

CENTRAL COASTAL CALIFORNIA SEISMIC IMAGING PROJECT

REQUEST FOR AN INCIDENTAL HARASSMENT AUTHORIZATION TO ALLOW THE
INCIDENTAL TAKE OF MARINE MAMMALS DURING A MARINE GEOPHYSICAL SURVEY



Submitted to:

National Marine Fisheries Service
S.W. Region Protected Resources Division
501 W. Ocean Blvd., Suite 4200
Long Beach, CA 90802

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Ventura Fish and Wildlife Office
2493 Portola Road, Suite B
Ventura, California 93003

Submitted by:

Pacific Gas and Electric Company
Diablo Canyon Power Plant
Avila Beach, California 93424

October 2012

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
1.0 OPERATIONS TO BE CONDUCTED	1
1.1 PROJECT PURPOSE	1
1.2 SURVEY DETAILS.....	2
1.3 VESSEL MOVEMENTS	4
1.3.1 Mobilization and Demobilization	6
1.3.2 Offshore Survey Operations	6
1.3.3 Survey Vessel Specifications.....	6
1.3.4 Air Gun Description.....	7
1.3.5 Hydrophone Streamer Description	9
1.3.6 Acoustic Measurements	10
1.3.7 Multibeam Echosounder and Sub-bottom Profiler	11
1.3.8 Gravimeter	12
1.3.9 Magnetometer.....	12
1.3.10 Onshore Survey Operations	13
1.4 EQUIPMENT REQUIREMENTS	14
1.5 PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS	16
2.0 DATES, DURATION, AND REGION OF ACTIVITY.....	17
2.1 2012 PROJECT SCHEDULE	17
2.2 REGION OF ACTIVITY	17
3.0 SPECIES AND NUMBERS OF MARINE MAMMALS IN AREA.....	18
4.0 STATUS, DISTRIBUTION AND SEASONAL DISTRIBUTION OF AFFECTED SPECIES OR STOCKS OF MARINE MAMMALS	22
4.1 ODONTOCETES (TOOTHED WHALES).....	22
4.1.1 Common Dolphin	22
4.1.2 Dall's Porpoise.....	23
4.1.3 Harbor Porpoise.....	23
4.1.4 Pacific White-sided Dolphin.....	23
4.1.5 Risso's Dolphin	24
4.1.6 Short-finned Pilot Whale	24
4.1.7 Bottlenose Dolphin.....	24
4.1.8 Northern Right Whale Dolphin	25
4.1.9 Killer Whale.....	25
4.1.10 Sperm Whale	25
4.1.11 Kogia Species.....	26
4.1.12 Baird's Beaked Whale	26
4.1.13 Striped Dolphin	27
4.1.14 Mesoplodont Beaked Whales	27
4.2 MYSTICETES (BALEEN WHALES).....	27
4.2.1 Gray Whale.....	28
4.2.2 Humpback Whale	28
4.2.3 Blue Whale	28

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

	Page
4.2.4 Minke Whale	29
4.2.5 North Pacific Right Whale	29
4.2.6 Fin Whale.....	29
4.2.7 Sei Whale	30
4.3 PINNIPEDS	30
4.3.1 California Sea Lion	30
4.3.2 Northern Fur Seal	31
4.3.3 Steller Sea Lion	31
4.3.4 Guadalupe Fur Seal.....	32
4.3.5 Northern Elephant Seal	32
4.3.6 Pacific Harbor Seal	32
4.4 FISSIPEDS.....	33
4.4.1 Southern Sea Otter.....	33
5.0 TYPE OF INCIDENTAL TAKE AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	34
6.0 NUMBERS OF MARINE MAMMALS THAT MAY BE TAKEN	35
6.1 INTRODUCTION.....	35
6.2 MARINE MAMMAL DENSITY ESTIMATES.....	35
6.3 3D SEISMIC SURVEY AREA.....	37
6.4 SAFETY RADIUS	37
6.5 3D SURVEY AREA WITH SAFETY RADIUS.....	38
6.6 POTENTIAL NUMBER OF ‘TAKES BY HARASSMENT’	39
7.0 ANTICIPATED IMPACT ON SPECIES OR STOCKS.....	45
7.1 POTENTIAL EFFECTS OF AIR GUN SOUNDS.....	45
7.1.1 Tolerance.....	45
7.1.2 Masking	45
7.1.3 Disturbance Reactions.....	46
7.2 EFFECTS ON MYSTICETES.....	47
7.3 EFFECTS ON ODONTOCETES.....	50
7.4 EFFECTS ON PINNIPEDS	51
7.5 EFFECTS ON FISSIPEDS.....	51
7.6 HEARING IMPAIRMENT AND OTHER PHYSICAL EFFECTS	51
7.6.1 Temporary Threshold Shift (TTS).....	52
7.6.2 Permanent Threshold Shift (PTS).....	55
7.6.3 Non-Auditory Physiological Effects.....	57
7.7 STRANDINGS AND MORTALITY.....	58
7.8 POSSIBLE EFFECTS OF MULTIBEAM ECHOSOUNDER SIGNALS .	59
7.8.1 Masking	60
7.8.2 Behavioral Responses.....	60
7.8.3 Hearing Impairment and Other Physical Effects.....	60
7.9 POSSIBLE EFFECTS OF THE SUB-BOTTOM PROFILER SIGNALS.	61
7.9.1 Masking	62
7.9.2 Behavioral Responses.....	62

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

	Page
7.9.3 Hearing Impairment and Other Physical Effects	62
7.10 ENTANGLEMENT	62
8.0. SUBSISTENCE USES	63
9.0 ANTICIPATED IMPACT ON HABITAT	64
9.1 INTRODUCTION	64
9.2. SEISMIC SURVEY EFFECTS ON FISHES	64
9.2.1 Pathological	64
9.2.2 Physiological	65
9.2.3 Behavioral Effects	66
9.3 SEISMIC EFFECTS ON INVERTEBRATES	66
9.3.1 Pathological Effects	66
9.3.2 Physiological Effects	66
9.3.3 Behavioral Effects	67
10.0 ANTICIPATED LOSS OR MODIFICATION OF HABITAT ON MARINE MAMMALS	68
11.0 MITIGATION MEASURES	69
11.1 MITIGATION MEASURES WITHIN THE SURVEY DESIGN	69
11.1.1 Vessel-based Marine Wildlife Contingency Plan (MWCP)	69
11.1.2 Scheduling to Avoid Areas of High Marine Wildlife Activity ...	70
11.1.3 Aerial Surveys	70
11.2 MITIGATION MEASURES DURING SURVEY ACTIVITIES	71
11.2.1 Safety and Exclusion Zones	72
11.2.2 Speed and Course Alterations	73
11.2.3 Ramp Ups	73
11.2.4 Power Downs	74
11.2.5 Shut Downs	74
11.2.6 Monitors	75
11.2.7 Use of Mitigation Air Gun	75
11.2.8 Passive Acoustic Monitoring	75
11.2.9 Night Survey Areas	76
11.3 Adaptive Management Plan	76
12.0 ARCTIC SUBSISTENCE HUNTING AREAS	78
13.0 MONITORING AND REPORTING PLAN	79
13.1 VESSEL-BASED MONITORING	79
13.2 AERIAL SURVEYS	80
13.3 REPORTING	80
13.3.1 Field Data Recording, Verification, Handling, and Security	80
13.3.2 Field Reports	81
13.3.3 Marine Mammal Carcasses	81
13.3.4. Final Reporting	81
14.0 COORDINATING RESEARCH TO REDUCE AND EVALUATE INCIDENTAL TAKE	83
15.0 REFERENCES	85

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	
1	Summary of Offshore Streamer Features 10
2	<i>R/V Langseth</i> Sub-bottom Profiler Specifications 11
3	Marine Mammal Protection Status and Population Estimates and Trends by Stock 19
5	Calculated Radii for Upslope, Downslope, and Alongshore Propagation Paths and Predicted RMS Radii for Single Bolt Air Gun 37
6	Box 4 Survey Area and Area with 160 dB Safety Radius 38
8	Estimated Number of Marine Mammals by Species in Proposed Safety Radius in Box 4 41
9	Requested "Take by Harassment" with Additional 25% for Box 4..... 44

LIST OF FIGURES	
1	Proposed Project Survey Area 3
2	Proposed 2012 Project Survey Track Line Map..... 5
3	One Linear Air Gun Array or String with Ten Air Guns, Nine of Which Would be Operating 8
4	<i>R/V Langseth</i> Air gun and Streamer Deployment 9
5	Bell BMG Marine Gravity Meter 12
6	Geometrics G-882 Magnetometer..... 12
7	Example of an Autonomous Wireless Recording Systems 13
8	Typical Wireless Iseis Sigma Nodal land Recording System Installation..... 14
9	Proposed Onshore Seismic Lines, Morro Strand..... 15
12	Box 4 Calculated Safety Zone Based on the 160 dB Distance 43

APPENDIX

Appendix A:	Greeneridge Sciences, Inc (2011)
Appendix B:	Harbor Porpoise Density Figures and Calculations
Appendix C:	Southern Sea Otter Density Figures and Calculations
Appendix D:	NMFS Harbor Porpoise Monitoring Study (Aerial and Acoustic Plan Draft)
Appendix E:	USFWS Southern Sea Otter Monitoring Study (Draft)
Appendix F:	Stranding Response Plan (Draft)

LIST OF ACRONYMS

2D	Two Dimensional Seismic Survey
3D	Three Dimensional Seismic Survey
24/7	24 hours per day/7 days per week
°C	degrees centigrade
°F	degrees Fahrenheit
AAC	Active Acoustic Monitoring
ACOE/Corps	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
AMS	Applied Marine Sciences
APCD	Air Pollution Control District
AWD	Accelerated Weight Drop
bar-m	Bar per meter pressure measurement
BOEMRE	Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Regulation and Enforcement
CAA	Clean Air Act
CCCSIP	Central Coastal California Seismic Imaging Project
CD	Compact Disc
CDFG	California Department of Fish and Game
cm	Centimeters
CPA	Closest Point of Approach
CPFV	Commercial Passenger Fishing Vessels
CSLC	California State Lands Commission
CW	Continuous wave
dB	Decibel
dB re 1µPa	Decibels in reference to 1 micro Pascal
DCPP	Diablo Canyon Power Plant
DPS	Distinct Population Segments
DOD	Department of Defense
EFH	Essential Fish Habitat
EFHA	Essential Fish Habitat Assessment
EIR	Environmental Impact Report
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
ESA	Endangered Species Act
FB	Fish Block
FESA	Federal Endangered Species Act

LIST OF ACRONYMS

FM	Frequency Modulation
FMP	Fishery Management Plan
ft	Feet
Ftm	Fathom (six feet)
GPS	Global Positioning System
GIS	Geographic Information Systems
HAPC	Habitat Areas of Particular Concern
HESS	High Energy Seismic Survey
HESST	High Energy Seismic Survey Team
HFZ	Hosgri Fault Zone
hp	Horsepower
Hz	Hertz
IAGS	International Association of Geophysical Contractors
IHA	Incidental Harassment Authorization
in	Inch(es)
IWC	International Whaling Commission
in ²	Square inch(es)
in ³	Inches cubed
kg	Kilogram
kHz	Kilohertz
KM	Kilometer Marks
km	Kilometer(s)
km ²	Square kilometers
kPa	Kilopascal
kt	Knot (Nautical Miles per Hour)
L-DEO	Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory
l	Liter(s)
lbs	Pounds
LOA	Letter of Authorization
m	Meter
m ²	Square meter
MBES	MultiBeam EchoSounder
MBNMS	Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary
MBTA	Migratory Bird Treaty Act

LIST OF ACRONYMS

mi	Mile
mi ²	Square mile
min	Minute
μPa	Micro Pascal
MLLW	Mean Lower Low Water
MMPA	Marine Mammal Protection Act
MMS	United States Minerals Management Service
MPA	Marine Protected Areas
ms	Millisecond
MSA	Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act
MWCP	Marine Wildlife Contingency Plan
M/V	Motor Vessel
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NCCOS	National Centers for Coastal Ocean Science
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NGO	Non-governmental Organization
NMFS	National Marine Fisheries Service
NOAA	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
NSF	National Science Foundation
nT	NanoTesla
OBIS-SEAMAP	Ocean Biogeographic Information System Spatial Ecological Analysis of Megavertebrate Populations
OEIS	Operational Environmental Impact Statement
OHWM	Ordinary High Water Mark
OSPR	California State Office of Oil Spill Prevention and Response
OWCN	Oiled Wildlife Care Network
PAM	Passive Acoustic Monitoring
PEIS	Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement
PFMC	Pacific Fishery Management Council
PG&E	Pacific Gas and Electric Company
pk-pk	Peak to Peak
Project	Central Coastal California Seismic Imaging Project
PSO	Protected Species Observer
psi	Pounds Per Square Inch

LIST OF ACRONYMS

PTS	Permanent Threshold Shift
RMS	Root Mean Squared
ROV	Remotely Operated Vehicle
rpm	Revolutions Per Minute
R/V	Research Vessel
SACLANT	Supreme Allied Commander, Atlantic
SBP	Sub-Bottom Profiler
SCB	Southern California Blight
sec	Second
SEL	Sound Exposure Levels
SERDP	Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program
SFZ	Shoreline Fault Zone
SMCA	State Marine Conservation Area
SML	Seafloor Mapping Lab
SMR	State Marine Reserve
SPL	Sound Pressure Level (RMS)
TTS	Temporary Threshold Shift
TWTT	Two-Way Travel Time
Uhl	Michael Uhl
USB	Universal Serial Bus
USCG	United States Coast Guard
USFWS	United States Fish and Wildlife Service
USGS	United States Geological Survey
WERC	Western Ecological Research Center
WS	Withering Syndrome

1.0 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.

The following updated project description was prepared by Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) in support of the proposed Offshore Central Coastal California Seismic Imaging Project (Project). This update reflects additional revisions to the project that have resulted during the permitting process, including the California State Lands Commission (CSLC) project approval which resulted in the elimination of portions of the originally planned survey area (Survey Box 3) and the extension of the project to a two-year work window. Additional revisions outlined in this updated project description have been developed in response to discussions with National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and California Coastal Commission (CCC). All Project related activities will occur within the central area of San Luis Obispo County, California (Figure 1). The following summarizes the proposed offshore deep seismic data collection survey operations proposed for 2012.

1.1 PROJECT PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed survey is to conduct a High Energy Seismic Survey (HESS) in the vicinity of the Diablo Canyon Power Plant (DCPP) and known offshore fault zones near DCPP (Figure 1). The Project as proposed by Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory (L-DEO), a part of Columbia University, in cooperation with PG&E consists of deploying seismic or sound sources and receivers at onshore and offshore locations to generate data that can be used to improve imaging of major geologic structures and fault zones in the vicinity of the DCPP.

The details of the proposed seismic studies are outlined in a Science Plan submitted to the National Science Foundation (NSF) by L-DEO, University of Nevada and Scripps Institution of Oceanography. NSF, as owner of the survey vessel *Marcus G. Langseth (R/V Langseth)*, will serve as the lead federal agency and will ensure the approval of the proposed Science Plan is in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969.

These seismic studies would provide additional insights of any relationships or connection between the known faults as well as enhance knowledge of offshore faults in proximity to the Central California Coast and DCPP. The proposed deep (10 to 15 kilometers [km] or 6 to 9 miles [mi]), HESS (energy >2 kilo joule) would complement a previously completed shallow (<1 km [<0.6 mi]), low energy (<2 kilo joule) three dimensional (3D) seismic reflection survey.

The objectives of the proposed high energy 3D seismic survey are to:

- Record high resolution two dimensional (2D) and 3D seismic reflection profiles of major geologic structures and fault zones in the vicinity of the Central California Coast and DCPP.

- Obtain high-resolution deep-imaging (>1 km [>0.6 mi]) of the Hosgri and Shoreline fault zones in the vicinity of the DCPD to constrain fault geometry and slip rate (Scheduled for 2013 survey activities) .
- Obtain improved (>1 km [>0.6 mi] depth) imaging of the intersection of the Hosgri and Shoreline fault zones northwest of Point Buchon.
- Obtain improved (>1 km [>0.6 mi] depth) imaging of the intersection of the Hosgri and Los Osos fault zones in Estero Bay.
- Augment current regional seismic data base for subsequent use and analysis.

The resulting data will provide significant societal benefit. The observations will be interpreted in the context of a global synthesis of observations bearing on earthquake rupture geometries, earthquake displacements, fault interactions, and fault evolution. Estimating the limits of future earthquake ruptures is becoming increasingly important as seismic hazard maps are based on geologists' maps of active faults and, locally, the Hosgri Fault strikes adjacent to one of California's major nuclear power plants.

The studies require the collection of data over a long period of time. However, the Project timeframe is limited to fall months due to whale and fish migration as well as nesting bird constraints. The current Project scope has been designed to minimize environmental impacts to the greatest extent feasible. PG&E is proposing to conduct the studies 24 hours per day, 7 days per week (24/7). This schedule is designed to reduce overall air emissions, length of time for operation in the water thereby reducing impacts to marine wildlife, commercial fishing, and other area users. PG&E will work with environmental agencies to appropriately address the balancing of public health and safety and environmental concerns during the conduct of these studies.

1.2 SURVEY DETAILS

The proposed 3D seismic survey track to be completed during the 2012 survey period will be Box 4 which is located within Estero Bay (See Figure 2). Boxes 1 and 2 have been deferred and will be scheduled for the 2013-2014 work window. Refinement of the Box 1 and 2 survey components will be completed following the 2012 survey and will be subject to a supplemental review process.

The proposed survey involves both marine and some limited onshore activities. The offshore components consist of operating a geophysical survey vessel and support/monitoring vessels within the areas shown in Figure 2. The geophysical survey vessel would tow a series of sound-generating air guns and sound-recording hydrophones along pre-determined shore-parallel and shore-perpendicular transects to conduct deep (10 to 15 km [6 to 9 mi]) seismic reflection profiling of major geologic structures and fault zones in the vicinity of DCPD.

Onshore operations will involve the installation of passive acoustical receivers on the Morro Strand. Installation and retrieval of these seismic receivers would be concurrent with the proposed offshore operations.



Figure 1. Proposed Project Survey Area

1.3. VESSEL MOVEMENTS

The 3D seismic survey race tracks will encompass an area of approximately 334.48 km² (129.14 mi²). The offshore (vessel) survey would be conducted in both federal and state waters and water depths within the proposed survey areas ranging from 0 to over 400 m (1,300 ft), the State Three-Mile Limit is the teal line in Figure 1 and 2. The Point Buchon Marine Protected Area (MPA) lies adjacent to portions of the survey area. In addition, the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary (MBNMS), a federally-protected marine sanctuary that extends northward from Cambria to Marin County, is located to the north and outside of the Project area. The 2012 survey area includes:

Survey Box 4. (Estero Bay)

- Area: 334.48 km² (129.14 mi²)
- Total survey line length is 1,417.6 km (880.9 mi)
- Dip line survey across the Hosgri and Los Osos fault zones in Estero Bay

Figure 2 depicts the proposed survey transit lines for Box 4. These lines depict the survey lines as well as the turning legs. The full seismic array is firing during the straight portions of the track lines as well as the initial portions of the run out sections and later portions of run in sections. During turns and most of the initial portion of the run ins, there will only be one air gun firing (mitigation air gun). Assuming a daily survey rate of approximately 8.3 km/hr (4.5 knots for 24/7 operations), Survey Box 4 is expected to be completed in approximately 9.25 days. When considering mobilization, demobilization, equipment maintenance, weather, marine mammal activity, and other contingencies, the proposed 2012 survey is expected to be completed in 32.25 days. For a more detailed discussion, refer to Section 2.1 - Project Schedule.




Figure 2. Proposed 2012 Project Survey Track Line Map

1.3.1 Mobilization and Demobilization

The offshore 3D marine survey equipment and vessels are highly specialized and typically not available in California. The proposed seismic survey vessel (*R/V Marcus G. Langseth [R/V Langseth]*) is currently operating on the west coast and is available to conduct the proposed survey work. The *R/V Langseth* would transit south prior to the start of survey operations (November 1 through December 31, 2012). Once the vessel has arrived in the Project area, the survey crew, any required equipment, and support provisions would be transferred to the vessel. The proposed survey vessel would be supported by a chaseboat (*R/V Nushagak Spirit or equivalent*) and scout/shore support boat (*M/V Enterprise or equivalent*). An additional scout/monitoring vessel, *M/V Michael Uhl (M/V Uhl)*, is available locally and would be utilized to support operations as necessary. Upon completion of the offshore survey operations, the survey crew would be transferred to shore and the survey vessel would transit out of the Project area.

1.3.2 Offshore Survey Operations

The proposed offshore seismic survey would be conducted with geophysical vessels specifically designed and built to conduct such surveys. PG&E has selected the *R/V Langseth*, which is operated by the L-DEO (Columbia University). The following outlines the general specifications for the *R/V Langseth* geophysical survey vessel and the support vessels needed to complete the offshore survey.

- Primary vessel - The *R/V Langseth* is 71.5 m [235 ft.] in length and is outfitted to deploy/retrieve hydrophone streamers and air gun arrays, air compressors for the air gun array, and survey recording facilities.
- Chase boat – *R/V Nushagak Spirit* is 33.5 m (110 ft) in length and will be deployed in front of the *R/V Langseth* to observe potential obstructions, additional marine mammal monitoring and support deployment of seismic equipment.
- Third vessel – *M/V Enterprise* is approximately 24.3 m [80 ft] in length and would act as a scout boat and support vessel for the *R/V Langseth*.
- Support work vessel – The *M/V Uhl* is approximately 30.5 m [100 ft] in length and would be used as a standby vessel to support marine operations

1.3.3 Survey Vessel Specifications

The *R/V Langseth* is proposed as the seismic survey vessel. The *R/V Langseth* would tow both the air gun and hydrophone streamer array along predetermined lines (Figure 2). When the *R/V Langseth* is towing the air gun array as well as the hydrophone streamers, the vessel would “fly” the appropriate USCG-approved day shapes (mast head signals used to communicate with other vessels) and display the appropriate lighting to designate the vessel has limited maneuverability. The turning radius is limited to 3 degrees per minute (2.5 km [1.5 mi]). Thus, the maneuverability of the vessel is limited during operations with the streamers.

The *R/V Langseth* has a length of 71.5 m (235 ft), a beam of 17.0 m (56 ft), and a maximum draft of 5.9 m (19.4 ft). The *R/V 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 3,550 hp, which drive the two propellers directly. Each propeller has four blades, and the shaft typically rotates at 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 data acquisition is typically 7.4 to 9.3 km/h (4.6 to 5.7 miles/h). When not towing seismic survey gear, the *R/V Langseth* typically cruises at 18.5 km/h (11.5 miles/h). Other details of the *R/V 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

1.3.4 Air Gun Description

The survey would be shot using two tuned air gun arrays, consisting of two sub-arrays with 1,650 cubic inches (in³). The array would consist of a mixture of Bolt 1500LL and Bolt 1900LLX air guns. The subarrays would be configured as two identical linear arrays or “strings” (Figure 3). Each string would have ten air guns; the first and last air guns in the strings are spaced 16 m (52.5 ft) apart. Nine air guns in each string would be fired simultaneously (for a total volume of approximately 3,300 in³), whereas the tenth is kept in reserve as a spare, to be turned on in case of failure of another air gun. The subarrays would be fired alternately during the survey. Each of the two subarrays would be towed approximately 140 m (459 ft) behind the vessel and would be distributed across an area of approximately 12 by 16 m (40 by 50 ft) behind the primary vessel, offset by 75 m (250 ft). Discharge intervals depend on both the ship’s speed and Two Way Travel Time (TWTT) recording intervals. For a 16-second TWTT, air guns will be discharged approximately every 37.5 meters (123 ft) based on an assumed boat speed of 4.5 knots. The firing pressure of the subarrays is 1,900 pounds per square inch (psi). During firing, a brief (~0.1 sec) pulse of sound is emitted. The air guns would be silent during the intervening periods.

The tow depth of the air gun array would be 9 m (29.5 ft). Because the actual source is a distributed sound source (9 air guns) rather than a single point source, the highest sound levels measurable at any location in the water would be less than the nominal single point source level. In addition, the effective (perceived) source level for sound propagating in near-horizontal directions would be substantially lower than the nominal omni-directional source level because of the directional nature of the sound from the air gun array (i.e. sound is directed downward).




Figure 3. One Linear Air Gun Array or String with Ten Air Guns, Nine of Which Would be Operating

Details regarding the proposed 18-air gun air gun array (2 strings) specifications are as follows:

- Energy source: Eighteen, 2,000 psi Bolt air guns of 40 to 360 in³ each
- Source output (downward): 0- peak (pk) is 42 bar-m (252 dB re 1 μ Pa at 1 m); pk-pk is 87 bar-m (259 dB)
- Towing depth of energy source: 9 m (29.5 ft.)
- Air discharge volume: ~3,300 in³
- Dominant frequency components: 0-188 Hertz (Hz)

Ropes are used to keep the air guns at a depth of 9 m (29.5 ft) and the vessel speed during data collection would range from 7.4 to 9.3 km/h (4 to 5 nautical miles per hour [knots]). The sound source would be generated by the discharge of the air guns approximately every 37.5 m (123 ft) (Figure 4), which is based on an assumed vessel speed of 8.3 km/h (4.5 knots). The expected timing of the shots is once every 15 to 20 seconds.




Figure 4. R/V Langseth Air gun and Streamer Deployment

1.3.5 Hydrophone Streamer Description

The *R/V Langseth* will tow four hydrophone streamers with a length of approximately 6 km (3.7 mi). The intended tow depth is approximately 10 m (32.8 ft). Each streamer would consist of Sentry Solid Streamer Sercel cable. Flotation is provided on each streamer, as well as Streamer Recovery Devices (SRD). The SRD are activated when the streamer sinks to a pre-determined depth (e.g. 50 m [164 ft]) to aid in recovery.

A series of seven hydrophones will be present along each streamer for acoustic measurement. The hydrophones will consist of a mixture of Sonardyne Transceivers. Each streamer will contain three groups of paired hydrophones, with each group approximately 2,375 m (7,800 ft) apart. The hydrophones within each group will be approximately 300 m (984 ft) apart. One additional hydrophone will be located on the tail buoy attached to the streamer cable. In addition, one Sonardyne Transducer will be attached to the air gun array. Compass Birds will be used to keep the streamer cables and hydrophones at a depth of approximately 10 m (33 ft). One compass bird will be placed at the front end of each streamer. Figure 4 depicts the configuration of both the streamer and air gun array used by the *R/V Langseth*.

Details regarding the proposed hydrophone streamer and acoustic recording equipment specifications are included in Table 1 below.

Table 1. Summary of Offshore Streamer Features

Hydrophone Type	Sonardyne XSRS Transceiver 7885 (Standard)
Length of Individual Unit (approximate)	85.8 cm (33.8 in)
Diameter of Individual Unit (approximate)	7.5 cm (3.0 in)
Weight of Individual Unit in Air (approximate)	7.3 kg (16.0 lbs)
Number of Units per String	5
Hydrophone Type	Sonardyne XSRS Transceiver 8005 (Long Life)
Length of Individual Unit (approximate)	91.1 cm (35.9 in)
Diameter of Individual Unit (approximate)	8.9 cm (3.5 in)
Weight of Individual Unit in Air (approximate)	10.4 kg (22.9 lbs)
Number of Units per String	2
Hydrophone Type	Sonardyne HGPS Transducer 7887 (Right Angle)
Length of Individual Unit (approximate)	56.3 cm (22.2 in)
Diameter of Individual Unit (approximate)	9.4 cm (3.7 in)
Weight of Individual Unit in Air (approximate)	9.6 kg (21.2 lbs)
Number of Units per String	1
Depth Sensor	ION Model 5011 Compass Bird
Length of Individual Unit (approximate)	120 cm (48.2 in)
Weight of Individual Unit in Air (approximate)	8.32 kg (18.3 lbs)
Number of Units per Streamer (approximate)	4
Streamer Type	Thompson Marconi Sentry
Streamer Depth (approximate)	10 m (33 ft.)
Group Interval (approximate)	12.5 m (41 ft.)
Group Length (approximate)	12.5 m (41 ft.)
Number of Groups	468
Length of Streamer	6 km (3.7 mi)

Source: Columbia University

1.3.6 Acoustic Measurements

The strengths of the air gun pulses can be measured in a variety of ways, but National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) commonly uses “root mean square” (in dB re 1 μ Pa [rms]), which is the level of the received air gun pulses averaged over the duration of the pulse. The rms value for a given air gun pulse is typically 10 dB lower than the peak level, and 16 dB lower than the pk-pk level (McCauley *et al.*, 1998, 2000 a,b).

The noise modeling for the proposed 3D seismic survey is based on the results of mathematical modeling conducted by Greeneridge Sciences, Inc. (2011). The model results are based upon the air gun specifications provided for the *R/V Langseth* and seafloor characteristic available for the Project area. Safety and Exclusion Zone dimensions are based on NMFS definitions for Incidental Harassment Authorizations (IHA). The Safety Zone is the distance within which received sound levels are modeled to be greater than 160 dB and the Exclusion Zone is the distance within which received sound levels are modeled to be greater than 180 dB. Distances to received levels of 120, 154, 160, 170, 180, 187, and 190 dB re 1 μ Pa (rms) are also provided (Table 4 in Section 6.4 below).

1.3.7 Multibeam Echosounder and Sub-bottom Profiler

Along with the air gun operations, two additional acoustical data acquisition systems will be operated from the *R/V Langseth* continuously during the survey. The ocean floor will be mapped with a Kongsberg EM-122 multibeam echosounder (MBES) and a Knudsen 320B sub-bottom profiler (SBP).

The Kongsberg EM-122 MBES operates at 10.5-13 (usually 12 kHz) and is hull-mounted on the *R/V Langseth*. The transmitting beam width is 1 or 2 degrees fore-aft and 150 degrees athwartship. The maximum source level is 242 dB re 1 μPa m_{rms} . Each “ping” consists of 8 (in water >1,000 m [3,300 ft] deep) or 4 (<1,000 m [3,300 ft]) successive fan-shaped transmissions, each ensonifying a sector that extends 1 degree fore-aft. Continuous-wave (CW) pulses increase from 2 to 15 (milliseconds) ms long in water depths up to 2,600 m (8,350 ft), and frequency-modulated (FM) chirp pulses up to 100 ms long are used in water >2,600 m (8,350 ft). The successive transmissions span an overall cross-track angular extent of about 150 degree, with 2 ms gaps between the pulses for successive sectors (see Table 2).

The Knudsen 320B SBP is normally operated to provide information about the sedimentary features and the bottom topography that is being mapped simultaneously by the MBES. The beam is transmitted as a 27-degree cone, which is directed downward by a 3.5-kHz transducer in the hull of the *R/V Langseth*. The maximum output is 1,000 watts (204 dB), but in practice, the output varies with water depth. The pulse interval is 1 second (sec), but a common mode of operation is to broadcast five pulses at 1-sec intervals followed by a 5-sec pause. Both the Kongsberg EM-122 MBES and Knudsen 320B SBP are operated continuously during survey operations. Given relatively shallow water depths of the survey area (20 to 300 m [66 to 984 ft]), the number of ‘pings’ or transmissions would be reduced from 8 to 4, and the pulse durations would be reduced from 100 ms to 2 to 15 ms for the Kongsberg EM-122. Power levels of both instruments would be reduced from maximum levels to account for water depth. Actual operating parameters will be established at the time of the survey. Additional details are provided in Table 2

Table 2. *R/V Langseth* Sub-bottom Profiler Specifications

Maximum source output (downward)	204 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}\cdot\text{m}$; 800 watts
Dominant frequency components	3.5 kHz
Bandwidth	1.0 kHz with pulse duration 4 ms
	0.5 kHz with pulse duration 2 ms
	0.25 kHz with pulse duration 1 ms
Nominal beam width	30 degrees
Pulse duration	1, 2, or 4 ms

1.3.8 Gravimeter

The *R/V Langseth* will employ a Bell Aerospace BGM-3 gravimeter system (Figure 5) to measure very tiny fractional changes in the Earth's gravity caused by nearby geologic structures, the shape of the Earth, and by temporal tidal variations. The BGM-3 has been specifically designed to make precision measurements in a high motion environment. Precision gravity measurements are attained by the use of the highly accurate Bell Aerospace Model XI inertial grade accelerometer.



Figure 5. Bell BMG Marine Gravity Meter

1.3.9 Magnetometer

The *R/V Langseth* will employ a Bell Aerospace BGM-3 geometer, which contains a model G-882 cesium-vapor marine magnetometer (Figure 6). Magnetometers measure the strength and/or direction of a magnetic field, generally in units of nanotesla (nT) in order to detect and map geologic formations. These data would enhance earlier marine magnetic mapping conducted by the United States Geological Survey (USGS) (Sliter *et al.*, 2009).



Figure 6. Geometrics G-882 Magnetometer

The G-882 is designed for operation from small vessels for shallow water surveys as well as for the large survey vessels for deep tow applications (4,000 psi rating, telemetry over steel coax available to 10 km [6.2 mi]). Power may be supplied from a 24 to 30 VDC battery power or a 110/220 VAC power supply. The standard G-882 tow cable includes a Vectran strength member and can be built to up to 700 m (2,297 ft) (no telemetry required). The shipboard end of the tow cable is attached to a junction box or on-board cable. Output data are recorded on a computer with an RS-232 serial port.

Both the gravimeter and magnetometers are “passive” instruments and do not emit sounds, impulses, or signals, and are not expected to adversely affect marine mammals.

1.3.10 Onshore Survey Operations

Onshore, a linear array of Zland nodals (or equivalent Iseis Sigma nodes) will be deployed along a single route on the Morro Strand to record onshore sound transmitted from the offshore air gun surveys. The autonomous, nodal, cable-less recording systems (geophones) (Figure 7) would be deployed by foot into the soil adjacent to existing roads, trails and beaches (Figure 8). Route location is shown in Figure 9. Ninety nodes would be placed at 100 m (328 ft.) intervals along the Strand for a total route length of 9 km (5.6 mi). The nodal systems are carried in backpacks and pressed into the ground at each receiver point. Each nodal would be removed following completion of the data collection. PG&E estimates that the onshore receiver activities would be conducted over a 2 to 3-day period, concurrent with the offshore surveys.




Figure 7. Example of an Autonomous Wireless Recording Systems



Figure 8. Typical Wireless Iseis Sigma Nodal Land Recording System Installation
(Battery Pack is located on the left and Recording System on Right)

1.4 EQUIPMENT REQUIREMENTS

The following vessels and equipment are proposed for use in the offshore survey.

- *R/V Marcus G. Langseth*
 - Two air gun arrays;
 - Four hydrophone streamers;
 - Multi Beam Echo Sounder and Sub Bottom Profiler; gravity and magnetic sensors.
- Chase boat – *R/V Nushagak Spirit* or equivalent
- Support vessel – *M/V Enterprise* or equivalent
- Support vessel - *M/V Michael Uhl*

The following is a preliminary estimate of anticipated vehicle and equipment needs for the proposed onshore geophone placement.

- 1 to 2 equipment van/truck for equipment transport and data recording/processing.
- Small support vessel




Figure 9. Proposed Onshore Seismic Lines, Morro Strand

The following is a preliminary estimate of anticipated onshore vehicle and equipment needs for the proposed seismic surveys.

- 1 to 2 vans for data recording/processing.
- Small support vessel

1.5 PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS

It is estimated that 77 personnel would be required for the proposed offshore survey program. Additional project-related personnel may also participate. The 77 personnel breakdown is as follows:

- *R/V Marcus G. Langseth* crew: 55 (Based on Coast Guard registration)
- *R/V Nushagak Spirit* 6
- *M/V Enterprise* 6
- *M/V Michael Uhl* crew: 5
- Administrative/computer support: 5

Onshore survey operations are expected to require approximately 6 crew members. In addition, biological and cultural resource monitors would accompany each team in sensitive resource areas. These teams would operate at intervals of 0.8 to 4.8 km (0.5 to 3 mi) throughout the proposed Project area.

2.0 DATES, DURATION, AND REGION OF ACTIVITY

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

2.1 2012 PROJECT SCHEDULE

The proposed activities, including mobilization and demobilization, are expected to take 32.25 operational days to complete, assuming 24/7 operations. This estimate includes time for instrument deployment, profiling, instrument recovery, and demobilization. Mobilization operations during 2012 work window will be initiated no earlier than November 15 and completed no later than December 31, 2012. Below is an estimated schedule for the Project:

- Mobilization to Project Site - 6 days
- Offshore Equipment Deployment - 3 days
- Pre-activity marine mammal surveys - 5 days (concurrent to equipment mobilization and deployment)
- Onshore geophone deployment – 2 - 3 days (concurrent with offshore deployment activities)
- Equipment Calibration and Sound Check - 5 days
- Seismic Survey
 - Survey Box 4 (Survey area within Estero Bay) - 9.25 days
- Streamer and air gun preventative maintenance - 1 days
- Additional shutdowns (marine mammal presence, crew changes, and unanticipated weather delays) - 2 days
- Demobilization - 6 days

TOTAL: 32.25 days (for 24/7 operation). Note that the total of 32.25 days is based on adding the above non-concurrent tasks.

Placement of the onshore receiver lines would be completed prior to the start of offshore survey activities and would remain in place until the offshore survey can be completed.

2.2 REGION OF ACTIVITY

The proposed survey area is located offshore of central California. See Figures 1 and 2 in Section 1.0 for a depiction of the Project area.

3.0 SPECIES AND NUMBERS OF MARINE MAMMALS IN AREA

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

The marine mammal species under the jurisdiction of NMFS and United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) that are known to or may occur in the seismic survey area include 18 cetacean species, 6 species of pinnipeds, and 1 fissiped species. Six cetacean species (fin whale, humpback whale, blue whale, northern right whale, sei whale, and sperm whale) are listed as Endangered under the Federal Endangered Species Act (FESA). Two pinniped species (Guadalupe fur seal and Steller sea lion) and 1 fissiped species (southern sea otter) are listed as Threatened under FESA.

Fin, sei, north Pacific right, and sperm whale sightings are uncommon in the area, and have a low likelihood of occurrence during the seismic survey. Similarly, the Project area is generally north of the range of the Guadalupe fur seal.

Table 3 below details the marine mammal species possibly occurring in the Project area, along with protected status and population estimates and trends by stock. Section 4.0 provides information on the numbers of species observed in the general Project area.

Table 3. Marine Mammal Protection Status and Population Estimates and Trends by Stock

Common Name Scientific Name	Protected Status ¹	Minimum Population Estimate	Current Population Trend
Mysticeti			
California gray whale <i>Eschrichtius robustus</i>	M	18,017 (Eastern North Pacific Stock)	Fluctuating annually
Fin whale <i>Balaenoptera physalus</i>	FE, M	2,624 (California/Oregon/Washington Stock)	Increasing off California
Humpback whale <i>Megaptera novaeangliae</i>	FE, M	1,878 (California/Oregon/Washington Stock)	Increasing
Blue whale <i>Balaenoptera musculus</i>	FE, M	2,046 (Eastern North Pacific Stock)	Unable to determine
Minke whale <i>Balaenoptera acutorostrata</i>	M	202 (California/Oregon/Washington Stock)	No long-term trends suggested
North Pacific right whale <i>Eubalaena japonica</i>	FE, M	17 (based on photo-identification) (Eastern North Pacific Stock)	No long-term trends suggested
Sei whale <i>Balaenoptera borealis</i>	FE, M	83 (Eastern North Pacific Stock)	No long-term trends suggested
Odonteceti			
Short-beaked common dolphin <i>Delphinus delphis</i>	M	343,990 (California/Oregon/Washington Stock)	Unable to determine
Long-beaked common dolphin <i>Delphinus capensis</i>	M	17,127 (California Stock)	Unable to determine
Harbor porpoise <i>Phocoena phocoena</i>	M	1,478 (Morro Bay Stock)	Unable to determine
Dall's porpoise <i>Phocoenoides dalli</i>	M	32,106 (California/Oregon/Washington Stock)	Unable to determine
Pacific white-sided dolphin <i>Lagenorhynchus obliquidens</i>	M	21,406 (California/Oregon/Washington Stock)	No long-term trends suggested
Risso's dolphin <i>Grampus griseus</i>	M	4,913 (California/Oregon/Washington Stock)	No long-term trends suggested
Northern right whale dolphin <i>Lissodelphis borealis</i>	M	6,019 (California/Oregon/Washington Stock)	No long-term trends suggested

Common Name Scientific Name	Protected Status ¹	Minimum Population Estimate	Current Population Trend
Striped dolphin <i>Stenella coeruleoalba</i>	M	8,231 (California, Oregon, Washington)	No long term trend due to rarity
Baird's beaked whale <i>Berardius bairdii</i>	M	615 (California, Oregon, Washington)	No long term trend due to rarity
Mesoplodont beaked whales	M	576 (California, Oregon, Washington)	No long term trend due to rarity
Bottlenose dolphin <i>Tursiops truncatus</i>	M	684 (California/Oregon/Washington Offshore Stock) 290 (California Coastal Stock)	No long-term trends suggested
Sperm whale <i>Physeter macrocephalus</i>	FE, M	751 (California/Oregon/Washington Stock)	No long-term trends suggested
Dwarf sperm whale <i>Kogia sima</i>	M	Unknown (California, Oregon, Washington)	No long term trend due to rarity
Short-finned pilot whale <i>Globicephala macrorhynchus</i>	M	465 (California/Oregon/Washington Stock)	No long-term trends suggested
Killer whale <i>Orcinus orca</i>	M	162 (Eastern North Pacific Offshore Stock) 354 (West Coast Transients)	No long-term trends suggested
Pinnipeds			
California sea lion <i>Zalophus californianus</i>	M	153,337 (U.S. Stock)	Unable to determine; increasing in most recent three year period
Northern elephant seal <i>Mirounga angustirostris</i>	M	74,913 (California Breeding Stock)	Increasing
Pacific harbor seal <i>Phoca vitulina richardsi</i>	M	26,667 (California Stock)	Stable
Northern fur seal <i>Callorhinus ursinus</i>	M	5,395 (San Miguel Island Stock)	Increasing
Guadalupe fur seal <i>Arctocephalus townsendi</i>	FT, M	3,028 (Mexico Stock) Undetermined in California	Increasing
Northern (Steller) sea lion <i>Eumetopias jubatus</i>	FT, M	42,366 (Western U.S. Stock)	Decreasing

Common Name Scientific Name	Protected Status ¹	Minimum Population Estimate	Current Population Trend
Fissipeds			
Southern sea otter <i>Enhydra lutris nereis</i>	FT, M	2,711*	Unable to determine

Source: NMFS, 2011; NMFS,2012

¹Protected Status Codes:

- FE Federally listed Endangered Species
- FT Federally listed Threatened Species
- M Protected under Marine Mammal Protection Act

4.0 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.

The marine mammal species under the jurisdiction of the NMFS and the USFWS most likely to occur in the seismic survey area include: four mysticeti species (gray whale, blue whale, minke whale, and humpback whale); six odontoceti species (Dall's porpoise, harbor porpoise, Pacific white-sided dolphin, Risso's dolphin, common dolphin, and bottlenose dolphin); four pinniped species (California sea lion, harbor seal, Steller sea lion, and northern fur seal); and, one fissiped species (southern sea otter). These species are described in detail below. A number of other species have a low probability of occurring in the Project area during the seismic survey Project, but are also described below.

4.1 ODONTOCETES (TOOTHED WHALES)

Odontocetes, or toothed whales, that are commonly found in the central California waters, include: sperm whale, several species of dolphins, porpoises, and at least six species of beaked whale. With the exception of killer whales, which are the top predators in the ocean and feed on a wide variety of fishes, squid, seabirds, sea turtles, pinnipeds, and cetaceans, odontocetes generally feed on schooling fishes and squid (Bonnell and Dailey, 1993). Major fish prey species include anchovy, mackerel, lanternfish, smelt, herring, and rockfishes. Octopus and crustaceans are also eaten on occasion.

Due to the offshore nature of the proposed Project, several of the odontocetes that exist within central California waters have the potential to occur within the Project area, or to be encountered by vessels traveling to the Project area. The species with the highest potential to be encountered during Project activities are discussed below.

4.1.1 Common Dolphin

Common dolphins are found worldwide and are the most abundant cetaceans in California waters (Bonnell and Dailey, 1993). Two recognized species of common dolphin are found in central California waters. The long-beaked common dolphin is commonly found within about 90 km (55 mi) from the coastline. Its relative abundance changes both seasonally and inter-annually, with the highest densities observed during warm water events (Heyning and Perrin, 1994). A recent population estimate for this species is about 17,127 (NMFS, 2011). The more numerous short-beaked common dolphin ranges from the coast to 550 km (340 mi) offshore. The most recent estimates indicate the California-Washington population of this species to be 343,990 individuals making it the most abundant cetacean off California (NMFS, 2011). California common dolphins are very gregarious and are frequently encountered in herds of 1,000 or more. Because populations tend to vary with water temperature, no long-term population trends have been determined at this time (NMFS, 2011). Common dolphins were

observed regularly from late summer through winter of 2010 during marine mammal monitoring events within or near Project area waters (Padre, 2010, 2011a).

4.1.2 Dall's Porpoise

Dall's porpoise is one of the most abundant small cetaceans in the North Pacific and are found in shelf, slope, and offshore waters throughout their range (Koski *et al.*, 1998). The Dall's porpoise is found year-round throughout the Project area (NCCOS, 2007). The most recent population estimates indicate that at least 32,106 individuals are known to occur off California, Oregon, and Washington (NMFS, 2011). The population trend for this species has not yet been determined (NMFS, 2011). Ten Dall's porpoises were observed from late summer through winter of 2010 during marine mammal monitoring events within Project area waters (Padre, 2011a). Tenera Environmental (2007) reported approximately 21 Dall's porpoises during marine mammal monitoring conducted in November 2007 within the Project area.

4.1.3 Harbor Porpoise

Harbor porpoise are found in coastal and inland waters from Point Conception, California to Alaska and across to the Kamchatka Peninsula and Japan. The harbor porpoise occurs year-round off of central California, mostly in the coastal ocean, and occasionally in bays, harbors, and estuaries (NCCOS, 2007). The most recent population estimates for the Morro Bay harbor porpoise stock indicate that at least 1,478 individuals occur between Cambria and Point Conception, and the population trend is increasing (NMFS, 2011). Harbor porpoises were observed regularly while transiting to the Project area in the late summer and winter of 2010 (Padre, 2010, 2011a).

Genetic testing in the early 1990s identified differences between the central coast population and the other populations along the west coast of the harbor porpoise, which ultimately led to the splitting of the central coast population into its own species stock. More recent genetic findings from Chivers *et al.*, (2002, 2007), found that there are six distinct harbor porpoise populations along the west coast and four genetically different populations along the California coast. Based on the threat of population isolation and density separation from aerial flights, what was once the central coast population has been split into the Monterey Bay and Morro Bay stocks. According to the recent 2009 stock assessment for harbor porpoise, the Morro Bay population has averaged a 13% annual growth since 1988, possibly due to dispersal from the Monterey Bay population. According to the recent density data provided by Karin Forney of NMFS (Appendix B), the highest density area of the Morro Bay stock is south of Oceano averaging over two individuals per km², with a total area of 504 km².

4.1.4 Pacific White-sided Dolphin

Pacific white-sided dolphins primarily range along the coasts of California, Oregon, and Washington. This species frequents deep water foraging areas, but may move into nearshore areas in search of prey. Analysis of sighting patterns suggest that Pacific white-sided dolphins make north-south movements, occurring primarily off California in cold water months and moving northward to Oregon and Washington as waters warm in the late spring in summer

(Forney *et al.*, 2000; Allen *et al.*, 2011). Pacific white-sided dolphin populations are not showing any long-term trend in terms of abundance, but have a current minimum population size of 21,406 off California, Oregon, and Washington (NMFS, 2011). This species was not observed during recent marine mammal monitoring projects in the general Project vicinity (Padre, 2010, 2011a).

4.1.5 Risso's Dolphin

Risso's dolphins are present off central and southern California year-round (Dohl *et al.*, 1981, 1983; Bonnell and Dailey, 1993). Risso's dolphins are found off California during the colder water months and are extending their range northward as water temperatures increase (Leatherwood *et al.*, 1982; Allen *et al.*, 2011). The most recent population estimates indicate that at least 4,913 individuals are known to occur off California, Oregon, and Washington (NMFS, 2011). No long-term population trends have been determined at this time. Risso's dolphins can be observed year-round within the Project area, and were observed regularly from late summer through winter of 2010 during marine mammal monitoring events within or near Project area waters (Padre, 2010, 2011a).

4.1.6 Short-finned Pilot Whale

The short finned pilot whale is a relatively more southern or warm water species. Pilot whales were common off southern California until the early 1980's (Dohl *et al.*, 1983), but disappeared from area waters following the 1982-1983 El Nino (Bonnell and Dailey, 1993; Forney *et al.*, 2000). Recently, pilot whales have begun reappearing in California waters, possibly in response to long-term changes in oceanographic conditions, but sightings are still rare (Forney *et al.*, 2000). The most recent estimates indicate that at least 465 individuals are known to occur off California, Oregon, and Washington (NMFS, 2011). No long-term population trends have been determined at this time. None were observed during recent marine mammal monitoring projects in the general Project vicinity (Padre, 2010, 2011a).

4.1.7 Bottlenose Dolphin

The bottlenose dolphin is probably more widely distributed than any other species of small cetacean in the eastern North Pacific (Leatherwood *et al.*, 1982). This species has been tentatively separated into a coastal form and offshore form. The coastal bottlenose dolphin is generally found within 1 km (0.6 mi) of shore and often enters the surf zone, bays, inlets, and river mouths (Leatherwood *et al.*, 1987). The California coastal population is estimated at 290 and appears to form small resident groups that range along the coastline (NMFS, 2011). The area of the project site within 1 km from shore is 46.6 km² within Box 4.

Offshore bottlenose dolphins are believed to have a more-or-less continuous distribution off the coast of California (Mangels and Gerrodette, 1994). The current minimal population is estimated at 684 individuals off California, Oregon, and Washington (NMFS, 2011). No long-term population trends have been determined at this time (NMFS, 2011). None were observed during recent marine mammal monitoring projects in the general Project vicinity (Padre, 2010, 2011a).

4.1.8 Northern Right Whale Dolphin

The northern right whale dolphins are endemic to temperate waters of the North Pacific, where they range from the Mexican border to British Columbia (Leatherwood and Walker, 1979; Leatherwood *et al.*, 1982). They are primarily found over the shelf and slope in U.S. coastal waters and are known to make seasonal north-south movements (Forney *et al.*, 2000). Northern right whale dolphins are found primarily off California during colder-water months and shift northward into Oregon and Washington as water temperatures increase in late spring and summer (NCCOS, 2007). The most recent population estimates indicate that at least 6,019 individuals are known to occur off California, Oregon, and Washington (NMFS, 2011). No long-term population trends have been determined at this time (NMFS, 2011). Ten northern right whale dolphins were observed during the winter of 2010 during marine mammal monitoring events within Project area waters (Padre, 2011a).

4.1.9 Killer Whale

The killer whale occurring off the coast of California has been tentatively separated into a transient form, an offshore form, and a resident form. The West Coast Transient form is the most frequently sighted off central California, and has been observed from southern California to Alaska. This form feeds on marine mammals, travels in small groups often over long ranges, and are usually quiet (NCCOS, 2007). It can occur year-round in the Project area, but are most frequently sighted from January-May and from September through November. The most recent population estimate for the transient stock of killer whales is 354 (NMFS, 2011). In January of 2012, 10 transient killer whales were observed off Avila Beach (KSBY, 2012). The Eastern North Pacific Southern Resident form is primarily sighted in more nearshore, areas well north of the Project area. (NMFS, 2011). Offshore killer whales have more recently been identified off the coasts of California, Oregon, and rarely, in Southeast Alaska (Carretta *et al.*, 2008). They apparently do not mix with the transient and resident killer whale stocks found in these regions. The offshore type is more vocal, travels in larger groups, and feeds on fishes and squid (NMFS, 2011). The total number of known offshore killer whales along the U.S. West Coast, Canada, and Alaska is 162 animals (NMFS, 2011). Two killer whales were observed in the winter of 2010 during marine mammal monitoring events within Project area waters (Padre, 2011a).

4.1.10 Sperm Whale

The sperm whale is a federally endangered species due to historically intensive commercial whaling. The sperm whale is the largest of the toothed whales and is found predominately in temperate to tropical waters in both hemispheres (Gosho *et al.*, 1984). Off California, sperm whales are present in offshore waters year-round, with peak abundance from April to mid-June and again from late August through November (Dohl *et al.*, 1981, 1983; Gosho *et al.*, 1984; Barlow *et al.*, 1997). Sperm whales are primarily pelagic species and are generally found in waters with depths of greater than 1,000 m (3,300 ft) (Watkins, 1977), although their distribution does suggest a preference for continental shelf margins and seamounts, areas of upwelling and high productivity (Leatherwood and Reeves, 1983). The majority of sightings by Dohl *et al.* (1983) in their 3-year study off central and northern California were in waters deeper than 1,800 m (5,900 ft), but near the continental shelf edge. These areas are well offshore of

the proposed survey area. The most recent estimates indicate that at least 751 individuals are known to occur off California, Oregon, and Washington (NMFS, 2011). No long-term population trends have been determined at this time (NMFS, 2011). None were observed during recent marine mammal monitoring projects in the general Project vicinity (Padre, 2010, 2011a).

4.1.11 *Kogia* Species

There are two *Kogia* spp. that may occur in the project area, the dwarf sperm whale (*Kogia sima*) and pygmy sperm whale (*Kogia breviceps*). The pygmy sperm whale is more likely to be observed within the project area. Below is a brief description of the pygmy and dwarf sperm whale.

Pygmy sperm whales are distributed worldwide in deep tropical and temperate waters. They are rarely seen at sea due to their deep diving times and inconspicuous nature on the surface. Pygmy sperm whales mostly feed on mid- and deep-water squid, but may also feed on shrimp and various small fish (Allen et al., 2011). The available data is not sufficient enough to distinguish seasonal distribution or stock boundaries (NMFS, 2012c). On occasion, pygmy sperm whales will strand together, reflecting a strong social structure within pods. The most recent estimate indicated that at least 271 individual occur off California, Oregon, and Washington (NMFS, 2012c). No long-term population trend has been determined at this time.

Dwarf sperm whales are distributed throughout deep waters and along the continental slopes of the North Pacific and other ocean basins. According to NMFS, no at-sea sightings of this species have been reported, which may be due to their pelagic distribution, small body size and cryptic behavior (NMFS, 2011). A few sightings of animals identified only as *Kogia* sp. have been reported, and some of these may have been dwarf sperm whales. At least five dwarf sperm whales stranded in California between 1967 and 2000 (NMFS, 2011). They are often observed as an individual or up to 10 individuals (Allen et al., 2011). No information is available on the minimum population for dwarf sperm whales off of California, Oregon, and Washington (NMFS, 2011).

4.1.12 Baird's Beaked Whale

The Baird's beaked whale is the largest of the beaked whale family and are distributed along continental slopes and throughout deep waters of the North Pacific (NCCOS, 2007). The Baird's beaked whale range is from the offshore waters of Baja California to as far as the Pribilof Islands. NMFS surveys indicated a seasonal presence of Baird's beaked whales off the west coast of the United States. Most sightings are in summer and fall along the continental slope, and it appears that these whales migrate further offshore in the winter (Allen et al., 2011). They are often observed in groups of three to 30 or more individuals. The most recent estimates in 2010 indicate that at least 615 individuals are known to occur off California, Oregon, and Washington (NMFS, 2011). No long-term population trends have been determined at this time (NMFS, 2011).

4.1.13 Striped Dolphin

Striped dolphins are distributed world-wide in tropical and warm-temperate pelagic waters. Striped dolphins are gregarious and are often observed in groups averaging from 28 to 83 individuals (Allen *et al.*, 2011). Most sightings of striped dolphins occur within about 185 to 556 km (100 to 300 nautical miles) from the coast. Based on sighting records off California and Mexico, striped dolphins appear to have a continuous distribution in offshore waters of these two regions. The most recent estimates in 2010 indicate that at least 8,231 individuals are known to occur off California, Oregon, and Washington (NMFS, 2011). No long-term population trends have been determined at this time (NMFS, 2011).

4.1.14 Mesoplodont Beaked Whales

Mesoplodont beaked whales are distributed throughout deep waters and along the continental slopes of the North Pacific Ocean. Six species known to occur in this region include: Blainville's beaked whale (*M. densirostris*), Perrin's beaked whale (*M. perrini*), Lesser beaked whale (*M. peruvianus*), Stejneger's beaked whale (*M. stejnegeri*), Ginkgo-toothed beaked whale (*M. ginkgodens*), and Hubbs' beaked whale (*M. carlhubbsi*) (NMFS, 2011). However, due to the rarity of records and the difficulty in identifying these animals in the field, virtually no species-specific information is available so this species has been grouped to include all in the *Mesoplodon* stocks for this region. The most recent estimates in 2010 indicate that at least 576 individuals are known to occur off California, Oregon, and Washington (NMFS, 2011).

4.2 MYSTICETES (BALEEN WHALES)

Three families of mysticetes, (baleen whales), along the central California coast. Species include the gray whale, the northern right whale, and members of the rorqual family (Balaenopteridae). Rorquals are characterized as having pleated throats that expand to take in water, which is then strained outward through the baleen. Rorqual species include: blue whale, fin whale, humpback whale, and minke whales.

Although individual species' patterns vary, baleen whales range widely in the North Pacific, migrating between coldwater summer feeding grounds in the north and winter calving grounds in the south (Bonnell and Dailey, 1993). The mating season generally begins during the fall during the southbound migration and lasts through winter. Most baleen whales feed low on the food chain, eating a variety of swarming, pelagic, shrimp-like invertebrates (Bonnell and Dailey, 1993). Some species also take small schooling fishes and squid. Larger rorquals, such as the blue whale, appear to feed mainly on large pelagic crustaceans, while the diets of smaller baleen whales tend to include more fish.

Due to the offshore nature of the proposed Project, several species of the mysticetes, have the potential to occur within the Project area, or to be encountered by vessels traveling to the Project area. The species with the highest potential to be encountered during Project activities are discussed below:

4.2.1 Gray Whale

The gray whale is the most commonly observed cetacean. The gray whale population breeds and calves in lagoons along the west coast of Baja California and in the Gulf of California in the winter (NCCOS, 2007). At the end of the season, the population begins an 8,000 km (5,000 mi) coastal migration to summer feeding grounds to the north. Migrating gray whales generally travel within 3 km (1.86 mi) of the shoreline over most of the route, unless crossing mouths of rivers and straits (Dohl *et al.*, 1983). The southward migration generally occurs from December through February and peaks in January. The northward migration in the Project area generally occurs from February through May with a peak in March. The most recent population estimates of eastern North Pacific gray whale indicated approximately 19,126 individuals and a minimum of 18,017 individuals (NMFS, 2011). The gray whale population growth rate was about 3.3 percent per year between 1968 and 1988 (NOAA, 1993), and following 3 years of review, was removed from the endangered species list on June 15, 1994. Gray whales were observed in the winter of 2010 during marine mammal monitoring events within or near Project area waters (Padre, 2011a).

4.2.2 Humpback Whale

The humpback whale is an endangered species due to intensive historical commercial whaling. Humpbacks are distributed worldwide and undertake extensive migration in parts of their range (Leatherwood *et al.*, 1982; NMFS, 1991). The population in the Project area is referred to as the eastern northern stock or California/Oregon/Washington stock, which spends the winter/spring months in coastal Central America and Mexico for breeding and calving and migrate to the coast of California to southern British Columbia in summer/fall to feed (NMFS, 2011). In the summer, humpbacks are found in high latitude feeding grounds of the Gulf of Alaska in the Pacific. The humpback whales are distributed mostly over shelf and slope habitats and are more frequently sighted off central California from March through November, with peaks in the summer and fall (NCCOS, 2007). Migrants passing through central California appear to follow a more inshore path than blue or fin whales (Bonnell and Dailey, 1993). The most recent population estimates of humpback whale indicate that at least 1,878 individuals occur off California, Oregon, and Washington (NMFS, 2011). This population estimate is anticipated to be increasing (NMFS, 2011). Humpback whales were observed on multiple occasions from late summer through winter of 2010 during marine mammal monitoring events within or near Project area waters (Padre, 2010, 2011a). Tenera Environmental (2007) reported approximately four humpback whales during marine mammal monitoring conducted in November 2007 within the Project area.

4.2.3 Blue Whale

The blue whale is a federally listed endangered species due to intensive historical commercial whaling. Blue whales are distributed worldwide in circumpolar and temperate waters, and inhabit both coastal and pelagic environments (Leatherwood *et al.*, 1982; Reeves *et al.*, 1998). Poleward movements in spring allow the whales to take advantage of high zooplankton production in summer (NMFS website [f]). This species is most common from June through November off central and southern California coastal waters where it tends to

concentrate near areas of upwelling particularly off the northern Channel Islands. The best available science suggests the gestation period is approximately 10 to 12 months and that calves are nursed for about 6 to 7 months. Most reproductive activity, including births and mating, takes place during the winter (NMFS website [a]). The most recent estimates of the blue whale indicate that a minimum of 2,046 individuals occur off the U.S. west coast (NMFS, 2011). Two blue whales were observed during a marine mammal monitoring event offshore of Point Sal at the limits of the Project survey area in the summer of 2010 (Padre, 2010a).

4.2.4 Minke Whale

Minke whales are a coastal species that are widely distributed on the continental shelf throughout the eastern North Pacific Ocean (Green *et al.*, 1989) and occur year-round off the coast of California. This species favors shallow water and venture near shore more often than other baleen whales (Watson, 1981). They seem to be curious about shipping and approach moving vessels. The most recent estimates of minke whales indicate that at least 202 individuals occur off California, Oregon, and Washington, but no long-term trend for the population has been identified at this time (NMFS, 2011). Two minke whales were observed from late summer through winter of 2010 and four were observed in the winter of 2011 during marine mammal monitoring events within or near Project area waters (Padre, 2010, 2011a, 2012).

4.2.5 North Pacific Right Whale

The north Pacific right whale is a federally listed endangered species due to historical intensive historical commercial whaling. Like other baleen whales, right whales appear to migrate from high-latitude feeding grounds toward more temperate waters in the fall and winter, although the location of seasonal migration routes is unknown (Allen *et al.*, 2011). The usual wintering ground of north Pacific right whales extends from northern California to Washington, although sightings have been recorded as far south as Baja California and near the Hawaiian Islands (Allen *et al.*, 2011; Gendron *et al.*, 1999; Scarff, 1986). Females give birth to their first calf at an average age of 9 to 10 years. Gestation lasts approximately one year. Calves are usually weaned toward the end of their first year. This species feeds from spring to fall, and also in winter in certain areas. The primary food sources are zooplankton, including copepods, euphausiids, and cyprids. Unlike other baleen whales, right whales are skimmers: they feed by removing prey from the water using baleen while moving with their mouth open through a patch of zooplankton (NMFS website [b]). According to the NMFS (2011), the population estimate for the Eastern North Pacific Stock for this species remains low at only 17 individuals. No long-term population trends have been determined at this time (NMFS, 2011). None were observed during recent marine mammal monitoring projects in the general Project vicinity (Padre, 2010, 2011a).

4.2.6 Fin Whale

The fin whale is a federally endangered species due to a severe worldwide population decline due to intensive commercial whaling. Summer distribution is generally offshore and south of the northern Channel Island chain, particularly over the Santa Rosa-San Nicolas Ridge.

However, acoustic signals from fin whale are detected year-round off northern California, Oregon, and Washington, with a concentration of vocal activity between September and February (Moore *et al.* 1998 in NMFS, 2011).

Little is known about the social and mating systems of fin whales. Males become sexually mature at 6 to 10 years of age; and females at 7 to 12 years of age. Physical maturity is attained at approximately 25 years for both sexes. Usually mating and birthing occurs in tropical and subtropical areas during midwinter. Fin whales are the second-largest species of whale, with a maximum length of about 22 m (75 ft) in the Northern Hemisphere, and 26 m (85 ft) in the Southern Hemisphere. Fin whales feed on euphasiid shrimp, copepods, and small fish. Although there is no indication of recent population trends, the California coastal waters stock did increase in the 1980s and 1990s (NMFS, 2011). The most recent estimates of the fin whale population indicate that at least 2,624 individuals occur off California, Oregon, and Washington (NMFS, 2011). There is some evidence that recent increases in fin whale abundance have occurred in California waters (Barlow, 1994; Barlow and Gerodette 1996, NMFS, 2011), but these have not been significant (Barlow *et al.*, 1997). None were observed during recent marine mammal monitoring projects in the general Project vicinity (Padre, 2010, 2011a).

4.2.7 Sei Whale

The sei whale is a federally listed endangered species. Sei whales were historically abundant off of the California coast and were the fourth most common whale taken by California coastal whalers in the 1950s-1960s. However, due to intensive whaling, they are now considered “extraordinarily” rare (NMFS, 2011; Allen *et al.*, 2011). The most recent estimate of the sei whale northern Pacific stock population is at least 83 individuals off California, Oregon, and Washington (NMFS, 2011). Sei whales occur throughout most temperate and subtropical oceans of the world. The northern Pacific stock rarely ventures above 55 degrees N latitude or south of California (Allen *et al.*, 2011). Like most baleen whales, they migrate between warmer waters used for breeding and calving in winter and high-latitude feeding grounds where food is plentiful in the summer. The northern Pacific stock ranges almost exclusively in pelagic waters and rarely ventures into coastal waters (Allen *et al.*, 2011). None were observed during recent marine mammal monitoring projects in the general Project vicinity (Padre, 2010, 2011a).

4.3 PINNIPEDS

Five of the 36 species of pinnipeds known worldwide occur off the central California coast. Three are eared seals (family Otariidae) and two are earless seals (family Phocidae). The species of Otariidae that may occur in central California waters are: northern fur seal, Steller sea lion, and California sea lion. Two species of Phocidae that are known to occur within the central California coast include the northern elephant seal and Pacific harbor seal.

4.3.1 California Sea Lion

The California sea lion is the most abundant pinniped in California, representing 50 to 93 percent of all pinnipeds on land and about 95 percent of all sightings at sea (Bonnell *et al.*,

1981; Bonnell and Ford, 1987). This species ranges from Baja California, Mexico to British Columbia. The breeding time period and rookery occupancy is mid-May to late July (NCCOS, 2007). In central California, a small number of pups are born on Año Nuevo Island, Southeast Farallon Island, and occasionally at a few other locations; otherwise the central California population is composed of non-breeders. The most recent population estimates for the California sea lion stock indicate that at least 153,337 individuals occur in California (NMFS, 2011). This number is believed to be increasing despite recent drops in pups due to El Niño events occurring in the late 1990's (NMFS, 2011). California sea lions were observed regularly from late summer through winter of 2010 during marine mammal monitoring events within or near Project area waters (Padre, 2010, 2011a).

4.3.2 Northern Fur Seal

The northern fur seal is the most abundant otariid in the Northern Hemisphere. Most of the population is associated with rookery islands in the Bering Sea and the Sea of Okhotsk, although a small population has existed on San Miguel Island since the late 1950s or early 1960s (NMFS, 2011). Adult females and juveniles migrate to the central California area (and Oregon and Washington) from rookeries on San Miguel Island in the Southern California Bight (SCB) (Carretta *et al.*, 2006), and from the Pribilof Islands in the Bering Sea (NCCOS, 2007). During winter migration, female northern fur seals from the Pribilof Islands travel south and arrive off California beginning in February and remain until about August before returning to breeding grounds (NCCOS, 2007). The most recent population estimates for the San Miguel Island stock indicate that at least 5,395 individuals are known to occur (NMFS, 2011). No long-term population trends have been determined at this time (NMFS, 2011). None were observed during recent marine mammal monitoring projects in the general Project vicinity (Padre, 2010, 2011a).

4.3.3 Steller Sea Lion

The Steller or northern sea lion is a federally listed threatened species. The Steller sea lion ranges along the North Pacific rim, from northern Japan, the Aleutian Islands, Gulf of Alaska, and south to Año Nuevo Island, California (the southernmost rookery). Critical habitat identified for this species includes the major California rookeries at Año Nuevo and the Farallon Islands. At least 90 percent of the species' world population is centered in the Gulf of Alaska, the Bering Sea, and the Sea of Okhotsk. Historically, this species was one of the most abundant pinnipeds in the SCB. Adult males begin arriving on the rookeries first, in mid-May, and establish territories. Pregnant females arrive in late May and give birth to a single pup. Females and pups begin leaving the rookeries in September and pups typically remain with their mother through the first year. Steller sea lions are known to feed on a variety of nearshore, sublittoral prey in estuarine and marine waters. Jones (1981) reported that Steller sea lions feed mainly on bottom-dwelling fishes, and that all the prey items normally eaten by this species inhabit waters less than about 183 m (600 ft) deep.

Numbers have declined precipitously in the last several decades, but the causes of the decline are not well understood (Bartholomew 1967; Le Boeuf and Bonnell 1980). The most recent population estimate for the Steller sea lion indicate that at least 42,366 individuals occur

in the Western U.S. Stock (NMFS, 2011). This population is decreasing (NMFS, 2011). There are three haul-out locations recorded near Lion Rock approximately 1.6 km (1 mi) north of the DCP embayment. None were observed during recent marine mammal monitoring projects in the general Project vicinity (Padre, 2010, 2011a).

4.3.4 Guadalupe Fur Seal

The Guadalupe fur seal is a federally listed threatened species due to the near extinction by commercial sealing in the 19th century. The Guadalupe fur seal range is from Guadalupe Island north to the California Channel Islands, but individuals are occasionally sighted as far south as Tapachula near the Mexico-Guatemala border and as far north as Mendocino, California (Allen *et al.*, 2011). As their numbers increase, Guadalupe fur seals are expanding their range and are regularly seen on San Miguel and San Nicolas islands, and, occasionally, on the South Farallon Islands. Presently, the species breeds only on Isla de Guadalupe off the coast of Baja California, Mexico, although individual animals are appearing more regularly in the Channel Islands and a single pup was born on San Miguel Island in 1997 (Allen *et al.*, 2011). The most recent population estimates for the Guadalupe fur seal in Mexico is 3,028 individuals. Overall, the population is increasing at approximately 13 percent, considered to be relatively rapid (NMFS, 2011). None were observed during recent marine mammal monitoring projects in the general Project vicinity (Padre, 2010, 2011a).

4.3.5 Northern Elephant Seal

Northern elephant seals breed along the coast from Baja California north to Point Reyes. Northern elephant seals typically haul-out on land only to breed and molt and then disperse widely at sea. The breeding period is generally December through March and molting occurs April through August; females and juveniles molt in April to May; sub-adult males molt in May to June, and adult males molt in July to August; and yearlings molt in the fall. The Northern elephant seal is present year-round off central California; however, because they spend very little time at the surface and forage mostly offshore, at-sea sightings are rare (NCCOS, 2007). The most recent population estimates for the California breeding stock of northern elephant seals indicated that at least 74,913 individuals occur in California and the stock appears to be increasing (NMFS, 2011). No haul-out or rookeries have been documented within the Project area (NMFS, 2011). However, there is a haul-out at Piedras Blancas within approximately 16 km (10 mi) of the Project area. No elephant seals were observed during recent marine mammal monitoring projects in the general Project vicinity (Padre, 2010, 2011a).

4.3.6 Pacific Harbor Seal

Pacific harbor seals range from Mexico to the Aleutian Islands (Allen *et al.*, 2011). Pacific harbor seals are year-round residents of central California. Unlike most pinnipeds occurring off California, the Pacific harbor seal maintain haul-out sites on the mainland on which they pup and breed (Allen *et al.*, 2011). Haul outs may be occupied at any time of year for resting. Pupping generally occurs between March and June and molting occurs between May and July (NCCOS, 2007). The most recent minimum population estimates of the California stock indicate there are at least 26,667 individuals (NMFS, 2011). After increases in the 1990s,

this population is believed to be stable and possibly reaching its carrying capacity (NMFS, 2011). Harbor seals were observed regularly from late summer through winter of 2010 during marine mammal monitoring events within or near Project area waters (Padre, 2010, 2011a).

4.4 FISSIPEDS

One fissioned species is known to occur within the central California coast, the southern sea otter.

4.4.1 Southern Sea Otter

The southern sea otter is listed as “threatened” under the FESA, “depleted” under the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA), and “fully protected” under California Fish and Game Code. Historically, the range of sea otters extended from the northern islands of the Japanese Archipelago northeast along Alaska and southward along North America to Baja California (Dailey *et al.*, 1993). The sea otter was nearly extirpated by the fur trade during the 18th and 19th centuries. The current range extends from about Half Moon Bay in the north to Santa Barbara in the south. A small, satellite population of 20 to 40 animals also occurs at San Nicolas Island, the result of a translocation effort in the late 1980s (NCCOS, 2007). This species prefers rocky shoreline with water depth of less than 5 m (50 ft), which support kelp beds where they feed on benthic macro-invertebrates including clams, crabs, abalone, sea urchins, and sea stars. Recent minimum population estimates for southern sea otters in California indicate that at least 2,711 individuals are known to occur and no long-term trends in this population are available (USGS, 2010). Within the Project area, an increase in population could be seen during the period when most breeding occurs (June - November) (NCCOS, 2007). Southern sea otters were observed regularly from late summer through winter of 2010 during marine mammal monitoring events within or near Project area waters (Padre, 2010, 2011a).

Sea otters are most common in and around kelp beds and open water areas support substantially fewer adults. Kelp habitat provides territories and home range areas for male and females and sea otters will regularly be found in the same area over an extended period. Open water area can and do have large numbers of otters on a regular basis, but the distributions can shift. It is believed that some of the highest densities continue to be found in open water habitat, such as Estero Bay, Monterey, and offshore of Pismo Beach (M. Harris, pers. comm., 2011).

5.0 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.

PG&E requests an Incidental Harassment Authorization (IHA) pursuant to Section 101(a)(5)(D) of the MMPA for the incidental take by harassment during its planned 3D marine seismic survey. The survey will occur in the Pacific Ocean off the Central Coast of California between Morro Bay and Avila Beach in San Luis Obispo County during the period between November 15 and December 31, 2012. Mobilization will initiate on November 1 2012; however, air guns will be active from November 15 through December 31, 2012.

Sounds generated by the operations, as detailed in Sections 1.0, have the potential to result in the take of marine mammals, which under the legal definition of the MMPA includes harassment. Sound sources with the potential to “harass” marine mammals include air guns, the pinger system, echosounder, and sub-bottom profiler used during the surveys. Harassment of animals can potentially occur when marine mammals within the distance from a sound source that exposes them to pre-determined sound levels generated by the air guns. The effects will depend on species, the behavior of the animal at the time of reception of the stimulus, as well as the distance and received sound level (see Section 7.0). Disturbance reactions by some of the marine mammals in the general vicinity of the track lines of the source vessel may likely occur. No take by injury or death is anticipated due to the nature of the seismic surveys operations and the proposed mitigation measures (see Section 11.0).

6.0 NUMBERS OF MARINE MAMMALS THAT MAY 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.

6.1 INTRODUCTION

The proposed marine seismic survey activities outlined in Sections 1.0 and 2.0 have the potential to disturb or displace small numbers of marine mammals. These potential effects, as summarized in Section 7.0, will not exceed what is defined in the 1994 amendments to the MMPA as “Level B” harassment (behavioral disturbance). The mitigation measures to be implemented during this survey are based on Level B harassment criteria using the sound level of 160 dB re 1 μ Pa (rms), and will, as such, minimize any potential risk of injury, such as damage to the auditory organs. No take by injury or death is likely given the nature of the activities and proposed monitoring and mitigation measures. Section 7.0 provides a summary of potential sound-related impacts on marine mammals.

This section describes the methods used to estimate the numbers of marine mammals that might be “taken by harassment” during PG&E’s proposed marine seismic survey along the Central California Coast. Density estimates are based on the best available peer-reviewed scientific data, specifically, the NMFS on-line marine mammal database (Barlow *et al.*, 2009). These data are supplemented with non-published survey data obtained from the Project area during an earlier low-energy 3D survey (Padre Associates, Inc., 2011b). The following subsections describe in more detail the data and methods used in deriving the estimated number of animals potentially “taken by harassment” during the proposed survey. It provides information on the expected marine mammal densities, estimated distances to received levels of 190, 180, 160, and 120 dB, and the calculation of anticipated areas ensonified by sound levels of ≥ 160 dB.

6.2 MARINE MAMMAL DENSITY ESTIMATES

The principal source of density information is the Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program (SERDP)- SDSS Marine Animal Model Mapper on the Ocean Biogeographic Information System Spatial Ecological Analysis of Megavertebrate Populations (OBIS-SEAMAP) website (Barlow, *et al.*, 2009), which was recommended by NMFS staff (M. DeAngelis, pers. comm., 2011). A second density dataset was prepared by Padre Associates, Inc. (2011b) based on marine mammal sightings recorded during a seismic survey conducted between October 2010 and February 2011. The Padre dataset was from the southern portion of the proposed 3D survey area, and contained densities for species for which data were sparse or absent from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) database.

It should be noted that the Padre dataset was compiled from a series of daily marine mammal monitoring reports, and the data were not originally collected for the purpose of developing density estimates. Further, all survey data are subject to detectability and

availability biases. Detectability bias is associated with diminishing sightability of marine mammals with increasing lateral distance from the survey trackline. Availability bias is due to the fact that not all marine mammals are at the surface at all times, and, as such, there is less than 100 percent probability of detecting a animals along the trackline. The Padre dataset was used particularly for species (i.e. gray whale) for which no data were reported in the NMFS database.

Within Table 6, marine mammal densities were calculated based on available density or survey data. The preferred method of acquiring density data was the SERDP sponsored by Department of Defense (DOD) with mapping provided by OBIS-SEAMAP. Within the mapping program density data are available by strata or density models (indicated with a superscripted lower case "a" (^a)). This method was recommended by Monica DeAngelis and Jay Barlow of NMFS.

For density models, the Geographic Information Systems (GIS) shapefile of the Project site (race track with Safety Zone buffer) was uploaded into the program and densities were calculated using available NMFS data within the uploaded Project site. Density data calculated using this method was indicated with a superscript 1 (¹). All densities calculated using this model was from summer data (defined as July-December). For density data indicated with a superscript 2 (²), stratum density data was used within the same SERDP; however, a different layer of the mapping program were utilized. The stratum layer provides limited density data for the region the species occurs within. This density number within the stratum layer is static for the region.

For Padre densities indicated with a uppercase superscript B (^B), data were acquired between October 2010 and February 2011 during geophysical surveys. The data used to acquire the densities were collected from daily monitoring logs where species were observed and recorded when navigating survey track lines and transiting to and from the survey area. The density was calculated based on a 305 m (1,000 ft) visibility in each direction of the observer/vessel by the distance of track lines or transits conducted during the survey period. These density data were used as supplemental information based on the lack of density models of species within the SERDP.

For harbor porpoise density data indicated with superscripted c (^C), Dr. Karin Forney constructed fine-scale density estimates based on aerial surveys of the central coast conducted between 2002 and 2011. Dr. Forney provided latitude coordinates of density changes for the harbor porpoise, which was inserted into GIS to delineate the associated polygon within the project survey box. The corrected density data from Dr. Forney was extracted for the project site within the 160 dB ensonified area of Box 4. The density data are variable based on the location within the project site, with the San Luis Bay having the highest density. Because of the variable densities used to extract the estimated number of individuals within the project site, the densities within Table 6 are broad categorical densities. Additionally, the offshore portion (> 92 m) of the harbor porpoise density is a stock-wide density used in Caretta et al. 2009 and also within the data provided by Dr. Forney of NMFS. An additional figure illustrating the fine scale densities used to calculate the take numbers is available in Appendix B.

USGS southern sea otter density data was used to calculate the number of individuals that could occur within the project site. Southern sea otter (sea otter) census and distribution data and shapefiles were extracted from the USGS Western Ecological Research Center's (WERC) Spring 2010 (May-July 7). The WERC data contain a GIS shapefile with various density estimates delineated by polygons along the central California coast including the project area. These data are presented as a 3-year average of the number of sea otters per square kilometers (km²) within each polygon; the data were averaged by 10 kilometer (km) coastline segments to account for spatial/temporal variation in sea otter activity and survey conditions. Data polygons are also provided from shore to the 30 meter (m) depth contour and between the 30 and 60 m depth contours. Similar to harbor porpoise density analysis, the density polygons that overlapped with the project footprint were extracted and analyzed. See Appendix C for density and sea otter range calculations and figures.

6.3 3D SEISMIC SURVEY AREA

The size of the proposed 2012 3D seismic survey area is approximately 334.48 km² (129.14 mi²) and located adjacent to the coastline and extending from 11 to 21 km (6.8 to 13 mi) offshore, as depicted in Figure 2.

6.4 SAFETY RADIUS

This section describes the methods and underlying assumptions used to estimate the safety radius for received levels of the 160 dB re 1μPa (rms) for pulsed sounds emitted by the air gun array. Distance to received sound levels of 160 dB re 1μPa (rms) is used to estimate the potential number of marine mammals subject to Level B Harassment and forms the basis for the requested take authorization. Distances to received levels of 120, 154, 160, 170, 180, 187, and 190 dB re 1μPa (rms) are detailed in Table 4 below.

Table 4. Calculated Radii for Upslope, Downslope, and Alongshore Propagation Paths and Predicted RMS Radii for Single Bolt Air Gun

Sound Pressure Level (SPL) (dB re 1 uPa)	Upslope Distance (In shore)			Downslope Distance (Offshore)			Alongshore Distance		
	M ¹	SM ²	NM ³	M ¹	SM ²	NM ³	M ¹	SM ²	NM ³
190	250	0.16	0.13	280	0.17	0.15	320	0.20	0.17
187	390	0.24	0.21	370	0.23	0.20	410	0.25	0.22
180	1,010	0.63	0.55	700	0.43	0.38	750	0.47	0.40
170	2,990	1.86	1.61	1,760	1.09	0.95	1,760	1.09	0.95
160	6,210	3.86	3.35	4,450	2.77	2.40	4,100	2.55	2.21
154	8,570	5.33	4.63	7,820	4.86	4.22	6,780	4.21	3.66
120	24,650	15.32	13.31	251,320	156.16	135.70	94,870	58.95	51.23
Predicted RMS Radii for Single Bolt Air Gun (40 in³)¹									
Source and Volume	Water Depth	Predicted RMS Distances (m/mile)							
		180 dB				160 dB			
Single Bolt air gun (40 in ³)	Shallow < 100 m	296 (0.18)				1,050 (0.65)			

Sound Pressure Level (SPL) (dB re 1 uPa)	Upslope Distance (In shore)			Downslope Distance (Offshore)			Alongshore Distance		
	M ¹	SM ²	NM ³	M ¹	SM ²	NM ³	M ¹	SM ²	NM ³
		Intermediate 100 – 1,000 m			60 (0.04)			578 (0.36)	
		Deep > 1,000 m			40 (0.02)			385 (0.24)	

¹Diebold, J.B., M. Tolstoy, L. Doermann, S.L. Nooner, S.C. Webb, and T.J. Crone. 2010. R/V Marcus G. Langseth seismic source: Modeling and calibration. *Geochem. Geophys. Geosyst*
 M¹ Meters
 SM² Statute miles
 NM³ Nautical Miles

Impacts on marine mammals from the planned seismic survey focus on the sound levels from the seismic air gun. The strengths of the air gun pulses can be measured in a variety of ways, but NMFS commonly uses rms (in dB re 1µPa [rms]), which is the level of the received air gun pulses averaged over the duration of the pulse. The rms value for a given air gun pulse is typically 10 dB lower than the peak level, and 16 dB lower than the peak-to-peak level (McCauley *et al.*, 1998, 2000a).

The 160 dB safety radius for the proposed 3D seismic survey was based on the results of mathematical modeling conducted by Greeneridge Sciences, Inc. (2011), and is summarized in Table 5 below. The modeling was based on the air gun description detailed previously in Section 1.3.4. A copy of the Greeneridge Sciences report is contained in Appendix A of this application.

6.5 3D SURVEY AREA WITH SAFETY RADIUS

The 3D survey area varies by survey box (Table 5). The anticipated area encompassed by the sound levels of ≥160 dB, based on the calculations provided by Greeneridge Scientific, is a 6.21 km (3.856 mi) radius extending from each point of the survey area perimeter (hereafter called the 160 dB safety radius). This results in a maximum total area as shown in Table 5 and depicted on Figure 10 below. This approach was taken because closely spaced survey lines and large cross-track distances of the ≥160 dB radii result in repeated exposure of the same area of water. Excessive amounts of repeated exposure probably results in an overestimate of the number of animals potentially exposed.

Table 5. Box 4 Survey Area and Area with 160 dB Safety Radius

Survey Box	Survey Area (km ² [mi ²])	Survey Area with Safety Radius (km ² [mi ²])
4	334.5 [129.1]	784.5 [302.9]

6.6 POTENTIAL NUMBER OF ‘TAKES BY HARASSMENT’

The number of individuals of each species potentially exposed to received levels ≥ 160 dB re 1 μ Pa (rms) was estimated by multiplying each anticipated survey area (Box 4) to be ensonified by the expected species density (in number/km²).

Some of the animals estimated to be exposed might show avoidance reactions before being exposed to ≥ 160 dB re 1 μ Pa (rms). Thus, these calculations actually estimate the number of individuals potentially exposed to ≥ 160 dB that would occur if there were no avoidance of the area ensonified to that level and, as such, may be overestimates.

In addition to density estimates, Table 6 includes the estimated number of marine mammals, by species, that would be potentially exposed to sounds ≥ 160 dB from seismic data acquisition in the 3D survey for each individual survey area. For the species that a density was not reported (Barlow *et al.*, 2009), a minimum density (0.00001/km²) was used for low probability for chance encounters.

Table 7 is a summary of requested take numbers by “harassment” for the two survey areas. Potential take numbers were derived from potential species to occur within the 160 dB safety radius in Table 6. Within Table 7, an additional 25% has been added to the species expected to occur within the safety radius. This additional 25% will account for repeated exposure.



Figure 10. Box 4 Calculated Safety Zone Based on the 160 dB Distance

**Table 6. Estimated Number of Marine Mammals by Species
in Proposed Safety Radius in Box 4**

Common Name Scientific Name	NOAA Density ^a (No/km ²)			Padre Density ^b (No/km ²)		Individuals in 160 dB Safety Radius ^c
	Min	Max	Mean	Transit	Transect	
Mysticeti						
California gray whale ^f <i>Eschrichtius robustus</i>	ND	ND	ND	0.0154	0.0211	NA
Fin whale ¹ <i>Balaenoptera physalus</i>	0.00239	0.0113	0.006177			5
Humpback whale ¹ <i>Megaptera novaeangliae</i>	0.00117	0.00635	0.003243	0.0028	0.0065	3
Blue whale ¹ <i>Balaenoptera musculus</i>	0.001254	0.006777	0.003579			3
Minke whale ⁹ <i>Balaenoptera acutorostrata</i>	0.000276	0.000276	0.000276	0.0007	0.0008	8
Northern Pacific right whale ² <i>Eubalaena japonica</i>	0.000061	0.000061	0.000061			0
Sei whale ² <i>Balaenoptera borealis</i>	0.000086	0.000086	0.000086			0
Odontoceti						
Short-beaked common dolphin ⁵ <i>Delphinus delphis</i>	0.1612	0.8285	0.4443	0.0252	0.0836	650
Long-beaked common dolphin ² <i>Delphinus capensis</i>	0.018004	0.018004	0.018004			14
Small beaked whale ^{1e}	0.000813	0.003422	0.001952			2
Harbor porpoise ³ <i>Phocoena phocoena</i>						
Morro Bay Inshore Stock (<92 m)	0.43	1.42	1.22	0.0259	0.0016	315
Morro Bay Offshore Stock (>92 m)	0.062	0.062	0.062			
Dall's porpoise ¹ <i>Phocoenoides dalli</i>	0.008552	0.0396	0.0209		0.0081	16
Pacific white-sided dolphin ¹ <i>Lagenorhynchus obliquidens</i>	0.01856	0.0896	0.04786			38
Risso's dolphin ¹ <i>Grampus griseus</i>	0.007767	0.04545	0.02316	0.0063	0.2881	18
Northern right whale dolphin ¹ <i>Lissodelphis borealis</i>	0.0112	0.05254	0.02867			22
Striped dolphin ¹ <i>Stenella coeruleoalba</i>	0.000943	0.003448	0.002075		0.0081	2
Baird's beaked whale ¹ <i>Berardius bairdii</i>	0.000244	0.001148	0.000638			1
Bottlenose dolphin ² <i>Tursiops truncatus</i>						
Coastal (year-round) (<1km) ⁴	0.361173	0.361173	0.361173			17
Offshore (winter)	0.000616	0.000616	0.000616			0
Sperm whale ¹ <i>Physeter macrocephalus</i>	0.000187	0.000768	0.000436			0

Common Name Scientific Name	NOAA Density ^a (No/km ²)			Padre Density ^b (No/km ²)		Individuals in 160 dB Safety Radius ^c
	Min	Max	Mean	Transit	Transect	
Kogia Species ² <i>Kogia spp</i>	0.001083	0.001083	0.001083			1
Short-finned pilot whale ² <i>Globicephala macrorhynchus</i>	0.000307	0.000307	0.000307			0
Killer whale ² <i>Orcinus orca</i>						1
Summer	0.000709	0.000709	0.000709			1
Winter	0.000246	0.000246	0.000246		0.0016	0
Pinnipedia						
California sea lion <i>Zalophus californianus</i>				0.0898	0.2321	182
Northern elephant seal <i>Mirounga angustirostris</i>			0.00001			0
Pacific harbor seal <i>Phoca vitulina richardsi</i>				0.0166	0.0089	13
Northern fur seal <i>Callorhinus ursinus</i>			0.00001			0
Guadalupe fur seal <i>Arctocephalus townsendi</i>			0.00001			0
Northern (Steller) sea lion <i>Eumetopias jubatus</i>			0.00001			0
Fissipedia						
Southern sea otter <i>Enhydra lutris nereis</i>			1.7	0.3247	0.0235	263

^a Barlow *et al.* (2009) Average density used in calculation.

¹ Density data based on density models of survey area in SERDP program

² Density data based on stratums within SERDP program

³ Density data from Caretta *et al.*, 2009

⁴ Density data based on stratums within SERDP program with only area ensounded within 1km from shore calculated.

⁵ Maximum density instead of mean density was used to calculate the number of individuals expected to occur within the 160 dB buffer because of the high number of individuals observed in the project area in 2012.

^b Padre Associates, Inc. (2011b) (Highest density between transit and track data used)

^c Based on a 2,307 km² safety radius

^d 0.00001 is an assumed minimum density for species with no reported densities.

^e SERPD Marine Mammal Mapper categorizes small-beaked whales as both [Mesoplodon](#) and [Ziphiidae](#) genera; whereas, the NMFS Stock Assessment has Ziphiidae genera whales as their own species assessment and combines only Mesoplodon species together.

^f Through consultation with southwest NMFS, and yearly fluctuations in migrating gray whale, alternate take number was recommended. According to NMFS, typically a build-up of migrating gray whales occur with 10% of population migrating through the project area by December 31. Since the project will be conducted in late November-early December a Level B take estimate of 1,000 individuals is requested.

^g Available density data does not reflect the number of minke whales observed in the project area within the last two years. During surveys for PG&E in 2011, four minke whales were observed during a 19-day survey (Padre, 2012). To provide coverage, a non-density related take estimate is being requested.

160 dB Safety Zone = 878.8 km²

**Table 7. Requested “Take by Harassment” Numbers with
 Additional 25 Percent for Box 4**

Common Name Scientific Name	Box 4 Requested Take Authorization ¹	Box 4 Take (with additional 25%) ²
Mysticeti		
California gray whale <i>Eschrichtius robustus</i>		1,000 ³
Fin whale <i>Balaenoptera physalus</i>	5	6
Humpback whale <i>Megaptera novaeangliae</i>	3	3
Blue whale <i>Balaenoptera musculus</i>	3	4
Minke whale <i>Balaenoptera acutorostrata</i>	8	10
Northern Pacific right whale <i>Eubalaena japonica</i>	0	0
Sei whale <i>Balaenoptera borealis</i>	0	0
Odontoceti		
Short-beaked common dolphin <i>Delphinus delphis</i>	650	813
Long-beaked common dolphin <i>Delphinus capensis</i>	14	18
Small beaked whale	2	2
Harbor porpoise ⁴ <i>Phocoena phocoena</i>		315
Dall's porpoise <i>Phocoenoides dalli</i>	16	20
Pacific white-sided dolphin <i>Lagenorhynchus obliquidens</i>	38	47
Risso's dolphin <i>Grampus griseus</i>	18	23
Northern right whale dolphin <i>Lissodelphis borealis</i>	22	28
Striped dolphin <i>Stenella coeruleoalba</i>	2	2
Baird's beaked whale <i>Berardius bairdii</i>	1	1
Bottlenose dolphin <i>Tursiops truncatus</i>		
Coastal (year-round)	17	21
Offshore (winter)	0	0
Sperm whale <i>Physeter macrocephalus</i>	0	0
Dwarf sperm whale <i>Kogia sima</i>	1	1
Short-finned pilot whale <i>Globicephala macrorhynchus</i>	0	0
Killer whale <i>Orcinus orca</i>	1	2

Common Name Scientific Name	Box 4 Requested Take Authorization ¹	Box 4 Take (with additional 25%) ²
Summer	1	1
Winter	0	0
Pinnipedia		
California sea lion <i>Zalophus californianus</i>	182	228
Northern elephant seal <i>Mirounga angustirostris</i>	0	0
Pacific harbor seal <i>Phoca vitulina richardsi</i>	13	16
Northern fur seal <i>Callorhinus ursinus</i>	0	0
Guadalupe fur seal <i>Arctocephalus townsendi</i>	0	0
Northern (Steller) sea lion <i>Eumetopias jubatus</i>	0	0
Fissipedia		
Southern sea otter ³ <i>Enhydra lutris nereis</i>		263

¹ Requested take numbers are compiled from Table 6

² Requested take numbers are compiled from column "Individuals in 160 dB Safety Radius" with an additional 25% added for repeated exposure."

³ Gray whale take request based on direction for NMFS staff and reflects the potential for animals to enter the survey area prior to the start of the recognized gray whale migration season (December 15 along this area of the California coastline.

³ Take estimates for gray whale, harbor porpoise, and southern sea otter were established through consultation with NMFS or USFWS; therefore, no 25% additional take estimates apply.

7.0 ANTICIPATED IMPACT ON SPECIES OR STOCKS

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

7.1 POTENTIAL EFFECTS OF AIR GUN SOUNDS

The following discussion provides a broad overview of the current understanding of the potential effects of air guns on marine mammals. A more comprehensive review of these issues can be found in the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement prepared for Marine Seismic Research that is funded by the National Science Foundation and conducted by the USGS (NSF/USGS, 2011).

7.1.1 Tolerance

Numerous studies have shown that marine mammals at distances more than a few kilometers from operating seismic vessels often show no apparent response (Richardson *et al.*, 1995; Southall *et al.*, 2007). That is often true even in cases when the pulsed sounds must be readily audible to the animals based on measured received levels and the hearing sensitivity of that mammal group. Although various baleen whales and toothed whales, and (less frequently) pinnipeds, have been shown to react behaviorally to air gun pulses under some conditions, at other times mammals of all three types have shown no overt reactions. The relative responsiveness of baleen and toothed whales are quite variable.

7.1.2 Masking

Masking is the obscuring of sounds of interest by interfering sounds, generally at similar frequencies (Richardson *et al.*, 1995). Introduced underwater sound will, through masking, reduce the effective communication distance of a marine mammal species if the frequency of the source is close to that used as a signal by the marine mammal, and if the anthropogenic sound is present for a significant fraction of the time (Richardson *et al.*, 1995). If little or no overlap occurs between the introduced sound and the frequencies used by the species, communication is not expected to be disrupted. If the introduced sound is present only infrequently, communication is not expected to be disrupted. The duty cycle of air guns is low, and the air gun sounds are pulsed, with relatively quiet periods between pulses. In most situations, strong air gun sounds will only be received for a brief period (<1 sec), separated by at least several seconds of relative silence, and longer in the case of deep-penetration surveys or refraction surveys. A single air gun array might cause appreciable masking when propagation conditions are such that sound from each air gun pulse reverberates strongly and persists between air gun pulses (Simard *et al.*, 2005; Clark and Gagnon, 2006).

Although masking effects of pulsed sounds on marine mammal calls and other natural sounds are expected to be limited, there are few specific studies on this. Some whales continue calling in the presence of seismic pulses and calls have been 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, there is one recent summary report indicating that calling fin whales distributed in one part of the North Atlantic Ocean went silent for an extended period starting soon after the onset of a seismic survey in the area (Clark and Gagnon, 2006). It was not clear whether the whales ceased calling because of masking, or whether this was a behavioral response not directly involving masking. Also, bowhead whales in the Beaufort Sea may decrease their call rates in response to seismic operations, although movement out of the area might also have contributed to the lower call detection rate (Richardson *et al.*, 1986). In contrast, Dilorio and Clark (2009) found evidence of increased calling by blue whales during operations by a lower-energy seismic source (i.e., a sparker).

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

Pinnipeds and fissipeds have the most sensitive hearing and/or produce most of their sounds at frequencies higher than the dominant components of air gun sound, but there is some overlap in the frequencies of the air gun pulses and the calls. However, the intermittent nature of air gun pulses presumably reduces the potential for masking.

Marine mammals are thought to be able to compensate for masking by adjusting their acoustic behavior through shifting call frequencies, increasing call volume, and increasing vocalization rates. For example, blue whales are found to increase call rates when exposed to seismic survey noise in the St. Lawrence Estuary (Di Iorio and Clark, 2009). The North Atlantic right whales exposed to high shipping noise increased call frequency (Parks *et al.*, 2007), while some humpback whales respond to low-frequency active sonar playbacks by increasing song length (Miller *et al.*, 2000).

7.1.3 Disturbance Reactions

Marine mammals may behaviorally react to sound when exposed to anthropogenic noise. These behavioral reactions are often shown as: changing durations of surfacing and dives, number of blows per surfacing, or moving direction and/or speed; reduced/increased vocal activities; changing/cessation of certain behavioral activities (such as socializing or feeding); visible startle response or aggressive behavior (such as tail/fluke slapping or jaw clapping); avoidance of areas where noise sources are located; and/or flight responses (e.g., pinnipeds flushing into water from haul-outs or rookeries).

The biological significance of many of these behavioral disturbances is difficult to predict, especially if the detected disturbances appear minor. However, the consequences of behavioral modification could be expected to be biologically significant if the change affects growth, survival, and/or reproduction. Some of these significant behavioral modifications include:

- Drastic change in diving/surfacing patterns (such as those thought to be causing beaked whale stranding due to exposure to military mid-frequency tactical sonar);
- Habitat abandonment due to loss of desirable acoustic environment; and,
- Cessation of feeding or social interaction.

The onset of behavioral disturbance from anthropogenic noise depends on both external factors (characteristics of noise sources and their paths) and the receiving animals (hearing, motivation, experience, demography) and is also difficult to predict (Richardson *et al.*, 1995; Southall *et al.*, 2007).

Currently, NMFS uses 160 dB re 1 μ Pa at received level for impulse noises (such as air gun pulses) as the onset of behavioral harassment for marine mammals that are under its jurisdiction.

7.2 EFFECTS ON MYSTICETES

Baleen whales generally tend to avoid operating air guns, but avoidance radii are quite variable among species, locations, activities, and oceanographic conditions affecting sound propagation, etc. (Richardson *et al.*, 1995; Gordon *et al.*, 2004). Whales are often reported to show no overt reactions to pulses from large arrays of air guns at distances beyond a few kilometers, even though the air gun pulses remain well above ambient noise levels out to much longer distances. However, baleen whales exposed to strong sound pulses from air guns often react by deviating from their normal migration route and/or interrupting their feeding and moving away. Although baleen whales often show only slight overt responses to operating air gun arrays (Stone and Tasker, 2006; Weir, 2008), strong avoidance reactions by several species of mysticetes have been observed at ranges from 6 to 8 km (3.7 to 5 mi) and occasionally as far as 20 to 30 km (12.4 to 18.6 mi) from the source vessel when large arrays of air guns were used. Experiments with a single air gun showed that bowhead, humpback, and gray whales all showed localized avoidance to a single air gun of 20 to 100 in³ (Malme *et al.*, 1984, 1985, 1986, 1988; Richardson *et al.*, 1986; McCauley *et al.*, 1998, 2000a, 2000b).

Studies of gray and humpback whales have shown that seismic pulses with received levels of 160 to 170 dB re 1 μ Pa (rms) seem to cause avoidance behavior in a substantial portion of the animals exposed (Richardson *et al.*, 1995). In many areas, seismic pulses from large arrays of air guns diminish to those levels at distances ranging from 4 to 15 km (2.5 to 9.3 mi) from the source. More recent studies have shown that some species of baleen whales (humpbacks in particular) at times show strong avoidance at received levels lower than 160 to 170 dB re 1 μ Pa (rms). In the cases of migrating gray whales, the observed changes in behavior appeared to be of little or no biological consequence to the animals. The migrating whales simply avoided the sound source by displacing their migration route to varying degrees,

but within the natural boundaries of the migration corridors (Malme *et al.*, 1984; Malme and Miles, 1985; Richardson *et al.*, 1995). In cases where there is no conspicuous avoidance or change in activity upon exposure to sound pulses from distant seismic operations, there are sometimes subtle changes in behavior (e.g., surfacing, respiration, dive cycles) that are only evident through detailed statistical analysis (e.g., Richardson *et al.*, 1986; Gailey *et al.*, 2007).

Responses of humpback whales to seismic surveys have been studied during migration, on summer feeding grounds, on Angolan winter breeding grounds, and 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-air gun, 2,678-in³ array, and to a single 20-in³ air gun. McCauley *et al.* (1998) documented that avoidance reactions began at 5 to 8 km (3 to 5 mi) from the array, and that those reactions kept most pods approximately 3 to 5 km (1.8 to 2.5 mi) from the operating seismic boat. McCauley *et al.* (2000a) noted localized displacement during migration of 4 to 5 km (2.5 to 3.1 mi) by traveling pods and 7 to 12 km (4.3 to 7.5 mi) by more sensitive resting pods of cow-calf pairs. Avoidance distances with respect to the single air gun 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 air gun was 140 dB re 1 μ Pa (rms) for humpback pods containing females, and at the mean closest point of approach (CPA) distance, the received level was 143 dB re 1 μ Pa (rms). The initial avoidance response generally occurred at distances of 5 to 8 km (3.1 to 5.0 mi) from the air gun array and 2 km (1.2 mi) from the single air gun. However, some individual humpback whales, especially males, approached within distances of 100 to 400 m (328 to 1,312 ft), where the maximum received level was 179 dB re 1 μ Pa (rms).

Data collected by observers during several seismic surveys in the Northwest Atlantic Ocean showed that sighting rates of humpback whales were significantly greater during non-seismic periods, compared against 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) air gun (Malme *et al.*, 1985). Some humpbacks seemed “startled” at received levels of 150-169 dB re 1 μ Pa. 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 μ Pa (rms). However, Moulton and Holst (2010) reported that humpback whales monitored during seismic surveys in the Northwest Atlantic Ocean had lower sighting rates and were most often seen swimming away from the vessel during seismic periods compared with periods when air guns were silent.

Engel *et al.* (2004) suggested that South Atlantic humpback whales wintering off Brazil may be displaced or even strand upon exposure to seismic surveys; however, the evidence for this was circumstantial and subject to alternative explanations (IAGC, 2004). It was also inconsistent 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).

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 air gun off St. Lawrence Island in the northern Bering Sea. They estimated, based on small sample sizes, that 50 percent of feeding gray whales stopped feeding at an average received pressure level of 173 dB re 1 μ Pa (rms), and that 10 percent of feeding whales interrupted feeding at received levels of 163 dB re 1 μ Pa (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, Canada (Bain and Williams, 2006).

Various species of *Balaenoptera* (blue, sei, fin, and minke whales) have occasionally been seen in areas ensounded by air gun pulses (Stone, 2003; MacLean and Haley, 2004; Stone and Tasker, 2006), and calls from blue and fin whales have been localized in areas with air gun 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 air guns 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 air gun 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 Sea moved away from an operating air gun array.

Ship-based monitoring studies of baleen whales (including blue, fin, sei, minke, and humpback whales) in the Northwest Atlantic Ocean 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 against 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 against non-seismic periods. A similar 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 rates, distribution, and habitat use in subsequent days or years. However, gray whales have continued to migrate annually along the west coast of North America despite intermittent seismic exploration (and much ship traffic) in that area for decades (Appendix A in Malme *et al.*, 1984; Richardson *et al.*, 1995), and there has been a substantial increase in the population over recent decades (Allen and Angliss, 2010). The western Pacific

gray whale population did not seem affected by a seismic survey in its feeding ground during a prior year (Johnson *et al.*, 2007). The history of coexistence between seismic surveys and baleen whales suggests that brief exposures to sound pulses from any single seismic survey are unlikely to result in prolonged effects.

7.3 EFFECTS ON ODONTOCETES

Little information is available about reactions of toothed whales to noise pulses. Seismic operators and marine mammal observers on seismic vessels regularly see dolphins and other small toothed whales near operating air gun arrays, but, in general, there is a tendency for most delphinids to show some avoidance of operating seismic vessels (L-DEO, 2011). 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 air guns 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 air gun array is operating (e.g., Stone and Tasker, 2006; Weir 2008; Barry *et al.*, 2010; Moulton and Holst, 2010).

For delphinids, the available data suggest that a ≥ 170 dB re 1 μ Pa (rms) disturbance criterion (rather than ≥ 160 dB) would be appropriate. With a medium-to-large air gun array, received levels typically diminish to 170 dB within 1 to 4 km (0.62 to 2.5 mi), whereas levels typically remain above 160 dB out to 4 to 15 km (2.5 to 9.3 mi) (e.g., Tolstoy *et al.*, 2009). Reaction distances for delphinids are more consistent with the typical 170 dB re 1 μ Pa (rms) distances (L-DEO, 2011).

Results are species specific. 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 air gun operations (MacLean and Koski, 2005; Bain and Williams, 2006), although they, too, have been observed to avoid large arrays (Calambokidis and Osmeck, 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 indicate that the sperm whale shows considerable tolerance of air gun pulses (e.g., Stone, 2003; Moulton *et al.*, 2005, 2006; Stone and Tasker, 2006; Weir, 2008). In most cases, the whales do not show strong avoidance, and they continue to call. However, controlled exposure experiments in the Gulf of Mexico indicate that foraging behavior was altered upon exposure to air gun sounds (Jochens *et al.*, 2008; Miller *et al.*, 2009; Tyack, 2009).

Overall, odontocete reactions to large arrays of air guns are variable and, at least for delphinids and some porpoises, seem to be confined to a smaller radius than has been observed for some mysticetes. However, other data suggest that some odontocete species, including harbor porpoises, may be more responsive than might be expected given their poor low-frequency hearing. Reactions at longer distances may be particularly likely when sound propagation conditions are conducive to transmission of the higher frequency components of air

gun sound to the animals' location (DeRuiter *et al.*, 2006; Goold and Coates, 2006; Tyack *et al.*, 2006; Potter *et al.*, 2007).

7.4 EFFECTS ON PINNIPEDS

Pinnipeds are not likely to show a strong avoidance reaction to an air gun array. Visual monitoring from seismic vessels has shown only slight (if any) avoidance of air guns by pinnipeds, and only slight (if any) changes in behavior (L-DEO, 2011). In the Beaufort Sea, some ringed seals avoided an area of 100 m (328 ft) to a few hundred meters (+660 ft) around seismic vessels, but many seals remained within 100 to 200 m (328 to 656 ft) of the trackline as the operating air gun array passed (Harris *et al.*, 2001; Moulton and Lawson, 2002; Miller *et al.*, 2005). In Puget Sound, sighting distances for harbor seals and California sea lions tended to be larger when air guns were operating (Calambokidis and Osmeck, 1998).

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

7.5 EFFECTS ON FISSIPEDS

Riedman (1983, 1984) observed the behavior of sea otters along the California coast during single, 100 in³ air gun pulses, and pulses from a 4,089 in³ air gun array. No disturbance reactions were evident when the air gun array was as close as 0.9 km (0.5 mi), and the sea otters did not respond noticeably to the single air gun. The results suggest that sea otters are less responsive to marine seismic pulse than are baleen whales. Also, sea otters spend a great deal of time at the surface feeding and grooming, as such, the potential noise exposure would be much reduced by the pressure release effect at the surface.

7.6 HEARING IMPAIRMENT AND OTHER PHYSICAL EFFECTS

Exposure to very strong sounds could affect marine mammals in a number of ways. These include temporary threshold shift (TTS), which is a short-term hearing impairment, and permanent threshold shift (PTS), which is a permanent hearing loss. 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 air guns. 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. The following subsections discuss in more detail the possibilities of TTS, PTS, and non-auditory physical effects.

7.6.1 Temporary Threshold Shift (TTS)

TTS is the mildest form of hearing impairment that can occur during exposure to a strong sound (Kryter, 1985). While experiencing TTS, the hearing threshold rises and a sound must be stronger in order to be heard. It is a temporary phenomenon, and (especially when mild) is not considered physical damage or “injury” (Southall *et al.*, 2007). Rather, the onset of TTS is an indicator that, if the animal is exposed to higher levels of that sound, physical damage is ultimately a possibility.

The magnitude of TTS depends on the level and duration of noise exposure, and to some degree, on frequency, among other considerations (Kryter, 1985; Richardson *et al.*, 1995; Southall *et al.*, 2007). For sound exposures at or somewhat above the TTS threshold, hearing sensitivity recovers rapidly after exposure to the noise ends. In terrestrial mammals, TTS can last from minutes or hours to days. Only limited data have been obtained on sound levels and durations necessary to elicit mild TTS in marine mammals (none in mysticetes), and none of the published data concern TTS elicited by exposure to multiple pulses of sound during operational seismic surveys (Southall *et al.*, 2007).

For toothed whales, experiments on a bottlenose dolphin and beluga whale showed that exposure to a single impulse at a received level of 207 kPa (or 30 psi) pk-pk,, which is equivalent to 228 dB re 1 μ Pa (p-p), resulted in a 7 and 6 dB TTS in the beluga whale at 0.4 and 30 kHz, respectively. Thresholds returned to within 2 dB of the pre-exposure level within 4 minutes of the exposure (Finneran *et al.*, 2002).

Finneran *et al.* (2005) examined the effects of tone duration on TTS in bottlenose dolphins. Bottlenose dolphins were exposed to 3 kHz tones (non-impulsive) for periods of 1, 2, 4, or 8 sec, with hearing tested at 4.5 kHz. For 1-sec exposures, TTS occurred with sound exposure levels (SELs) of 197 dB, and for exposures >1 sec, SEL >195 dB resulted in TTS (SEL is equivalent to energy flux, in dB re 1 μ Pa²-s). At an SEL of 195 dB, the mean TTS (4 min after exposure) was 2.8 dB. Finneran *et al.* (2005) suggested that an SEL of 195 dB is the likely threshold for the onset of TTS in dolphins and belugas exposed to tones of durations 1 to 8 sec (i.e., TTS onset occurs at a near-constant SEL, independent of exposure duration). That implies that, at least for non-impulsive tones, a doubling of exposure time results in a 3 dB lower TTS threshold.

However, the assumption that, in marine mammals, the occurrence and magnitude of TTS is a function of cumulative acoustic energy (i.e. SEL) is probably an oversimplification. Kastak *et al.* (2005) reported preliminary evidence from pinnipeds that, for prolonged non-impulse noise, higher SELs were required to elicit a given TTS if exposure duration was short

than if it was longer, i.e., the results were not fully consistent with an equal-energy model to predict TTS onset. Mooney *et al.* (2009a) showed this in a bottlenose dolphin exposed to octave-band non-impulse noise ranging from 4 to 8 kHz at sound pressure levels (SPLs) of 130 to 178 dB re 1 μ Pa for periods of 1.88 to 30 minutes (min). Higher SELs were required to induce a given TTS if exposure duration was shorter than if it was longer. Exposure of bottlenose dolphins to a sequence of brief sonar signals showed that, with those brief (but non-impulse) sounds, the received energy (i.e. SEL) necessary to elicit TTS was higher than was the case with exposure to the more prolonged octave-band noise (Mooney *et al.* 2009b). The researchers concluded that, when using (non-impulse) acoustic signals of duration approximately 0.5 sec SEL must be at least 210 to 214 dB re 1 μ Pa²-s to induce TTS in the bottlenose dolphin. Most recent studies conducted by Finneran *et al.* also support the notion that exposure duration has a more significant influence compared to SPL as the duration increases, and that TTS growth data are better represented as functions of SPL and duration rather than SEL alone (Finneran *et al.*, 2010a,b). In addition, Finneran *et al.* (2010b) concluded that when animals are exposed to intermittent noises, there is recovery of hearing during the quiet intervals between exposures through the accumulation of TTS across multiple exposures. Such findings suggest that when exposed to multiple seismic pulses, partial hearing recovery also occurs during the seismic pulse intervals.

For baleen whales, there are no data on levels or properties of sound that are required to induce TTS. The frequencies to which baleen whales are most sensitive are lower than those to which odontocetes are most sensitive, and natural ambient noise levels at those low frequencies tend to be higher (Urick, 1983). 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. However, no cases of TTS are expected given the strong likelihood that baleen whales would avoid the approaching air guns (or vessel) before being exposed to levels high enough for there to be any possibility of TTS.

In pinnipeds, TTS thresholds associated with exposure to brief pulses (single or multiple) of underwater sound have not been measured. Initial evidence from prolonged exposures suggested that some pinnipeds may incur TTS at somewhat lower received levels than do small odontocetes exposed for similar durations (Kastak *et al.*, 1999, 2005). However, more recent indications are that TTS onset in the most sensitive pinniped species studied (harbor seal) may occur at a similar SEL as in odontocetes (Kastak *et al.*, 2005).

Most cetaceans show some degree of avoidance of seismic vessels operating an air gun array. It is unlikely that these cetaceans would be exposed to air gun pulses at a sufficiently high level for a sufficiently long period to cause more than mild TTS, given the relative movement of the vessel and the marine mammal (NMFS, 2010). TTS would be more likely in any odontocetes that bow- or wake-ride or otherwise linger near the air guns. However, while bow- or wake-riding, odontocetes would be at the surface and thus not exposed to strong sound pulses given the pressure release and Lloyd's mirror effects at the surface. But if bow- or wake-

riding animals were to dive intermittently near air guns, they would be exposed to strong sound pulses, possibly repeatedly (NMFS, 2010).

If some cetaceans did incur mild or moderate TTS through exposure to air gun sounds in this manner, this would very likely be a temporary and reversible phenomenon. However, even a temporary reduction in hearing sensitivity could be deleterious in the event that, during that period of reduced sensitivity, a marine mammal needed its full hearing sensitivity to detect approaching predators (NMFS, 2010c).

Some pinnipeds show avoidance reactions to air guns, but their avoidance reactions are generally not as strong or consistent as those of cetaceans. Pinnipeds occasionally seem to be attracted to operating seismic vessels (NMFS, 2010c). There are no specific data on TTS thresholds of pinnipeds exposed to single or multiple low-frequency pulses. However, given the indirect indications of a lower TTS threshold for the harbor seal than for odontocetes exposed to impulse sound, it is possible that some pinnipeds within the 190 dB isopleths for a prolonged time of a large air gun array could incur TTS (NMFS, 2010c).

Current NMFS noise exposure standards require that cetaceans and pinnipeds should not be exposed to pulsed underwater noise at received levels exceeding, respectively, 180 and 190 dB re 1 μ Pa (rms) (NMFS, 2010c). These criteria were taken from recommendations by an expert panel of the HESS Team that did assessment on noise impacts by seismic air guns to marine mammals in 1997, although the HESS Team recommended a 180-dB limit for pinnipeds in California (HESS, 1999). The 180 and 190 dB re 1 μ Pa (rms) levels have not been considered to be the levels above which TTS might occur. Rather, they were the received levels above which, in the view of a panel of bioacoustics specialists convened by NMFS before TTS measurements for marine mammals started to become available, one could not be certain that there would be no injurious effects, auditory or otherwise, to marine mammals. As summarized above, data that are now available imply that TTS is unlikely to occur in various odontocetes (and probably mysticetes as well) unless they are exposed to a sequence of several air gun pulses stronger than 190 dB re 1 μ Pa (rms). On the other hand, for the harbor seal, harbor porpoise, and perhaps some other species, TTS may occur upon exposure to one or more air gun pulses whose received level equals the NMFS “do not exceed” value of 190 dB re 1 μ Pa (rms). That criterion corresponds to a single-pulse SEL of 175 to 180 dB re 1 μ Pa²-s in typical conditions, whereas TTS is suspected to be possible in harbor seals and harbor porpoises with a cumulative SEL of approximately 171 and approximately 164 dB re 1 μ Pa²-s, respectively.

It has been shown that most marine mammals show at least localized avoidance of ships and/or seismic operations. Even when avoidance is limited to the area within a few hundred meters of an air gun array, that should usually be sufficient to avoid TTS based on what is currently known about thresholds for TTS onset in cetaceans. In addition, ramping up air gun arrays, which is standard operational protocol for many seismic operators, should allow cetaceans near the air guns at the time of startup (if the sounds are aversive) to move away from the seismic source and to avoid being exposed to the full acoustic output of the air gun array. Thus, most baleen whales likely will not be exposed to high levels of air gun sounds

provided the ramp-up procedure is applied. Likewise, many odontocetes close to the trackline are likely to move away before the sounds from an approaching seismic vessel become sufficiently strong for there to be any potential for TTS or other hearing impairment. Hence, there is little potential for baleen whales or odontocetes that show avoidance of ships or air guns to be close enough to an air gun array to experience TTS. Therefore, it is not likely that marine mammals in the vicinity of the proposed marine seismic surveys by PG&E would experience TTS as a result of these activities with implementation of the mitigation measures detailed in Section 11.0.

7.6.2 Permanent Threshold Shift (PTS)

When PTS occurs, there is physical damage to the sound receptors in the ear. In severe cases, there can be total or partial deafness. 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 from air guns can cause PTS in any marine mammal, even with large arrays of air guns. However, given the possibility that mammals close to an air gun array might incur at least mild TTS in the absence of appropriate mitigation measures, there has been further speculation about the possibility that some individuals occurring very close to air guns might incur PTS (e.g., Richardson *et al.*, 1995; Gedamke *et al.*, 2008). Single or occasional occurrences of mild TTS are not indicative of permanent auditory damage, but repeated or (in some cases) single exposures to a level well above that causing TTS onset might elicit PTS.

Relationships between TTS and PTS thresholds have not been studied in marine mammals, but are assumed to be similar to those in humans and other terrestrial mammals (Southall *et al.*, 2007). Based on data from terrestrial mammals, a precautionary assumption is that the PTS threshold for impulse sounds (such as air gun pulses as received close to the source) is at least 6 dB higher than the TTS threshold on a peak-pressure basis, and probably >6 dB higher (Southall *et al.*, 2007). The low-to-moderate levels of TTS that have been induced in captive odontocetes and pinnipeds during controlled studies of TTS have been confirmed to be temporary, with no measurable residual PTS (Kastak *et al.*, 1999; Schlundt *et al.*, 2000; Finneran *et al.*, 2002, 2005; Nachtigall *et al.*, 2003, 2004). However, very prolonged exposure to sound strong enough to elicit TTS, or shorter-term exposure to sound levels well above the TTS threshold, can cause PTS, at least in terrestrial mammals (Kryter, 1985). In terrestrial mammals, the received sound level from a single, non-impulsive sound exposure must be far above the TTS threshold for any risk of permanent hearing damage (Kryter, 1994; Richardson *et al.*, 1995; Southall *et al.*, 2007). However, there is special concern about strong sounds whose pulses have very rapid rise times. In terrestrial mammals, there are situations when pulses with rapid rise times (e.g., from explosions) can result in PTS even though their peak levels are only a few dB higher than the level causing slight TTS. The rise time of air gun pulses is fast, but not as fast as that of an explosion.

Some factors that contribute to onset of PTS, at least in terrestrial mammals, are as follows:

- exposure to single very intense sound;
- fast rise time from baseline to peak pressure;
- repetitive exposure to intense sounds that individually cause TTS but not PTS; and
- recurrent ear infections or (in captive animals) exposure to certain drugs.

Cavanagh (2000) reviewed the thresholds used to define TTS and PTS. Based on this review and Supreme Allied Commander, Atlantic (SACLANT) (1998), it is reasonable to assume that PTS might occur at a received sound level 20 dB or more above that inducing mild TTS. However, for PTS to occur at a received level only 20 dB above the TTS threshold, the animal probably would have to be exposed to a strong sound for an extended period, or to a strong sound with rather rapid rise time.

Southall *et al.*, (2007) estimated that received levels would need to exceed the TTS threshold by at least 15 dB, on an SEL basis, for there to be risk of PTS. Thus, for cetaceans exposed to a sequence of sound pulses, they estimate that the PTS threshold might be an M-weighted SEL (for the sequence of received pulses) of approximately 198 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}^2\text{-s}$. Additional assumptions had to be made to derive a corresponding estimate for pinnipeds, as the only available data on TTS-thresholds in pinnipeds pertained to non-impulse sound. Southall *et al.*, (2007) estimated that the PTS threshold could be a cumulative SEL of approximately 186 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}^2\text{-s}$ in the case of a harbor seal exposed to impulse sound. The PTS threshold for the California sea lion and northern elephant seal would probably be higher given the higher TTS thresholds in those species. Southall *et al.*, (2007) also note that, regardless of the SEL, there is concern about the possibility of PTS if a cetacean or pinniped received one or more pulses with peak pressure exceeding 230 or 218 dB re 1 μPa , respectively. Thus, PTS might be expected upon exposure of cetaceans to either SEL ≥ 198 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}^2\text{-s}$ or peak pressure ≥ 230 dB re 1 μPa . Corresponding proposed dual criteria for pinnipeds (at least harbor seals) are ≥ 186 dB SEL and ≥ 218 dB peak pressure (Southall *et al.*, 2007). These estimates are all first approximations, given the limited underlying data, assumptions, species differences, and evidence that the “equal energy” model may not be entirely correct (L-DEO, 2011).

Sound impulse duration, peak amplitude, rise time, number of pulses, and inter-pulse interval are the main factors thought to determine the onset and extent of PTS. Ketten (1993) has noted that the criteria for differentiating the sound pressure levels that result in PTS (or TTS) are location and species specific. PTS effects may also be influenced strongly by the health of the receiver’s ear.

As described above for TTS, in estimating the amount of sound energy required to elicit the onset of TTS (and PTS), it is assumed that the auditory effect of a given cumulative SEL from a series of pulses is the same as if that amount of sound energy were received as a single strong sound. There are no data from marine mammals concerning the occurrence or magnitude of a potential partial recovery effect between pulses. In deriving the estimates of PTS (and TTS) thresholds, Southall *et al.* (2007) made the precautionary assumption that no recovery would occur between pulses.

It is unlikely that an odontocete would remain close enough to a large air gun array for sufficiently long to incur PTS. Due to proposed monitoring and mitigation measures the source would quickly be powered down or shut down, thereby preventing marine mammals from prolonged exposure. There is some concern about bow-riding odontocetes, but for animals at or near the surface, auditory effects are reduced by Lloyd's mirror and surface release effects. The presence of the vessel between the air gun array and bow-riding odontocetes could also, in some, but probably not all cases, reduce the levels received by bow-riding animals (e.g., Gabriele and Kipple, 2009). The TTS (and PTS) thresholds of baleen whales are unknown but, as an interim measure, assumed to be no lower than those of odontocetes. Also, baleen whales generally avoid the immediate area around operating seismic vessels. So it is unlikely that a baleen whale could incur PTS from exposure to air gun pulses. The TTS (and PTS) thresholds of some pinnipeds (e.g., harbor seal), as well as the harbor porpoise, may be lower (Kastak *et al.*, 2005; Southall *et al.*, 2007; Lucke *et al.*, 2009). If so, TTS and potentially PTS may extend to a somewhat greater distance for those animals. Again, Lloyd's mirror and surface release effects will ameliorate the effects for animals at or near the surface.

Although it is unlikely that air gun operations during most seismic surveys would cause PTS in many marine mammals, caution is warranted given:

- the limited knowledge about noise-induced hearing damage in marine mammals, particularly baleen whales and pinnipeds;
- the seemingly greater susceptibility of certain species (e.g., harbor porpoise and harbor seal) to TTS and presumably also PTS; and
- the lack of knowledge about TTS and PTS thresholds in many species.

The avoidance reactions of many marine mammals, along with commonly applied monitoring and mitigation measures (See Section 11.0), would reduce the already low probability of exposure of marine mammals to sounds strong enough to induce PTS.

7.6.3 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 (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 air gun 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 air gun 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.

7.7 STRANDINGS AND MORTALITY

Marine mammals close to underwater detonations of high explosives can be killed or severely injured, and the auditory organs are especially susceptible to injury (Ketten *et al.*, 1993; Ketten, 1995). However, explosives are no longer used for marine waters for commercial seismic surveys or (with rare exceptions) for seismic research. These methods have been replaced entirely by air guns or related non-explosive pulse generators. Air gun 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 air gun arrays.

Specific sound-related processes that lead to strandings and mortality are not well documented, but may include (1) swimming in avoidance of a sound into shallow water; (2) a change in behavior (such as a change in diving behavior) that might contribute to tissue damage, gas bubble formation, hypoxia, cardiac arrhythmia, hypertensive hemorrhage, or other forms of trauma; (3) a physiological change such as a vestibular response leading to a behavioral change or stress-induced hemorrhagic diathesis, leading in turn to tissue damage; and, (4) tissue damage directly from sound exposure, such as through acoustically mediated bubble formation and growth or acoustic resonance of tissues. Some of these mechanisms are unlikely to apply in the case of impulse sounds. However, there are increasing indications that gas-bubble disease (analogous to “the bends”), induced in supersaturated tissue by a behavioral response to acoustic exposure, could be a pathologic mechanism for the strandings and mortality of some deep-diving cetaceans exposed to sonar. The evidence for this remains circumstantial and associated with exposure to naval mid-frequency sonar, not seismic surveys (Cox *et al.*, 2006; Southall *et al.*, 2007).

Seismic pulses and mid-frequency sonar signals are quite different, and some mechanisms by which sonar sounds have been hypothesized to affect beaked whales are unlikely to apply to air gun pulses. Sounds produced by air gun arrays are broadband impulses with most of the energy below 1 kHz. Typical military mid-frequency sonar emit non-impulse sounds at frequencies of 2 to 10 kHz, generally within 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.

L-DEO (2011) noted there is currently no conclusive evidence of cetacean stranding 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 of a possible link.

Engel *et al.*, (2004, in L-DEO, 2011) suggested that humpback whales wintering off Brazil may be displaced or even stranded during seismic surveys. Others have suggested the evidence was circumstantial and subject to alternative explanations (IAGC, 2004), or inconsistent with subsequent results from the same area (IAGC, 2004; Parente *et al.* 2006, in L-DEO, 2011). Based on data from subsequent years, no observable direct correlation between strandings and seismic surveys was found (IWC, 2007, L-DEO, 2011).

In September 2002, two Cuvier's beaked whales stranded in the Gulf of California, Mexico at the same time when the L-DEO vessel R.V Maurice Ewing was operating a 20-air gun, 8,490 in³ air gun array in the general area. The link was inconclusive and not based on any physical evidence (Hogarth, 2002; Yoder, 2002, in L-DEO, 2011). A need for caution is recommended when conducting seismic surveys in area occupied by beaked whales until more is known about the effect on those species (L-DEO, 2011).

7.8 POSSIBLE EFFECTS OF MULTIBEAM ECHOSOUNDER SIGNALS

The Kongsberg EM 122 MBES will be operated from the source vessel during the planned study. Sounds from the MBES are very short signals, occurring for 2 to 15 ms once every 5 to 20 sec, depending on water depth. Most of the energy in the signals 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 (1-2 degrees) in fore-aft extent and wide (150 degrees) in the cross-track extent. Each ping consists of 8 (in water >1,000 m deep [0.62 mi]) or 4 (<1,000 m deep [0.62 mi]) 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 1 or 2 of the 9 segments. Also, marine mammals that encounter the Kongsberg EM 122 are unlikely to be subjected to repeated pings because of the narrow fore-aft width of the beam and will receive only limited amounts of energy because of the short pings. Animals close to the ship (where the beam is narrowest) are especially unlikely to be ensonified for more than one 2 to 15 ms pings (or two pings if in the overlap area). Similarly, Kremser *et al.* (2005) noted that the probability of a cetacean swimming through the area of exposure when an MBES emits a ping is small. The animal would have to pass the transducer at close range and be swimming at speeds similar to the vessel in order to receive the multiple pings that might result in sufficient exposure to cause TTS.

Navy sonars that have been linked to avoidance reactions and stranding of cetaceans generally have longer signal durations than the Kongsberg EM 122, and 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 pings will be very short, and a given mammal would not receive many of the downward-directed pings as the vessel passes. Possible effects of an MBES on marine mammals are detailed below.

7.8.1 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.

7.8.2 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 beaching by beaked whales. During exposure to a 21 to 25 kHz “whale-finding” sonar with a source level of 215 dB re 1 μ Pa m, gray whales reacted by orienting slightly away from the source and being deflected from their course by ~200 m (656 ft) (Frankel 2005). When a 38 kHz echosounder and a 150 kHz acoustic Doppler current profiler 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).

Captive bottlenose dolphins and a white whale exhibited changes in behavior when exposed to 1 sec 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.

7.8.3 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. However, the MBES proposed for use by L-DEO is quite different than sonars used for navy operations. Ping duration of the MBES is very short relative to the naval sonars. Also, at any given location, an individual marine mammal would be in the beam of the MBES for much

less time given the generally downward orientation of the beam and its narrow fore-aft beam width; 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 $\mu\text{Pa}\cdot\text{m}_{\text{rms}}$, the received level for an animal within the MBES beam 100 m (328 ft) below the ship would be ~ 202 dB re 1 μPa rms, assuming 40 dB of spreading loss over 100 m (328 ft) (circular spreading). Given the narrow beam, only one ping is likely to be received by a given animal as the ship passes overhead. The received energy level from a single ping of duration 15 ms would be ~ 184 dB re 1 μPa^2 s, i.e., 202 dB + 10 log (0.015 sec). That is below the TTS threshold for a cetacean receiving a single non-impulse sound (195 dB re 1 μPa^2 s) and even further below the anticipated PTS threshold (215 dB re 1 μPa^2 s) (Southall *et al.* 2007). In contrast, an animal that was only 10 m (32.8 ft) below the MBES when a ping is emitted would be expected to receive a level ~ 20 dB higher, i.e., 204 dB re 1 μPa^2 s in the case of the EM120. That animal might incur some TTS (which would be fully recoverable), but the exposure would still be below the anticipated PTS threshold for cetaceans. As noted by Burkhardt *et al.* (2008), cetaceans are very unlikely to incur PTS from operation of scientific sonars on a ship that is underway.

In harbor seals, the TTS threshold for non-impulse sounds is about 183 dB re 1 μPa^2 s, as compared with ~ 195 dB re 1 μPa^2 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 (328 ft) below the *R/V Langseth* could receive a single MBES ping with received energy level of ≥ 184 dB re 1 μPa^2 s 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 μPa^2 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, the narrow MBES beam, and proposed mitigation, only a small fraction of the pinnipeds below (and close to) the ship would receive a ping as the ship passed overhead.

7.9 POSSIBLE EFFECTS OF THE SUB-BOTTOM PROFILER SIGNALS

An SBP will also be operated from the source vessel during the planned study. Sounds from the SBP are very short pings, occurring for 1 to 4 ms once every second. Most of the energy in the pings emitted by the SBP is at 3.5 kHz, and the beam is directed downward. The SBP on the *R/V Langseth* has a maximum source level of 204 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}\cdot\text{m}$. Kremser *et al.* (2005) noted that the probability of a cetacean swimming through the area of exposure when a bottom profiler emits a ping is small—even for an SBP more powerful than that on the *R/V 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.

7.9.1 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.

7.9.2 Behavioral Responses

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

7.9.3 Hearing Impairment and Other Physical Effects

It is unlikely that the SBP produces sound levels strong enough to cause hearing impairment or other physical injuries even in an animal that is (briefly) in a position near the source. The SBP is usually operated simultaneously with other higher-power acoustic sources, including air guns. 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 from Section 11 would be applied to minimize effects of other sources would further reduce or eliminate any minor effects of the SBP.

7.10 ENTANGLEMENT

Entanglement can occur if wildlife becomes immobilized in survey lines, cables, nets, or other equipment that is moving through the water column. The proposed seismic survey would require towing approximately 6.4 km² (2.5 mi²) of equipment and cables. This large of an array carries the risk of entanglement for marine mammals. Wildlife, especially slow moving individuals, such as large whales, have a low probability of becoming entangled due to the slow speed of the survey vessel and onboard monitoring efforts. The National Science Foundation has no recorded cases of entanglement during any of their 160,934 km (100,000 mi) of seismic surveys (2011). However, there have been cases of baleen whales, mostly gray whales (Heyning, 1990), becoming entangled in fishing lines. As stated in the Marine Wildlife Contingency Plan (MWCP), a Safety Zone radius of 6.2 km (3.85 mi) from the vessel will be enforced by Protected Species Observers (PSOs) and operations will be shut down before any marine mammal comes into close proximity with the survey equipment. The probability for entanglement of marine mammals is considered not significant because of the vessel speed and the efforts of marine mammal monitors onboard the survey vessel. If entanglement does occur the onboard PSO will contact the appropriate Wildlife Rescue Center immediately and all operations will be halted.

8.0. SUBSISTENCE USES

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

Not applicable to the Project.

9.0 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.

9.1 INTRODUCTION

The proposed seismic Project will not result in any permanent impact on habitats used by marine mammals, or to the food sources they utilize. The proposed activities will be of short duration in any particular area of the 1,237 km² (477.6 mi²) Project area. As such, effects would be localized and short-term. The principal impact of the seismic survey will be temporarily elevated noise levels and their effects on marine mammals.

One of the reasons for the adoption of air guns as the standard energy source for marine seismic surveys was that, unlike explosives, they do not result in any appreciable fish kill. However, information on impacts to marine fish and invertebrates is limited.

9.2. SEISMIC SURVEY EFFECTS ON FISHES

Seismic surveys using air guns can disturb and displace fishes and interrupt feeding, but displacement may vary among species. Previous studies have shown that pelagic or nomadic fishes leave seismic survey areas (Engas *et al.*, 1999; Lokkeborg and Soldal, 1993, in MMS, 2005). L-DEO (2011) noted that the potential effect of seismic surveys on fish includes: 1) pathological; 2) physiological; and 3) behavioral.

9.2.1 Pathological

The potential for pathological damage to hearing structures in fish depends on the energy level of the received sound and the physiology and hearing capabilities of the species in question (L-DEO, 2011).

McCauley *et al.*, 2003 in MMS, 2005) noted the fishes exposed to an operating air gun may sustain extensive damage to their auditory hair cell, which would likely adversely affect hearing. Two months after exposure, the damage had not been repaired. Further, fishes with impaired hearing may have a temporary reduction in fitness resulting in increased vulnerability to predation, less success in locating prey and sensing their acoustic environmental, and, in the case of vocal fishes, reduction in ability to communicate. Some fishes displayed aberrant and disoriented swimming behavior, suggesting vestibular impacts. There was also evidence that seismic survey acoustic-energy sources could damage eggs and fry of some fishes, but the effect was limited to within 1 to 2 m (3.3 to 6.6 ft) of the array.

Popper *et al.* (2005, in MMS, 2005) investigated the effects of a 730 in³ air gun array on the hearing of northern pike, broad whitefish, and lake chub in the Mackenzie River Delta. Threshold shifts were found for exposed fish at exposure of sound levels of 177 dB re 1 μ Pa²·s, as compared to controls in the northern pike and lake chub, with recovery within 24 hours. There was no threshold shift in the broad whitefish.

An experiment of the effects of a single, 700 in³ air gun was conducted in Lake Mead, Nevada (USGS, 1999). The data were used in an environmental assessment of the effects of a marine reflection survey of the Lake Meade fault system by the National Park Service (Paulson *et al.*, 1993, in USGS, 1999). The air gun was suspended 3.5 m (11.5 ft) above a school of threadfin shad in Lake Meade and was fired three successive times at a 30-sec interval. Neither surface inspection nor diver observations of the water column and bottom found any dead fish.

For a proposed seismic survey in Southern California, USGS (1999) conducted a review of the literature on the effects of air guns on fish and fisheries. They reported a 1991 study of the Bay Area Fault system from the continental shelf to the Sacramento River, using a 10-gun, 5,828 in³ air gun array. Brezina and Associates were hired by USGS to monitor the effects of the surveys, and concluded that air gun operations were not responsible for the death of any of the fish carcasses observed, and the air gun profiling did not appear to alter the feeding behavior of sea lions, seals, or pelicans observed feeding during the surveys.

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; Boorman *et al.*, 1996, in L-DEO, 2011). Some of the reports claimed effects from treatments quite different from actual seismic survey sounds or even reasonable surrogates. However, Payne *et al.* (2009, in L-DEO, 2011) reported no statistical differences in mortality/morbidity between control and exposed groups of capelin eggs or monkfish larvae. Saetre and Ona (1996, in L-DEO, 2011) 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 against natural mortality rates, that the impact of seismic surveying on recruitment to a fish stock must be regarded as insignificant.

9.2.2 Physiological

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, in L-DEO, 2011). The periods necessary for the physiological changes to return to normal are variable and depend on numerous aspects of the biology of the species and the sound stimulus.

9.2.3 Behavioral Effects

Behavioral effects include changes in the distribution, migration, mating, and catchability of fish populations. Studies investigating the possible effects of sound (including seismic survey sound) on fish behavior have been conducted on both uncaged and caged individuals (Chapman and Hawkins, 1969; Pearson *et al.*, 1992; Santulli *et al.*, 1999; Wardle *et al.*, 2001; Hassel *et al.*, 2003, in L-DEO, 2011). Typically, 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.

MMS (2005) assessed the effects of a proposed seismic survey in Cook Inlet. The seismic survey proposed using three vessels, each towing two, 4-air gun arrays ranging from 1,500 to 2,500 in³. MMS noted that the impact to fish populations in the survey area and adjacent waters would likely be very low and temporary. MMS also concluded that seismic surveys may displace the pelagic fishes from the area temporarily when air guns are in use. However, fishes displaced and avoiding the air gun noise are likely to backfill the survey area in minutes to hours after cessation of seismic testing. Fishes not dispersing from the air gun noise (e.g., demersal species) may startle and move short distances to avoid air gun emissions.

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

9.3 SEISMIC EFFECTS ON INVERTEBRATES

9.3.1 Pathological Effects

Controlled seismic survey sound experiments have been conducted on adult crustaceans and adult cephalopods (Christian *et al.* 2003; DFO, 2004; McCauley *et al.*, 2000a,b). No significant pathological impacts were reported. It has been suggested that exposure to commercial seismic survey activities had injured giant squid (Guerra *et al.*, 2004), but there is no evidence to support such claims. However, Tenera Environmental (2011b) reported that Norris and Mohl (1983, summarized in Mariyasu *et al.*, 2004) observed lethal effects in squid (*Loligo vulgaris*) at levels of 246 to 252 dB after 3 to 11 minutes.

9.3.2 Physiological Effects

Primary and secondary stress responses in crustaceans, as measured by changes in haemolymph levels of enzymes, proteins, etc., were noted several days and months after exposure to seismic sounds (Payne *et al.*, 2007, in L-DEO, 2011). It was noted however, that no behavioral impacts were exhibited by crustaceans (Christian *et al.*, 2003, 2004; DFO, 2004, in L-DEO, 2011).

9.3.3 Behavioral Effects

In its review of literature concerning the effects of seismic surveys on fishes and fisheries, Tenera Environmental (2011b) reported that McCauley *et al.* (2000b) observed an alarm response at 156 to 161 dB in caged squid subjected to a single air gun, and a strong startle response (ink ejection and rapid swimming) at 174 dB. No behavioral impacts were exhibited by crustaceans (Christian *et al.*, 2003, 2004; DFO, 2004, in L-DEO, 2011). Adriguetto-Filho *et al.* (2005, in L-DEO, 2011) noted anecdotal reports of reduced catch rates of shrimp after exposure to seismic surveys; however, other studies have not reported significant changes in catch rates. Parry and Gason (2006, in L-DEO, 2011) did not find evidence of a reduced catch rate for lobsters exposed to seismic surveys.

10.0 ANTICIPATED 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 air gun operations will not result in any permanent impact on habitats used by marine mammals, or to the food sources they exploit. The main impact of the Project will be temporarily elevated noise levels and the effects on marine mammals discussed above.

During the seismic survey, only a small fraction of the available habitat would be ensonified at any given time. Disturbance to fish species would be short-term and fish are expected to return to their pre-disturbance behavior at the cessation of seismic activities.

11.0 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 use, paying particular attention to rookeries, mating grounds, and areas of similar significance.

During marine survey operations, potential impacts to marine mammals include exposure to high sound levels associated with the use of the air guns on a 24-hr basis, direct collisions with the survey vessels, and the effects from an accidental discharge of oil. PG&E is proposing to implement a MWCP that includes measures designed to reduce the potential impacts on marine wildlife, particularly marine mammals, from the proposed operations. This program will be implemented in compliance with measures developed in consultation with NMFS/FWS and will be based on anticipated Safety Zones that were determined from the results of mathematical modeling of the energy source levels. This program has been modeled after the mitigation measures (e.g., pre-project scheduling, visual monitoring (aerial and shipboard), passive acoustic monitoring, safety radii, shut down, ramp up, power down, etc.), currently used and recommended by the NSF and USGS in marine seismic research, as detailed in their recently completed Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)/Operational Environmental Impact Statement (OEIS) (Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement [PEIS]) (NSF/USGS, 2011). Specifically for this survey, additional measures have been proposed by PG&E and LDEO based on the requirements outlined within the HESS Study as well as measures identified by the California State Lands Commission's (CSLC) Environmental Impact Report (EIR) (2012) and direct consultations with NMFS/FWS.

The Final EIS/OEIS notes that "preliminary results from completed NSF-funded L-DEO academic seismic surveys indicate that monitoring and mitigation measures have been effective in reducing the potential exposure of marine mammals and sea turtles to high-level seismic sounds and, presumably, of biologically significant effects (LGL, Ltd., unpublished data)."

11.1 MITIGATION MEASURES WITHIN THE SURVEY DESIGN

11.1.1 Vessel-based Marine Wildlife Contingency Plan (MWCP)

The vessel-based operations of the PG&E MWCP are designed to meet the anticipated federal and state regulatory requirements. The objectives of the program will be:

- to minimize any potential disturbance to marine mammals and other sensitive marine species and ensure all regulatory requirements are followed;
- to document observations of the proposed survey activities on marine wildlife; and,
- to collect baseline data on the occurrence and distribution of marine wildlife in the study area.

The MWCP will be implemented by a team of experienced PSOs. PSOs will be stationed aboard the survey vessels through the duration of the Project. Reporting of the results of the vessel-based monitoring program will include the estimation of the number of takes as stipulated in the Final IHA .

The vessel-based work will provide:

- the basis for real-time mitigation, if necessary, as required by the various permits and authorizations issued to PG&E;
- information needed to estimate the number of “takes” of marine mammals by harassment, which must be reported to NMFS and USFWS;
- data on the occurrence, distribution, and activities of marine wildlife in the areas where the survey program is conducted; and,
- information to compare the distances, distributions, behavior, and movements of marine mammals relative to the survey vessel at times with and without air gun activity.

11.1.2 Scheduling to Avoid Areas of High Marine Wildlife Activity

PG&E proposes to conduct offshore surveys from November 1 through December 31, with air gun operations taking place from November 1 through December 31 to coincide with the reduced number of cetaceans in the area, and outside the peak gray whale migration period. This time frame also is outside breeding and pupping periods for the harbor seal (March to June) and California sea lion (May to late July), both of which have rookeries inshore, but adjacent to the Project area. No other pinnipeds breed in the Project area. The southern sea otter breeds and pups in water, and do not have defined rookeries. Breeding is non-seasonal, but young are generally born within two peak periods in spring and fall. As such, breeding and pupping could occur during the Project period, but this is likely to occur closer to shore than the survey tracks. The 2012 survey timing has also been refined to address breeding activity of the resident Morro Bay harbor porpoise. As such, active use of air guns will not be started until November 1st, which will minimize exposure of nursing harbor porpoise to seismic operations.

11.1.3 Aerial Surveys

NMFS/USFWS, with assistance from PG&E, will conduct aerial surveys in conjunction with the proposed seismic survey operations as outlined in the HESS Guidelines and in accordance with the requirements established by the CSLC EIR mitigation measures (CSLC, 2012), and as listed in project-specific permits. The NMFS/USGS/USFWS/CDF&G will be conducting low level aerial surveys designed to monitor southern sea otter and Morro Bay harbor porpoise movements in response to the seismic survey operations and to document the presence of large cetaceans within and outside of the survey area. The information generated by these survey operations will be used cooperatively as part of the project’s Adaptive Management Plan. Information regarding NMFS aerial survey operations is provided in Appendix D but are not part of this IHA request.

The purpose and objectives of the aerial surveys are:

- to obtain pre-survey information on the numbers and distribution of marine mammals or turtles in the seismic survey area;
- to identify direction of travel and corridors utilized by marine mammals relative to the Project area;
- to identify locations within the survey area that support aggregations of marine mammals;
- to document the relative abundance of marine mammals and turtles within the survey area; and
- to document changes in the behavior and distribution of marine mammals and turtles in the area before, during, and after seismic operations.

With the proposed timing of the seismic survey operations, particular attention will be directed to the identification of the presence of large cetaceans including blue, gray, and humpback whales, as well as fin whales, due to the likelihood that those species will be present in the Project area (November to December). Aerial surveys operations will include the follow components:

- pre-geophysical survey aerial surveys for harbor porpoise will be initiated in early October to document “baseline” conditions;
- approximately 5-10 days prior to the start of seismic survey operations, an aerial survey will be flown to establish a baseline for numbers and distribution of marine mammals in the Project area;
- aerial surveys for harbor porpoise and large cetaceans will be conducted when weather allows during seismic survey operations to assist in the identification of marine mammals distribution within and outside of the geophysical survey area. Aerial monitors will be in direct communications with ship-based monitors to assess the effectiveness of monitoring operations. Based on the results of these coordinated monitoring efforts, the need for additional aerial surveys will be evaluated; and,
- approximately 5-10 days following completion of the offshore seismic survey operations, a series of final aerial surveys will be conducted to document the number and distribution of marine mammals in the Project area. These data will be used in comparison with original survey data completed prior to the seismic operations.

11.2 MITIGATION MEASURES DURING SURVEY ACTIVITIES

PG&E’s planned site survey program and associated MWCP incorporates both survey design features and operational procedures for minimizing potential impacts on marine mammals. Survey design features include:

- timing and locating survey activities to avoid potential interference with the annual gray whale migration period;
- limiting the size of the seismic sound source to minimize energy introduced into the marine environment; and,
- establishing precautionary Safety and Exclusion Zone radii based on modeling results of the proposed sound sources.

The potential disturbance of marine mammals during survey operations will be minimized further through the implementation of several ship-based mitigation measures.

11.2.1 Safety and Exclusion Zones

Under current NMFS guidelines (e.g., NMFS, 2000), the “Exclusion Zone” is customarily defined as the distances within which received sound levels are ≥ 180 dB re 1 μ Pa (rms) and ≥ 190 dB re 1 μ Pa (rms) for cetaceans and pinnipeds, respectively. These safety criteria are based on an assumption that sound energy received at lower received levels will not injure these animals or impair their hearing abilities, but that higher received levels might have some effects. Disturbance or behavioral effects to marine mammals from underwater sound may occur after exposure to underwater sound at distances greater than the designated Exclusion Zone (Richardson *et al.*, 1995). In addition, a 160 dB re 1 μ Pa (rms) safety zone has been designated to provide an adequate buffer to allow the initial reduction in sound levels prior to the potential entry of a protected species into the Exclusion Zone. Estimates of the 160 dB re 1 μ Pa [rms]), safety zone sound levels produced by the planned air gun configurations have been estimated in Table 4 and depicted on Figure 10. For the purpose of this analysis the project is proposing to use the upslope distances for the determination of the exclusion and safety zones since this represents the greatest distance determined by the Greeneridge modeling (additional information on the noise modeling is provided in Appendix A). The Exclusion Zone for full air gun array will be extended to 1.8 km (1.1 mi) for mysticetes, sperm whales (*Physeter macrocephalus*) and large groups of marine mammals. For all other marine wildlife, the initial (prior to sound verification study results) Exclusion Zone radius for the full air gun array will be a 1.0 km (0.6 mi) around the sound source, and the Safety Zone will extend to 6.2 km (3.8 mi) from the sound source for all marine wildlife.

To augment PSO observations on the *R/V Langseth*, two scout vessels with a minimum of three qualified PSOs onboard each, shall be positioned adjacent to the *R/V Langseth*. These boats shall remain outside of the surface kelp area to avoid otter disturbance. The scout vessel PSOs will report to the *R/V Langseth* PSOs if any animals are observed.

At the initiation of the 3D seismic survey, an acoustics contractor will perform direct measurements of the received levels of underwater sound versus distance and direction from the air gun survey vessel using calibrated hydrophones. The acoustic data will be analyzed as quickly as reasonably practicable in the field and used to verify and adjust the safety and Exclusion Zone distances. The field report will be made available to NMFS and the PSOs within 120 hrs of completing the measurements. The mitigation measures to be implemented at the 180 dB sound levels will include power downs and shut downs as described below.

11.2.2 Speed and Course Alterations

If a marine mammal is detected outside the applicable Exclusion Zone and, based on its position and direction of travel, is likely to enter the Exclusion Zone, changes of the vessel's speed and course will be considered if this does not compromise operational safety. For marine seismic surveys using large streamer arrays, course alterations are not typically possible. After any such speed and/or course alteration is begun, the animals' activities and movements relative to the seismic vessel will be closely monitored to ensure that the animal does not approach within the Exclusion Zone. If the mammal appears likely to enter the Exclusion Zone, further mitigation actions will be taken, including a power down or shut down of the air gun(s).

11.2.3 Ramp Ups

Ramping up of an air gun array provides a gradual increase in sound levels, and involves a step-wise increase in the number and total volume of air guns firing until the full volume is achieved. The purpose of a ramp up (or soft start) is to "warn" cetaceans and pinnipeds in the vicinity of the air guns, and to provide the time for them to leave the area and thus avoid any potential injury or impairment of their hearing abilities.

During the proposed seismic survey program, the seismic operator will ramp up the air gun cluster slowly (6 dB/5 min). Full ramp ups (i.e., from a cold start after a shut down, when no air guns have been firing) will begin by firing a single air gun in the array. The minimum duration of a shut down period, (i.e., without air guns firing), which must be followed by a ramp up, is typically the amount of time it would take the source vessel to cover the 180-dB Exclusion Zone. Given the size of the planned air gun array, this period is estimated to be about 2 minutes based on the modeling results described above and a survey speed of 4.5 knots. Since from a practical and operational standpoint this time period is too brief, we propose to use 8 minutes, which is a time period used during previous 2D surveys.

The full ramp up, after a shut down, will not begin until there has been a minimum of 30 min of observation of the Exclusion Zone by PSOs to assure that no marine mammals are present. The entire Exclusion Zone must be visible during the 30-min lead-in to a full ramp up. If the entire Exclusion Zone is not visible, then ramp up from a cold start cannot begin. If a marine mammal(s) is sighted within the exclusionary zone during the 30-min watch prior to ramp up, ramp up will be delayed until the marine mammal(s) is sighted outside of the Exclusion Zone or the animal(s) is not sighted for 15 min for small odontocetes and pinnipeds, or 30 min for baleen whales and large odontocetes.

During turns or brief transits between seismic transects, one air gun will continue operating. The ramp up procedure will still be followed when increasing the source levels from one air gun to the full air gun array. However, keeping one air gun firing will avoid the prohibition of a cold start during darkness or other periods of poor visibility. Through use of this approach, seismic operations can resume without the 30-min watch period of the full Exclusion Zone required for a cold start, and without ramp-up if operating with mitigation gun for under 8 minutes, or with ramp-up if operating with mitigation gun for over 8 minutes. PSOs will be on duty whenever the air guns are firing during daylight, and at night during the 30-min periods

prior to ramp ups as well as during ramp ups or when acoustical monitor detects the presence of marine mammals. The seismic operator and PSOs will maintain records of the times when ramp ups start and when the air gun arrays reach full power.

11.2.4 Power Downs

A power down for mitigation purposes is the immediate reduction in the number of operating air guns such that the radius of the Exclusion Zone is decreased to the extent that an observed marine mammal(s) is not in the applicable Exclusion Zone of the full array. Power downs are also used while the vessel turns from the end of one survey line to the start of the next. During a power down, one air gun continues firing. The continued operation of one air gun is intended to: (a) alert marine mammals to the presence of the seismic vessel in the area; and, (b) retain the option of initiating a ramp up to full operations under poor visibility conditions.

The full array will be immediately powered down whenever a marine mammal is sighted approaching close to or is first detected within the Exclusion Zone of the full array. If a marine mammal is sighted within or about to enter the applicable Exclusion Zone of the single mitigation air gun, it too will be shut down (see following section).

Following a power down, operation of the full air gun array 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 of the full array; or,
- has not been seen within the Exclusion Zone for 15 min in the case of pinnipeds or small odontocetes; or,
- has not been seen within the Exclusion Zone for 30 min in the case of mysticetes or large odontocetes.

11.2.5 Shut Downs

The operating air gun(s) will be shut down completely if a marine mammal approaches or enters the Exclusion Zone and a power down is not practical or adequate to reduce exposure to less than 180 dB (rms). In most cases, this means the mitigation air gun will be shut down completely if a marine mammal approaches or enters the Exclusion Zone around the single mitigation air gun while it is operating during a power down. Air gun activity will not resume until the marine mammal has cleared the Exclusion Zone in accordance with the criteria above.

If a North Pacific right whale is observed at any distance from the vessel, the air guns will be shut down, and the PSOs on duty will immediately contact NMFS and consult on how to proceed with the survey. When four shut downs occur for mysticeti whales in the Exclusion Zone, a project review will be initiated immediately with CSLC and NMFS to assess the safety of project area conditions. The two agencies will be notified within twenty-four hours of the fourth consecutive shut down, however the survey activity may proceed while the agencies assess the situation, unless otherwise directed by the CSLC. Aerial survey data and observations noted

by PSOs will be provided to the agencies for review and consideration of potential refinements to mitigation measures.

11.2.6 Monitors

See Vessel-based Monitoring below in Section 13.0.

11.2.7 Use of Mitigation Air Gun

Throughout the 24/7 geophysical survey, particularly during turning movements, and short-duration equipment maintenance activities, and unless animals are observed within the Exclusion Zone, the mitigation air gun will be continuously used to deter marine wildlife from being within the immediate area..

11.2.8 Passive Acoustic Monitoring

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

The PAM system consists of hardware (i.e., hydrophones) and software. The “wet end” of the system consists of a towed hydrophone array that is connected to the vessel by a tow cable. The tow cable is 250 m (820 ft) long, and the hydrophones are fitted in the last 10 m (33 ft) of cable. A depth gauge is attached to the free end of the cable, and the cable is typically towed at depths <20 m (66 ft). The array will be deployed from a winch located on the aft deck. A deck cable will connect the tow cable to the electronics unit in the main computer lab where the acoustic station, signal conditioning, and processing system will be located. The acoustic signals received by the hydrophones are amplified, digitized, and then processed by the Pamguard software. The system can detect marine mammal vocalizations at frequencies up to 250 kHz.

One acoustic PSO (in addition to the visual PSOs) will be on board. The towed hydrophones will be monitored 24 hours per day during air gun operations. However, PAM may not be possible if damage occurs to the array or back-up systems during operations. One PSO will monitor the acoustic detection system at any one time by listening to the signals from two channels via headphones and/or speakers and watching the real-time spectrographic display for frequency ranges produced by cetaceans. The PSO monitoring the acoustical data will be on shift for 1 to 6 hours at a time. All PSOs are expected to rotate through the PAM position, although the acoustic PSO will be on PAM duty more frequently.

When a vocalization is detected while visual observations (during daylight) are in progress, the acoustic PSO will contact the visual PSO immediately, to alert him/her to the presence of cetaceans (if they have not already been seen), and to allow a power down or shut down to be initiated, if required. During non-daylight hours, when a cetacean is detected within the Exclusion Zone by acoustic monitoring, the geophysical crew and the captain of the survey vessel will be notified immediately so that mitigation measures called for in the applicable authorization(s) may be implemented. The acoustic PSO will continue to monitor the hydrophones and inform the geophysical crew, and the captain when the mammal(s) appear to be outside the Exclusion Zone.

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

11.2.9 Night Survey Areas

To the extent possible, nighttime operations will be restricted to areas in which marine wildlife abundance is low based on daytime observations and historical distribution patterns. Data collection along inshore tracklines and near Church Rock (35° 20.675' N, 120° 59.049' W) will be done during daylight hours to the extent possible.

If nighttime survey operations are located within the 40-m (131-ft) depth contour, PSOs will visually monitor the area forward the vessel with the aid of infrared goggles/binoculars and the forward-looking infrared system available on the *R/V Langseth*. Mitigation measures, such as avoidance, power down, and/or shut down, would be implemented, if a sea otter is observed within the vessels' path.

11.3 ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT PLAN

Data generated during pre-activities surveys and ongoing operational monitoring activities will actively be used during the proposed seismic survey to adjust or redirect operations should significant adverse impacts be observed to marine resources in the project area. The Adaptive Management Plan will be finalized in consultation with resource agencies involved in the permitting and monitoring activities associated with the proposed 2012 seismic survey operations. Information sources used as part of this plan will included but not be limited to the following:

- Pre-activity and weekly aerial surveys (See Appendix D);
- Sound source verification study;
- Onboard visual monitoring by PSOs;
- National Marine Fisheries Service Morro Bay harbor porpoise Monitoring Program (See Appendix D);

- Fish and Wildlife Service Southern Sea Otter Monitoring Program (See Appendix E);
and
- Marine Mammal Stranding Response Plan (Appendix F).

Data developed during the 2012 seismic survey operations will also be used to revise proposed survey operations within Survey Box 1 currently scheduled for 2013.

12.0 ARCTIC SUBSISTENCE HUNTING AREAS

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.

Not applicable to Project.

13.0 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 requirement 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. Guidelines for developing a site-specific monitoring plan may be obtained by writing to the Director, Office of Protected Resources.

13.1 VESSEL-BASED MONITORING

Vessel-based monitoring for marine wildlife will be done by trained PSOs throughout the period of survey activities to comply with expected provisions in the IHA that L-DEO and PG&E receives. The visual PSOs will monitor the occurrence and behavior of marine mammals near the survey vessel during daylight survey operations. Acoustic monitoring will occur 24 hours per day, please refer to Section 11.2.8 – Passive Acoustic Monitoring. PSO duties will include watching for and identifying marine mammals; recording their numbers, distances, and reactions to the survey operations; and, documenting potential “take by harassment” as defined by NMFS.

- A sufficient number of PSOs will be required onboard the survey and support vessels to meet the following criteria:
 - 100 percent monitoring during all periods of survey operations (daylight visual and acoustic monitoring, and non-daylight acoustic monitoring); and
 - maximum of four consecutive hours on watch per PSO;

PSO teams will consist of at least one NMFS-approved PSOs and experienced field biologists. An experienced field crew leader will supervise the PSO team onboard the survey vessels. Crew leaders and most other biologists serving as PSOs will be individuals with experience as PSOs during high energy survey projects, and/or shallow hazards surveys in California.

PSOs will have previous marine mammal observation experience, and field crew leaders will be highly experienced with previous vessel-based marine mammal monitoring and mitigation projects. Resumes for those individuals will be provided to NMFS and USFWS for review and acceptance of their qualifications. PSOs will be experienced in the region, familiar with the marine mammals of the area, and complete an in-house observer training course designed to familiarize individuals with monitoring and data collection procedures.

The PSOs will watch for marine mammals from the best available vantage point on the survey vessels, typically the PSO tower on the *R/V Langseth*, or from dedicated monitoring vessel. The PSOs will scan systematically with the unaided eye and with binoculars. Personnel

on the bridge of the survey and monitoring vessels will assist the PSOs in watching for marine mammals.

Information to be recorded by PSOs will include the same types of information that were recorded during recent monitoring programs associated with surveys completed offshore California. When a mammal sighting is made, the following information about the sighting will be recorded:

- species, group size, age/size/gender (if determinable), behavior when first sighted and after initial sighting, heading (if determinable), bearing and distance from observer, apparent reaction to activities (e.g., none, avoidance, approach, paralleling, etc.), closest point of approach, and pace;
- time, location (GPS coordinates), speed, activity of the vessel, sea state, visibility, and sun glare will be recorded; and,
- the positions of other vessel(s) in the vicinity of the observer location.

The ship's position, speed of the vessel, water depth, sea state, visibility, and sun glare will also be recorded at the start and end of each observation watch, every 30 min during a watch, and whenever there is a substantial change in any of those variables.

When a marine mammal is seen within the Exclusion Zone, the geophysical crew will be notified immediately so that mitigation measures called for in the applicable authorization(s) can be implemented. It is expected that the air gun arrays will be shut down within several seconds—often before the next shot would be fired, and almost always before more than one additional shot is fired. The PSO will then maintain a watch to determine when the mammal(s) appear to be outside the Exclusion Zone such that air gun operations can resume.

13.2 AERIAL SURVEYS

See Section 11.0 (Mitigation Measures) above for discussion of aerial surveys.

13.3 REPORTING

13.3.1 Field Data Recording, Verification, Handling, and Security

The PSOs will record their observations onto datasheets. During periods between watches and periods when operations are suspended, those data will be entered into a laptop computer running a custom computer database. The accuracy of the data entry will be verified in the field by computerized validity checks as the data are entered, and by subsequent manual checking of the database printouts. These procedures will allow initial summaries of data to be prepared during and shortly after the survey, and will facilitate transfer of the data to statistical, graphical, or other programs for further processing. Quality control of the data will be facilitated by: (1) the start-of survey training session; (2) subsequent supervision by the onboard PSO crew leader; and, (3) ongoing data checks during the survey.

The data will be backed up regularly onto CDs and/or USB drives, and stored at separate locations on the vessel. If possible, data sheets will be photocopied daily during the survey. Data will be secured further by having data sheets and backup data CDs carried back to the shore during crew rotations.

13.3.2 Field Reports

Throughout the survey program, PSOs will prepare a report each day or at such other intervals as required by NMFS, USFWS, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE), California State Lands Commission, California Coastal Commission, or PG&E, summarizing the recent results of the monitoring program. The reports will summarize the species and numbers of marine mammals sighted. These reports will be provided to NMFS and to PG&E, LDEO, and NSF.

13.3.3 Marine Mammal Carcasses

If an injured or dead marine mammal is sighted within an area where air guns had been operating within the past 24 hours, the array will be shut down immediately. Activities can resume after the lead PSO has (to the best of his/her ability) determined that the injury resulted from something other than air gun operations. After documenting those observations, including supporting documents (e.g., photographs or other evidence), the operations will resume. Within 24 hours of the observation, the vessel operator will notify NMFS and provide them with a copy of the written documentation.

If the cause of injury or death cannot be immediately determined by the lead PSO, the incident will be reported immediately to either the NMFS Office of Protected Resources and the NMFS Southwest Regional Office. The seismic air gun array shall not be restarted until NMFS is able to review the circumstances, make a determination as to whether modifications to the activities are appropriate and necessary, and has notified the operator that activities may be resumed.

In addition to PG&E proposed monitoring and notification protocols, NMFS will develop and implement a Stranding Response Plan. PG&E will work in close coordination with NMFS to follow the procedures and notification requirements outline in this plan.

13.3.3 Final Reporting

The results of the vessel-based monitoring, including estimates of potential “take by harassment,” will be in a report and submitted to NMFS within 90-days of survey conclusion; the report will also be posted on the NSF website at: <http://www.nsf.gov/geo/oce/envcomp/index.jsp>. Reporting will address any requirements established by NMFS and USFWS.

Along with any other state or federal requirements, the 90-day report minimally will include:

- summaries of monitoring effort: total hours, total distances, and distribution of marine mammals through the study period accounting for sea state and other factors affecting visibility and detectability of marine mammals;
- analyses of the effects of various factors influencing detectability of marine mammals including sea state, number of observers, and fog/glare;
- species composition, occurrence, and distribution of marine mammal sightings including date, water depth, numbers, age/size/gender, and group sizes; and analyses of the effects of survey operations:
- sighting rates of marine mammals during periods with and without air gun activities (and other variables that could affect detectability);
- initial sighting distances versus air gun activity state;
- closest point of approach versus air gun activity state;
- observed behaviors and types of movements versus air gun activity state;
- numbers of sightings/individuals seen versus air gun activity state;
- distribution around the survey vessel versus air gun activity state; and
- estimates of potential “take by harassment”.

14.0 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.

In addition to those mitigation and monitoring programs developed by PG&E in support of the seismic survey project implementation, PG&E has agreed to participate in a Comprehensive Monitoring Program. This program has been developed in consultation with numerous resource agencies and research groups including NMFS, USFWS, CDFD, The Nature Conservancy, Ocean Science Trust, Cal Poly San Luis Obispo, and Moss Landing Marine Laboratories. These programs are summarized below.

- **Harbor Porpoise Monitoring Program.** PG&E has agreed to fund a Harbor Porpoise Monitoring Program that will be conducted by the NMFS. The program involves a direct collaboration between NMFS, U.S. Geological Survey (USGS), Brandon Southall (SEA, Inc.), and possibly others. Monitoring would involve a 3-pronged approach to collect data before, during, and after the seismic surveys. . See Appendix D.
- **Sea Otter Monitoring Program.** PG&E has agreed to fund a Sea Otter Monitoring Program that will be conducted by the USFWS, CDFG Marine Wildlife Veterinary Care and Research Center (MWVCRC), the Monterey Bay Aquarium Sea Otter Research and Conservation Department, and University of California and Santa Cruz and Davis. The monitoring program will provide a real-time monitoring infrastructure with which to detect and measure levels of harassment caused by the surveys, as required by the USFWS, while at the same time providing useful information on behavioral response thresholds as a function of sound exposure for sea otters. This program was initiated on October 2, 2012. See Appendix E
- **Stranding Response Plan.** PG&E has agreed to support a Stranding Response Plan developed by the NMFS, USFWS and CDFG. This plan will be implemented in close coordination with the Harbor Porpoise and Sea Otter Monitoring Programs. Data from the program will also be used in the evaluation of impacts under the Adaptive Management Program.
- **Aerial Survey Program.** NMFS will conduct aerial surveys in conjunction with the proposed seismic survey operations as outlined in the HESS Guidelines and in accordance with the requirements established by the CSLC FEIR mitigation measures (CSLC, 2012). In addition to the these aerial surveys, NMFS/USFWS will be conducting low level aerial surveys designed to monitor southern sea otter and Morro Bay harbor porpoise movements in response to the seismic survey operations. Baseline aerial surveys will commence on October 2, 2012.
- **Adaptive Management Program.** Data generated during pre-activities surveys and ongoing operational monitoring activities will actively be used during the proposed seismic survey to adjust or redirect operations should significant adverse impacts be

observed to marine resources in the project area. This program will rely on data generated during the Harbor Porpoise and Sea Otter Monitoring Programs along with vessel based PSO observations.

- **Study of the Effects of the Seismic Survey on Fishes.** PG&E has agreed to fund a two-component study to examine the short- and long-term effects of the seismic survey on fish abundance (and invertebrates). Components of the study include: (1) Remote Operated Vehicle (ROV) surveys to assess the abundance of common rockfishes and other demersal fish and invertebrate species in sites before, during, and after the seismic survey; and (2) funding the California Collaborative Fisheries Research Program (CCFRP), which is an existing program between the fishing communities of Half Moon Bay, Moss Landing/Monterey, Morro Bay, Port San Luis and the academic institutions of Moss Landing Marine Labs and Center for Coastal Marine Sciences at Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo to study the long-term effects of the HESS on fish abundance in shallower waters. The CCFRP involves both Catch per Unit Effort (CPUE) and Commercial Trap surveys.

15.0 REFERENCES

- Adriquetto-Filho, J., A. Ostrensky, M. Pie, U. Silva, and W. Boeger. 2005. Evaluating the impact of seismic prospecting on artisanal shrimp fisheries. *Continental Shelf. Research* 25: 1720-177.
- Allen, B.M. and R.P. Angliss. 2010. Alaska marine mammal stock assessments, 2010. Draft, April 2010. U.S. Dep. Commerce. NOAA Tech. Memo. 247 p.
- Allen, S., J. Mortenson, and, S. Webb. 2011. *Field Guide to Marine Mammals of the Pacific Coast: Baja, California, Oregon, Washington, British Columbia.* University of California Press. Berkeley, California.
- 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 Paper. SC/58/E35. International Whaling Commission. Cambridge, U.K. 13 p.
- Balcomb, K.C. and D.E. Claridge. 2001. A mass stranding of cetaceans caused by naval sonar in the Bahamas. *Bahamas J. Sci.* 8(2):2-12.
- Barlow, J. 1994. Recent information on the status of large whales in California waters, NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SWFSC-203, 27 pp.
- Barlow, J. and P. Boveng. 1991. Modeling age-specific mortality for marine mammal populations. *Marine Mammal. Science.* 7(1):84-119.
- Barlow, J., and T. Gerrodette. 1996. Abundance of cetaceans in California waters based on 1991 and 1993 ship surveys, NOAA Tech. Memo. NOAA-TM-NMFS-SWFSC-223.
- Barlow, J., *et al.* 1997. U.S. Pacific Marine Mammal Stock Assessments 1996, NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SWFSC-248.
- Barlow, J., M.C. Ferguson, E.A. Becker, J.V. Redfern, K.A. Forney, I.L. Vilchis, P.C. Fiedler, T. Gerrodette, L.T. Ballance. 2009. Predictive Modeling of Marine Mammal Density from existing survey data and model validation using upcoming surveys. NOAA Technical Memorandum. NOAA-TMNMFS-SWFSC-XXX. 196pp.
- Barry, S.B., A.C. Cucknell, and N. Clark. 2010. A direct comparison of bottlenose and common dolphin behavior during seismic surveys when airguns are and are not being utilized. Abstract *In: Second International Conference on The Effects of Noise on Aquatic Life, Cork, Ireland, August 15-20, 2010.*
- Bartholomew, G.A. 1967. Seal and sea lion populations of the California Islands. *In: R.N. Philbrick (ed.) Proceedings, Symposium on the Biology of the California Islands.* Santa Barbara Botanic Garden, Santa Barbara, CA. pp. 229-244.

- Bonnell, M.L., B.J. Le Boeuf, M.O. Pierson, D.H. Dettman, G.D. Farrens, and C.B. Heath. 1981. Pinnipeds of the Southern California Bight, Part 1 of Summary of Marine Mammal and Seabird Surveys of the Southern California Bight Area, 1975-1978, Volume II - Synthesis of Findings. Report to the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, NTIS No. PB 81248171.
- Bonnell, M.L., and M.D. Dailey. 1993. *Ecology of the Southern California Bight: A Synthesis and Interpretation*, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Bonnell, M.L., R.G. Ford. 1987. California sea lion distribution: A statistical analysis of aerial transect data. *J. Wildl. Manage*, 51(1):13-20.
- Boorman, C.et. al. 1996. The physiological effects of seismic exploration on fish eggs, larvae, and fry. *Fisk og Havet, Havforskningsinsitutettet, Bergen, Norway*, No. 3.
- 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. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 96(4):2469-2484.
- Burkhardt, E., O. Boebel, H. Bornemann, and C. Ruholl. 2008. Risk assessment of scientific sonars. *Bioacoustics* 17: 235-237.
- Calambokidis, J. and S.D. Osmeck. 1998. Marine mammal research and mitigation in conjunction with airgun operation for the USGS 'SHIPS' seismic surveys in 1998. Report by Cascadia Research, Olympia, WA, for U.S. Geological Survey and Minerals Management Service.
- Carretta, J.V., K.A Forney, M.M. Muto, J. Barlow, J. Baker, B. Hanson and M.S. Lowry. 2006. U.S. Pacific Marine Mammal Stock Assessments: 2005. NMFS Southwest Fisheries Science Center. NOAA Technical Memorandum NOAA-TM-NMFS-SWFSC-388.
- Carretta, J.V., K.A Forney, M.M. Muto, J. Barlow, J. Baker, B. Hanson and M.S. Lowry. 2008. U.S. Pacific Marine Mammal Stock Assessments: 2007. NMFS Southwest Fisheries Science Center. NOAA Technical Memorandum NOAA-TM-NMFS-SWFSC-388.
- Carretta, J., K. Forney, and S. Bensen. 2009. Preliminary Estimates of Harbor Porpoise Abundance in California Waters From 2002 to 2007. NOAA Technical Memorandum (NOAA-TM-NMFS-SWFSC-435). National Marine Fisheries Service, Southwest Fisheries Center. La Jolla, CA
- Castellote, M., C.W. Clark, and M.O. Lammers. 2010. Acoustic compensation to shipping and airgun noise by Mediterranean fin whales (*Balaenoptera physalus*). Abstract. *In: The Second International Conference on The Effects of Noise on Aquatic Life*, Cork, Ireland, August 15-20, 2010.

- Caswell, H., S. Brault, A. Read, and T. Smith. 1998. Harbor porpoise and fisheries: an uncertainty analysis of incidental mortality. *Ecological Applications* 84(4):1226-1238
- Cavanagh, R. 2000. Criteria and thresholds for adverse effects of underwater noise on marine mammals. Report by Science Applications International Corp., McLean, VA., for Air Force Research Laboratory, Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio. AFRL-HW-WP-T2-2000-0092.
- Chapman, C.J. and A.D. Hawkins. 1969. The importance of sound in fish behavior in relation to capture by trawls. *FAO Fisheries Report* 62:717-729.
- Chivers, S.J., A.E. Dizon, P.J. Gearin, and K.M. Robertson. 2002. Small-scale population structure of eastern North Pacific harbor porpoises, (*Phocoena phocoena*), indicated by molecular genetic analyses. *Journal of Cetacean Research and Management* 4(2):111-122.
- Chivers, S.J., B. Hanson, J. Laake, P. Gearin, M.M. Muto, J. Calambokidis, D. Duffield, T. McGuire, J. Hodder, D. Greig, E. Wheeler, J. Harvey, K.M. Robertson, and B. Hancock. 2007. Additional genetic evidence for population structure of *Phocoena phocoena* off the coasts of California, Oregon, and Washington. Southwest Fisheries Science Center Administrative Report LJ-07-08. 16pp.
- Christian, J.R., A. Mathieu, D.H. Thomson, D. White, and R.A. Buchanan. 2003. Effect of seismic energy on snow crab (*Chionoecetes opilio*). Rep. by LGL Ltd., St. John's, Nfld., for Environmental Studies Research Fund (ESRF), Calgary, Alta. 56 p.
- Clark, C.W. and W.T. Ellison. 2004. Potential use of low-frequency sounds by baleen whales for probing the environment: evidence from models and empirical measurements. p. 564-582 *In*: Thomas, J.A., C.F. Moss and M. Vater (eds.) *Echolocation in bats and dolphins*. Univ. Chicago Press, Chicago, IL.
- Clark, C.W. and G.C. Gagnon. 2006. Considering the temporal and spatial scales of noise exposures from seismic surveys on baleen whales. Working Paper. SC/58/E9 presented to the International Whaling Commission 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. Fernandez, 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. *Journal of Cetacean. Research. Management*. 7(3):177-187.
- Crum, L.A., M.R. Bailey, J. Guan, P.R. Hilmo, S.G. Kargl, and T.J. Matula. 2005. Monitoring bubble growth in supersaturated blood and tissue ex vivo and the relevance to marine mammal bioeffects. *Acoustic Research Letters Online* 6(3):214-220.

- Dailey, M., J. Anderson, D. Reish, and D. Gorsline. 1993. Ecology of the Southern California Bight: A Synthesis and Interpretation. University of California Press. Berkeley, CA.
- 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, NY. 839 p.
- DeAngelis, M., NMFS. Personal communication (email) with Ray deWit, Padre Associates, Inc. August 29, 2011.
- DeRuiter, S. P. Tyack, Y. Lin, A. Newhall, J. Lynch, and P. Miller. 2006. Modeling acoustic propagation of airgun array pulses recorded on tagged sperm whales (*Physeter macrocephalus*). Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 120(6):4100-4114.
- DFO (Fisheries and Oceans Canada). 2004. Potential impacts of seismic energy on snow crab. Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans Canadian. Science. Advisory. Section. Habitat Status Report 2004/003.
- Di Iorio, L. and C. Clark. 2009. Exposure to seismic surveys alters blue whale acoustic communication. Biological Letter Doi.1098/rsbl.2009.0651
- Dohl, T.P., K.S. Norris, R.C. Guess, J.D. Bryant, and M.W. Honig. 1981. *Cetacea of the Southern California Bight, Part II of Investigators' Reports*: In: Summary of Marine Mammal and Seabird Surveys of the Southern California Bight Area, 1975-1978, prepared for U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, Pacific OCS Region, NTIS #PB 81-248-189, 414 pp.
- Dohl, T.P., R.C. Guess, M.L. Duman, and R.C. Helm. 1983. *Cetaceans of central and northern California, 1980-1983: Status, abundance, and distribution*, prepared for U.S. Department of the Interior, Minerals Management Service, Pacific OCS Region, OCS Study MMS 84-0045, 284 pp.
- Dunn, R.A. and O. Hernandez. 2009. Tracking blue whales in the eastern tropical Pacific with an ocean-bottom seismometer and hydrophone array. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 126(3):1084-1094.
- 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*). Canadian. Journal of Fish and Aquatic Science 53:2238-2249.
- 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. International. Whaling Commission Cambridge, U.K. 8 p.

- Fernández, A., M. Arbelo, R. Deaville, I.A.P. Patterson, P. Castro, J.R. Baker, E. Degollada, H.M. Ross, P. Herráez, A.M. Pocknell, E. Rodríguez, F.E. Howie, A. Espinosa, R.J. Reid, J.R. Jaber, V. Martin, A.A. Cunningham, and P.D. Jepson. 2004. Pathology: whales, sonar and decompression sickness (reply). *Nature* 428(6984):1.
- Fernández, A., J.F. Edwards, F. Rodriguez, A.E. de los Monteros, P. Herráez, P. Castro, J.R. Jaber, V. Martin, and M. Arbelo. 2005. "Gas and fat embolic syndrome" involving a mass stranding of beaked whales (Family Ziphiidae) exposed to anthropogenic sonar signals. *Vet. Pathol.* 42(4):446-457.
- Finneran, J.J., C.E. Schlundt, R. Dear, D.A. Carder and S. H. Ridgway. 2002. Temporary shift in masked hearing thresholds (MTTS) in odontocetes after exposure to single underwater impulses from a seismic watergun. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 111:2929-2940.
- Finneran, J.J., and C.E. Schlundt. 2004. Effects of intense pure tones on the behaviour of trained odontocetes. TR 1913, SSC San Diego. San Diego, CA.
- 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. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 118:2696-2705.
- Finneran, J.J., D.A. Carder, C.E. Schlundt and R.L. Dear. 2010a. Growth and recovery of temporary threshold shift at 3 kHz in bottlenose dolphins: Experimental data and mathematical models. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 127(5):3256-3266.
- Finneran, J.J., D.A. Carder, C.E. Schlundt and R.L. Dear. 2010b. Temporary threshold shift in a bottlenose dolphin (*Tursiops truncatus*) exposed to intermittent tones. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 127(5):3267-3272.
- Forney, K.A., *et al.* 2000. *U.S. Pacific marine mammal stock assessments*. U.S. Department of Commerce, NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SWFSC-300, 276 pp.
- Frankel, A. 2005. Gray whales hear and respond to a 21-25 kHz high-frequency whale-finding sonar. In: Abstr, 16th Bien Conf. Mar. Mamm., 12-16 Dec 2005, San Diego, CA.
- Gabriele, C. and B. Kipple. 2009. Measurements of near-surface, near bow underwater sound from cruise ships. p. 86 *In: Abstracts of the 18th Biennial Conference on the Biology of Marine Mammals*, 12-16 October 2009 Quebec City, Canada.
- 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. *Environmental Monitoring and Assessment*. 134(1-3):75-91. doi: 10.1007/s10661-007-9812-1.

- 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. International Whaling Commission Working Paper SC/60/E9. 10 p.
- Gendron, D., S. Lanham, and M. Carwardine. 1999. North Pacific right whale sighting south of Baja California. *Aquatic Mammals* 25(1):31-34.
- Gentry, R. (ed). 2002. Report of the workshop on acoustic resonance as a source of tissue trauma in cetaceans. 24-25 April, NMFS, Silver Spring, MD. 19 p.
- Gerrodette, T. and J. Pettis. 2005. Response of tropical cetaceans to an echo sounder during research vessel surveys. In: Abstr, 16th Bien Conf. Mar. Mamm., 12-16 Dec 2005, San Diego, CA.
- Goold, J. and R. Coates. 2006. Near Source, High Frequency Air-Gun Signatures. Paper presented to the International Whaling Commission Science Committee. SC/58/E30.
- 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. *Marine Technology Society Journal* 37(4): 16-34.
- Gosho, M.E., D.W. Rice, and J.M. Breiwick. 1984. *The sperm whale, Physeter macrocephalus*. In: J.M. Breiwick and H.W. Brahm (eds.), *The status of endangered whales*. *Mar. Fish. Rev.* 46: 54-64.
- Greene, G.D., F.R. Engelhardt and R.J. Paterson (eds.). 1985. Proceedings of the Workshop on Effects of Explosives Use in the Marine Environment, Jan. 1985, Halifax, NS. Tech. Rep. 5. Can. Oil & Gas Lands Admin., Environ. Prot. Branch, Ottawa, Ont.
- Green, G.A., et al. 1989. Synthesis of information on marine mammals of the eastern North Pacific, with emphasis on the Oregon and Washington OCS area. In: Information synthesis and hypothesis formulation for Oregon and Washington marine mammal and seabird surveys. Final Report prepared for U.S. Department of the Interior, Minerals Management Service, Pacific OCS Region, Bellevue, WA: EnviroSphere Company, and Portland, OR: Ecological Consulting, Inc. OCS Study MMS 89-0030. pp. 1-116.
- Greene, C.R., Jr., N.S. Altman, and W.J. Richardson. 1999a. Bowhead whale calls. p. 6-1 to 6-23 In: Richardson, W.J. (ed.) Marine mammal and acoustical monitoring of Western Geophysical's open-water seismic program in the Alaskan Beaufort Sea, 1998. LGL Rep. TA2230-3. Rep. by LGL Ltd., King City, Ont., and Greeneridge Sciences Inc., Santa Barbara, CA, for Western Geophysical, Houston, TX, and U.S. Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., Anchorage, AK, and Silver Spring, MD. 390 p.
- Greene, C.R., Jr., N.S. Altman, and W.J. Richardson. 1999b. The influence of seismic survey sounds on bowhead whale calling rates. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 106(4, Pt. 2):2280 (Abstract).

- Greeneridge Sciences, Inc. 2011. Central California Acoustic Propagation Modeling Report. Draft GSI Technical Memorandum 470-2 Rev A. Prepared for Padre Associates, Inc. Santa Barbara, CA.
- Guerra. A., A. Gonzalez, 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.
- Harris, M. 2011. CDFG Sea Otter Information. Personal communication with Ray de Wit of Padre Associates, Inc. 07-18-11.
- 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. *Marine Mammal Science* 17(4): 795-812.
- 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 sand eel to seismic shooting: a field experiment and fishery statistics study. Institute of Marine Research, Bergen, Norway.
- Hastis, G. and V. Janik. 2007. Behavioural responses of grey seals to multibeam imaging sonar. In: Abstr. 17th Bien. Conf. Biol. Mar. Mamm. 29 Nov - 3 Dec. Cape Town, South Africa.
- HESS. 1999. High Energy Seismic Survey review process and interim operational guidelines for marine surveys offshore Southern California. Report from High Energy Seismic Survey Team for Calif. State Lands Commission and Minerals Management Service, Camarillo, CA. 39 p. + Appendices.
- Heyning, J. E. 1990. Entanglements of baleen whales in fishing gear off southern California. *Reports of the International Whaling Commission* 40: 427-431.
- HESS. 1999. High Energy Seismic Survey review process and interim operational guidelines for marine surveys offshore Southern California. Report from High Energy Seismic Survey Team for Calif. State Lands Commission and Minerals Management Service, Camarillo, CA. 39 p. + Appendices.
- Heyning, J.E., and W.F. Perrin. 1994. Evidence for two species of common dolphins from the eastern North Pacific. *Contributions in Science Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County* 442:1-35.
- Hildebrand, J.A. 2005. Impacts of anthropogenic sound. p. 101-124 In: J.E. Reynolds, W.F. Perrin, R.R. Reeves, S. Montgomery, and T. Ragen (eds.), *Marine Mammal Research: Conservation Beyond Crisis*. Johns Hopkins Univ. Press, Baltimore, MD. 223 p.

- Hogarth, W.T. 2002. Declaration of William T. Hogarth in opposition to plaintiff's motion for temporary restraining order, 23 October 2002. Civ. No. 02-05065-JL. U.S. District Court, Northern District of California, San Francisco Div.
- Holst, M., 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. by LGL Ltd., King City, Ont., for Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory of Columbia Univ., Palisades, NY. NMFS, 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. by LGL Ltd., King City, Ont., for Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory of Columbia Univ., Palisades, NY, .NMFS. 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. Abstract. Presented at American Geophysical Union - Society Explorer Geophysical Joint Assembly on Environ. Impacts from Marine Geophysical & Geological Studies - Recent Advances from Academic & Industry Research. Program, Baltimore, MD, May 2006.
- International Association of American Geographers Contractors (IAGC). 2004. Further analysis of 2002 Abrolhos Bank, Brazil humpback whale strandings coincident with seismic surveys. Houston, TX.
- International Whaling Commission (IWC). 2007. Report of the standing working group on environmental concerns. Annex K to Report of the Scientific Committee. *J. Cetacean Research Management* 9 (Suppl.): 227-260.
- 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 Department. Oceanography., Texas A & M Univ., College Station, TX, for MMS 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. Environmental Monitoring and Assessment 134 (1-3): 1-19. doi: 10.1007/s10661-007-9813-0.
- Jones, R. 1981. Food habits of smaller marine mammals from Northern California. Proc. Cal. Acad. Sci. 46(16): 409-433.
- 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. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 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. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America. 118(5): 3154-3163.
- Ketten, D.R., J. Lien, and S. Todd. 1993. Blast injury in humpback whale ears: evidence and implications. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America. 94(3, Pt. 2): 1849-1850.
- Ketten, D.R. 1995. Estimates of blast injury and acoustic trauma zones for marine mammals from underwater explosions. p. 391-407 *In*: Kastelein, R.A., J.A. Thomas, and P.E. Nachtigall (eds.) Sensory Systems of Aquatic Mammals. De Spil Publ., Woerden, Netherlands. 588 p. Koski, W.R., *et al.* 1998. *Point Mugu Sea Range Marine Mammal Technical Report*. LGL Limited, environmental research associates, King City, Ontario, Canada, in association with Ogden Environmental and Energy Services, Santa Barbara, CA, for Naval Air Warfare Center, Weapons Division, Point Mugu, CA, and Southwest Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command, San Diego, CA, 281 pp.
- Kostyuchenko, L.P. 1973. Effect of elastic waves generated in marine seismic prospecting on fish eggs on the Black Sea. Hydrobiology. J. 9: 45-48.
- Kremser, U., P. Klemm, and W. Kotz. 2005. Estimating the risk of temporary acoustic shift, caused by hydroacoustic devices, in whales in the Southern Ocean. Antarctic Science 17(1): 3-10.
- Kryter, K.D. 1985. The Effects of Noise on Man, 2nd ed. Academic Press, Orlando, FL. 688 p.
- Kryter, K.D. 1994. The Handbook of Hearing and the Effects of Noise. Academic Press, Orlando, FL. 673 p.
- KSBY. 2012. Orcas spotted off of Avila Beach. <http://w.ksby.com/news/orcas-spotted-off-of-avila-beach/>
- Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory. 2011. Request by Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory for an Incidental Harassment Authorization to Allow the Incidental Take of Marine Mammals during a Marine Geophysical Survey by the R/V *Marcus G. Langseth* in the western Gulf of Alaska, July - August 2011. Submitted to: National Marine Fisheries Service, Office of Protected Resources, Silver Springs, MD.

- Leatherwood, S. and W.A. Walker. 1979. *The northern right whale dolphin in the eastern North Pacific*, pp. 85-141, In: H.E. Winn and B.L. Olla (eds.), *Behavior of Marine Mammals, Volume 3, Cetaceans*, Plenum, New York, NY.
- Leatherwood, S., R.R. Reeves, W.F. Perrin, and W.E. Evans. 1982. Whales, dolphins, and porpoises of the eastern North Pacific and adjacent Arctic waters. A guide to their identification, NOAA Tech. Rept., NMFS Circular 444, 245 pp.
- Leatherwood, S. and R. Reeves. 1983. *The Sierra Club Handbook of Whales and Dolphins*. Sierra Club Books. San Francisco, CA.
- Leatherwood, S., et al. 1987. *Cetaceans of the Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary*. NOAA, Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary and NMFS, 66 pp.
- LeBouef, B.J., and M.L. Bonnell. 1980. Pinnipeds of the California islands: Abundance and Distribution. In: D.M. Power, ed., *The California Islands: Proceedings of a Multidisciplinary Symposium*, Haagen Printing, Santa Barbara, CA, pp. 475-493.
- Lokkeborg, S. and A. Soldal. 1993. The Influence of Seismic Exploration with Airguns on Cod (*Gadus morhua*) Behaviour and Catch Rates. ICES Marine Science Symposium 196: 62-67.
- 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. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 125(6): 4060-4070.
- MacLean, S.A. and B. Haley. 2004. Marine mammal monitoring during Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory's seismic study in the Støregga Slide area of the Norwegian Sea, August - September 2003. LGL Rep. TA2822-20. Rep. from LGL Ltd., King City, Ont., for Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory, Palisades, NY, and NMFS, 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 NMFS, Silver Spring, MD. 102 p.
- Madsen, P.T., B. Mohl, B.K. Nielsen, and M. Wahlberg. 2002. Male sperm whale behavior during exposures to distant seismic survey pulses. *Aquatic Mammalogy* 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 airgun pulses recorded on sperm whales (*Physeter macrocephalus*) using acoustic tags during controlled exposure experiments. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 120(4): 2366-2379.

- Malme, C.I., P.R. Miles, C.W. Clark, P. Tyack, and J.E. Bird. 1984. Investigations of the potential effects of underwater noise from petroleum industry activities on migrating gray whale behavior/Phase II: January 1984 migration. BBN Rep. 5586. Rep. by Bolt Beranek & Newman Inc., Cambridge, MA, for MMS Anchorage, AK. Var. page. NTIS PB86-218377.
- Malme, C.I. and P.R. Miles. 1985. Behavioral responses of marine mammals (gray whales) to seismic discharges. p. 253-280 *In*: G.D. Greene, F.R. Engelhardt and R.J. Paterson (eds.), Proc. workshop on effects of explosives use in the marine environment, Jan. 1985, Halifax, N.S. Technical Report 5. Canadian Oil & Gas Lands Administration Environmental Protection Branch, Ottawa, Ont. 398 p.
- 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. Report by BBN Labs Inc., Cambridge, MA, for MMS, Anchorage, AK. NTIS PB86-218385.
- Malme, C.I., B. Würsig, J.E. Bird, and P. Tyack. 1986. Behavioral responses of gray whales to industrial noise: feeding observations and predictive modeling. Outer Cont. Shelf Environ. Assessment Program Final Report Princ. Invest, NOAA, Anchorage, AK 56(1988):393-600. BBN Rep. 6265. 600 p. OCS Study MMS 88-0048; NTIS PB88-249008.
- Malme, C.I., B. Würsig, J.E. Bird, and P. Tyack. 1988. Observations of feeding gray whale responses to controlled industrial noise exposure. p. 55-73 *In*: Sackinger, W.M., M.O. Jeffries, J.L. Imm, and S.D. Treacy (eds.) Port and ocean engineering under arctic conditions, Vol. II. Geophysical Institution. Univ. Alaska, Fairbanks, AK. 111 p.
- Mangels, K.F., and T. Gerrodette. 1994. Report of cetacean sightings during a marine mammal survey in the eastern Pacific Ocean and Gulf of California aboard the NOAA ships McArthur and David Starr Jordan, July 28-November 6, 1993. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SWFSC-211, 88 pp.
- Mate, B. and J. Harvey. 1987. Acoustical deterrents in marine mammal conflicts with fisheries workshop. 17-18 February 1986. Newport, Oregon. Oregon State University, Publication No. ORESO-W-86-001.
- 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 (Australian Petroleum. Production Association.) 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 airgun exposure on humpback whales, sea turtles, fishes,

- and squid. Report from Centre for Marine Science and Technology, Curtin Univ., Perth, W.A., for Australian Petroleum. Production Association, 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 (Australian Petroleum. Production Association) J. 40:692-708.
- McCauley, R.D., J. Fewtrell, and A.N. Popper. 2003. High Intensity Anthropogenic Sound Damages Fish Ears. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* . 113:638-42.
- McDonald, M.A., J.A. Hildebrand, and S.C. Webb. 1995. Blue and fin whales observed on a seafloor array in the Northeast Pacific. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 98(2): 712-721.
- Miller, G.W., V.D. Moulton, R.A. Davis, M. Holst, P. Millman, A. MacGillivray, and D. Hannay. 2005. Monitoring seismic effects on marine mammals—southeastern Beaufort Sea, 2001-2002. p. 511-542. In: Armsworthy, S.L., P.J. Cranford, and K. Lee (eds.) *Offshore oil and gas environmental effects monitoring, approaches and technologies*. Battelle Press, Columbus, OH.
- Miller, P. N. Biassoni, A. Samuels, P. Tyack. 2000. Whale song length in response to sonar. *Nature* 405: 903.
- 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.
- Minerals Management Service (MMS). 2005. Environmental Assessment. Proposed Geophysical Survey Cosmopolitan Unit, Cook Inlet. Alaska OCS Region. OCS EIS/EA MMS 2005-045.
- Mooney, T. P. Nachtigall, M. Breese, S. Vlachos, and W. Au. 2009a. Predicting temporary threshold shifts in bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*): The effects of noise level and duration. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 125(3): 1816-1826.
- Mooney, T., P. Nachtigall, and, S. Vlachos. 2009b. Sonar-induced temporary hearing loss in dolphins. *Biol. Lett.* 2009(5): 566-567.
- Moore, S., K. Stafford, M. Dahlheim, C. Fox, H. Braham, J. Polovina, and D. Bain. 1998. Seasonal variation in reception of fin whale calls at five geographic areas in the North Pacific. *Marine Mammal Science* 50(2): 617-627.
- Moriyasu, M., R. Allain, K. Benhalima and R. Claytor. 2004. Effects of seismic and marine noise on invertebrates: A literature review. Research Document 2004/126. Canadian Science Advisory Secretariat. Available at <http://www.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/csas>.

- Moulton, V.D. and J.W. Lawson. 2002. Seals, 2001. p. 3-1 to 3-48 *In*: Richardson, W.J. (ed.), Marine mammal and acoustical monitoring of WesternGeco's open water seismic program in the Alaskan Beaufort Sea, 2001. LGL Report TA2564-4. Report by LGL Ltd., King City, Ont., and Greeneridge Sciences Inc., Santa Barbara, CA, for WesternGeco, Houston, TX, and NMFS Anchorage, AK, and Silver Spring, MD.
- Moulton, V.D. and G.W. Miller. 2005. Marine mammal monitoring of a seismic survey on the Scotian Slope, 2003. p. 29-40. *In*: Lee, K., H. Bain and G.V. Hurley (eds.), Acoustic monitoring and marine mammal surveys in the Gully and Outer Scotian Shelf before and during active seismic programs. Environment Studies Research Funds Report. No. 151. 154 p.
- Moulton, V.D. and M. Holst. 2010. Effects of seismic survey sound on cetaceans in the northwest Atlantic. Environmental Studies Research Funds Report No. 182. St. John's, Newfoundland. 28 p.
- Moulton, V.D., B.D. Mactavish, and R.A. Buchanan. 2005. Marine mammal and seabird monitoring of Chevron Canada Resources' 3-D seismic program on the Orphan Basin, 2004. LGL Rep. SA817. Report by LGL Ltd., St. John's, NL, for Chevron Canada Resources, Calgary, Alb., ExxonMobil Canada Ltd., St. John's, Nfld., and Imperial Oil Resources Ventures Ltd., Calgary, Alb. 90 p. + appendices.
- Moulton, V.D., B.D. Mactavish, R.E. Harris, and R.A. Buchanan. 2006. Marine mammal and seabird monitoring of Chevron Canada Limited's 3-D seismic program on the Orphan Basin, 2005. LGL Rep. SA843. Rep. by LGL Ltd., St. John's, Nfld., for Chevron Canada Resources, Calgary, Alb., ExxonMobil Canada Ltd., St. John's, Nfld., and Imperial Oil Resources Ventures Ltd., Calgary, Alb. 111 p. + appendices.
- Nachtigall, P. J. Pawloski, and W. Au. 2003. Temporary threshold shifts and recovery following noise exposure in the Atlantic bottlenose dolphin (*Tursiops truncatus*). *Journal of Acoustic Society America* 113: 3425-3429.
- Nachtigall, P. A. Supin, J. Pawloski, and W. Au. 2004. Temporary threshold shifts after noise exposure in the Atlantic bottlenose dolphin (*Tursiops truncatus*) measured using evolved auditory potential. *Marine Mammal Science* 24: 673-687.
- National Marine Fisheries Service. 1991. *Recovery plan for the humpback whale (Megaptera novaeangliae)*, prepared by the Humpback Whale Recovery Team for the National Marine Fisheries Service, Silver Spring, MD, 105 pp.
- 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. *Federal Register*. 65(60):16374-16379.
- National Marine Fisheries Service. 2008. Marine Mammal Stock Assessment Reports by Species. Website: <http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/pr/sars/species.htm>.

- National Marine Fisheries Service. 2010. Environmental Assessment for the Issuance of Incidental Harassment Authorizations to Take Marine Mammals by Harassment Incidental to Conducting Open Water Seismic and Marine Surveys in the Chukchi and Beaufort Seas. USDOC, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service, Office of Protected Resources. Silver Spring, MD.
- National Marine Fisheries Service. 2011. Marine Mammal Stock Assessment Reports by Species. Website: <http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/pr/sars/species.htm>. accessed on June 14, 2011.
- National Marine Fisheries Service. 2012. Marine Mammal Stock Assessment Reports by Species. Website: <http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/pr/sars/species.htm>. Accessed on August 23, 2012.
- National Marine Fisheries Service website (a). Fact sheet on blue whale (*Balaenoptera musculus*): <http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/pr/species/mammals/cetaceans/bluewhale.htm>
- National Marine Fisheries Service website (b). Fact sheet on northern right whale (*Eubalaena japonica*): http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/pr/species/mammals/cetaceans/rightwhale_northpacific.htm
- National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA). 1993. Our Living Oceans, Report on the Status of U.S. Living Marine Resources.
- National Science Foundation and U.S. Geological Survey (NSF/USGS). 2011. Final Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement for Marine Seismic Research Funded by the National Science Foundation or Conducted by the U.S. Geological Survey.
- 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. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 115(4): 1832-1843.
- 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. Commerce., NOAA Fisheries., Sec. Navy, Assist. Sec. Navy, Installations and Environ. 51 p. Available at http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/pr/pdfs/health/stranding_bahamas2000.pdf.
- NOAA National Centers for Coastal Ocean Science (NCCOS). 2007. A Biogeographic Assessment off North/Central California: In Support of the National Marine Sanctuaries of Cordell Bank, Gulf of the Farallones and Monterey Bay. Phase II - Environmental Setting and Update to Marine Birds and Mammals. Prepared by NCCOS's Biogeography Branch, R.G. Ford Consulting Co. and Oikonos Ecosystem Knowledge, in cooperation with the National Marine Sanctuary Program. Silver Spring, MD. NOAA Technical Memorandum NOS NCCOS 40. 240 pp.

- Norris, K. and B. Mohl. 1983. Can odontocetes debilitate prey with sound? *American Naturalist* 122: 85-104.
- Padre Associates, Inc. 2010. Marine Wildlife Monitoring Report for the Aera Santa Maria Basin Hazards Survey. Letter Report to Aera Energy, LLC. San Luis Obispo, CA
- Padre Associates, Inc. 2011a. Marine Wildlife Monitoring Report, PG&E Geophysical Surveys Offshore Point Buchon for the Survey Period: December 2010 to February 2011. Letter Report to Jeff Carothers, Survey Manager, Fugro West, Inc. San Luis Obispo, CA
- Padre Associates, Inc. 2011b. Marine Mammal Density Estimates for the PG&E Geophysical Surveys Offshore Point Buchon for the Survey Period between December 2010 and February 2011. Memorandum to the File.
- Padre Associates, Inc. 2012. Marine Wildlife Monitoring Report, PG&E Geophysical Surveys Offshore san Luis Bay for the Survey Period: December 4, 2011 to December 23, 2011. Letter Report to Jeff Carothers, Survey Manager, Fugro West, Inc. San Luis Obispo, CA
- 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 prepared for the International Whaling Commission 16 p.
- Parks, S. C. Clark, and P. Tyack. 2007. Short- and long-term changes in right whale calling behavior: the potential effects of noise on acoustic communication. *J. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 122: 3725-3731.
- Parry, G.D. and A. Gason. 2006. The effect of seismic surveys on catch rates of rock lobsters in western Victoria, Australia *Fish Research* 79: 272-284.
- Paulson *et al.* 1993. Environmental Assessment for National Park Service for Understanding the Rifting of Continents: A Marine Reflection Survey of the Lake Meade Fault System (Project BARGE). Las Vegas, NV (unpublished).
- Payne, J.F., J. Coady, and D. White. 2009. Potential effects of seismic airgun discharges on monkfish eggs (*Lophius americanus*) and larvae. Environmental Studies Research Funds Report No. 170. St. Johns, NL. 35 p.
- Pearson, W.H., J.R. Skalski, and C.I. Malme. 1992. Effects of sounds from a geophysical survey device on behaviour of captive rockfish (*Sebastes* spp.). *Canadian Journal of Fish and Aquatic Science* 49(7): 1343-1356.
- 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. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 117(6): 3958-3971.

- 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 Journal of Oceanic Engineering* 32(2): 469-483.
- Reeves, R. R. Hofman, G. Silber, and D. Wilkinson. 1996. Acoustic deterrence of harmful marine mammal-fishery interactions. Proceedings of a workshop held in Seattle, Washington, 20-22 March 1996. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-OPR-10.
- Reeves, R.R., P.J. Clapham, R.L. Brownell, Jr., and G.K. Silber. 1998. *Recovery plan for the blue whale (Balaenoptera musculus)*. Office of Protected Resources, National Marine Fisheries Service, NOAA, Silver Spring, MD, 42 pp.
- Rendell, L. and J. 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.
- Richardson, W.J., B. Würsig, and C.R. Greene. 1986. Reactions of bowhead whales, *Balaena mysticetus*, to seismic exploration in the Canadian Beaufort Sea. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 79(4): 1117-1128.
- 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.
- Riedman, M.L. 1983. Studies of the effects of experimentally produced noise associated with oil and gas exploration and development on sea otters in California. Rep. by Cent. Coastal Mar. Stud., Univ. Calif. Santa Cruz, CA, for MMS, Anchorage, AK. 92 p. NTIS PB86-218575.
- Riedman, M.L. 1984. Effects of sounds associated with petroleum industry activities on the behavior of sea otters in California. p. D-1 to D-12 *In*: Malme, C.I., P.R. Miles, C.W. Clark, P. Tyack, and J.E. Bird, Investigations of the potential effects of underwater noise from petroleum industry activities on migrating gray whale behavior/Phase II: January 1984 migration. BBN Rep. 5586. Rep. by Bolt Beranek & Newman Inc., Cambridge, MA, for MMS., Anchorage, AK. NTIS PB86-218377.
- SACLANT. 1998. Estimation of cetacean hearing criteria levels. Section II, Chapter 7 *In*: SACLANTCEN Bioacoustics Panel Summary Record and Report. Report from NATO Undersea Res. Center. Available at <http://enterprise.spawar.navy.mil/nepa/whales/pdf/doc2-7.pdf>
- Saetre, R. and E. Ona. 1996. Seismike undersøkelser og på fiskeegg og -larver en vurdering av mulige effekter på bestandsniva. [Seismic investigations and damages on fish eggs and larvae; an evaluation of possible effects on stock level]. *Fisken og Havet* 1996:1-17, 1-8. (In Norwegian, with an English summary).

- Santulli, La A., A. Modica, C. Messina, L. Ceffa, A. Curatolo, G. Rivas, G. Fabi, and V. D'Amelio. 1999. Biochemical responses of European sea bass (*Dicentrarchus labrax* L.) to the stress induced by off shore experimental seismic prospecting. *Marine Pollution Bulletin* 38:1105-1114.
- Scarff, J.E. 1986. Historic and present distribution of the right whale in the eastern North Pacific south of 50 N and east of 180 W. Report of the International Whaling Commission (Special Issue 10): 43-63.
- 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. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 107(6): 3496-3508.
- Simard, Y., F. Samaran, and N. Roy. 2005. Measurement of whale and seismic sounds in the Scotian Gully and adjacent canyons in July 2003. p. 97-115 *In*: K. Lee, H. Bain, and C.V. Hurley (eds.) *Acoustic monitoring and marine mammal surveys in The Gully and Outer Scotian Shelf before and during active seismic surveys*. Environmental Studies Research Funds Report 151. 154 p (Published 2007).
- Sliter, R., P. Triezenberg, P. Hart, J. Watt, S. Johnson, and D. Scheirer. 2009, revised 2010. High-resolution seismic reflection and marine magnetic data along the Hosgri Fault Zone, central California. U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 2009-1100, version 1.1
- Smultea, M.A., M. Holst, W.R. Koski, and S. Stoltz. 2004. Marine mammal monitoring during Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory's seismic program in the Southeast Caribbean Sea and adjacent Atlantic Ocean, April-June 2004. LGL Rep. TA2822-26. Rep. by LGL Ltd., King City, Ont., for Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory of Columbia Univ., Palisades, NY, and NMFS, 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 *Aquatic Mammalogy*. 33(4): 411-522.
- 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. *Journal of Cetacean Research Management*. 8(3): 255-263.
- Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program (SERDP) and Environmental Security Technology Certification Program (ESTCP). 2011. Marine Animal Mapping Model Mapper. http://seamap.env.duke.edu/prod/serdp/serdp_map.php.

- 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. *Journal of Fish Biology*. 45: 973-995.
- Tenera Environmental. 2007. Diablo Canyon Power Plant, Marine Mammal Protection Plan Monitoring - Replacement Steam Generator Transport Project. Prepared for: LSA Associates. Lafayette, CA.
- Tenera Environmental. 2011. A Review of Effects of Seismic Testing on Marine Fish and Fisheries as Applied to the DCPD 3-D Seismic Project. Prepared for: Pacific Gas and Electric Co. San Luis Obispo, CA
- Tolstoy, M., J. Diebold, L. Doermann, S. Nooner, S.C. Webb, D.R. Bohlenstiehl, T.J. Crone and R.C. Holmes. 2009. Broadband calibration of R/V *Marcus G. Langseth* four-string seismic sources. *Geochemistry, Geophysics, Geosystems* 10, Q08011, doi:10.1029/2009GC002451.
- Tyack, P., M. Johnson, and P. Miller. 2003. Tracking responses of sperm whales to experimental exposures of airguns. p. 115-120 In: Jochens, A.E. and D.C. Biggs (eds.), *Sperm whale seismic study in the Gulf of Mexico/annual report: Year 1*. OCS Study MMS 2003-069. Rep. by Texas A&M Univ., College Station, TX, for MMS., 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.
- Tyack, P.L. 2009. Human-generated sound and marine mammals. *Phys. Today* 62(11, Nov.):39-44.
- U.S. Geological Survey. 1999. Negative Determination for a Marine Geophysical Survey.
- U.S. Geological Survey. 2010. Spring Surveys 1983-2010: Spring Counts of Southern Sea Otters. website: <http://www.werc.usgs.gov/ProjectSubWeb-Page.aspx?SubWebPageID=16&ProjectID=91>Urlick, 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. *Continental Shelf Research*. 21(8-10): 1005-1027.
- Watkins, W.A. 1977. *Acoustic behavior of sperm whales*. *Oceanus* 20: 50-58.
- Watkins, W.A., K. Moore, and P. Tyack. 1985. Sperm whale acoustic behavior in the southeast Caribbean. *Cetology* 49: 1-15.
- Watson, L. 1981. *Sea Guide to the Whales of the World*. E.P. Dutton, New York, N.Y.

- 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. *Aquatic Mammalogy* 34(1): 71-83.
- 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. *Environmental Monitoring Assessment*. 134(1-3): 45-73.
- Yazvenko, S.B., T.L. McDonald, S.A. Blokhin, S.R. Johnson, H.R. Melton, and M.W. Newcomer. 2007b. Feeding activity of western gray whales during a seismic survey near Sakhalin Island, Russia. *Environmental Monitoring Assessment* 134(1-3): 93-106
- 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.

**APPENDIX A
GREENERIDGE SCIENCES, INC. 2011**



6160-C WALLACE BECKNELL ROAD • SANTA BARBARA, CALIFORNIA 93117 • TEL/FAX 805 967-7720

MEMORANDUM

To: Ray de Wit, Padre Associates, Inc.
From: Katherine H. Kim, Charles R. Greene, Jr.
Date: 22 September 2011
Re: Central California acoustic propagation modeling report
[GSI Technical Memorandum 470-2RevB]

This is a report of acoustic propagation modeling conducted by Greeneridge Sciences, Inc., sponsored by Padre Associates, Inc., to estimate received sound pressure level radii for airgun pulses operating off central California in the vicinity of the Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant.

Introduction

The objective of the work reported here is to predict the distances to received sound pressure levels (SPLs) of 190, 187, 180, 170, 160, 154, and 120 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}_{\text{rms}}$ from a specified airgun array using a range-dependent acoustic propagation model and local environmental parameters. These predicted distances are needed for establishing exclusion radii, or safety radii, for pinnipeds and cetaceans that might occur in the survey area. Array airgun details and preliminary exclusion radii based upon a measurement-based propagation model were reported in GSI Technical Memorandum 470-1.

Due to model input uncertainties, the predicted distances should be confirmed by measurements at the beginning of survey operations. Adjustments to the exclusion radii should be made using the measurement results.

Methods

To accurately model sound transmission in the ocean, one requires a wave-theory model and precise waveguide parameters that describe sound reflections and refractions at the ocean surface, seafloor, and water column. The current study uses RAM, Range-dependent Acoustic Model developed by Michael Collins at the Naval Research Laboratory, to compute acoustic transmission loss for the survey site offshore of central California. Specifically, a variant of RAM known as RAMGEO, based on RAM version 1.5 and also developed by Collins, which implements a stratified seabed model in which multiple bottom layers run parallel to the bathymetry, was utilized in the current study. RAM is based on the parabolic equation (PE) solution to the acoustic wave equation and is widely used by the ocean acoustics community due

to its proven accuracy and computational efficiency. The theory behind RAM is discussed in detail in Collins 1993.

The accuracy of the sound field predicted by an acoustic propagation model is limited by the quality and resolution of the available environmental data. The environmental parameters that describe the ocean waveguide, affect sound propagation in the ocean, and serve as input into an acoustic propagation model are: (a) bathymetry data, i.e., water depth, (b) water column sound speed profiles, and (c) geoacoustic profiles of the ocean subbottom.

Figure 1 shows the bathymetry data for the survey site, where water depth is in meters. The triangle denotes the location of the Diablo Canyon Power Plant, lines and squares represent propagation paths and their respective waypoints, and circles indicate locations of water column sound speed measurements. Three different acoustic propagation paths were examined in this study:

- (1) upslope, from waypoints A to C, 5.0 km long, 138.8 m to 55.8 m in depth,
- (2) downslope, from waypoints A to B, 40.0 km long, 138.8 m to 610.0 m in depth,
- (3) alongshore, from waypoints A to D, 55.7 km long, 138.8 m to 340.1 m in depth

Waypoint A lay roughly in the middle of the airgun survey site in 138.8 m deep water and served as the source location.




Figure 1. Bathymetry at the survey site, water depth in meters. Triangle denotes the location of the Diablo Canyon Power Plant, lines and squares represent propagation paths and their respective waypoints, and circles indicate locations of water column sound speed measurements.

Water column sound speed profiles (SSPs) were measured daily from 20 January through 2 February 2011 and are displayed in Figure 2. The locations of these SSP measurements were depicted as circles in Figure 1. Apart from spurious data points at the bottom of two of the SSPs not uncommon in such measurements, the water column sound speed at these shallow waters is effectively isovelocity. For the model input, the sound speed was thus considered to be simply 1495 m/s at all depths.




Figure 2. Water column sound speed profiles (SSPs). Measurement locations are shown in Figure 1.

General offshore rock properties were provided by Pacific Gas & Electric and Padre Associates, Inc. (Stu Nishenko, Pacific Gas & Electric, personal communications, August–September 2011; Ray de Wit, Padre Associates, personal communications, August–September 2011). These data indicated that the region inshore of Waypoint A was composed of primarily unconsolidated soft sediments mixed with sand. Offshore of Waypoint A, silts and clays were the dominant surficial sediments. This sediment layer overlaid sedimentary bedrock, composed largely of sandstone .

In terms of geoacoustic parameters, these bottom layers were modeled as a 10-m thick, sand seafloor (1650 m/s compressional sound speed) for the upslope propagation path and a 10-m thick, silt seafloor (1575 m/s compressional sound speed) for the downslope and alongshore propagation paths. In all cases, the sediment layer overlaid an 800-m, effectively halfspace, sandstone layer (3000 m/s compressional sound speed). Consequently, density and compressional attenuation values for the bottom layers were estimated to be 1.9 g/cc and 0.8 dB/λ for the upslope sediment layer, 1.7 g/cc and 1.0 dB/λ for the downslope and alongshore sediment layers, downslope and alongshore), and 2.4 g/cc and 0.1 dB/λ (Jensen et al., 1994).

The frequency content of the broadband airgun signal was expressed in terms of eighteen 1/3-octave band frequencies, spanning 10 to 500 Hz, this frequency range containing the vast

majority of acoustic energy radiated by an airgun array. The powers in these bands were summed to yield the total sound pressure level of the broadband signal. The frequency dependence of the source level was taken into account using the source spectrum for this array configuration which was characterized by a 0.11 dB/Hz rolloff from peak amplitude.

Predicted sound contours for the airgun array were modeled by L-DEO/Columbia University and cast in terms of sound exposure levels (SEL) (Helene Carton, personal communications, September 2011). SEL is a measure of the received energy in the pulse, calculated as the time-integral of the square pressure over the pulse duration, defined as the time from 5% to 95% of the total pulse energy. (These limits exclude long periods of low-level reverberation. If included, the pulse energy would be unrealistically diminished.) Sound pressure level (SPL) is the root-mean-square (rms) pressure averaged over the pulse duration and is utilized in U.S. National Marine Fisheries Service guidelines regarding marine mammals and seismic noise. For a pulse duration of 1 s, SEL and SPL are equivalent. However, seismic pulses are less than 1 s in duration in most situations, and, therefore, the SEL value for a given pulse is usually lower than the SPL calculated over the actual pulse duration. Based upon measured airgun pulses, the difference between SEL and SPL values for the same pulse measured at the same location average ~10–15 dB, depending on the propagation characteristics of the location (Greene 1997). Consequently, in this report, the rms pressure levels of received seismic pulses are assumed to be 13 dB higher than the SEL values predicted by L-DEO's source model. Specifically, the source modeled as operating at a tow depth of 6 m was assumed to have an effective source level at 1 m of 223.8 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}^2 \cdot \text{s}$ SEL or, equivalently, 236.8 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}_{\text{rms}}$ SPL.

Results

Two-dimensional (depth vs. range) transmission loss results are shown in Figures 3 through 5 for each of the propagation path cases: upslope, downslope, and alongshore, respectively. In each figure, the top plot represents a 10 Hz source and the bottom plot a 500 Hz source, the outer limits of the frequencies under consideration. In all cases, low frequency sounds were readily absorbed into the bottom compared to high frequency sounds, as expected in bottom-interacting ocean environments. Due to the isovelocity sound speed profile and relatively reflective seafloor, higher frequency energy was largely retained in the water column.

Received levels as a function of range for a receiver depth of 6 m (the same depth as the source/airgun array) is shown in Figure 6 for each of the propagation path cases. Received levels (SPLs) were calculated from the aforementioned transmission loss results via:

$$RL = SL - TL,$$

where RL denotes received level, SL source level (236.8 dB re 1 μPa at 1 m, as described above), and TL transmission loss. In Figure 6, the thin black line is the received level curve output by the acoustic propagation model, the thick black line is a regression equation for the aforementioned curve, and the colored lines are SPL limits for exclusion radii. Regression equations derived from propagation model received levels (predicted SPLs) for each of the propagation paths are:




Figure 3. Transmission loss as a function of range (10 Hz source, upper plot; 500 Hz source, lower plot) for an upslope propagation path.




Figure 4. Transmission loss as a function of range (10 Hz source, upper plot; 500 Hz source, lower plot) for a downslope propagation path.




Figure 5. Transmission loss as a function of range (10 Hz source, upper plot; 500 Hz source, lower plot) for an alongshore propagation path.




Figure 6. Received levels as a function of range for upslope, downslope, and alongshore propagation paths (top to bottom plots). The thin black line is the received level curve output by the acoustic propagation model, the thick black line is a regression equation for the aforementioned curve, and the colored lines are SPL limits for exclusion radii.

$$\text{SPL}_{\text{predicted, upslope}} = 224.1 - 14.1\log(R) - 0.0017R,$$

$$\text{SPL}_{\text{predicted, downslope}} = 251.3 - 25.1\log(R) - 0.0000R, \text{ and}$$

$$\text{SPL}_{\text{predicted, alongshore}} = 257.5 - 27.0\log(R) - 0.0000R.$$

in units of dB re 1 μPa for a given range R in meters. The second term in the above equations indicate spreading loss for the survey site is indicative of spherical combined with cylindrical spreading, a result of reflection, absorption, and refraction of sound energy in this waveguide.

Table 1 summarizes the exclusion radii given the predicted regression equations.

SPL (dB re 1 μPa)	Upslope: Distance			Downslope: Distance			Alongshore: Distance		
	(m statute mi nautical mi)	(m statute mi nautical mi)	(m statute mi nautical mi)	(m statute mi nautical mi)	(m statute mi nautical mi)	(m statute mi nautical mi)	(m statute mi nautical mi)	(m statute mi nautical mi)	
190	250	0.16	0.13	280	0.17	0.15	320	0.20	0.17
187	390	0.24	0.21	370	0.23	0.20	410	0.25	0.22
180	1,010	0.63	0.55	700	0.43	0.38	750	0.47	0.40
170	2,990	1.86	1.61	1,760	1.09	0.95	1,760	1.09	0.95
160	6,210	3.86	3.35	4,450	2.77	2.40	4,100	2.55	2.21
154	8,570	5.33	4.63	7,820	4.86	4.22	6,780	4.21	3.66
120	24,650	15.32	13.31	251,320	156.16	135.70	94,870	58.95	51.23

Table 1. Predicted exclusion radii for upslope, downslope, and alongshore propagation paths.

Discussion

The exclusion radii predicted via propagation modeling (Table 1 above) compared favorably with previous radii predicted via measurements made in the Chukchi Sea and applied to this California site (refer to GSI Technical Memorandum 470-1). Discrepancies between the two can be attributed to the two sites' different waveguide characteristics (shallow versus relatively deeper and depth-varying water columns, varying seafloor properties, etc.) as well as different airgun array source levels (measured versus modeled levels, SEL to SPL conversion).

The order of magnitude difference in the 120-dB exclusion radii for the downslope propagation path compared with the upslope and alongshore cases is likely a result of a phenomenon in shallow water underwater acoustics known as "downslope conversion". Acoustic energy originating from a source over the continental shelf becomes increasingly distributed close to the horizontal (i.e., low angle in the vertical plane) as the energy travels seaward into deeper water, due to its interaction with the sloping seafloor. The result is less interaction with the seafloor in the deeper water (fewer bottom bounces) and, thus, less transmission loss (higher received levels as a function of range and, thus, larger exclusion radii).

As with all theoretically-based acoustic propagation models, their output, in this case transmission loss and, consequently, received levels, are only as good as their input, specifically, waveguide environmental parameters and especially geoacoustic parameters which are typically poorly known in terms of spatial and temporal variability. In addition, the propagation model

utilized in this report does not account for airgun array directionality. Therefore, the exclusion radii summarized in Table 1 should be considered estimates until confirmed by in situ measurements.

References

- Collins, M.D. 1993. A split-step Pade solution for the parabolic equation method. **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 93:1736–1742.
- Greene, C.R., Jr. 1997. Physical acoustics measurements. p. 3-1 to 3-63 *In*: W.J. Richardson (ed.) Northstar marine mammal monitoring program, 1996: marine mammal and acoustical monitoring of a seismic program in the Alaskan Beaufort Sea. LGL Rep. 2121-2. Rep. from LGL Ltd., King City, Ont., and Greeneridge Sciences Inc., Santa Barbara, CA, for BP Explor. (Alaska) Inc., Anchorage, AK, and Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., Anchorage, AK, and Silver Spring, MD. 245 p.
- Jensen, F.B., W.A. Kuperman, M.B. Porter, and H.S. Schmidt. 1994. *Computational Ocean Acoustics*. American Institute of Physics Press, New York, NY. 595 p.

**Appendix B:
Harbor Porpoise Density Figures and Calculations**

Survey Design and Harbor Porpoise Distribution

As indicated in Section 4.1.3, according to the recent density data provided by Dr. Karin Forney (see Table 1 and Figure 1 below); the highest density area of the Morro Bay stock is south of Oceano averaging over two individuals per km², with a total area of 504 km². Dr. Forney provided data from aerial flight referenced by Caretta et al. 2009 with additional data from 2009-2011. This data contained delineating aerial transect lines (start/end latitude) that separate the project site by density. The latitude provided by D. Forney was imputed into GIS and each density was grouped into a specific polygon based on the density provided. The project site was overlaid and polygons were clipped by the corresponding 160 dB for each survey box. The densities within the associated GIS database were compiled and the used to gather the estimated number of individuals within each boxes 160 dB safety zone.

Using data from GIS and Figure 1 below some basic calculations and explanations were made. Approximately 48 percent of this high density area will not be ensonified by survey activities (total ensonified area is 261 km²). No matter what order the Boxes are surveyed, 48 percent of the highest density area in the Morro Bay stock will remain open without ensonification. Typically, food, shelter, and lack of competition and or predators are the reason for populations sustaining higher densities in one area and not the other. Under the assumption that the biology and population dynamics of the harbor porpoise operate in the same manner, by temporarily limiting the species to this high density, successful area would not be detrimental to the population.

Surveying the project site in a manner to allow harbor porpoises to seek refuge in high density areas while the survey is being conducted is plausible. If Box 4 of the survey plan was to be conducted first, it would allow all of the high density area south of Oceano and San Luis Bay (second highest density area) to remain open for harbor porpoises to seek refuge. If Box 2 was conducted in the same survey year, but after Box 4, harbor porpoise individuals located in Box 2 (159 km² of high density area ensonified) would be able to move west along the coastline, where ensonification does not reach. Much of San Luis Bay and areas to the south would also remain open, totaling 68 percent of the 504 km² high density habitat remaining un-ensonified. In addition, individuals that were present near the northern portion of Box 2 would be able to remain along shoreline of the Morro Bay area where they would not be ensonified.

Table 1. PRELIMINARY ANALYSES, conducted by Karin Forney, NOAA/SWFSC, 8/2/2012, in support of NMFS Permit Office evaluation of potential impacts. Table below uses the line-transect parameter estimates [f(0) and g(0)] from Carretta et al. 2009, and includes 2002-2011 data for the same survey conditions (cloud cover < 25%, Beaufort sea states 0-2 only) to estimate finer-scale densities within the inshore stratum for this stock (<50fm or <92m)

Start Lat	End Lat	TRANSECT / Stratum	Area (km ²) represented	# Harbor porpoise sightings	# Harbor porpoise individuals	Km surveyed	Porpoise seen per km	Density (D)* (ani km ⁻²)	Approximate stratum abundance	Average porpoise density	Notes
34.448	34.568	1	165	2	3	182	0.016	0.146	24	0.736	Southern edge of stock range
34.568	34.755	2	276	10	21	171	0.123	1.089	300		
34.755	35.007	3	347	43	78	338	0.231	2.040	708	2.178	Core Area of Stock Range
35.007	35.098	4	157	39	79	168	0.471	4.167	652		
35.098	35.207	5	182	37	52	300	0.173	1.533	280		
35.207	35.425	6	193	9	29	180	0.161	1.423	275		
35.425	35.577	8	524	7	13	269	0.048	0.427	224	0.427	Northern edge of stock range
35.577	35.692	9		3	6	139	0.043	0.381			
35.692	35.757	10		0	0	62	0.000	0.000			
35.757	35.91	11		8	13	216	0.060	0.533			
35.91	36.192	12		5	7	332	0.021	0.186			
36.192	36.238	13		0	0	153	0.000	0.000			
All Inshore			1844	163	301	2510	0.120	1.061	2463		

L-T parameter estimates from Carretta et al. 2009:

f(0)= 5.166
 g(0)= 0.292

$$*D = (\text{porp/km} * f(0))/(2*g(0))$$

These "All Inshore" values are equivalent to the Carretta et al. 2009 Morro Bay stock (Inshore) density=0.959 and Abundance = 1776. Differences could be caused by random sampling variation, the per-transect stratification, and/or increasing population trend in recent years. Further analyses will be required to examine differences and finalize these preliminary estimates, as appropriate.




Figure 1. Harbor Porpoise Fine-Scale Density

**Appendix C:
Southern Sea Otter Density Figures and Calculations**

Survey Design and Sea Otter Distribution

Southern sea otter (sea otter) census and distribution data and shapefiles were extracted from the USGS Western Ecological Research Center's (WERC) Spring 2010 (May-July 7) survey results (<http://www.werc.usgs.gov/ProjectSubWebPage.aspx?SubWebPageID=4&ProjectID=91>). The WERC data contains a GIS shapefile with various density estimates delineated by polygons along the central California coast and includes the project area. These data are presented as a 3-year average of the number of sea otters per square kilometers (km²) within each polygon; the data were averaged by 10 kilometer (km) coastline segments to account for spatial/temporal variation in sea otter activity and survey conditions. Data polygons are also provided from shore to the 30 meter (m) depth contour and between the 30 and 60 m depth contours (See Figure 1).

Level B "Take by Harassment" Calculation

In order to estimate the number of sea otters within each polygon ensounded by the 160 dB, ArcGIS was used to delineate a 6,210 m radius zone of ensoundment. The USGS 2010 Sea Otter Census data polygons within each of these ensoundment areas were extracted and the area calculated (Figures 1 and 2). The census data associated with the extracted areas were exported to an Excel spreadsheet for data analysis and to calculate the estimated number of sea otters within each area.

Once the data were exported to Excel, the number of sea otters within the 160 dB ensoundment area zone were totaled (See Table 1).

Table 1 Otter Density and number of Individuals per Survey Box

	Area of 160 dB buffer	# of Otters in Buffer	Otter/Km	70% surface reduction
Box 2	245	261	1.07	78.3
Box 4	155	263	1.70	78.9
Total	400	524		157.2

The estimated number of sea otters was then reduced by the 70 percent to account for the time when sea otters are at the surface and not subjected to underwater ensoundment (see discussion below regarding Surface Time).

70% Surface Time Reduction:

The basis for reducing the estimated number of sea otters that will be exposed to "take" noise levels within each of the estimated ensoundment zones by 70% are studies that have documented the amount of time that sea otters actually spend underwater where the animal is exposed to the sound generated by the air guns. Below are summaries of several studies on the percentage of time that sea otters spend in specific activities. For this analysis, it is assumed that "feeding" and "foraging" are activities that require the animal to be underwater.

Yeates, et al. (2007) reported the following mean percent activity categories for six adult male California sea otters: feeding (36.3); resting (40.2); swimming (8.5); grooming (9.1); and, other (7.3). Estes, et al. (1986) reported 11,939 observations of sea otter activity in four areas

of the central California coast involving 245 sea otters in spring of 1982 and 219 in fall of 1982. The mean time foraging was 24.5 percent, the mean time resting was 59 percent, and other behaviors accounted for 17 percent.

Bodkin, et al. (2004), cited in Watwood and Buonantony (2012) studied activity patterns of 14 sea otters in southern Alaska and found that those animals spent an average of 37 percent of their time foraging, 11 percent diving/non-foraging, and 52 percent resting. Walker, et al. (2008) reported on 7,116 observations of sea otter activity in Washington State between 2003 and 2004. The percent of activity times were: feeding (7.6); grooming (19.7), resting (62.3), play (1.8), travel (7.6), nursing (0.6), and other (0.4).

Based on these data, a 30 percent “underwater time” was selected as a conservative value for the purpose of this analysis. The actual submerged time when the sea otters could be exposed to subsurface noise generated by the seismic equipment would be expected to be a fraction of the 30 percent, as it is assumed that more time is spent consuming food than the actual capture of the prey.

Ensonification and Boat Transect time and Linear Length within Otter Habitat

Using the USGS otter density and the otter delineating habitat depth of the 40 meter isobath contour, GIS was used to isolate tracklines that ensonify otter habitat and also tracklines that are traversed shoreward of the 40 m isobath. See Table 2 and Figure 3 and 4 for illustrations and calculations

Table 2. Portion of Otter Range Impacted by tracklines and 160 dB Ensonification.

	Otter Habitat within 160 dB Buffer^{1,2}	% of Otter Range within 160 dB Buffer	Otter Habitat (<40 m) within Boat Transect Boxes^{1,2}	% of Otter Range within Transect Boxes
Box 2	111.5	8.28%	1.67	0.12%
Box 4	100	7.43%	44.74	3.32%
Total	211.5	15.71%	46.41	3.45%

¹ Area calculated in km²

² Area calculated contains overlap of boxes

Total Area of southern sea otter Habitat within range is 1,346 km²

Using the linear length and an average boat speed of 8.5 km² per hour the amount of time spent ensonifying otter habitat was calculated. In addition, the amount of time spent traversing shoreward of the 40 m contour was also calculated, see Table 3.

Table 3: Southern Sea Otter Habitat Exposure Time and Linear Length

	Total Length Transects within Box (km)	Total Length of Tracks within 6,210 m of 40 m Contour (160 dB)	Total # of Hours of 160 dB Exposure	Km² Traveled Landward of 40 m Contour (otter habitat)	Total # of Hours of Survey Boat within Otter Habitat
Box 2	2148.2	981.2	115.4	1.67	0.2
Box 4	1417.6	583.9	68.7	44.74	5.3
Total	3565.8	1565.1	184.1	46.4	5.5

Based on the travel speed of 8.5 km/hour

Literature Cited

- Bodkin, J.L., and G.G. Esslinger, and D.H. Monson. 2004. Foraging Depths of Sea Otters and Implications to Coastal Marine Communities. *Marine Mammal Science* 20(2): 305-321.
- Estes, J.A., K.E. Undersood, and M.J. Karman. 1986. Activity-Time Budgets of Sea Otters in California. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 50(4): 626-636.
- MacLean, S.A. and W.R. Koski. 2005. Marine mammal monitoring during Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory's seismic program in the Gulf of Alaska, August–September 2004. LGL Rep. TA2822-28. Rep. from LGL Ltd., King City, Ont., for Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory of Columbia Univ., Palisades, NY, and Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., Silver Spring, MD. 102 p.
- Walker, K.A., J.W. Davis, and D.A. Duffield. 2008. Activity Budgets and Prey Consumption of Sea Otters (*Enhydra lutris kenyoni*) in Washington. *Aquatic Mammals* 32(4): 393-401.
- Watwood, S.L. and D.M. Buonantony. 2012. Dive Distribution and Group Size Parameters for Marine Species Occurring in Navy Training and Testing Areas in the North Atlantic and North Pacific Oceans. Naval Undersea Warfare Center Division. NUWC-NPT Technical Document 12,085. Newport, RI.
- Yeates, L.C., T. M. Williams, and T.L. Fink. 2008. Diving and foraging energetic of the smallest marine mammal, the sea otter (*Enhydra lutris*). *Journal of Experimental Biology* 210: 1960-1970.

FIGURES




Figure 1. Sea otter 160 dB and 180 dB Buffer for Box 2




Figure 2. Sea otter 160 dB and 180 dB Buffer for Box 4




Figure 3. Box 2 Tracklines Ensonifying Sea Otter Habitat and Boat Tracklines shoreward of the 40 meter Contour




Figure 4. Box 4 Tracklines Ensonifying Sea Otter Habitat and Boat Tracklines shoreward of the 40 meter Contour

**Appendix D:
NMFS Harbor Porpoise Monitoring Study
(Aerial and Acoustic Plan Draft)**

Cetacean Aerial Survey and Passive Acoustic Monitoring Plan

Diablo Canyon, CA

October 1, 2012 through January 31, 2013.

PURPOSE AND DEFINITIONS

The purpose of this plan is to monitor the distribution of cetaceans, with particular emphasis on the harbor porpoise (*Phocoena phocoena*), before, during, and after seismic survey work to be conducted in the Diablo Canyon area off central California by Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E), as authorized under the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA) and Endangered Species Act (ESA). The overarching goal is to provide appropriate information for the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), and other agencies to assess the impacts of the seismic survey work.

For purposes of this document, the term *Study Area* refers to waters between Pt. Conception and Pt. Sur, which includes the full range of the Morro Bay harbor porpoise stock that will be exposed to seismic operations. The term *Operations Area* is defined to include waters between Pt. Sal and Pt. Estero, where the seismic survey will take place. Harbor porpoise *Core Habitat* includes waters between Pt. Arguello and Pt. Estero, from the coast offshore to the 50-fathom (92-m) isobath, where past surveys (e.g. Forney et al. 1991, Carretta et al. 2009) have shown the highest densities of this species. Harbor porpoise *Secondary Habitat* includes waters within the study area that are north of Pt. Estero or south of Pt. Arguello or beyond the 50-fm isobath to the offshore edge of the stock's range (See Figure 1).

Specific objectives of the plan are:

1. To collect baseline aerial survey and passive acoustic data on the distribution (and its variation) of harbor porpoises and other marine mammals within the study area prior to the seismic survey operations.
2. To monitor the distribution of harbor porpoise during and after the survey using passive acoustic moorings and aerial surveys, to allow the detection of potential major shifts in the distribution of this population. Specifically, the project seeks to identify potential changes in the distribution of harbor porpoises between *Core Habitat* and *Secondary Habitat*, because prolonged (days to weeks) shifts into *Secondary Habitat* could adversely impact the foraging success and health of individual porpoises. Given the level of daily, weekly, and inter-annual variability in harbor porpoise distribution documented during past SWFSC surveys within the study area, the planned aerial surveys are not expected to be able to detect minor shifts in distribution, only substantial and/or sustained shifts. The continuous passive acoustic monitoring is expected to provide data on more subtle changes in porpoise occurrence, but these results will only be apparent during post-survey analysis. The precise level of potential changes cannot presently be estimated, because no fine-scale spatial or temporal baseline data are available.

3. To monitor the distribution of all marine mammals during and after the seismic surveys, with the goals of detecting any large aggregations of endangered whales in or near the *Operations Area*, documenting any unusual marine mammal behaviors that may be observed, and providing offshore distribution data for sea otters (*Enhydra lutris*), in collaboration with USGS investigators conducting separate studies of potential impacts of the seismic surveys on sea otters.
4. Describe adaptive management triggers that would require either a suspension of seismic airgun activities, or a further evaluation of data and discussions among governmental and PG&E staff.

BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES

There is considerable scientific uncertainty about the behavioral and physiological responses of marine mammals when exposed to unusual stimuli, including sounds produced by airguns. One potential response is that animals move away from the vicinity of the sound source. While this is generally considered to minimize physical harm to the animal (e.g. hearing loss), it can lead to disruption of essential biological functions, such as breeding or foraging. The combined 160 db sound exposure area of the planned 2012 seismic operations (Boxes 2 and 4) include the majority of *core habitat* of the Morro Bay harbor porpoise stock. Harbor porpoises are known to be particularly sensitive to sound disturbance, and have been documented to move tens of kilometers away from areas of loud sounds caused by pile-driving activities (e.g. Cartensen et al. 2006, Brandt et al. 2011). In the current study area, this could displace animals into *secondary habitat* for days or weeks, affecting their ability to forage successfully. Metabolic requirements of small-bodied cetaceans, such as harbor porpoise, require daily food intake to maintain health and reproductive capacity, and any disruption of foraging activities or reduction in foraging efficiency has the potential to cause deleterious effects.

For this reason, a key objective of this plan is to be able to document changes in the distribution of harbor porpoise that could reduce their capacity to forage during and after the seismic survey activities. The plan will also provide information the distribution, abundance, and potential responses of other cetaceans, including endangered blue whales, *Balaenoptera musculus*; fin whales, *B. physalus*; and humpback whales, *Megaptera novaeangliae*). Any injured or dead marine mammals observed will be reported to stranding response staff (see separate Stranding Response Plan). Data on the open-water distribution of southern sea otters, *Enhydra lutris*, will be collected during aerial surveys and provided to the USFWS in support of their monitoring and research program for this species.

The aerial survey and passive acoustic monitoring plan, combined with an adaptive management plan, is part of the required mitigation and monitoring for the seismic study being conducted by PG&E around the Diablo Canyon Power Plant (DCPP), Avila Beach, CA. NMFS and USFWS will consider all observations made during the seismic survey in light of available baseline data, and provide the best scientific assessment of whether and how cetaceans respond to the seismic survey operations. The aerial survey data will be the primary tool for identifying potential adaptive management triggers during the seismic survey operations, as described below. However, such surveys can only be conducted in limited good-weather windows, with clear skies and light winds. If seas are sufficiently calm, an attempt will be made to retrieve at least some of the acoustic data during the seismic surveys for preliminary

evaluation. This will be of greater priority if the aerial survey operations are hampered by cloudy weather. The logistic details of this process will be determined during the course of the project based on weather, achieved levels of survey coverage, and other logistic factors.

AERIAL SURVEYS

Survey areas, transects, and timing

The aerial surveys are designed to meet several objectives, and are therefore divided into multiple sets of transect lines (see Figure 1) that can each be completed within a single flight of 3.5-4.0 hrs

- 1) Fine-scale inshore harbor porpoise ('Inshore Porpoise') transects: These transects are designed to provide a synoptic assessment of the distribution of harbor porpoises throughout the study area (their stock range). Similar parallel transect lines have been flown by SWFSC for many years within the range of the separate Monterey Bay Stock of harbor porpoises, and they effectively show changes in porpoise distribution between flights. Weather permitting, these transects will be flown at least 3x before (Oct 1-31), 3x during (Nov 1 to ~Dec 7), and 3x after seismic survey operations (~Dec 7 to early January). Baseline data will be critical for assessing potential impacts during and after the seismic surveys, so all available good-weather opportunities will be targeted for flights.
- 2) Broad-scale offshore harbor porpoise ('Offshore Porpoise') transects: These transects are designed to monitor harbor porpoise occurrence in offshore waters. Past data have shown only low densities of harbor porpoises in these deeper waters, which are considered secondary habitat, and a measurable increase in porpoise presence would require further examination. As with the inshore porpoise transects, these lines will be flown 3x before, 3x during, and 3x after seismic survey operations, weather permitting.
- 3) Large Cetacean Surveys: These transects are designed to document marine mammal distribution and identify any aggregations of ESA-listed whales within an 8.6 nmi area surrounding the seismic survey activities, as required by the California State Lands Commission. Weather permitting, the lines within 8.6nmi around each seismic survey box will be completed about 5-10 days before and 1-2 times during the seismic survey operations [awaiting clarification of actual timing requirements from Simon].

The sequence of flights will be prioritized based on weather, timing of previously completed flights, observations of potential concern that may require additional data, and other factors. In general, inshore porpoise transects will be given highest priority, followed by the large cetacean transects and lastly, the offshore porpoise transects. Additional transects may be developed and surveyed, as needed, to allow a more complete evaluation of observations of interest. Further, beach surveys that are part of the separate stranding response plan may be prioritized at a higher level than transect flights, depending on timing, weather, and needs.




Figure 1. Study area showing planned aerial survey transects and proposed approximate locations of passive acoustic moorings (exact locations to be determined). Thin black ‘race tracks’ are seismic survey Boxes 2 and 4.

Aircraft type and specifications

Safety and survey effectiveness of the aerial survey platform are critical, and all surveys will be conducted in high-wing, twin-engine Partenavia P-68 aircraft, which have been used successfully and

safely for over 30 years by NOAA/SWFSC staff. When configured for surveys, the aircraft can carry up to 5 persons (including pilot). It has two bubble windows for lateral viewing and a belly window for optimal downward viewing. Whenever possible, the P-68 “Observer” model with a Plexiglas nose will be used for enhanced forward viewing. All available aircraft are equipped with communication and safety equipment that meets or exceeds NOAA safety standards.

Survey methodology

Survey methods will follow established SWFSC line-transect protocols for harbor porpoise aerial surveys (Forney et al. 1991). Flights will be flown at about 650 ft altitude and 90-100kts airspeed. The full survey team includes a pilot, two bubble-window observers, one belly observer, and a data recorder. The data recorder will enter all survey and sighting data into a laptop computer connected to a GPS unit in real time. Location, time, declination angle to each sighting, species, and estimated number of animals will be recorded for each sighting. Transect start/end, viewing conditions, altitude, and speed will be updated whenever conditions change. Hand-held tape recorders will be used by observers as a backup method for recording sighting information in areas with high densities of marine mammals. Note that California sea lions, *Zalophus californianus*, will not be recorded, because their great abundance interferes with the detection of other species, and they are not part of this cetacean monitoring plan. Transects will generally be flown in ‘passing mode’ without diverting from the transect line during sightings, but occasional circling may be required to identify or enumerate whales or dolphins. Notes on marine mammal behavior and other observations (e.g. locations of seismic survey vessels, presence of krill swarms or multi-species feeding aggregations, etc) will be entered on an opportunistic basis into the computerized data record.

Porpoise flights require light winds (Beaufort sea states of 0-2) and mostly clear or sunny skies. Large cetacean surveys can be flown in light to moderate winds (Beaufort sea states 0-4) and clear to partly cloudy skies. Surveys will be initiated when weather conditions are expected to meet these criteria, and will be terminated when weather conditions deteriorate or when required by operational or safety considerations. Expected flight durations, based on aircraft type, weight, and maintenance of fuel reserves are 3.5-4.0 hrs. SWFSC already has the required NMFS and Sanctuary permits for low-altitude over-flights throughout the study area, and will take precautions to avoid disturbance of pinnipeds and seabirds on land.

Real-time communications

The aircraft will have radio transmission capability (marine and/or aviation band radios) to allow communication with seismic survey teams, as needed. The vessel-based marine mammal observer teams are expected to detect whales or and marine mammals in the vicinity of the seismic survey vessel, and the aerial team will generally not report sightings in real-time to avoid interfering with their own data collection procedures (which can be fast-paced at times). However, in limited circumstances, the aerial survey team may relay marine mammal observations to a vessel-based point-of-contact. For example, marine mammals observed within 1 km of the seismic survey vessel (180db zone) will be reported if there is reason to suspect that vessel-based observers might not be able to detect the mammal (e.g. an animal floating just below the water surface, or an otherwise cryptic behavior).

ESA-listed whale thresholds

The CSLC and NMFS have specified threshold densities and numbers of whales within 8.6 nmi of the seismic survey operations that would require potential adaptive management actions (Table 1). However, aerial observations do not directly provide information on the total number of animals present, but rather the observations represent a sample from which a total density can be estimated post-survey within the framework of line-transect theory. The probability of detecting animals decreases with increasing distance from the transect line, and animals directly on the line may be missed, e.g. because they are diving when the aircraft passes or because there is glare on the water surface. To account for missed animals, two parameters are generally estimated during line-transect analyses: the effective search width, *ESW*, and the probability of detecting animals on the transect line, *g(0)*. However, such analyses require a minimum quantity of taxon-specific data collected during the surveys, and must be conducted post-survey.

To allow for more rapid evaluation of whether the thresholds for ESA-listed whales have been met, SWFSC will use past aerial survey data (which used the same methods) and whale telemetry data provided by collaborators (J. Calambokidis, Cascadia Research) to estimate approximate *ESW* and *g(0)* values prior to the start of seismic survey operations [NOTE: still need to verify collaborators can provide these data in time – if not, we will need to select conservative default values of *g(0)*]. These parameter estimates, will allow *a priori* calculation of a ‘trigger’ number of observed whales within the aerial survey area that would correspond to the specified threshold densities and total numbers of whales present. If the number of observed whales reaches the trigger, this will be communicated to the relevant entities as soon as possible. [distribution list TBD, but it would be better to have just one or a few key contacts, who can then forward to PGE, CSLC, NMFS, USFWS etc, as needed]

Table 1. ESA-listed whale thresholds

ESA-Listed Mysticete Species	Density Threshold Predicted to Result in High Magnitude Intensity Rating (per km ²) ^a	Number of Animals within Estimated Aerial Survey Area ^b	
		Box 2 Area (2,333 km ²)	Box 4 Area (1,394 km ²)
Fin whale, <i>Balaenoptera physalus</i>	0.0073	17	10
Blue whale, <i>Balaenoptera musculus</i>	0.0063	15	9
Humpback whale, <i>Megaptera novaeangliae</i>	0.0053	12	7

Source: Modified from California State Lands Commission, 2012.

^a Densities correspond to 2.5 percent threshold for probabilistic Level B noise disturbance over duration of Project.

^b Survey area based on 14-kilometer (8.6 mile) buffer of the outermost survey lines.

Flight data analysis and reporting

At the end of each survey day, all data will be reviewed, edited, and backed up. Plots showing completed transect lines and species seen will be prepared. Following harbor porpoise surveys,

porpoise encounter rates will be summarized a) by transect, b) with respect to *core/secondary habitat*, and/or c) with respect to areas of seismic survey operations. These plots and summaries will form the basis for evaluating potential changes in marine mammal distribution that might meet adaptive management triggers, and will be forwarded to the relevant entities as soon as possible (~next day or sooner) [distribution list TBD, see above].

Post-project summary

Following the completion of all aerial survey activities that are part of the marine mammal monitoring plan, a Marine Mammal Summary Report will be completed and provided to NMFS, CSLC, USFWS, and PG&E. This report will include information on marine mammal observations relative to seismic survey operations and Safety Zones. The report will also compare observations pre-survey, during and post-survey. [Note: SWFSC staff retain all rights to conduct comprehensive analyses and publish research papers on the aerial survey and porpoise passive acoustic monitoring results.]

PASSIVE ACOUSTIC MONITORING

Background

A second component of the monitoring plan is the deployment of a network of passive acoustic instruments (C-PODs; *Chelonia Limited*, http://www.chelonia.co.uk/cpod_specification.htm) designed to detect and record porpoise echolocation clicks. C-PODs, or similar T-PODs, have been used successfully to monitor harbor porpoise activity before, during, and after wind turbine construction activity in Europe (e.g. Cartensen et al. 2006, Brandt et al. 2011). In those studies, decreased porpoise presence was detected near the construction sites for periods of 1-3 days following activity, and over a distance of up to 20 km. At one site, porpoise presence increased 21+ km from the wind turbines site, indicating an influx of displaced individuals at these greater distances.

The European studies were conducted in regions with a relatively wide continental shelf, where shallow-water porpoise habitat water extends >50 km from shore. In contrast, suitable habitat for the Morro Bay harbor porpoise stock is limited to nearshore waters within 10-30 km of the coast, and the highest porpoise densities (presumed *core habitat*) are found within 5-15km of shore, inside of the 50-fm (90-m) isobath. The 160db zone for the Diablo Canyon seismic survey extend beyond this range, suggesting that animals displaced by 20km would likely move north or south to escape sound impacts. The goal of the passive acoustic monitoring component of this plan is to allow a post-seismic-survey analysis of the magnitude and extent of north/south porpoise displacement, if it occurs.

Methods

Ten C-PODs will be placed within harbor porpoise *core habitat* and *secondary habitat*, at varying distances from the operations area. These devices record high frequency (~130 kHz) harbor porpoise echolocation clicks for a period of up to three months, providing a detailed temporal record of porpoise presence within about 200-300m of the C-PODs during this extended period. The continuous point measurements of porpoise occurrence will complement the spatial ‘snapshot’ data from the aerial

surveys, such that combining the two data sources will allow an integrated assessment of porpoise distribution and occurrence patterns during, before, and after the seismic surveys. The majority of C-POD data will be retrieved after completion of the post-seismic-survey aerial monitoring. However, some of the shallow-water C-POD data will be accessible during the seismic surveys, and - weather permitting – would allow data to be retrieved for a preliminary evaluation of detection rates in support of adaptive management needs.

Draft C-POD mooring locations are shown in Figure 1, but final locations will be determined based on consideration of porpoise densities, distance from the operations area, and environmental conditions, such as high winds (daily 10-30kts), rough seas (5-20+ ft), fishing activity (esp. trawl and net fisheries), and other factors that could threaten the mooring and instrumentation or reduce data quality and effectiveness.

Two types of moorings will be used (Figure 2): A) a shallow-water, diver-deployed mooring restricted to waters of <20m depth that can be pulled up for data retrieval and re-deployed from a small boat, and B) a deeper-water mooring with acoustic release that will be retrieved at the end of the entire monitoring project, likely during late December or early January. Up to five of the C-POD moorings will include additional ambient sound recorders, and two of these paired moorings will be located near separate ambient sound recorders deployed within the kelp beds to monitor sound exposure of sea otters.

Ambient sound monitoring

The passive acoustic monitoring of low-frequency ambient noise and received signals produced during PG&E seismic surveys will be conducted by SEA, Inc. in collaboration with SWFSC and USGS staff. Measurements will be made using calibrated archival listening systems deployed in multiple strategic locations in near-shore habitat of harbor porpoises and sea otters. The specific objectives for the passive acoustic monitoring are to provide: (1) a longitudinal record of average low-frequency (considered here as 50 Hz- 10 kHz) ambient noise measured at discrete intervals before, during, and after the seismic survey and (2) calibrated measurements of maximum received levels of seismic signals in porpoise and otter habitat in areas around the survey. SEA has extensive expertise and current projects obtaining similar calibrated signal and noise analyses in both field and laboratory settings.

Calibrated acoustic recording systems (Loggerhead DSG archival recorders) will be deployed in various (~6-8) locations strategically selected in porpoise and otter habitat. These devices have known and relatively flat frequency response across the low-frequency range of interest. They are capable of recording at sampling rates of up to 400 kHz, but will be sampled at 20 kHz (enabling acoustic measurements up to 10 kHz) for this project to enable a higher sampling duty cycle. A variable sampling duty cycle will be selected for each recorder before deployment based on the expected timing of the seismic survey to ensure both objectives above can be sufficiently met with adequate temporal sampling; a higher sampling duty cycle will be selected during the seismic operation period.

Each recording unit will be sampled identically and analyses of data from each will be conducted individually but assessed relative to all other units. Several different measurements of low-frequency ambient noise will be provided, including broadband equivalent noise levels and 1/3rd octave

measurements, with a time resolution of one average sample per hour over the entire deployment duration. Maximum received levels of seismic signals will also be reported for each deployment location using several different acoustic measurements (RMS and peak sound pressure level); these data will also be reported as a maximum value per hour but all signals will be analyzed individually.

A final report detailing the deployments and results will be produced. Data will be reported as time-series representation of average ambient noise level averages and maximum received levels of seismic periods across the duration of deployments. These data will be interpreted relative to what is known about the potential effects of both acute and chronic noise exposure on the hearing and behavior of harbor porpoises and sea otters.




Figure 2. Sample (conceptual) designs for A) a shallow-water C-POD mooring and B) a deep-water C-POD and DSG mooring. Details of each mooring design will depend on environmental and sampling constraints at each site. All shallow-water gear is expected to be retrieved at the end of the study. Deep-water moorings will be retrieved using an acoustic release, leaving the anchor in place on the bottom. Moorings within National Marine Sanctuary waters will use a biodegradable anchor, such as a sand bag or other approved material. No moorings will be located in California State Marine Protected Areas.

ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT CONSIDERATIONS

Ideally, baseline studies should be conducted prior to any activity that has the potential to adversely impact cetaceans and other animals. Such baseline studies provide data that a) allow an informed decision process during the planning, and b) allow the identification of quantitative criteria for an adaptive management framework to minimize impacts. This is particularly important in dynamic marine environments and for marine predators such as cetaceans, because natural variation in their distribution can confound efforts to document and mitigate impacts. For the present Diablo Canyon Seismic Survey, insufficient baseline data are available to establish quantitative adaptive management criteria to mitigate potential adverse impacts. Nonetheless there is a recognized potential for adverse impacts on harbor porpoises and some other cetacean species, as outlined in the EIR and described above. Therefore, this plan identifies more general, observable criteria that indicate potential adverse impacts, to be considered within an adaptive management framework. As data become available in the future, these qualitative criteria may be refined to become more quantitative and specific.

Criterion A:

If the aerial surveys or passive acoustic monitoring detect changes in porpoise densities that indicate moderate to large numbers of the Morro Bay stock of harbor porpoises have moved out of the *core habitat* into *secondary habitat* and/or outside of their normal stock range during the seismic activities, this should be considered a trigger for adaptive management action. Although SWFSC has conducted population-wide aerial surveys of this stock for many years, those surveys were by nature much coarser than required for the current monitoring effort. Without fine-scale baseline data on porpoise distribution, spatial density patterns, and temporal variation therein, it is presently not possible to specify *a priori* quantitative thresholds for this trigger. Specific measures will have to be identified based in part on the fine-scale aerial surveys planned for October (before seismic operations start) and in part based on our knowledge about their use of *core* vs. *secondary habitat* from the coarser historical aerial survey data. If weather conditions prevent adequate aerial surveys, and/or if retrieval of passive acoustic data is possible part-way through the study is possible, acoustic detection rates of harbor porpoise may also provide relevant information on changes in habitat use. In all cases, efforts will be made to draw on the available past data to the extent possible, and to conduct additional analyses (as time permits) to assist in the interpretation of observations of potential concern.

Criterion B:

A second criterion for adaptive management action would be observations of unusual behavior that might indicate harbor porpoises are experiencing severe disturbance or stress/injury. Details of this criterion are also difficult to predict without baseline data or prior studies, but porpoises usually occur in loosely aggregated groups of 1-5 individuals, with characteristic surfacing behaviors. So, for example, a large, tight group of 50-100 individuals rafting or bunched in an unusual area would be of concern. If any behaviors considered unusual for other cetaceans are observed, this would also be communicated as a potential adaptive management trigger.

TARGET SCHEDULE (SEP 2012-JAN 2013)

(NOTE: all field work is weather-dependent)

- Sep 1 - Sep 30: Develop monitoring plan, design study and moorings, coordinate with collaborators
- Oct 1 - Oct 31: Conduct at least three sets of baseline porpoise surveys)
- Oct 1 - Oct 10: Assemble and deploy passive acoustic moorings
- Oct 21 -Oct 31: Conduct baseline large cetacean survey
- Nov 1 - Dec 15: Conduct monitoring activities during period of seismic surveys, including 3 sets of porpoise surveys, 1-3 large whale surveys, and – if possible - retrieve some passive acoustic data to inform adaptive management.
- Dec 15 - Jan 15: (approximate). After seismic operations are completed, conduct post-survey porpoise aerial surveys (3 sets); retrieve passive acoustic moorings and data.

LITERATURE CITED:

- Brandt, M., et al. 2011 Responses of harbour porpoises to pile driving at the Horns Rev II offshore wind farm in the Danish North Sea. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* 421, 205–216.
- California State Lands Commission, 2012. Draft Environmental Impact Report, Central Coastal California.
- Carretta JV, KA Forney, SR Benson. 2009. Preliminary estimates of harbor porpoise abundance in California waters from 2002 to 2007. NOAA Tech Memo NMFS-SWFSC-435.
- Carstensen J, O Henriksen, J Teilmann. 2006. Impacts of offshore wind farm construction on harbour porpoises: acoustic monitoring of echolocation activity using porpoise detectors (T-PODs). *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* 321, 295–308.
- Forney KA, DA Hanan, J Barlow. 1991. Detecting trends in harbor porpoise abundance from aerial surveys using analysis of covariance. *Fishery Bulletin* 89:367-377.

Appendix E
USFWS Southern Sea Otter Monitoring Study (Draft)

Monitoring of potential impacts on sea otters of Seismic Surveys, Diablo Canyon

A proposal by US Geological Survey, Western Ecological Research Center
and California Department of Fish & Game Office of Spill Prevention and Response
Principal Investigator: Dr. M. T. Tinker, Supervisory Research Biologist, USGS

Background:

The coastal regions to the north and south of Diablo Canyon Power Plant (DCPP) provide vital habitat for a relatively large proportion (~23%) of the Threatened southern sea otter (*Enhydra lutris nereis*) population. The proposed High Energy Seismic Survey (HESS) in the vicinity of DCPP, designed to image major geologic structures and fault zones in the vicinity of the DCPP, represents a potentially significant disturbance to certain marine wildlife species in the area. However, to-date there is a paucity of information as to the sensitivity of sea otters to acoustic disturbances of this nature, and thus little basis for estimating the magnitude of the impacts on individual sea otter behavior and/or population level vital rates.

We propose to address this information gap by using the proposed seismic surveys as a natural experiment, measuring behavioral and demographic responses (if any) to the acoustic disturbance event. The proposed work would provide a real-time monitoring infrastructure with which to detect and measure levels of harassment caused by the surveys, as required by US Fish and Wildlife Service, while at the same time providing useful information on behavioral response thresholds as a function of sound exposure for sea otters. While these might seem to be ambitious goals, the aims are reasonable in light of the extensive baseline data we have amassed over the past two decades on sea otter behavior, habitat use, movements, and rates of survival and reproduction, using telemetry-based field studies. This information includes data collected from sea otters in the area of DCPP. We will take advantage of this baseline data set, and using well-established methodological protocols we will conduct a case/control comparison study, based around radio-tagged sea otters equipped with bio-logging time-depth recorders (TDRs) that have been shown to provide highly-resolved information on dive behavior and activity.

Objectives:

Research objectives include: 1) assessment and description of pre-survey (baseline) values of standard health and behavioral metrics of sea otters in the “treatment” area (coastal areas between Port San Luis and Cayucos that will be impacted by the seismic surveys) and a nearby control area (San Simeon, immediately to the north of the treatment area). Metrics include body condition, blood panel diagnostics, gene expression biomarkers, habitat/spatial use patterns, activity budgets (% time feeding and forage bout durations) and details of diving behavior such as mean dive depth; 2) real-time and post-hoc (bio-logged) measurement of behavioral responses to seismic surveys, defined as statistically detectable changes in one or more behavioral metrics concurrent with the timing of seismic surveys that are observed in treatment but not control populations, and/or changes in population-level patterns of spatial distribution within the treatment area but not the control area; 3) in the event of detection of significant responses, establishment of behavioral response thresholds as a function of sound exposure levels at the sea otter’s location (accounting for propagation of sound within kelp forest habitat); and 4) the event of detection of significant behavioral or distributional responses to the seismic survey, determination of any effects on sea otter survival or reproductive success (as measured by differing hazard rates for sea otters within the treatment area as compared to control area, evaluated within the context of variation in baseline values as determined from previous studies).

Study Plan/Methods:

This study plan is restricted to the operations associated with the capture and monitoring of radio-tagged sea otters in the treatment and control area, and to the monitoring of population-level distribution patterns of sea otters (within both treatment and control areas) before, during and after the survey. However we note that this work will be coordinated with 3 other components of marine mammal impact monitoring, specifically 1) monitoring of marine mammal strandings (primarily sea otters and harbor porpoise), conducted cooperatively with California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) and National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS); 2) multi-species aerial surveys conducted by NMFS; and 3) acoustic monitoring of received noise levels at sea otter resting and feeding sites adjacent to or within kelp beds in the treatment area, conducted in collaboration with NMFS. In all cases we will coordinate activities between participating agencies, share equipment and personnel whenever possible, and generally streamline operations so as to minimize costs and logistical overhead.

Working closely with our collaborators from CDFG Marine Wildlife Veterinary Care and Research Center (MWVCRC), the Monterey Bay Aquarium Sea Otter Research and Conservation department (SORAC), and the University of California at Santa Cruz and Davis (UCSC and UCD), we will capture and implant radio-transmitters into 60 free-ranging sea otters in the region of DCPP, including 40 otters within the treatment area (between Port San Luis in the south and Cayucos in the north) and 20 in the control area (north of Cambria and south of San Simeon Point). We will target both resident females and territorial males in kelp-dominated habitat, as well as animals found in the open water areas of Estero Bay. We will disproportionately sample animals from the former group, as our previous work in this area suggests that the latter group consists largely of transient males and sub-adult females, animals that are more likely to disperse and thus not be present during the second year seismic survey operations (moreover, disturbance impacts to the former group will have a greater population-level impact).

Initial capture operations will begin on October 1, 2012, and conclude on or before October 20, 2012. If required, additional captures will be conducted in early summer 2013 to achieve desired sample sizes for the second year of seismic surveys. Methods of capture, sampling and tagging will be identical to the procedure used by our group on dozens of previous projects (e.g. Tinker et al 2006), and include scuba-based techniques from small boats in kelp dominated areas, as well as tangle-nets deployed and tended from small boats. Captured sea otters will be transported to a mobile veterinary lab stationed at the Morro Bay Coast Guard office or other suitable facility (depending on the location of the targeted sea otter group). At the mobile lab they will be anesthetized by a qualified veterinarian for the placement of flipper tags, VHF transmitter, and TDRs. Health parameters, including weight, body condition, tooth wear, will be assessed at the same time, and a pre-molar tooth will be collected for cementum-based age estimation. Blood and tissue samples will be taken from each otter to evaluate overall health and nutritional state, immune function, pathogen exposure and presence, and exposure to petrochemicals and other contaminants. In addition to venous blood samples we will collect skin punches (obtained during flipper tag application), vibrissae (for characterizing diets via stable isotope analysis; Newsome et al 2009) and nasal swabs. We will use gene expression analysis for assessing recent or chronic exposure to a suite of stressors and xenobiotics, including hydrocarbons (Bowen et al 2012), which will be important for assessing any later emerging health symptoms unrelated to the seismic surveys. All the above activities are covered by an existing federal permit and institutional animal care and use (IACUC) permit issued to the principal investigator.

Tracking and observation of the study animals will commence immediately after captures (i.e. starting October 2, 2012), continue through September 30, 2015, and will occur throughout the study area, defined as the coastal waters between Point Sal in the south and Point Piedras Blancas to the north, from the low tide line out to the 40m isobath. Field personnel will conduct shore-based daily surveys of the study site using standard telemetric protocols (triangulation on radio signal using VHF telemetry receivers and visual identification using 50-80X Questar spotting scopes: see Tinker et. al 2006, 2008) to locate all study animals within the study area and record precise GPS position, survival, reproductive status and instantaneous behavior. Attempts will be made to re-sight all study animals at least 5 times per week, both before, during and after the seismic surveys. Aerial flights will be conducted at approximately 2-week intervals during seismic surveys and monthly during other periods (as needed) to supplement these data and to locate missing study animals via radio telemetry, including those that have moved outside of the intensive study area. Aerial flights will include coastal areas between Pt. Conception and Monterey.

A series of intensive focal-animal observation sessions will be established to collect detailed behavioral data from study animals before, during and after the seismic survey experiment. During these 12-hour sessions focal animal monitoring sessions, data will be recorded at 10 minute intervals on the individual's activity state, diet, dive behavior, distance-to-shore and fine-scale movements (habitat use). Whenever study animals feed during these activity sessions, continuous data will be recorded on dive/surface intervals, prey capture rates and handling times, following previously established protocols (see Tinker et al. 2008). Dive behavior recorded during these observational sessions can later be cross-matched with bio-logged data from TDRs, in order to detect even subtle responses to disturbances (e.g. sudden changes in dive depth or cessation of feeding behavior concurrent with received noise disturbance). The anticipated schedule of focal-animal observation sessions in both treatment and control areas includes at least 10 sessions in October 2012, prior to the start of year-1 seismic surveys, 20 sessions during the year-1 seismic surveys (November-December 2012), and 20 sessions after the completion of surveys. In the case of the second year of seismic surveys (fall 2013), we will conduct 20 sessions before, 20 sessions during, and 20 sessions after completion of the year-2 seismic surveys.

A single aerial-based census of the treatment area will be made immediately prior to initiation of seismic surveys, in order to characterize the abundance and distribution of sea otters at the start of the seismic surveys. The methods for this aerial count will be identical to the aerial counts conducted as part of the annual range-wide population census headed by USGS and CDFG (see <http://www.werc.usgs.gov/ProjectSubWebPage.aspx?SubWebPageID=4&ProjectID=91>). This aerial survey will be synchronized with one of the multi-species survey conducted by NMFS, so that we can calibrate the results of the dedicated sea otter census with the distance-based survey methods employed in the multi-species surveys. A similar aerial census will be completed prior to the initiation of seismic surveys in fall 2013.

In order to detect any changes in sea otter distribution associated with disturbance from the seismic surveys, we will establish a series of 4 index survey sections, two within the treatment area and two within the control area. These index areas will comprise contiguous stretches of coastline selected so as to allow a pair of shore based observers to complete a survey within a 4 hour period, following methods identical to ground counts conducted as part of the annual range-wide population census. Briefly, during each survey the observers will sequentially visit a series of designated observation stations within the index area, and at each station will scan the coastal waters out to 1.5 km using binoculars and 50X Questar spotting scope and record the precise

location of all sea otters into a hand-held field computer equipped with a GIS. A custom survey application is being constructed for this purpose using the ArcPAD 10 mobile GIS software platform. Each index area will be surveyed 5 times prior to the initiation of seismic surveys in 2012, 10 times during and 5 times after completion of the seismic surveys. The same schedule will be repeated for the seismic surveys in fall 2013. Spatial statistics will be used to describe distribution patterns, and linear mixed-effects models will be used to determine what proportion (if any) of variance in these patterns can be explained by the timing of the seismic surveys in treatment areas as compared to control areas. Examples of significant effects might include movement of animals closer to shore during the seismic surveys in treatment (but not control) areas, or reduction in sea otter densities during the seismic surveys in treatment (but not control) areas.

Beginning in winter/spring 2014, after completion of the second set of seismic surveys, attempts will be made to re-capture all study animals in order to retrieve TDR bio-logging instruments. Methods for recaptures are essentially identical to those of the initial captures. Re-captured otters will be anesthetized and archival TDR instruments surgically explanted for data extraction. Health parameters will be re-assessed at this time, tissue samples taken, and any missing flipper tags will be replaced.

Any study animals (as well as non-tagged animals within the study area) that die during the course of the study will be immediately retrieved by field personnel. Data on primary and contributing causes of mortality in wild otters, as well as information on environmental risk factors, can be obtained from thorough necropsies of dead animals (e.g. Miller et al 2010). Any animals that disappear from the study areas will be located by airplane and, if a mortality signal is detected, personnel will be dispatched (by car, boat, or on foot) to retrieve the carcass. Carcasses will be subjected to detailed necropsies by a veterinary pathologist at MWVCRC following established protocols (for details, refer to study plan for marine mammal stranding). In addition to determining the primary and contributing cause(s) of death, the pathologist will supervise collection of tissue samples for a variety of otter and ecosystem health studies.

Project Deliverables

Weekly reports will be provided by field staff during the seismic surveys summarizing any observed responses (either perceived or empirically measured) of sea otters to the seismic surveys. A more extensive report will be completed after completion of the seismic surveys in year 1 and year 2, describing preliminary results. Annual progress reports will be provided after year 1 and year 2 of the project. A final project report will be submitted upon completion of the project (Sept 2015) with comprehensive analyses of the behavior, habitat use, health parameters, reproduction and survival of study animals in treatment and control groups, including detailed descriptions of any detected responses to acoustic disturbance and a model of behavioral response thresholds as a function of sound exposure levels in sea otter habitat. A minimum of one manuscript will be submitted for publication to a peer-reviewed scientific journal.

References

- Bowen L., Miles A.K., Murray M., Haulena M., Tuttle J., Van Bonn W., Adams L., Bodkin J.L., Ballachey B., Estes J., Tinker M.T., Keister R. & Stott J.L. (2012). Gene transcription in sea otters (*Enhydra lutris*); development of a diagnostic tool for sea otter and ecosystem health. *Molecular Ecology Resources*, 12, 67-74.
- Miller M.A., Kudela R.M., Mekebri A., Crane D., Oates S.C., Tinker M.T., Staedler M., Miller W.A., Toy-Choutka S., Dominik C., Hardin D., Langlois G., Murray M., Ward K. & Jessup D.A. (2010). Evidence for a Novel Marine Harmful Algal Bloom: Cyanotoxin (Microcystin) Transfer from Land to Sea Otters. *PLoS One*, 5, Article No.: e12576.
- Newsome S.D., Tinker M.T., Monson D.H., Oftedal O.T., Ralls K., Staedler M.M., Fogel M.L. & Estes J.A. (2009). Using stable isotopes to investigate individual diet specialization in California sea otters (*Enhydra lutris nereis*). *Ecology*, 90, 961-974.
- Tinker M.T., Bentall G. & Estes J.A. (2008). Food limitation leads to behavioral diversification and dietary specialization in sea otters. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 105, 560-565.
- Tinker M.T., Doak D.F., Estes J.A., Hatfield B.B., Staedler M.M. & Bodkin James L. (2006). Incorporating diverse data and realistic complexity into demographic estimation procedures for sea otters. *Ecological Applications*, 16, 2293-2312.

**Appendix F
Stranding Response Plan (Draft)**

DRAFT Stranding Response Plan

Diablo Canyon, CA

November 1, 2012 through December 31, 2012.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this plan is 1) to ensure efficient responses to and investigation of live and dead stranded marine mammals in the Diablo Canyon area during the seismic survey work to be conducted by Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E), as authorized under the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA) and Endangered Species Act, and 2) to describe the adaptive management triggers resulting from detection of stranded marine mammals that would require a suspension of seismic airgun activities (additional adaptive management triggers resulting from other monitoring are discussed in other parts of the authorization). Specifically, the plan provides for rapid response to live stranded marine mammals and the timely recovery, necropsy, and examination of dead stranded marine mammals, resulting in appropriate information for the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), and other agencies to assess the impacts of the seismic survey work.

BACKGROUND

Strandings

Marine mammal strandings, as defined by the MMPA, have occurred throughout recorded history, although U.S. stranding programs have only been keeping consistent records for (in some cases) the last three decades or (more commonly) the last decade. Strandings may result from many different causes, including infectious agents, biotoxigenesis (usually associated with Harmful Algal Blooms), shark bites, starvation, fishery interactions, ship strikes, unusual oceanographic or weather events, sound exposures, or combinations of these stressors sustained concurrently or in series. In many cases, and for a number of reasons, the cause of a live stranding or death cannot be determined.

There is considerable scientific uncertainty about the behavioral and physiological responses of marine mammals when exposed to unusual stimuli, including airguns. One of the potential responses is a stranding event. Cetacean strandings have been associated with mid-frequency active sonar and underwater detonations; the potential for cetacean strandings to occur during seismic testing activities exists and must therefore be assessed. The responses of other marine mammals to seismic survey airguns are largely unknown. The plan outlined below describes the active monitoring and responses to marine mammal strandings that will be undertaken in the near shore area of the Diablo Canyon seismic survey study area. The goal of the plan is to ensure a rapid response to strandings, to provide information that will be used to assess potential impacts of the seismic survey activity on marine mammals, including whether adaptive management triggers have been reached, and to contribute scientific data that will improve our understanding of why marine mammal strandings occur.

This stranding response plan and adaptive management triggers contained within are part of the required mitigation and monitoring for the seismic study being conducted by PG&E around the Diablo Canyon Power Plant (DCPP), Avila Beach, CA. This plan is specifically intended to outline the requirements of the authorizations

issued by NMFS and USFWS in the event that marine mammal strandings are detected within the seismic study zone during or following the seismic testing. NMFS and USFWS will consider all plausible causes within the course of a stranding investigation, and the development of this plan in no way presumes that any strandings are related to, or caused by, the seismic testing conducted by PG&E, unless and until a determination is made following a Stage 2 investigation as outlined in this plan.

Stranding Network

Pinnipeds and Cetaceans

Response to stranded pinnipeds and cetaceans in California is conducted by members of the California Marine Mammal Stranding Network. There are two stranding network response groups authorized by NMFS for this geographic area. For live animals (primarily pinnipeds, but live cetacean triage and stabilization), the authorized response group is The Marine Mammal Center (TMMC), which has its main campus in the Marin Headlands north of San Francisco, but which maintains a satellite facility in Morro Bay (TMMC-SLO), approximately 45 minutes north of Avila Beach. Rehabilitation of live cetaceans would occur in Santa Cruz, San Diego, or Sausalito (typically a single cetacean each; multiple pinnipeds would be rehabilitated in Sausalito).

The authorized response group for dead cetacean response is the Santa Barbara Museum of Natural History (SBMNH), located in Santa Barbara, which is approximately 2 hours south of Avila Beach. Both groups operate primarily with volunteers with only a few (or 1) paid staff member, and typically handle minimal case loads during this time of year (see Appendix 1 for historical stranding information). Neither organization is well equipped for a drastic increase in the number of stranded animals, particularly with the distances involved to respond to each stranded animal. In addition neither organization has an active beach or near shore surveillance programs. No organization is responsible for assessment of dead pinnipeds, and most of the dead stranded pinnipeds are not examined.

These network participants also work collaboratively with other agencies throughout the region; for example, CDFG personnel in the Morro Bay have historically assisted with pinniped and cetacean strandings, and may be able to provide boat and/or vehicle access to difficult to reach locations during this timeframe.

Sea Otters

The CDFG and the U. S. Geological Survey (USGS) have intensively monitored and studied southern sea otter strandings along the Central California coast for over 40 years. An attempt is made by these groups to verify, examine, and/or collect every stranded sea otter. Under the existing program, dead stranded sea otters are either field necropsied by an experienced CDFG or USGS biologist or collected and examined by a veterinary pathologist at the CDFG Marine Wildlife Veterinary Care and Research Center (MWVCRC) in Santa Cruz. Live stranded sea otters (in the PG&E project area) are collected by the CDFG and/or TMMC and are transferred to the Monterey Bay Aquarium's Sea Otter Research and Conservation (MBA) program for evaluation, care and possible rehabilitation.

MARINE MAMMAL STRANDING RESPONSE AUGMENTATION

Personnel Requirements

To augment local response capabilities, a 2-person trained team (rotating through for two week periods) will be staged on the coast in the geographic area of the proposed seismic survey area. They will rapidly respond to reports of stranded animals and arrange further treatment/assessment/sampling. These teams would receive any reports of strandings (floaters, nearshore or on beach) from the aerial survey teams, the public (via established stranding network hotlines; Appendix 2), or other sources. Notification of strandings would be given following the Communication Plan (Appendix 3). This team will also perform active surveillance, driving or walking stretches of local beach looking for stranded animals on a periodic basis. A minimum of two people at any one time are needed for safety.

Active Surveillance

An active surveillance plan will be implemented to maximize the activities of this two person team. Coordination is planned with the existing stranding network responders (TMMC-SLO and SBMNH) and the Moss Landing Marine Laboratories BeachCOMBERs program, which has volunteers that survey index beaches in the Morro Bay area, as well as with local land management authorities (e.g., State Parks – Environmental Scientists and Rangers) and any aerial survey teams. In addition, up to four sea otter tracking staff working on the USGS-led sea otter monitoring program will be spending considerable time on the coast in the study area and can report any marine mammal strandings.

A seismic study zone is defined as the geographic area from Point Piedras Blancas, San Luis Obispo Co, to Point Arguello, Santa Barbara Co. This area is a broader than merely inshore of the seismic survey, as impacted animals may potentially move out of that area and strand to the north or south. This zone may be redefined during the project (expanded or shifted) based upon observations from aerial surveys or animal movement/distribution data. Within the seismic study zone, surveys will be prioritized in areas with higher deposition rates of animals (based upon historic data). These areas include:

- Point Piedras Blancas
- San Simeon
- Cayucos Beach
- Morro Bay area – Morro Rock and Morro Strand
- Montana de Oro State Park
- Avila State Beach
- Pismo State Beach
- Oceano Dunes State Vehicular Recreation Area
- Guadalupe Dunes
- Point Sal State Beach
- Vandenberg Air Force Base – Sherman Creek, San Antonio Creek, Surf Beach, Purisima Point

A comprehensive survey will be undertaken in the 10 days immediately preceding the start of the seismic activities to document and mark all pinniped and cetacean carcasses present on the beach, so that if they are reported again it will be known that they stranded prior to the start of the survey (all sea otter carcasses will be removed or buried, per current sea otter stranding protocols). Potential marking methods include addition of ropes or twine, paint or dye, removal of particular parts, or some other method to be determined; carcasses may also be removed or buried whenever feasible. During the project, the choice of which beach(es) to survey

on a given day will be determined by the 2-person team, and subject to factors such as weather conditions, but the goal will be to cover all of these beaches in a 7-day period (if no stranding response is needed). A survey will consist of walking or slowly driving the beach from one end to the other. Any observed marine mammal strandings will be examined to determine if they were previously detected or if they are new; if new strandings, they would be reported according to the communication protocol (Appendix 3) and an investigation would be started.

The active surveillance and readiness component will also persist past the end of the seismic work to account for animals that may have been impacted at the end of the seismic activities but do not strand until days later. At a minimum, this will be one week after the end of the seismic work. Following this week, the 2-person team will be demobilized and the active surveillance work will be concluded, but the local stranding network responders will continue to respond to all reports of stranded animals, and may complete a detailed investigation.

RESPONSE ACTIONS – PINNIPEDS AND CETACEANS

1. **Initial stranding response** – The 2-person team, acting in coordination with the local stranding network responders, will respond to reports of stranded pinnipeds or cetaceans within the seismic study zone when feasible. All marine mammals that are responded to will receive examination appropriate to the condition code of the animal and the feasibility of the logistics.
 - a. **Dead animals** - Once observed, a dead animal will be recovered (including towed or picked up if observed floating) if feasible. Following recovery, the animal will be removed from the beach for necropsy, or a beach necropsy performed if carcass retrieval is not possible (depending on carcass decomposition and logistics/weather/safety conditions). If possible, necropsies will be done in a laboratory setting following diagnostic imaging (for fresh animals. At the necropsy, samples will be taken and may be shipped to appropriate laboratories for diagnosis.
 - b. **Live animals** - Live animals will be evaluated and determined whether they are rehabilitation candidates, should be released from the scene, or euthanized. Cetaceans will receive auditory evoked potential (AEP) examination(s) when appropriate to determine the hearing capabilities of each animal at stranding or at release according to permit requirements and with approval of the veterinarian. Rehabilitation candidates will require transport to the appropriate rehabilitation facility.
 - c. **Mass strandings or other elevated stranding rates** – If a mass stranding occurs, or if stranding rates are very elevated, additional personnel from other stranding network organizations may be brought in for response or animals transported to more distant necropsy or rehabilitation facilities. Significant additional resources must be made available for both live and dead mass stranding response. Costs would be very high if there is a mass stranding event. Depending on the number of animals that strand and on the veterinary assessment for each, animals may be returned to the water and released, taken to a rehabilitation center, or they may be euthanized or die on the beach or during transport. All dead animals would require a necropsy.
 - d. **Phase 1 investigation** – The Phase 1 investigation refers to the initial investigation on a stranded animal (both alive and dead). The specific assessment performed will depend upon the species, condition code, and logistics, but generally includes the following:

- i. General description of the stranding event (numbers, location, environmental parameters, behavioral assessment of live animals)
 - ii. Live animals – physical examination, morphometrics, photographs, blood work, diagnostics such as AEP or ultrasound
 - iii. Dead animals – external examination, morphometrics, photographs, diagnostic imaging including CT/MRI scans as appropriate and feasible, gross necropsy with internal examination, descriptions, photographs and sample collection
 - iv. Preliminary analysis of information collected during Phase 1
- e. **Phase 2 investigation** – The Phase 2 investigation is a more comprehensive investigation into a stranded animal for purposes of documentation of lesions, determining the cause of stranding or determining the cause of death. Again, the specific assessment will depend upon many factors, and will be informed by the findings obtained during the Phase 1 investigation, but may include:
- i. Further analyses and review of information obtained in Phase 1 (potentially including formation of an expert panel)
 - ii. Histopathology, including special stains where needed
 - iii. Ancillary diagnostics (e.g., PCR for infectious agents, air bubble sampling when emboli were discovered, domoic acid levels)
 - iv. Additional diagnostic imaging as needed
 - v. Histology of ears, where indicated

2. **Adaptive management** - Adaptive management triggers resulting from stranding investigations have been identified. If these triggers are met, suspension of seismic airgun activities will occur. Following suspension of activities, NMFS and our stranding network partners will further evaluate the available information, including new information collected while activities are suspended, and coordinate with PG&E to determine if and how seismic operations may continue. The triggers that have been identified are as follows:
- a. A mass stranding (2 or more animals that simultaneously strand, other than cow-calf pairs) or atypical nearshore milling (aka "near mass stranding") of any cetacean species. At a minimum, the shutdown would continue until the disposition of the animals was complete - this could involve herding offshore, refloating/transporting/herding, transport to rehabilitation, euthanasia, or any combination of the above. Shutdown procedures will remain in effect until NMFS determines that, and advises PG&E that, all live animals have left the geographic area (either of their own volition or following herding).
 - b. If 2 cetaceans within one day, 3 or more cetaceans within a week, or 5 or more pinnipeds within a week are newly detected stranded (sick, injured, in need of medical attention, or dead) on the beach or floating incapacitated or dead within the impact zone during the seismic testing period, the following would occur:
 - i. For live stranded animals, the stranding team would attempt to capture the animal and perform a Phase 1 examination (detailed above), including auditory evoked potential (AEP) testing of all odontocetes, and any clinical tests deemed necessary by the attending veterinarian. If the animal(s) are determined to be candidates for immediate release (either from the original stranding location or following transport to a new location), shutdown may be needed until the release is complete. If the animal is determined to be a candidate for rehabilitation and the initial examination is

inconclusive regarding a reason for stranding, Phase 2 investigations (see description above) will be conducted.

- ii. For all dead stranded animals, the stranding team would attempt to recover the carcass(es) and perform a detailed necropsy with diagnostic imaging scans to rule out obvious causes of death (e.g. a Phase 1 investigation, described above), as appropriate given the decomposition state of the animal and other logistical constraints (size, weight, location, etc.). Then, if Phase 1 tests are inconclusive and the animal(s) is (are) in good body condition, Phase 2 investigations will be conducted.
 - iii. In either case, if Phase 2 investigations are warranted for enough animals to meet the initial numerical criteria, seismic testing will be suspended.
 - c. Strandings of single marine mammals with signs of acoustic trauma or barotrauma without another etiology would require a suspension.
 - d. A shipstrike of a marine mammal by any of the vessels involved in the seismic testing (including observation vessels) would require a suspension.
3. **Final report** - At the end of the survey period, sample and data analyses will be completed and a report will be generated by the SWFSC, SERO, TMMC and SBNHM personnel.

RESPONSE ACTIONS – SEA OTTERS

1. **Initial stranding response** – Using the existing network of collaborators, CDFG, USGS, and TMMC will coordinate an efficient, timely response to all reported sea otters strandings.
- a. **Dead animals** – During the project operation and extending seven days after, all dead stranded sea otters between Point Piedras Blancas (San Luis Obispo County) and Point Arguello (Santa Barbara County) will be collected and transported to the MWVCRC for necropsy. Fresh dead and any tagged (i.e., study animal) dead sea otter will be transported via FedEx overnight shipping or scheduled TMMC transport to the MWVCRC, to ideally arrive within 24 hours of recovery. These fresh and/or tagged cases will receive a detailed necropsy by a veterinary pathologist to determine the cause of death. All non-tagged moderately to severely decomposed sea otters recovered within the study area will be collected, frozen and transported to the MWVCRC for future necropsy. At the necropsy, samples will be taken and may be shipped to appropriate laboratories for diagnosis.
 - b. **Live animals** - Following established protocols, all live stranded sea otters will be collected after consultation with CDFG and/or MBA. TMMC has the trained personnel and equipment to provide timely response and transportation. Once a live sea otter is recovered, MBA will direct the treatment for each case. In general, all live sea otters will be transported to MBA as soon as possible.
 - c. **Phase 1 investigation** – The Phase 1 investigation refers to the initial investigation on a stranded animal (both alive and dead). The specific assessment generally includes the following:
 - i. General description of the stranding event (numbers, location, environmental parameters, behavioral assessment of live animals)

- ii. Live animals – physical examination, morphometrics, photographs, blood work, and appropriate diagnostics.
 - iii. Dead animals – external examination, morphometrics, photographs, gross necropsy with internal examination, descriptions, photographs and sample collection.
 - iv. Assessment of stranding numbers and locations in comparison to historic stranding data for sea otters (corrected for increased search effort) to determine if stranding is unusual.
 - v. Preliminary analysis of information collected during Phase 1
- d. **Phase 2 investigation** – The Phase 2 investigation is a more comprehensive investigation into a stranded animal for purposes of determining the cause of stranding or determining the cause of death. If the Phase 1 investigation identifies a clear cause of death that is not associated with the project, Phase 2 investigation may not be required. The specific Phase 2 assessment will depend upon many factors, and will be informed by the findings obtained during the Phase 1 investigation, but may include:
- i. Further analyses and review of information obtained in Phase 1 (potentially including formation of an expert panel)
 - ii. Diagnostic imaging including CT/MRI scans as appropriate
 - iii. Histopathology, including special stains where needed
 - iv. Ancillary diagnostics (e.g., PCR for infectious agents, air bubble sampling when emboli were discovered, domoic acid levels)
 - v. Additional diagnostic imaging as needed
 - vi. Histology of ears, where indicated
2. **Adaptive management** – For sea otters, permitting documents from the USFWS and CDFG call for suspension of activities only in the case of acute mortality found to be associated with the project. There are no interim adaptive management triggers for harassment of sea otters; the USGS sea otter monitoring program may detect potential effects of the project on otters, but sub-lethal effects are not likely to be evident prior to post-project data analysis. If these acute mortality triggers are met, suspension of seismic airgun activities will occur. Following suspension of activities, USFWS and partner agencies will further evaluate the available information, including new information collected while activities are suspended, and coordinate with PG&E to determine if and how seismic operations may continue. The triggers that have been identified are as follows:
- a. Stranding of a single dead sea otter with signs of acoustic trauma or barotrauma without another etiology (based on Phase 2 investigation above) would require a suspension.
 - b. A lethal shipstrike of a sea otter by any of the vessels involved in the seismic testing (including observation vessels) would require a suspension.
3. **Final report** - At the end of the survey period, sample and data analyses will be completed and a sea otter stranding report will be generated by the CDFG and USGS personnel.

APPENDIX 1

Historical stranding information from the California Marine Mammal Stranding Network and USGS (for sea otters) from the Monterey/San Luis Obispo County line to Point Conception, 1988-2010.

	Species	Total Strandings (1988-2010)			Average Strandings		
		Nov	Dec	Jan	Nov	Dec	Jan
CETACEANS							
	Common Dolphin*	2	2		0.09	0.09	
	Gray Whale	3	0		0.14	0	
	Minke Whale	1	0		0.05	0	
	Northern Right Whale Dolphin	0	1		0	0.05	
	Pacific White-Sided Dolphin	1	0		0.05	0	
	Pygmy Sperm Whale	0	1		0	0.05	
PINNIPED							
	California sea lion	100	86		4.5	3.9	
	Harbor seal	2	1		0.09	0.05	
	Northern elephant seal	9	13		0.41	0.59	
	Northern fur seal	24	3		1.1	0.14	
	Unidentified pinniped	5	5		0.23	0.23	
MUSTELID							
	Southern Sea Otter	108	89	80	4.7	3.9	3.5


*includes long-beaked, short-beaked, and unidentified common dolphin

APPENDIX 2


Marine mammal stranding response reporting phone numbers.

Field Team:	TBD
Live Marine Mammals (TMMC):	805-771-8300
Dead Pinnipeds or Cetaceans (SBMNH):	805-682-4711 ext. 156
Dead Sea Otters (CDFG):	805-772-1135 (office); 831-212-7090 (mobile)

APPENDIX 3: STRANDING RESPONSE ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT DURING DCP P SEISMIC WORK DECISION TREE




1 DPCC: CONFIRMED CETACEAN or PINNIPED STRANDING COMMUNICATION TREE




Criteria for Notification of Stranded Marine Mammals During DPCC Seismic Study:

- The 2-person field team and other members of the NMFS SWR stranding network will respond to reports of stranded marine mammals in the operation area when feasible.
- When a stranded marine mammal is confirmed, the two person field team will initiate a Phase 1 Investigation appropriate to condition code and feasibility. NMFS will provide PG&E with the following: species, time and location of the stranding event, # of stranded animals and condition of the animal (live v. dead).
- All marine mammals that are responded to will receive an examination appropriate to the condition code of the animal and the feasibility of the logistics.
- Adaptive Management Triggers from Stranding Response: a) Mass stranding or atypical nearshore milling of 2 or more cetaceans (other than cow-calf pairs); b) two or more individuals of any cetacean species within one day, three or more stranded cetaceans within a 7-day period, or 5 or more stranded pinnipeds within a 7-day period for which Phase 2 investigations are deemed warranted by the investigation team; c) a single stranded marine mammal with signs of acoustic trauma or barotrauma without another etiology; and d) a shipstrike of a marine mammal by any vessel involved in the seismic study.

#2 DPCC CONFIRMED SEA OTTER STRANDING COMMUNICATION TREE



3 DPCC: IMMEDIATE SHUTDOWN and RESTART COMMUNICATION TREE




Adaptive Management Triggers from Stranding Response

- a) Mass stranding or atypical nearshore milling of 2 or more cetaceans (other than cow-calf pairs);
- b) two or more individuals of any cetacean species within one day, three or more stranded cetaceans within a 7-day period, or 5 or more stranded pinnipeds within a 7-day period for which Phase 2 investigations are deemed warranted by the investigation team;
- c) a single stranded marine mammal with signs of acoustic trauma or barotrauma without another etiology; and d) a shipstrike of a marine mammal by any vessel involved in the seismic study.

Criteria for Restart

- Following the disposition of all live animals (herded or transported and released at sea, taken to rehabilitation, euthanasia or death) out of the geographic area.
- Following the Phase 2 investigation, if the determination of the investigative team is that the number of strandings is not met because alternate causes of stranding were determined.

3 DPCC: ADAPTIVE MANAGMENT SHUTDOWN and RESTART COMMUNICATION TREE



Adaptive Management Triggers from Stranding Response

- a) Mass stranding or atypical nearshore milling of 2 or more cetaceans (other than cow-calf pairs);
- b) two or more individuals of any cetacean species within one day, three or more stranded cetaceans within a 7-day period, or 5 or more stranded pinnipeds within a 7-day period for which Phase 2 investigations are deemed warranted by the investigation team;
- c) a single stranded marine mammal with signs of acoustic trauma or barotrauma without another etiology; and d) a shipstrike of a marine mammal by any vessel involved in the seismic study.

Criteria for Restart

- Following the disposition of all live animals (herded or transported and released at sea, taken to rehabilitation, euthanasia or death) out of the geographic area.
- Following the Phase 2 investigation, if the determination of the investigative team is that the number of strandings is not met because alternate causes of stranding were determined.