND NUMBERS OF MARINE MAMMALS IN AREA	7
IV. STATUS, DISTRIBUTION AND SEASONAL DISTRIBUTION OF AFFECTED SPECIES OR STOCKS OF MARINE MAMMALS	7
Mysticetes.....	9
Humpback Whale.....	9
Minke Whale.....	10
Bryde’s Whale.....	11
Sei Whale	11
Fin Whale	12
Blue Whale.....	13
Odontocetes	14
Sperm Whale.....	14
Dwarf and Pygmy Sperm Whales	14
Cuvier’s Beaked Whale	15
Longman’s Beaked Whale	16
Mesoplodont Beaked Whales.....	16
Rough-toothed Dolphin.....	17
Common Bottlenose Dolphin.....	17
Pantropical Spotted Dolphin	18
Spinner Dolphin	18
Striped Dolphin	19
Fraser’s Dolphin.....	19
Risso’s Dolphin.....	20
Melon-headed Whale	20
Pygmy Killer Whale.....	20
False Killer Whale	21
Killer Whale	21
Short-finned Pilot Whale	21
Pinniped.....	22
V. TYPE OF INCIDENTAL TAKE AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	22

VI. NUMBERS OF MARINE MAMMALS THAT COULD BE TAKEN.....	23
VII. ANTICIPATED IMPACT ON SPECIES OR STOCKS	23
Summary of Potential Effects of Airgun Sounds	23
Tolerance.....	23
Masking.....	24
Disturbance Reactions.....	24
Hearing Impairment and Other Physical Effects.....	29
Possible Effects of Multibeam Echosounder Signals	34
Masking.....	34
Behavioral Responses	34
Hearing Impairment and Other Physical Effects.....	35
Possible Effects of the Sub-bottom Profiler Signals.....	36
Masking.....	36
Behavioral Responses	36
Hearing Impairment and Other Physical Effects.....	36
Possible Effects of Acoustic Doppler Current Profiler Signals.....	36
Masking.....	36
Behavioral Responses	36
Hearing Impairment and Other Physical Effects.....	37
Numbers of Marine Mammals that could be “Taken by Harassment”.....	37
Basis for Estimating “Take by Harassment”.....	37
Potential Number of Marine Mammals Exposed to ≥ 160 dB	39
Conclusions.....	41
VIII. ANTICIPATED IMPACT ON SUBSISTENCE	42
IX. ANTICIPATED IMPACT ON HABITAT	42
Effects on Fish.....	42
Pathological Effects	43
Physiological Effects.....	44
Behavioral Effects.....	44
Effects on Invertebrates.....	44
Pathological Effects	45
Physiological Effects.....	45
Behavioral Effects.....	46
X. ANTICIPATED IMPACT OF LOSS OR MODIFICATION OF HABITAT ON MARINE MAMMALS	46
XI. MITIGATION MEASURES.....	46
Planning Phase.....	47
Proposed Exclusion Zones	47
Mitigation During Operations	47
Speed or Course Alteration	48
Shut-down Procedures	48
Ramp-up Procedures	48

XII. PLAN OF COOPERATION 49

XIII. MONITORING AND REPORTING PLAN 49

 Vessel-based Visual Monitoring 49

 PSO Data and Documentation..... 50

XIV. COORDINATING RESEARCH TO REDUCE AND EVALUATE INCIDENTAL TAKE 51

XV. LITERATURE CITED..... 51

 Marine Mammals and Acoustics 51

 Fish, Invertebrates, and Other..... 70

Request by Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory for an Incidental Harassment Authorization to Allow the Incidental Take of Marine Mammals during a Low-Energy Marine Geophysical Survey by the R/V *Marcus G. Langseth* in the Central Pacific Ocean, May 2012

SUMMARY

Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory (L-DEO), with research funding from the National Science Foundation (NSF), plans to conduct a marine coring and low-energy seismic survey in the Line Islands ~1800 km south of Hawaii in the central Pacific Ocean during May 2012. The survey will take place partly in the Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) of the Republic of Kiribati and partly in the U.S. EEZ, in water depths of ~1100–5000 m. The seismic survey will use a towed pair of 105-in³ GI airguns. On behalf of L-DEO, the U.S. State Department will seek authorization from the Republic of Kiribati for clearance to work in its EEZ. 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 cetaceans and pinnipeds inhabit the proposed survey area in the central Pacific. Several of these species are listed as *endangered* under the ESA, including the humpback, sei, fin, blue, and sperm whales, and the Hawaiian monk seal. ESA-listed sea turtle species that could occur in the survey area include the *endangered* hawksbill and leatherback turtles, and the *threatened* green, loggerhead, and olive ridley turtles. Listed seabirds that could be encountered in the area include the *endangered* Hawaiian petrel and the *threatened* Newell’s shearwater; the band-rumped storm petrel and black-footed albatross are candidate species for listing.

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 marine coring and low-energy seismic survey in the Line Islands ~1800 km south of Hawaii in the central Pacific Ocean. The survey will encompass the area 0.5°S–8°N and 156–162°W (Fig. 1). Water depth in the survey area is ~1100–5000 m. The project is scheduled to occur during 1–26 May 2012. Some minor deviation from these dates is possible, depending on logistics and weather.




FIGURE 1. Study area and proposed survey design for the seismic survey in the Line Islands, central Pacific Ocean, planned for 1–26 May 2012. The survey will likely start at the southern-most site (A) and continue northwest in alphabetical order through to Site E2, however this may be adjusted as necessary based on conditions at sea.

L-DEO plans to use conventional low-energy seismic methodology and coring to collect a suite of observations that will provide data necessary to understand sedimentation patterns on the flanks of the Line Islands Ridge and how important climate patterns have varied in the late Pleistocene.

The survey will involve one source vessel, the R/V *Marcus G. Langseth*. The *Langseth* will deploy as an energy source a pair of GI airguns with a maximum volume of 105 in³ each (210 in³ maximum total). The receiving system will consist of one 2-km long hydrophone streamer. As the airguns are towed along the survey lines, the hydrophone streamer will receive the returning acoustic signals and transfer the data to the on-board processing system.

The planned seismic survey will take place at six sites in the Line Islands, central Pacific Ocean, in water ~1100–5000 m deep (Fig. 1). The survey will likely start at the southern-most site (A) and continue northwest in alphabetical order through to site E2, however this may be adjusted as necessary based on conditions at sea (Fig. 1). A seismic survey conducted at each site will be used to determine coring locations, and an overall total of 15 piston cores, 30 gravity cores, and 8 multicores (64 samples) will be taken. If sample quality is not adequate, it may be necessary to collect more cores. The total seismic survey effort will consist of ~1400 km of transect lines. There will 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 § IV(3)), 25% has been added for those additional operations.

In addition to the GI airgun operations, a multibeam echosounder (MBES), a sub-bottom profiler (SBP), and an acoustic doppler current profiler (ADCP) will also be operated from the *Langseth* continuously throughout the cruise except while on station for coring. All planned geophysical data acquisition activities will be conducted by L-DEO with on-board assistance by the scientists who have proposed the study. The Principal Investigators (PIs) are Dr. J. Lynch-Stieglitz of the Georgia Institute of Technology and Dr. P. Polissar of L-DEO. The vessel will be self-contained, and the crew will live aboard the vessel for the entire cruise.

Vessel Specifications

The R/V *Marcus G. Langseth* will be used as the source vessel. The *Langseth* will tow a pair of 105-in³ GI airguns and a 2-km streamer along predetermined lines (Fig. 1). Given the relatively short streamer length behind the vessel, the turning rate of the vessel while the gear is deployed is much higher than the limit of five degrees per minute for a seismic vessel towing a streamer of more typical length (>>1 km). Thus, the maneuverability of the vessel is not limited much during operations.

The *Langseth* has a length of 71.5 m, a beam of 17.0 m, and a maximum draft of 5.9 m. The *Langseth* was designed as a seismic research vessel, with a propulsion system designed to be as quiet as possible to avoid interference with the seismic signals. The ship is powered by two Bergen BRG-6 diesel engines, each producing 3550 hp, which drive the two propellers directly. Each propeller has four blades, and the shaft typically rotates at 600 or 750 revolutions per minute (rpm). The vessel also has an 800 hp bowthruster, which is not used during seismic acquisition. The operation speed during seismic acquisition will be 8.5 km/h. When not towing seismic survey gear, the *Langseth* typically cruises at 18.5 km/h. The *Langseth* has a range of 25,000 km.

The *Langseth* will also serve as the platform from which vessel-based protected species observers (PSOs) will watch for marine mammals and sea turtles before and during airgun operations, as described in § XIII, below.

Other details of the *Langseth* include the following:

Owner:	National Science Foundation
Operator:	Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory of Columbia University
Flag:	United States of America
Date Built:	1991 (Refitted in 2006)
Gross Tonnage:	3834
Accommodation Capacity:	55 including ~35 scientists

Airgun Description

During the survey, the R/V *Langseth* will tow a pair of 45–105-in³ Sercel GI airguns. Seismic pulses will be emitted at intervals of ~12 s. At a speed of ~11 km/h, the 12-s spacing corresponds to shot intervals of ~37.5 m. During firing, a brief (~0.1 s) pulse of sound is emitted. The airguns will be silent during the intervening periods.

The generator chamber of each GI airgun, the one responsible for introducing the sound pulse into the ocean, is either 45 in³ or 105-in³, depending on how it is configured. The injector chamber injects air into the previously generated bubble to maintain its shape, and does not introduce more sound into the water. The two GI airguns will be towed 8 m apart side by side, ~50 m behind the R/V *Langseth*, at a depth of 3 m. Depending on configuration, the total maximum volume could be 210 in³, however it could be as low as 90 in³. As a precautionary measure, we assume that the larger volume will be used.

GI Airgun Specifications

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

Predicted Sound Levels

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

Empirical data concerning the 190-, 180-, 170- and 160-dB distances were acquired for various airgun arrays based on measurements during the acoustic verification studies conducted by L DEO in the northern Gulf of Mexico in 2003 (6-, 10-, 12-, and 20-airgun arrays, and 2 GI airguns; Tolstoy et al. 2004) and 2007–2008 (36-airgun array; Tolstoy et al. 2009). Results for the 36-airgun array are not relevant for the 2 GI airguns to be used in the proposed survey. The empirical data for the 6-, 10-, 12-, and 20-airgun arrays indicate that, for deep water (>1000 m), the L-DEO model tends to overestimate the received sound levels at a given distance (Tolstoy et al. 2004). Measurements were not made for the 2 GI airgun array in deep water, however, we propose to use the safety radii predicted by L-DEO's model for the proposed GI airgun operations in deep water, although they are likely conservative given the empirical results for the other arrays.

2 x 105 GI guns 90% RMS dB





FIGURE 2. Modeled received sound levels from two 105-in³ GI airguns that will be used during the L-DEO survey in the Line Islands, central Pacific Ocean, planned for 1–26 May 2012. Model results provided by L-DEO.

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

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

Description of Operations

The source vessel, the R/V *Marcus G. Langseth*, as an energy source a pair of GI airguns with a maximum volume of 105 in^3 each (210 in^3 maximum total) at a depth of 3 m. The receiving system will consist of one 2-km long hydrophone streamer. As the airguns are towed along the survey lines, the hydrophone streamer will receive the returning acoustic signals and transfer the data to the on-board processing system.

The planned seismic survey will take place at six sites in the Line Islands, central Pacific Ocean, in water $\sim 1100\text{--}5000$ m deep (Fig. 1). The survey will likely start at the southern-most site (A) and continue northwest in alphabetical order through to site E2, however this may be adjusted as necessary based on conditions at sea (Fig. 1). A seismic survey conducted at each site will be used to determine coring locations, and an overall total of 15 piston cores, 30 gravity cores, and 8 multicores (64 samples) will be taken. If sample quality is not adequate, it may be necessary to collect more cores. The total seismic survey effort will consist of ~ 1400 km of transect lines. There will 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 § IV(3)), 25% has been added for those additional operations. In addition to the airgun operations, a Kongsberg EM 122 MBES, a Knudsen Chirp 3260 SBP, and an RDI OS75 ADCP will also be operated from the *Langseth* continuously throughout the cruise except while on station for coring.

Multibeam Echosounder and Sub-bottom Profiler

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

The Knudsen Chirp 3260 SBP is normally operated to provide information about the sedimentary features and the bottom topography that is being mapped simultaneously by the MBES. The SBP is capable of reaching depths of 10,000 m. The beam is transmitted as a 27° cone, which is directed downward by a 3.5-kHz transducer in the hull of the *Langseth*. The nominal power output is 10 kW, but the actual maximum radiated power is 3 kW or 222 dB re $1 \mu\text{Pa} \cdot \text{m}$. The ping duration is up to 64 ms, and the ping interval is 1 s. A common mode of operation is to broadcast five pulses at 1-s intervals followed by a 5-s pause.

TABLE 1. Distances to which sound levels ≥ 190 , 180, and 160 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}_{\text{rms}}$ could be received from the two 105-in³ GI airguns that will be used for the seismic survey in the Line Islands, central Pacific Ocean, planned for 1–26 May 2012. Distances are based on model results provided by L-DEO.

Airgun(s)	Depth range (m)	Estimated Distances (m) at Received Levels		
		190 dB	180 dB	160 dB
Two 105-in ³ GI airguns (3 m)	>1000	20	70	670

Acoustic Doppler Current Profiler

The Teledyne OS75 is an ADCP operating at a frequency of 75 kHz, producing a ping every 1.4 s. The system is a four-beam phased array with a beam angle of 30°. Each beam has a width of 4° and there is no overlap. Maximum output power is 1 kW with a maximum depth range of 700 m.

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 will occur in the Line Islands, central Pacific Ocean, ~1800 km south of Hawaii, in the area 0.5°S–8°N and 156–162°W (Fig. 1). The seismic survey will take place in water ~1100–5000 m deep. The exact dates of the activities depend on logistics and weather conditions. The R/V *Langseth* will depart from Honolulu, HI, on ~1 May 2012 for a 5-day transit to the survey area and will return to Honolulu for arrival on 26 May 2012. Seismic operations will be carried out for ~6 days.

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-six marine mammal species could occur in the central Pacific 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.

Twenty-five cetacean species could occur in the central Pacific survey area, including odontocetes (toothed cetaceans, such as dolphins) and mysticetes (baleen whales); although considered unlikely, the Hawaiian monk seal could also be encountered (Table 2). Information on the occurrence, population size, and conservation status for each of the 26 species is presented in Table 2. The status of these species is based on the ESA, the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) Red List of Threatened Species (IUCN 2011), and the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species in Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES; UNEP-WCMC 2011). Six of these species are listed under the ESA as *Endangered*: the sperm, humpback, fin, sei, and blue whales, and the Hawaiian monk seal.

Only one study on cetacean distribution has been conducted in the survey area. The Pacific Island Cetacean and Ecosystem Assessment Survey (PICEAS) was conducted during July–November 2005 to

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

Species	Occurrence in survey area	Habitat	Abundance in the ETP ¹	ESA ²	IUCN ³	CITES ⁴
Mysticetes						
Humpback whale	Rare	Mainly nearshore waters and banks	20,800; 36,600 ⁵	EN	LC	I
Minke whale	Rare	Coastal	9000 ⁶	NL	LC	I
Bryde's whale	Common	Pelagic, coastal	10,422 ⁷	NL	DD	I
Sei whale	Rare	Mostly pelagic	7260–12,620 ⁸	EN	EN	I
Fin whale	Rare	Slope, pelagic	13,620–18,680 ⁹	EN	EN	I
Blue whale	Rare	Pelagic, coastal	1400 ¹⁰	EN	EN	I
Odontocetes						
Sperm whale	Common	Pelagic, steep topography	26,053 ¹¹	EN	VU	I
Pygmy sperm whale	Uncommon	Deep, off shelf	N.A.	NL	DD	II
Dwarf sperm whale	Common	Deep, shelf, slope	11,200 ¹²	NL	DD	II
Cuvier's beaked whale	Common	Slope, pelagic	20,000 ¹⁰	NL	LC	II
Longman's beaked whale	Uncommon	Pelagic	291 ¹³	NL	DD	II
Ginkgo-toothed beaked whale	Rare	Pelagic	25,300 ¹⁴	NL	DD	II
Blainville's beaked whale	Uncommon	Pelagic	25,300 ¹⁴	NL	DD	II
Rough-toothed dolphin	Common	Mainly pelagic	107,633	NL	LC	II
Common bottlenose dolphin	Common	Coastal, shelf, deep	335,834	NL	LC	II
Pantropical spotted dolphin	Common	Coastal and pelagic	439,208 ¹⁵	NL	LC	II
Spinner dolphin	Common	Coastal and pelagic	1,797,716 ¹⁶	NL	DD	II
Striped dolphin	Common	Off continental shelf	964,362	NL	LC	II
Fraser's dolphin	Common	Pelagic	289,300 ¹⁰	NL	LC	II
Risso's dolphin	Uncommon	Shelf, slope, mounts	110,457	NL	LC	II
Melon-headed whale	Common	Pelagic	45,400 ¹⁰	NL	LC	II
Pygmy killer whale	Uncommon	Pelagic, coastal	38,900 ¹⁰	NL	DD	II
False killer whale	Common	Pelagic	1329 ¹⁷ ; 39,800 ¹⁰	NL	DD	II
Killer whale	Uncommon	Widely distributed	8500 ¹⁸	NL	DD	II
Short-finned pilot whale	Common	Pelagic, high-relief	589,315 ⁷	NL	DD	II
Pinnipeds						
Hawaiian monk seal	Rare	Mainly coastal	N.A.	EN	CR	I

N.A. = Not available, not applicable, or not assessed; ETP = Eastern Tropical Pacific

¹ Gerrodette et al. (2008) unless otherwise indicated

² U.S. ESA: EN = Endangered, NL = Not listed

³ Codes for IUCN (2011): EN = Endangered; VU = Vulnerable; LC = Least Concern; DD = Data Deficient

⁴ CITES (UNEP-WCMC 2011): Appendix I = threatened with extinction; Appendix II = not necessarily now threatened with extinction but may become so unless trade is closely controlled

⁵ North Pacific (Barlow et al. 2009a) and Southern Hemisphere (Reilly et al. 2008)

⁶ North Pacific (Wada 1976)

⁷ Gerrodette and Forcada (2002)

⁸ North Pacific (Tillman 1977)

⁹ Ohsumi and Wada (1974)

¹⁰ Wade and Gerrodette (1993)

¹¹ Whitehead (2002)

¹² Estimate mostly for *K. sima* but may also include *K. breviceps* (Wade and Gerrodette 1993)

¹³ Ferguson and Barlow (2003)

¹⁴ This estimate includes all species of the genus *Mesoplodon* (Wade and Gerrodette 1993)

¹⁵ For the western/southern offshore spotted dolphin

¹⁶ For the whitebelly and the eastern spinner dolphin stocks (Gerrodette et al. 2008)

¹⁷ Palmyra stock (Barlow and Rankin 2007)

¹⁸ Ford (2009)

estimate the abundance of cetaceans in the U.S. EEZs of Palmyra Atoll, Kingman Reef, Johnston Atoll, and surrounding waters south of Hawaii (Barlow et al. 2008). The Hawaiian Island Cetacean Ecosystem

Assessment Survey (HICEAS) was conducted in the EEZ of the Hawaiian Islands, ~1400 km north of the survey area, from 27 July to 8 December 2002 (Barlow et al. 2004).

Several other studies of marine mammal distribution and abundance have been conducted in the wider eastern tropical Pacific (ETP). The most extensive regional distribution and abundance data come primarily from multi-year vessel surveys conducted by NMFS' Southwest Fisheries Science Center (SWFSC). The surveys were conducted during July–December in an area generally extending from 30°N to 18°S from the coastline to 153°W (Wade and Gerrodette 1993; Ferguson and Barlow 2001; Gerrodette et al. 2008; Jackson et al. 2008). The western boundary of the survey area is ~350 km east of the proposed seismic survey area. Acoustic detections of cetaceans were also reported during summer/fall shipboard surveys in the eastern and central Pacific Ocean (Rankin et al. 2008).

Mysticetes

Humpback Whale (*Megaptera novaeangliae*)

The humpback whale is found throughout all of the oceans of the world (Clapham 2009). The species is listed as *Endangered* under the ESA and *Least Concern* on the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species (IUCN 2011), and it is listed in CITES Appendix I (UNEP-WCMC 2011) (Table 2). The world-wide population of humpback whales is divided into northern and southern ocean populations, but genetic analyses suggest some gene flow (either past or present) between the North and South Pacific (e.g., Baker et al. 1983; Caballero et al. 2001). Geographical overlap of these populations has been documented only off Central America (Acevedo and Smultea 1995; Rasmussen et al. 2004, 2007).

The entire North Pacific stock has been recently estimated at 18,302, excluding calves (Calambokidis et al. 2008). Barlow (2009a) provided a bias-corrected abundance estimate of 20,800. Overall, the North Pacific stock is increasing (Calambokidis et al. 2008). The total abundance estimate for humpback whales in the Southern Hemisphere is 36,600 (Reilly et al. 2008).

Humpback whales migrate between summer feeding grounds in high latitudes and winter calving and breeding grounds in tropical waters (Clapham and Mead 1999). North Pacific humpback whales summer in feeding grounds along the Pacific Rim and in the Bering and Okhotsk seas (Pike and MacAskie 1969; Rice 1978; Winn and Reichley 1985; Calambokidis et al. 2000, 2001, 2008), and winter in three different breeding areas: (1) the eastern North Pacific along the coast of Mexico and Central America, and near the Revillagigedo Islands; (2) around the main Hawaiian Islands; and (3) in the western Pacific, particularly around the Ogasawara and Ryukyu islands in southern Japan and the northern Philippines (Perry et al. 1999a; Calambokidis et al. 2008). There is a low level of interchange of whales among the three main wintering areas and among feeding areas (e.g., Darling and Cerchio 1993; Salden et al. 1999; Calambokidis et al. 2001, 2008).

South Pacific humpback whales summer on feeding grounds in Antarctic waters. Three breeding stocks are recognized in the South Pacific: Western, Central (Oceania), and Eastern South Pacific, each showing some evidence of substructure within stocks. The Oceania breeding grounds in austral winter range from 145°E to 120°W and from ~0° to 30°S and include New Caledonia, Vanuatu, Tonga, Niue, Cook Islands, American Samoa and French Polynesia (Childerhouse et al. 2008). The interchange between these populations is poorly understood; at least the New Caledonian wintering ground represents an autonomous population unit (Garrigue et al. 2004). Humpback whales wintering in Tonga, Cook Islands, and French Polynesia may also represent separate populations (Olavarria et al. 2007).

Although considered to be mainly a coastal species, humpback whales often traverse deep pelagic areas while migrating (Clapham and Mattila 1990; Norris et al. 1999; Calambokidis et al. 2001). The diving behavior of humpback whales is related to time of year and whale activity (Clapham and Mead

1999). On winter breeding grounds, humpback dives have been recorded at depths >100 m (Baird et al. 2000). In summer feeding areas, humpbacks typically forage in the upper 120 m of the water column, with a maximum recorded dive depth of 500 m (Dolphin 1987; Dietz et al. 2002). Humpback whales are often sighted singly or in groups of two or three; however, while on their breeding and feeding ranges, they can occur in groups of up to 15 (Leatherwood and Reeves 1983; Donoghue 1996). Jackson et al. (2008) reported a mean group size of 1.5 for the ETP.

Calambokidis et al. (2008) estimated that over 50% of the North Pacific population (from the central and eastern stocks) winters in Hawaiian waters. Humpbacks use the area for breeding from December to April; peak abundance around the Hawaiian Islands is from late February through early April (Mobley et al. 2001). Humpbacks are not expected to occur further than 100 km from the Hawaiian coastline (DoN 2005). It is not known how many whales occur in areas farther offshore and to the south of Hawaii. Humpback whales also aggregate in small numbers during austral winter months (July–October) south of the proposed survey area in the southern Cook Islands (18–21°S; Hauser et al. 2000).

No sightings were made southwest of Hawaii during the PICEAS program in July–November 2005 (Barlow et al. 2008). One unconfirmed sighting of a humpback whale was reported in the Phoenix Islands (11°S; 178°W), ~1600 km southwest of the proposed survey area, during rapid assessment surveys in June–July 2000 (Obura et al. 2011a).

Humpback whales are not expected to occur in the survey area during May and no takes are anticipated or requested.

Minke Whale (*Balaenoptera acutorostrata*)

The minke whale has a cosmopolitan distribution that spans polar, temperate, and tropical regions (Jefferson et al. 2008). In the Northern Hemisphere, the minke whale is usually seen in coastal areas, but can also be seen in pelagic waters during northward migrations in spring and summer, and southward migration in autumn (Stewart and Leatherwood 1985). In the North Pacific, the summer range of the minke whale extends to the Chukchi Sea; in the winter, the whales move farther south to within 2° of the Equator (Perrin and Brownell 2009). Wada (1976) estimated the abundance of minke whales in the North Pacific at ~9000.

The minke whale is relatively solitary, but can occur in aggregations of up to 100 when food resources are concentrated (Jefferson et al. 2008). The small size, inconspicuous blows, and brief surfacing times of minke whales mean that they are easily overlooked in heavy sea states, although they are known to approach vessels in some circumstances (Stewart and Leatherwood 1985). Little is known about the diving behavior of minke whales, but they are not known to make prolonged deep dives (Leatherwood and Reeves 1983).

The International Whaling Commission (IWC) recognizes three stocks of minke whales in the North Pacific: the Sea of Japan/East China Sea, the rest of the western Pacific west of 180°N, and the remainder of the Pacific (Donovan 1991). The minke whale is generally believed to be uncommon in Hawaiian waters, although Rankin et al. (2007) suggested that minke whales could be more common than previously thought. A lack of sightings is likely related to misidentification or low detection capability in poor sighting conditions (Rankin et al. 2007). The minke whale is thought to occur seasonally in Hawaii, from November through March (Rankin and Barlow 2005).

A minke whale sighting was made to the west of Hawaii in November during HICEAS shipboard surveys in July–November 2002 (Barlow et al. 2004). Acoustic detections as well as a visual sighting of a minke whale were made during a survey in the Hawaiian Islands in February 2005 (Rankin et al. 2007). Acoustic detections were also made around the Hawaiian Islands during surveys in 1997, 2002, and 2003

(Rankin and Barlow 2005), as well as in 2005 (Barlow et al. 2008; Rankin et al. 2008). No sightings were made near Palmyra Atoll during the PICEAS program in July–November 2005 (Barlow et al. 2008). Minke whales are not expected to occur in the proposed survey area during May, and no takes are anticipated or requested.

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

Bryde's whale is found in tropical and warm temperate waters throughout the world in waters warmer than 16.3°C (Kato and Perrin 2009). Long confused with sei whales (*Balaenoptera borealis*), *B. edeni* was named in 1913 and *B. brydei* was named in 1950, although it is still uncertain whether the two are distinct species or subspecies. Populations in the western North Pacific, western South Pacific, eastern South Pacific, and eastern Indian Ocean currently show low levels of genetic interchange (Kanda et al. 2007). Here, we follow Kato and Perrin (2009) in recognizing the uncertainty and using *B. edeni/brydei*.

Bryde's whales are known to occur in both shallow coastal and deeper offshore waters (Jefferson et al. 2008). Some populations show a general pattern of movement toward the equator in winter and toward higher latitudes in summer, though the locations of actual winter breeding grounds are unknown (Kanda et al. 2007). Bryde's whales are usually solitary or in pairs, although groups of 10–20 are known from feeding grounds (Jefferson et al. 2008). Barlow (2006) reported a mean group size of 1.5 for Hawaii, and Barlow et al. (2008) reported a mean group size of 3.8 for the PICEAS area. For the ETP, Wade and Gerrodette (1993) and Jackson et al. (2008) reported mean group sizes of 1.7 and 1.5, respectively. The duration of Bryde's whale dives range from 1 to 20 min (Cummings 1985).

In Hawaii, Bryde's whales are typically seen offshore (e.g., Barlow 2006), but Hopkins et al. (2009) reported a Bryde's whale sighting within 70 km of the main Hawaiian Islands. The population size of Bryde's whales in the ETP was estimated at 10,422 (Gerrodette and Forcada 2002).

At least six Bryde's whale sightings and four sightings of *B. edeni/borealis* were made near Palmyra Atoll during the PICEAS program in July–November 2005 (Barlow et al. 2008).

Sei Whale (*Balaenoptera borealis*)

The sei whale is listed as *Endangered* under the ESA and on the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species (IUCN 2011), and is listed in CITES Appendix I (UNEP-WCMC 2011) (Table 2). Sei whale populations were depleted by whaling, and the current status of this species is generally uncertain (Horwood 1987). The global population is thought to be ~80,000 (Horwood 2009), with up to ~12,620 in the North Pacific (Tillman 1977). The sei whale is poorly known because of confusion with Bryde's whale and unpredictable distribution patterns; it can be common in an area for several years and then seemingly disappear (Schilling et al. 1992; Jefferson et al. 2008).

The sei whale is pelagic and generally not found in coastal waters (Harwood and Wilson 2001). It is found in deeper waters characteristic of the continental shelf edge region (Hain et al. 1985) and in other regions of steep bathymetric relief such as seamounts and canyons (Kenney and Winn 1987; Gregr and Trites 2001). On feeding grounds, sei whales associate with oceanic frontal systems (Horwood 1987) such as the cold eastern currents in the North Pacific (Perry et al. 1999a). Sei whales are frequently seen in groups of 2–5 (Leatherwood et al. 1988; Jefferson et al. 2008), although larger groups sometimes form on feeding grounds (Gambell 1985a). Sei whales generally do not dive deeply, and dive durations are 15 min or longer (Gambell 1985a).

The distribution of the sei whale is not well known, but it is found in all oceans and appears to prefer mid-latitude temperate waters (Jefferson et al. 2008). Sei whales migrate from temperate zones occupied in winter to higher latitudes in the summer, where most feeding takes place (Gambell 1985a).

During summer in the North Pacific, the sei whale can be found from the Bering Sea to the Gulf of Alaska and down to southern California, as well as in the western Pacific from Japan to Korea. Its winter distribution is concentrated at about 20°N, and sightings have been made between southern Baja California and the Islas Revillagigedo (Rice 1998).

In Hawaii, the occurrence of sei whales is considered rare (DoN 2005). However, they have been sighted near the islands and to the northwest during surveys in July–December 2002; most of those sightings were made during the month of November (Barlow et al. 2004). Sei whales, including subadults, were seen east of Oahu in November 2007 (Hopkins et al. 2009). As breeding and calving areas in the Pacific are unknown, the sightings of subadult sei whales suggest that Hawaii may be an important reproductive area for this species (Hopkins et al. 2009). Sightings of *B. edeni/borealis* were made near Palmyra Atoll during the PICEAS survey in July–November 2005 (Barlow et al. 2008). Given the difficulty in distinguishing sei from Bryde’s whales, those could have been sei whales, but in both cases, Bryde’s whales were positively identified and sei whales were not. Sei whales are not expected to occur in the proposed survey area, and no takes are anticipated or requested.

Fin Whale (*Balaenoptera physalus*)

The fin whale is widely distributed in all the world’s oceans (Gambell 1985b), but typically occurs in temperate and polar regions from 20° to 70° north and south of the equator (Perry et al. 1999b). It is listed as **Endangered** under the ESA and on the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species (IUCN 2011), and is listed in CITES Appendix I (UNEP-WCMC 2011) (Table 2). Probably at least in part because of its initially high abundance, wide distribution, and diverse feeding habits, the fin whale does not seem to have been as badly depleted as the other large whales in the North Pacific. Northern and southern fin whale populations are distinct and are sometimes recognized as different subspecies (Aguilar 2009).

Fin whales occur in coastal, shelf, and oceanic waters. Moore et al. (2002a) reported that in the eastern Bering Sea, sighting rates were more than twice as high in water >100 m deep than in water 50–100 m deep; no sightings occurred in water <50 m deep. Sergeant (1977) suggested that fin whales tend to follow steep slope contours, either because they detect them readily or because biological productivity is high along steep contours because of tidal mixing and perhaps current mixing. Stafford et al. (2009) noted that sea-surface temperature is a good predictor variable for fin whale call detections in the North Pacific.

Fin whales can be found as individuals or groups of 2–7, but can form much larger feeding aggregations, sometimes with humpback and minke whales (e.g., Waite 2003; Jefferson et al. 2008). Barlow et al. (2004) reported a mean group size of 1.2 for Hawaii, and Jackson et al. (2008) reported a group size of 1.2 for the ETP. Foraging fin whales have mean dive depths and times of 98 m and 6.3 min, and non-foraging fin whales have mean dive depths and times of 59 m and 4.2 min (Croll et al. 2001). Dive depths of >150 m coinciding with the diel migration of krill were reported by Panigada et al. (1999).

Fin whales appear to have complex seasonal movements and are likely seasonal migrants (Gambell 1985b). They mate and calve in temperate waters during the winter and migrate to feed at northern latitudes during the summer (Mackintosh 1965 in Gambell 1985b). The North Pacific population summers from the Chukchi Sea to California and winters from California southwards (Gambell 1985b). Recent information about the seasonal distribution of fin whales in the North Pacific has been obtained from the reception of fin whale calls by bottom-mounted, offshore hydrophone arrays along the U.S. Pacific coast, in the central North Pacific, and in the western Aleutian Islands (Moore et al. 1998, 2006; Watkins et al. 2000a,b; Stafford et al. 2007, 2009). Fin whale calls are detected year-round in the Northern Pacific (Moore et al. 2006; Stafford et al. 2007, 2009). In the central North Pacific, the Gulf of

Alaska, and the Aleutian Islands, call rates peak during fall and winter (Moore et al. 1998, 2006; Watkins et al. 2000a,b; Stafford et al. 2009).

A recent review of fin whale distribution in the North Pacific noted the lack of sightings across the pelagic waters between eastern and western winter areas (Mizroch et al. 2009). Thompson and Friedl (1982) suggested that fin whales migrate to Hawaiian waters during the fall and winter; but during spring–summer, their occurrence in Hawaii is considered rare (DoN 2005). No fin whale sightings were made during the PICEAS program in July–November 2005 (Barlow et al. 2008). The few fin whale sightings reported during ETP surveys in summer/fall occurred east of ~120°W (Wade and Gerrodette 1993; Jackson et al. 2008). Fin whales are not expected to occur in the proposed survey area, and no takes are anticipated or requested.

Blue Whale (*Balaenoptera musculus*)

The blue whale has a cosmopolitan distribution and tends to be pelagic, only coming nearshore to feed and possibly to breed (Jefferson et al. 2008). It is listed as *Endangered* under the ESA and on the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species (IUCN 2011), and is listed in CITES Appendix I (UNEP-WCMC 2011) (Table 2). All blue whale populations have been exploited commercially, and many have been severely depleted as a result. Blue whale abundance has been estimated at 2300 for the Southern Hemisphere (IWC 2010), 1400 for the ETP (Wade and Gerrodette 1993), and ~2842 off the U.S. west coast (Carretta et al. 2010).

Blue whales are typically found singly or in groups of two or three (Yochem and Leatherwood 1985; Jefferson et al. 2008). For the ETP, Wade and Gerrodette (1993) and Jackson et al. (2008) reported mean group sizes of 1.5 and 1.9, respectively. Croll et al. (2001) reported mean dive depths and times of 140 m and 7.8 min for foraging blue whales, and 68 m and 4.9 min for non-foraging individuals. Four satellite-radio-tagged blue whales in the northeast Pacific Ocean spent 94% of their time underwater; 72% of dives were <1 min long, and “true” dives (>1 min) were 4.2–7.2 min long. Shallow (<16-m) dives were most common (75%), and the average depth of deep (>16-m) dives was 105 m (Lagerquist et al. 2000). Dives of up to 300 m were recorded for tagged blue whales (Calambokidis et al. 2003).

Generally, blue whales are seasonal migrants between high latitudes in the summer, where they feed, and low latitudes in the winter, where they mate and give birth (Lockyer and Brown 1981). However, little information is available on blue whale wintering areas (Perry et al. 1999a). Some individuals may stay in low or high latitudes throughout the year (Reilly and Thayer 1990; Watkins et al. 2000b). In the North Pacific, blue whale calls are received year-round (Moore et al. 2002b, 2006). Stafford et al. (2009) noted that sea-surface temperature is a good predictor variable for blue whale call detections in the North Pacific.

Although it has been suggested that there are at least five subpopulations of blue whales in the North Pacific (NMFS 1998), analysis of blue whale calls monitored from the U.S. Navy Sound Surveillance System (SOSUS) and other offshore hydrophones (see Stafford et al. 1999, 2001, 2007; Watkins et al. 2000a; Stafford 2003) suggest that there are two separate populations—one in the eastern and one in the western North Pacific (Sears 2009). The western North Pacific stock includes whales that are found around Hawaii during winter; the eastern North Pacific stock includes whales that feed primarily off California (Carretta et al. 2010). Broad-scale acoustic monitoring indicates that blue whales of the eastern stock range from the Gulf of Alaska to the ETP, and as far west as Wake Island (Stafford et al. 1999, 2001). Blue whales from the eastern stock feed from June to November and migrate south in winter/spring (Calambokidis et al. 1990; Mate et al. 1999). The western Pacific stock feeds off Kamchatka, south of the Aleutians, and in the Gulf of Alaska in summer (Stafford 2003; Watkins et al. 2000b); in the winter, they migrate to lower latitudes in the western Pacific and occasionally to the central

Pacific, such as Hawaii (Stafford et al. 2001). Nonetheless, blue whales are considered rare in Hawaii (DoN 2005; Carretta et al. 2010). Blue whale acoustic data from Hawaii discussed in Thompson and Friedl (1982) were described as bi-modal (one peak from July–September and another from November–January). No sightings were made in Hawaii during shipboard surveys in July–December 2002 (Barlow et al. 2004) or during the PICEAS program in July–November 2005 (Barlow et al. 2008). Blue whales are not expected to occur in the proposed survey area in May, and no takes are anticipated or requested.

Odontocetes

Sperm Whale (*Physeter macrocephalus*)

The sperm whale is the largest of the toothed whales, with an extensive worldwide distribution (Rice 1989). The species is listed as **Endangered** under the U.S. ESA, but on a worldwide basis it is abundant and not biologically endangered. It is listed as **Vulnerable** on the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species (IUCN 2011), and is listed in CITES Appendix I (UNEP-WCMC 2011) (Table 2). The best population estimate for the ETP probably is that of Whitehead (2002), who provided a sperm whale population size of 26,053.

Sperm whale distribution is linked to social structure: mixed groups of adult females and juvenile animals of both sexes generally occur in tropical and subtropical waters, whereas adult males are commonly found alone or in same-sex aggregations, often occurring in higher latitudes outside the breeding season (Best 1979; Watkins and Moore 1982; Arnborn and Whitehead 1989; Whitehead and Waters 1990). Males can migrate north in the summer to feed in the Gulf of Alaska, Bering Sea, and waters around the Aleutian Islands (Kasuya and Miyashita 1988). Mature male sperm whales migrate to warmer waters to breed when they are in their late twenties (Best 1979). They spend periods of at least months on the breeding grounds, moving between mixed groups of ~20–30 animals (Whitehead 1993, 2003). For Hawaii, the mean group size was reported as 7.3 (Barlow 2006), and for the PICEAS area, it was estimated at 7.9 (Barlow et al. 2008). For the ETP, Wade and Gerrodette (1993) and Jackson et al. (2008) reported mean group sizes of 7.9 and 6.1, respectively.

Sperm whales generally are distributed over large areas that have high secondary productivity and steep underwater topography, in waters at least 1000 m deep (Jaquet and Whitehead 1996; Whitehead 2009). They are often found far from shore, but can be found closer to oceanic islands that rise steeply from deep ocean waters (Whitehead 2009). Adult males can occur in water depths <100 m and as shallow as 40 m (Whitehead et al. 1992; Scott and Sadove 1997). They can dive as deep as ~2 km and possibly deeper on rare occasions for periods of over 1 h; however, most of their foraging occurs at depths of ~300–800 m for 30–45 min (Whitehead 2003). A recent study of tagged male sperm whales off Norway found that foraging dives extended to highly variable maximum depths, ranging from 14 to 1860 m, with a median of 175 m (Teloni et al. 2008). During a foraging dive, sperm whales typically travel ~3 km horizontally and 0.5 km vertically (Whitehead 2003). Whales in the Galápagos Islands typically dove for ~40 min and then spent 10 min at the surface (Papastavrou et al. 1989).

In the North Pacific Ocean, sperm whales are distributed widely, with the northernmost occurrences at Cape Navarin (62°N) and the Pribilof Islands (Omura 1955). During the PICEAS program in July–November 2005, at least six sperm whale sightings were made near Palmyra Atoll (Barlow et al. 2008); at least 10 acoustic detections were also made near Palmyra Atoll during the survey (Barlow et al. 2008; Rankin et al. 2008).

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

Pygmy sperm whales (*Kogia breviceps*) and dwarf sperm whales (*K. sima*) are distributed widely throughout tropical and temperate seas, but their precise distributions are unknown as most information

on these species comes from strandings (McAlpine 2009). They are difficult to sight at sea, perhaps because of their avoidance reactions to ships and behavior changes in relation to survey aircraft (Würsig et al. 1998). The two species are difficult to distinguish from one another when sighted (McAlpine 2009).

Pygmy sperm whales could inhabit waters beyond the continental shelf edge, whereas dwarf sperm whales are thought to inhabit the shelf edge and slope waters (Rice 1998; Wang et al. 2002; MacLeod et al. 2004). Barros et al. (1998) suggested that dwarf sperm whales could be more pelagic and dive deeper than pygmy sperm whales. Dwarf sperm whale could prefer warmer waters than pygmy sperm whales (e.g., Wade and Gerrodette 1993; Muñoz-Hincapié et al. 1998; McAlpine 2009). Pygmy sperm whales occur in small groups of up to six, and dwarf sperm whales can form groups of up to 10 (Caldwell and Caldwell 1989). Mean group size for the dwarf sperm whale was 2.3 in Hawaii (Barlow 2006) and 1.6–1.7 for the ETP (Wade and Gerrodette 1993; Jackson et al. 2008). The mean group size of the pygmy sperm whale in Hawaiian waters was 1.0 (Barlow 2006), and for the ETP was 1.3 (Jackson et al. 2008).

Pygmy sperm whales feed mainly on various species of squid in the deep zones of the continental shelf and slope (McAlpine et al. 1997). In the Gulf of California, median dive and surface times for dwarf or unidentified *Kogia* sp. were 8.6 min and 1.2 min, and dives of up to 25 min and surface times up to 3 min were common (J. Barlow, pers. comm. in Willis and Baird 1998). Little is known about dive depths of *Kogia* spp. A satellite-tagged pygmy sperm whale released off Florida made longer dives (>8 min and up to ~18 min) at night and on overcast days, and shorter dives (usually 2–5 min) on clear days, probably because of the distribution of their prey, vertically-migrating squid (Scott et al. 2001).

Although there are few useful estimates of abundance for pygmy or dwarf sperm whales anywhere in their range, they are thought to be fairly common in some areas. For the ETP, the *Kogia* population size was estimated at 11,200 (mostly for *K. sima* but may also include *K. breviceps*; Wade and Gerrodette 1993). Except for one sighting of *K. sima* in the ETP (~30°N; 140°W), no *Kogia* sp. were seen during the PICEAS program in July–November 2005 (Barlow et al. 2008). During summer/fall surveys of the ETP during 1986–1996, *Kogia* sp. were sighted >2000 km east of the survey area (Ferguson and Barlow 2001).

Cuvier's Beaked Whale (*Ziphius cavirostris*)

Cuvier's beaked whale is probably the most widespread of the beaked whales, although it is not found in polar waters (Heyning 1989). Cuvier's beaked whale appears to prefer steep continental slope waters (Jefferson et al. 2008) and is most common in water depths >1000 m (Heyning 1989). Ferguson et al. (2006a) reported that in the ETP, the mean water depth where Cuvier's beaked whales were sighted was ~3.4 km. It is rarely observed at sea and is mostly known from strandings. It strands more commonly than any other beaked whale (Heyning 1989). Its inconspicuous blows, deep-diving behavior, and tendency to avoid vessels all help to explain the infrequent sightings (Barlow and Gisiner 2006).

Adult males of this species usually travel alone, but these whales can be seen in groups of up to 7 (Heyning and Mead 2009), with a mean group size of 2.3 (MacLeod and D'Amico 2006). Barlow (2006) reported a mean group size of 2 for Hawaii, and Barlow et al. (2008) reported a mean group size of 3.0 for the PICEAS area. For the ETP, Wade and Gerrodette (1993) and Jackson et al. (2008) reported mean group sizes of 2.2 and 1.8, respectively. Cuvier's beaked whale dives generally last 30–60 min, but dives of 85 min have been recorded (Tyack et al. 2006). The maximum dive depth recorded by Baird et al. (2006) was 1450 m.

In the ETP, the estimated population size is 20,000 (Wade and Gerrodette 1993). Cuvier's beaked whales were sighted to the east (~140–144°W) of the proposed survey area during summer–fall surveys of the ETP in 1986–1996 and 2006 (Wade and Gerrodette 1993; Ferguson and Barlow 2001; Jackson et al. 2008). In 2006, an unidentified ziphiid was seen ~900 km east of the proposed survey area (Jackson et

al. 2008). During the PICEAS program in July–November 2005, two sightings were made at Johnston Atoll ~1300 km northwest of the survey area, and one was made west of Hawaii (Barlow et al. 2008). Another three sightings of unidentified ziphiids were made at Johnston Atoll and Hawaii, and in adjacent waters (Barlow et al. 2008).

Longman’s Beaked Whale (*Indopacetus pacificus*)

Initially, Longman’s beaked whale was thought to be extremely rare, and it was known only from two skulls (Pitman et al. 1987). Subsequent morphometric and genetic analyses of those two original specimens and an additional four specimens have allowed a more detailed characterization of the species (Dalebout et al. 2003). It seems likely that it is, in fact, the cetacean that has been seen in Indo-Pacific waters and called the “tropical bottlenose whale”. Some authorities place the species in the genus *Mesoplodon*, but there now seems to be sufficient information to afford it status as a separate genus (Dalebout et al. 2003). Records of this species exist within an area from 10°S to 40°N.

Longman’s beaked whales have been sighted in waters with temperatures 21–31°C and have been seen in the tropics in every month of the year except June, indicating year-round residency (Pitman et al. 1999; Jefferson et al. 2008). Although widespread throughout the tropical Pacific, the species must still be considered rare because of a scarcity of sightings despite a great deal of survey effort (Pitman et al. 1999). Longman’s beaked whales have been seen alone, but more commonly in groups of at least 10 and up to 100, with an average group size of 15–20 (Jefferson et al. 2008). Pitman et al. (1999) reported a mean group size of 18.5 in the tropics, whereas group sizes were smaller in the ETP, averaging 8.6. For Hawaii, Barlow (2006) reported a group size of 17.8. Dives are thought to last 18–33 min (Jefferson et al. 2008).

The population size was estimated at 291 in the ETP (Ferguson and Barlow 2003). During the PICEAS program in July–November 2005, one sighting was made at Johnston Atoll, ~1300 km northwest of the proposed survey area (Barlow et al. 2008). One Longman’s beaked whale was reported at ~120°W during summer–fall surveys of the ETP during 2006 (Jackson et al. 2008).

Mesoplodont Beaked Whales

Two species of mesoplodont whales can occur in deep waters of the proposed survey area in the central Pacific Ocean: Blainville’s and ginkgo-toothed beaked whales. Almost everything that is known regarding most mesoplodont species has come from stranded animals (Pitman 2009). Because of the scarcity of sightings, most are thought to be rare. The different mesoplodont species are difficult to distinguish in the field, and confirmed at-sea sightings are rare (Mead 1989; Carretta et al. 2010; Jefferson et al. 2008).

Mesoplodonts are distributed primarily in deep waters (>2000 m) and along continental slopes at depths 200–2000 m; they are rarely found in continental shelf waters (Pitman 2009). Most mesoplodonts identified to species are known from strandings involving single individuals (Jefferson et al. 2008); thus, it is not possible to identify spatial or seasonal patterns in their distribution (Carretta et al. 2010). Dive depths of most of these species are undocumented.

Typical group sizes range from one to six (Pitman 2009). Mean group sizes are unknown for many of the *Mesoplodon* species. For the ETP, Wade and Gerrodette (1993) and Jackson et al. (2008) reported mean group sizes of 3.0 and 2.4, respectively. Wade and Gerrodette (1993) estimated the abundance of all mesoplodonts in the ETP at 25,300.

Except for two sightings of *Mesoplodon* sp. northeast of Hawaii, no other sightings of *Mesoplodon* spp. were made during the PICEAS program in July–November 2005 (Barlow et al. 2008). There were three sightings of unidentified *Mesoplodon* in offshore waters west of Hawaii during July–December

2002 (Barlow et al. 2004). One *Mesoplodon* was reported in the Phoenix Islands during rapid assessment surveys in June–July 2000 (Obura et al. 2011a).

Blainville’s beaked whale (*Mesoplodon densirostris*).—This species is found in tropical and temperate waters of all oceans (Jefferson et al. 2008). Blainville’s beaked whale has the widest distribution throughout the world of all *Mesoplodon* species (Mead 1989). There is no evidence that Blainville’s beaked whale undergoes seasonal migrations. It is most often found in singles or pairs, but also in groups of 3–7 (Jefferson et al. 2008). Barlow (2006) reported a mean group size of 2.3 for Hawaii.

Like other beaked whales, Blainville’s beaked whales are generally found in waters 200–1400 m deep (Gannier 2000; Jefferson et al. 2008). Maximum dive depths have been reported as 1251 m (Tyack et al. 2006) and 1408 m (Baird et al. 2006), and dives have lasted as long as 54 min (Baird et al. 2006) to 57 min (Tyack et al. 2006). However, they also can occur in coastal areas and have been known to spend long periods of time at depths <50 m (Jefferson et al. 2008).

In Hawaii, the population size in 2002 was estimated at 2872 (Barlow 2006). A Blainville’s beaked whale sighting was made ~1400 km to the east of the proposed survey area during summer–fall surveys of the ETP during 1986–1990 (Wade and Gerrodette 1993).

Ginkgo-toothed beaked whale (*Mesoplodon ginkgodens*).—This species is only known from stranding records (Mead 1989; Jefferson et al. 2008). The ginkgo-toothed whale is hypothesized to occupy warm temperate and tropical waters of the Indian and Pacific oceans (Jefferson et al. 2008). Strandings have been reported for the western and eastern North Pacific, South Pacific, and Indian oceans, and from the Galápagos Islands (Palacios 1996). The species is thought to occupy relatively cool areas in the temperate and tropical Pacific, where upwelling is known to occur, such as in the California and Peru Currents and the equatorial front (Palacios 1996).

Rough-toothed Dolphin (*Steno bredanensis*)

The rough-toothed dolphin is widely distributed around the world, mainly occurring in tropical and warm temperate waters (Miyazaki and Perrin 1994). In the Pacific, rough-toothed dolphins occur from central Japan and northern Australia to Baja California, Mexico, and southern Peru (Jefferson 2009). Rough-toothed dolphins generally occur in deep, oceanic waters, but can be found in shallower coastal waters in some regions (Jefferson et al. 2008). Rough-toothed dolphins are deep divers and can dive for up to 15 min (Jefferson et al. 2008). They usually form groups of 10–20, but aggregations of hundreds have been seen (Jefferson et al. 2008). Barlow (2006) reported a mean group size of 14.8 for Hawaii, and Barlow et al. (2008) reported a mean group size of 13.4 for the PICEAS area. For the ETP, mean group sizes were 9.9–15.5 (Wade and Gerrodette 1993; Ferguson et al. 2006b; Jackson et al. 2008).

In the ETP, the population size in 2006 was estimated at 107,633 (Gerrodette et al. 2008). During the PICEAS program in July–November 2005, at least three sightings and three acoustic detections were made near Palmyra Atoll (Barlow et al. 2008; Rankin et al. 2008).

Common Bottlenose Dolphin (*Tursiops truncatus*)

The bottlenose dolphin is distributed worldwide. It is found mainly where surface temperatures are 10–32°C (Reeves et al. 2002). Generally, there are two distinct bottlenose dolphin types: a shallow water type, mainly found in coastal waters, and a deep water type, mainly found in oceanic waters (Duffield et al. 1983; Hoelzel et al. 1998; Walker et al. 1999). As well as inhabiting different areas, these ecotypes differ in their diving abilities (Klatsky 2004) and prey types (Mead and Potter 1995). Bottlenose dolphins have been reported to regularly dive to depths >450 m for periods of >5 min, and even down to depths of 600–700 m for up to 12 min (Klatsky et al. 2007). Mean group sizes have been reported as 9.0 for Hawaii (Barlow 2006) and 11.8 for the PICEAS area (Barlow et al. 2008). Mean group sizes for the ETP were

22–24 (Wade and Gerrodette 1993; Smith and Whitehead 1999; Ferguson et al. 2006b; Jackson et al. 2008).

In the ETP, the population size in 2006 was estimated at 335,834 (Gerrodette et al. 2008). During the PICEAS program in July–November 2005, at least five sightings and at least two acoustic detections were made near Palmyra Atoll (Barlow et al. 2008; Rankin et al. 2008). Five bottlenose dolphin sightings were reported in the Phoenix Islands during rapid assessment surveys in June–July 2000 (Obura et al. 2011a).

Pantropical Spotted Dolphin (*Stenella attenuata*)

The pantropical spotted dolphin can be found throughout tropical and some subtropical oceans of the world (Perrin and Hohn 1994). The southernmost limit of its range is ~40°S (Perrin 2009). There are two forms of pantropical spotted dolphin—coastal and offshore—although the coastal form occurs mainly in the ETP from Baja California to South America (Jefferson et al. 2008). In the ETP, this dolphin is associated with warm (>25°C) tropical surface water (Au and Perryman 1985; Reilly 1990; Reilly and Fiedler 1994). The offshore form inhabits tropical, equatorial, and southern subtropical water masses (Perrin 2009). This species is found primarily in deeper waters, and rarely over the continental shelf or continental shelf edge (Davis et al. 1998).

Pantropical spotted dolphins are extremely gregarious, forming groups of hundreds or even thousands. Barlow (2006) reported a mean group size of 60 for Hawaii, and Barlow et al. (2008) reported a mean group size of 50 for the PICEAS area. For the offshore stock in the ETP, Jackson et al. (2008) reported a mean group size of 95, Ferguson et al. (2006b) estimated a mean group size of 131, and Gerrodette and Forcada (2005) estimated a mean group size of 114. Pantropical spotted and spinner dolphins are commonly seen together in mixed-species groups, e.g., in the ETP (Au and Perryman 1985), off Hawaii (Psarakos et al. 2003), and in the Marquesas Archipelago (Gannier 2002).

For the ETP, the population size for the western/southern offshore stock in 2006 was estimated at 439,208 (Gerrodette et al. 2008). The spotted dolphin is expected to be one of the most abundant cetaceans in the proposed project area; based on the Southwest Fisheries Science Center (SWFSC) surveys and model used to calculate densities in the proposed survey area (see § IV[3]), it is the second-ranked species there. During the PICEAS program in July–November 2005, at least 12 sightings and at least six acoustic detections were made near Palmyra Atoll (Barlow et al. 2008; Rankin et al. 2008).

Spinner Dolphin (*Stenella longirostris*)

The spinner dolphin is distributed in oceanic and coastal tropical waters, although in the ETP, its range is mostly oceanic (Jefferson et al. 2008). In the ETP, it is associated with warm, tropical surface water, similar in distribution to the pantropical spotted dolphin (Au and Perryman 1985; Reilly 1990; Reilly and Fiedler 1994). Spinner dolphins are extremely gregarious, and usually form large schools in the open sea and small ones in coastal waters (Perrin and Gilpatrick 1994). Mean group sizes have been reported as 32 for Hawaii (Barlow 2006), 42–155 for the PICEAS area (Barlow et al. 2008), and 83–148 for the ETP (Wade and Gerrodette 1993; Ferguson et al. 2006b). Spinner dolphins and pantropical spotted dolphins are commonly seen together in mixed-species groups, e.g., in the ETP (Au and Perryman 1985) and off Hawaii (Psarakos et al. 2003).

In Hawaii, there is one subspecies of spinner dolphin, Gray's spinner dolphin (*S. l. longirostris*). In the ETP, three types of spinner dolphins have been identified, two of which are recognized as subspecies: the eastern spinner dolphin, *S. l. orientalis*, considered an offshore species, the Central American spinner, *S. l. centroamericana* (also known as the Costa Rican spinner), considered a coastal species (Perrin 1990; Dizon et al. 1991), and the whitebelly spinner, which is thought to be a hybrid of the eastern spinner and

Gray's spinner. Although there is a great deal of overlap between the ranges of eastern and whitebelly spinner dolphins, the eastern form generally occurs in the northeastern portion of the ETP, whereas the whitebelly spinner occurs in the southern portion of the ETP, ranging farther offshore (Wade and Gerrodette 1993; Reilly and Fiedler 1994). In the proposed survey area, Gray's and the whitebelly spinner can occur.

For the whitebelly and eastern stocks in the ETP, the population sizes in 2006 were estimated at 734,837 and 1,062,879, respectively (Gerrodette et al. 2008). This species is expected to be the most abundant cetacean in the proposed survey area; based on the SWFSC surveys and model used to calculate densities in the study area (see § IV[3]), it is the first-ranked species there. During the PICEAS program in July–November 2005, at least 21 sightings of spinner dolphins (3 Gray's, at least 8 whitebelly or southwestern, and at least 8 unidentified) were made in and adjacent to Palmyra Atoll (Barlow et al. 2008). At least nine acoustic detections of spinner dolphins were also made near Palmyra Atoll (Barlow et al. 2008; Rankin et al. 2008). One group of 10 spinner dolphins was reported in the Phoenix Islands during rapid assessment surveys in June–July 2000 (Obura et al. 2011a).

Striped Dolphin (*Stenella coeruleoalba*)

The striped dolphin has a cosmopolitan distribution in tropical to warm temperate waters (Perrin et al. 1994a) and is generally seen south of 43°N (Archer 2009). It is typically found in waters outside the continental shelf and is often associated with convergence zones and areas of upwelling (Archer 2009). The striped dolphin is fairly gregarious (groups of 20 or more are common) and active at the surface (Whitehead et al. 1998). Mean group sizes were reported as 37 for Hawaii (Barlow 2006), 46 for the PICEAS area (Barlow et al. 2008), and 50 for the Galápagos Islands (Smith and Whitehead 1999). For the ETP, reported mean group sizes were 52–61 (Wade and Gerrodette 1993; Ferguson et al. 2006b; Jackson et al. 2008).

In the ETP, the population size in 2006 was estimated at 964,362 (Gerrodette et al. 2008). The striped dolphin is expected to be one of the most abundant cetaceans in the proposed survey area; based on the SWFSC surveys and model used to calculate densities in the study area (see § IV[3]), it is the third-ranked species there. During the PICEAS program in July–November 2005, at least 12 sightings and at least 9 acoustic detections were made near Palmyra Atoll (Barlow et al. 2008; Rankin et al. 2008).

Fraser's Dolphin (*Lagenodelphis hosei*)

Fraser's dolphin is a tropical species found between 30°N and 30°S (Dolar 2009). It occurs rarely in temperate regions, and then only in relation to temporary oceanographic anomalies such as El Niño events (Perrin et al. 1994b). The species typically occurs in deep, oceanic waters. In the ETP, sightings were at least 15 km from shore in waters 1500–2500 m deep (Dolar 2009). Off Huahine and Tahiti (Society Islands), it was observed in waters 500–1500 m deep (Gannier 2000). Fraser's dolphin travels in groups ranging from just a few animals to 100 or even 1000 (Perrin et al. 1994b). Barlow (2006) reported a mean group size of 286 for Hawaii. For the ETP, Wade and Gerrodette (1993) and Ferguson et al. (2006b) reported mean group sizes of 395 and 440, respectively.

The population size during 1986–1990 was estimated at 289,300 in the ETP (Wade and Gerrodette 1993). Fraser's dolphins were seen to the east of the proposed survey area during summer–fall surveys of the ETP during 1986–1996 (Wade and Gerrodette 1993; Ferguson and Barlow 2001) and 2006 (Jackson et al. 2008). During the PICEAS program in July–November 2005, two sightings and one acoustic detection were made near Palmyra Atoll (Barlow et al. 2008; Rankin et al. 2008).

Risso's Dolphin (*Grampus griseus*)

Risso's dolphin is primarily a tropical and mid-temperate species distributed worldwide. It occurs between 60°N and 60°S, where surface water temperatures are at least 10°C (Kruse et al. 1999). Water temperature appears to be an important factor affecting its distribution (Kruse et al. 1999; see also Becker 2007). Off the U.S. west coast, Risso's dolphin is believed to make seasonal north-south movements related to water temperature, spending colder winter months off California and moving north to waters off Oregon–Washington during the spring and summer as northern waters begin to warm (Green et al. 1992, 1993; Buchanan et al. 2001; Barlow 2003; Becker 2007).

Risso's dolphins are pelagic, mostly occurring on the upper continental slope shelf edge in waters 350–1000 m deep (Baumgartner 1997; Davis et al. 1998). They occur individually or in small to moderate-sized groups, normally 10–50, although groups as large as 4000 have been sighted (Baird 2009a). The majority of groups consist of <50 individuals (Kruse et al. 1999; Miyashita 1993). Mean group sizes were reported as 15 for Hawaii (Barlow 2006), 14 for the PICEAS area (Barlow et al. 2008), and 9–19 for the ETP (Wade and Gerrodette 1993; Ferguson et al. 2006b; Jackson et al. 2008).

In the ETP, the population size during 1986–1990 was estimated at 110,457 (Gerrodette et al. 2008). Risso's dolphins were seen to the east of the proposed survey area during summer–fall surveys of the ETP during 1986–1996 (Wade and Gerrodette 1993; Ferguson and Barlow 2001). During the PICEAS program in July–November 2005, one sighting was made at Johnston Atoll, and one sighting was made just southwest of Hawaii (~18°N; Barlow et al. 2008). Acoustic detections were also made in the PICEAS survey area to the north and east of the proposed survey area (Barlow et al. 2008; Rankin et al. 2008).

Melon-headed Whale (*Peponocephala electra*)

The melon-headed whale is a pantropical and pelagic species that occurs mainly between 20°N and 20°S (Perryman et al. 1994). Melon-headed whales tend to occur in groups of 100–500, but have also been seen in groups of up to 2000 (Jefferson et al. 2008). Barlow (2006) reported a mean group size of 89 for Hawaii, and Barlow et al. (2008) reported a mean group size of 101 for the PICEAS area. For the ETP, Wade and Gerrodette (1993) reported a mean group size of 199, and Ferguson et al. (2006b) estimated the mean group size at 258. Melon-headed whales are commonly seen in mixed groups with other cetaceans (Jefferson and Barros 1997; Huggins et al. 2009).

For the ETP, the population size during 1986–1990 was estimated at 45,400 (Wade and Gerrodette 1993). During the PICEAS program in July–November 2005, at least two sightings and one acoustic detection were made near Palmyra Atoll (Barlow et al. 2008; Rankin et al. 2008).

Pygmy Killer Whale (*Feresa attenuata*)

The pygmy killer whale is distributed throughout tropical and subtropical oceans worldwide (Ross and Leatherwood 1994; Donahue and Perryman 2009). In warmer water, it is usually seen close to the coast (Wade and Gerrodette 1993), but it is also found in deep water. In Hawaiian waters, the pygmy killer whale is found in nearshore waters, but not in offshore waters (Barlow 2006). In the Marquesas, it was sighted in water 100 m deep (Gannier 2002). Pygmy killer whales tend to travel in groups of 15–50, although groups of a few hundred have been sighted (Ross and Leatherwood 1994). Mean group sizes have been reported as 14 for Hawaii (Barlow 2006) and 25–30 for the ETP (Wade and Gerrodette 1993; Ferguson et al. 2006b; Jackson et al. 2008).

The population size during 1986–1990 was estimated at 38,900 in the ETP (Wade and Gerrodette 1993). Pygmy killer whales were sighted far to the east of the proposed survey area (up to ~128°W)

during summer–fall surveys of the ETP during 1986–1990 (Wade and Gerrodette 1993). No sightings were made during the PICEAS program in July–November 2005 (Barlow et al. 2008).

False Killer Whale (*Pseudorca crassidens*)

The false killer whale is found in all tropical and warmer temperate oceans, especially in deep, off-shore waters (Odell and McClune 1999). However, it is also known to occur in nearshore areas (e.g., Stacey and Baird 1991). False killer whales travel in groups of 20–100 (Baird 2009b), although groups of several hundred are sometimes observed. Mean group sizes have been reported as 10 for Hawaii (Barlow 2006), 9 for the PICEAS area (Barlow et al. 2008), and 11–12 for the ETP (Wade and Gerrodette 1993; Ferguson et al. 2006b; Jackson et al. 2008).

In the U.S. Pacific Islands region, there are currently three different stocks of false killer whales: the Hawaii insular, the Hawaii pelagic, and the Palmyra stocks (Chivers et al. 2007; Carretta et al. 2010). The Hawaii insular false killer whale is genetically distinct from other populations in the Indo-Pacific Ocean, including the central North Pacific, eastern North Pacific, Hawaii pelagic, Mexico, Panama, and American Samoa (Chivers et al. 2007, 2010). It is unclear if the false killer whales at Palmyra Atoll are part of the Hawaiian pelagic stock or whether they represent a separate population (Chivers et al. 2010).

The population size of the Palmyra stock has been estimated at 1329, with another 906 in the remainder of the PICEAS area (Barlow and Rankin 2007). For the ETP, the population size during 1986–1990 was estimated at 39,800 (Wade and Gerrodette 1993). During the PICEAS program in July–November 2005, at least eight sightings and at least seven acoustic detections were made near Palmyra Atoll (Barlow et al. 2008; Rankin et al. 2008).

Killer Whale (*Orcinus orca*)

The killer whale is cosmopolitan and globally fairly abundant; it has been observed in all oceans of the world (Ford 2009). It is very common in temperate waters and also frequents tropical waters, at least seasonally (Heyning and Dahlheim 1988). High densities of the species occur in high latitudes, especially in areas where prey is abundant. Although resident in some parts of its range, the killer whale can also be transient. Killer whale movements generally appear to follow the distribution of their prey, which includes marine mammals, fish, and squid. Killer whales are large and conspicuous, often traveling in close-knit matrilineal groups of a few to tens of individuals (Dahlheim and Heyning 1999). Mean group sizes have been reported as 6.5 for Hawaii (Barlow 2006), 5.3 for the PICEAS area (Barlow et al. 2008), and 5.4–8.1 for the ETP (Wade and Gerrodette 1993; Ferguson et al. 2006b; Jackson et al. 2008). The maximum depth to which seven tagged free-ranging killer whales dove off B.C. was 228 m, but only an average of 2.4 % of their time was spent below 30-m depth (Baird et al. 2003).

In the ETP, the population size was estimated at 8500 (Ford 2009). Killer whales were sighted far to the east of the proposed survey area during summer–fall surveys of the ETP during 1986–1996 (Wade and Gerrodette 1993; Ferguson and Barlow 2001) and 2006 (Jackson et al. 2008). During the PICEAS program in July–November 2005, one sighting was made near Palmyra Atoll and another near Johnston Atoll (Barlow et al. 2008). One acoustic detection was made ~1000 km to the east (~147°W) of the proposed survey area (Rankin et al. 2008).

Short-finned Pilot Whale (*Globicephala macrorhynchus*)

The short-finned pilot whale is found in tropical, subtropical, and warm temperate waters (Olson 2009); it is seen as far south as ~40°S and as far north as ~50°N (Jefferson et al. 2008). Pilot whales are generally nomadic, but may be resident in certain locations, including California and Hawaii (Olson 2009). It is an occasional visitor as far north as the Alaska Peninsula. Pilot whales occur on the shelf break, over the slope, and in areas with prominent topographic features (Olson 2009).

Pilot whales are very social and are usually seen in groups of 20–90 with matrilineal associations (Olson 2009). Mean group sizes have been reported as 22.5 for Hawaii (Barlow 2006), 24.3 for the PICEAS area (Barlow et al. 2008), and 18.0–18.3 for the ETP (Wade and Gerrodette 1993; Ferguson et al. 2006b; Jackson et al. 2008). Both species (short-finned and long-finned) are known for single and mass strandings. Long-finned pilot whales outfitted with time-depth recorders dove to depths up to 828 m, although most of their time was spent above depths of 7 m (Heide-Jørgensen et al. 2002). The species' maximum recorded dive depth is 971 m (Baird pers. comm. in DoN 2005).

In the ETP, the population size of both *G. macrorhynchus* and *G. melas* was estimated at 589,315 (Gerrodette and Forcada 2002). At least nine sightings were made near Palmyra Atoll during the PICEAS program in July–November 2005 (Barlow et al. 2008). At least four acoustic detections of pilot whales were also made near Palmyra Atoll as well as to the north and east of the proposed survey area (Barlow et al. 2008; Rankin et al. 2008).

Pinniped

Only one species of pinniped has the potential to occur in the proposed survey area: the Hawaiian monk seal (*Monachus schauinslandi*). The Hawaiian monk seal is listed as **Endangered** under the ESA and **Critically Endangered** on the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species (IUCN 2011), and is listed in CITES Appendix I (UNEP-WCMC 2011). The Hawaiian monk seal occurs throughout the Hawaiian Island chain, mostly in six main breeding locations in the northwestern Hawaiian Islands, with a small but increasing number of births documented in the main Hawaiian Islands (Lowry and Aguilar 2008). It is estimated that the population has declined by 49% in 49 years. Since 1999 the population has declined at a rate of ~4% per year (Lowry and Aguilar 2008). The best estimate for the population is 1202 (NMFS 2007).

Monk seals are benthic foragers that feed on marine terraces of atolls and banks, generally to depths <40 m but occasionally to depths >500 m (Parrish et al. 2000; Stewart et al. 2006). Stewart et al. (2006) used satellite tracking to examine the foraging behavior of monk seals at the six main breeding colonies in the northwestern Hawaiian Islands. Foraging trips varied by sex and by age and ranged from <1 km up to 217 km from haul-out sites. Satellite tracking of Hawaiian monk seals in the main Hawaiian Islands revealed home ranges of 34–800 km². The home ranges for monk seals in the northwestern Hawaiian Islands were much greater (163–7400 km²; NMFS 2007).

Hawaiian monk seals are seen occasionally at Johnston Atoll, ~1400 km northwest of the northern end of the proposed survey area, and at least one birth has occurred at the atoll (NMFS 2007). In addition, twelve males were translocated to Johnston Atoll over the past 20 years. In the late 1980s, two Hawaiian monk seal sightings were reported at Palmyra Atoll (Westlake and Gilmartin 1990).

Given the very low population abundance and that the proposed survey area is >1400 km from their most common coastal habitat, sightings are not expected in the proposed survey area, and no takes are anticipated or requested.

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 central Pacific Ocean during May 2012.

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, echosounders, the ADCP, and 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, echosounders, or ADCP. 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 Appendix A of the EA.
- Then we discuss the potential impacts of operations by the echosounders and ADCP.
- Finally, we estimate the numbers of marine mammals that could be affected by the proposed survey in the central Pacific Ocean during May 2012. 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, in the unlikely event that it occurred, would constitute injury, but temporary threshold shift (TTS) is not an injury (Southall et al. 2007). Although the possibility cannot be entirely excluded, it is unlikely that the project would result in any cases of temporary or especially permanent hearing impairment, or any significant non-auditory physical or physiological effects. Some behavioral disturbance is expected, but this would be localized and short-term.

Tolerance

Numerous studies have shown that pulsed sounds from airguns are often readily detectable in the water at distances of many kilometers. For a summary of the characteristics of airgun pulses, see Appen-

dix A (3) in the EA. Several studies have shown that marine mammals at distances more than a few kilometers from operating seismic vessels often show no apparent response—see Appendix A (5) in the EA. 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 have been shown to react behaviorally to airgun pulses under some conditions, at other times mammals of both 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 (e.g., Richardson et al. 1986; McDonald et al. 1995; Greene et al. 1999a,b; Nieukirk et al. 2004; Smultea et al. 2004; Holst et al. 2005a,b, 2006; Dunn and Hernandez 2009). However, Clark and Gagnon (2006) reported that fin whales in the northeast Pacific Ocean went silent for an extended period starting soon after the onset of a seismic survey in the area. Similarly, there has been one report that sperm whales ceased calling when exposed to pulses from a very distant seismic ship (Bowles et al. 1994). However, more recent studies found that they continued calling in the presence of seismic pulses (Madsen et al. 2002; Tyack et al. 2003; Smultea et al. 2004; Holst et al. 2006; Jochens et al. 2008). Dolphins and porpoises commonly are heard calling while airguns are operating (e.g., Gordon et al. 2004; Smultea et al. 2004; Holst et al. 2005a,b; Potter et al. 2007). The sounds important to small odontocetes are predominantly at much higher frequencies than are the dominant components of airgun sounds, thus limiting the potential for masking. In general, masking effects of seismic pulses are expected to be minor, given the normally intermittent nature of seismic pulses. Masking effects on marine mammals are discussed further in Appendix A (4) of the EA.

Disturbance Reactions

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

Reactions to sound, if any, depend on species, state of maturity, experience, current activity, reproductive state, time of day, and many other factors (Richardson et al. 1995; Wartzok et al. 2004; Southall et al. 2007; Weilgart 2007). If a marine mammal does react briefly to an underwater sound by changing its behavior or moving a small distance, the impacts of the change are unlikely to be significant to the individual, let alone the stock or population. However, if a sound source displaces marine mammals from an important feeding or breeding area for a prolonged period, impacts on individuals and populations could be significant (e.g., Lusseau and Bejder 2007; Weilgart 2007). Given the many uncertainties in predicting the quantity and types of impacts of noise on marine mammals, it is common practice to estimate how many mammals would be present within a particular distance of industrial activities and/or exposed to a particular level of industrial sound. In most cases, this approach likely overestimates the numbers of marine mammals that would be affected in some biologically important manner.

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

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

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

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

Data collected by observers during several seismic surveys in the Northwest Atlantic showed that sighting rates of humpback whales were significantly greater during periods of no seismic compared with periods when a full array was operating (Moulton and Holst 2010). In addition, humpback whales were more likely to swim away and less likely to swim towards a vessel during seismic vs. non-seismic periods (Moulton and Holst 2010).

Humpback whales on their summer feeding grounds in southeast Alaska did not exhibit persistent avoidance when exposed to seismic pulses from a 1.64-L (100-in³) airgun (Malme et al. 1985). Some humpbacks seemed “startled” at received levels of 150–169 dB re 1 μPa . Malme et al. (1985) concluded

that there was no clear evidence of avoidance, despite the possibility of subtle effects, at received levels up to 172 re 1 μPa on an approximate rms basis. However, Moulton and Holst (2010) reported that humpback whales monitored during seismic surveys in the Northwest Atlantic had lower sighting rates and were most often seen swimming away from the vessel during seismic periods compared with periods when airguns were silent.

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

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

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

Various species of *Balaenoptera* (blue, sei, fin, and minke whales) have occasionally been seen in areas ensounded by airgun pulses (Stone 2003; MacLean and Haley 2004; Stone and Tasker 2006), and calls from blue and fin whales have been localized in areas with airgun operations (e.g., McDonald et al. 1995; Dunn and Hernandez 2009; Castellote et al. 2010). Sightings by observers on seismic vessels off the United Kingdom from 1997 to 2000 suggest that, during times of good sightability, sighting rates for mysticetes (mainly fin and sei whales) were similar when large arrays of airguns were shooting vs. silent (Stone 2003; Stone and Tasker 2006). However, these whales tended to exhibit localized avoidance, remaining significantly further (on average) from the airgun array during seismic operations compared with non-seismic periods (Stone and Tasker 2006). Castellote et al. (2010) reported that singing fin whales in the Mediterranean moved away from an operating airgun array.

Ship-based monitoring studies of baleen whales (including blue, fin, sei, minke, and humpback whales) in the Northwest Atlantic found that overall, this group had lower sighting rates during seismic vs. non-seismic periods (Moulton and Holst 2010). Baleen whales as a group were also seen significantly

farther from the vessel during seismic compared with non-seismic periods, and they were more often seen to be swimming away from the operating seismic vessel (Moulton and Holst 2010). Blue and minke whales were initially sighted significantly farther from the vessel during seismic operations compared to non-seismic periods; the same trend was observed for fin whales (Moulton and Holst 2010). Minke whales were most often observed to be swimming away from the vessel when seismic operations were underway (Moulton and Holst 2010).

Data on short-term reactions by cetaceans to impulsive noises are not necessarily indicative of long-term or biologically significant effects. It is not known whether impulsive sounds affect reproductive rate or distribution and habitat use in subsequent days or years. However, gray whales have continued to migrate annually along the west coast of North America with substantial increases in the population over recent years, despite intermittent seismic exploration (and much ship traffic) in that area for decades (Appendix A *in* Malme et al. 1984; Richardson et al. 1995; Allen and Angliss 2010). The western Pacific gray whale population did not seem affected by a seismic survey in its feeding ground during a previous year (Johnson et al. 2007). Similarly, bowhead whales have continued to travel to the eastern Beaufort Sea each summer, and their numbers have increased notably, despite seismic exploration in their summer and autumn range for many years (Richardson et al. 1987; Allen and Angliss 2010).

Toothed Whales.—Little systematic information is available about reactions of toothed whales to noise pulses. Few studies similar to the more extensive baleen whale/seismic pulse work summarized above and (in more detail) in Appendix A of the EA have been reported for toothed whales. However, there are recent systematic studies on sperm whales (e.g., Gordon et al. 2006; Madsen et al. 2006; Winsor and Mate 2006; Jochens et al. 2008; Miller et al. 2009). There is an increasing amount of information about responses of various odontocetes to seismic surveys based on monitoring studies (e.g., Stone 2003; Smultea et al. 2004; Moulton and Miller 2005; Bain and Williams 2006; Holst et al. 2006; Stone and Tasker 2006; Potter et al. 2007; Hauser et al. 2008; Holst and Smultea 2008; Weir 2008; Barkaszi et al. 2009; Richardson et al. 2009; Moulton and Holst 2010).

Seismic operators and marine mammal observers on seismic vessels regularly see dolphins and other small toothed whales near operating airgun arrays, but in general there is a tendency for most delphinids to show some avoidance of operating seismic vessels (e.g., Goold 1996a,b,c; Calambokidis and Osmeck 1998; Stone 2003; Moulton and Miller 2005; Holst et al. 2006; Stone and Tasker 2006; Weir 2008; Barkaszi et al. 2009; Richardson et al. 2009; Moulton and Holst 2010). Some dolphins seem to be attracted to the seismic vessel and floats, and some ride the bow wave of the seismic vessel even when large arrays of airguns are firing (e.g., Moulton and Miller 2005). Nonetheless, small toothed whales more often tend to head away, or to maintain a somewhat greater distance from the vessel, when a large array of airguns is operating than when it is silent (e.g., Stone and Tasker 2006; Weir 2008; Barry et al. 2010; Moulton and Holst 2010). In most cases the avoidance radii for delphinids appear to be small, on the order of 1 km less, and some individuals show no apparent avoidance. The beluga is a species that (at least at times) shows long-distance avoidance of seismic vessels. Aerial surveys conducted in the southeastern Beaufort Sea during summer found that sighting rates of beluga whales were significantly lower at distances 10–20 km compared with 20–30 km from an operating airgun array, and observers on seismic boats in that area rarely see belugas (Miller et al. 2005; Harris et al. 2007).

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

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

Most studies of sperm whales exposed to airgun sounds indicate that the sperm whale shows considerable tolerance of airgun pulses (e.g., Stone 2003; Stone and Tasker 2006; Weir 2008; Moulton and Holst 2010). In most cases the whales do not show strong avoidance, and they continue to call (see Appendix A of the EA for review). However, controlled exposure experiments in the Gulf of Mexico indicate that foraging behavior was altered upon exposure to airgun sound (Jochens et al. 2008; Miller et al. 2009; Tyack 2009).

There are almost no specific data on the behavioral reactions of beaked whales to seismic surveys. However, some northern bottlenose whales remained in the general area and continued to produce high-frequency clicks when exposed to sound pulses from distant seismic surveys (Gosselin and Lawson 2004; Laurinolli and Cochrane 2005; Simard et al. 2005). Most beaked whales tend to avoid approaching vessels of other types (e.g., Würsig et al. 1998). They may also dive for an extended period when approached by a vessel (e.g., Kasuya 1986), although it is uncertain how much longer such dives may be as compared to dives by undisturbed beaked whales, which also are often quite long (Baird et al. 2006; Tyack et al. 2006). Based on a single observation, Aguilar-Soto et al. (2006) suggested that foraging efficiency of Cuvier's beaked whales may be reduced by close approach of vessels. 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. In fact, Moulton and Holst (2010) reported 15 sightings of beaked whales during seismic studies in the Northwest Atlantic; seven of those sightings were made at times when at least one airgun was operating. There was little evidence to indicate that beaked whale behavior was affected by airgun operations; sighting rates and distances were similar during seismic and non-seismic periods (Moulton and Holst 2010).

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

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

Pinnipeds.—Pinnipeds are not likely to show a strong avoidance reaction to the airgun array. Visual monitoring from seismic vessels has shown only slight (if any) avoidance of airguns by pinnipeds, and only slight (if any) changes in behavior—see Appendix A (5) of the EA. In the Beaufort Sea, some ringed seals avoided an area of 100 m to (at most) a few hundred meters around seismic vessels, but many

seals remained within 100–200 m of the trackline as the operating airgun array passed by (e.g., Harris et al. 2001; Moulton and Lawson 2002; Miller et al. 2005). Ringed seal sightings averaged somewhat farther away from the seismic vessel when the airguns were operating than when they were not, but the difference was small (Moulton and Lawson 2002). Similarly, in Puget Sound, sighting distances for harbor seals and California sea lions tended to be larger when airguns were operating (Calambokidis and Osmeck 1998). Previous telemetry work suggests that avoidance and other behavioral reactions may be stronger than evident to date from visual studies (Thompson et al. 1998).

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

Hearing Impairment and Other Physical Effects

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

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

Recommendations for new science-based noise exposure criteria for marine mammals, frequency-weighting procedures, and related matters have been published (Southall et al. 2007). Those recommendations have not, as of mid 2011, been formally adopted by NMFS for use in regulatory processes and during mitigation programs associated with seismic surveys. However, some aspects of the recommendations have been taken into account in certain environmental impact statements and small-take authorizations. NMFS has indicated that it may issue new noise exposure criteria for marine mammals that account for the now-available scientific data on TTS, the expected offset between the TTS and PTS thresholds, differences in the acoustic frequencies to which different marine mammal groups are sensitive (e.g., M-weighting or generalized frequency weightings for various groups of marine mammals, allowing for their functional bandwidths), and other relevant factors. Preliminary information about possible changes in the regulatory and mitigation requirements, and about the possible structure of new criteria, was given by Wieting (2004) and NMFS (2005).

Several aspects of the planned monitoring and mitigation measures for this project are designed to detect marine mammals occurring near the airgun array, and to avoid exposing them to sound pulses that

might, at least in theory, cause hearing impairment (see § XI and § XIII). In addition, many cetaceans and (to a limited degree) sea turtles show some avoidance of the area where received levels of airgun sound are high enough such that hearing impairment could potentially occur. In those cases, the avoidance responses of the animals themselves will reduce or (most likely) avoid any possibility of hearing impairment.

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

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

For toothed whales exposed to single short pulses, the TTS threshold appears to be, to a first approximation, a function of the energy content of the pulse (Finneran et al. 2002, 2005). Based on these data, the received energy level of a single seismic pulse (with no frequency weighting) might need to be ~ 186 dB re $1 \mu\text{Pa}^2 \cdot \text{s}$ (i.e., 186 dB SEL or ~ 196 – 201 dB re $1 \mu\text{Pa}_{\text{rms}}$) in order to produce brief, mild TTS¹. Exposure to several strong seismic pulses that each have received levels near 190 dB re $1 \mu\text{Pa}_{\text{rms}}$ might result in cumulative exposure of ~ 186 dB SEL and thus slight TTS in a small odontocete assuming the TTS threshold is (to a first approximation) a function of the total received pulse energy; however, this ‘equal-energy’ concept is an oversimplification. The distances from the *Langseth*’s airguns at which the received energy level (per pulse, flat-weighted) would be expected to be ≥ 190 dB re $1 \mu\text{Pa}_{\text{rms}}$ are estimated in Table 1. Levels ≥ 190 dB re $1 \mu\text{Pa}_{\text{rms}}$ are expected to be restricted to radii no more than 20 m (Table 1). For an odontocete closer to the surface, the maximum radius with ≥ 190 dB re $1 \mu\text{Pa}_{\text{rms}}$ would be smaller.

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

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

For baleen whales, there are no data, direct or indirect, on levels or properties of sound that are required to induce TTS. The frequencies to which baleen whales are most sensitive are assumed to be lower than those to which odontocetes are most sensitive, and natural background noise levels at those low frequencies tend to be higher. As a result, auditory thresholds of baleen whales within their frequency band of best hearing are believed to be higher (less sensitive) than are those of odontocetes at their best frequencies (Clark and Ellison 2004). From this, it is suspected that received levels causing TTS onset may also be higher in baleen whales (Southall et al. 2007). In any event, no cases of TTS are expected given three considerations: (1) the low abundance of baleen whales in the planned study area at the time of the survey; (2) the strong likelihood that baleen whales would avoid the approaching airguns (or vessel) before being exposed to levels high enough for TTS to occur; and (3) the mitigation measures that are planned.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Southall et al. (2007) also note that, regardless of the SEL, there is concern about the possibility of PTS if a cetacean received one or more pulses with peak pressure exceeding 230 or 218 dB re $1 \mu\text{Pa}$ (peak), respectively. Thus, PTS might be expected upon exposure of cetaceans to *either* SEL ≥ 198 dB re $1 \mu\text{Pa}^2 \cdot \text{s}$ *or* peak pressure ≥ 230 dB re $1 \mu\text{Pa}$. Corresponding proposed dual criteria for pinnipeds (at least harbor seals) are ≥ 186 dB SEL and ≥ 218 dB peak pressure (Southall et al. 2007). These estimates are all first approximations, given the limited underlying data, assumptions, species differences, and evidence that the “equal energy” model may not be entirely correct. A peak pressure of 230 dB re $1 \mu\text{Pa}$ (3.2 bar·m, 0-pk) would only be found within a few meters of the GI airguns planned for this survey (e.g., Caldwell and Dragoset 2000). A peak pressure of 218 dB re $1 \mu\text{Pa}$ could be received somewhat farther away; to estimate that specific distance, one would need to apply a model that accurately calculates peak pressures in the near-field around an array of airguns.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

In general, very little is known about the potential for seismic survey sounds (or other types of strong underwater sounds) to cause non-auditory physical effects in marine mammals. Such effects, if they occur at all, would presumably be limited to short distances and to activities that extend over a prolonged period. The available data do not allow identification of a specific exposure level above which

non-auditory effects can be expected (Southall et al. 2007), or any meaningful quantitative predictions of the numbers (if any) of marine mammals that might be affected in those ways. Marine mammals that show behavioral avoidance of seismic vessels, including most baleen whales, some odontocetes, and some pinnipeds are especially unlikely to incur non-auditory physical effects. Also, the planned mitigation measures (§ XI), including shut downs of the airguns, will reduce any such effects that might otherwise occur.

Possible Effects of Multibeam Echosounder Signals

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

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

Masking

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

Behavioral Responses

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

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

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

Hearing Impairment and Other Physical Effects

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

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

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

Possible Effects of the Sub-bottom Profiler Signals

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

Masking

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

Behavioral Responses

Marine mammal behavioral reactions to other pulsed sound sources are discussed above, and responses to the SBP are likely to be similar to those for other pulsed sources if received at the same levels. However, the pulsed signals from the SBP are considerably weaker than those from the MBES. Therefore, behavioral responses are not expected unless marine mammals are very close to the source.

Hearing Impairment and Other Physical Effects

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

Possible Effects of Acoustic Doppler Current Profiler Signals

An ADCP will be operated during the proposed program. Sounds from the ADCP are very short, occurring every 0.65 ms to 1.4 s. Most of the energy in the sound emitted is at high frequencies (~75 kHz). The ADCP produces sounds that are within the range of frequencies used by odontocetes that occur or may occur in the area of the planned survey.

Masking

Whereas the ADCP produce sounds within the frequency range used by odontocetes that may be present in the survey area, marine mammal communications will not be masked appreciably by the signals. This is a consequence of the relatively low power output, low duty cycle, and brief period when an individual mammal is likely to be within the area of potential effects. In the case of mysticetes, the pulses do not overlap with the predominant frequencies in the calls, which would avoid significant masking.

Behavioral Responses

When a 38-kHz echosounder and a 150-kHz ADCP were transmitting during studies in the Eastern Tropical Pacific, baleen whales showed no significant responses, while spotted and spinner dolphins were detected slightly more often and beaked whales less often during visual surveys (Gerrodette and Pettis

2005). Marine mammal behavioral reactions to other sound sources are discussed above. Responses to the ADCP are likely to be similar to those for other sources if received at the same levels. The signals from the ADCP are weaker than those from the echosounders and the airguns. Therefore, behavioral responses are not expected unless marine mammals are very close to the source.

Hearing Impairment and Other Physical Effects

Source levels of the ADCP are lower than those of the airguns, which are discussed above. It is unlikely that the ADCP produces sound levels strong enough to cause temporary hearing impairment or (especially) physical injuries even in an animal that is (briefly) in a position near the source.

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 pair of 105-in³ GI airguns to be used during ~1400 km of seismic surveys in the central Pacific 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 or ADCP 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 ADCP given their characteristics (e.g., narrow downward-directed beam) and other considerations described in § I. 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”

We used densities from two sources: (1) SWFSC has recently developed habitat modeling as a method to estimate cetacean densities on a finer spatial scale than traditional line-transect analyses by using a continuous function of habitat variables, e.g., sea surface temperature, depth, distance from shore, and prey density (Barlow et al. 2009b). For the ETP, the models are based on data from 12 SWFSC ship-based cetacean and ecosystem assessment surveys conducted during July–December 1986–2006, extending just to the east of the proposed survey area. The models have been incorporated into a web-based Geographic Information System (GIS) developed by Duke University’s Department of Defense Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program (SERDP) team in close collaboration with the SWFSC SERDP team (Read et al. 2009). For the cetacean species in the model, we used the GIS to obtain mean densities near the proposed survey area, i.e., in a rectangle bounded by 150 and 156°W and 5 and 10°N. (2) For species not included in the model, we used densities from the offshore stratum of the surveys of Hawaiian waters conducted in August–November 2002 (Barlow 2006).

Table 3 gives the estimated densities for each cetacean species that could occur in the proposed survey area. The densities have been corrected for both trackline detection probability and availability bias by the authors. Trackline detection probability bias is associated with diminishing sightability with

TABLE 3. Densities of marine mammals near the proposed survey area. Cetacean densities are based on NMFS SWFSC ETP ship transect surveys conducted in 1986–2006 from predictive modeling (Barlow et al. 2009b; Read et al. 2009) or in 2002 from Barlow (2006). See text for details. Densities are corrected for $f(0)$ and $g(0)$. Species listed as "Endangered" under the ESA are in italics.

Species	Density (#/1000 km ²)	Source ¹
Mysticetes		
<i>Humpback whale</i>	0	
Minke whale	0	
Bryde's whale	0.58	Read et al. (2009)
<i>Sei whale</i>	0	
<i>Fin whale</i>	0	
<i>Blue whale</i>	0.01	Read et al. (2009)
Odontocetes		
<i>Sperm whale</i>	3.03	Barlow (2006)
Pygmy sperm whale	0.03	Read et al. (2009)
Dwarf sperm whale	7.82	Barlow (2006)
Cuvier's beaked whale	6.80	Barlow (2006)
Longman's beaked whale	0.45	Barlow (2006)
Mesoplodon spp. ²	0.35	Read et al. (2009)
Rough-toothed dolphin	1.24	Read et al. (2009)
Bottlenose dolphin	4.94	Read et al. (2009)
Pantropical spotted dolphin	120.4	Read et al. (2009)
Spinner dolphin	183.5	Read et al. (2009)
Striped dolphin	16.45	Read et al. (2009)
Fraser's dolphin	4.57	Barlow (2006)
Risso's dolphin	0.83	Barlow (2006)
Melon-headed whale	1.32	Barlow (2006)
Pygmy killer whale	0	
False killer whale	0.11	Barlow (2006)
Killer whale	0.16	Barlow (2006)
Short-finned pilot whale	5.07	Read et al. (2009)
Pinnipeds		
<i>Hawaiian monk seal</i>	0	

¹ Where no source is given, the species was not included in Read et al. (2009) or Barlow (2006).

² Includes ginkgo-toothed and Blainville's beaked whales.

increasing lateral distance from the trackline [$f(0)$]. Availability bias refers to the fact that there is less-than-100% probability of sighting an animal that is present along the survey trackline, and it is measured by $g(0)$.

Because survey effort within the proposed survey area is limited, and densities for some species are from offshore Hawaiian waters, there is some uncertainty about the representativeness of the data and the assumptions used in the calculations below. However, the approach used here is believed to be the best available approach.

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

It should be noted that the following estimates of exposures to various sound levels assume that the surveys will be fully completed; in fact, the 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 ship surveys, inclement weather and equipment malfunctions are likely to cause delays and may limit the number of useful line-kilometers of seismic operations that can be undertaken. Furthermore, any marine mammal sightings within or near the designated exclusion zone will result in the 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 $\mu\text{Pa}_{\text{rms}}$ sounds are precautionary, and probably overestimate the actual numbers of marine mammals that might be involved. These estimates assume that there will be no weather, equipment, or mitigation delays, which is highly unlikely.

Furthermore, as summarized in § IV(1)(a) and Appendix A (5), delphinids and pinnipeds 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, 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 to ≥ 160 dB

Number of Cetaceans that could be Exposed to ≥ 160 dB.—The number of different individuals that could be exposed to airgun sounds with received levels ≥ 160 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}_{\text{rms}}$ on one or more occasions can be estimated by considering the expected density of animals in the area along with the total marine area that would be within the 160-dB radius around the operating airgun array on at least one occasion. 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. There is little overlap in the proposed survey; the area including overlap is 1.01 x the area excluding overlap, so a marine mammal that stayed in the survey area during the entire survey could be exposed once, 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 $\mu\text{Pa}_{\text{rms}}$ 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. Areas of overlap were included only once when estimating the number of individuals exposed.

Applying the approach described above, $\sim 1853 \text{ km}^2$ ($\sim 2316 \text{ km}^2$ including the 25% contingency) would be within the 160-dB isopleth during the survey. Because this approach does not allow for turnover in the mammal populations in the proposed survey area during the course of the survey, the actual number of individuals exposed could be underestimated. However, the approach assumes that no cetaceans will move away from or toward the trackline as the *Langseth* approaches in response to increasing sound levels prior to the time the levels reach 160 dB, which will result in overestimates for those species known to avoid seismic vessels (see § IV a).

Table 4 shows estimates of the number of different individual marine mammals that potentially could be exposed to ≥ 160 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}_{\text{rms}}$ during the seismic survey if no animals moved away from the survey vessel. The *Requested Take Authorization* is given in the far right column of Table 4. For *Endangered*

TABLE 4. Estimates of the possible numbers of different individuals that could be exposed during L-DEO's proposed seismic survey in the Line Islands, central Pacific Ocean, in May 2012. The proposed sound source consists of a pair of 105-in³ GI airguns. Received levels of seismic sounds are expressed in dB re 1 μ Pa (rms, averaged over pulse duration), consistent with NMFS' practice. Not all marine mammals will change their behavior when exposed to these sound levels, but some may alter their behavior when levels are lower (see text). Species in italics are listed under the ESA as endangered or threatened. The column of numbers in boldface shows the numbers of "takes" for which authorization is requested.

Species	Number ¹	% Regional Pop'n ²	Requested Take Authorization
Mysticetes			
<i>Humpback whale</i>	0	0	0
Minke whale	0	0	0
Bryde's whale	1	0.01	4⁴
<i>Sei whale</i>	0	0	0
<i>Fin whale</i>	0	0	0
<i>Blue whale</i>	0	<0.01	0
Odontocetes			
<i>Sperm whale</i>	7	0.03	8⁴
Pygmy sperm whale	0	NA	0
Dwarf sperm whale	18	0.16	18
Cuvier's beaked whale	16	0.08	16
Longman's beaked whale	1	0.36	14⁴
Mesoplodon spp. ³	1	<0.01	4⁴
Rough-toothed dolphin	3	<0.01	13⁴
Bottlenose dolphin	11	<0.01	12⁴
Pantropical spotted dolphin	279	0.06	279
Spinner dolphin	425	0.02	425
Striped dolphin	38	<0.01	46⁴
Fraser's dolphin	11	<0.01	182⁴
Risso's dolphin	2	<0.01	14⁴
Melon-headed whale	3	0.01	101⁴
Pygmy killer whale	0	0	0
False killer whale	0	<0.01	9⁴
Killer whale	0	<0.01	0
Short-finned pilot whale	12	<0.01	24⁴
Pinnipeds			
<i>Hawaiian monk seal</i>	0	0	0

NA = not available.

¹ Estimates are based on densities from Table 3 and an ensouified area (including 25% contingency) of 2316 km².

² Regional population size estimates are from Table 2.

³ Could include ginkgo-toothed and/or Blainville's beaked whales.

⁴ Requested Take Authorization increased to mean group size (see text on page 59).

species, the **Requested Take Authorization** has been increased to the mean group size in the ETP (Jackson et al. 2008) for the particular species in cases where the calculated number of individuals exposed was between 0.05 and the mean group size (i.e., for the sperm whale). For non-listed species, the **Requested Take Authorization** has been increased to the mean group size in the PICEAS survey area (Barlow et al. 2008) for the particular species in cases where the calculated number of individuals exposed was between 1 and the mean group size. For the false killer whale, which was not sighted in any of the surveys used to

estimate densities but was sighted relatively frequently near Palmyra Atoll during the PICEAS survey, the **Requested Take Authorization** was also increased to the mean group size.

The estimate of the number of individual cetaceans that could be exposed to seismic sounds with received levels ≥ 160 dB re $1 \mu\text{Pa}_{\text{rms}}$ during the proposed survey is 828 (Table 4). That total includes 7 sperm whales (listed as **Endangered** under the ESA) or 0.03% of the regional population.

In addition, 18 beaked whales (16 Cuvier's, 1 Longman's, and 1 *Mesoplodon* spp.) could be exposed during the survey (Table 4). Most (94.7%) of the cetaceans potentially exposed are delphinids; spinner, pantropical spotted, and striped dolphins are estimated to be the most common species in the area, with estimates of 425 (0.02% of the regional population), 279 (0.06%), and 38 ($<0.01\%$) exposed to ≥ 160 dB re $1 \mu\text{Pa}_{\text{rms}}$, respectively. As noted above, a more meaningful estimate for delphinids would be for sound levels ≥ 170 dB.

Number of Pinnipeds that could be Exposed to ≥ 160 dB.—The Hawaiian monk seal was sighted in the 1980s at Palmyra Atoll near the proposed survey area, but given its very low population abundance and the fact that the proposed survey area is >1800 km from its most common coastal habitat, sightings are not expected in the proposed survey area and therefore no takes are anticipated or requested.

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, SBP, and ADCP. The survey will employ a pair of 105-in³ GI airguns similar to the airguns used for typical low-energy seismic surveys. The total airgun discharge volume is ~ 210 in³. 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 or ADCP operations given the considerations discussed in § I, i.e., sounds are beamed downward, the beam is narrow, and the pulses are extremely short.

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

Odontocete reactions to seismic pulses, or at least the reactions of delphinids and Dall's porpoise, are expected to extend to lesser distances than are those of mysticetes. Odontocete low-frequency hearing is less sensitive than that of mysticetes, and dolphins are often seen from seismic vessels. In fact, there are documented instances of dolphins approaching active seismic vessels. However, delphinids (along with other cetaceans) sometimes show avoidance responses and/or other changes in behavior when near operating seismic vessels.

Taking into account the low-energy source and mitigation measures that are planned (see § XI), effects on cetaceans are generally expected to be limited to avoidance of the area around the seismic operation and short-term changes in behavior, falling within the MMPA definition of “Level B harassment”.

Estimates of the numbers of marine mammals that might be exposed to airgun sounds ≥ 160 dB re $1 \mu\text{Pa}_{\text{rms}}$ during the proposed program have been presented with a corresponding requested “take authorization” for each species. Those figures likely overestimate the actual number of animals that will be exposed to and will react to the seismic sounds. The reasons for that conclusion are outlined above.

The relatively short-term exposures are unlikely to result in any long-term negative consequences for the individuals or their populations.

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

Pinnipeds.— Only one species of pinniped has the potential to occur in the proposed survey area: the Hawaiian monk seal. However, given the very low population size and the distance between the proposed survey area and its main habitat in Hawaii, the monk seal is unlikely to be encountered during the proposed survey.

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 will 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. The following sections briefly review effects of airguns on fish and invertebrates, and more details are included in Appendices C and D of the EA, respectively.

Effects on Fish

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

The specific received sound levels at which permanent adverse effects to fish potentially could occur are little studied and largely unknown. Furthermore, the available information on the impacts of seismic surveys on marine fish is from studies of individuals or portions of a population; there have been no studies at the population scale. The studies of individual fish have often been on caged fish that were exposed to airgun pulses in situations not representative of an actual seismic survey. Thus, available

information provides limited insight on possible real-world effects at the ocean or population scale. This makes drawing conclusions about impacts on fish problematic because, ultimately, the most important issues concern effects on marine fish populations, their viability, and their availability to fisheries.

Hastings and Popper (2005), Popper (2009), and Popper and Hastings (2009a,b) provided recent critical reviews of the known effects of sound on fish. The following sections provide a general synopsis of the available information on the effects of exposure to seismic and other anthropogenic sound as relevant to fish. The information comprises results from scientific studies of varying degrees of rigor plus some anecdotal information. Some of the data sources may have serious shortcomings in methods, analysis, interpretation, and reproducibility that must be considered when interpreting their results (see Hastings and Popper 2005). Potential adverse effects of the program's sound sources on marine fish are then noted.

Pathological Effects

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

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

Wardle et al. (2001) suggested that in water, acute injury and death of organisms exposed to seismic energy depends primarily on two features of the sound source: (1) the received peak pressure and (2) the time required for the pressure to rise and decay. Generally, as received pressure increases, the period for the pressure to rise and decay decreases, and the chance of acute pathological effects increases. According to Buchanan et al. (2004), for the types of seismic airguns and arrays involved with the proposed program, the pathological (mortality) zone for fish would be expected to be within a few meters of the seismic source. Numerous other studies provide examples of no fish mortality upon exposure to seismic sources (Falk and Lawrence 1973; Holliday et al. 1987; La Bella et al. 1996; Santulli et al. 1999; McCauley et al. 2000a,b, 2003; Bjarti 2002; Thomsen 2002; Hassel et al. 2003; Popper et al. 2005; Boeger et al. 2006).

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

Physiological Effects

Physiological effects refer to cellular and/or biochemical responses of fish to acoustic stress. Such stress potentially could affect fish populations by increasing mortality or reducing reproductive success. Primary and secondary stress responses of fish after exposure to seismic survey sound appear to be temporary in all studies done to date (Sverdrup et al. 1994; Santulli et al. 1999; McCauley et al. 2000a,b). The periods necessary for the biochemical changes to return to normal are variable and depend on numerous aspects of the biology of the species and of the sound stimulus (see Appendix D of the EA).

Behavioral Effects

Behavioral effects include changes in the distribution, migration, mating, and catchability of fish populations. Studies investigating the possible effects of sound (including seismic survey sound) on fish behavior have been conducted on both uncaged and caged individuals (e.g., Chapman and Hawkins 1969; Pearson et al. 1992; Santulli et al. 1999; Wardle et al. 2001; Hassel et al. 2003). Typically, in these studies fish exhibited a sharp “startle” response at the onset of a sound followed by habituation and a return to normal behavior after the sound ceased.

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

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

Effects on Invertebrates

The existing body of information on the impacts of seismic survey sound on marine invertebrates is very limited. However, there is some unpublished and very limited evidence of the potential for adverse effects on invertebrates, thereby justifying further discussion and analysis of this issue. The three types of potential effects of exposure to seismic surveys on marine invertebrates are pathological, physiological, and behavioral. Based on the physical structure of their sensory organs, marine invertebrates appear to be

specialized to respond to particle displacement components of an impinging sound field and not to the pressure component (Popper et al. 2001; see also Appendix E of the EA).

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

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

Pathological Effects

In water, lethal and sub-lethal injury to organisms exposed to seismic survey sound appears to depend on at least two features of the sound source: (1) the received peak pressure, and (2) the time required for the pressure to rise and decay. Generally, as received pressure increases, the period for the pressure to rise and decay decreases, and the chance of acute pathological effects increases. For the type of airgun array planned for the proposed program, the pathological (mortality) zone for crustaceans and cephalopods is expected to be within a few meters of the seismic source, at most; however, very few specific data are available on levels of seismic signals that might damage these animals. This premise is based on the peak pressure and rise/decay time characteristics of seismic airgun arrays currently in use around the world.

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

Physiological Effects

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

normal are variable and depend on numerous aspects of the biology of the species and of the sound stimulus.

Behavioral Effects

There is increasing interest in assessing the possible direct and indirect effects of seismic and other sounds on invertebrate behavior, particularly in relation to the consequences for fisheries. Changes in behavior could potentially affect such aspects as reproductive success, distribution, susceptibility to predation, and catchability by fisheries. Studies investigating the possible behavioral effects of exposure to seismic survey sound on crustaceans and cephalopods have been conducted on both uncaged and caged animals. In some cases, invertebrates exhibited startle responses (e.g., squid in McCauley et al. 2000a,b). In other cases, no behavioral impacts were noted (e.g., crustaceans in Christian et al. 2003, 2004; DFO 2004). There have been anecdotal reports of reduced catch rates of shrimp shortly after exposure to seismic surveys; however, other studies have not observed any significant changes in shrimp catch rate (Andriguetto-Filho et al. 2005). Similarly, Parry and Gason (2006) did not find any evidence that lobster catch rates were affected by seismic surveys. Any adverse effects on crustacean and cephalopod behavior or fisheries attributable to seismic survey sound depend on the species in question and the nature of the fishery (season, duration, fishing method).

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. 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.

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.

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 the EEZs of the U.S. and Kiribati.

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 low-energy 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

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. After considering what energy source level was necessary to achieve the research goals, the PIs determined that although the R/V *Langseth* has sophisticated, high-resolution seismic capability, the use of a pair of 105-in³ GI airguns was adequate to meet the research goals.

Proposed Exclusion Zones

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

Empirical data concerning the 190-, 180-, 170- and 160-dB distances were acquired for various airgun arrays based on measurements during the acoustic verification studies conducted by L DEO in the northern Gulf of Mexico in 2003 (6-, 10-, 12-, and 20-airgun arrays, and 2 GI airguns; Tolstoy et al. 2004) and 2007–2008 (36-airgun array; Tolstoy et al. 2009). Results for the 36-airgun array are not relevant for the 2 GI airguns to be used in the proposed survey. The empirical data for the 6-, 10-, 12-, and 20-airgun arrays indicate that, for deep water (>1000 m), the L-DEO model tends to overestimate the received sound levels at a given distance (Tolstoy et al. 2004). Measurements were not made for the 2 GI airgun array in deep water, however, we propose to use the safety radii predicted by L-DEO’s model for the proposed GI airgun operations in deep water, although they are likely conservative given the empirical results for the other arrays.

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

Detailed recommendations for new science-based noise exposure criteria were published in early 2008 (Southall et al. 2007). 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) speed or course alteration, (2) shut-down procedures, and (3) ramp-up procedures.

Speed or Course Alteration

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

Shut-down Procedures

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

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

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

Ramp-up Procedures

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

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

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 central Pacific 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, three 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.

When mammals or turtles are detected within or about to enter the designated exclusion zone, the airguns will immediately be shut down. The PSO(s) will continue to maintain watch to determine when the animal(s) are outside the exclusion zone. Airgun operations will not resume until the animal has left the exclusion zone.

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 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 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 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

Marine Mammals and Acoustics

- Acevedo, A. and M.A. Smultea. 1995. First records of humpback whales including calves at Golfo Dulce and Isla del Coco, Costa Rica, suggesting geographical overlap of northern and southern hemisphere populations. **Mar. Mamm. Sci.** 11(4):554-560.
- Aguilar, A. 2009. Fin whale *Balaenoptera physalus*. p. 433-437 In: W.F. Perrin, B. Würsig, and J.G.M. Thewissen (eds.) Encyclopedia of marine mammals, 2nd edit. Academic Press, San Diego, CA. 1316 p.
- Aguilar-Soto, N., M. Johnson, P.T. Madsen, P.L. Tyack, A. Bocconcelli, and J.F. Borsani. 2006. Does intense ship noise disrupt foraging in deep-diving Cuvier’s beaked whales (*Ziphius cavirostris*)? **Mar. Mamm. Sci.** 22(3):690-699.
- Allen, B.M. and R.P. Angliss. 2010. Alaska marine mammal stock assessments, 2009. U.S. Dep. Commer., NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-AFSC-206. 276 p.
- Archer, F.I. 2009. Striped dolphin *Stenella coeruleoalba*. p. 1127-1129 In: W.F. Perrin, B. Würsig, and J.G.M. Thewissen (eds.), Encyclopedia of marine mammals, 2nd edit. Academic Press, San Diego, CA. 1316 p.
- Arnbom, T. and H. Whitehead. 1989. Observations on the composition and behaviour of groups of female sperm whale near the Galápagos Islands. **Can. J. Zool.** 67(1):1-7.
- Au, D.K.W. and W.L. Perryman. 1985. Dolphin habitats in the eastern tropical Pacific. **Fish. Bull.** 83(4):623-643.
- Bain, D.E. and R. Williams. 2006. Long-range effects of airgun noise on marine mammals: responses as a function of received sound level and distance. Working Pap. SC/58/E35. Int. Whal. Comm., Cambridge, U.K. 13 p.

- Baird, R.W. 2009a. Risso's dolphin. p. 975-976 *In*: W.F. Perrin, B. Würsig, and J.G.M. Thewissen (eds.), *Encyclopedia of marine mammals*, 2nd edit. Academic Press, San Diego, CA. 1316 p.
- Baird, R.W. 2009b. False killer whale. p. 405-406 *In*: W.F. Perrin, B. Würsig, and J.G.M. Thewissen (eds.), *Encyclopedia of marine mammals*, 2nd edit. Academic Press, San Diego, CA. 1316 p.
- Baird, R.W., A.D. Ligon, and S.K. Hooker. 2000. Sub-surface and night-time behavior of humpback whales off Maui, Hawaii: a preliminary report. Rep. prepared under Contract #40ABNC050729 from the Hawaiian Islands Humpback Whale National Marine Sanctuary, Kihei, HI, to the Hawaii Wildlife Fund, Paia, HI.
- Baird, R.W., M.B. Hanson, E.A. Ashe, M.R. Heithaus, and G.J. Marshall. 2003. Studies of foraging in "southern resident" killer whales during July 2002: dive depths, bursts in speed, and the use of a "Critttercam" system for examining sub-surface behavior. Rep. for the Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., Nat. Mar. Mamm. Lab., Seattle, WA.
- Baird, R.W., D.L. Webster, D.J. McSweeney, A.D. Ligon, G.S. Schorr, and J. Barlow. 2006. Diving behavior and ecology of Cuvier's (*Ziphius cavirostris*) and Blainville's (*Mesoplodon densirostris*) beaked whales in Hawaii. **Can. J. Zool.** 84(8):1120-1128.
- Baker, C.S., L.M. Herman, B.G. Bays, and G.B. Bauer. 1983. The impact of vessel traffic on the behavior of humpback whales in southeast Alaska: 1982 season. Rep. from Kewalo Basin Mar. Mamm. Lab., Honolulu, HI, for U.S. Nat. Mar. Mamm. Lab., Seattle, WA. 30 p. + fig., tables.
- Balcomb, K.C., III and D.E. Claridge. 2001. A mass stranding of cetaceans caused by naval sonar in the Bahamas. **Bahamas J. Sci.** 8(2):2-12.
- Barkaszi, M.J., D.M. Epperson, and B. Bennett. 2009. Six-year compilation of cetacean sighting data collected during commercial seismic survey mitigation observations throughout the Gulf of Mexico, USA. p. 24-25 *In*: *Abstr. 18th Bienn. Conf. Biol. Mar. Mamm., Québec, Canada, Oct. 2009.* 306 p.
- Barlow, J. 2003. Cetacean abundance in Hawaiian waters during summer/fall 2002. Admin. Rep. LJ-03-13, Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., Southwest Fish. Sci. Center, La Jolla, CA. 31 p.
- Barlow, J. 2006. Cetacean abundance in Hawaiian waters estimated from a summer/fall survey in 2002. **Mar. Mamm. Sci.** 22(2):446-464.
- Barlow, J. and R. Gisiner. 2006. Mitigating, monitoring and assessing the effects of anthropogenic sound on beaked whales. **J. Cetac. Res. Manage.** 7(3):239-249.
- Barlow, J. and S. Rankin. 2007. False killer whale abundance and density: preliminary estimates for the PICEAS study area south of Hawaii and new estimates for the US EEZ around Hawaii. Admin. Rep. LJ-07-02, Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., Southwest Fish. Sci. Center, La Jolla, CA. 15 p.
- Barlow, J., S. Rankin, E. Zele, and J. Appler. 2004. Marine mammal data collected during the Hawaiian Islands cetacean and ecosystem assessment survey (HICEAS) conducted aboard the NOAA ships *McArthur* and *David Starr Jordan*, July–December 2002. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SWFSC-362. Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., Southwest Fish. Sci. Center, La Jolla, CA. 39 p.
- Barlow, J., S. Rankin, A. Jackson, and A. Henry. 2008. Marine mammal data collected during the Pacific Islands cetacean and ecosystem assessment survey (PICEAS) conducted aboard the NOAA ship *McArthur II*, July–November 2005. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SWFSC-420. Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., Southwest Fish. Sci. Center, La Jolla, CA. 27 p.
- Barlow, J., J. Calambokidis, E.A. Falcone, C.S. Baker, A.M. Burdin, P.J. Clapham, J.K.B. Ford, C.M. Gabriele, R.G. LeDuc, D.K. Mattila, T.J. Quinn, L. Rojas-Bracho, J.M. Straley, B.L. Taylor, J. Urban R., P. Wade, D.W. Weller, B.H. Witteveen, and M. Yamaguchi. 2009a. Humpback whale abundance in the North Pacific estimated by photographic capture-recapture with bias correction from simulation studies. p. 25 *In*: *Abstr. 18th Bienn. Conf. Biol. Mar. Mamm., Québec, Oct. 2009.* 306 p.
- Barlow, J., M.C. Ferguson, E.A. Becker, J.V. Redfern, K.A. Forney, I.L. Vilchis, P.C. Fiedler, T. Gerrodette, and L.T. Ballance. 2009b. Predictive modeling of marine mammal densities in the eastern Pacific Ocean. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SWFSC-444. Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., Southwest Fish. Sci. Center, La Jolla, CA. 206 p.

- Barros, N.B., D.A. Duffield, P.H. Ostrom, D.K. Odell, and V.R. Cornish. 1998. Nearshore vs. offshore ecotype differentiation of *Kogia breviceps* and *K. simus* based on hemoglobin, morphometric and dietary analyses. Abstr. World Mar. Mamm. Sci. Conf., Monaco, 20–24 Jan. 1998.
- Barry, S.B., A.C. Cucknell, and N. Clark. 2010. A direct comparison of bottlenose and common dolphin behaviour during seismic surveys when airguns are and are not being utilized. Abstr. In: 2nd Int. Conf. Effects Noise Aquat. Life, Cork, Ireland, 15–20 Aug. 2010.
- Baumgartner, M.F. 1997. The distribution of Risso's dolphin (*Grampus griseus*) with respect to the physiography of the Northern Gulf of Mexico. **Mar. Mamm. Sci.** 13(4):614-638.
- Becker, E.A. 2007. Predicting seasonal patterns of California cetacean density based on remotely sensed environmental data. Ph.D. thesis, Univ. Calif. Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara, CA. 284 p.
- Best, P.B. 1979. Social organization in sperm whales, *Physeter macrocephalus*. p. 227-289 In: H.E. Winn and B.L. Olla (eds.), Behavior of marine animals, Vol. 3. Plenum, New York, NY.
- Bowles, A.E., M. Smultea, B. Würsig, D.P. DeMaster, and D. Palka. 1994. Relative abundance and behavior of marine mammals exposed to transmissions from the Heard Island Feasibility Test. **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 96(4):2469-2484.
- Buchanan, J.B., D.H. Johnson, E.L. Greda, G.A. Green, T.R. Wahl, and S.J. Jeffries. 2001. Wildlife of coastal and marine habitats. p. 389-422 In: D.H. Johnson and T.A. O'Neil (eds.), Wildlife-habitat relationships in Oregon and Washington.
- Burkhardt, E., O. Boebel, H. Bornemann, and C. Ruholl. 2008. Risk assessment of scientific sonars. **Bioacoustics** 17:235-237.
- Caballero, S., H. Hamilton, C. Jaramillo, J. Capella, L. Flórez-González, C. Olavarria, H. Rosenbaum, F. Guhl, and C.S. Baker. 2001. Genetic characterisation of the Colombian Pacific Coast humpback whale population using RAPD and mitochondrial DNA sequences. **Mem. Queensl. Mus.** 47(2):459-464.
- Calambokidis, J. and S.D. Osmek. 1998. Marine mammal research and mitigation in conjunction with air gun operation for the USGS 'SHIPS' seismic surveys in 1998. Rep. from Cascadia Research, Olympia, WA, for U.S. Geol. Surv., Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., and Minerals Manage. Serv.
- Calambokidis, J., G.H. Steiger, J.C. Cabbage, K.C. Balcomb, C. Ewald, S. Kruse, R. Wells, and R. Sears. 1990. Sightings and movements of blue whales off central California 1986–88 from photo-identification of individuals. **Rep. Int. Whal. Comm. Spec. Iss.** 12:343-348.
- Calambokidis, J., G.H. Steiger, K. Rasmussen, J. Urbán R., K.C. Balcomb, P. Ladrón De Guevara, M. Salinas Z., J.K. Jacobsen, C.S. Baker, L.M. Herman, S. Cerchio, and J.D. Darling. 2000. Migratory destinations of humpback whales from the California, Oregon and Washington feeding ground. **Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.** 192:295-304.
- Calambokidis, J., G.H. Steiger, J.M. Straley, L.M. Herman, S. Cerchio, D.R. Salden, J. Urbán R., J.K. Jacobsen, O. von Ziegesar, K.C. Balcomb, C.M. Gabrielle, M.E. Dahlheim, S. Uchida, G. Ellis, Y. Miyamura, P.L. de Guevara, M. Yamaguchi, F. Sato, S.A. Mizroch, L. Schlender, K. Rasmussen, J. Barlow, and T.J. Quinn II. 2001. Movements and population structure of humpback whales in the North Pacific. **Mar. Mamm. Sci.** 17(4):769-794.
- Calambokidis, J., T. Chandler, L. Schlender, G.H. Steiger, and A. Douglas. 2003. Research on humpback and blue whales off California, Oregon, and Washington in 2002. Final Rep. from Cascadia Research, Olympia, WA, for Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., Southwest Fish. Sci. Center, La Jolla, CA. 47 p.
- Calambokidis, J., E.A. Falcone, T.J. Quinn, A.M. Burdin, P.J. Clapham, J.K.B. Ford, C.M. Gabriele, R. LeDuc, D. Mattila, L. Rojas-Bracho, J.M. Straley, B.L. Taylor, J. Urban R., D. Weller, B.H. Witteveen, M. Yamaguchi, A. Bendlin, D. Camacho, K. Flynn, A. Havron, J. Huggins, and N. Maloney. 2008. SPLASH: structure of populations, levels of abundance and status of humpback whales in the North Pacific. Rep. AB133F-03-RP-0078 for U.S. Dept. of Comm., Seattle, WA.

- Caldwell, D.K. and M.C. Caldwell. 1989. Pygmy sperm whale *Kogia breviceps* (de Blainville, 1838): dwarf sperm whale *Kogia simus* Owen, 1866. p. 235-260 In: S.H. Ridgway and R. Harrison (eds.), Handbook of marine mammals, Vol. 4: River dolphins and the larger toothed whales. Academic Press, San Diego, CA. 444 p
- Carretta, J.V., K.A. Forney, M.S. Lowry, J. Barlow, J. Baker, D. Johnston, B. Hanson, R.L. Brownell Jr., J. Robbins, D.K. Mattila, K. Ralls, M.M. Muto, D. Lynch, and L. Carswell. 2010. U.S. Pacific marine mammal stock assessments: 2009. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SWFSC-453. Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., Southwest Fish. Sci. Center, La Jolla, CA. 336 p.
- Castellote, M., C.W. Clark, and M.O. Lammers. 2010. Acoustic compensation to shipping and airgun noise by Mediterranean fin whales (*Balaenoptera physalus*). Abstr. In: 2nd Int. Conf. Effects Noise Aquat. Life, Cork, Ireland, 15–20 Aug. 2010.
- Childerhouse, S., J. Jackson, C.S. Baker, N. Gales, P.J. Clapham, and R.L. Brownell Jr. 2008. *Megaptera novaeangliae* (Oceania subpopulation). In: IUCN 2011. IUCN Red List of Threatened Species, Version 2011.2. Accessed on 11 November 2011 at <http://www.iucnredlist.org/apps/redlist/details/132832/0>.
- Chivers, S.J., R.W. Baird, D.J. McSweeney, D.L. Webster, N.M. Hedrick, and J.C. Salinas. 2007. Genetic variation and evidence for population structure in eastern North Pacific false killer whales (*Pseudorca crassidens*). **Can. J. Zool.** 85(7):783-794.
- Chivers, S.J., R.W. Baird, K.M. Martien, B.L. Taylor, E. Archer, A.M. Gorgone, B.L. Hancock, N.M. Hedrick, D. Matilla, D.J. McSweeney, E.M. Oleson, C.L. Palmer, V. Pease, K.M. Robertson, J. Robbins, J.C. Salinas, G.S. Schorr, M. Schultz, J.L. Thieleking, and D.L. Webster. 2010. Evidence of genetic differentiation for Hawai'i insular false killer whales (*Pseudorca crassidens*). NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SWFSC-458. Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., Southwest Fish. Sci. Center, La Jolla, CA. 44 p.
- Clapham, P.J. 2009. Humpback whale. p. 582-595 In: W.F. Perrin, B. Würsig, and J.G.M. Thewissen (eds.), Encyclopedia of marine mammals, 2nd edit. Academic Press, San Diego, CA. 1316 p.
- Clapham, P.J. and D.K. Mattila. 1990. Humpback whale songs as indicators of migration routes. **Mar. Mamm. Sci.** 6(2):155-160.
- Clapham P.J. and J.G. Mead. 1999. *Megaptera novaeangliae*. **Mamm. Spec.** 604:1-9.
- Clark, C.W. and W.T. Ellison. 2004. Potential use of low-frequency sounds by baleen whales for probing the environment: evidence from models and empirical measurements. p. 564-582 In: J.A. Thomas, C.F. Moss, and M. Vater (eds.), Echolocation in bats and dolphins. Univ. Chicago Press, Chicago, IL.
- Clark, C.W. and G.C. Gagnon. 2006. Considering the temporal and spatial scales of noise exposures from seismic surveys on baleen whales. Working Pap. SC/58/E9. Int. Whal. Comm., Cambridge, U.K. 9 p.
- Cox, T.M., T.J. Ragen, A.J. Read, E. Vos, R.W. Baird, K. Balcomb, J. Barlow, J. Caldwell, T. Cranford, L. Crum, A. D'Amico, G. D'Spain, A. Fernández, J. Finneran, R. Gentry, W. Gerth, F. Gulland, J. Hildebrand, D. Houser, T. Hullar, P.D. Jepson, D. Ketten, C.D. MacLeod, P. Miller, S. Moore, D.C. Mountain, D. Palka, P. Ponganis, S. Rommel, T. Rowles, B. Taylor, P. Tyack, D. Wartzok, R. Gisiner, J. Mead, and L. Benner. 2006. Understanding the impacts of anthropogenic sound on beaked whales. **J. Cetac. Res. Manage.** 7(3):177-187.
- Croll, D.A., A. Acevedo-Gutiérrez, B. Tershy, and J. Urbán-Ramírez. 2001. The diving behavior of blue and fin whales: is dive duration shorter than expected based on oxygen stores? **Comp. Biochem. Physiol.** 129A:797-809.
- Crum, L.A., M.R. Bailey, J. Guan, P.R. Hilmo, S.G. Kargl, and T.J. Matula. 2005. Monitoring bubble growth in supersaturated blood and tissue *ex vivo* and the relevance to marine mammal bioeffects. **Acoust. Res. Lett. Online** 6(3):214-220.
- Cummings, W.C. 1985. Bryde's whale *Balaenoptera edeni* (Anderson, 1878). p. 137-154 In: S.H. Ridgway and R. Harrison (eds.), Handbook of marine mammals, Vol. 3: The sirenians and baleen whales. Academic Press, London, U.K. 362 p.

- Dahlheim, M.E. and J.E. Heyning. 1999. Killer whale *Orcinus orca* (Linnaeus, 1758). p. 281-322 In: S.H. Ridgway and R. Harrison (eds.), Handbook of marine mammals, Vol. 6: The second book of dolphins and the porpoises. Academic Press, San Diego, CA. 486 p.
- Dalebout, M.L., G.J.B. Ross, C.S. Baker, R.C. Anderson, P.B. Best, V.G. Cockcroft, H.L. Hinsz, V. Peddemors, and R.L. Pitman. 2003. Appearance, distribution, and genetic distinctiveness of Longman's beaked whale, *Indopacetus pacificus*. **Mar. Mamm. Sci.** 19(3):421-461.
- Darling, J.D. and S. Cerchio. 1993. Movement of a humpback whale (*Megaptera novaeangliae*) between Japan and Hawaii. **Mar. Mamm. Sci.** 9:84-89.
- Davis, R.W., G.S. Fargion, N. May, T.D. Leming, M. Baumgartner, W.E. Evans, L.J. Hansen, and K. Mullin. 1998. Physical habitat of cetaceans along the continental slope in the north-central and western Gulf of Mexico. **Mar. Mamm. Sci.** 14(3):490-507.
- Dietz, R., J. Teilmann, M.P. Jørgensen, and M.V. Jensen. 2002. Satellite tracking of humpback whales in West Greenland. NERI Tech. Rep. No. 411. National Environmental Research Institute, Roskilde, Denmark. 40 p.
- Dizon, A.E., S.O. Southern, and W.F. Perrin. 1991. Molecular analysis of mtDNA types in exploited populations of spinner dolphins (*Stenella longirostris*). **Rep. Int. Whal. Comm. Spec. Iss.** 15:355-363.
- Dolar, M.L.L. 2009. Fraser's dolphin *Lagenodelphis hosei*. p. 469-471 In: W.F. Perrin, B. Würsig, and J.G.M. Thewissen (eds.), Encyclopedia of marine mammals, 2nd edit. Academic Press, San Diego, CA. 1316 p.
- Dolphin, W.F. 1987. Dive behavior and foraging of humpback whales in Southeast Alaska. **Can. J. Zool.** 65(2):354-362.
- DoN (U.S. Department of the Navy). 2005. Marine resources assessment for the Hawaiian Islands Operating Area. Pacific Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Pearl Harbor, HI. Contract No. N62470-02-D-9997, CTO 0026. Prepared by Geo-Marine, Inc., Plano, TX.
- Donahue, M.A. and W.L. Perryman. 2009. Pygmy killer whale. p. 938-939 In: W.F. Perrin, B. Würsig and J.G.M. Thewissen (eds.), Encyclopedia of marine mammals, 2nd edit. Academic Press, San Diego, CA. 1316 p.
- Donoghue, M.F. 1996. New Zealand, progress report on cetacean research, April 1994 to March 1995. **Rep. Int. Whal. Comm.** 46:265-269.
- Donovan, G.P. 1991. A review of IWC stock boundaries. **Rep. Int. Whal. Comm. Spec. Iss.** 13:39-63.
- Duffield, D.A., S.H. Ridgway, and L.H. Cornell. 1983. Hematology distinguishes coastal and offshore forms of dolphins (*Tursiops*). **Can. J. Zool.** 61(4):930-933.
- Dunn, R.A. and O. Hernandez. 2009. Tracking blue whales in the eastern tropical Pacific with an ocean-bottom seismometer and hydrophone array. **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 126(3):1084-1094.
- Engel, M.H., M.C.C. Marcondes, C.C.A. Martins, F.O. Luna, R.P. Lima, and A. Campos. 2004. Are seismic surveys responsible for cetacean strandings? An unusual mortality of adult humpback whales in Abrolhos Bank, northeastern coast of Brazil. Working Paper SC/56/E28. Int. Whal. Comm., Cambridge, U.K. 8 p.
- Ferguson, M.C. and J. Barlow. 2001. Spatial distribution and density of cetaceans in the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean based on summer/fall research vessel surveys in 1986-96. Admin. Rep. LJ-01-04, Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., Southwest Fish. Sci. Center, La Jolla, CA. 61 p.
- Ferguson, M.C. and J. Barlow. 2003. Addendum: Spatial distribution and density of cetaceans in the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean based on summer/fall research vessel surveys in 1986-96. Admin. Rep. LJ-01-04, Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., Southwest Fish. Sci. Center, La Jolla, CA. 120 p.
- Ferguson, M.C., J. Barlow, S.B. Reilly, and T. Gerrodette. 2006a. Predicting Cuvier's (*Ziphius cavirostris*) and *Mesoplodon* beaked whale population density from habitat characteristics in the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean. **J. Cetac. Res. Manage.** 7(3):287-299.
- Ferguson, M.C., J. Barlow, P. Fiedler, S.B. Reilly, and T. Gerrodette. 2006b. Spatial models of delphinid (family Delphinidae) encounter rate and group size in the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean. **Ecol. Model.** 193(3-4):645-662.

- Fernández, A., M. Arbelo, R. Deaville, I.A.P. Patterson, P. Castro, J.R. Baker, E. Degollada, H.M. Ross, P. Herráez, A.M. Pocknell, E. Rodríguez, F.E. Howie, A. Espinosa, R.J. Reid, J.R. Jaber, V. Martin, A.A. Cunningham, and P.D. Jepson. 2004. Pathology: whales, sonar and decompression sickness (reply). **Nature** 428(6984):1.
- Fernández, A., J.F. Edwards, F. Rodríguez, A.E. de los Monteros, P. Herráez, P. Castro, J.R. Jaber, V. Martin, and M. Arbelo. 2005. "Gas and fat embolic syndrome" involving a mass stranding of beaked whales (Family Ziphiidae) exposed to anthropogenic sonar signals. **Vet. Pathol.** 42(4):446-457.
- Finneran, J.J. and C.E. Schlundt. 2004. Effects of intense pure tones on the behavior of trained odontocetes. Tech. Rep. 1913. Space and Naval Warfare (SPAWAR) Systems Center, SSC San Diego, San Diego, CA.
- Finneran, J.J., C.E. Schlundt, D.A. Carder, J.A. Clark, J.A. Young, J.B. Gaspin, and S.H. Ridgway. 2000. Auditory and behavioral responses of bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*) and beluga whales (*Delphinapterus leucas*) to impulsive sounds resembling distant signatures of underwater explosions. **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 108(1):417-431.
- Finneran, J.J., C.E. Schlundt, R. Dear, D.A. Carder, and S.H. Ridgway. 2002. Temporary shift in masked hearing thresholds in odontocetes after exposure to single underwater impulses from a seismic watergun. **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 111(6):2929-2940.
- Finneran, J.J., D.A. Carder, C.E. Schlundt, and S.H. Ridgway. 2005. Temporary threshold shift in bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*) exposed to mid-frequency tones. **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 118(4):2696-2705.
- Ford, J.K.B. 2009. Killer whale. p. 650-657 In: W.F. Perrin, B. Würsig, and J.G.M. Thewissen (eds.), *Encyclopedia of marine mammals*, 2nd edit. Academic Press, San Diego, CA. 1316 p.
- Frankel, A.S. 2005. Gray whales hear and respond to a 21–25 kHz high-frequency whale-finding sonar. Abstr. 16th Bienn. Conf. Biol. Mar. Mamm., 12–16 Dec. 2005, San Diego, CA.
- Frantzis, A. 1998. Does acoustic testing strand whales? **Nature** 392(6671):29.
- Gailey, G., B. Würsig, and T.L. McDonald. 2007. Abundance, behavior, and movement patterns of western gray whales in relation to a 3-D seismic survey, northeast Sakhalin Island, Russia. **Environ. Monit. Assess.** 134(1-3):75-91. doi: 10.1007/s10661-007-9812-1.
- Gambell, R. 1985a. Sei whale *Balaenoptera borealis* Lesson, 1828. p. 155-170 In: S.H. Ridgway and R. Harrison (eds.), *Handbook of marine mammals*, Vol. 3: The sirenians and baleen whales. Academic Press, London, U.K. 362 p.
- Gambell, R. 1985b. Fin whale *Balaenoptera physalus* (Linnaeus, 1758). p. 171-192 In: S.H. Ridgway and R. Harrison (eds.), *Handbook of marine mammals*, Vol. 3: The sirenians and baleen whales. Academic Press, London, U.K. 362 p.
- Gannier, A. 2000. Distribution of cetaceans off the Society Islands (French Polynesia) as obtained from dedicated surveys. **Aquat. Mamm.** 26(2):111-126.
- Gannier, A. 2002. Cetaceans of the Marquesas Islands (French Polynesia): distribution and relative abundance as obtained from a small boat dedicated survey. **Aquat. Mamm.** 28(2):198-210
- Garrigue, C., R. Dodemont, D. Steel, and C.S. Baker. 2004. Organismal and 'gametic' capture-recapture using microsatellite genotyping confirm low abundance and reproductive autonomy of humpback whales on the wintering grounds of New Caledonia. **Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.** 274:251-262.
- Gedamke, J., S. Frydman, and N. Gales. 2008. Risk of baleen whale hearing loss from seismic surveys: preliminary results from simulations accounting for uncertainty and individual variation. Working Pap. SC/60/E9. Int. Whal. Comm., Cambridge, U.K. 10 p.
- Gentry, R. (ed.). 2002. Report of the workshop on acoustic resonance as a source of tissue trauma in cetaceans. April 24 and 25, Silver Spring, MD. Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv. 19 p. Accessed on 19 November 2011 at <http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/pr/pdfs/acoustics/cetaceans.pdf>.
- Gerrodette, T. and J. Forcada. 2002. Estimates of abundance of western/southern spotted, whitebelly spinner, striped and common dolphins, and pilot, sperm and Bryde's whales in the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean. Admin. Rep. LJ-02-20, Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., Southwest Fish. Sci. Center, La Jolla, CA. 24 p.

- Gerrodette, T. and J. Forcada. 2005. Non-recovery of two spotted and spinner dolphin populations in the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean. **Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.** 291:1-21.
- Gerrodette, T. and J. Pettis. 2005. Responses of tropical cetaceans to an echosounder during research vessel Surveys. p. 104 *In*: Abstr. 16th Bien. Conf. Biol. Mar. Mamm., 12–16 Dec. 2005, San Diego, CA.
- Gerrodette, T., G. Watters, W. Perryman, and L. Balance. 2008. Estimates of 2006 dolphin abundance in the eastern tropical Pacific, with revised estimates from 1986–2003. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SWFSC-422. Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., Southwest Fish. Sci. Center, La Jolla, CA. 39 p.
- Goold, J.C. 1996a. Acoustic assessment of common dolphins off the west Wales coast, in conjunction with 16th round seismic surveying. Rep. from School of Ocean Sciences, Univ. Wales, Bangor, Wales, for Chevron UK Ltd, Repsol Explor. (UK) Ltd., and Aran Energy Explor. Ltd. 22 p.
- Goold, J.C. 1996b. Acoustic assessment of populations of common dolphin *Delphinus delphis* in conjunction with seismic surveying. **J. Mar. Biol. Assoc. U.K.** 76:811-820.
- Goold, J.C. 1996c. Acoustic cetacean monitoring off the west Wales coast. Rep. from School of Ocean Sciences, Univ. Wales, Bangor, Wales, for Chevron UK Ltd, Repsol Explor. (UK) Ltd, and Aran Energy Explor. Ltd. 20 p.
- Gordon, J., D. Gillespie, J. Potter, A. Frantzis, M.P. Simmonds, R. Swift, and D. Thompson. 2004. A review of the effects of seismic surveys on marine mammals. **Mar. Technol. Soc. J.** 37(4):16-34.
- Gordon, J., R. Antunes, N. Jaquet, and B. Würsig. 2006. An investigation of sperm whale headings and surface behaviour before, during and after seismic line changes in the Gulf of Mexico. Working Pap. SC/58/E45. Int. Whal. Comm., Cambridge, U.K. 10 p.
- Gosselin, J.-F. and J. Lawson. 2004. Distribution and abundance indices of marine mammals in the Gully and two adjacent canyons of the Scotian Shelf before and during nearby hydrocarbon seismic exploration programmes in April and July 2003. Res. Doc. 2004/133. Can. Sci. Advis. Secret., Fisheries and Oceans Canada. 24 p. Accessed in November 2011 at http://www.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/CSAS/Csas/DocREC/2004/RES2004_133_e.pdf.
- Green, G.A., J.J. Brueggeman, R.A. Grotefendt, C.E. Bowlby, M.L. Bonnell, and K.C. Balcomb, III. 1992. Cetacean distribution and abundance off Oregon and Washington, 1989–1990. Chapter 1 *In*: J.J. Brueggeman (ed.), Oregon and Washington marine mammal and seabird surveys. Minerals Manage. Serv. Contract Rep. 14-12-0001-30426.
- Green, G.A., R.A. Grotefendt, M.A. Smultea, C.E. Bowlby, and R.A. Rowlett. 1993. Delphinid aerial surveys in Oregon and Washington offshore waters. Rep. from Ebasco Environmental, Bellevue, WA, for Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., Nat. Mar. Mamm. Lab., Seattle, WA. Contract #50ABNF200058. 35 p.
- Greene, C.R., Jr., N.S. Altman, and W.J. Richardson. 1999a. Bowhead whale calls. p. 6-1 to 6-23 *In*: W.J. Richardson (ed.), Marine mammal and acoustical monitoring of Western Geophysical's open-water seismic program in the Alaskan Beaufort Sea, 1998. LGL Rep. TA2230-3. Rep. from LGL Ltd., King City, Ont., and Greeneridge Sciences Inc., Santa Barbara, CA, for Western Geophysical, Houston, TX, and U.S. Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., Anchorage, AK, and Silver Spring, MD. 390 p.
- Greene, C.R., Jr., N.S. Altman, and W.J. Richardson. 1999b. The influence of seismic survey sounds on bowhead whale calling rates. **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 106(4, Pt. 2):2280 (Abstract).
- Gregr, E.J. and A.W. Trites. 2001. Predictions of critical habitat of five whale species in the waters of coastal British Columbia. **Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.** 58(7):1265-1285.
- Hain, J.H.W., W.A.M. Hyman, R.D. Kenney, and H.E. Winn. 1985. The role of cetaceans in the shelf-edge region of the U.S. **Mar. Fish. Rev.** 47(1):13-17.
- Harris, R.E., G.W. Miller, and W.J. Richardson. 2001. Seal responses to airgun sounds during summer seismic surveys in the Alaskan Beaufort Sea. **Mar. Mamm. Sci.** 17(4):795-812.
- Harris, R.E., T. Elliot, and R.A. Davis. 2007. Results of mitigation and monitoring program, Beaufort Span 2-D marine seismic program, open water season 2006. LGL Rep. TA4319-1. Rep. from LGL Ltd., King City, Ont., for GX Technol., Houston, TX. 48 p.

- Harwood, J. and B. Wilson. 2001. The implications of developments on the Atlantic Frontier for marine mammals. **Cont. Shelf Res.** 21:1073-1093.
- Hastie, G.D. and V.M. Janik. 2007. Behavioural responses of grey seals to multibeam imaging sonars. *In*: Abstr. 17th Bien. Conf. Biol. Mar. Mamm., 29 Nov.–3 Dec., Cape Town, South Africa.
- Hauser, D.D.W., M. Holst, and V.D. Moulton. 2008. Marine mammal and sea turtle monitoring during Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory's marine seismic program in the Eastern Tropical Pacific, April–August 2008. LGL Rep. TA4656/7-1. Rep. from LGL Ltd., King City, Ont., and St. John's, Nfld., for Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory of Columbia Univ., Palisades, NY, and Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., Silver Spring, MD. 98 p.
- Hauser, N., H. Peckham, and P.J. Clapham. 2000. Humpback whales in the southern Cook Islands, South Pacific. **J. Cetac. Res. Manage.** 2:159-164.
- Heide-Jørgensen, M.P., D. Bloch, E. Stefansson, B. Mikkelsen, L.H. Ofstad, and R. Dietz. 2002. Diving behaviour of long-finned pilot whales *Globicephala melas* around the Faroe Islands. **Wildl. Biol.** 8:307-313.
- Heyning, J.E. 1989. Cuvier's beaked whale *Ziphius cavirostris* G. Cuvier, 1823. p. 289-308 *In*: S.H. Ridgway and R. Harrison (eds.), Handbook of marine mammals, Vol. 4: River dolphins and the larger toothed whales. Academic Press, San Diego, CA. 444 p.
- Heyning, J.E. and M.E. Dahlheim. 1988. *Orcinus orca*. **Mammal. Spec.** 304:1-9.
- Heyning, J.E. and J.G. Mead. 2009. Cuvier's beaked whale *Ziphius cavirostris*. p. 294-295 *In*: W.F. Perrin, B. Würsig, and J.G.M. Thewissen (eds.), Encyclopedia of marine mammals, 2nd edit. Academic Press, San Diego, CA. 1316 p.
- Hildebrand, J.A. 2005. Impacts of anthropogenic sound. p. 101-124 *In*: J.E. Reynolds, W.F. Perrin, R.R. Reeves, S. Montgomery, and T. Ragen (eds.), Marine mammal research: conservation beyond crisis. Johns Hopkins Univ. Press, Baltimore, MD. 223 p.
- Hogarth, W.T. 2002. Declaration of William T. Hogarth in opposition to plaintiff's motion for temporary restraining order, 23 October 2002. Civ. No. 02-05065-JL. U.S. District Court, Northern District of California, San Francisco Div.
- Hoelzel, A.R., C.W. Potter, and P.B. Best. 1998. Genetic differentiation between parapatric 'nearshore' and 'offshore' populations of the bottlenose dolphin. **Proc. Roy. Soc. Lond. B** 265:1177-1183.
- 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.
- Holst, M., W.J. Richardson, W.R. Koski, M.A. Smultea, B. Haley, M.W. Fitzgerald, and M. Rawson. 2006. Effects of large and small-source seismic surveys on marine mammals and sea turtles. Abstr. Presented at Am. Geophys. Union - Soc. Explor. Geophys. Joint Assembly on Environ. Impacts from Mar. Geophys. Geol. Studies - Recent Adv. Acad. Indust. Res. Progr., Baltimore, MD, May 2006.
- Hopkins, J.L., M.A. Smultea, T.A. Jefferson, and A.M. Zoidis. 2009. Rare sightings of a Bryde's whale (*Balaenoptera brydei/edeni*) and subadult sei whales (*B. borealis*) (Cetacea: Balaenopteridae) northeast of

- Oahu in November 2007. p. 115 *In*: Abstr. 18th Bienn. Conf. Biol. Mar. Mamm., Québec, Canada, Oct. 2009. 306 p.
- Horwood, J. 1987. The sei whale: population biology, ecology, and management. Croom Helm, Beckenham, Kent, U.K. 375 p.
- Horwood, J. 2009. Sei whale. p. 1001-1003 *In*: W.F. Perrin, B. Würsig, and J.G.M. Thewissen (eds.), *Encyclopedia of marine mammals*, 2nd edit. Academic Press, San Diego, CA. 1316 p.
- Huggins, J.L., R.W. Baird, D.L. Webster, D.J. McSweeney, G.S. Schorr, and A.D. Ligon. 2005. Inter-island movements and re-sightings of melon-headed whales within the Hawaiian archipelago. p. 133-134 *In*: Abstr. 16th Bienn. Conf. Biol. Mar. Mamm., 12–16 Dec. 2005, San Diego, CA.
- IAGC. 2004. Further analysis of 2002 Abrolhos Bank, Brazil, humpback whale strandings coincident with seismic surveys. *Int. Assoc. Geophys. Contr.*, Houston, TX.
- IUCN (The World Conservation Union). 2011. 2011 IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. Version 2011.2. Accessed in November 2011 at <http://www.iucnredlist.org>.
- IWC (International Whaling Commission). 2007. Report of the standing working group on environmental concerns. Annex K to Report of the Scientific Committee. **J. Cetac. Res. Manage.** 9(Suppl.):227-260.
- IWC (International Whaling Commission). 2010. Whale population estimates. Accessed on 19 November 2011 at <http://www.iwcoffice.org/conservation/estimate.htm>.
- Jackson, A., T. Gerrodette, S. Chivers, M. Lynn, S. Rankin, and S. Mesnick. 2008. Marine mammal data collected during a survey in the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean aboard NOAA ships *David Starr Jordan* and *McArthur II*, July 28–December 7, 2006. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SWFSC-421. *Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv.*, Southwest Fish. Sci. Center, La Jolla, CA. 45 p.
- Jaquet, N. and H. Whitehead. 1996. Scale-dependent correlation of sperm whale distribution with environmental features and productivity in the South Pacific. **Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.** 135(1-3):1-9.
- Jefferson, T.A. 2009. Rough-toothed dolphin *Steno bredanensis*. p. 990-992 *In*: W.F. Perrin, B. Würsig, and J.G.M. Thewissen (eds.), *Encyclopedia of marine mammals*, 2nd edit. Academic Press, New York, NY. 1316 p.
- Jefferson, T.A. and N.B. Barros. 1997. *Peponocephala electra*. **Mammal. Spec.** 553:1-6.
- Jefferson, T.A., M.A. Webber, and R.L. Pitman. 2008. *Marine mammals of the world: a comprehensive guide to their identification*. Academic Press, New York, NY. 573 p.
- Jepson, P.D., M. Arbelo, R. Deaville, I.A.P. Patterson, P. Castro, J.R. Baker, E. Degollada, H.M. Ross, P. Herráez, A.M. Pocknell, F. Rodríguez, F.E. Howie, A. Espinosa, R.J. Reid, J.R. Jaber, V. Martin, A.A. Cunningham, and A. Fernández. 2003. Gas-bubble lesions in stranded cetaceans. **Nature** 425(6958):575-576.
- Jochens, A., D. Biggs, K. Benoit-Bird, D. Engelhaupt, J. Gordon, C. Hu, N. Jaquet, M. Johnson, R. Leben, B. Mate, P. Miller, J. Ortega-Ortiz, A. Thode, P. Tyack, and B. Würsig. 2008. Sperm whale seismic study in the Gulf of Mexico: synthesis report. OCS Study MMS 2008-006. Rep. from Dep. Oceanogr., Texas A&M Univ., College Station, TX, for U.S. Minerals Manage. Serv., Gulf of Mexico OCS Reg., New Orleans, LA. 341 p.
- Johnson, S.R., W.J. Richardson, S.B. Yazvenko, S.A. Blokhin, G. Gailey, M.R. Jenkerson, S.K. Meier, H.R. Melton, M.W. Newcomer, A.S. Perlov, S.A. Rutenko, B. Würsig, C.R. Martin, and D.E. Egging. 2007. A western gray whale mitigation and monitoring program for a 3-D seismic survey, Sakhalin Island, Russia. **Environ. Monit. Assess.** 134(1-3):1-19. doi: 10.1007/s10661-007-9813-0.
- Kanda, N., M. Goto, H. Kato, M.V. McPhee, and L.A. Pastene. 2007. Population genetic structure of Bryde's whales (*Balaenoptera brydei*) at the inter-oceanic and trans-equatorial levels. **Conserv. Genet.** 8:853-864.
- Kastak, D., R.L. Schusterman, B.L. Southall, and C.J. Reichmuth. 1999. Underwater temporary threshold shift induced by octave-band noise in three species of pinnipeds. **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 106(2):1142-1148.
- Kastak, D., B.L. Southall, R.J. Schusterman, and C. Reichmuth. 2005. Underwater temporary threshold shift in pinnipeds: effects of noise level and duration. **J. Acoust. Soc. Amer.** 118(5):3154-3163.

- Kasuya, T. 1986. Distribution and behavior of Baird's beaked whales off the Pacific coast of Japan. **Sci. Rep. Whales Res. Inst.** 37:61-83.
- Kasuya, T. and T. Miyashita. 1988. Distribution of sperm whale stocks in the North Pacific. **Sci. Rep. Whales Res. Inst.** 39:31-75.
- Kato, H. and W.F. Perrin. 2009. Bryde's whales *Balaenoptera edeni/brydei*. p. 158-162 *In*: W.F. Perrin, B. Würsig and J.G.M. Thewissen (eds.), Encyclopedia of marine mammals, 2nd edit. Academic Press, San Diego, CA. 1316 p.
- Kenney, R.D. and H.E. Winn. 1987. Cetacean biomass densities near submarine canyons compared to adjacent shelf/slope areas. **Continental Shelf Res.** 7:107-114.
- Ketten, D.R. 1995. Estimates of blast injury and acoustic trauma zones for marine mammals from underwater explosions. p. 391-407 *In*: R.A. Kastelein, J.A. Thomas, and P.E. Nachtigall (eds.), Sensory systems of aquatic mammals. De Spil Publ., Woerden, Netherlands. 588 p.
- Ketten, D.R., J. Lien, and S. Todd. 1993. Blast injury in humpback whale ears: evidence and implications. **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 94(3, Pt. 2):1849-1850.
- Ketten, D.R., J. O'Malley, P.W.B. Moore, S. Ridgway, and C. Merigo. 2001. Aging, injury, disease, and noise in marine mammal ears. **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 110(5, Pt. 2):2721.
- Klatsky, L.J. 2004. Movement and dive behavior of bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*) near the Bermuda Pedestal. M.Sc. Thesis. San Diego State University, CA. 31 p.
- Klatsky, L.J., R.S. Wells, and J.C. Sweeney. 2007. Offshore bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*): movement and dive behavior near the Bermuda Pedestal. **J. Mammal.** 88:59-66.
- Kremser, U., P. Klemm, and W.D. Kötz. 2005. Estimating the risk of temporary acoustic threshold shift, caused by hydroacoustic devices, in whales in the Southern Ocean. **Antarctic Sci.** 17(1):3-10.
- Kruse, S., D.K. Caldwell, and M.C. Caldwell. 1999. Risso's dolphin *Grampus griseus* (G. Cuvier, 1812). p. 183-212 *In*: S.H. Ridgway and R. Harrison (eds.), Handbook of marine mammals, Vol. 6: The second book of dolphins and the porpoises. Academic Press, San Diego, CA. 486 p.
- Kryter, K.D. 1985. The effects of noise on man, 2nd ed. Academic Press, Orlando, FL. 688 p.
- Lagerquist, B.A., K.M. Stafford, and B.R. Mate. 2000. Dive characteristics of satellite-monitored blue whales (*Balaenoptera musculus*) off the central California coast. **Mar. Mamm. Sci.** 16(2):375-391.
- Laurinolli, M.H. and N.A. Cochrane. 2005. Hydroacoustic analysis of marine mammal vocalization data from ocean bottom seismometer mounted hydrophones in the Gully. p. 89-95 *In*: K. Lee, H. Bain, and G.V. Hurley (eds.), Acoustic monitoring and marine mammal surveys in The Gully and outer Scotian Shelf before and during active seismic surveys. Environ. Stud. Res. Funds Rep. 151. 154 p. Published 2007.
- Leatherwood, S. and R.R. Reeves. 1983. The Sierra Club handbook of whales and dolphins. Sierra Club, San Francisco, CA. 302 p.
- Leatherwood, S., R.R. Reeves, W.F. Perrin, and W.E. Evans. 1988. Whales, dolphins, and porpoises of the eastern North Pacific and adjacent arctic waters, a guide to their identification. NOAA Tech. Rep. NMFS Circular 444. 245 p.
- Ljungblad, D.K., B. Würsig, S.L. Swartz, and J.M. Keene. 1988. Observations on the behavioral responses of bowhead whales (*Balaena mysticetus*) to active geophysical vessels in the Alaskan Beaufort Sea. **Arctic** 41(3):183-194.
- Lockyer, C.H. and S.G. Brown. 1981. The migration of whales. p. 105-137 *In*: D.J. Aidley (ed.), Animal migration. Soc. Exp. Biol. Seminar Ser. 13, Cambridge University Press, U.K.
- Lowry, L. and A. Aguilar. 2008. *Monachus schauinslandi*. *In*: IUCN 2011. IUCN Red List of Threatened Species, Version 2011.2. Accessed on 9 May 2011 at <http://www.iucnredlist.org/apps/redlist/details/13654/0>.

- Lucke, K., U. Siebert, P.A. Lepper, and M.-A. Blanchet. 2009. Temporary shift in masked hearing thresholds in a harbor porpoise (*Phocoena phocoena*) after exposure to seismic airgun stimuli. **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 125(6):4060-4070.
- Lusseau, D. and L. Bejder. 2007. The long-term consequences of short-term responses to disturbance experience from whalewatching impact assessment. **Int. J. Comp. Psych.** 20(2-3):228-236.
- MacLean, S.A. and B. Haley. 2004. Marine mammal monitoring during Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory's seismic study in the Støregga Slide area of the Norwegian Sea, August–September 2003. LGL Rep. TA2822-20. Rep. from LGL Ltd., King City, Ont., for Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory of Columbia Univ., Palisades, NY, and Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., Silver Spring, MD. 59 p.
- MacLean, S.A. and W.R. Koski. 2005. Marine mammal monitoring during Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory's seismic program in the Gulf of Alaska, August–September 2004. LGL Rep. TA2822-28. Rep. by LGL Ltd., King City, Ont., for Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory of Columbia Univ., Palisades, NY, and Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., Silver Spring, MD. 102 p.
- MacLeod, C.D. and A. D'Amico. 2006. A review of beaked whale behaviour and ecology in relation to assessing and mitigating impacts of anthropogenic noise. **J. Cetac. Res. Manage.** 7(3):211-221.
- MacLeod, C.D., N. Hauser, and H. Peckham. 2004. Diversity, relative density and structure of the cetacean community in summer months east of Great Abaco, Bahamas. **J. Mar. Biol. Assoc. U.K.** 84:469-474.
- Madsen, P.T., B. Mohl, B.K. Nielsen, and M. Wahlberg. 2002. Male sperm whale behavior during exposures to distant seismic survey pulses. **Aquat. Mamm.** 28(3):231-240.
- Madsen, P.T., M. Johnson, P.J.O. Miller, N. Aguilar de Soto, J. Lynch, and P.L. Tyack. 2006. Quantitative measures of air gun pulses recorded on sperm whales (*Physeter macrocephalus*) using acoustic tags during controlled exposure experiments. **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 120(4):2366–2379.
- Malakoff, D. 2002. Suit ties whale deaths to research cruise. **Science** 298(5594):722-723.
- Malme, C.I. and P.R. Miles. 1985. Behavioral responses of marine mammals (gray whales) to seismic discharges. p. 253-280 *In*: G.D. Greene, F.R. Engelhardt, and R.J. Paterson (eds.), Proc. Worksh. Effects Explos. Mar. Envir., Jan. 1985, Halifax, N.S. Tech. Rep. 5. Can. Oil & Gas Lands Admin., Environ. Prot. Br., Ottawa, Ont. 398 p.
- Malme, C.I., P.R. Miles, C.W. Clark, P. Tyack, and J.E. Bird. 1984. Investigations of the potential effects of underwater noise from petroleum industry activities on migrating gray whale behavior/Phase II: January 1984 migration. BBN Rep. 5586. Rep. from Bolt Beranek & Newman Inc., Cambridge, MA, for U.S. Minerals Manage. Serv., Anchorage, AK. Var. pag. NTIS PB86-218377.
- Malme, C.I., P.R. Miles, P. Tyack, C.W. Clark, and J.E. Bird. 1985. Investigation of the potential effects of underwater noise from petroleum industry activities on feeding humpback whale behavior. BBN Rep. 5851; OCS Study MMS 85-0019. Rep. from BBN Labs Inc., Cambridge, MA, for U.S. Minerals Manage. Serv., Anchorage, AK. Var. pag. NTIS PB86-218385.
- Malme, C.I., B. Würsig, J.E. Bird, and P. Tyack. 1986. Behavioral responses of gray whales to industrial noise: feeding observations and predictive modeling. Outer Cont. Shelf Environ. Assess. Progr., Final Rep. Princ. Invest., NOAA, Anchorage, AK 56(1988):393-600. BBN Rep. 6265. 600 p. OCS Study MMS 88-0048; NTIS PB88-249008.
- Malme, C.I., B. Würsig, J.E. Bird, and P. Tyack. 1988. Observations of feeding gray whale responses to controlled industrial noise exposure. p. 55-73 *In*: W.M. Sackinger, M.O. Jeffries, J.L. Imm, and S.D. Treacy (eds.), Port and ocean engineering under arctic conditions, Vol. II. Geophys. Inst., Univ. Alaska, Fairbanks, AK. 111 p.
- Mate, B.R., B.A. Lagerquist, and J. Calambokidis. 1999. Movements of North Pacific blue whales during the feeding season off southern California and their southern fall migration. **Mar. Mamm. Sci.** 15(4):1246-1257.
- McAlpine, D.F. 2009. Pygmy and dwarf sperm whales. p. 936-938 *In*: W.F. Perrin, B. Würsig, and J.G.M. Thewissen (eds.), Encyclopedia of marine mammals, 2nd edit. Academic Press, San Diego, CA. 1316 p.

- McAlpine, D.F., L.D. Murison, and E.P. Hoberg. 1997. New records for the pygmy sperm whale, *Kogia breviceps* (Physeteridae) from Atlantic Canada with notes on diet and parasites. **Mar. Mamm. Sci.** 13(4):701-704.
- McCauley, R.D., M.-N. Jenner, C. Jenner, K.A. McCabe, and J. Murdoch. 1998. The response of humpback whales (*Megaptera novaeangliae*) to offshore seismic survey noise: preliminary results of observations about a working seismic vessel and experimental exposures. **APPEA (Austral. Petrol. Product. Explor. Assoc.) J.** 38:692-707.
- McCauley, R.D., J. Fewtrell, A.J. Duncan, C. Jenner, M.-N. Jenner, J.D. Penrose, R.I.T. Prince, A. Adhitya, J. Murdoch, and K. McCabe. 2000a. Marine seismic surveys: analysis of airgun signals; and effects of air gun exposure on humpback whales, sea turtles, fishes and squid. Rep. from Centre for Marine Science and Technology, Curtin Univ., Perth, W.A., for Austral. Petrol. Prod. Assoc., Sydney, N.S.W. 188 p.
- McCauley, R.D., J. Fewtrell, A.J. Duncan, M.-N. Jenner, C. Jenner, R.I.T. Prince, A. Adhitya, K. McCabe, and J. Murdoch. 2000b. Marine seismic surveys: a study of environmental implications. **APPEA (Austral. Petrol. Product. Explor. Assoc.) J.** 40:692-708.
- McDonald, M.A., J.A. Hildebrand, and S.C. Webb. 1995. Blue and fin whales observed on a seafloor array in the northeast Pacific. **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 98(2, Pt.1):712-721.
- Mead, J.G. 1989. Beaked whales of the genus *Mesoplodon*. p. 349-430 In: S.H. Ridgway and R.J. Harrison (eds.), Handbook of marine mammals, Vol. 4: River dolphins and the larger toothed whales. Academic Press, San Diego, CA. 444 p.
- Mead, J.G. and C.W. Potter. 1995. Recognizing two populations of the bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*) off the Atlantic coast of North America: morphological and ecological considerations. **IBI Reports** 5:31-44.
- Miller, G.W., R.E. Elliott, W.R. Koski, V.D. Moulton, and W.J. Richardson. 1999. Whales. p. 5-1 to 5-109 In: W.J. Richardson (ed.), Marine mammal and acoustical monitoring of Western Geophysical's open-water seismic program in the Alaskan Beaufort Sea, 1998. LGL Rep. TA2230-3. Rep. from LGL Ltd., King City, Ont., and Greeneridge Sciences Inc., Santa Barbara, CA, for Western Geophysical, Houston, TX, and U.S. Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., Anchorage, AK, and Silver Spring, MD. 390 p.
- Miller, G.W., V.D. Moulton, R.A. Davis, M. Holst, P. Millman, A. MacGillivray, and D. Hannay. 2005. Monitoring seismic effects on marine mammals—southeastern Beaufort Sea, 2001–2002. p. 511-542 In: S.L. Armsworthy, P.J. Cranford, and K. Lee (eds.), Offshore oil and gas environmental effects monitoring: approaches and technologies. Battelle Press, Columbus, OH. 631 p.
- Miller, P.J.O., M.P. Johnson, P.T. Madsen, N. Biassoni, M. Quero, and P.L. Tyack. 2009. Using at-sea experiments to study the effects of airguns on the foraging behavior of sperm whales in the Gulf of Mexico. **Deep-Sea Res. I** 56(7):1168-1181.
- Miyashita, T. 1993. Abundance of dolphin stocks in the western North Pacific taken by the Japanese drive fishery. **Rep. Int. Whal. Comm.** 43:417-437.
- Miyazaki, N. and W.F. Perrin. 1994. Rough-toothed dolphin *Steno bredanensis* (Lesson, 1828). p. 1-21 In: S.H. Ridgway and R. Harrison (eds.), Handbook of marine mammals, Vol. 5: The first book of dolphins. Academic Press, San Diego, CA. 416 p.
- Mizroch, S.A., D.W. Rice, D. Zwiefelhofer, J. Waite, and W.L. Perryman. 2009. Distribution and movements of fin whales in the North Pacific Ocean. **Mammal. Rev.** 39(3):193-227.
- Mobley, J.M., Jr., S. Spitz, and R. Grotefendt. 2001. Abundance of humpback whales in Hawaiian waters: results of 1993–2000 aerial surveys. Prepared for the Hawaiian Islands Humpback Whale National Marine Sanctuary, NOAA, U.S. Department of Commerce, and the Hawaii Department of Land and Natural Resources. 16 p.
- Moore, S.E., K.M. Stafford, M.E. Dahlheim, C.G. Fox, H.W. Braham, J.J. Polovina, and D.E. Bain. 1998. Seasonal variation in reception of fin whale calls at five geographic areas in the North Pacific. **Mar. Mamm. Sci.** 14(3):617-627.

- Moore, S.E., J.M. Waite, N.A. Friday, and T. Honkalehto. 2002a. Distribution and comparative estimates of cetacean abundance on the central and south-eastern Bering Sea shelf with observations on bathymetric and prey associations. **Progr. Oceanogr.** 55(1-2):249-262.
- Moore, S.E., W.A. Watkins, M.A. Daher, J.R. Davies, and M.E. Dahlheim. 2002b. Blue whale habitat associations in the Northwest Pacific: analysis of remotely-sensed data using a Geographic Information System. **Oceanography** 15(3):20-25.
- Moore, S.E., K.M. Stafford, D.K. Mellinger, and C.G. Hildebrand. 2006. Listening for large whales in the offshore waters of Alaska. **BioScience** 56(1):49-55.
- Moulton, V.D. and M. Holst. 2010. Effects of seismic survey sound on cetaceans in the Northwest Atlantic. Environ. Stud. Res. Funds Rep. No. 182. St. John's, Nfld. 28 p.
- Moulton, V.D. and J.W. Lawson. 2002. Seals, 2001. p. 3-1 to 3-48 *In*: W.J. Richardson (ed.), Marine mammal and acoustical monitoring of WesternGeco's open water seismic program in the Alaskan Beaufort Sea, 2001. LGL Rep. TA2564-4. Rep. from LGL Ltd., King City, Ont., and Greeneridge Sciences Inc., Santa Barbara, CA, for WesternGeco, Houston, TX, and Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., Anchorage, AK, and Silver Spring, MD.
- Moulton, V.D. and G.W. Miller. 2005. Marine mammal monitoring of a seismic survey on the Scotian Slope, 2003. p. 29-40 *In*: K. Lee, H. Bain, and G.V. Hurley (eds.), Acoustic monitoring and marine mammal surveys in the Gully and outer Scotian Shelf before and during active seismic programs. Env. Stud. Res. Funds Rep. No. 151. 154 p. + xx. (Published 2007).
- Muñoz-Hincapié, M.F., D.M. Mora-Pinto, D.M. Palacios, E.R. Secchi, and A.A. Mignucci-Giannoni. 1998. First osteological record of the dwarf sperm whale in Colombia, with notes on the zoogeography of *Kogia* in South America. **Revista Acad. Colomb. Cien.** 22(84):433-444.
- Nieukirk, S.L., K.M. Stafford, D.K. Mellinger, R.P. Dziak, and C.G. Fox. 2004. Low-frequency whale and seismic airgun sounds recorded in the mid-Atlantic Ocean. **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 115(4):1832-1843.
- NMFS (National Marine Fisheries Service). 1995. Small takes of marine mammals incidental to specified activities; offshore seismic activities in southern California. **Fed. Regist.** 60(200, 17 Oct.):53753-53760.
- NMFS (National Marine Fisheries Service). 1998. Recovery plan for the blue whale (*Balaenoptera musculus*). Prepared by R.R. Reeves, P.J. Clapham, R.L. Brownell, Jr., and G.K. Silber for the Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., Silver Spring, MD. 42 p.
- NMFS (National Marine Fisheries Service). 2000. Small takes of marine mammals incidental to specified activities: marine seismic-reflection data collection in southern California/Notice of receipt of application. **Fed. Regist.** 65(60, 28 Mar.):16374-16379.
- NMFS (National Marine Fisheries Service). 2001. Small takes of marine mammals incidental to specified activities: oil and gas exploration drilling activities in the Beaufort Sea/Notice of issuance of an incidental harassment authorization. **Fed. Regist.** 66(26, 7 Feb.):9291-9298.
- NMFS (National Marine Fisheries Service). 2005. Endangered fish and wildlife: notice of intent to prepare an environmental impact statement. **Fed. Regist.** 70(7, 11 Jan.):1871-1875.
- NMFS (National Marine Fisheries Service). 2007. Recovery plan for the Hawaiian monk seal (*Monachus schauinslandi*), 2nd rev. Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., Silver Spring, MD. 165 p.
- NOAA and USN (National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration and U.S. Navy). 2001. Joint interim report: Bahamas marine mammal stranding event of 15–16 March 2000. U.S. Dep. Commer., Nat. Oceanic Atmos. Admin., Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., Sec. Navy, Assist. Sec. Navy, Installations and Environ. 51 p. Accessed in April 2011 at http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/pr/pdfs/health/stranding_bahamas2000.pdf.
- Norris, T.F., M. Mc Donald, and J. Barlow. 1999. Acoustic detections of singing humpback whales (*Megaptera novaeangliae*) in the eastern North Pacific during their northbound migration. **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 106(1):506-514.
- Nowacek, D.P., L.H. Thorne, D.W. Johnston, and P.L. Tyack. 2007. Responses of cetaceans to anthropogenic noise. **Mamm. Rev.** 37(2):81-115.

- NRC (National Research Council). 2005. Marine mammal populations and ocean noise/Determining when noise causes biologically significant effects. U.S. Nat. Res. Council., Ocean Studies Board, Committee on characterizing biologically significant marine mammal behavior (Wartzok, D.W., J. Altmann, W. Au, K. Ralls, A. Starfield, and P.L. Tyack). Nat. Acad. Press, Washington, DC. 126 p.
- Obura D.O., G. Stone, S. Mangubhai, S. Bailey, A. Yoshinaga, C. Holloway, and R. Barrel. 2011a. Baseline marine biological surveys of the Phoenix Islands, July 2000. **Atoll Res. Bull.** 589:1-62.
- Odell, D.K. and K.M. McClune. 1999. False killer whale *Pseudorca crassidens* (Owen, 1846). p. 213-243 In: S.H. Ridgway and R. Harrison (eds.), Handbook of marine mammals, Vol. 6: The second book of dolphins and the porpoises. Academic Press, San Diego, CA. 486 p.
- Ohsumi, S. and S. Wada. 1974. Status of whale stocks in the North Pacific, 1972. **Rep. Int. Whal. Comm.** 25:114-126.
- Olavarría, C., C.S. Baker, C. Garrigue, M. Poole, N. Hauser, S. Caballero, L. Flórez-González, M. Brasseur, J. Bannister, J. Capella, P. Clapham, R. Dodemont, M. Donoghue, C. Jenner, M. Jenner, D. Moro, M. Oremus, D. Paton, and K. Russell. 2007. Population structure of humpback whales throughout the South Pacific and the origins of the eastern Polynesian breeding grounds. **Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.** 330:257-268.
- Olson, P.A. 2009. Pilot whales *Globicephala melas* and *G. macrorhynchus*. p. 847-852 In: W.F. Perrin, B. Würsig, and J.G.M. Thewissen (eds.), Encyclopedia of marine mammals, 2nd edit. Academic Press, San Diego, CA. 1316 p.
- Omura, H. 1955. Whales in the northern part of the North Pacific. **Nor. Hvalfangst-Tidende** 44(6):323-345.
- Palacios, D.M. 1996. On the specimen of the ginkgo-toothed beaked whale, *Mesoplodon ginkgodens*, from the Galápagos Islands. **Mar. Mamm. Sci.** 12(3):444-446.
- Panigada, S., M. Zanardelli, S. Canese, and M. Jahoda. 1999. Deep diving performances of Mediterranean fin whales. p. 144 In: Abstracts, 13th Bienn. Conf. Biol. Mar. Mamm. 28 Nov.–3 Dec. 1999, Wailea, Maui, HI.
- Papastavrou, V., S.C. Smith, and H. Whitehead. 1989. Diving behaviour of the sperm whale, *Physeter macrocephalus*, off the Galápagos Islands. **Can. J. Zool.** 67(4):839-846.
- Parente, C.L., M.C.C. Marcondes, and M.H. Engel. 2006. Humpback whale strandings and seismic surveys in Brazil from 1999 to 2004. Working Pap. SC/58/E41. Int. Whal. Comm., Cambridge, U.K. 16 p.
- Parrish, F.A., M.P. Craig, T.J. Ragen, G.J. Marshall, and B.M. Buhleier. 2000. Identifying diurnal foraging habitat of endangered Hawaiian monk seals using a seal-mounted video camera. **Mar. Mamm. Sci.** 16(2):392-412.
- Perrin, W.F. 1990. Subspecies of *Stenella longirostris* (Mammalia: Cetacea, Delphinidae). **Proc. Biol. Soc. Wash.** 103(2):453-463.
- Perrin, W.F. 2009. Pantropical spotted dolphin *Stenella attenuata*. p. 819-821 In: W.F. Perrin, B. Würsig, and J.G.M. Thewissen (eds.), Encyclopedia of marine mammals, 2nd edit. Academic Press, San Diego, CA. 1316 p.
- Perrin, W.F. and R.L. Brownell, Jr. 2009. Minke whales *Balaenoptera acutorostrata* and *B. bonaerensis*. p. 733-735 In: W.F. Perrin, B. Würsig, and J.G.M. Thewissen (eds.), Encyclopedia of marine mammals, 2nd edit. Academic Press, San Diego, CA. 1316 p.
- Perrin, W.F. and J.W. Gilpatrick, Jr. 1994. Spinner dolphin. p. 99-128 In: S.H. Ridgway and R. Harrison (eds), Handbook of marine mammals, Vol. 5: The first book of dolphins. Academic Press, San Diego, CA. 416 p.
- Perrin, W.F. and A.A. Hohn. 1994. Pantropical spotted dolphin *Stenella attenuata*. p. 71-98 In: S.H. Ridgway and R. Harrison (eds.), Handbook of marine mammals, Vol. 5: The first book of dolphins. Academic Press, San Diego, CA. 416 p.
- Perrin, W.F., C.E. Wilson, and F.I. Archer II. 1994a. Striped dolphin *Stenella coeruleoalba* (Meyen, 1833). p. 129-159 In: S. H. Ridgway and R. J. Harrison (eds.), Handbook of marine mammals, Vol. 5: The first book of dolphins. Academic Press, San Diego, CA. 416 p.

- Perrin, W.F., S. Leatherwood, and A. Collet. 1994b. Fraser's dolphin *Lagenodelphis hosei* Fraser, 1956. p. 225-240 *In*: S.H. Ridgway and R. Harrison (eds.), Handbook of marine mammals, Vol. 5: The first book of dolphins. Academic Press, London, U.K. 416 p.
- Perry, S.L., D.P. DeMaster, and G.K. Silber. 1999a. The great whales: history and status of six species listed as endangered under the U.S. Endangered Species Act of 1973. **Mar. Fish. Rev.** 61(1):7-23.
- Perry, S.L., D.P. DeMaster, and G.K. Silber. 1999b. The fin whale. **Mar. Fish. Rev.** 61(1):44-51.
- Perryman, W.L., D.W.K. Au, S. Leatherwood, and T.A. Jefferson. 1994. Melon-headed whale *Peponocephala electra* Gray, 1846. p. 363-386 *In*: S.H. Ridgway and R. Harrison (eds.), Handbook of marine mammals, Vol. 5: The first book of dolphins. Academic Press, London, U.K. 416 p.
- Pierson, M.O., J.P. Wagner, V. Langford, P. Birnie, and M.L. Tasker. 1998. Protection from, and mitigation of, the potential effects of seismic exploration on marine mammals. Chapter 7 *In*: M.L. Tasker and C. Weir (eds.), Proc. Seismic Mar. Mamm. Worksh., London, U.K., 23–25 June 1998.
- Pike, G.C. and I.B. MacAskie. 1969. Marine mammals of British Columbia. **Bull. Fish. Res. Board Can.** 171. 54 p.
- Pitman, R.L. 2009. Mesoplodont whales (*Mesoplodon* spp.) p. 721-726 *In*: W.F. Perrin, B. Würsig, and J.G.M. Theewissen (eds.), Encyclopedia of marine mammals, 2nd edit. Academic Press, San Diego, CA. 1316 p.
- Pitman, R.L., A. Aguayo L., and J. Urbán R. 1987. Observations of an unidentified beaked whale (*Mesoplodon* sp.) in the eastern tropical Pacific. **Mar. Mamm. Sci.** 3(4):345-352.
- Pitman, R.L., D.M. Palacios, P.L.R. Brennan, B.J. Brennan, K.C. Balcomb III, and T. Miyashita. 1999. Sightings and possible identity of a bottlenose whale in the tropical Indo-Pacific: *Indopacetus pacificus*? **Mar. Mamm. Sci.** 15(2):513-518.
- Potter, J.R., M. Thillet, C. Douglas, M.A. Chitre, Z. Doborzynski, and P.J. Seekings. 2007. Visual and passive acoustic marine mammal observations and high-frequency seismic source characteristics recorded during a seismic survey. **IEEE J. Oceanic Eng.** 32(2):469-483.
- Psarakos, S., D.L. Herzog, and K. Marten. 2003. Mixed-species associations between pantropical spotted dolphins (*Stenella attenuata*) and Hawaiian spinner dolphins (*Stenella longirostris*) off Oahu, Hawaii. **Aquat. Mamm.** 29(3):390-395.
- Rankin, S. and J. Barlow. 2005. Source of the North Pacific “boing” sound attributed to minke whales. **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 118(5):3346-3351.
- Rankin, S., T.F. Norris, M.A. Smultea, C. Oedekoven, A.M. Zoidis, E. Silva, and J. Rivers. 2007. A visual sighting and acoustic detections of minke whales, *Balaenoptera acutorostrata* (Cetacea: Balaenopteridae), in near-shore Hawaiian waters. **Pacific Sci.** 61(3):395-398.
- Rankin, S., J. Barlow, J. Oswald, and L. Balance. 2008. Acoustic studies of marine mammals during seven years of combined visual and acoustic line-transect surveys for cetaceans in the eastern and central Pacific Ocean. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SWFSC-429. Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., Southwest Fish. Sci. Center, La Jolla, CA. 58 p.
- Rasmussen, K., J. Calambokidis, and G.H. Steiger. 2004. Humpback whales and other marine mammals off Costa Rica and surrounding waters, 1996–2003. Report of the Oceanic Society 2003 field season in cooperation with Elderhostel volunteers. Cascadia Research, Olympia, WA. 24 p.
- Rasmussen, K., D.M. Palacios, J. Calambokidis, M.T. Saborio, L. Dalla Rosa, E.R. Secchi, G.H. Steiger, J.M. Allen, and G.S. Stone. 2007. Southern Hemisphere humpback whales wintering off Central America: insights from water temperature into the longest mammalian migration. **Biol. Lett.** 3:302-305.
- Read, A.J., P.N. Halpin, L.B. Crowder, B.D. Best, and E. Fujioka (eds). 2009. OBIS-SEAMAP: mapping marine mammals, birds and turtles. World Wide Web electronic publication. Accessed on 17 April 2010 at http://seamap.env.duke.edu/prod/serdp/serdp_map.php.
- Reeves, R.R., B.S. Stewart, P.J. Clapham, and J.A. Powell. 2002. Guide to marine mammals of the world. Chanticleer Press, New York, NY. 525 p.

- Reilly, S.B. 1990. Seasonal changes in distribution and habitat differences among dolphins in the eastern tropical Pacific. **Mar. Ecol. Progr. Ser.** 66(1-2):1-11.
- Reilly, S.B. and P.C. Fiedler. 1994. Interannual variability of dolphin habitats in the eastern tropical Pacific. I: Research vessel surveys, 1986–1990. **Fish. Bull.** 92(2):434-450.
- Reilly, S.B. and V.G. Thayer. 1990. Blue whale (*Balaenoptera musculus*) distribution in the eastern tropical Pacific. **Mar. Mamm. Sci.** 6:265-277.
- Reilly, S.B., J.L. Bannister, P.B. Best, M. Brown, R.L. Brownell Jr., D.S. Butterworth, P.J. Clapham, J. Cooke, G.P. Donovan, J. Urbán, and A.N. Zerbini. 2008. *Megaptera novaeangliae*. In: IUCN 2011. IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. Version 2011.2. Accessed at <http://www.iucnredlist.org/apps/redlist/details/13006/0> on 10 November 2011.
- Rendell, L.E. and J.C.D. Gordon. 1999. Vocal response of long-finned pilot whales (*Globicephala melas*) to military sonar in the Ligurian Sea. **Mar. Mamm. Sci.** 15(1):198-204.
- Rice, D.W. 1978. The humpback whale in the North Pacific: distribution, exploitation and numbers. p. 29-44 In: K.S. Norris and R.R. Reeves (eds.), Report on a workshop on problems related to humpback whales (*Megaptera novaeangliae*) in Hawaii. NTIS PB 280 794, U.S. Dept. Comm.
- Rice, D.W. 1989. Sperm whale *Physeter macrocephalus* Linnaeus, 1758. p. 177-233 In: S.H. Ridgway and R. Harrison (eds.), Handbook of marine mammals, Vol. 4: River dolphins and the larger toothed whales. Academic Press, San Diego, CA. 444 p.
- Rice, D.W. 1998. Marine mammals of the world, systematics and distribution. Spec. Publ. 4. Soc. Mar. Mammal., Allen Press, Lawrence, KS. 231 p.
- Richardson, W.J., B. Würsig, and C.R. Greene. 1986. Reactions of bowhead whales, *Balaena mysticetus*, to seismic exploration in the Canadian Beaufort Sea. **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 79(4):1117-1128.
- Richardson, W.J., R.A. Davis, C.R. Evans, D.K. Ljungblad, and P. Norton. 1987. Summer distribution of bowhead whales, *Balaena mysticetus*, relative to oil industry activities in the Canadian Beaufort Sea, 1980–84. **Arctic** 40(2):93-104.
- Richardson, W.J., C.R. Greene, Jr., C.I. Malme, and D.H. Thomson. 1995. Marine mammals and noise. Academic Press, San Diego. 576 p.
- Richardson, W.J., G.W. Miller, and C.R. Greene, Jr. 1999. Displacement of migrating bowhead whales by sounds from seismic surveys in shallow waters of the Beaufort Sea. **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 106(4, Pt. 2):2281 (Abstr.).
- Richardson, W.J., M. Holst, W.R. Koski and M. Cummings. 2009. Responses of cetaceans to large-source seismic surveys by Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory. p. 213 In: Abstr. 18th Bienn. Conf. Biol. Mar. Mamm., Québec, Oct. 2009. 306 p.
- Ross, G.J.B. and S. Leatherwood. 1994. Pygmy killer whale *Feresa attenuata* Gray, 1874. p. 387-404 In: S.H. Ridgway and R.J. Harrison (eds.), Handbook of marine mammals, Vol. 5: The first book of dolphins. Academic Press, San Diego, CA. 416 p.
- Salden, D.R., L.M. Herman, M. Yamaguchik, and F. Sato. 1999. Multiple visits of individual humpback whales (*Megaptera novaeangliae*) between the Hawaiian and Japanese winter grounds. **Can. J. Zool.** 77(3):504-508.
- Schilling, M.R., I. Selpt, M.T. Weinrich, S.E. Frohock, A.E. Kuhlberg, and P.J. Clapham. 1992. Behavior of individually-identified sei whales *Balaenoptera borealis* during an episodic influx into the southern Gulf of Maine in 1986. **Fish. Bull.** 90:749-755.
- Schlundt, C.E., J.J. Finneran, D.A. Carder, and S.H. Ridgway. 2000. Temporary shift in masking hearing thresholds of bottlenose dolphins, *Tursiops truncatus*, and white whales, *Delphinapterus leucas*, after exposure to intense tones. **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 107(6):3496-3508.
- Scott, M.D., A.A. Hohn, A.J. Westgate, J.R. Nicolas, B.R. Whitaker, and W.B. Cambell. 2001. A note on the release and tracking of a rehabilitated pygmy sperm whale (*Kogia breviceps*). **J. Cetac. Res. Manage.** 3:87-94.

- Scott, T.M. and S.S. Sadove. 1997. Sperm whale, *Physeter macrocephalus*, sightings in the shallow shelf waters off Long Island, New York. **Mar. Mamm. Sci.** 13(2):317-321.
- Sears, R. 2009. Blue whale *Balaenoptera musculus*. p. 120-124 In: W.F. Perrin, B. Würsig, and J.G.M. Thewissen (eds.), Encyclopedia of marine mammals, 2nd edit. Academic Press, San Diego, CA. 1316 p.
- Sergeant, D.E. 1977. Stocks of fin whales *Balaenoptera physalus* L. in the North Atlantic Ocean. **Rep. Int. Whal. Comm.** 27:460-473.
- Simard, Y., F. Samaran, and N. Roy. 2005. Measurement of whale and seismic sounds in the Scotian Gully and adjacent canyons in July 2003. p. 97-115 In: K. Lee, H. Bain, and C.V. Hurley (eds.), Acoustic monitoring and marine mammal surveys in The Gully and outer Scotian Shelf before and during active seismic surveys. Environ. Stud. Res. Funds Rep. 151. 154 p. (Published 2007).
- Simmonds, M. P. and L.F. Lopez-Jurado. 1991. Whales and the military. **Nature** 351(6326):448.
- Smith, S.D. and H. Whitehead. 1999. Distribution of dolphins in Galápagos waters. **Mar. Mamm. Sci.** 15(2):550-555.
- 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.
- Stacey, P.J. and R.W. Baird. 1991. Status of the false killer whale, *Pseudorca crassidens*, in Canada. **Can. Field-Nat.** 105(2):189-197.
- Stafford, K.M. 2003. Two types of blue whale calls recorded in the Gulf of Alaska. **Mar. Mamm. Sci.** 19(4):682-693.
- Stafford, K.M., S.L. Nieuwkirk, and C.G. Fox. 1999. Low-frequency whale sounds recorded on hydrophones moored in the eastern tropical Pacific. **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 106(6):3687-3698.
- Stafford, K.M., S.L. Nieuwkirk, and C.G. Fox. 2001. Geographic and seasonal variation of blue whale calls in the North Pacific. **J. Cetac. Res. Manage.** 3(1):65-76.
- Stafford, K.M., D.K. Mellinger, S.E. Moore, and C.G. Fox. 2007. Seasonal variability and detection range modeling of baleen whale calls in the Gulf of Alaska, 1999–2002. **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 122(6):3378-3390.
- Stafford, K.M., J.J. Citta, S.E. Moore, M.A. Daher, and J.E. George. 2009. Environmental correlates of blue and fin whale call detections in the North Pacific Ocean from 1997 to 2002. **Mar. Ecol. Progr. Ser.** 395:37-53.
- Stewart, B.S. and S. Leatherwood. 1985. Minke whale *Balaenoptera acutorostrata* Lacépède, 1804. p. 91-136 In: S.H. Ridgway and R. Harrison (eds.), Handbook of marine mammals, Vol. 3: The sirenians and baleen whales. Academic Press, London, U.K. 362 p.
- Stewart, B.S., G.A. Antonelis, J.D. Baker, and P. Yochem. 2006. Foraging biogeography of the Hawaiian monk seal in the northwestern Hawaiian Islands. **Atoll Res. Bull.** 543:313-145.
- Stone, C.J. 2003. The effects of seismic activity on marine mammals in UK waters 1998–2000. JNCC Report 323. Joint Nature Conservancy, Aberdeen, Scotland. 43 p.
- Stone, C.J. and M.L. Tasker. 2006. The effects of seismic airguns on cetaceans in UK waters. **J. Cetac. Res. Manage.** 8(3):255-263.
- Teloni, V., P.M. Johnson, P.J.O. Miller, and P.T. Madsen. 2008. Shallow food for deep divers: dynamic foraging of male sperm whales. **J. Exp. Mar. Biol. Ecol.** 354(1):119-131.
- Thompson, D., M. Sjöberg, E.B. Bryant, P. Lovell, and A. Bjørge. 1998. Behavioural and physiological responses of harbour (*Phoca vitulina*) and grey (*Halichoerus grypus*) seals to seismic surveys. Abstr. World Mar. Mamm. Sci. Conf., Monaco.

- Thompson, P.O. and W.A. Friedl. 1982. A long term study of low frequency sound from several species of whales off Oahu, Hawaii. **Cetology** 45:1-19.
- Tillman, M.F. 1977. Estimates of population size for the North Pacific sei whale. **Rep. Int. Whal. Comm. Spec. Iss.** 1:98-106.
- Tolstoy, M., J.B. Diebold, S.C. Webb, D.R. Bohnenstiehl, E. Chapp, R.C. Holmes, and M. Rawson. 2004. Broadband calibration of R/V *Ewing* seismic sources. **Geophys. Res. Lett.** 31, L14310, doi: 10.1029/2004GL020234.
- Tolstoy, M., J. Diebold, L. Doermann, S. Nooner, S.C. Webb, D.R. Bohnenstiehl, T.J. Crone, and R.C. Holmes. 2009. Broadband calibration of R/V *Marcus G. Langseth* four-string seismic sources. **Geochem. Geophys. Geosyst.** 10, Q08011, doi:10.1029/2009GC002451.
- Tyack, P.L. 2009. Human-generated sound and marine mammals. **Phys. Today** 62(11, Nov.):39-44.
- Tyack, P., M. Johnson, and P. Miller. 2003. Tracking responses of sperm whales to experimental exposures of airguns. p. 115-120 *In*: A.E. Jochens and D.C. Biggs (eds.), Sperm whale seismic study in the Gulf of Mexico/annual report: year 1. OCS Study MMS 2003-069. Rep. from Texas A&M Univ., College Station, TX, for U.S. Minerals Manage. Serv., Gulf of Mexico OCS Reg., New Orleans, LA.
- Tyack, P.L., M. Johnson, N. Aguilar Soto, A. Sturlese, and P.T. Madsen. 2006. Extreme diving of beaked whales. **J. Exp. Biol.** 209(21):4238-4253.
- UNEP-WCMC. 2011. UNEP-WCMC Species Database: CITES-Listed Species. Appendices I, II and III. Valid from 27 April 2011. Accessed on 1 November 2011 at <http://www.cites.org/eng/app/appendices.php>.
- Wada, S. 1976. Indices of abundance of large-sized whales in the 1974 whaling season. **Rep. Int. Whal. Comm.** 26:382-391.
- Wade, P.R. and T. Gerrodette. 1993. Estimates of cetacean abundance and distribution in the eastern tropical Pacific. **Rep. Int. Whal. Comm.** 43:477-493.
- Waite, J. 2003. Cetacean assessment and ecology program: cetacean survey. Quarterly report. Accessed in April 2011 at <http://www.afsc.noaa.gov/Quarterly/jas2003/divrptsNMML2.htm>.
- Walker, J.L., C.W. Potter, and S.A. Macko. 1999. The diets of modern and historic bottlenose dolphin populations reflected through stable isotopes. **Mar. Mamm. Sci.** 15(2):335-350.
- Wang, M.C., W.A. Walker, K.T. Shao, and L.S. Chou. 2002. Comparative analysis of the diets of pygmy sperm whales and dwarf sperm whales in Taiwanese waters. **Acta Zool. Taiwan** 13(2):53-62.
- Wartzok, D., A.N. Popper, J. Gordon, and J. Merrill. 2004. Factors affecting the responses of marine mammals to acoustic disturbance. **Mar. Technol. Soc. J.** 37(4):6-15.
- Watkins, W.A. and K.E. Moore. 1982. An underwater acoustic survey for sperm whales (*Physeter catodon*) and other cetaceans in the southeast Caribbean. **Cetology** 46:1-7.
- Watkins, W.A., K.E. Moore, and P. Tyack. 1985. Sperm whale acoustic behaviors in the southeast Caribbean. **Cetology** 49:1-15.
- Watkins, W.A., M.A. Daher, G.M. Reppucci, J.E. George, D.L. Martin, N.A. DiMarzio, and D.P. Gannon. 2000a. Seasonality and distribution of whale calls in the North Pacific. **Oceanography** 13:62-67.
- Watkins, W.A., J.E. George, M.A. Daher, K. Mullin, D.L. Martin, S.H. Haga, and N.A. DiMarzio. 2000b. Whale call data from the North Pacific, November 1995 through July 1999: occurrence of calling whales and source locations from SOSUS and other acoustic systems. Tech. Rep. WHOI-00-02. Woods Hole Oceanographic Inst., Woods Hole, MA. 160 p.
- 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. 2008. Overt responses of humpback whales (*Megaptera novaeangliae*), sperm whales (*Physeter macrocephalus*), and Atlantic spotted dolphins (*Stenella frontalis*) to seismic exploration off Angola. **Aquat. Mamm.** 34(1):71-83.

- Weir, C.R. and S.J. Dolman. 2007. Comparative review of the regional marine mammal mitigation guidelines implemented during industrial seismic surveys, and guidance towards a worldwide standard. **J. Int. Wildl. Law Policy** 10(1):1-27.
- Westlake, R.L. and W.G. Gilmartin. 1990. Hawaiian monk seal pupping locations in the northwestern Hawaiian Islands. **Pacific Sci.** 44:366-383.
- Whitehead, H. 1993. The behavior of mature male sperm whales on the Galápagos breeding grounds. **Can. J. Zool.** 71(4):689-699.
- Whitehead, H. 2002. Estimates of the current global population size and historical trajectory for sperm whales. **Mar. Ecol. Progr. Ser.** 242:295-304.
- Whitehead, H. 2003. Sperm whales: social evolution in the ocean. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL. 431 p.
- Whitehead, H. 2009. Sperm whale *Physeter macrocephalus*. p. 1091-1097 In: W.F. Perrin, B. Würsig, and J.G.M. Theewissen (eds.), Encyclopedia of marine mammals, 2nd edit. Academic Press, San Diego, CA. 1316 p.
- Whitehead, H. and S. Waters. 1990. Social organization and population structure of sperm whales off the Galápagos Islands, Ecuador (1985–1987). **Rep. Int. Whal. Comm. Spec. Iss.** 12:249-257.
- Whitehead, H., S. Waters, and T. Lyrholm. 1992. Population structure of female and immature sperm whales (*Physeter macrocephalus*) off the Galápagos Islands. **Can. J. Fish. Aquatic Sci.** 49(1):78-84.
- Whitehead, H., W.D. Bowen, S.K. Hooker, and S. Gowans. 1998. Marine mammals. p. 186-221 In: W.G. Harrison and D.G. Fenton (eds.), The Gully: a scientific review of its environment and ecosystem. Canadian Stock Assess. Secret. Res. Doc. 98/83. Dep. Fish. Oceans, Ottawa, Ont.
- Wieting, D. 2004. Background on development and intended use of criteria. p. 20 In: S. Orenstein, L. Langstaff, L. Manning, and R. Maund (eds.), Advisory Committee on Acoustic Impacts on Marine Mammals, final meet. summ. Second Meet., April 28–30, 2004, Arlington, VA. Sponsored by the Mar. Mamm. Comm., 10 Aug.
- Willis, P.M. and R.W. Baird. 1998. Sightings and strandings of beaked whales on the west coast of Canada. **Aquat. Mamm.** 24(1):21-25.
- Winn, H.E. and N.E. Reichley. 1985. Humpback whale *Megaptera novaeangliae* (Borowski, 1781). p. 241-273 In: S.H. Ridgway and R. Harrison (eds.), Handbook of marine mammals, Vol. 3: The sirenians and baleen whales. Academic Press, London, U.K. 362 p.
- Winsor, M.H. and B.R. Mate. 2006. Seismic survey activity and the proximity of satellite tagged sperm whales. Working Pap. SC/58/E16. Int. Whal. Comm., Cambridge, U.K. 8 p.
- Würsig, B., S.K. Lynn, T.A. Jefferson, and K.D. Mullin. 1998. Behaviour of cetaceans in the northern Gulf of Mexico relative to survey ships and aircraft. **Aquat. Mamm.** 24(1):41-50.
- Würsig, B.G., D.W. Weller, A.M. Burdin, S.H. Reeve, A.L. Bradford, S.A. Blokhin, and R.L. Brownell, Jr. 1999. Gray whales summering off Sakhalin Island, Far East Russia: July–October 1997. A joint U.S.-Russian scientific investigation. Final Report. Rep. from Texas A&M Univ., College Station, TX, and Kamchatka Inst. Ecol. & Nature Manage., Russian Acad. Sci., Kamchatka, Russia, for Sakhalin Energy Investment Co. Ltd. and Exxon Neftegaz Ltd., Yuzhno-Sakhalinsk, Russia. 101 p.
- Yazvenko, S.B., T.L. McDonald, S.A. Blokhin, S.R. Johnson, S.K. Meier, H.R. Melton, M.W. Newcomer, R.M. Nielson, V.L. Vladimirov, and P.W. Wainwright. 2007a. Distribution and abundance of western gray whales during a seismic survey near Sakhalin Island, Russia. **Environ. Monit. Assess.** 134(1-3):45-73. doi: 10.1007/s10661-007-9809-9.
- Yazvenko, S.B., T.L. McDonald, S.A. Blokhin, S.R. Johnson, H.R. Melton, and M.W. Newcomer. 2007b. Feeding activity of western gray whales during a seismic survey near Sakhalin Island, Russia. **Environ. Monit. Assess.** 134(1-3): 93-106. doi: 10.1007/s10661-007-9810-3.
- Yochem, P.K. and S. Leatherwood. 1985. Blue whale. p. 193-240 In: S.H. Ridgway and R. Harrison (eds.), Handbook of marine mammals, Vol. 3: The sirenians and baleen whales. Academic Press, New York, NY. 362 p.

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

Fish, Invertebrates, and Other

- André, M., M. Solé, M. Lenoir, M. Durfort, C. Quero, A. Mas, A. Lombarte, M van der Schaar, M. López-Bejar, M. Morell, S. Zaugg, and L. Houégnigan. 2011. Low-frequency sounds induce acoustic trauma in cephalopods. **Front. Ecol. Environ.** doi:10.1890/100124.
- Andrighetto-Filho, J.M., A. Ostrensky, M.R. Pie, U.A. Silva, and W.A. Boeger. 2005. Evaluating the impact of seismic prospecting on artisanal shrimp fisheries. **Cont. Shelf. Res.**25:1720-1727.
- Antochiw, D., A. Dubuque, S. Milne, D. Palacios, and M. Piercy. 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.
- Bjarti, T. 2002. An experiment on how seismic shooting affects caged fish. Faroese Fisheries Laboratory, University of Aberdeen, Scotland. 41 p.
- Boeger, W.A., M.R. Pie, A. Ostrensky, and M.F. Cardoso. 2006. The effect of exposure to seismic prospecting on coral reef fishes. **Braz. J. Oceanog.** 54(4): 235-239.
- Booman, C., J. Dalen, H. Leivestad, A. Levsen, T. van der Meeren, and K. Toklum. 1996. Effeter av luftkanonshyting på egg, larver og yngel. **Fisken og Havet** 1996(3):1-83. (Norwegian with English summary).
- Buchanan, R.A., J.R. Christian, V.D. Moulton, B. Mactavish, and S. Dufault. 2004. 2004 Laurentian 2-D seismic survey environmental assessment. Rep. from LGL Ltd., St. John's, Nfld., and Canning & Pitt Associates, Inc., St. John's, Nfld., for ConocoPhillips Canada Resources Corp., Calgary, Alb. 274 p.
- Chapman, C.J. and A.D. Hawkins. 1969. The importance of sound in fish behaviour in relation to capture by trawls. **FAO Fish. Rep.** 62:717-729.
- Christian, J.R., A. Mathieu, and R.A. Buchanan. 2004. Chronic effects of seismic energy on snow crab (*Chionoecetes opilio*). Environ. Stud. Res. Funds Rep. No. 158, March 2004. Calgary, Alb. 45 p.
- Christian, J.R., A. Mathieu, D.H. Thomson, D. White, and R.A. Buchanan. 2003. Effect of seismic energy on snow crab (*Chionoecetes opilio*). Rep. from LGL Ltd., St. John's, Nfld., for Environ. Stud. Res. Fund (ESRF), Calgary, Alb. 56 p.
- Dalen, J. and G.M. Knutsen. 1986. Scaring effects in fish and harmful effects on eggs, larvae and fry by offshore seismic explorations. p. 93-102 In: H.M. Merklinger (ed.), Progress in underwater acoustics. Plenum, New York, NY. 839 p.
- Dalen, J. and A. Raknes. 1985. Scaring effects on fish from three dimensional seismic surveys. Inst. Mar. Res. Rep. FO 8504/8505, Bergen, Norway. (Norwegian, with an English summary).
- Dalen, J., E. Ona, A.V. Soldal, and R. Saetre. 1996. Seismiske undersøkelser til havs: en vurdering av konsekvenser for fisk og fiskerier [Seismic investigations at sea; an evaluation of consequences for fish and fisheries]. **Fisken og Havet** 1996:1-26. (Norwegian, with an English summary).
- DFO (Fisheries and Oceans Canada). 2004. Potential impacts of seismic energy on snow crab. DFO Can. Sci. Advis. Sec. Habitat Status Rep. 2004/003.
- Engås, A, S. Løkkeborg, E. Ona, and A.V. Soldal. 1996. Effects of seismic shooting on local abundance and catch rates of cod (*G. morhua*) and haddock (*M. aeglefinus*). **Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.** 53(10):2238-2249.
- Falk, M.R. and M.J. Lawrence. 1973. Seismic exploration: its nature and effect on fish. Tech. Rep. CENT-73-9. Fish. Mar. Serv., Resource Management Branch, Fisheries Operations Directorate.
- Guerra, A., A.F. González, and F. Rocha. 2004. A review of the records of giant squid in the north-eastern Atlantic and severe injuries in *Architeuthis dux* stranded after acoustic explorations. ICES CM 2004/CC:29.

- Hassel, A., T. Knutsen, J. Dalen, S. Løkkeborg, K. Skaar, Ø. Østensen, E.K. Haugland, M. Fonn, Å. Høines, and O.A. Misund. 2003. Reaction of sandeel to seismic shooting: a field experiment and fishery statistics study. Institute of Marine Research, Bergen, Norway.
- Hastings, M.C. and A.N. Popper. 2005. Effects of sound on fish. Prepared for Jones & Stokes, Sacramento, CA, for California Department of Transportation, Sacramento, CA. 28 January.
- 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.
- Holliday, D.V., R.E. Piper, M.E. Clarke, and C.F. Greenlaw. 1987. The effects of airgun energy release on the eggs, larvae, and adults of the northern anchovy (*Engraulis mordax*). American Petroleum Institute, Washington, DC. Tracer Applied Sciences.
- Holst, M. 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.
- Kostyuchenko, L.P. 1973. Effect of elastic waves generated in marine seismic prospecting on fish eggs on the Black Sea. **Hydrobiol. J.** 9:45-48.
- LaBella, G., C. Frogli, A. Modica, S. Ratti, and G. Rivas. 1996. First assessment of effects of air-gun seismic shooting on marine resources in the central Adriatic Sea. Society of Petroleum Engineers, Inc. Int. Conf. Health Safety Envir., New Orleans, LA, 9–12 June 1996.
- Løkkeborg, S. 1991. Effects of geophysical survey on catching success in longline fishing. **ICES CM B** 40. 9 p.
- McCauley, R.D., J. Fewtrell, A.J. Duncan, C. Jenner, M.-N. Jenner, J.D. Penrose, R.I.T. Prince, A. Adhitya, J. Murdoch, and K. McCabe. 2000a. Marine seismic surveys: analysis of airgun signals; and effects of air gun exposure on humpback whales, sea turtles, fishes and squid. Rep. from Centre for Marine Science and Technology, Curtin Univ., Perth, W.A., for Austral. Petrol. Prod. Assoc., Sydney, N.S.W. 188 p.
- McCauley, R.D., J. Fewtrell, A.J. Duncan, M.-N. Jenner, M.-N., C. Jenner, R.I.T. Prince, A. Adhitya, K. McCabe, and J. Murdoch. 2000b. Marine seismic surveys: a study of environmental implications. **APPEA (Austral. Petrol. Product. Explor. Assoc.) J.** 40:692-708.
- McCauley, R.D., J. Fewtrell, and A.N. Popper. 2003. High intensity anthropogenic sound damages fish ears. **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 113(1):638-642.
- Moriyasu, M., R. Allain, K. Benhalima, and R. Claytor. 2004. Effects of seismic and marine noise on invertebrates: a literature review. Canadian Sci. Advis. Secret. Res. Doc. 2004/126. Fisheries and Oceans Canada, Science.

- Parry, G.D. and A. Gason. 2006. The effect of seismic surveys on catch rates of rock lobsters in western Victoria, Australia. **Fish. Res.** 79:272-284.
- Payne, J.F., C.A. Andrews, L.L. Fancey, A.L. Cook, and J.R. Christian. 2007. Pilot study on the effects of seismic air gun noise on lobster (*Homarus americanus*). **Can. Tech. Rep. Fish. Aquat. Sci.** 2712.
- Payne, J.F., C. Andrews, L. Fancey, D. White, and J. Christian. 2008. Potential effects of seismic energy on fish and shellfish: an update since 2003. Canadian Sci. Advis. Secret. Res. Doc. 2008/060. Lasted updated 26 November 2008. Fisheries and Oceans Canada. Accessed in November 2011 at www.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/CSAS/Csas/Publications/ResDocs-DocRech/2008/2008_060_e.htm.
- Payne, J.F., J. Coady, and D. White. 2009. Potential effects of seismic airgun discharges on monkfish eggs (*Lophius americanus*) and larvae. *Envir. Stud. Res. Funds Rep. No. 170*. St. John's, Nfld. 35 p.
- Pearson, W.H., J.R. Skalski, and C.I. Malme. 1992. Effects of sounds from a geophysical survey device on behaviour of captive rockfish (*Sebastes* spp.). **Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.** 49(7):1343-1356.
- Pearson, W., J. Skalski, S. Sulkin, and C. Malme. 1994. Effects of seismic energy releases on the survival and development of zoeal larvae of Dungeness crab (*Cancer magister*). **Mar. Envir. Res.** 38:93-113.
- Pickett, G.D., D.R. Eaton, R.M.H. Seaby, and G.P. Arnold. 1994. Results of bass tagging in Poole Bay during 1992. *Lab. Leaflet 74*, MAFF Direct. Fish. Res., Lowestoft, U.K. 12 p.
- Popper, A.N. 2005. A review of hearing by sturgeon and lamprey. Rep. from A.N. Popper, Environmental BioAcoustics, LLC, Rockville, MD, for U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Portland District.
- Popper, A.N. 2009. Are we drowning out fish in a sea of noise? **Mar. Scientist** 27:18-20.
- Popper, A.N. and M.C. Hastings. 2009a. The effects of human-generated sound on fish. **Integr. Zool.** 4:43-52.
- Popper, A.N. and M.C. Hastings. 2009b. The effects of anthropogenic sources of sound on fishes. **J. Fish Biol.** 75:455-489.
- Popper, A.N., M. Salmon, and K.W. Horch. 2001. Acoustic detection and communication by decapod crustaceans. **J. Comp. Physiol. A** 187:83-89.
- Popper, A.N., M.E. Smith, P.A. Cott, B.W. Hanna, A.O. MacGilvray, M.E. Austin, and D.A. Mann. 2005. Effects of exposure to seismic air gun use on hearing of three fish species. **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 117(6):3958-3971.
- Rogers, P. and M. Cox. 1988. Underwater sound as a biological stimulus. p. 131-149 *In*: J. Atema., R.R. Fay, A.N. Popper, and W.N. Tavolga (eds.), *The sensory biology of aquatic animals*. Springer-Verlag, New York, NY.
- Saetre, R. and E. Ona. 1996. Seismike undersøkelser og på fiskeegg og -larver en vurdering av mulige effekter på bestandsniva. [Seismic investigations and damages on fish eggs and larvae; an evaluation of possible effects on stock level]. **Fisken og Havet** 1996:1-17, 1-8. (Norwegian, with an English summary).
- Santulli, La A., A. Modica, C. Messina, L. Ceffa, A. Curatolo, G. Rivas, G. Fabi, and V. D'Amelio. 1999. Biochemical responses of European sea bass (*Dicentrarchus labrax* L.) to the stress induced by offshore experimental seismic prospecting. **Mar. Pollut. Bull.** 38:1105-1114.
- Skalski, J.R., W.H. Pearson, and C.I. Malme. 1992. Effects of sounds from a geophysical survey device on catch-per-unit-effort in a hook-and-line fishery for rockfish (*Sebastes* spp.). **Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.** 49(7):1357-1365.
- Slotte, A., K. Hansen, J. Dalen, and E. Ona. 2004. Acoustic mapping of pelagic fish distribution and abundance in relation to a seismic shooting area off the Norwegian west coast. **Fish. Res.** 67:143-150.
- 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.
- Sverdrup, A., E. Kjellsby, P.G. Krüger, R. Fløysand, F.R. Knudsen, P.S. Enger, G. Serck-Hanssen, and K.B. Helle. 1994. Effects of experimental seismic shock on vasoactivity of arteries, integrity of the vascular endothelium and on primary stress hormones of the Atlantic salmon. **J. Fish Biol.** 45:973-995.

- Thomsen, B. 2002. An experiment on how seismic shooting affects caged fish. Thesis, Faroese Fisheries Laboratory, University of Aberdeen, Aberdeen, Scotland. 16 August.
- Urick, R.J. 1983. Principles of underwater sound, 3rd ed. McGraw-Hill, New York, NY. 423 p.
- Wardle, C.S., T.J. Carter, G.G. Urquhart, A.D.F. Johnstone, A.M. Ziolkowski, G. Hampson, and D. Mackie. 2001. Effects of seismic air guns on marine fish. **Cont. Shelf Res.** 21(8-10):1005-1027.

