Orsted Wind Power North America, LLC

Application for Incidental Harassment Authorization for the Non-Lethal Taking of Marine Mammals: Site Characterization Surveys

Lease OCS-A 0486, 0517, 0487, 0500 and Associated Export Cable Routes

Prepared by CSA Ocean Sciences Inc.

July 2020

Orsted

CSA Ocean Sciences Inc.

Application for Incidental Harassment Authorization for the Non-Lethal Taking of Marine Mammals: Site Characterization Surveys Lease OCS-A 0486, 0517, 0487, and 0500

DOCUMENT NO.CSA-ORSTED-FL-20-81107-3468-1_2_3-REP-01-FIN

Version	Date	Description	Prepared by:	Reviewed by:	Approved by:
01	09/17/2019	Preliminary draft for review	M. Barkaszi K. Hartigan	B. Douglas A. Lawson	M. Barkaszi
02	06/01/2020	NMFS comments / revised scope	K. Hartigan	M. Barkaszi	M. Barkaszi
03	06/25/2020	NMFS comments	K. Hartigan	M. Barkaszi	M. Barkaszi
FIN	07/22/2020	Final	K. Hartigan	M. Barkaszi	M. Barkaszi

Suggested citation: CSA Ocean Sciences Inc. 2020. Application for incidental harassment authorization for the non-lethal taking of marine mammals: site characterization surveys Lease OCS-A 0486, 0517, 0487, 0500 and Associated Export Cable Routes. Submitted to Orsted. July 2020. 89 pp.

Table of Contents

Page

Table of Contents (Continued)

Page

List of Tables

List of Tables (Continued)

Page

Ørsted

List of Figures

List of Acronyms

μPa	micropascal
AA	Applied Acoustics
AMAPPS	Atlantic Marine Assessment Program for Protected Species
AWS	Atlantic white-sided (dolphin)
BOEM	Bureau of Ocean Energy Management
CETAP	Cetacean and Turtles Assessment Program
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CHIRP	Compressed High-Intensity Radiated Pulse
dB	decibel
DMA	Dynamic Management Area
DoN	Department of the Navy
DPS	distinct population segment
EA	environmental assessment
ECR	export cable route
EIS	environmental impact statement
ESA	Endangered Species Act
ESL	sound exposure source level
ET	EdgeTech
EZ	exclusion zone
FR	*Federal Register*
G&G	geophysical and geotechnical
GAPS	Global Acoustic Positioning System
HF	high frequency
HRG	high-resolution geophysical
IHA	Incidental Harassment Authorization
ISO	International Organization for Standardization
J	joule
LF	low frequency
MAI	Marine Acoustics, Inc.
MBES	multibeam echosounder
MF	mid frequency
MMPA	Marine Mammal Protection Act
NARW	North Atlantic right whale
NMFS	National Marine Fisheries Service
NOAA	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
OCS	Outer Continental Shelf
OPR	Office of Protected Resources
OW	otariid pinnipeds in water
PBR	Potential Biological Removal
PSO	Protected Species Observer
PTS	permanent threshold shift
PW	phocid pinniped in water
re	referenced to
ROV	remotely operated vehicle
RPM	Reasonable and Prudent Measure
RWSAS	Right Whale Sighting Advisory System
SAR	Stock Assessment Report

List of Acronyms (Continued)

SBP	sub-bottom profiler
SEL_{cum}	cumulative sound exposure level
SFV	sound field verification
SL	source level
SL_{rms}	root-mean-square source level
SMA	Seasonal Management Area
SPL	sound pressure level
$SPL_{0\text{-}pk}$	zero to peak sound pressure level
SPL_{rms}	root-mean-square sound pressure level
SSS	side-scan sonar
TL	transmission loss
TTS	temporary threshold shift
UHD	ultra-high definition
UME	Unusual Mortality Event
USBL	ultra-short baseline
USFWS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
WEA	wind energy area
WFA	weighing factor adjustment
ZOI	zone of influence

1.0 Description of Proposed Activities

The Applicant submits this request for Incidental Harassment Authorization (IHA) pursuant to Section 101(a)(5) of the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA) for the incidental take of small numbers of marine mammals by Level B harassment during site characterization surveys, including high-resolution geophysical (HRG) sources operating at frequencies less than 200 kHz, to support the development of offshore wind farm technology within the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management (BOEM) Rhode Island (RI) – Massachusetts (MA) Wind Energy Area (WEA). The information provided in this document is submitted in response to the requirements of 50 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 216.104 to allow for the incidental harassment of small numbers of marine mammals resulting from site characterization surveys.

1.1 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Orsted Wind Power North America LLC (Applicant) on its behalf and on behalf of any successors in interest or assignee, submits this application to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) requesting the issuance of an IHA to allow for the incidental harassment of small numbers of marine mammals resulting from site characterization surveys to support the development of offshore wind farm technology. The Applicant is proposing to conduct site characterization surveys within federal waters located in the area of Commercial Lease of Submerged Lands for Renewable Energy Development on the Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) Lease Areas OCS-A 0486, 0517, 0487, and 0500 (Lease Areas) and along potential export cable routes (ECRs) to landfall locations between Raritan Bay (part of the New York Bight) and Falmouth, Massachusetts. In January 2020 Deepwater Wind New England, LLC requested that BOEM assign a portion of Lease Area OCS-A 0486 to Deepwater Wind South Fork to be given the designation OCS-A 0517. This Lease split was approved in April 2020. **Figure 1** shows the Lease Area and survey boundaries (gray shaded area) for the site characterization surveys, which include potential cable routes (Project Area).

Geophysical and geotechnical surveys are required by BOEM and the Applicant to provide data concerning seabed (geophysical, geotechnical, and geohazard), ecological, and archeological conditions within the footprint of offshore wind facility development. The IHA is being requested to allow for the incidental harassment of small numbers of marine mammals resulting from the operation of HRG sources with frequencies less than 200 kHz. An existing IHA, published in the Federal Register (*FR*) on 2 October 2019 (84 *FR* 52464), for the same Lease Areas and ECRs is valid through 25 September 2020. The period of coverage for HRG activities included in this Application is 26 September 2020 to 25 September 2021.

Survey equipment will be deployed from multiple vessels or remotely operated vehicles (ROVs) during the site characterization activities conducted within the Project Area. HRG surveys will include the use of seafloor mapping equipment with operating frequencies above 200 kHz (e.g., side-scan sonar [SSS], multibeam echosounder [MBES]); magnetometers and gradiometers that have no acoustic output; and shallow- to medium-penetration sub-bottom profiling (SBP) equipment (e.g., parametric sonars, compressed high-intensity radiated pulses [CHIRPs], boomers, sparkers) with operating frequencies below 200 kHz. No deep-penetration sub-bottom profiling (e.g., airgun or bubble gun surveys) will be conducted.



Figure 1. Project Area for the site characterization surveys which includes the Lease Areas and potential export cable route area.

1.2 ACTIVITIES CONSIDERED IN THIS APPLICATION

Site characterization surveys described in this Application will include HRG surveys. Only activities using HRG sources with operating frequencies below 200 kHz are considered in this Application, as sources with operating frequencies >200 kHz are outside the general hearing range of most marine mammals (**Section 1.2.1.2**).

All site characterization activities will utilize one or more of the survey methods and acoustic sources identified below. As applicable, surveys will follow BOEM Lease stipulations and will be conducted in accordance with the following BOEM guidelines:

- Guidelines for Providing Archaeological and Historic Property Information Pursuant to 30 CFR Part 585 (March 2017); and
- Guidelines for Providing Geophysical, Geotechnical, and Geohazard Information Pursuant to 30 CFR Part 585 (July 2015).

1.2.1 Acoustic Analysis of Activities Considered in this Application

1.2.1.1 Acoustic Terminology

This document follows International Organization for Standardization (ISO) 18405:2017 (ISO, 2017) for all acoustic terminology. Underwater acoustic source levels (SLs), exposure levels, and associated measurements are expressed in decibels (dB) referenced to (re) 1 micropascal (µPa). In turn, acoustic metrics can be expressed in several ways depending on the quantity being reported. **Table 1** provides a list of the acoustic units used in this document.

Table 1. Acoustic metric definitions and their units used in this document.

Quantity	Abbreviation	Units	Reference
Sound pressure level	SPL	dB re 1 µPa	ISO 18405
Root-mean-square sound pressure level	SPL_{rms}	dB re 1 µPa	ISO 18405
Zero to peak sound pressure level (peak sound pressure level is a synonym)	SPL_{0-pk}	dB re 1 µPa	ISO 18405
Cumulative sound exposure level	SEL_{cum}	dB re 1 μPa^2 s	ISO 18406
Source level	SL	dB re 1 µPa m	ISO 18405
Source level (root-mean-square)	SL_{rms}	dB re 1 µPa m	ISO 18405
Source level (zero to peak)	SL_{0-pk}	dB re 1 µPa m	Ainslie, 2010
Sound exposure source level	ESL	dB re 1 μPa^2 m^2 s	Ainslie, 2010

µPa = micropascal; dB = decibel; re = referenced to.

1.2.1.2 Regulatory Criteria

The included analysis applies the most recent noise exposure criteria utilized by NMFS Office of Protected Resources (OPR) to estimate acoustic harassment (NMFS, 2018a). The MMPA defines two levels of harassment: Level A harassment is statutorily defined as any act of pursuit, torment, or annoyance that has the potential to injure a marine mammal or marine mammal stock in the wild; Level B harassment is any act of pursuit, torment, or annoyance that has the potential to disturb a marine mammal or marine mammal stock in the wild by causing disruption of behavioral patterns, including, but not limited to, migration, breathing, nursing, breeding, feeding, or sheltering. The NMFS acoustic criteria were developed primarily to address the regulatory requirements of the MMPA when assessing the effect of sound on marine mammal species. In the guidance, NMFS establishes acoustic thresholds that if exceeded, have the potential to cause auditory injury or behavioral disturbance for marine mammals. In 2018, NMFS published a revision to the acoustic guidance for marine mammals for use in impact assessments (NMFS, 2018a).

NMFS recognizes two main types of sound sources: impulsive and non-impulsive; non-impulsive sources are further broken down into continuous or intermittent categories. Sound source characteristics and acoustic thresholds are used to establish the ensonified area of received sound pressure level (SPL) or cumulative sound exposure levels (SEL_{cum}) depending on the source type and marine mammal hearing group. This ensonified area constitutes the zone of influence (ZOI) within which impacts and takes of marine mammals are considered.

Hearing Groups

Recognizing that marine mammal species do not have equal hearing capabilities, marine mammals are separated into hearing groups (Southall et al., 2007; NMFS, 2018a; Southall et al., 2019). Hearing groups are used in acoustic impact assessment through the application of frequency weighting functions. Frequency weighting functions use physiological parameters to scale a species' sensitivity to a propagated sound source depending on the spectral content of the sound source and the hearing acuity of that animal to that spectral content. Sound energy contained within the hearing range of an animal has the potential to affect hearing while sound energy outside an animal's hearing range is unlikely to affect its hearing.

Regulatory marine mammal hearing groups, originally identified by Southall et al., 2007 then later modified by Finneran (2016) and adopted by NMFS (2018a), are categorized as low-frequency (LF) cetaceans, mid-frequency (MF) cetaceans, high-frequency (HF) cetaceans, phocid pinnipeds in water (PW), and otariid pinnipeds in water. Each category has a defined auditory weighting function and estimated acoustic threshold for the onset of temporary and injury-level hearing impacts.

More recently, Southall et al. (2019) conducted a broad, structured assessment of the audiometric, physiological, and acoustic output bases for the categorization of these hearing groups using the best available data at that time. Their assessment revealed several important features and distinctions present within the cetaceans that were not reflected in the less robust assessments used in previous categorizations of hearing groups. However, Southall et al. (2019) acknowledge that there is presently insufficient direct data within several groups to explicitly derive distinct thresholds and weighting functions. They thus propose retaining the thresholds and functions developed by Finneran (2016) and adopted by NMFS (2018a), but with slightly different categorical identifiers. This results in slightly different grouping nomenclature from the NMFS (2018a) designations, but the overall conclusions of Southall (2019) remain congruent with the current regulatory guidance (NMFS, 2018a).

The four hearing groups of marine mammals, based on the NMFS (2018a) nomenclature, that potentially occur in the Project Area include:

- LF cetaceans – mysticetes with a collective generalized hearing range of approximately 7 Hz to 35 kHz;
- MF cetaceans – most dolphins, all toothed whales except for *Kogia* spp., and all beaked and bottlenose whales with a generalized hearing range of approximately 150 Hz to 160 kHz;
- HF cetaceans – all true porpoises and *Kogia* spp. with a generalized hearing range of approximately 275 Hz to 160 kHz; and
- PW – all true seals with a generalized hearing range of 50 Hz to 86 kHz.

The 2018 NMFS guidance also defines an otariid pinniped underwater hearing group; however, this group does not occur within the Project Area.

Impact Levels

Level A auditory impacts under the MMPA include a permanent threshold shift (PTS), which is a condition that occurs when sound intensity is very high and/or of such long duration that the result is a permanent loss of hearing sensitivity which is an irreversible auditory tissue injury (Southall et al., 2007). Level A acoustic thresholds are defined as sound exposures that potentially elicit the onset of a PTS in marine mammal hearing. The acoustic thresholds are used to establish the ensonified area of received SPL or SEL_{cum} depending on the source type and marine mammal hearing group.

The sound sources of potential concern during site characterization surveys include non-impulsive intermittent sources and impulsive sources. For non-impulsive sources, only the SEL_{cum} metric is used to assess potential injury-level impacts. For impulsive noises, both zero to peak sound pressure level ($SPL_{0\text{-}pk}$) and SEL_{cum} criteria are identified to account for the intensity of impulsive sounds and the duration required to elicit PTS.

Level B harassment impacts include temporary threshold shift(s) (TTS) and behavioral responses. Compared to PTS, TTS is a lesser impact to hearing. TTS results when sounds of sufficient loudness cause a transient condition in which an animal's hearing sensitivity over the frequency band of exposure is impaired for a period of time (minutes to days). A TTS does not cause permanent damage and is not considered a tissue injury (Richardson et al., 1995; Southall et al., 2007). Similarly, underwater sound may elicit a behavioral response from marine mammals that may or may not be biologically significant. In principle, behavioral thresholds are lower than TTS thresholds. TTS thresholds are defined in the 2018 criteria; however, TTS thresholds and behavioral response thresholds have not yet been separated within a regulatory framework and are all considered Level B harassment. Currently, the regulatory framework uses interim guidance to define Level B thresholds (NMFS, 2012) provided as unweighted root-mean-square sound pressure level (SPL_{rms}) to assess Level B behavioral impacts (NMFS, 2012, 2018a).

The corresponding Level A and Level B acoustic threshold criteria are summarized in **Table 2**. While the Level B threshold for non-impulsive sources is an SPL_{rms} of 120 dB re µPa, non-impulsive sources that have signals that sweep through a range of frequencies are assigned a threshold level of 160 dB re µPa.

Table 2. Summary of National Marine Fisheries Service regulatory acoustic thresholds for Level A and Level B exposures from impulsive and non-impulsive sources.

Source Type	Non-Impulsive		Impulsive - Peak		Impulsive - Exposure
Hearing Group	Level B[1]	Level A[2]	Level B[1]	Level A[3]	Level A[2]
Low-frequency cetacean	120	199	160	219	183
Mid-frequency cetacean		198		230	185
High-frequency cetacean		173		202	155
Phocid pinnipeds (in water)		201		218	185

µPa = micropascal; dB = decibel; re = referenced to; SEL_{cum} = cumulative sound exposure level; $SPL_{0\text{-}pk}$ = zero to peak sound pressure level; SPL_{rms} = root-mean-square sound pressure level.
[1]Units expressed as SPL_{rms} in dB re 1 µPa (unweighted).
[2]Units expressed as SEL_{cum} in dB re 1 μPa^2 s (frequency weighted).
[3]Units expressed as $SPL_{0\text{-}pk}$ in dB re 1 µPa (unweighted).

1.3 SURVEY EQUIPMENT

HRG surveys will use the equipment categories described below. Survey equipment is either towed, pole or hull-mounted on the vessel, or equipment mounted on the source itself or towed on an ROV (**Table 3**).

- **Shallow penetration SBPs (pingers/CHIRP sonars)** are used to map the near-surface stratigraphy (top 0 to 10 m) of sediment below seabed. A CHIRP system emits sonar pulses that increase in frequency from approximately 2 to 20 kHz over time. The pulse length frequency range can be adjusted to meet project variables. These shallow penetration SPBs are typically mounted on a pole, either over the side of the vessel or through a moon pool in the bottom of the hull.

- **Parametric SBPs**, also called sediment echosounders, are used for providing high data density in sub-bottom profiles that are typically required for cable routes, very shallow water, and archaeological surveys. Parametric SBPs are typically mounted on a pole, either over the side of the vessel or through a moon pool in the bottom of the hull.

- **Medium penetration SBPs (boomers)** are used to map deeper subsurface stratigraphy as needed. A boomer is a broad-band sound source operating in the 3.5 Hz to 10 kHz frequency range. This system is commonly mounted on a sled and towed behind the vessel.

- **Medium penetration SBPs (sparkers)** are used to map deeper subsurface stratigraphy as needed. Sparkers create acoustic pulses from 50 Hz to 4 kHz omnidirectionally from the source. Sparkers are typically towed behind the vessel with adjacent hydrophone arrays to receive the return signals.

- **Acoustic cores** are used to provide multi-aspect acoustic intensity imaging to delineate sub-seabed stratigraphy and buried geohazards. Whilst more akin to a geotechnical survey as this equipment is stationary on the seafloor, they operate acoustic sources (CHIRP sonars and a parametric sonar) to achieve the data collection. They are stationary sources mounted on the seafloor approximately 3.5 m above the seabed. Due to high-frequency content of the parametric sonar component, the operational beam width of less than eight degrees, and stationary operational position of <3.5 m above the seabed (Pangeo Subsea, 2018), this equipment was scanned out and will not be discussed further in this Application.

- **Ultra-short baseline (USBL) positioning** are used to provide high-accuracy ranges by measuring the time between the acoustic pulses transmitted by the vessel transceiver and a transponder (or beacon) necessary to produce the acoustic profile. It is a two-component system with a moonpool- or side pole-mounted transceiver and one or several transponders mounted on other survey equipment. The transceiver may have a wide or narrow beamwidth depending on the utility. The utility and frequencies of USBLs result in all combinations having very short propagation distances and, like the SSS and MBES, do not propagate sound that is likely to be perceived by, much less impact, marine mammals.

- **MBESs and SSS** will also be used during HRG surveys. These equipment types are generally used for seafloor mapping purposes to determine water depth and general seafloor topography or to identify potential obstructions in the survey area. As these equipment types all have operating frequencies >200 kHz, they are outside the general hearing range of marine mammals likely to occur in the Project Area and are not likely to affect these species. Therefore, these equipment types will not be discussed further in this Application.

The operational parameters (e.g., operating frequency, SL, pulse duration, ping rate) for each piece of equipment, as well as the output parameters (e.g., SPLs, propagation distance, frequency content) are generally similar within each category and therefore the overall magnitude of impact radii can often be predicted based on the equipment category (Crocker and Fratantonio, 2016).

The operational parameters for each piece of equipment are typically provided as a range of options that can be specified by the user. The precise settings are often field-specific depending on each contractor's individual survey methodologies and data needs. The selected parameters will affect the impact analysis for each piece of equipment within each category; therefore, the parameters used in the analysis must be as closely aligned as possible with the expected operation at the time of the survey. This information helps determine the expected acoustic output for this project by selecting the appropriate measurements reported in Crocker and Fratantonio (2016). For equipment that were not measured by Crocker and Fratantonio (2016), manufacturer information was used with the most applicable operational parameters (**Table 3**).

Sound field verification (SFV) measurements were previously conducted by the Applicant on this Lease and on other wind farm areas between 2015 and 2018. However, due to significant variation in SFV methodologies and SFV reporting, NMFS OPR provided supplemental guidance to the Applicant in July 2019, which did not allow the use of SFV results. Because there are no standardized field measurements for HRG survey equipment, NMFS recommended that the controlled measurements provided in Crocker and Fratantonio (2016) be the primary reference for equipment SLs with manufacturer information supplementing for equipment that was not measured in the Crocker and Fratantonio (2016) study. Where applicable, SFV measurements are provided in equipment descriptions to supplement the data used in the analysis; however, SFV measurements were not used to define SLs or acoustic threshold distances.

Although the final equipment choices will vary depending on the final survey design, vessel availability, make and model updates, and survey contractor selection, all sources that are representative of those that could be employed during the HRG surveys are provided in **Table 3** along with details of the parameters used in acoustic analyses within this Application.

Table 3. List of all representative geophysical sound sources with operating frequencies below 200 kHz that may be used during the site characterization surveys. All source information that was used to calculate threshold isopleths are provided in the table.

Equipment	Source Type	Frequency used for WFA in User Spreadsheets (kHz)[1]				Reference for SL	Operational Parameters						
		Low-frequency Cetaceans	Mid-frequency Cetaceans	High-frequency Cetaceans	Phocid Pinnipeds in Water	**CF**= Crocker and Fratantonio (2016) **MAN** = Manufacturer	Operating Frequency (kHz)	SL_{rms} (dB re 1 µPa m)	$SL_{0\text{-}pk}$ (dB re 1 µPa m)	Pulse Duration (width) (millisecond)	Repetition Rate (Hz)	Beamwidth (degrees)	**T** = towed; **PM** = pole-mounted; **HM**= hull-mounted; **SM** = seabed-mounted; **EM** = equipment-mounted
Shallow Sub-bottom Profilers (CHIRP Sonars)													
ET 216 (2000DS or 3200 top unit)	Non-impulsive, mobile, intermittent	2	16	16	6.2	MAN	2–16 2–8	195	-	20	6	24	PM/T/EM
ET 424	Non-impulsive, mobile, intermittent	4	24	24	6.2	CF	4–24	176	-	3.4	2	71	PM/T/EM
ET 512	Non-impulsive, mobile, intermittent	1.7	12	12	6.2	CF	0.7–12	179	-	9	8	80	PM/T/EM
GeoPulse 5430A	Non-impulsive, mobile, intermittent	2	17	17	6.2	MAN	2–17	196	-	50	10	55	PM/T/EM
Teledyne Benthos Chirp III - TTV 170	Non-impulsive, mobile, intermittent	2	7	7	6.2	MAN	2–7	197	-	60	15	100	PM/T/EM
Parametric Sub-bottom Profilers													
Innomar, SES-2000 compact	Non-impulsive, mobile, intermittent	85				MAN	85–115	222	-	1	40	4	PM/EM
Innomar, SES-2000 Light & Light Plus	Non-impulsive, mobile, intermittent	85				MAN	85–115	222	-	1	50	4	PM/EM
Innomar, SES-2000 Medium-70	Non-impulsive, mobile, intermittent	60				MAN	60–80	231	-	5	40	3	PM/EM
Innomar, SES-2000 Medium-100	Non-impulsive, mobile, intermittent	85				MAN	85–115	232	-	3.5	40	2	PM/EM
Innomar, SES-2000 Quattro	Non-impulsive, mobile, intermittent	85				MAN	85–115	220	-	1	60	3–5	PM/EM
Innomar, SES-2000 Smart	Non-impulsive, mobile, intermittent	90				MAN	90–110	220	-	0.5	40	5	PM/EM
Innomar, SES-2000 Standard & Standard Plus	Non-impulsive, mobile, intermittent	85				MAN	85–115	225	-	1.5	60	1–3.5	PM/EM

Table 3. (Continued).

Equipment	Source Type	Frequency used for WFA in User Spreadsheets (kHz)[1]				Reference for SL	Operational Parameters						
		Low-frequency Cetaceans	Mid-frequency Cetaceans	High-frequency Cetaceans	Phocid Pinnipeds in Water	**CF**= Crocker and Fratantonio (2016) **MAN** = Manufacturer	Operating Frequency (kHz)	SL_{rms} (dB re 1 µPa m)	$SL_{0\text{-}pk}$ (dB re 1 µPa m)	Pulse Duration (width) (millisecond)	Repetition Rate (Hz)	Beamwidth (degrees)	**T** = towed; **PM** = pole-mounted; **HM**= hull-mounted; **SM** = seabed-mounted; **EM** = equipment-mounted
Medium Sub-bottom Profilers (Sparkers & Boomers)													
AA, Dura-spark UHD (400 tips, 500 J)[2]	Impulsive, mobile	1				CF	0.3–1.2	203	211	1.1	4	Omni	T
AA, Dura-spark UHD (400+400)[2]	Impulsive, mobile	1				CF (AA Dura-spark UHD Proxy)	0.3–1.2	203	211	1.1	4	Omni	T
GeoMarine, Geo-Source or similar dual 400 tip sparker (≤800 J)[2]	Impulsive, mobile	1.5				CF (AA Dura-spark UHD Proxy)	0.4–5	203	211	1.1	2	Omni	T
GeoMarine Geo-Source 200 tip light weight sparker (400 J)[2]	Impulsive, mobile	1				CF (AA Dura-spark UHD Proxy)	0.3–1.2	203	211	1.1	4	Omni	T
GeoMarine Geo-Source 200-400 tip freshwater sparker (400 J)[2]	Impulsive, mobile	1				CF (AA Dura-spark UHD Proxy)	0.3–1.2	203	211	1.1	4	Omni	T
AA, triple plate S-Boom (700–1,000 J)[3]	Impulsive, mobile	3.4				CF	0.1–5	205	211	0.6	4	80	T
Acoustic Corers													
PanGeo (LF CHIRP)	Non-impulsive, stationary, intermittent	2	6.5	6.5	6.2	MAN	2–6.5	177.5	-	4.5	0.06	73	SM
PanGeo (HF CHIRP)	Non-impulsive, stationary, intermittent	4.5	12.5	12.5	6.2	MAN	4.5–12.5	177.5	-	4.5	0.06	73	SM

Table 3. (Continued).

Equipment	Source Type	Frequency used for WFA in User Spreadsheets (kHz)[1]				Reference for SL	Operational Parameters						
		Low-frequency Cetaceans	Mid-frequency Cetaceans	High-frequency Cetaceans	Phocid Pinnipeds in Water	**CF**= Crocker and Fratantonio (2016) **MAN** = Manufacturer	Operating Frequency (kHz)	SL_{rms} (dB re 1 µPa m)	SL_{0-pk} (dB re 1 µPa m)	Pulse Duration (width) (millisecond)	Repetition Rate (Hz)	Beamwidth (degrees)	**T** = towed; **PM** = pole-mounted; **HM**= hull-mounted; **SM** = seabed-mounted; **EM** = equipment-mounted
Acoustic Positioning Systems (USBL)													
Advances Navigation, Subsonus	Non-impulsive, mobile, intermittent	-	-	-	-	MAN	30	NR	176	90	5	Up to 300	PM/HM/EM
AA, Easytrak Alpha	Non-impulsive, mobile, intermittent	-	-	-	-	MAN	18–24	189	192	10	0.125–1	Up to 180	PM/HM/EM
AA, Easytrak Nexus 2	Non-impulsive, mobile, intermittent	1.7	24	24	6.2	MAN	18–24	192	193	10	2	150-180	PM/HM/EM
AA, Easytrak Nexus Lite	Non-impulsive, mobile, intermittent	-	-	-	-	MAN	18–24	190	192	10	2	180	PM/HM/EM
ET, BATS II	Non-impulsive, mobile, intermittent	-	-	-	-	MAN	16–21	NR	NR	1-15	0.05–1.67	90	PM/HM/EM
EvoLogics, S2C	Non-impulsive, mobile, intermittent	-	-	-	-	MAN	18–78	NR	NR	NR	NR	100-Omni	PM/HM/EM
iXblue, IxSea GAPS Beacon System	Non-impulsive, mobile, intermittent	1.7	16	16	6.2	MAN	8–16	188	-	10	1	Omni	PM/HM/EM
Kongsberg HiPAP 501/502	Non-impulsive, mobile, intermittent	-	-	-	-	MAN	20.5–29.6	NR	207	30	0.8–30	15	PM/HM/EM
Sonardyne Ranger 2 and Mini Ranger 2 USBL HPT 3000/5/7000	Non-impulsive, mobile, intermittent	1.7	25	25	6.2	MAN	19–34	194	NR	5	1	NR	PM/HM/EM

Table 3. (Continued).

Equipment	Source Type	Frequency used for WFA in User Spreadsheets (kHz)[1]				Reference for SL	Operational Parameters						
		Low-frequency Cetaceans	Mid-frequency Cetaceans	High-frequency Cetaceans	Phocid Pinnipeds in Water	**CF**= Crocker and Fratantonio (2016) **MAN** = Manufacturer	Operating Frequency (kHz)	SL_{rms} (dB re 1 µPa m)	SL_{0-pk} (dB re 1 µPa m)	Pulse Duration (width) (millisecond)	Repetition Rate (Hz)	Beamwidth (degrees)	**T** = towed; **PM** = pole-mounted; **HM**= hull-mounted; **SM** = seabed-mounted; **EM** = equipment-mounted
Sonardyne Scout Pro	Non-impulsive, mobile, intermittent	-	-	-	-	MAN	35–50	188	NR	5	3	NR	PM/HM/EM
Tritech, MicroNav	Non-impulsive, mobile, intermittent	-	-	-	-	MAN	20–28	NR	169	NR	0.1–2	180	PM/HM/EM

- = not applicable; NR = not reported; µPa = micropascal; AA = Applied Acoustics; BATS = Broadband Acoustic Tracking System; dB = decibel; ET = EdgeTech; GAPS = Global Acoustic Positioning System; HF = high-frequency; HiPAP = high-precision acoustic positioning system; J = joule; LF = low-frequency; Omni = omnidirectional source; re = referenced to; SL = source level; SL_{0-pk} = zero to peak source level; SL_{rms} = root-mean-square source level; UHD = ultra-high definition; WFA = weighting factor adjustments.

[1]WFAs were selected in the User Spreadsheet for each marine mammal hearing group based on estimated hearing sensitivities of each group and the operational frequency of the source.

[2]The Dura-spark measurements and specifications provided in Crocker and Fratantonio (2016) were used for all sparker systems proposed for the survey. The data provided in Crocker and Fratantonio (2016) represent the most applicable data for similar sparker systems with comparable operating methods and settings when manufacturer or other reliable measurements are not available.

[3]Crocker and Fratantonio (2016) provide S-Boom measurements using two different power sources (CSP-D700 and CSP-N). The CSP-D700 power source was used in the 700 J measurements but not in the 1,000 J measurements. The CSP-N source was measured for both 700 J and 1,000 J operations but resulted in a lower SL; therefore, the single maximum SL value was used for both operational levels of the S-Boom.

1.4 DISTANCES TO REGULATORY ACOUSTIC THRESHOLDS

Operational SLs and operational parameters will vary throughout the survey and therefore a level of judgment is required to establish appropriate parameters and SLs to estimate the distances to regulatory thresholds. Typically, field-measured data is considered the best available science for HRG sources due to the high site- and result-specific variables that direct frequency content, power, beamwidths, and other user-defined parameters. The same equipment used in a deep-water, clay bottom environment may be operated very differently and therefore produce different acoustic propagation characteristics than if it were operated in a shallow water, sand bottom environment. However, recent communication with NMFS OPR indicates that, due to inconsistencies in field verifications conducted on existing wind leases, Crocker and Fratantonio (2016) measurements are preferable to field measurement results. Therefore, the following hierarchy was used for selecting input to the NMFS User Spreadsheet Tool (NMFS, 2018b) and transmission loss (TL) equations:

- For equipment that was measured in Crocker and Fratantonio (2016), the reported SL for the most likely operational parameters was selected;
- For equipment not measured in Crocker and Fratantonio (2016), the best available manufacturer specifications were selected. Use of manufacturer specifications represent the absolute maximum output of any source and do not adequately represent the operational source. Therefore, they should be considered an overestimate of the sound propagation range for that equipment; and
- For equipment that was not measured in Crocker and Fratantonio (2016) and did not have sufficient manufacturer information, the closest proxy source measured in Crocker and Fratantonio (2016) was used.

Because impulsive sources use dual metrics (SEL_{cum} and $SPL_{0\text{-}pk}$) for Level A exposure criteria, the metric resulting in the largest isopleth distance was used to determine the ZOI for exposure estimation. Weighting factor adjustments (WFAs) for Level A isopleths used to account for differences in marine mammal hearing were determined by examining the frequency range and spectral densities for each source. The selected WFAs were then compared to the Applicable Frequencies Table located in the WFA tab of the NMFS User Spreadsheet Tool (NMFS, 2018b). If the determined frequency was lower than the applicable frequency for all hearing groups, it was entered as the WFA. When the frequency of a source exceeded the applicable frequency for a certain hearing group, an additional worksheet was created that applied the “use” frequency of the exceeded hearing group as indicated by NMFS (NMFS, 2018b).

The User Spreadsheet does not calculate distances to Level B thresholds; the range to the Level B thresholds was determined by applying spherical spreading loss to the SL for that equipment. The operational depth and directionality can greatly influence how the sound propagates and can influence the resulting isopleth distance, so these parameters were considered for sources that had reported beamwidths. Surface-towed omnidirectional sources (e.g., sparkers, boomers) and equipment with wide (>180°) reported beamwidths are expected to propagate further in the horizontal direction and produce larger ensonified fields. For these sources, the rate of TL was estimated using spherical spreading loss to calculate the distance to the Level B threshold.

Sources that project a narrow beam, often in frequencies above 10 kHz directed at the seabed, are expected to have smaller isopleths and less horizontal propagation due to the directionality of the source and faster attenuation rate of higher frequencies. Narrow beamwidths allow geophysical equipment to be highly directional, focusing its energy in the vertical direction and minimizing horizontal propagation, which greatly reduces the possibility of direct path exposure to receivers (i.e., marine mammals) from sounds emitted by these sources. Therefore, for sources with beamwidths <180°, isopleth distances were calculated following NMFS OPR interim guidance (NMFS, 2019a) to account for the influence of beamwidth and frequency on the horizontal propagation of these sources.

The operational characteristics and supplemental source information considered in the analyses for this Application, as well as justification for selected proxy equipment categories, are provided below.

- **Parametric SBPs**: there are no relevant information sources or measurement data within the Crocker and Fratantonio (2016) reference for parametric SBPs. Source information is available from the manufacturer; however, no field measurements or propagation characteristics are provided with the manufacturer specifications. Due to the highly specialized nature of these sonars (high frequencies and narrow beamwidth) the source information alone is not sufficient to fully evaluate the expected propagation. Like the USBLs, the parametric SBPs are moonpool- or side pole-mounted or attached to the hull of a towed ROV operating near the seabed. This configuration significantly reduces the likelihood of the beam intersecting an animal.

  The Innomar SES-2000 SBP uses the principle of "parametric" or "nonlinear" acoustics to generate short, very narrow-beam sound pulses at very high frequencies (generally around 100 kHz). The transducer projects a beamwidth of approximately 1 to 3.5°. The narrow beamwidth significantly reduces the impact range of the source while the high frequencies of the source are rapidly attenuated in sea water. Neither are well-captured in the NOAA User Spreadsheets used to calculate Level A isopleths. Therefore, the manufacturer reported source level (root-mean-square) (SL_{rms}) was converted to sound exposure source level (ESL) then exposure distances were calculated for each hearing group following guidance provided by NMFS OPR (July 2019) which considers both the beamwidth and frequency absorption as previously mentioned.

- **Pangeo acoustic corer**: unlike the other mobile geophysical sources, acoustic corers are stationary and made up of three distinct sound sources comprised of a HF parametric sonar (which will not be included in this assessment), a HF CHIRP sonar, and a LF CHIRP sonar with each source having its own transducer. The corer is seabed-mounted; therefore, measurements for similar towed equipment are unlikely to be fully comparable.

  The beam width of the parametric sonar is narrow (3.5 to 8°) and the sonar is operated roughly 3.5 m above the seabed with the transducer pointed directly downward. This configuration represents the expected operation of the acoustic corer during the survey to maximize the energy channeled into the seabed and subsequently results in nominal horizontal propagation. There are no relevant information sources or measurement data within the Crocker and Fratantonio (2016) reference for acoustic corers; however, an acoustic assessment similar to an SFV and a modeling assessment were conducted for the acoustic corer by the manufacturer. The modeling assessment showed much larger propagation distances than those that were measured in the field (Pangeo Subsea, 2018), further demonstrating the significant reduction in operational propagation distances for these highly directional, seabed-mounted sources.

- **Shallow SBPs (CHIRP sonars)**: Crocker and Fratantonio (2016) tested two CHIRP sonars; the EdgeTech (ET) models 424 and 512i. SFVs were completed on four CHIRP sonars: the ET 216 with a 2000DS top side unit, the ET 512, the ET 216 with a 3200 top side unit, and the GeoPulse 5430A. SFVs for this group measured a maximum SPL_{rms} of 153 dB re 1 µPa at 30 m (Marine Acoustics, Inc., 2018; Subacoustech, 2017).

- **Medium SBPs (boomer/sparkers)**: Crocker and Fratantonio (2016) measurements are available for two identical equipment models proposed for the survey:

  1. The Applied Acoustics (AA) triple plate S-Boom; and
  2. AA Dura-spark ultra-high definition (UHD).

  The AA Dura-spark is comparable to the other sparkers (e.g., AA Dura-spark UHD 400+400, GeoMarine Geo-Source dual 400 tip sparker) that are proposed for use during the HRG surveys. Sources will be operated at varied power levels throughout a survey in order to maximize the desired output data and compensate for environmental conditions and interactions with other equipment. Therefore, while full or near-full power operations of the equipment is assumed, the actual operational level, and subsequently the SLs, could vary throughout the survey. Reliable measurements are available from Crocker and Fratantonio (2016) for the AA Duraspark UHD; therefore, the measurements from Crocker and Fratantonio (2016) are used as maximal proxies for all other sparker sources.

  In situ field measurements for the medium SBP group resulted in a maximum measured received SPL_{rms} of 150.7 dB re 1 µPa at 60.4 m from the source for the Dura-spark (Subacoustech, 2017) and 169.86 dB re 1 µPa at 10 m from the source for the GeoMarine Geo-Source 400 sparker (Gardline, N.D.); and a measured SPL_{rms} of 171 dB re 1 µPa at 35 m from the source (Marine Acoustics, Inc. [MAI], 2018) and 146 dB re 1 µPa at 144 m from the source (Noise Control Engineering and RPS Group PLC, 2018). These measurements suggest that actual propagation distances are significantly smaller than those calculated using TL equations and confirm the validity of using the selected Crocker and Frantantonio (2016) measurement data as maximum source levels expected during the use of sparkers.

- **USBL positioning systems**: there are no relevant information sources or measurement data within the Crocker and Fratantonio (2016) reference for USBLs and only limited manufacturer source level (SL_{rms}) information. USBLs have a wide variety of configurations, source levels, and beamwidths but have been shown to produce extremely small acoustic propagation distances due to their typical operating configuration. There are numerous options for make and model of USBLs, and of combinations pairing USBL transceivers and beacons. Eleven USBL systems have been identified as possible equipment on the site characterization surveys; therefore, the proxy source used was the Sonardyne Ranger 2 operating with an omnidirectional beamwidth. This USBL and beamwidth was chosen as the maximal proxy because it has the highest reported SL_{rms} at 194 dB re 1 µPa m.

  Geophysical sources have been extensively reviewed in the Gulf of Mexico OCS due to the large amount of ongoing and planned oil and gas geophysical and geotechnical (G&G) surveys. A programmatic environmental impact statement (EIS) was issued for G&G surveys in the Gulf of Mexico in 2017. Within this EIS, non-airgun HRG sources were considered for potential impacts. USBLs were not considered in the assessment as no impacts or appreciable noise propagation was expected. Additionally, in the most recent petition for a Gulf of Mexico incidental take regulation USBLs were not considered for take requests by NMFS in the proposed rule issued on 22 June 2018 (83 *FR* 29212). In the proposed rule, HRG surveys with equipment comparable to the equipment proposed in these activities were fully evaluated and USBLs were not considered in the take evaluation. All USBL sound field verifications conducted by the Applicant resulted in Level B zones less than 7 m (MAI, 2018)

There is, therefore, precedence for not considering USBLs as sound sources likely to propagate sound levels reaching Level A or Level B thresholds. However, due to the lack of definitive *in situ* field or laboratory measurements, USBL manufacturer information was used to calculate Level A and Level B zones and were thus included in source analysis.

The estimated distances to Level A and Level B isopleths calculated for each marine mammal hearing group are given in **Table 4**.

Table 4. Maximum distance to weighted Level A and unweighted Level B thresholds for each sound source or comparable sound source category for all marine mammal hearing groups[1].

Source	Distance to Level A Threshold (m)					Distance to Level B (m)
	LF (SEL_{cum} threshold)	MF (SEL_{cum} threshold)	HF (SEL_{cum} threshold)	HF (SPL_{0-pk} threshold)	PW (SEL_{cum} threshold)	All (SPL_{rms} threshold)
Shallow SBPs						
ET 216 CHIRP	<1	<1	2.9	-	0	12
ET 424 CHIRP	0	0	0	-	0	4
ET 512i CHIRP	0	0	<1	-	0	6
GeoPulse 5430	<1	<1	36.5	-	<1	29
TB CHIRP III	<1	<1	16.9	-	<1	54
Parametric SBPs						
Innomar Parametric SBPs[2]	<1	<1	1.7	-	<1	4
Medium SBPs						
AA Triple plate S-Boom (700/1,000 J)	<1	0	0	4.7	<1	76
AA, Dura-spark UHD (500 J/400 tip)	<1	0	0	2.8	<1	141
AA, Dura-spark UHD 400+400	<1	0	0	2.8	<1	141
GeoMarine, Geo-Source dual 400 tip sparker	<1	0	0	2.8	<1	141
Acoustic Corers						
Pangeo Acoustic Corer (LF CHIRP)	<1	0	<1	-	<1	4
Pangeo Acoustic Corer (HF CHIRP)	<1	<1	<1	-	<1	4
Acoustic Positioning (USBL)						
USBL (all models)	0	0	1.7	-	0	50

- = not applicable; µPa = micropascal; AA = Applied Acoustics; CHIRP = Compressed High-Intensity Radiated Pulse; dB = decibels; ET = EdgeTech; HF = high-frequency; J = joules; LF= low-frequency; MF = mid-frequency; PW = Phocids in water; re= referenced to; SBP = sub-bottom profiler; SEL_{cum} = cumulative sound exposure level in dB re 1 µPa^2 s; SPL_{0-pk} = zero to peak sound pressure level in dB re 1 µPa; TB = teledyne benthos; UHD = ultra-high definition; USBL = ultra-short baseline.

[1]The Level A and B isopleths were calculated to comprehensively assess the potential impacts of the predicted source operations as required for this Application. However, as described in **Section 5.0**, Level A takes are not expected.

[2]The Level A distances for the Innomar parametric sonar are based on sound source level and use beamwidth and frequency absorption factors (NMFS OPR guidance July 2019) rather than the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration User Spreadsheet.

1.4.1 Environmental Assessments of Site Characterization Geophysical Sources

The operation of certain geophysical equipment has the potential to cause acoustic harassment to marine species, in particular marine mammals (NMFS, 2018a). Operating mode, frequency, and beam direction all affect sound propagation. Site characterization geophysical sources were addressed extensively in the environmental assessment (EA) prepared by BOEM for site assessment activities on the Atlantic OCS offshore New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, and Virginia (Mid-Atlantic EA) (BOEM, 2012) as well as an EA prepared by BOEM for wind leases on the Atlantic OCS offshore Rhode Island and Massachusetts (RI-MA EA) (BOEM, 2013).

The Mid-Atlantic EA (BOEM, 2012) refers to an acoustic evaluation conducted by Cape Wind Associates for its project on Horseshoe Shoal offshore Massachusetts to estimate the distances to the 180 and 160 dB re 1 μPa SPL_{rms} isopleths produced by site characterization survey sources. No references are supplied for this acoustic evaluation; however, it is assumed to be the sound source verification study conducted by Jasco Applied Sciences within Nantucket Sound between 6 and 7 July 2012 (Martin et al., 2012). The RI-MA EA (BOEM, 2013) used modeled sound information from the then-draft *Atlantic OCS Proposed Geological and Geophysical Activities, Mid-Atlantic and South Atlantic Planning Areas: Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement* (BOEM, 2014), which was finalized in 2014, and represents a more applicable acoustic analysis for the mid-Atlantic region.

The modeled area of ensonification for some geophysical survey equipment showed potential Level B thresholds at distances beyond what BOEM considered could be effectively (visually) monitored from a vessel for the presence of marine mammals. However, NMFS determined that with standard operating conditions and reasonable and prudent measures (RPMs,) as defined in the Biological Opinions dated 10 April 2013 for Commercial Wind Lease Issuance and Site Assessment Activities on the Atlantic OCS in Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New York, and New Jersey WEAs, and the 19 July 2013 Biological Opinion for Programmatic Geological and Geophysical Activities in the Mid- and South Atlantic Planning Areas from 2013 to 2020 resulting from BOEM Endangered Species Act (ESA) consultation, that the proposed geophysical surveys may adversely affect but are not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of threatened or endangered species. Furthermore, the behavioral responses from geophysical are expected to be temporary and would not affect the reproduction, survival, or recovery of threatened or endangered species.

2.0 Survey Dates, Duration, and Specific Geographic Region

2.1 SURVEY ACTIVITY DATES AND DURATION

Site characterization surveys considered under this Application will occur between 26 September 2020 and 25 September 2021. A survey day is defined here as a 24-hour activity day; a survey day might be added up by several partly used days. The number of anticipated survey days was calculated as the number of days needed to reach the overall level of effort required to meet survey objectives assuming a vessel covers 70 km per 24-hour operations.

During the one-year period covered by this IHA, we are proposing up to 1,302 vessel survey days during which HRG surveys will be conducted within Lease Area OCS-A 0486, 0517, 0487, 0500 and the associated ECR areas. The number of estimated survey days varies by Lease Area and ECR (**Table 5**).

Additionally, not all survey days will include the use of sparker systems which produce the largest impact isopleths. Sparker systems will be used for only a portion of the surveys days within the Lease Areas and ECR. Surveys days that do not utilize sparkers will use the Innomar parametric sonar systems or other equipment combined with a USBL system which produce smaller impact zones. A conservative estimate of the proportional sparker use is provided in **Table 5**. Survey operations within the Lease Areas are proposed to be conducted 24 hours per day. Surveys within the ECR will include 24-hour and 12-hour (daylight only) surveys. Up to nine (24-hour plus 12-hour) vessels may work concurrently throughout all Lease Areas and ECR considered in this application; however, no more than 3 vessels are expected to work concurrently within any single lease area with an estimated four offshore (24-hour) vessels and two nearshore (12-hour) vessels are expected to work concurrently in the ECR. Seasonal vessel restrictions are detailed in **Section 11.0**.

Table 5. Proposed number of survey days for each of the three Lease Areas as well as the export cable route (ECR) area with and without the medium penetration sub-bottom profilers (SBPs) (i.e., sparkers and boomers) operating.

Area	Total Number of Survey days	Maximum Number of Survey Days using Medium Penetration SBPs (sparkers or boomers)[1]
OCS-A-0486 and OCS-A-0517	217	114
OCA-A-0487	261	97
OCS-A-0500	164	112
ECR	661	378
TOTAL	**1,302**	**701**

[1]Days with no sparkers operating will use the Innomar parametric sub-bottom profiling or other equipment and an ultra-short baseline positioning device.

2.2 SPECIFIC GEOGRAPHIC REGION

The proposed survey activities will occur within the Project Area in federal waters in the Lease Areas and along potential export cable routes to landfall locations along the coast between New York and Massachusetts, as shown in **Figure 1**. The three combined Lease Areas comprise approximately 1,425.6 km^2 and are within the RI – MA WEA and MA WEA of BOEM's North Atlantic planning area. Water depths in the three Lease Areas primarily range from approximately 25 to 62 m. Water depths in the submarine cable corridor area in federal waters range from the shoreline to maximum depth of approximately 90 m.

2.3 SURVEY ACTIVITIES

Site characterization survey activities will include multibeam depth sounding, seafloor imaging, and shallow and medium penetration sub-bottom profiling to meet BOEM requirements as set out in the Guidelines for Providing Archaeological and Historic Property Information Pursuant to 30 CFR Part 585 [March, 2017]; and the Guidelines for Providing Geophysical, Geotechnical, and Geohazard Information Pursuant to 30 CFR Part 585 [July, 2015] (BOEM, 2019) as applicable.

Site characterization survey activities considered in this IHA (HRG sources with operating frequencies below 200 kHz) will use combinations of the equipment listed in **Table 3** to collect multiple aspects of geophysical data along one transect. Equipment with operating frequencies above 200 kHz (e.g., SSS, MBES) and equipment that does not have an acoustic output (e.g., magnetometers) will also be used but are not considered in the IHA analysis. Selection of equipment combinations is based on specific survey objectives. Field operation modes of each source are based on survey parameters and ongoing modification due to field conditions and data quality constraints.

3.1 PROTECTED POPULATIONS

All marine mammal species are protected under the MMPA. Some marine mammal stocks (defined as a group of nonspecific individuals that are managed separately) (NMFS, 2019b) may be designated as strategic under the MMPA, which requires the jurisdictional agency (NMFS or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service [USFWS]) to impose additional protection measures.

A stock is considered strategic if:

- Direct human-caused mortality exceeds its Potential Biological Removal (PBR) level (defined as the maximum number of animals, not including natural mortality, that can be removed from the stock while still allowing the stock to reach or maintain its optimum sustainable population level);
- It is listed under the ESA;
- It is declining and likely to be listed under the ESA; or
- It is designated as depleted under the MMPA.

A depleted species or population stock is defined by the MMPA as any case in which:

- The Secretary, after consultation with the Marine Mammal Commission and the Committee of Scientific Advisors on Marine Mammals established under MMPA Title II, determines that a species or population stock is below its optimum sustainable population;
- A State, to which authority for the conservation and management of a species or population stock is transferred under Section 109 of the MMPA, determines that such species or stock is below its optimum sustainable population; or
- A species or population stock is listed as an endangered species or a threatened species under the ESA.

Some species are further protected under the ESA. Under the ESA, a species is considered endangered if it is "in danger of extinction throughout all or a significant portion of its range." A species is considered threatened if it "is likely to become an endangered species within the foreseeable future throughout all or a significant portion of its range."

3.2 MARINE MAMMAL SPECIES

There are 36 species (comprising 37 stocks) of marine mammals in the Western North Atlantic OCS Region that are protected by the MMPA (**Table 6**) (BOEM, 2012). The marine mammal assemblage comprises 31 cetacean species, including 25 members of the suborder Odontoceti (toothed whales, dolphins, and porpoises) and 6 of the suborder Mysticeti (baleen whales). There are five whale species listed as endangered under the ESA with ranges that include the Project Area:

- Fin whale (*Balaenoptera physalus*);
- Sei whale (*Balaenoptera borealis*);
- Blue whale (*Balaenoptera musculus*);
- North Atlantic right whale (NARW) (*Eubalaena glacialis*); and
- Sperm whale (Physeter macrocephalus).

Along with cetaceans, seals are also protected under the MMPA. Four species of phocids (true seals) with ranges that include the Project Area include harbor seals (*Phoca vitulina*), gray seals (*Halichoerus grypus*), harp seals (*Pagophilus groenlandicus*), and hooded seals (*Cystiphora cristata*) (Waring et al., 2012). Lastly, one species of sirenian, the Florida manatee (*Trichechus manatus*), is an occasional visitor to the region during summer months (USFWS, 2019). The manatee is listed as threatened under the ESA and is protected under the MMPA along with the other marine mammals.

The expected occurrence of each species is based on the following criteria and/or on the habitat models (i.e., Best et al., 2012; Roberts et al., 2016; Roberts, 2018) for the Project Area and species available in the model analyses:

- Common – occurring consistently in moderate to large numbers;
- Regular – occurring in low to moderate numbers on a regular basis or seasonally;
- Uncommon – occurring in low numbers or on an irregular basis;
- Rare – records for some years but limited; and
- Not expected – range includes the Project Area but due to habitat preferences and distribution information, species are not expected to occur in the Project Area although records may exist for adjacent waters.

The protection status, stock identification, occurrence, and abundance estimates of the species listed in **Table 6** are discussed in more detail in **Section 4.0**.

Table 6. Marine mammals protected by the Marine Mammal Protection Act with geographic ranges that include the Project Area (NMFS, 2019b; Waring et al., 2015).

Common Name	Scientific Name	Stock	Federal ESA/MMPA Status	Relative Occurrence in the Region	Population (Best Estimate)[1]
Fin whale	*Balaenoptera physalus*	Western North Atlantic	ESA Endangered/ Depleted and Strategic	Common	7,418
Sei whale	*Balaenoptera borealis*	Nova Scotia	ESA Endangered/ Depleted and Strategic	Regular	6,292
Minke whale	*Balaenoptera acutorostrata*	Canadian East Coast	Non-strategic	Common	24,202
Blue whale	*Balaenoptera musculus*	Western North Atlantic	ESA Endangered/ Depleted and Strategic	Rare	402
Humpback whale	*Megaptera novaeangliae*	Gulf of Maine	Non-strategic	Common	1,396
North Atlantic right whale	*Eubalaena glacialis*	Western North Atlantic	ESA Endangered/ Depleted and Strategic	Common	428 (N_{min} = 418)
Sperm whale	*Physeter macrocephalus*	North Atlantic	ESA Endangered/ Depleted and Strategic	Common	4,349
Dwarf sperm whale	*Kogia sima*	Western North Atlantic	Non-strategic	Rare	7,750

Table 6. (Continued).

Common Name	Scientific Name	Stock	Federal ESA/MMPA Status	Relative Occurrence in the Region	Population (Best Estimate)[1]
Pygmy sperm whale	*Kogia breviceps*	Western North Atlantic	Non-strategic	Rare	7,750
Killer whale	*Orcinus orca*	Western North Atlantic	Non-strategic	Rare	Unknown
Pygmy killer whale	*Feresa attenuata*	Western North Atlantic	Non-strategic	Not Expected	Unknown
False killer whale	*Pseudorca crassidens*	Western North Atlantic	Non-strategic	Rare	1,791
Northern bottlenose whale	*Hyperoodon ampullatus*	Western North Atlantic	Non-strategic	Not Expected	Unknown
Cuvier's beaked whale	*Ziphius cavirostris*	Western North Atlantic	Non-strategic	Rare	21,818
Mesoplodon beaked whales	*Mesoplodon* spp.	Western North Atlantic	Depleted	Rare	21,818
Melon-headed whale	*Peponocephala electra*	Western North Atlantic	Non-strategic	Not Expected	Unknown
Risso's dolphin	*Grampus griseus*	Western North Atlantic	Non-strategic	Common	35,493
Long-finned pilot whale	*Globicephala melas*	Western North Atlantic	Strategic	Common	39,215
Short-finned pilot whale	*Globicephala macrorhynchus*	Western North Atlantic	Strategic	Rare	28,924
Atlantic white-sided dolphin	*Lagenorhynchus acutus*	Western North Atlantic	Non-strategic	Common	93,233
White-beaked dolphin	*Lagenorhynchus albirostris*	Western North Atlantic	Non-strategic	Rare	536,016
Common dolphin	*Delphinus delphis*	Western North Atlantic	Non-strategic	Common	178,825
Atlantic spotted dolphin	*Stenella frontalis*	Western North Atlantic	Non-strategic	Uncommon	39,921
Pantropical spotted dolphin	*Stenella attenuata*	Western North Atlantic	Non-strategic	Rare	6,593
Striped dolphin	*Stenella coeruleoalba*	Western North Atlantic	Non-strategic	Rare	67,036
Fraser's dolphin	*Lagenodelphis hosei*	Western North Atlantic	Non-strategic	Rare	Unknown
Rough toothed dolphin	*Steno bredanensis*	Western North Atlantic	Non-strategic	Rare	136
Clymene dolphin	*Stenella clymene*	Western North Atlantic	Non-strategic	Not Expected	4,237
Spinner dolphin	*Stenella longirostris*	Western North Atlantic	Non-strategic	Rare	4,102
Common bottlenose dolphin[2]	*Tursiops truncatus*	Western North Atlantic, Offshore	Non-strategic	Common	62,851

Table 6. (Continued).

Common Name	Scientific Name	Stock	Federal ESA/MMPA Status	Relative Occurrence in the Region	Population (Best Estimate)[1]
Common bottlenose dolphin[2]	*Tursiops truncatus*	Western North Atlantic, northern migratory coastal	Strategic	Rare	6,639
Harbor porpoise	*Phocoena phocoena*	Gulf of Maine/Bay of Fundy	Non-strategic	Common	95,543
Harbor seal	*Phoca vitulina*	Western North Atlantic	Non-strategic	Regular	75,834
Gray seal	*Halichoerus grypus*	Western North Atlantic	Non-strategic	Regular	27,131
Harp seal	*Pagophilus groenlandica*	Western North Atlantic	Non-strategic	Rare	Unknown
Hooded seal	*Cystophora cristata*	Western North Atlantic	Non-strategic	Rare	Unknown
Florida manatee[3]	*Trichechus manatus*	-	ESA Threatened/ Depleted and Strategic	Rare	Unknown

- = not applicable for this species; ESA = Endangered Species Act; MMPA = Marine Mammal Protection Act N_{min} = minimum population estimate.
[1]Best estimate from the most recently published draft National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Stock Assessment Reports.
[2]Common bottlenose dolphins likely to occur in this area belong to two distinct stocks.
[3]Under management jurisdiction of United States Fish and Wildlife Service rather than National Marine Fisheries Service.

4.0 Affected Species Status and Distribution

Of the 36 marine mammal species with geographic ranges that include the Project Area (**Table 6**), 15 species can be reasonably expected to reside, traverse, or occasionally visit the Project Area and may be considered affected. Species information is based on NMFS stock assessment reports (SARs) (Waring et al., 2007, 2010, 2015; Hayes et al., 2017, 2018, 2019; NMFS, 2019b), and regional survey records (e.g., Cetacean and Turtle Assessment Program [CETAP] 1982; Atlantic Marine Assessment Program for Protected Species [AMAPPS], 2010 to 2014 [Palka et al, 2017]; North Atlantic Right Whale Sighting Survey and Right Whale Sighting Advisory System (RWSAS); BOEM Mid-Atlantic EA [BOEM, 2012]; the Northeast Large Pelagic Survey Collaborative Aerial and Acoustic Surveys for Large Whales and Sea Turtles [Kraus et al., 2016]); and preliminary results (unpublished) of mitigation surveys conducted by the Applicant during 2017 and 2018.

Affected species are those that have a common, regular, or uncommon relative occurrence in the Project Area (**Table 6**) or have a very wide distribution with limited distribution or abundance details. Species not expected or rare are not carried forward in this application. Therefore, the Applicant requests an IHA for Level B disturbance for the 15 species listed below and described in the following sections.

- North Atlantic right whale (NARW) (*Eubalaena glacialis*);
- Humpback whale (*Megaptera novaeangliae*);
- Fin whale (*Balaenoptera physalus*);
- Sei whale (*Balaenoptera borealis*);
- Minke whale (*Balaenoptera acutorostrata*);
- Sperm whale (*Physeter microcephalus*);
- Risso's dolphin (*Grampus griseus*);
- Long-finned pilot whale (*Globicephala melas*);
- Atlantic white-sided dolphin (AWS) (*Lagenorhynchus acutus*);
- Common dolphin (*Delphinus delphis*);
- Atlantic spotted dolphin (*Stenella frontalis*);
- Common bottlenose dolphin (*Tursiops truncatus*) - Western North Atlantic offshore stock;
- Harbor porpoise (*Phocoena phocoena*);
- Harbor seal (*Phoca vitulina*); and
- Gray seal (*Halichoerus grypus*).

Species will not be equally affected by the proposed activities due to individual exposure patterns, the context in which noise is received, and, most prominently, individual hearing sensitivities. To account for acoustic sensitivity, marine mammal species are categorized into hearing groups that are designated to better predict and quantify impacts of noise (NMFS, 2018a; Southall et al., 2007, 2019). These functional hearing groups are described below with associated reference frequencies. While all these species likely hear beyond these bounds, primary sensitivities fall within the listed frequencies (**Section 1.2.1.1**).

The following information summarizes data on the status and trends, distribution and habitat preferences, behavior and life history, and auditory capabilities of marine mammals found in the Project Area as available in published literature and reports, including NMFS marine mammal SARs (Waring et al., 2007, 2010, 2015; Hayes et al., 2017, 2018, 2019; NMFS, 2019b).

4.1 MYSTICETES

4.1.1 North Atlantic Right Whale

The NARW is the only member of the mysticete family Balaenidae found in North Atlantic waters. They are skim feeders that primarily consume zooplankton, including copepods, euphausiids, and cyprids. The NARW is listed as endangered and is considered one of the most endangered large whale species in the world (Jefferson et al., 2011). The most recent NMFS SAR estimates a population size for the Western North Atlantic stock of only 428 individuals (NMFS, 2019b), which has recovered only slightly from the estimated 100 individuals in the 1930s just prior to the species being afforded protection (Reeves, 2001). The minimum population size for this stock is based on a published state-space model of the sighting histories of individual whales using photo identification techniques. A review of the photo-ID recapture database from 2017 indicated that 428 is the median estimate of abundance for NARWs, which represents the current minimum population size estimate (NMFS, 2019b).

The most recent draft NMFS SAR (NMFS, 2019b) identified seven areas where Western North Atlantic NARW aggregate seasonally: the coastal waters of the southeastern U.S.; the Great South Channel; Jordan Basin; Georges Basin along the northeastern edge of Georges Bank; Cape Cod and Massachusetts Bays; the Bay of Fundy; and the Roseway Basin on the Scotian Shelf (Brown et al., 2001; Cole et al., 2013). Several of these congregation areas correlate with seasonally high copepod concentrations (Pendleton et al., 2009). New England waters are a primary feeding habitat for NARWs during late winter through spring with feeding moving into deeper and more northerly waters during summer and fall. Less is known regarding winter distributions; however, it is understood that calving takes place during this time in coastal waters of the Southeastern U.S.

Recent passive acoustic studies of NARWs have demonstrated they may also be present year-round in the Gulf of Maine (Morano et al., 2012; Bort et al., 2015), Rhode Island (Kraus et al., 2016), New Jersey (Whitt et al., 2013), and Virginia (Salisbury et al., 2016). Additionally, NARWs were acoustically detected off Georgia and North Carolina during 7 of the 11 months monitored (Hodge et al., 2015). All of this work further demonstrates the highly mobile nature of NARWs. Movements within and between habitats are extensive and the area off the coasts of Rhode Island and Massachusetts is an important migratory corridor. Critical foraging habitat for this species has been designated to the north of the Project Area in the Gulf of Maine and Georges Bank region (81 *FR* 4837). Davis et al. (2017) recently examined detections from passive acoustic monitoring devices and documented a broad-scale use of much more of the U.S. Eastern Seaboard than was previously believed, and an apparent shift in habitat use patterns to the south of traditionally identified NARW congregations. Increased use of Cape Cod Bay and decreased use of the Great South Channel were also observed (Davis et al., 2017).

Around the Project Area NARWs were predominantly observed during the winter and spring during visual surveys (Kraus et al., 2016; NOAA, 2019). Sighting data from the RWSAS indicate approximately 289 NARWs have been seen in waters around the Project Area between 2015 and 2018 between January and March (NOAA, 2019).

The major threat to the NARW stock is human-caused mortality through incidental fishery entanglement that averaged 5.55 incidents per year and ship strikes that averaged 1.3 incident records per year based on data from 2013 through 2017 (NMFS, 2019b). In June 2017, NMFS declared an Unusual Mortality Event (UME) following an increase in NARW mortalities in the U.S. and Canada. As of 26 July 2019, a total of 27 dead stranded whales have been reported, 19 in Canada, and 8 in the U.S., and the preliminary cause of death for most of these cases was determined to be due to vessel strike or entanglement (NMFS, 2019c). The SAR for NARW sets the PBR level at 0.8; therefore, any mortality or serious injury for this stock can be considered significant. The Western North Atlantic stock is considered strategic by NMFS because the average annual human-related mortality and serious injury exceeds PBR, and because the NARW is an endangered species.

Seasonal Management Areas (SMAs) for reducing ship strikes of the NARW have also been designated in the U.S. and Canada. All vessels greater than 19.8 m in overall length must operate at speeds of 10 knots or less within these areas during specified time periods (NMFS, 2019d). The closest SMA to the Project Area is at the entrance to Delaware Bay which is, in effect, seasonal from November 1 to April 30 (**Figure 2**).



Figure 2. Mid-Atlantic Seasonal Management Areas for North Atlantic right whales (*Eubalaena glacialis*). (NMFS, 2019d).

The NARW underwent a NMFS 5-year review in 2017, which resulted in no change to its listing status. In 2009, NMFS received a petition to expand the critical habitat, and the agency considered this petition in the rulemaking process. In January 2016, two additional units comprising over 102,000 km^2 of marine habitat were designated as critical habitat to encompass the northeast feeding area in the Gulf of Maine/Georges Bank and the southeast calving grounds from North Carolina to Florida.

The following final rules notices are associated with the NARW:

- Critical Habitat Designation: 59 *FR* 28805, June 3, 1994;
- Atlantic Large Whale Take Reduction Plan: 62 *FR* 39157, July 22, 1997;
- Federal Regulations Governing the Approach to North Atlantic right whales: 69 *FR* 69536, November 30, 2004;
- Final Rule to Implement Speed Restrictions to Reduce the Threat of Ship Collisions with North Atlantic right whales: 73 *FR* 60173, October 10, 2008;
- Findings on Petition to Revise Critical Habitat: 75 *FR* 61690, October 6, 2010;
- Final Rule to Remove the Sunset Provision of the Final Rule Implementing Vessel Speed Restrictions to Reduce the Threat of Ship Collisions with North Atlantic right whales 78 *FR* 73726 December 9, 2013; and
- Final Rule for North Atlantic right whale (*Eubalaena glacialis*) Critical Habitat 81 *FR* 4837, January 27, 2016.

NARWs are LF cetaceans that vocalize using a number of distinctive call types, most of which have peak acoustic energy below 500 Hz. Most vocalizations do not go above 4 kHz (Matthews et al., 2014). One typical NARW vocalization is the “up call”; a short sweep that rises from roughly 50 to 440 Hz over a period of 2 seconds. These up calls are characteristic of NARWs and are used by research and monitoring programs for indication of species presence. A characteristic “gunshot” call is believed to be produced by male NARWs. These pulses can have SLs of 174 to 192 dB re 1 µPa m with frequency range from 50 to 2,000 Hz (Parks et al., 2005; Parks and Tyack, 2005). Other tonal calls range from 20 to 1,000 Hz and have SLs between 137 and 162 dB re 1 µPa m.

4.1.2 Humpback Whale

The humpback whale is a robust and medium-sized mysticete. It is distinguished from all other cetaceans by their long flippers, which are approximately one-third the length of the body (Jefferson et al., 2008). One species of the humpback whale is currently recognized (Committee on Taxonomy, 2018). Humpback whales are largely piscivorous, feeding primarily on herring (*Clupea* spp.), sand lance (*Ammodytes* spp.), and other small fishes as well as euphausiids in the Gulf of Maine (Hayes et al., 2019). Humpbacks show fidelity to feeding sites; however, local distribution is driven by prey availability and bathymetry resulting in the whales transiting widely throughout their feeding habitat between spring and fall in search of prey. Feeding is the principal activity of humpback whales in New England waters, and their distribution in this region has been largely correlated to prey species and abundance (Payne et al., 1986, 1990).

The humpback whales occurring within the Project Area are believed to be mainly part of the Gulf of Maine stock (NMFS, 2019b). Humpback whales have a global distribution and follow a migratory pattern of feeding in the high latitudes during summers and spending winters in the lower latitudes for calving and mating. The Gulf of Maine stock follows this pattern with winters spent in the Caribbean and West Indies; although acoustic recordings show a small number of males persisting in Stellwagen Bank throughout the year (Vu et al., 2012). The Gulf of Maine stock is estimated at 1,396 individuals (NMFS, 2019b).

Sightings of humpback whales in the northeast are common (Kenney and Vigness-Raposa, 2010; Kraus et al., 2016). Surveys in the RI – MA WEA reported humpback whale sightings in all seasons with peak abundance during the spring and summer, but their presence within the region varies between years (Kraus et al., 2016). Stocks of sand lance appear to correlate with the years in which the most abundant whales are observed, suggesting that humpback whale distribution and occurrences could largely be influenced by prey availability (Kenney and Vigness-Raposa, 2010). The greatest number of sightings of humpbacks in the WEA occurred during April (33 sightings); their presence increased starting in March and continuing through July. Acoustic detections within the WEA were also primarily during the summer months (Kraus et al., 2016).

Primary threats to humpback whales are fishing gear entanglements and ship strikes. Mortality and serious injury records for large whales in the Western North Atlantic over a 40-year period (1970 to 2009) were reviewed for assessing the magnitude of human related mortalities (van der Hoop et al., 2013). Results showed that roughly 27% of mortalities and serious injuries were humpback whale records. Of the humpback records where a cause could be determined (203 records), 57% of mortalities were caused by entanglements in fishing gear and 15% were attributable to vessel strikes. Glass et al. (2009) reported that between 2002 and 2006, humpback whales belonging to the Gulf of Maine stock were involved in 77 confirmed fishing gear entanglements and nine confirmed ship strikes. Records assessed between 2013 and 2017 resulted in a minimum annual rate of human-caused mortality and serious injury to the Gulf of Maine stock of 12.15 animals per year (NMFS, 2019b). This value includes an annual rate of incidental fishery interactions (7.75) and vessel strikes (4.4) (NMFS, 2019b). In 2016, a high number of humpback mortalities prompted NMFS to declare a UME starting in January (NMFS, 2019e). As of 26 July 2019, a total of 100 humpback whales have been found dead between Maine and Florida. Of these mortalities, 7 occurred in Delaware, 2 in Maryland, 7 in New Jersey, and 19 in New York. Of the carcasses examined, approximately 50% had evidence of human interaction such as vessel strike or entanglement (NMFS, 2019e).

On 8 September 2016, NMFS published a final decision changing the status of humpback whales under the ESA (81 *FR* 62259), effective as of 11 October 2016. Previously, humpback whales were listed under the ESA as an endangered species worldwide. In the 2016 decision, NMFS recognized the existence of 14 distinct population segments (DPSs), of which four were listed as endangered, one was listed as threatened, and the remaining nine did not warrant protection under the ESA. A status review of the humpback whale was undertaken by NMFS in 2015 (Bettridge et al., 2015) to identify taxonomic units such as DPSs and assess the extinction risk of these units. To be considered a DPS, a population or group of populations must be "discrete" from the remainder of the taxon to which it belongs; and "significant" to the taxon to which it belongs. Information on distribution, ecological situation, genetics, and other factors is used to evaluate a population's discreteness and significance. This review process resulted in the identification of a West Indies DPS, which includes the Gulf of Maine stock. The West Indies DPS was considered not to be at risk of extinction. Subsequently, the Gulf of Maine stock is not a strategic stock and no critical habitat has been designated for the humpback whale (NMFS, 2019b).

Like other large whales, increases in noise levels may affect this species' ability to transmit and access acoustic cues in the environment. For example, Clark et al. (2009) predicted an 8% reduction in communication space due to shipping for singing humpback whales in the Northeast. Humpbacks are LF species but have one of the most varied vocal repertoires of the baleen whales. Male humpbacks will arrange vocalizations into a complex, repetitive sequence to produce a characteristic "song." Songs are variable, but typically occupy frequency bands between 300 and 3,000 Hz and last upwards of 10 minutes. Songs are predominately produced while on breeding grounds; however, they have been recorded on feeding grounds throughout the year (Clark and Clapham, 2004; Vu et al., 2012). Typical feeding calls are centered at 500 Hz with some other calls and songs reaching 20 kHz. Common humpback calls also contain a series of grunts between 25 and 1,900 Hz as well as strong, LF pulses (with SLs up to 176 dB re 1 µPa m) between 25 and 90 Hz (Clark and Clapham, 2004; Vu et al., 2012).

4.1.3 Fin Whale

Fin whales are a widely distributed species found in all oceans of the world. The fin whale is listed as endangered under the ESA and a Final Recovery Plan for fin whales is available for review (NMFS, 2010). Fin whales transit between summer feeding grounds in the high latitudes and their wintering, calving, or mating habitats in low latitudes or offshore. However, acoustic records indicate that fin whale populations may be less migratory than other mysticetes whose populations make distinct annual migrations (Watkins et al., 2000). Fin whales typically feed on sand lance, capelin (*Mallotus villosus*), euphausiids, herring, copepods, and cephalopods (i.e., squid) in deeper waters near the edge of the continental shelf (90 to 180 m) but will migrate towards coastal areas following prey distribution.

The fin whales that occur with the Project Area are part of the Western North Atlantic stock of fin whales. This is considered a strategic stock because fin whales are listed as endangered throughout their range. In February 2019, NMFS undertook a 5-year status review (NMFS, 2019f) of the fin whale and determined that there should be no change in its listing status. The best population abundance estimate is 7,418 individuals (minimum population estimate for this stock is 6,029) (NMFS, 2019b).

Along the U.S. Atlantic seaboard they are mainly found from Cape Hatteras northward with a distribution in both continental shelf and deep water habitats (Hayes et al., 2019). The Northern fin whale subspecies is found within the Project Area. Fin whales accounted for 46% of the large whales sighted during aerial surveys along the continental shelf (CETAP, 1982) between Cape Hatteras and Nova Scotia from 1978 to 1982. Two well-known feeding grounds for fin whales are present near the Project Area in the Great South Channel and Jeffrey's Ledge and in waters directly east of Montauk, New York (Hayes et al., 2019; Kenney and Vigness-Raposa, 2010). The highest occurrences are identified south of Montauk Point to south of Nantucket (Kenney and Vigness-Raposa, 2010). Surveys conducted in the RI – MA WEA indicate fin whales may be present year-round, but sightings were the highest during the spring and summer (Kraus et al., 2019).

Threats to fin whales are entanglements in fishing gear and ship strikes. For the time period between 2013 through 2017, the minimum annual rate of human-caused mortality and serious injury to fin whales was 2.35 per year. This value includes 1.55 fishery interaction records per year and 0.8 vessel strike records per year (NMFS, 2019b). The total human-caused mortality and serious injury is less than the calculated PBR; however, it cannot be considered insignificant due to uncertainties regarding these estimates and the current endangered status of this population which make this a strategic stock under the MMPA. There is no designated critical habitat for this stock (NMFS, 2019b).

Fin whales are LF cetaceans that produce short-duration, down sweep calls between 15 and 30 Hz, typically termed "20-Hz pulses" as well as tonal calls up to 150 Hz. The SL of the fin whale vocalizations can reach 186 dB re1 µPa m, making it one of the most powerful biological sounds in the ocean (Charif et al., 2002).

4.1.4 Sei Whale

Sei whales are a widespread species throughout the world's temperate, subpolar, subtropical, and tropical oceans (Waring et al., 2015). It is very similar in appearance to fin and Bryde's whales (*Balaenoptera edeni*). Two subspecies of sei whales are currently recognized (Committee on Taxonomy, 2018) and the Northern sei whale (*B. b. borealis*) is known to occur within the Project Area. The sei whales occurring in the Project Area are part of the Nova Scotia stock (formerly the Western North Atlantic stock). Sei whales are most common in deeper waters along the continental shelf edge (Hayes et al., 2017) but will forage occasionally in shallower, inshore waters. The average spring abundance estimate for surveys conducted between 2010 and 2013 is 6,292 which is considered the best available abundance estimate for the Nova Scotia stock because these surveys covered the largest portion of its range (NMFS, 2019b).

Sei whales are most abundant in Northeastern U.S. waters during the spring, with sightings concentrated along the eastern and southwestern margins of Georges Bank in the area of Hydrographer Canyon (CETAP, 1982). Small groups of sei whales have also been reported south of Montauk Point, New York and Block Island, Rhode Island (Kenney and Vigness-Raposa, 2010). The sei whale feeds primarily on euphausiids and copepods, but will also prey upon fish, and local abundance is largely driven by prey availability. The occurrence and abundance of sei whales on feeding grounds may shift dramatically from one year to the next. CETAP surveys observed sei whales along the continental shelf edge only during the spring and summer (CETAP, 1982). This agrees with sightings in the RI – MA WEA where sei whales were also only observed during the spring (eight sightings) and summer (13 sightings). No sightings were reported in the WEA during the fall and winter (Kraus et al., 2016).

From 2013 through 2017, the minimum rate of confirmed human-caused serious injury and mortality to the Nova Scotia stock was 1.0 per year, which was attributed to fisheries interactions (0.2) and vessel strikes (0.8) (NMFS, 2019b). The Nova Scotia stock is strategic because the species is listed as endangered under the ESA and the average human-related mortality and serious injury exceeds the PBR. There is no designated critical habitat for this species (NMFS, 2019b).

There are limited confirmed sei whale vocalizations; however, studies indicate that this species produces several, mainly LF (<1,000 Hz) vocalizations. Several calls attributed to sei whales include pulse trains up to 3 kHz, broadband "growl" and "whoosh" sounds between 100 and 600 Hz, tonal calls and upsweeps between 200 and 600 Hz, and down sweeps between 34 and 100 Hz (Baumgartner et al., 2008; Rankin and Barlow, 2007; McDonald et al., 2005).

4.1.5 Minke Whale

The minke whale is a small mysticete that is divided into two species: the common minke whale and the Antarctic minke whale. The common minke whale is further divided into three subspecies (Committee on Taxonomy, 2018). The subspecies *B. a. acutorostrata* occurs throughout the North Atlantic. Generally, minke whales occupy warmer waters during the winter and travel north to colder regions in the summer, with some animals migrating as far as the ice edge. Minke whales are frequently observed in coastal or shelf waters along with humpback and fin whales owing to their piscivorous feeding habitats where prey includes sand lance and herring (Hayes et al., 2019). The current best abundance estimate for the Canadian East Coast stock is 24,202 (NMFS, 2019b).

The minke whales that occur within the Project Area are part of the Canadian East Coast stock, which is one of four stocks in the North Atlantic. Little is known about their specific migratory behavior compared to other large whale species; however, acoustic detections show that minke whales migrate south in mid-October to early November and return from wintering grounds starting in March through early April (Risch et al., 2014). Northward migration appears to track the warmer waters of the Gulf Stream along the continental shelf, while southward migration is made farther offshore (Risch et al., 2014). Surveys conducted in the RI – MA WEA, reported 103 minke whale sightings within the area, predominantly in the spring (76) followed by summer (26) and fall (1) (Kraus et al., 2016).

Like other baleen whales, threats to minke whales include ship strikes and fisheries interactions. However, unlike the larger whales, minke whales are more susceptible to bycatch threats from bottom trawls, lobster trap/pot, gillnet, and purse seine fisheries. During the period from 2013 to 2017, the average annual minimum detected human-caused mortality and serious injury was 8.0 minke whales per year. This number was composed of 0.2 whales per year from U.S. fisheries bycatch, 6.6 whales per year from U.S. and Canadian entanglement data, and 1.0 whale per year from ship strikes (NMFS, 2019b). Estimated rates of serious injury and mortality are less than the calculated PBR, but it cannot be considered insignificant or approaching zero (NMFS, 2019b). Vessel strikes have been documented from

New York, North Carolina, New Jersey, and Virginia (Hayes et al., 2017). Since January 2017 a UME has been declared due to minke whale mortalities occurring between Maine and South Carolina. As of 26 July 2019, a total of 63 strandings have been reported with 11 of those occurring in New York and four in New Jersey. Examinations for several of the whales showed evidence of human interactions such as vessel strike or entanglement, or infectious disease (NMFS, 2019g). Additionally, minke whales continue to be hunted as part of an ongoing whaling industry in the northeastern North Atlantic, the North Pacific, and Antarctic (Reeves et al., 2012).

Minke whale recordings have resulted in some of the most variable and unique vocalizations of any marine mammals. Common calls for minke whales found in the North Atlantic include repetitive, LF (100 to 500 Hz) pulse trains that may consist of either grunt-like pulses or thump-like pulses. The thumps are very short duration (50 to 70 milliseconds) with peak energy between 100 and 200 Hz. The grunts are slightly longer in duration (165 to 320 milliseconds) with most energy between 80 and 140 Hz. In addition, minke whales will repeat a 6 to 14-minute pattern of 40 to 60 second pulse trains over several hours (Risch et al., 2014). Minke whales produce a unique sound called the "boing" which consists of a short pulse at 1.3 kHz followed by an undulating tonal call around 1.4 kHz. This call was widely recorded but remained unidentified for many years and scientists widely speculated as to its source (Rankin and Barlow, 2005). The call frequency of minke whales suggest a hearing sensitivity higher than that of other baleen whales.

4.2 ODONTOCETES

4.2.1 Sperm Whale

Sperm whales can easily be distinguished in visual surveys by their large, blunt head, narrow underslung jaw, and characteristic blow shape resulting from the S-shaped blowhole set at the front-left of the head (Jefferson et al., 2008). They can be found throughout the world's oceans; they have been observed near the edge of the ice packs in both hemispheres and are also common along the equator. The North Atlantic stock is distributed mainly along the continental shelf edge, over the continental slope, and mid-ocean regions, where they prefer water depths of 600 m or more. Sperm whales are uncommon in waters <300 m deep (Waring et al., 2015). Sperm whales are listed as endangered under the ESA and are considered a strategic stock by NMFS (Waring et al., 2015). Data are insufficient to assess population trends and the current abundance estimate was based on only a fraction of the known stock range (Waring et al., 2015). The best recent abundance estimate for sperm whales is the sum of the estimates from 2016 surveys totaling 4,349, with a minimum population estimate of 3,451 (NMFS, 2019b).

In winter, sperm whales concentrate east and northeast of Cape Hatteras. In spring, distribution shifts northward to east of Delaware and Virginia, and is widespread throughout the central Mid-Atlantic Bight and the southern part of Georges Bank. In the fall, sperm whale occurrence on the continental shelf south of New England reaches peak levels (Waring et al., 2015). Sperm whales were the fifth most commonly sighted large whale in the CETAP study area and were observed in all four seasons. CETAP and NMFS Northeast Fisheries Science Center sightings in shelf-edge and off-shelf waters included many social groups with calves/juveniles (CETAP, 1982). Sperm whales were usually seen at locations corresponding to the tops of the seamounts and rises and did not generally occur over the slopes. Sperm whales were recorded at the surface over depths varying from 800 to 3,500 m. Kraus et al. (2016) reported sightings of sperm whales in the RI – MA WEA during the summer and fall months, with five individuals in August, one in September, and three in June. There have also been occasional strandings in Massachusetts and Long Island (Kenney and Vigness-Raposa, 2010). Although the likelihood of occurrence within the Project Area remains very low, the sperm whale was included as an affected species because of its high seasonal densities east of the Project Area.

Historically, thousands of sperm whales were killed during the early 18th Century. Presently, no hunting is allowed for any purposes in the North Atlantic. Occasionally, sperm whales will become entangled in fishing gear or struck by ships off the east coast of the U.S. However, this rate of mortality is not believed to have biologically significant impacts. The annual average human-caused mortality for 2008 to 2012 was estimated to be 0.8 due to entanglement and vessel strikes. During this same period, a total of 14 sperm whale strandings have been reported in the U.S. and while the reasons for stranding could not be determined for all these cases, possible causes include vessel strikes, entanglement, pollution, and changes to their environment (Waring et al., 2015). However, there were no documented reports of human-cause mortality or serious injury for the period between 2013 and 2017 (NMFS, 2019b). This stock is considered strategic under the MMPA due to its endangered status but since human-caused mortality and serious injury is less than PBR, it is not considered significant (Waring et al., 2015).

Sperm whales are in the MF hearing group with an estimated auditory range of 150 Hz to 160 kHz (Southall et al., 2007). Sperm whales produce short-duration repetitive broadband clicks used for communication and echolocation. These clicks range in frequency from 0.1 to 30 kHz, with dominant frequencies between the 2 to 4 kHz and 10 to 16 kHz ranges (Department of the Navy [DoN], 2008). Echolocation clicks from adult sperm whales are highly directional clicks and have a SL estimated at up to 236 dB re 1 μPa m.

4.2.2 Risso's Dolphin

Risso's dolphins are large dolphins with a characteristic blunt head and light coloration, often with extensive scarring. They are widely distributed in tropical and temperate seas. In the Western North Atlantic they occur from Florida to eastern Newfoundland (Leatherwood et al., 1976; Baird and Stacey, 1991). Off the U.S. Northeast Coast, Risso's dolphins are primarily distributed along the continental shelf, but can also be found swimming in shallower waters to the mid-shelf (Waring et al., 2016).

The status of the Western North Atlantic stock of the Risso's dolphin in the U.S. Atlantic Exclusive Economic Zone is not well documented. An abundance estimate of 35,493 for this stock was generated from a shipboard and aerial survey conducted between Florida and Newfoundland during 2016 (NMFS, 2019b). Risso's dolphins are not listed as threatened or endangered under the ESA and the Western North Atlantic stock is not considered strategic under the MMPA.

Risso's dolphins are widely distributed in tropical and temperate seas. In the Western North Atlantic they occur from Florida to eastern Newfoundland (Leatherwood et al., 1976; Baird and Stacey, 1991). Risso's dolphins occur along the continental shelf edge from Cape Hatteras to Georges Bank during spring, summer, and autumn. In winter, they occur in continental shelf slope waters within the Mid-Atlantic Bight (Waring et al., 2014). The majority of sightings during 2011 AMAPPS surveys occurred along the continental shelf break with generally lower sighting rates over the continental slope (Palka, 2012). Offshore Rhode Island, Risso's dolphin have been observed year-round, with a peak abundance during the summer. This species is primarily observed along the continental shelf break, with few individuals seen in waters shallower than 100 m (Kenney and Vigness-Raposa, 2010). Only two Risso's dolphins were observed in the RI – MA WEA during spring (Kraus et al., 2016).

Entanglement and fisheries interactions are to the primary threats to Risso's dolphins in the U.S. Atlantic. Estimated annual rates of serious injury and mortality for 2013 to 2017 were 53.9 mortalities in observed fisheries and 0.4 mortalities from non-fishery-related strandings (NMFS, 2019b). There were 38 strandings were reported during this period, three of which had confirmed evidence of human interactions (NMFS, 2019b). Total human-related mortality does not exceed the calculated PBR but is not considered to be insignificant or approaching zero for this population (NMFS, 2019b).

Risso's dolphins are in the MF functional hearing group, with an estimated auditory bandwidth of 150 Hz to 160 kHz (Southall et al., 2007). Vocalizations range from 400 Hz to 65 kHz (DoN, 2008).

4.2.3 Long-finned Pilot Whale

There are two species of pilot whale in the Western North Atlantic: long-finned (*G. melas*) and short-finned (*G. macrorhynchus*). The species overlap, are difficult to tell apart, and parameters that define their distributions are not well differentiated. The best distinguishing characteristic of the long-finned pilot whale are the long, slender flippers, which are typically not visible during aerial or shipboard surveys (Jefferson et al., 2011). However, it is generally accepted that pilot whale sightings above approximately 42° N are most likely long-finned pilot whales (Waring et al., 2015). Short-finned pilot whales prefer warmer or tropical waters and are considered rare in New England. In the Northeastern U.S., they are typically sighted in deeper waters offshore near the Gulf Stream, but given the limited observations of this species in New England, they are not expected to occur in the Project Area and will not be discussed further (Kenney and Vigness-Raposa, 2010; Hayes et al., 2019).

Long-finned pilot whales occur over the continental slope in high densities during winter and spring then move inshore and into shelf waters during summer and autumn following prey populations of cephalopods (i.e., squid) and mackerel (*Scomber* spp.) (Reeves et al., 2012). They will also readily feed on other fish, cephalopods, and crustaceans. Pilot whales are common in central and northern Georges Bank, Great South Channel, Stellwagen Bank, and Gulf of Maine during the summer and early fall (May and October) (Hayes et al., 2019). Long-finned pilot whales are highly social and vocal and are typically observed in groups of 10 to 20 surface-active individuals. Long-finned pilot whales are not listed as threatened or endangered, and the Western North Atlantic stock is not considered strategic under the MMPA. The best population estimate for the Western North Atlantic stock of long-finned pilot whales is 39,215 individuals (NMFS, 2019b).

Pilot whales are distributed along the continental shelf waters off the Northeastern U.S. coast in the winter and early spring. By late spring, pilot whales migrate into more northern waters including Georges Bank and the Gulf of Maine and will remain there until fall (Hayes et al., 2019). Long-finned pilot whales concentrate along the Northeast U.S. shelf edge between the 100 m and 1,000 m isobaths during mid-winter and early spring (CETAP, 1982). In late spring, pilot whales move from the mid-Atlantic region onto Georges Bank and the Scotian Shelf, and into the Gulf of Mexico, where they remain through late autumn (CETAP, 1982). Pilot whales generally occur in areas of high relief or submerged banks and are also associated with the Gulf Stream wall and thermal fronts along the continental shelf edge (Hamazaki, 2002). Pilot whales are highly social and vocal and are typically observed in groups of 10 to 20. Pilot whales are highly social and vocal and are typically observed in groups of 10 to 20 surface-active individuals. Within the RI – MA WEA, no sightings of pilot whales were observed during the summer, fall, or winter (Kraus et al., 2016).

A source of mortality and injury to long-finned pilot whales is through bycatch during gillnet fishing, pelagic trawling, longline fishing, and purse seine fishing. For the period between 2013 and 2017, the observed average fishery-related mortality or serious injury was 21 long-finned pilot whales per year (NMFS, 2019b). The highest observed bycatch rate for all pilot whales occurred in the pelagic longline fishery with peak bycatch occurring during September and October along the mid-Atlantic coast. However, based on biopsy data, the majority, if not all, of the bycatch whales were short-finned. Other fisheries mortalities (i.e., bottom trawls, mid-water trawls, gillnet) are more frequently observed north of 40° N; therefore, these fisheries likely have a higher proportional impact on long-finned pilot whales. Mean human-caused annual mortality and serious injury does not exceed the calculated PBR for this stock; however, it is not considered insignificant or approaching zero. There is no designated critical habitat for this species (NMFS, 2019b).

Long-finned pilot whales also demonstrate a propensity to mass strand; however, the role that human activities play in these strandings is not known. From 2013 to 2017, 16 long-finned pilot whales stranded between Maine and Florida. Bioaccumulated toxins are also a potential source of human-caused source of mortality in pilot whales. Polychlorinated biphenyls and chlorinated pesticides (i.e., DDT, DDE, dieldrin, etc.) have been found in pilot whale blubber (Muir et al., 1988; Weisbrod et al., 2000) and bioaccumulation levels of these toxins were more similar in whales from the same stranding group than from animals within the same sex or age category (Weisbrod et al., 2000).

Long-finned pilot whales are part of the MF hearing group with an estimated auditory bandwidth of 150 Hz to 160 kHz (Southall et al., 2007). All pilot whales echolocate and produce tonal calls. Long-finned pilot whales produce burst-pulses which ranged from 100 to 22,000 Hz. The primary tonal calls of the long-finned pilot whale range from 1 to 8 kHz with a mean duration of about 1 second. The calls can be varied with seven categories identified (level, falling, rising, up-down, down-up, waver, and multi-hump) and are likely associated with specific social activities (Vester et al., 2014).

4.2.4 Atlantic White-Sided Dolphin

The AWS dolphin is a robust animal characterized by a strongly "keeled" tail stock and distinctive color pattern (Jefferson et al., 2008; Waring et al., 2015). The AWS dolphin occurs primarily along the 100-m depth contour within temperate and subpolar waters of the North Atlantic. Seasonally, AWS dolphins occupy northern, inshore waters during summer and southern, offshore waters in the winter. AWS dolphins that potentially occur in the Project Area are all part of the Western North Atlantic stock, which inhabit waters from central West Greenland to North Carolina (about 35° N) (Waring et al., 2015). There is some evidence supporting the division of the Western Atlantic population into three separate stocks; however, this has not been clearly established (Hayes et al, 2019). The estimated average annual human-related mortality does not exceed the PBR for this stock and the AWS dolphin is not listed as threatened or endangered; therefore, the stock is not considered strategic under the MMPA. The best abundance estimate for the Western North Atlantic AWS dolphin stock is 93,233 (NMFS, 2019b).

AWS dolphins feed on a variety of fish such as herring, hake (*Merluccius* spp.), smelt (*Osmerus* spp.), capelin, and cod (*Gadus* spp.) as well as cephalopods and crustaceans (i.e., squid and shrimp). Like many dolphins, this species is highly gregarious and will often travel in groups of 100 or more and are highly vocal when in these aggregations. Breeding takes place between May and August with most calves born in June and July (Rasmussen and Miller, 2002).

Prior to the 1970s, AWS dolphins in U.S. waters were found primarily offshore on the continental slope, while white-beaked dolphins (*L. albirostris*) were found on the continental shelf. During the 1970s, there was an apparent switch in habitat use between these two species. This shift may have been a result of the decrease in herring and increase in sand lance in the continental shelf waters (Katona et al., 1993; Kenney et al., 1996). AWS dolphins are opportunistic feeders and their diet is based on available prey (Craddock et al., 2009). AWS dolphins primarily inhabit continental shelf waters, shoreward of the 100-m depth contour (CETAP, 1982; Hayes et al., 2019). Most of the sightings during CETAP surveys were seen in depths ranging from approximately 38 to 271 m. Sightings were concentrated in coastal waters near Cape May and in shallow waters within the Gulf of Maine (CETAP, 1982). The Gulf of Maine population is commonly seen from the Hudson Canyon to Georges Bank. Sightings south of Georges Bank and Hudson Canyon occur year-round; however, at lower densities (Hayes et al., 2019). Offshore Rhode Island, AWS dolphins were common in continental shelf waters, with a slight tendency to occur in shallower waters in the spring (Kenney and Vigness-Raposa, 2010). Records indicate that there is an aggregation of sightings southeast of Montauk Point during the spring and summer. In the RI – MA WEA, 185 individual AWS dolphins were sighted primarily during summer (112 individuals) followed by fall (70 individuals) (Kraus et al., 2016).

Mortality to AWS dolphins resulting from fisheries interactions averaged 26 dolphins per year between 2013 and 2017. This number was comprised of recorded mortality or serious injury from gillnets (2.8 per year), bottom trawls (21 per year), and mid-water trawls (1.9 per year) (NMFS, 2019b). There was a total of 123 documented strandings of this species during this period; human interaction, such as pollution, was indicated for four of these cases (NMFS, 2019b). The total human-caused annual mortality and serious injury is less than the calculated PBR but is not considered insignificant or approaching zero (NMFS, 2019b).

AWS dolphins are in the MF hearing group with an estimated auditory bandwidth of 150 Hz to 160 kHz (Southall et al., 2007). Their vocalizations range from 6 to 15 kHz (DoN, 2008).

4.2.5 Common Dolphin

The common dolphin may be one of the most widely distributed species of cetaceans, as it is found worldwide in temperate, tropical, and subtropical seas (Waring et al., 2015). Two species were previously recognized: the long beaked common dolphin (*D. capensis*) and the short-beaked common dolphin; however, Cunha et al. (2015) summarized the relevant data and analyses, along with additional molecular data and analysis, and recommended that the long beaked common dolphin not be further used for the Atlantic stock. This taxonomic convention is used by the Society for Marine Mammalogy. The best population estimate for this stock is 172,825. The species is not listed as threatened or endangered under the ESA, and the stock is not classified as a strategic or depleted stock (NMFS, 2019b).

Common dolphins are distributed in waters off the U.S. East Coast from Cape Hatteras to Georges Bank (35° N to 42° N) during mid-January to May and move as far north as the Scotian Shelf from mid-summer to autumn (CETAP, 1982; Hamazaki, 2002; Hayes et al., 2019; Selzer and Payne, 1988). Primarily occurring at the shelf and shelf break along the Gulf Stream, however, common dolphins are known to occur in both nearshore and deep offshore waters (Perrin, 2002). Common dolphins aggregate in large schools numbering in the hundreds, although the typical group size is 30 or fewer (Reeves et al., 2012).

Kraus et al. (2016) observed 3,896 individual common dolphins within the RI – MA WEA. Summer surveys observed the most individuals (1,964) followed by fall (725), winter (132), then spring (75).

The common dolphin feeds on small schooling fish and squid; as such, common dolphins are subject to bycatch in gillnets, pelagic trawls, and longline fisheries (Reeves et al., 2012; NMFS, 2019b). During 2013 to 2017, an estimated average of 419 common dolphins were taken each year in fisheries activities, plus 0.2 per year from research takes (NMFS, 2019b). Over 600 common dolphins were reported stranded between Maine and Florida during this period; 30 of these cases showed signs of human interaction such as entanglement or fishery interaction. The total annual mortality and serious injury does not exceed the calculated PBR, but it cannot be considered insignificant or approaching zero for this population. There is no designated critical habitat for this species (NMFS, 2019b).

Common dolphins are in the MF hearing group with an estimated auditory bandwidth of 150 Hz to 160 kHz (Southall et al., 2007). Their vocalizations range widely from 200 Hz to 150 kHz (DoN, 2008).

4.2.6 Atlantic Spotted Dolphin

Atlantic spotted dolphins are widely distributed in tropical and warm temperate waters of the Western North Atlantic (Leatherwood et al., 1976). They range from southern New England, south through the Gulf of Mexico, and the Caribbean to Venezuela (Leatherwood et al., 1976; Perrin et al., 1994). Atlantic spotted dolphins are not listed as threatened or endangered under the ESA. Atlantic species of spotted dolphins were not differentiated during surveys, resulting in insufficient data to determine the population trends. The stock status is also unknown (Waring et al., 2014). The best estimate of abundance derived from 2016 surveys for the Western North Atlantic stock of Atlantic spotted dolphins is 39,921 (NMFS, 2019b).

There are few reported occurrences of spotted dolphins (*Stenella* spp.) in the Project Area. CETAP reported 126 spotted dolphin sightings over the course of 3-year study. The CETAP data for 1982 observed 40 individuals south of Block Island (CETAP, 1982). NMFS shipboard surveys conducted during June-August between central Virginia and the Lower Bay of Fundy reported 542 to 860 individual sightings from two separate visual teams (Palka et al., 2017).

Between 2013 and 2017, 21 Atlantic spotted dolphins were reported stranded in the U.S. Atlantic. None showed definitive signs of human interaction (NMFS, 2019b). There have been no recent reports of injury or mortality due to fisheries interactions and is therefore considered insignificant for this population. There is no designated critical habitat for this population (NMFS, 2019b).

Atlantic spotted dolphins are in the MF hearing group with an estimated auditory bandwidth of 150 Hz to 160 kHz (Southall et al., 2007). Vocalizations typically range from 100 Hz to 130 kHz (DoN, 2008).

4.2.7 Common Bottlenose Dolphin

The common bottlenose dolphin occupies a wide variety of habitats, occurring in both peripheral seas and oceans in tropical and temperate climates (Stewart et al., 2002). They are common all along the U.S. East Coast year-round (Hayes et al., 2018). Within the Western North Atlantic, there are two distinct common bottlenose dolphin forms, or morphotypes: coastal and offshore. The two forms are genetically and morphologically distinct although regionally variable (Jefferson et al., 2008; Waring et al., 2015). Both inhabit waters in the Western North Atlantic Ocean (Hersh and Duffield, 1989; Mead and Potter, 1995; Curry and Smith, 1997) along the U.S. Atlantic coast. The common bottlenose dolphin is not listed as threatened or endangered under the ESA.

The Western North Atlantic offshore stock expected to occur in the Project Area is not listed as depleted under the MMPA. The offshore stock is distributed primarily along the outer continental shelf and slope, from Georges Bank to Cape Hatteras during the spring and summer (CETAP, 1982; Kenney, 1990). Stock status within U.S. Atlantic waters is unknown and data are insufficient to determine population trends. The best available abundance estimate for the offshore morphotype of common bottlenose dolphins in the Western North Atlantic is 62,851 (NMFS, 2019b).

Spatial distribution data and genetic studies indicate the coastal morphotype comprises multiple stocks distributed throughout coastal and estuarine waters of the U.S. East Coast. The northern migratory coastal stock ranges from North Carolina to New York (Hayes et al., 2018). All coastal stocks are listed as depleted (Waring et al., 2010). The best abundance estimates for the northern migratory coastal stock of common bottlenose dolphin is 6,639 (NMFS, 2019b). The northern migratory coastal stock's summer range has been identified between upper New Jersey and Virginia (Hayes et al., 2018). During winter months, bottlenose dolphins are rarely observed north of the North Carolina-Virginia border, and their northern distribution appears to be limited by water temperatures <9.5°C (Garrison et al., 2003).

Common bottlenose dolphins were observed in the RI – MA WEA in all seasons with the highest seasonal abundance estimates during the fall, summer, and spring. The greatest concentrations of bottlenose dolphins were observed in the southernmost portion of the RI – MA WEA (Kraus et al., 2016). Common bottlenose dolphins occurring within the Project Area are likely to come from the offshore population, as the seasonal stranding records match the temporal patterns of the offshore stock than the coastal stock (Kenney and Vigness-Raposa, 2010). Therefore, the northern migratory coastal stock is not likely to occur in the Project Area and will not be discussed further.

Total annual fishery-caused mortality and serious injury for the offshore stock of common bottlenose dolphin from 2013 to 2017 was estimated to be 28 due to interactions with sink gillnet and bottom trawl fisheries (NMFS, 2019b). Total human-caused mortality and serious injury for this stock is considered insignificant, and this stock is not strategic under the MMPA. There is no designated critical habitat for this species (NMFS, 2019b).

Common bottlenose dolphins are in the MF hearing group, with an estimated auditory bandwidth of 150 Hz to 160 kHz (Southall et al., 2007). Bottlenose dolphin vocalization frequencies range from 3.4 to 130 kHz (DoN, 2008).

4.2.8 Harbor Porpoise

The harbor porpoise is the only porpoise species found in the Atlantic. It is a small, stocky cetacean with a blunt, short-beaked head. There are four subspecies, with *P. phocoena* residing in the North Atlantic (Committee on Taxonomy, 2018). The harbor porpoises that occur in the Project Area comprise the Gulf of Maine/Bay of Fundy stock. This stock is not considered strategic under the MMPA because they are not listed as threatened or endangered. In 2001, NMFS conducted a status review for the stock, mainly due to the level of bycatch in fisheries (66 *FR* 53195). The determination from the review was that listing the harbor porpoise under the ESA was not warranted and the species was removed from the candidate list. Population trends for this species are unknown. The best, and most recent, abundance estimate for harbor porpoise in the Gulf of Maine/Bay of Fundy stock is 95,543 (NMFS, 2019b).

Harbor porpoises commonly occur throughout Massachusetts Bay from September through April. During the fall and spring, harbor porpoises are widely distributed along the U.S. East Coast from New Jersey to Maine. During the summer, the porpoises are concentrated in the Northern Gulf of Maine and Southern Bay of Fundy in water depths <150 m. In winter, densities increase in waters off New Jersey to North Carolina and decrease in the waters from New York to New Brunswick; however, specific migratory timing or routes are not apparent (Wingfield et al., 2017; Hayes et al., 2019).

Harbor porpoise occurrence offshore Rhode Island is highly seasonal with most sightings occurring predominantly in winter and spring and relatively few in summer and fall (Kenney and Vigness-Raposa, 2010). They are most commonly reported in eastern Long Island Sound, Gardiner's Bay, and Peconic Bay during the winter. They have the greatest abundance on the continental shelf offshore Rhode Island during the spring when they are known to migrate from their offshore wintering habitat in the mid-Atlantic to their summer feeding grounds in the Gulf of Maine (Kenney and Vigness-Raposa, 2010). Within the RI – MA WEA, Kraus et al. (2016) observed 121 individual harbor porpoises throughout the course of the study. Fall observations included the most individuals (49) followed by winter (35), spring (36), and summer (1). Vertical camera detections of all small cetaceans showed that the most commonly detected species over time was the harbor porpoise (Kraus et al., 2016).

Harbor porpoise feed on small schooling fish such as mackerel, herring, and cod, as well as worms, cephalopods (i.e., squid), and sand eels (*Hyperoplus* spp.). Their foraging habits and habitats make this species particularly susceptible to mortality in bottom-set gill nets (Waring et al., 2015). The average estimated human-caused mortality or serious injury for this stock is 217 harbor porpoises per year, derived from U.S. fisheries observer data (NMFS, 2019b). In 2010, a final rule was published for the existing Harbor Porpoise Take Reduction Plan in the Federal Register (75 *FR* 7383) to address closure areas and timing based on bycatch rates. A total of 383 harbor porpoises were stranded in the U.S. between 2013 and 2017, 26 of which showed evidence for human interaction such as entanglement or fishery interaction. The total annual human-related mortality rates do not exceed the PBR but cannot be considered insignificant or approaching zero. There is no designated critical habitat for this species (NMFS, 2019b).

The harbor porpoise is the only potentially affected species in the Project Area within the HF hearing group that uses ultrasonic echolocation clicks to navigate and hunt prey. The click frequency is between 110 and 150 kHz, which is consistent with harbor porpoise hearing sensitivity centered between 100 and 120 kHz (Thompson et al., 2013). Click trains can have very short inter-click intervals when close to a prey item which results in a "feeding buzz" due to the rapid succession of individual clicks, making them highly identifiable in acoustic surveys.

4.3 PHOCIDS

4.3.1 Harbor Seal

The harbor seal is found in all nearshore waters of the Atlantic Ocean and adjoining seas north of 30° N (Hayes et al., 2019). In the Western North Atlantic, they are distributed from Eastern Canada to southern New England and New York, and occasionally to the Carolinas (Payne and Selzer, 1989). Harbor seals are the most abundant seals in the Eastern U.S.; they are not listed as threatened or endangered. The harbor seals within the Project Area are part of the single Western North Atlantic stock, which is not considered strategic under the MMPA. The best population estimate of harbor seals for this stock is 75,834 (NMFS, 2019b).

Harbor seals will exploit a variety of available food sources and will feed both in shallow coastal habitats and offshore (Waring, 2015). Typical prey items include cephalopods (i.e., squid) and small schooling fish (i.e., herring, alewife [*Alosa pseudoharengus*], flounder [*Paralichthys* spp. and *Pseudopleuronectes* spp.), redfish [*Sciaenops ocellatus*], cod, yellowtail flounder [*Pleuronectes ferruginea*], sand eel, hake) and they spend up to 85% of the day diving, presumably foraging.

Harbor seals are the most abundant seals in the Northeastern U.S. They can be found year-round in the coastal waters of Eastern Canada and Maine (Hayes et al., 2019). Harbor seals occur seasonally along the southern New England and New York coasts from September through late May although evidence suggests they may remain in this region over longer time period (Schneider and Payne, 1983; Barlas, 1999; deHart, 2002). Survey data collected from NMFS and the Provincetown Center for Coastal Research reported 151 harbor seal sightings in this region, a large concentration of which were observed near the coast from eastern Long Island to Buzzards Bay and Vineyard Sound. There were occurrences of harbor seals offshore; however, abundances offshore were lower than what was observed near haul-out sites (Kenney and Vigness-Raposa, 2010). No pupping areas have been identified in southern New England, but there are several haul-out sites on Block Island and six haul-out sites have been identified in Narragansett Bay (Barlas, 1999; Kenney and Vigness-Raposa, 2010). They are most commonly observed at the Dumplings off Jamestown at Rome Point in North Kingstown. Nearly all the haul-outs within Narragansett Bay are rocky ledges or isolated rocks with the exception of Spar Island which is a man-made dredge spoil (Kenney and Vigness-Raposa, 2010).

Fisheries interactions are common, and harbor seals are legally killed in Canada, Norway, and the United Kingdom to protect fish farms or local fisheries (Reeves et al., 2013). They are also susceptible to bycatch in gillnets, trawls, and purse seines. For the period from 2013 to 2017, the average human-caused mortality and serious injury to harbor seals was 350 per year, of which 338 occurred in fisheries interactions. Other causes of mortality for this population include human interactions such as vessel strikes, pollution, and harassment; storms; abandonment by the mother; disease; and predation (Hayes et al., 2019). Since July 2018 a UME has been declared for both the harbor seal and gray seal due to mortalities throughout the Northeast U.S. Based on results of preliminary examinations, the 2,812 strandings (which include both species) are likely the result of phocine distemper virus (NMFS, 2019h). The total human-caused mortality and serious injury does not exceed PBR but cannot be considered insignificant for this population (NMFS, 2019b).

Harbor seals belong to the PW hearing group. Male harbor seals produce underwater vocalizations during mating season to attract females and defend territories (Sabisnky et al., 2012). These calls are comprised of "growls" or "roars" with a peak energy at 1.2 kHz (Sabinsky et al., 2012). Captive studies have shown that harbor seals have good (>50%) sound detection thresholds between 0.1 and 80 kHz, with primary sound detection between 0.5 and 40 kHz (Kastelein et al., 2009).

4.3.2 Gray Seal

Gray seals within the Project Area are part of the Western North Atlantic stock. They are not listed as threatened or endangered and the stock is not considered strategic under the MMPA. The best population estimate of gray seals for this stock is 27,131 (Hayes et al., 2019). A U.S. population estimate for this species is not available; however, the Canadian gray seal population was estimated to be 424,300 in 2016 (NMFS, 2019b). Gray seals will aggregate in large numbers to breed, molt, and rest. Gray seals will exploit a variety of available food sources and will feed both in shallow coastal habitats and offshore (Waring, 2015). Typical prey items include cephalopods, sessile organisms, small schooling fish (i.e., herring, alewife, flounder, redfish, cod, yellowtail flounder, sand eel, hake), and crustaceans. Gray seals will go on extensive dives to depths to 475 m to capture food (Waring, 2015).

The gray seal has a year-round range from Canada to Massachusetts and may seasonally migrate further south to northern parts of New Jersey between September and May (Hayes et al., 2019). Historically, gray seals were relatively absent from Rhode Island and nearby waters. However, with the recent recovery of the Massachusetts and Canadian populations, their occurrence has increased in southern New England waters (Kenney and Vigness-Raposa, 2010). In New York, gray seals are typically seen alongside harbor seal haul-outs. Two frequent sighting locations include Great Gull Island and Fisher's Island (Kenney and Vigness-Raposa, 2010). Two breeding and pupping grounds have also been identified near the Project Area in Nantucket Sound at Monomoy and Muskeget Island (Hayes et al., 2019). Gray seals have been observed using the historic pupping site on Muskeget Island in Massachusetts since 1990 (Wood LaFond, 2009).

Gray seals are susceptible to bycatch and fisheries interactions and, like the harbor seal, are legally killed in some countries to protect fisheries resources. The gray seal is also taken commercially outside the U.S. The average estimated human-caused mortality and serious injury of gray seals between 2013 and 2017 was 5,410 seals per year for both the U.S. and Canada (NMFS, 2019b). As discussed in **Section 4.3.1**, there is currently a UME declared for this population likely due to viral infection (NMFS, 2019h). As with the harbor seal, the total annual human-caused mortality and serious injury does not exceed the PBR, but it cannot be considered insignificant (NMFS, 2019b).

Gray seals, like harbor seals, belong to the PW hearing group. As with all pinnipeds they are assigned to hearing groups based on the medium (air or water) through which they are detecting the sounds, for an estimated underwater auditory bandwidth of 75 Hz to 75 kHz (Southall et al., 2007). Vocalizations range from 100 Hz to 3 kHz (DoN, 2008).

5.0 Type of Incidental Take Requested

The Applicant requests an IHA pursuant to Section 101 (a)(5)(D) of the MMPA for incidental take of small numbers of marine mammals by Level B harassment during geophysical surveys conducted as part of site characterizations activities within the Project Area. Proposed activities, as outlined in **Section 1.0**, have the potential to impact marine mammals within the Project Area from sounds generated by survey equipment.

For impulsive and non-impulsive intermittent sources, the maximum range to a Level A threshold is <100 m and Level A takes are not anticipated during HRG surveys. The calculations for Level A (and Level B) assumed that 44% of the full 1,302 days of vessel surveys conducted during the survey window will use the source producing the largest acoustic isopleths (i.e., the Dura-sparks and GeoMarine sparker). The remaining days will use the Innomar parametric sonar equipment for shallow sub-bottom profiling. The Innomar requires use of a USBL and in those cases, the USBL represents the source producing the largest acoustic isopleth. This assumption provides a cautious approach to predicting active survey operations and their potential impact on marine mammal species while also providing a more realistic representation of anticipated equipment-specific survey effort.

The most likely Level B take is expected to result from minor behavioral reactions such as avoidance and temporary displacement for some individuals or groups of marine mammals near the proposed activities. It is expected that the severity of behavioral effects will vary with the duration of operations, the behavior of the animal at the time of reception of the sound, and the distance and received SPL_{rms} of the sound. The Level B take is unlikely to manifest as TTS (Southall et al., 2007) but has the potential in the immediate vicinity (several meters) of the sound source where the received SPLs might be high enough to cause a temporary loss of hearing sensitivity (Holt, 2008). No PTS, physiological damage, or injury is expected to occur to marine mammals from the noise generated by the survey equipment or vessels during proposed surveys.

Potential impacts will be mitigated through a visual monitoring program and associated vessel activity management program, both of which are described in **Section 11.0**.

6.0 Take Estimates for Marine Mammals

The Applicant is seeking authorization for potential "taking" of small numbers of marine mammals under the jurisdiction of NMFS in the proposed region of activity, as described in **Section 2.0**. The 15 species potentially taken are described in **Section 4.0**. Each species has a geographic distribution that encompasses the Project Area and has at least a minimal potential to occur.

Authorization for Level B harassment is sought for the following 15 species:

- North Atlantic right whale;
- Humpback whale;
- Fin whale;
- Sei whale;
- Minke whale;
- Sperm whale;
- Risso's dolphin;
- Long-finned pilot whale;
- Atlantic white-sided dolphin;
- Common dolphin;
- Atlantic spotted dolphin;
- Common bottlenose dolphin;
- Harbor porpoise;
- Harbor seal; and
- Gray seal.

The only anticipated impacts to marine mammals are associated with noise and are limited to the use of HRG survey equipment operating sources less than 200 kHz. The potential activities are not expected to take more than a small number of marine mammals or have more than a negligible effect on their populations based on their seasonal density and distribution and known reactions to underwater sound exposure. The source activity is described in **Section 1.2**, and survey equipment is listed in **Section 1.3**.

6.1 BASIS FOR ESTIMATING NUMBERS OF MARINE MAMMALS THAT MIGHT BE TAKEN BY HARASSMENT

Estimating exposures of marine mammal species assumes that exposure of an animal to a specified noise level within a region of ensonification will result in a take of that animal. The ensonified area is calculated based on the SL and operational mode of the equipment (**Table 3**). Potential Level B take exposures are estimated within the area ensonified as an SPL_{rms} exceeding 160 dB re 1 µPa for non-impulsive intermittent sources (e.g., sonar, CHIRP sonars) and impulsive sources (e.g., sparkers, boomers) within an average day of activity. The potential number of exposed animals is estimated from the mean monthly densities (animals km^{-2}) of a given species expected within the Project Area. These densities are then multiplied by the maximum number of survey days. These calculations result in unmitigated take estimates for each affected species over the entire survey period.

6.1.1 Zone of Influence Calculations

The ZOI is a representation of the maximum extent of the ensonified area around a sound source over a 24-hour period. The ZOI for each piece of equipment operating below 200 kHz was calculated per the following formulae:

Stationary Source: ZOI = πr^2

Mobile Source: ZOI = (Distance/day × 2r) + πr^2

Where r is the linear distance from the source to the isopleth for Level A or Level B thresholds and day = 1 (i.e., 24 hours).

The estimated potential daily active survey distance of 70 km was used as the estimated areal coverage over a 24-hour period. This distance accounts for the vessel traveling at roughly 4 knots and only for periods during which equipment <200 kHz are in operation. A vessel traveling 4 knots can cover approximately 110 km per day; however, based on data from 2017, 2018, and 2019 surveys, survey coverage over a 24-hour period is closer to 70 km per day. For daylight only vessels, the distance is reduced to 35 km per day. The corresponding Level A and Level B ZOIs for each source are based on 24-hour operational period and are provided in **Table 7**.

Table 7. Zone of Influence encompassing Level A and Level B thresholds[1] for each sound source or comparable sound source category.

Source	Level A ZOI (km^2)[2]				Level B ZOI (km^2)[3]
Hearing Group[4]	LF	MF	HF	PW	All
Shallow SBP (CHIRP sonars)					
ET 216 CHIRP	0	0	0.4	0	1.7
ET 424 CHIRP	0	0	0	0	0.6
ET 512i CHIRP	0	0	0	0	0.8
GeoPulse 5430	0.1	0.1	5.1	0	4.1
TB CHIRP III	0.2	0	2.4	0.1	7.6
Parametric SBP					
Innomar Parametric SBPs	0	0.1	0.2	0	0.6
Medium SBP (Boomers and Sparkers)					
AA Triple plate S-Boom (700-1,000 J)	0.1	0	0.7	0	10.7
AA, Dura-spark UHD	0.1	0	0.4	0	19.8
AA, Dura-spark UHD 400+400	0.1	0	0.4	0	19.8
GeoMarine, Geo-Source dual 400 tip Sparker	0.1	0	0.4	0	19.8
Acoustic Corers					
Pangeo Acoustic Corer (LF CHIRP)	0	0	0	0	0
Pangeo Acoustic Corer (HF CHIRP)	0	0	0	0	0
Positioning Systems					
USBLs (all models)	0	0	0.2	0	7.0

AA = Applied Acoustics; CHIRP = compressed high-intensity radiated pulse; ET = EdgeTech; HF = high-frequency; J = joules; LF = low-frequency; MF = mid-frequency; PW = Phocid pinnipeds in water; SBP = sub-bottom profiler; TB = Teledyne Benthos; UHD = ultra-high definition.

[1]The Level A and B isopleths were calculated to comprehensively assess the potential impacts of the predicted source operations as required for this Application. However, as described in **Section 5.0**, Level A takes are not expected.

[2]Based on maximum distances in **Table 4**. For consistency, the metric producing the largest distance to the Level A thresholds (either cumulative sound exposure level or zero to peak sound pressure level) was used to calculate the ZOIs for each hearing group.

[3]Based on maximum distances in **Table 4** calculated for Level B root-mean-square sound pressure level thresholds.

[4]As defined by the National Marine Fisheries Service.

For sources that have operating beamwidths that are less than 180°, the ZOI will be conical below the source with maximum radial propagation widths dependent upon the water depth and absorption. For these equipment cases (CHIRP sonars, boomers, parametric SBPs), the radial distance was calculated using interim recommendations provided from NMFS (2019a) and provided as part of the User Spreadsheet submitted with this application.

The Level A and Level B threshold isopleths were calculated to comprehensively assess the potential impacts of the predicted maximum practicable source operations as required for this Application. However, as described in **Section 5.0**, Level A takes are not expected. A conservative approach to estimate the Level B take distances for the survey was done by using the equipment that produced the greatest Level B isopleth distance from apparent or measured SL to define the impact radii of all proposed equipment within that group. The maximum estimated distance from a geophysical source to the Level B threshold (SPL_{rms} of 160 dB re 1 µPa) were for the sparkers (the Dura-sparks and GeoMarine sparker), all which produced a 141 m threshold range.

6.1.2 Marine Mammal Density Calculation

The density calculation methodology applied to take estimates for this application is derived from the model results produced by Roberts et al. (2016) and draft model results produced by Roberts (2018) for the East Coast region. In order to determine cetacean densities for take estimates, the density coverages that included any portion of the Project Area were selected for all survey months (**Figure 3**). These files were retrieved as raster files from the website http://cetsound.noaa.gov/cda or directly from Roberts (2018) with permission for use. These estimates are considered to be the best information currently available for calculating marine mammal densities in the U.S. Atlantic by NMFS.

Given their size and behavior when in the water, seals are difficult to identify during shipboard visual surveys and limited information is currently available on their distribution. Therefore, density estimates are provided for all seal species that may occur in the Western North Atlantic (i.e., harbor, gray, hooded, harp). Only the harbor seal and gray seal are reasonably expected to occur in the Project Area, and because they have an equal likelihood of occurring in the Project Area densities were evenly split between the two species.



Figure 3. Sample density blocks (Roberts et al., 2016; Roberts, 2018) from models used to determine monthly marine mammal densities within the Project Area.

Given the variability in level of effort between the Lease Areas and the ECR area, densities were separated for the three Lease Areas (OCS-A 0486, 0517, 0487, and 0500) and the ECR area. Densities for Lease Areas 0486 and 0517 were combined as they occupy the same area and densities overlap between the two areas. All density squares intersecting each area were isolated and the average monthly and annual densities were estimated from these value (**Tables 8** to **11**).

Table 8. Estimated monthly and average annual density (animals km^{-2}) of potentially affected marine mammals within Lease Areas OCS-A 0486 and 0517 based on monthly habitat density models (Roberts et al., 2016; Roberts, 2018).

Species	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Average Annual Density (km^{-2})
Low-Frequency Cetaceans													
Fin whale	0.0020	0.0015	0.0016	0.0026	0.0023	0.0022	0.0026	0.0025	0.0020	0.0021	0.0018	0.0023	**0.0021**
Sei whale	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0002	0.0003	0.0001	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0001	**0.0001**
Minke whale	0.0006	0.0007	0.0007	0.0003	0.0005	0.0005	0.0005	0.0004	0.0003	0.0002	0.0006	0.0006	**0.0005**
Humpback whale	0.0010	0.0010	0.0011	0.0008	0.0012	0.0020	0.0012	0.0016	0.0021	0.0022	0.0020	0.0009	**0.0014**
North Atlantic right whale	0.0010	0.0015	0.0022	0.0136	0.0039	0.0023	0.0000	0.0000	0.0002	0.0000	0.0000	0.0011	**0.0021**
Mid-Frequency Cetaceans													
Sperm whale	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0000	0.0001	0.0001	**0.0001**
Atlantic white sided dolphin	0.0140	0.0054	0.0047	0.0115	0.0232	0.0179	0.0119	0.0091	0.0136	0.0169	0.0207	0.0261	**0.0146**
Atlantic spotted dolphin	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	**0.0001**
Common bottlenose dolphin	0.0053	0.0021	0.0008	0.0014	0.0084	0.0167	0.0193	0.0188	0.0235	0.0208	0.0162	0.0076	**0.0117**
Long-finned pilot whale	0.0016	0.0016	0.0016	0.0016	0.0016	0.0016	0.0016	0.0016	0.0016	0.0016	0.0016	0.0016	**0.0016**
Risso's dolphin	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	**0.0000**
Common dolphin	0.0252	0.0103	0.0091	0.0223	0.0681	0.0731	0.0483	0.0529	0.0508	0.0644	0.0746	0.0623	**0.0468**
High-Frequency Cetaceans													
Harbor porpoise	0.0893	0.0486	0.0394	0.0867	0.0516	0.0140	0.0025	0.0013	0.0025	0.0147	0.0050	0.0573	**0.0344**
Pinnipeds in Water[1,2]													
Gray seal	0.0090	0.0090	0.0090	0.0090	0.0090	0.0021	0.0021	0.0021	0.0090	0.0090	0.0090	0.0090	**0.0073**
Harbor seal	0.0090	0.0090	0.0090	0.0090	0.0090	0.0021	0.0021	0.0021	0.0090	0.0090	0.0090	0.0090	**0.0073**

[1]Seal densities are not given by individual month, instead, seasons are divided as Summer (June, July, August) and Winter (September – May); as a result, reported seasonal densities for spring and fall are the same (Roberts, 2018).
[2]Seal species are not separated in the Roberts (2018) data therefore densities were evenly split between the two species.

Table 9. Estimated monthly and average annual density (animals km^{-2}) of potentially affected marine mammals within Lease Areas OCS-A 0487 based on monthly habitat density models (Roberts et al., 2016; Roberts, 2018).

Species	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Average Annual Density (km^{-2})
Low-Frequency Cetaceans													
Fin whale	0.0027	0.0021	0.0019	0.0029	0.0030	0.0028	0.0034	0.0033	0.0023	0.0020	0.0020	0.0028	**0.0026**
Sei whale	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0003	0.0004	0.0002	0.0001	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0001	**0.0001**
Minke whale	0.0006	0.0006	0.0006	0.0005	0.0007	0.0008	0.0009	0.0006	0.0004	0.0002	0.0005	0.0006	**0.0006**
Humpback whale	0.0010	0.0008	0.0011	0.0008	0.0012	0.0018	0.0011	0.0013	0.0019	0.0018	0.0018	0.0008	**0.0013**
North Atlantic right whale	0.0008	0.0013	0.0023	0.0094	0.0042	0.0036	0.0001	0.0000	0.0003	0.0000	0.0000	0.0011	**0.0019**
Mid-Frequency Cetaceans													
Sperm whale	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0000	0.0001	0.0001	**0.0001**
Atlantic white sided dolphin	0.0268	0.0113	0.0089	0.0200	0.0392	0.0316	0.0211	0.0156	0.0240	0.0305	0.0346	0.0429	**0.0255**
Atlantic spotted dolphin	0.0002	0.0002	0.0002	0.0002	0.0002	0.0002	0.0002	0.0002	0.0002	0.0002	0.0002	0.0002	**0.0002**
Common bottlenose dolphin	0.0043	0.0015	0.0006	0.0010	0.0050	0.0101	0.0116	0.0112	0.0139	0.0157	0.0116	0.0056	**0.0077**
Long-finned pilot whale	0.0033	0.0033	0.0033	0.0033	0.0033	0.0033	0.0033	0.0033	0.0033	0.0033	0.0033	0.0033	**0.0033**
Risso’s dolphin	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	**0.0000**
Common dolphin	0.0415	0.0181	0.0152	0.0344	0.1076	0.1225	0.0781	0.0873	0.0883	0.1027	0.1152	0.0982	**0.0758**
High-Frequency Cetaceans													
Harbor porpoise	0.1165	0.0738	0.0580	0.1214	0.0734	0.0182	0.0033	0.0014	0.0027	0.0179	0.0057	0.0624	**0.0462**
Pinnipeds in Water[1,2]													
Gray seal	0.0088	0.0088	0.0088	0.0088	0.0088	0.0016	0.0016	0.0016	0.0088	0.0088	0.0088	0.0088	**0.0070**
Harbor seal	0.0088	0.0088	0.0088	0.0088	0.0088	0.0016	0.0016	0.0016	0.0088	0.0088	0.0088	0.0088	**0.0070**

[1]Seal densities are not given by individual month, instead, seasons are divided as Summer (June, July, August) and Winter (September – May); as a result, reported seasonal densities for spring and fall are the same (Roberts, 2018).
[2]Seal species are not separated in the Roberts (2018) data therefore densities were evenly split between the two species.

Table 10. Estimated monthly and average annual density (animals km^{-2}) of potentially affected marine mammals within Lease Areas OCS-A 0500 based on monthly habitat density models (Roberts et al., 2016; Roberts, 2018).

Species	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Average Annual Density (km^{-2})
Low-Frequency Cetaceans													
Fin whale	0.0029	0.0022	0.0020	0.0028	0.0034	0.0031	0.0033	0.0032	0.0023	0.0018	0.0021	0.0029	**0.0027**
Sei whale	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0004	0.0007	0.0003	0.0001	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0001	**0.0002**
Minke whale	0.0004	0.0004	0.0005	0.0009	0.0012	0.0014	0.0013	0.0009	0.0005	0.0003	0.0004	0.0004	**0.0007**
Humpback whale	0.0010	0.0008	0.0012	0.0008	0.0012	0.0015	0.0011	0.0012	0.0016	0.0016	0.0017	0.0009	**0.0012**
North Atlantic right whale	0.0009	0.0016	0.0029	0.0069	0.0037	0.0040	0.0000	0.0000	0.0002	0.0000	0.0000	0.0013	**0.0018**
Mid-Frequency Cetaceans													
Sperm whale	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0000	0.0001	0.0001	**0.0001**
Atlantic white sided dolphin	0.0398	0.0181	0.0139	0.0305	0.0593	0.0500	0.0304	0.0230	0.0369	0.0480	0.0538	0.0601	**0.0386**
Atlantic spotted dolphin	0.0005	0.0005	0.0005	0.0005	0.0005	0.0005	0.0005	0.0005	0.0005	0.0005	0.0005	0.0005	**0.0005**
Common bottlenose dolphin	0.0035	0.0013	0.0005	0.0011	0.0048	0.0099	0.0107	0.0110	0.0139	0.0144	0.0110	0.0047	**0.0072**
Long-finned pilot whale	0.0068	0.0068	0.0068	0.0068	0.0068	0.0068	0.0068	0.0068	0.0068	0.0068	0.0068	0.0068	**0.0068**
Risso’s dolphin	0.0001	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0001	0.0001	0.0002	0.0003	0.0003	0.0002	0.0001	0.0001	**0.0001**
Common dolphin	0.0230	0.0102	0.0091	0.0199	0.0626	0.0750	0.0460	0.0488	0.0516	0.0604	0.0665	0.0552	**0.0440**
High-Frequency Cetaceans													
Harbor porpoise	0.1258	0.0977	0.0795	0.1526	0.0893	0.0292	0.0057	0.0021	0.0040	0.0241	0.0069	0.0606	**0.0565**
Pinnipeds in Water[1,2]													
Gray seal	0.0082	0.0082	0.0082	0.0082	0.0082	0.0015	0.0015	0.0015	0.0082	0.0082	0.0082	0.0082	**0.0065**
Harbor seal	0.0082	0.0082	0.0082	0.0082	0.0082	0.0015	0.0015	0.0015	0.0082	0.0082	0.0082	0.0082	**0.0065**

[1]Seal densities are not given by individual month, instead, seasons are divided as Summer (June, July, August) and Winter (September – May); as a result, reported seasonal densities for spring and fall are the same (Roberts, 2018).
[2]Seal species are not separated in the Roberts (2018) data therefore densities were evenly split between the two species.

Table 11. Estimated monthly and average annual density (animals km^{-2}) of potentially affected marine mammals within the export cable route area based on monthly habitat density models (Roberts et al., 2016; Roberts, 2018).

Species	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Average Annual Density (km^{-2})
Low-Frequency Cetaceans													
Fin whale	0.0015	0.0012	0.0013	0.0022	0.0018	0.0019	0.0019	0.0016	0.0012	0.0012	0.0012	0.0015	**0.0015**
Sei whale	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0002	0.0004	0.0002	0.0001	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0001	**0.0001**
Minke whale	0.0004	0.0004	0.0005	0.0004	0.0006	0.0006	0.0005	0.0003	0.0002	0.0001	0.0004	0.0004	**0.0004**
Humpback whale	0.0006	0.0005	0.0006	0.0003	0.0005	0.0007	0.0004	0.0005	0.0005	0.0006	0.0007	0.0005	**0.0005**
North Atlantic right whale	0.0009	0.0011	0.0012	0.0035	0.0006	0.0003	0.0000	0.0000	0.0001	0.0000	0.0000	0.0009	**0.0007**
Mid-Frequency Cetaceans													
Sperm whale	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0000	0.0001	0.0001	**0.0001**
Atlantic white sided dolphin	0.0231	0.0118	0.0084	0.0162	0.0291	0.0254	0.0136	0.0089	0.0163	0.0246	0.0281	0.0322	**0.0198**
Atlantic spotted dolphin	0.0005	0.0005	0.0005	0.0005	0.0005	0.0005	0.0005	0.0005	0.0005	0.0005	0.0005	0.0005	**0.0005**
Common bottlenose dolphin	0.0088	0.0039	0.0021	0.0061	0.0399	0.0674	0.0770	0.0695	0.0572	0.0466	0.0323	0.0102	**0.0351**
Long-finned pilot whale	0.0037	0.0037	0.0037	0.0037	0.0037	0.0037	0.0037	0.0037	0.0037	0.0037	0.0037	0.0037	**0.0037**
Risso's dolphin	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0001	0.0001	0.0002	0.0002	0.0001	0.0001	0.0000	**0.0001**
Common dolphin	0.0156	0.0077	0.0064	0.0125	0.0364	0.0409	0.0270	0.0299	0.0300	0.0345	0.0386	0.0328	**0.0260**
High-Frequency Cetaceans													
Harbor porpoise	0.0715	0.0578	0.0541	0.0880	0.0393	0.0189	0.0039	0.0012	0.0019	0.0115	0.0034	0.0324	**0.0320**
Pinnipeds in Water[1,2]													
Gray seal	0.0195	0.0195	0.0195	0.0195	0.0195	0.0051	0.0051	0.0051	0.0195	0.0195	0.0195	0.0195	**0.0159**
Harbor seal	0.0195	0.0195	0.0195	0.0195	0.0195	0.0051	0.0051	0.0051	0.0195	0.0195	0.0195	0.0195	**0.0159**

[1]Seal densities are not given by individual month, instead, seasons are divided as Summer (June, July, August) and Winter (September – May); as a result, reported seasonal densities for spring and fall are the same (Roberts, 2018).
[2]Seal species are not separated in the Roberts (2018) data therefore densities were evenly split between the two species.

6.1.3 Take Calculation

Based on the average annual densities for each species (**bolded** numbers in **Tables 8** to **11**), the estimated number of marine mammal takes per equipment type was determined. Calculations were based on vessel-towed or mounted geophysical survey equipment operating between 164 and 261 vessel days in each Lease Area and 661 days in the ECR area, with the sources producing the largest threshold distances (i.e., sparkers) operating only 46% of the total survey days (see **Table 5** for break down in lease areas).

Estimates of take are calculated according to the following formula:

Estimated Take = D × ZOI × # of Survey Days

Where: D = average species density (km^{-2}); and ZOI = maximum ensonified area that equates to NMFS thresholds for noise impact criteria. To estimate take, the density of marine mammals within the Project Area (animals km^{-2}) was multiplied by the daily ensonified area (km^2). That result is then multiplied by the number of survey days (rounded to the nearest whole number) to arrive at the estimated take. This final number equals the instances of take for the entire operational period. The result is an estimate of the maximum potential number of instances that marine mammals could be exposed to sounds above the

Level A or Level B harassment thresholds over the duration of survey activities. The Applicant has agreed to extensive mitigation measures to reduce any potential Level B harassment and eliminate the possibility of any Level A harassment.

6.2 ESTIMATED NUMBERS OF MARINE MAMMALS THAT MIGHT BE TAKEN BY HARASSMENT

The Applicant is requesting approval for the incidental harassment takes of marine mammals associated with geophysical surveys. Take estimates were projected based on marine mammal presence, calculated density estimates, and activity-specific noise source propagation characteristics.

16.2.1 Estimated Level A Harassment of Marine Mammals

Level A exposures are not expected to occur for any of the hearing groups during operation of geophysical impulsive sources. Estimated $SPL_{0\text{-}pk}$ threshold distances extend to a maximum of 4.7 m from the medium SBP equipment only for HF cetaceans (i.e., harbor porpoise); the linear threshold distances (i.e. acoustic ranges) for the SEL_{cum} metric extend to a maximum of 97.7 m, an isopleth produced by only a single source, the GeoPulse 5430. All other sources produced SEL_{cum} isopleths of less than 40 m. Also, the acoustic ranges do not adequately represent the actual exposure ranges for species because of movement in and out of the sound field does not allow the accumulation of sound energy over 24 hours that is required for an animal to reach those thresholds. Therefore, although takes are calculated for some species, the Level A SEL_{cum} threshold is not expected to be realized for any species. The $SPL_{0\text{-}pk}$ metric is measured based on a single impulse from the impulsive medium SBP equipment, and given the short duration of this impulse and the proposed mitigation measures (**Section 11.0**), it is unlikely an animal will be close enough to the source during an impulse to receive Level A harassment. Therefore, Level A takes are not being requested by the Applicant and will not be discussed further. Maximum potential Level A take calculations, without mitigation applied, are provided in **Table 12**.

Table 12. Maximum potential Level A take exposures for each equipment category operating in all Lease Areas and the export cable route.

Species	Abundance	Geophysical Equipment Category						Max % Population
		USBLs	SBP CHIRP sonars	Parametric SBP	SBP Boomers	SBP Sparkers	Acoustic Corers	
Low-Frequency Cetaceans								
Fin whale	7,418	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00
Sei whale	6,292	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00
Minke whale	24,202	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00
Humpback whale	1,396	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00
North Atlantic right whale	428	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00
Mid-Frequency Cetaceans								
Sperm whale	4,349	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00
Atlantic white-sided dolphin	93,233	0	1	1	0	0	0	<0.01
Atlantic spotted dolphin	39,921	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00
Common bottlenose dolphin	62,851	0	1	1	0	0	0	<0.01
Long-finned pilot whale	39,215	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00
Risso's dolphin	35,493	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00
Common dolphin	178,825	0	2	4	0	0	0	<0.01
High-Frequency Cetaceans								
Harbor porpoise[1]	95,543	6	176	3	13	12	0	0.23
Pinnipeds								
Gray seal	27,131	0	1	0	0	0	0	0.00
Harbor seal	75,834	0	1	0	0	0	0	0.00

CHIRP = Compressed High-Intensity Radiated Pulse; SBP = sub-bottom profiler; USBL = ultra-short baseline.
[1]Level A takes were calculated for some marine mammal species; however because it is unlikely the 24-hour accumulation period for the cumulative sound exposure level metric will be realized during surveys, the zero to peak sound pressure level isopleth distance was <5 m for all species, and proposed mitigation measures, no Level A takes are expected.

6.2.2 Estimated Level B Harassment of Marine Mammals

Level B exposures were estimated by multiplying the average annual density of each species (**Tables 8** to **11**) (Roberts et al., 2016; Roberts, 2018) by the daily ZOI area that was estimated to be ensonified to an SPL_{rms} exceeding 160 dB re 1 µPa, times the number of operating days expected for the survey in each area assessed. In this Application, it was assumed between 164 and 261 survey days in each Lease Area and 661 days in the ECR area, with sparker systems only operated a portion of the total survey period (see **Table 5**).

Tables 13 through **16** summarize the Level B take estimates for each Lease Area (with Lease Areas 0486 and 0517 combined) and ECR for all species having an occurrence in the Project Area that was considered common, uncommon, or regular.

Table 13. Summary of maximum potential Level B take exposures resulting from 114 survey days using the sparkers systems, and the remaining 103 survey days using the non-sparker sources in Lease Areas OCS-A 0486 and 0517.

Species	Abundance	Maximum Level B Takes	Max % Population
Low-Frequency Cetaceans			
Fin whale	7,418	7	0.09%
Sei whale	6,292	0	0.00%
Minke whale	24,202	1	0.00%
Humpback whale	1,396	4	0.29%
North Atlantic right whale	428	7	1.64%
Mid-Frequency Cetaceans			
Sperm whale	4,349	0	0.00%
Atlantic white-sided dolphin	93,233	44	0.05%
Atlantic spotted dolphin	39,921	0	0.00%
Common bottlenose dolphin	62,851	35	0.06%
Long-finned pilot whale	39,215	5	0.01%
Risso's dolphin	35,493	0	0.00%
Common dolphin	178,825	143	0.08%
High-Frequency Cetaceans			
Harbor porpoise	95,543	105	0.11%
Pinnipeds			
Gray seal[1]	27,131	22	0.08%
Harbor seal[1]	75,834	22	0.03%

[1]Roberts (2018) only provides density estimates for "generic" seals; therefore, densities were evenly split between the two species.

Table 14. Summary of maximum potential Level B take exposures resulting from 97 survey days using the sparker systems, and the remaining 164 days using the non-sparker sources in Lease Area OCS-A 0487.

Species	Abundance	Maximum Level B Takes	Max % Population
Low-Frequency Cetaceans			
Fin whale	7,418	8	0.11%
Sei whale	6,292	0	0.00%
Minke whale	24,202	2	0.01%
Humpback whale	1,396	4	0.29%
North Atlantic right whale	428	6	1.40%
Mid-Frequency Cetaceans			
Sperm whale	4,349	0	0.00%
Atlantic white-sided dolphin	93,233	81	0.09%
Atlantic spotted dolphin	39,921	0	0.00%
Common bottlenose dolphin	62,851	25	0.04%
Long-finned pilot whale	39,215	10	0.03%
Risso's dolphin	35,493	0	0.00%
Common dolphin	178,825	240	0.13%
High-Frequency Cetaceans			
Harbor porpoise	95,543	146	0.15%
Pinnipeds			
Gray seal[1]	27,131	22	0.08%
Harbor seal[1]	75,834	22	0.03%

[1]Roberts (2018) only provides density estimates for "generic" seals; therefore, densities were evenly split between the two species.

Table 15. Summary of maximum potential Level B take exposures resulting from 112 survey days using the sparker systems, and the remaining 52 survey days using the non-sparker sources in Lease Area OCS-A 0500.

Species	Abundance	Maximum Level B Takes	Max % Population
Low-Frequency Cetaceans			
Fin whale	7,418	7	0.09%
Sei whale	6,292	0	0.00%
Minke whale	24,202	2	0.01%
Humpback whale	1,396	3	0.21%
North Atlantic right whale	428	5	1.17%
Mid-Frequency Cetaceans			
Sperm whale	4,349	0	0.00%
Atlantic white-sided dolphin	93,233	101	0.11%
Atlantic spotted dolphin	39,921	1	0.00%
Common bottlenose dolphin	62,851	19	0.03%
Long-finned pilot whale	39,215	18	0.05%
Risso's dolphin	35,493	0	0.00%
Common dolphin	178,825	115	0.06%
High-Frequency Cetaceans			
Harbor porpoise	95,543	147	0.15%
Pinnipeds			
Gray seal[1]	27,131	17	0.06%
Harbor seal[1]	75,834	17	0.02%

[1]Roberts (2018) only provides density estimates for "generic" seals; therefore, densities were evenly split between the two species.

Table 16. Summary of maximum potential Level B take exposures resulting from 378 survey days using the sparker systems, and the remaining 283 days using the non-sparker sources in the export cable route area.

Species	Abundance	Estimated Level B Takes	Max % Population
Low-Frequency Cetaceans			
Fin whale	7,418	14	0.19%
Sei whale	6,292	1	0.02%
Minke whale	24,202	4	0.02%
Humpback whale	1,396	5	0.36%
North Atlantic right whale	428	7	1.64%
Mid-Frequency Cetaceans			
Sperm whale	4,349	1	0.02%
Atlantic white-sided dolphin	93,233	191	0.20%
Atlantic spotted dolphin	39,921	5	0.01%
Common bottlenose dolphin	62,851	337	0.54%
Long-finned pilot whale	39,215	36	0.09%
Risso's dolphin	35,493	1	0.00%
Common dolphin	178,825	251	0.14%
High-Frequency Cetaceans			
Harbor porpoise	95,543	309	0.32%
Pinnipeds			
Gray seal[1]	27,131	153	0.55%
Harbor seal[1]	75,834	153	0.20%

[1]Roberts (2018) only provides density estimates for "generic" seals; therefore, densities were evenly split between the two species.

6.2.3 Requested Level B Takes

The estimated Level B exposures in **Tables 13** to **16** are based on the operation of the sparker sources that produced the largest threshold isopleth (141 m) during a portion of the required vessel days; and the remaining survey days employing the Innomar SBP or other non-sparker source along with USBL equipment which produces smaller impact isopleths (4 to 54 m). This breakdown of use provides a more realistic estimate of take risk rather than assuming 100% use of the maximum source. A nominal 54-m impact isopleth was used to calculate take for all non-sparker sources. Similarly, the annual average densities were used for species rather than the single monthly maximum density. Due to the variability in survey timing and locations using the maximum monthly species densities is not representative of the spatial and temporal density variability over the entire survey. To maintain a conservative approach to addressing variability in density, the overall potential number of survey days was maximized to increase the potential survey days within any lease area or ECR section.

There are a number of other factors which reduce the overall number of takes expected to occur during this Project.

1. It is assumed that an animal will only be taken once over a 24-hour period and that the maximum number of calculated takes represents different individuals from a population. In actuality, an activity may result in multiple takes of the same animal over a period of time and only a limited number of individuals within a single population may realize behavioral modification. Both the estimated number of takes and the percentage of the population potentially affected represent the maximum potential take numbers which do not account for species behavior or the context within which a behavioral disturbance may occur.
2. Sparker systems are intermittent sources meaning they are only operational for a fraction of time within a 24-hour period. This fraction, often referred to as the duty cycle, is considered in the User Spreadsheet Tool for Level A takes (NMFS, 2018b), but is not included in the Level B calculations. The Level B calculations assume it is active 100% of the time during a 24-hour period when in reality the sources only transmit acoustic pulses for a portion of this period and they are not operated continuously throughout the day. For example, while the vessel is turning or transiting between work sites these sources are not activated, reducing the overall period of time they are actually producing noise in the water.
3. Mitigation will be effective to fully eliminate Level A takes and will significantly minimize the potential for Level B takes. Maximum radial distance for Level B threshold levels is 141 m, allowing for effective mitigation.

The requested number Level B takes provided in **Table 17** are based on the combined take estimates in each Lease Area and ECR. Any calculated Level A takes were added to the requested Level B takes as a precautionary measure, even though Level A exposures will not be realized.

<u>Species with no or perceived low calculated takes:</u>

- Only one take was calculated for sperm whales and Risso's dolphins; however, based on anticipated species distributions and data from previous surveys conducted in this RI – MA WEA, it is likely these species could be encountered. Therefore, requested takes are based on estimated group sizes for these species (i.e., three for sperm whales, 30 for Risso's dolphins) (Kenney and Vigness-Raposa, 2010; Barkaszi and Kelly, 2019).

- Preliminary protected species observer (PSO) data from the ongoing site characterization surveys being conducted under the existing IHA were reviewed to provide an overview of the most recent species detections. The maximum Level B zone for the referenced PSO data are slightly larger (178 m) than the Level B zone calculated for this application (141 m). While detections within the Level B zone in the PSO reports are still very low, higher numbers of several species (e.g., minke whale, humpback whale, common dolphin) are being seen in the area which present an increased potential for take. Based on the PSO data from 26 September 2019 through 29 January 2020, take requests have been increased for the species described below.
  - Minke whale: two additional group sightings were added to the calculated takes based on an estimated group size of two minke whales (Kenney and Vigness-Raposa, 2010). Therefore, requested takes were raised from 9 to 13;
  - Humpback whale: two additional group sightings were added to the calculated takes based on an estimated group size of three humpback whales (CETAP, 1982). Therefore, requested takes were raised from 16 to 21; and
  - Common dolphin: preliminary PSO reports indicate 2,824 individuals recorded with 2,205 reported within the Level B zone during applicable source operations. Therefore, based on the high number of both overall detections and detections within the Level B zone, requested takes were raised from 747 to 2,205 to match that of the previous estimate. Notably, the Level B zone is smaller for this scope of work than the scope of work covered under the existing IHA (141 m versus 178 m); and a large proportion of the survey conducted with the non-sparker source combinations will have an even smaller Level B zone (54 m).

Table 17. Summary of requested Level B takes for the Project.

Species	Abundance	Requested Level B Takes	Max % Population
Low-Frequency Cetaceans			
Fin whale	7,418	36	0.49%
Sei whale	6,292	2	0.03%
Minke whale[1]	24,202	13	0.05%
Humpback whale[1]	1,396	21	1.50%
North Atlantic right whale	428	24	5.60%
Mid-Frequency Cetaceans			
Sperm whale[2]	4,349	3	0.07%
Atlantic white-sided dolphin	93,233	416	0.45%
Atlantic spotted dolphin	39,921	7	0.02%
Common bottlenose dolphin	62,851	417	0.66%
Long-finned pilot whales	39,215	69	0.18%
Risso’s dolphin[3]	35,493	30	0.08%
Common dolphin[1]	178,825	2,205	1.23%
High-Frequency Cetaceans			
Harbor porpoise	95,543	706	0.74%
Pinnipeds[4]			
Gray seal	27,131	214	0.79%
Harbor seal	75,834	214	0.28%

[1]Requested takes were increased from calculated takes based on preliminary protected species observer data from the same Lease Areas and export cable routes during 2019 and 2020.
[2]Only one take was calculated for sperm whales; however, due to general variability in movement of this species and likelihood they may occur in the Project Area based on previous survey information, takes are requested based on an estimated group size of three for this species (Barkaszi and Kelly, 2019).
[3]Only one take was calculated for Risso’s dolphins, however due to general variability in movement of this species and likelihood they may occur in the Project Area based on previous survey information, takes are requested based on an estimated group size of 30 for this species (Kenney and Vigness-Raposa, 2010).
[4]Roberts (2018) only provides density estimates for “generic” seals; therefore, densities were evenly split between the two species.

7.0 Effects on Marine Mammal Species or Stocks

Marine mammals exposed to natural or man-made sound may experience non-auditory and auditory impacts which range in severity (Southall et al., 2007; Southall et al., 2019; NMFS, 2018a; Wood et al., 2012). The potential exists for small numbers of marine mammals to be exposed to underwater sound associated with survey activities. These impacts are likely to affect individual species but have only negligible effects on the marine mammal stocks and, therefore, will not adversely affect the population of any species.

7.1 MITIGATION AND AVERSION

Mitigation and aversion are not considered in the take estimates. The inclusion of mitigation and aversion would reduce the take estimates. Although the proposed mitigation (**Section 11.0**) is implemented to eliminate the potential for Level A takes, it will also serve to reduce the exposure of animals to SLs that could constitute Level B takes. NMFS determined that with the RPMs, (e.g., mitigation measures such as clearance periods, ramp ups, and shutdowns when an animal is detected within an exclusion zone [EZ]) the proposed geophysical surveys may adversely affect but are not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of NARW, humpback, fin, sei, or sperm whales. This suggests that geophysical survey operations would not jeopardize the sustainability of other cetaceans, particularly other LF and MF species that occupy the same acoustic habitat.

7.2 MULTIPLE EXPOSURES AND SEASONALITY

Level B exposures likely include the same individuals across multiple days and not exposures to the entire stock; therefore, they can be considered instances of exposure rather than a discrete count of individuals that have received regulatory-level sound exposures. The acoustic metric used to establish Level B isopleths (SPL_{rms}) does not consider a duration of exposure (SEL_{cum}) in its calculations. The SPL_{rms} assumes that an animal within the Level B isopleth, regardless of the length of time, is taken by exposure. The take estimates assume that an animal will only be taken once over a 24-hour period; however, an activity may result in multiple takes of the same animal over a period of time. It is only the multiplication of the same animals being exposed over the survey days that numbers become inflated and hence, a conservative approach to the population-level exposure. Animals in an area of exposure may move location depending on their acoustic sensitivity, life stage, and acclimation (Wood et al., 2012) and may or may not demonstrate behavioral responses.

As stated in **Section 6.2.3**, estimates using the habitat density data (Roberts et al., 2016, 2018) may not fully reflect the actual observation in the field. In the case of the NARW, seasonal, patchy densities increase the average annual densities across an entire lease area for only a short period of time resulting in much fewer detections during the surveys when compared to the calculated exposure estimates. Population percentages represent the maximum potential take numbers; in actuality a limited number of marine mammals may realize behavioral modification.

7.3 VOLUMETRIC DENSITY CALCULATIONS

Particularly for HRG sources that have narrow bandwidths, the linear distances to impact isopleths are typically over-estimations of the actual three-dimensional sound field produced and the resultant volume of water in which species densities should be applied. Using a volumetric calculation for highly directional sources, such as those used during site characterization surveys for this Project, the sound fields for exposure densities will significantly reduce the number of Level B exposures. As increased information regarding beamwidths for individual geophysical sources is acquired, takes will be reduced accordingly.

7.4 NEGLIGIBLE IMPACTS

Animals in an area of exposure may move location depending on their acoustic sensitivity, life stage, and acclimation (Wood et al., 2012) and may or may not demonstrate behavioral responses. Therefore, while the number of takes and the affected population percentages represent the maximum potential take numbers, in actuality a limited number of marine mammals may realize behavioral modification.

Under the requirements of 50 CFR § 216.104, NMFS has defined negligible impact as an impact that is not reasonably expected to adversely affect a species or stock through effects on annual rates of recruitment or survival. The small numbers requirement is not based on take estimates alone; rather, for NMFS to make a negligible impact determination, small numbers must denote that the portion of a marine mammal species or stock in the take estimates will have a negligible impact on that species or stock.

As discussed in **Sections 9.0** and **10.0**, physical auditory effects, vessel strikes, PTS or TTS, and long-term impacts to habitat or prey species are not expected to occur. Temporary masking may occur in localized areas for short periods of time when an animal is in proximity to the survey. Masking occurs when an animal's acoustic "space" (i.e., auditory perception and discrimination) is covered up by noise of similar frequency but at higher amplitudes of biologically important sounds. However, due to movement of the sources masking effects are expected to be negligible and not contribute significantly to other noise sources operating in the region.

The primary potential impact on marine mammals from exposure to survey-related underwater sound are behavioral responses, which do not necessarily constitute significant changes in biologically important behaviors. The National Research Council (2005) noted that an action or activity becomes biologically significant to an individual animal when it affects the ability of the animal to grow, survive, and reproduce, wherein an impact on individuals can lead to population-level consequences and affect the viability of the species. The reasonably expected impacts from the proposed activities are based on noise exposure thresholds that can potentially elicit a behavioral response and are categorized as Level B takes under the MMPA. Here, due to the variability in species reaction to sound sources, short time period of the survey operations, and use of mitigation measures, any behavioral reactions are expected to be **minor**, **localized**, **short-term**, and have **negligible** effects on individuals and stocks. It is expected that behavioral reactions will mainly comprise a temporary shift in spatial use. No long-term or population effects are expected from the behavioral reactions to the proposed surveys.

8.0 Minimization of Adverse Effects to Subsistence Uses

This section addresses NFMS' requirement to identify methods to minimize adverse effects of the proposed activity on subsistence uses.

There are no current subsistence hunting areas in the vicinity of the proposed Project Area and there are no activities related to the proposed surveys that may affect the availability of a species or stock of marine mammals for subsistence uses. Consequently, there are no available methods to minimize potentially adverse effects to subsistence uses.

9.0 Anticipated Impacts on Habitat

This section addresses NFMS' requirement to characterize the short- and long-term impacts of the proposed activity on marine mammals associated with the predicted loss or modification of habitat and to address available methods and likelihood of restoration of lost or modified habitat. Anticipated impacts to marine mammal habitat have been summarized in the following sections.

9.1 SHORT-TERM IMPACTS

The proposed activity has the potential to affect marine mammal habitat primarily through short-term impacts from increases in ambient noise levels from survey equipment. The expected short-term impacts to the acoustic habitat are highly localized and transient during the survey and therefore, have the potential to only temporarily affect marine mammal prey availability.

9.2 LONG-TERM IMPACTS

Due to the short duration of the potential activities and the minimal acoustic disturbance expected, no long-term impacts associated with loss or modification habitat are anticipated.

10.0 Anticipated Effects of Habitat Impacts on Marine Mammals

This section addresses the NFMS requirement to characterize the short- and long-term impacts of the proposed activity on predicted habitat loss or modification. The predicted impacts to marine mammal habitat have been summarized in **Sections 10.1** and **10.2**.

10.1 SHORT-TERM IMPACTS

Marine mammals use sound to navigate, communicate, find open water, avoid predators, and find food. Acoustic acuity within the habitat must be available for species to conduct these ecological processes. If noise levels within critical frequency bands preclude animals from accessing the acoustic properties of that habitat, then availability and quality of that habitat has been diminished. The sounds that marine mammals hear and generate will vary in terms of dominant frequency, bandwidth, energy, temporal pattern, and directionality. The same variables in ambient noise will, therefore, determine a marine mammal's acoustic resource availability. In the case of marine mammals, anthropogenic noise can be viewed as a form of habitat fragmentation resulting in a loss of acoustic space that could otherwise be occupied by vocalizations or other acoustic cues (Rice et al., 2014). Primary acoustic habitat for a species will be focused within the vocal ranges for that species; therefore, habitat impact assessment should be conducted within those vocal ranges. The functional extent of the ensonified space around operations employing HRG sources will require an understanding of the distribution of SPLs by their spectral probability density and knowledge of received exposure levels with coordinated species densities. Therefore, marine mammals may experience some short-term loss of acoustic habitat, but the nature and duration of this loss is not expected to represent a significant loss of habitat.

Reduction of prey availability might indirectly affect marine mammals by altering prey abundance, behavior, and distribution. Rising sound levels could affect fish populations (McCauley et al., 2003; Popper and Hastings, 2009; Slabbekoorn et al., 2010). Marine fish are typically sensitive to the 100 to 500 Hz range, which is below the primary operating frequencies of most HRG survey sources. However, several studies have demonstrated that seismic airguns and other impulsive sources might affect the behavior of at least some species of fish. For example, field studies by Engås et al. (1996) and Whitlock and Schluter (2009) showed that the catch rate of haddock (*Melanogrammus aeglefinus*) and Atlantic cod (*Gadus morhua*) significantly declined over the five days following seismic airgun operation, after which the catch rate returned to normal. Other studies found only minor responses by fish to seismic surveys, such as a small decline in lesser sand eel (*Ammodytes marinus*) abundance that quickly returned to pre-seismic levels (Hassel et al., 2004) or no permanent changes in the behavior of marine reef fishes (Wardle et al., 2001). Squid (*Sepioteuthis australis*) are an extremely important food chain component for many higher order marine predators, including sperm whales. McCauley et al. (2000) recorded caged squid responding to airgun signals. Given the generally low SPLs produced by the HRG sources used in this activity compared to sources such as airguns, no short-term impacts to potential prey items (fishes, cephalopods, crustaceans) are expected from the proposed survey activities.

10.2 LONG-TERM IMPACTS

Due to the short duration of the potential activities and the minimal disturbance expected, no long-term impacts to marine mammals associated with loss or modification habitat are anticipated.

11.0 Mitigation Measures

This section addresses NMFS' IHA requirement to assess the availability and feasibility (economic and technological), methods, and manner of conducting this survey activity that has the least practicable impact upon affected species or stock, its habitat, and its availability for subsistence uses, paying particular attention to rookeries, mating grounds, and areas of similar significance.

The Applicant has demonstrated a commitment to minimizing impacts to marine mammal species through a comprehensive and progressive mitigation and monitoring program, described here. The Applicant has committed to engaging in ongoing consultations with NMFS and following a comprehensive set of mitigation measures during site characterization surveys. These measures include the following components which are described in detail below:

- Vessel strike avoidance procedures;
- Seasonal right whale monitoring requirements;
- Establishment of EZs
- Visual monitoring, including low visibility monitoring tools;
- Area clearance;
- Ramp-up procedures;
- Source minimization during turns;
- Operational shutdowns and delays;
- Communication of sightings between vessels; and
- Utilization of Whale Alert as able for monitoring for Dynamic Management Areas (DMAs).

The mitigation protocols have been designed to provide protection to marine mammals, both individuals and, by extension, species' stocks where designated, by minimizing exposure to potentially disruptive noise levels during site characterization activities. The mitigation measures will also reduce the likelihood of ship strikes to large whales in the area.

Project-specific training will be conducted for all vessel crew prior to the start of a survey and during any changes in crew such that all survey personnel are fully aware and understand the mitigation, monitoring, and reporting requirements. Prior to implementation with vessel crews, the training program will be provided to NMFS for review and approval. Confirmation of the training and understanding of the requirements will be documented on a training course log sheet. Signing the log sheet will certify that the crew member understands and will comply with the necessary requirements throughout the survey activities.

11.1 VESSEL STRIKE AVOIDANCE PROCEDURES

The Applicant will ensure that vessel operators and crew maintain a vigilant watch for cetaceans, pinnipeds, and change course, slow down, or switch the engines to neutral, as safely as applicable to avoid striking these protected species. The applicant will follow speed guidance and regulated approach requirements provided by NMFS (50 CFR § 224.103 and 224.105). Survey vessel crew members responsible for navigation duties will receive site-specific training on marine mammal detection and identification, sighting/reporting, and vessel strike avoidance measures. Vessel strike avoidance measures will include, but are not limited to, the following except under extraordinary circumstances when complying with these requirements would put the safety of the vessel or crew at risk or the vessel is restricted in its ability to maneuver:

- All vessel operators and crew will maintain vigilant watch for cetaceans, and pinnipeds, and change course, slow down or switch engines to neutral to avoid striking an animal;
- All vessel operators will comply with 10 knot speed restrictions in any SMA or DMA;
- All vessels 19.8 m or greater operating from November 1 through July 31 will operate at speeds of 10 knots or less;
- All vessel operators will reduce vessel speed to 10 knots or less when mother/calf pairs, pods, or larger assemblages of non-delphinid cetaceans are observed near an underway vessel;
- All survey vessels will maintain a separation distance of 500 m or greater from any sighted NARW (50 CFR § 224.103);
- If underway, vessels must steer a course away from any sighted NARW at 10 knots or less until the 500-m minimum separation distance has been established. If a NARW is sighted in a vessel's path, or within 500 m to an underway vessel, the underway vessel must reduce speed and shift the engine to neutral. Engines will not be engaged until the NARW has moved outside of the vessel's path and beyond 500 m. If the whale is stationary, the vessel must not engage engines until the NARW has moved beyond 500 m;
- All vessels will maintain a separation distance of 100 m or greater from any sighted non-delphinid cetacean. If sighted, the vessel underway must reduce speed and shift the engine to neutral and must not engage the engines until the non-delphinid cetacean has moved outside of the vessel's path and beyond 100 m. If a survey vessel is stationary, the vessel will not engage engines until the non-delphinid cetacean has moved out of the vessel's path and beyond 100 m;
- All vessels will maintain a separation distance of 50 m or greater from any sighted delphinid cetacean. Any vessel underway should remain parallel to a sighted delphinid cetacean's course whenever possible and avoid excessive speed or abrupt changes in direction. Any vessel underway reduces vessel speed to 10 knots or less when pods (including mother/calf pairs) or large assemblages of delphinid cetaceans are observed. Vessels may not adjust course and speed until the delphinid cetaceans have moved beyond 50 m and/or the abeam of the underway vessel;
- All vessels underway will not change course to approach any delphinid cetacean or pinniped. Any vessel underway will avoid excessive speed or abrupt changes in direction to avoid injury to the sighted delphinid cetacean or pinniped; and
- All vessels will maintain a separation distance of 50 m or greater from any sighted pinniped.

11.2 SEASONAL RIGHT WHALE OPERATING REQUIREMENTS

No more than 3 survey vessels will operate concurrently from March through June within the area that includes the three lease areas (OCSA 0486, 0487, and 0500) and the ECR areas north of the lease areas up to, but not including, coastal and bay waters.

Members of the monitoring team will consult NMFS NARW reporting system and Whale Alert, as able, for 1) the presence of NARWs throughout survey operations, and 2) establishment of a DMA. If NMFS should establish a DMA in the Lease Areas under survey, the vessels will abide by speed restrictions in the DMA per the lease conditions.

11.3 MONITORING, EXCLUSION, AND LEVEL B HARASSMENT ZONES

Three distinct zones are defined to better describe the monitoring activities and mitigation actions associated with the detection of a marine mammals during the survey. The Applicant will employ the following zones during all site characterization survey activities using HRG sources operating at frequencies below 200 kHz:

Monitoring zone:

- Waters surrounding the sound sources and the vessel;
- All marine mammals detected will be recorded; and
- The monitoring zone will encompass all the EZs.

Level B Zones:

- 141 m for all marine mammals around active sparker sound sources;
- 50 m for all marine mammals around the Innomar/USBL source combination;
- For any sources other than the Innomar/USBL combination, the Level B zone is assumed to be 141 m whether or not a sparker source is operating.

Exclusion Zones:

- 500 m for NARWs;
- 100 m for all other whales, dolphins, seals, and porpoises; and
- The EZ may or may not encompass the Level B zone and an animal's entry into the EZ does not necessarily represent a take.

11.4 VISUAL MONITORING

Visual monitoring of the established EZs and monitoring zone will be performed by the NMFS-approved PSOs.

PSOs will be stationed on all survey vessels and will work in shifts such that observers obtain adequate rest periods between active watch periods. For all HRG survey activities with sources operating at <200 kHz, PSOs will work in shifts as stipulated above such that one PSO will be on watch during all daylight hours and two PSOs equipped with nighttime monitoring devices will be on watch during all hours of reduced visibility, including nighttime. On a case-by-case basis, and upon approval from NMFS, changes in the PSO numbers, schedule, or 3rd party status may be adjusted during the project. During PSO observations the following guidelines shall be followed:

- Other than brief alerts to bridge personnel of maritime hazards and the collection of ancillary wildlife data, no additional duties may be assigned to the PSO during his/her visual observation watch.
- No PSO will be allowed more than four consecutive hours on watch before being allocated a break from visual watch.

- No PSO will be assigned a combined watch schedule of more than 12 hours in a 24-hour period.
- The PSOs will stand watch in a suitable location that will not interfere with the navigation or operation of the vessel and affords an optimal view of the sea surface.
- Position data will be recorded using hand-held or vessel GPS units for each sighting.
- The PSOs will be responsible for visually monitoring and identifying marine mammals approaching or entering the established zones during survey activities. It will be the responsibility of the Lead PSO on duty to communicate the presence of marine mammals as well as to communicate and enforce the action(s) that are necessary to ensure mitigation and monitoring requirements are implemented as appropriate.
- PSOs will share sighting data between project survey vessels, as able.
- Each PSO will be equipped with reticled binoculars that have an internal compass in order to estimate range and bearing to detected marine mammals. Digital single-lens reflex camera equipment will be used to record sightings and assist in subsequent verification of species identification.

11.4.1 Nighttime Monitoring

During night operations, night vision equipment (night vision goggles) and infrared/thermal imaging technology will be used. Recent studies have concluded that the use of infrared/thermal imaging technology allow for the detection of marine mammals at night (Verfuss et al., 2018; Guazzo et al., 2019). Guazzo et al (2019) showed that probability of detecting a large whale blow by a commercially-available infrared camera was similar at night as during the day; camera monitoring distance was 2.1 km from an elevated vantage point at night versus 3 km for daylight visual monitoring from the same location. The Applicant finds that use of thermal camera systems for mitigation purposes warrants additional application in the field as both a standalone tool and in conjunction with other alternative monitoring methods (e.g., night vision binoculars).

11.4.2 Data Recording

PSOs will record all sightings of marine mammals while monitoring during day or night. Data on all PSO observations will be recorded based on standard PSO collection requirements. This will include dates and locations of construction operations; time of observation, location and weather; details of the sightings (e.g., species, age classification [if known], numbers, behavior); and details of any observed behavioral disturbances or injury/mortality. Visual detections will be shared between vessels in near-real time, to the extent possible via computer, radio, phone, or other methods, thus increasing situational awareness.

11.5 PRE-CLEARANCE OF THE EXCLUSION ZONES

The Applicant will implement a 30-minute clearance period of the EZs prior to the initiation of ramp-up (**Section 11.6**). After 30 minutes of monitoring, if any marine mammal has entered their respective EZ, ramp-up will not be initiated until the animal is confirmed outside the EZ or until the following time has elapsed since the last sighting of the animal in the EZ:

- 30 minutes for whales, including the NARW; and
- 15 minutes for dolphins, porpoises, and seals.

After clearance, if the EZs, Level B Zones, and/or Monitoring Zone are not fully visible to PSOs due to darkness or inclement weather, survey activities may continue, unless a marine mammal is detected within or entering the applicable EZs.

11.6 RAMP-UP PROCEDURES

A ramp-up procedure will be used, to the extent practicable, at the beginning of HRG survey activities in order to provide additional protection to marine mammals near the survey by allowing them to vacate the area prior to the commencement of survey equipment use. Where technically feasible, a ramp-up procedure will be used for HRG survey equipment capable of adjusting energy levels at the start or restart of HRG survey activities. A ramp-up would begin with powering up of the HRG equipment that has the lowest source level output and start it at its lowest practical power appropriate for the survey. The ramp-up will proceed by either adding equipment with higher source levels, increasing the power output of the operating equipment, or a combination of both.

The ramp-up procedure will not be initiated (i.e., equipment will not be started) during periods of inclement conditions when the marine mammal EZ cannot be adequately monitored by the PSOs for a 30-minute period using the appropriate visual technology. If any marine mammal enters the EZ, ramp-up will not be initiated until the animal is confirmed outside the marine mammal EZ or until the appropriate time (30 minutes for whales, 15 minutes for dolphins, porpoises, and seals) has elapsed since the last sighting of the animal in the EZ.

11.7 SHUT-DOWN PROCEDURES

An immediate shut down of the HRG survey equipment operating at frequencies <200 kHz will be required if a whale, porpoise, or seal is sighted at or within the 100-m marine mammal EZ or if a NARW is observed within the 500-m right whale EZ. Survey equipment will not be shut down for dolphins that voluntarily approach the vessel or survey equipment. The vessel operator must comply immediately with any call for shut-down by the Lead PSO. Any disagreement between the Lead PSO and vessel operator should be discussed only after shut-down has occurred. Subsequent restart of the survey equipment can be initiated if the animal has been observed exiting its respective EZ or has not been re-sighted within their respective EZ for the appropriate time period (30 minutes for whales, 15 minutes for dolphins, porpoises, and seals). The PSOs will determine if the marine mammal is inside or outside the respective EZ.

If another marine mammal enters the respective EZ during this shutdown period, the equipment may not restart until that animal is confirmed outside the marine mammal EZ as above or until the appropriate time listed below has elapsed since the last sighting of the animal in the EZ.

If the acoustic source is shut down for reasons other than mitigation (e.g., mechanical difficulty) for <20 minutes, it may be activated again without ramp-up as long as PSOs have maintained constant observation and no detections of any marine mammal have occurred within the respective EZs. If these conditions are not met, standard ramp-up conditions apply.

11.7.1 USBL Equipment Shutdown

USBL equipment is necessary for maintaining communication and localization between the vessel and towed equipment. Equipment that is towed close to the bottom or groups of equipment that are towed together rely upon operation of the USBL transceiver and transponders to maintain the safe towing of the equipment. Therefore, in some cases, USBL equipment is not able to be shut down because there is a risk of equipment loss and/or entanglement. Given the small Level B zone (50 m or less) produced by USBL equipment, takes are not expected from the continued operation of USBL sources.

11.8 SURVEY COMMUNICATION AND COORDINATION FOR SIGHTINGS

The Applicant will utilize radios and available software to communicate sightings between all vessels. This will allow all PSOs and vessel crew to maintain awareness of marine mammal observations and adjust activities accordingly. The Applicant will also utilize the Whale Alert application to report all NARW detections and monitor for DMAs. The Whale Alert will be checked at least once every 4 hours by the PSOs.

12.0 Arctic Plan of Cooperation

This requirement is applicable only for activities that occur in Alaskan waters north of 60° N latitude. The proposed survey activities will not take place within the designated region and, therefore, will not have an adverse effect on the availability of marine mammals for subsistence uses. As such, there is no need to form such a plan.

13.0 Monitoring and Reporting

As required for Leases OCS-A 0486, 0517, 0487, and 0500, The Applicant will comply with the marine mammal reporting requirements for site characterization activities detailed below.

Reporting Injured or Dead Species. The Applicant will ensure that sightings of any injured or dead marine mammals are reported to the Greater Atlantic (Northeast) Region Marine Mammal and Sea Turtle Stranding & Entanglement Hotline (866-755-NOAA [6622]) within 24 hours of a sighting, regardless of whether the injury or death is caused by a vessel. In addition, if the injury or death was caused by a collision with a project-related vessel, the Applicant will ensure that BOEM is notified of the strike within 24 hours. The notification of such strike will include the date and location (latitude/longitude) of the strike, the name of the vessel involved, and the species identification or a description of the animal, if possible. If the project activity is responsible for the injury or death, the Applicant will supply a vessel to assist in any salvage effort as requested by NMFS.

Reporting of Observed Impacts to Species. The observers will report any observations concerning impacts on marine mammals to BOEM and NMFS within 48 hours. Any observed takes of listed marine mammals resulting in injury or mortality must be reported within 24 hours to BOEM and NMFS.

Final Report. The Applicant will provide BOEM and NMFS with a report within 90 calendar days following the completion of survey activities including a summary of the survey activities and an estimate of the number of marine mammals taken during these survey activities. Data on all marine mammal observations will be recorded and based on standards of observer collection data by the PSOs. This information will include dates, times, and locations of survey operations; time of observation, location and weather; details of marine mammal sightings (e.g., species, numbers, behavior) and details of any observed taking (e.g., behavioral disturbances, injury/mortality).

14.0 Suggested Means of Coordinated Research

This section addresses the IHA requirement to suggest means of learning of, encouraging, and coordinating research opportunities, plans, and activities related to reducing incidental take and evaluating its effects.

While no direct research on marine mammals or marine mammal stocks is expected from the project, there is the opportunity for the proposed activity to contribute greatly to the noise characterization in the region and to specific sound source measurements.

Data acquired during the mitigation and monitoring may provide valuable information to direct or refine future research on marine mammal species present in the area. Sightings data (e.g., date, time, weather conditions, species identification, approximate sighting distance, direction, heading in relation to sound sources, behavioral observations) may be useful in designing the location and scope of future marine mammal survey and monitoring programs.

The applicant commits to sharing all NARW sightings with NMFS as quickly as practicable. At all times the PSOs will maintain primary responsibility to observe and facilitate mitigations as needed when marine mammals are sighted.

All marine mammal data collected by the Applicant during marine characterization survey activities will be provided to NMFS and BOEM through the reporting processes. In addition, the data may be made available to educational institutions and environmental groups upon request.

15.0 List of Preparers

CSA Ocean Sciences Inc.

- Mary Jo Barkaszi, Marine Mammal Programs Manager
- Kayla Hartigan, Project Scientist
- Ashley Lawson, Project Scientist
- Melanie Cahill, Project Scientist
- Jeffrey Martin, Project Scientist
- Mark Fonseca, Science Reviewer

Orsted

- Stephanie Wilson, Manager of Permitting and Environmental Affairs
- Laura Morse, Environmental Manager
- Brita Woeck, Lead Environmental and Permitting Specialist
- Thomas Bojer Kristensen, Lead Geophysicist, Geophysics and Seabed Surveys
- Pernille Engelbredt Krogh, Senior Geophysicist, Geophysics and Seabed Surveys

59 *Federal Register* (*FR*) 28805. 1994. Designated Critical Habitat; North Atlantic Right Whale. June 3, 1994.

62 *Federal Register* (*FR*) 39157. 1997. Taking of Marine Mammals Incidental to Commercial Fishing Operations; Atlantic Large Whale Take Reduction Plan Regulations. July 22, 1997.

66 *Federal Register* (*FR*) 53195. 2001. Threatened Fish and Wildlife; Status Review of the Gulf of Maine/Bay of Fundy Population of Harbor Porpoise under the Endangered Species Act (ESA). October 19, 2001.

69 *Federal Register* (*FR*) 69536. 2004. Regulations Governing the Approach to North Atlantic Right Whales. November 30, 2004.

73 *Federal Register* (*FR*) 60173. 2008. Endangered Fish and Wildlife; Final Rule to Implement Speed Restrictions to Reduce the Threat of Ship Collisions with North Atlantic Right Whales. October 10, 2008.

75 *Federal Register* (*FR*) 61690. 2010. Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Designating Critical Habitat for the Endangered North Atlantic Right Whale. October 6, 2010.

75 *Federal Register* (*FR*) 7383. 2010. Taking of Marine Mammals Incidental to Commercial Fishing Operations; Harbor Porpoise Take Reduction Plan Regulations. February 19, 2010.

78 *Federal Register* (*FR*) 73726. 2013. Endangered Fish and Wildlife; Final Rule to Remove the Sunset Provision of the Final Rule Implementing Vessel Speed Restrictions to Reduce the Threat of Ship Collisions with North Atlantic Right Whales. December 9, 2013.

81 *Federal Register* (*FR*) 4837. 2016. Endangered and Threatened Species; Critical Habitat for Endangered North Atlantic Right Whale. January 27, 2016.

81 *Federal Register* (*FR*) 62259. 2016. Endangered and threatened species; Identification of 14 distinct population segments of the humpback whale (*Megaptera novaengliae*) and revision of species-wide listing. September 8, 2016.

83 *Federal Register* (*FR*) 29212. 2018. Taking and Importing Marine Mammals; Taking Marine Mammals Incidental to Geophysical Surveys Related to Oil and Gas Activities in the Gulf of Mexico. June 22, 2018.

84 *Federal Register* (*FR*) 52464. 2019. Takes of Marine Mammals Incidental to Specified Activities; Taking Marine Mammals Incidental to Site Characterization Surveys of Lease Areas. October 2, 2019.

Ainslie MA. 2010. *Principles of sonar performance modeling*. Springer-Verlag Heidelberg. 723 pp.

Baird RW, Stacey PJ. 1991. Status of the Risso's dolphin, *Grampus griseus*, in Canada. Canadian Field-Naturalist 105:233-242.

Barkaszi MJ, Kelly CJ. 2019. Seismic survey mitigation measures and protected species observer reports: synthesis report. U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau Ocean Energy Management, Gulf of Mexico OCS Region, New Orleans, LA. Contract No.: M17PD00004. OCS Study BOEM 2019-012. 220 pp.

Barlas ME. 1999. The distribution and abundance of harbor seals, *Phoca vitulina concolor*, and gray seals, *Halichoerus grypus*, in southern New England, winter 1998 - summer 1999. M.A. Thesis, Boston University, Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, Boston, MA.

Baumgartner MF, Van Parijs SM, Wenzel FW, Tremblay CJ, Esch HC, Warde AM. 2008. Low-frequency vocalizations attributed to sei whales (*Balaenoptera borealis*). Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 124(2):1339-1349.

Best BD, Halpin PN, Read AJ, Fujioka E, Good CP, Labrecque EA, Schick RS, Roberts JJ, Hazen LJ, Qian SS, Palka DL, Garrison LP, McLellan WA. 2012. Online Cetacean Habitat Modeling System for the U.S. East Coast and Gulf of Mexico. Endangered Species Research 18:1-15.

Bettridge S, Baker CS, Barlow J, Clapham PJ, Ford M, Gouveia D, Mattila DK, Pace III RM, Rosel PE, Silber GK, Wade PR. 2015. Status Review of the Humpback Whale (*Megaptera novaeangliae*) Under the Endangered Species Act. U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS Southwest Fisheries Science Center-540. 263 pp.

Bort J, Van Parijs SM, Stevick PT, Summers E, Todd S. 2015. North Atlantic right whale *Eubalaena glacialis* vocalization patterns in the central Gulf of Maine from October 2009 through October 2010. Endangered Species Research 26:271-280.

Brown MW, Hamilton PK, Kenney RD, Knowlton AR, Marx MK, Mayo CA, Slay CK, Kraus SD, Brault S. 2001. Sighting heterogeneity of right whales in the western North Atlantic: 1980-1992. Journal of Cetacean Research and Management (Special Issue) 2:245-250.

Bureau of Ocean Energy Management (BOEM). 2012. Commercial Wind Lease Issuance and Site Assessment Activities on the Atlantic Outer Continental Shelf Offshore New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, and Virginia. Final Environmental Assessment. U.S. Department of the Interior, BOEM Office of Renewable Energy Programs. OCS EIS/EA BOEM 2012-003. 366 pp.

Bureau of Ocean Energy Management (BOEM). 2013. Commercial Wind Lease Issuance and Site Assessment Activities on the Atlantic Outer Continental Shelf Offshore Rhode Island and Massachusetts. Revised Environmental Assessment. U.S. Department of the Interior, BOEM Office of Renewable Energy Programs. OCS EIS/EA BOEM 2013-1131. 417 pp.

Bureau of Ocean Energy Management (BOEM). 2014. Atlantic OCS Proposed Geological and Geophysical Activities: Mid-Atlantic and South Atlantic Planning Areas; Final Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement. Volume I: Chapters 1-8, Figures, Tables, and Keyword Index. Prepared by CSA Ocean Sciences Inc. for U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Gulf of Mexico OCS Region, New Orleans, LA. OCS EIS/EA BOEM 2014-001. 788 pp.

Bureau of Ocean Energy Management (BOEM). 2019. Survey Guidelines for Renewable Energy Development. https://www.boem.gov/Survey-Guidelines/. Accessed 18 October 2019.

Cetacean and Turtle Assessment Program (CETAP). 1982. A Characterization of Marine Mammals and Turtles in the Mid- and North Atlantic Areas of the U.S. Outer Continental Shelf. Kingston, Rhode Island: University of Rhode Island, Sponsored by the U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management. Contract #AA552-CT8-48. 576 pp.

Charif RA, Mellinger DK, Dunsmore KJ, Fristrup KM, Clark CW. 2002. Estimated source levels of fin whale (*Balaenoptera physalus*) vocalizations: Adjustments for surface interference. Marine Mammal Science 18(1):81-98.

Clark CW, Clapham PJ. 2004. Acoustic monitoring on a humpback whale (*Megaptera novaeangliae*) feeding ground shows continual singing into late spring. Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences 271:1051-1057.

Clark CW, Ellison WT, Southall BL, Hatch L, Van Parijs SM, Frankel AS, Ponirakis D. 2009. Acoustic masking in marine ecosystems: Intuitions, analysis, and implication. Marine Ecology Progress Series 395:201-222.

Cole TVN, Hamilton P, Henry AG, Duley P, Pace III RM, White BN, Frasier T. 2013. Evidence of a North Atlantic right whale *Eubalaena glacialis* mating ground. Endangered Species Research 21(1):55-64.

Committee on Taxonomy. 2018. List of marine mammal species and subspecies. Society for Marine Mammalogy. Internet website: https://www.marinemammalscience.org/species-information/list-marine-mammal-species-subspecies/. Accessed 23 August 2019.

Craddock JE, Polloni PT, Hayward B, Wenzel FW. 2009. Food habits of Atlantic white-sided dolphins (*Lagenorhynchus acutus*). Fisheries Bulletin 107:384-394.

Crocker SE, Fratantonio FD. 2016. Characteristics of Sounds Emitted During High-Resolution Marine Geophysical Surveys. Naval Undersea Warfare Center Division, Newport, RI. For U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Environmental Assessment Division and U.S. Geological Survey. OCS Study BOEM 2016-044. NUWC-NPT Technical Report 12,203, 24 March 2016. 266 pp.

Cunha HA, de Castra ER, Secchi ER, Crespo EA, Lailson-Brito J, Azevedo AF, Lazoski C, Solé-Cava AM. 2015. Correction: Molecular and Morphological Differentiation of Common Dolphins (Delphinus sp.) in the Southwestern Atlantic: Testing the Two Species Hypothesis in Sympatry. PLoS One 10(11):e0140251.

Curry BE, Smith J. 1997. Phylogeographic structure of the bottlenose dolphin (*Tursiops truncatus*): Stock identification and implications for management. Molecular Genetics of Marine Mammals Special Publication 3:327-347.

Davis GE, Baumgartner MF, Bonnell JM, Bell J, Berchok C, Bort Thornton J, Brault S, Buchanan G, Charif RA, Cholewiak D, Clark CW, Corkeron P, Delarue J, Dudzinski K, Hatch L, Hildebrand J, Hodge L, Klinck H, Kraus S, Martin B, Mellinger DK, Moors-Murphy H, Nieukirk S, Nowacek DP, Parks S, Read AJ, Rice AN, Risch D, Sirovic A, Soldevilla M, Stafford K, Stanistreet JE, Summers E, Todd S, Warde A, Van Parijs SM. 2017. Long-term passive acoustic recordings track the changing distribution of North Atlantic right whales (*Eubalaena glacialis*) from 2004 to 2014. Scientific Reports 7(1):13460.

deHart PAP. 2002. The distribution and abundance of harbor seals, *Phoca vitulina concolor*, in the Woods Hole region. M.A. Thesis, Boston University, Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, Boston, MA.

Department of the Navy (DoN). 2008. Request for Letter of Authorization for the incidental harassment of marine mammals resulting from Navy training activities conducted within the northwest training range complex. Prepared by Commander, U.S. Pacific Fleet for U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service Office of Protected Resources. September 2008. 322 pp.

Engås A, Løkkeborg S, Ona E, Soldal AV. 1996. Effects of seismic shooting on local abundance and catch rates of cod (*Gadus morhua*) and haddock (*Melanogrammus aeglefinus*). Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences 53(10):2238-2249.

Finneran JJ. 2016. Auditory Weighting Functions and TTS/PTS Exposure Functions for Marine Mammals Exposed to Underwater Noise. Marine Mammal Scientific and Vet Support Branch of the Biosciences Division, Space and Naval Warfare Systems Center, San Diego, CA. Technical Report 3026. 134 pp.

Gardline. N.D. Technical Memo to Support DONG Energy's IHA Application for Ocean Wind. 3 pp.

Garrison LP, Rosel PE, Hohn AA, Baird R, Hoggard W. 2003. Abundance of the coastal morphotype of bottlenose dolphin *Tursiops truncatus* in U.S. continental shelf waters between New Jersey and Florida during winter and summer 2002. U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service, Southeast Fisheries Science Center. Prepared and review for the Bottlenose Dolphin Take Reduction Team. Available from Southeast Fisheries Science Center, Miami, FL.

Glass AH, Cole TVN, Geron M. 2009. Mortality and serious injury determinations for baleen whale stocks along the United States eastern seaboard and adjacent Canadian Maritimes, 2003–2007. U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Northeast Fisheries Science Center. Document 09-04. 18 pp.

Guazzo RA, Weller DW, Europe HM, Durban JW, D'Spain GL, Hildebrand JA. 2019. Migrating eastern North Pacific gray whale call and blow rates estimated from acoustic recordings, infrared camera video, and visual sightings. Scientific Reports 9(1):12617.

Hamazaki T. 2002. Spatiotemporal prediction models of cetacean habitats in the mid-western North Atlantic Ocean (from Cape Hatteras, North Carolina, U.S.A. to Nova Scotia, Canada). Marine Mammal Science 18:920-939.

Hassel A, Knutsen T, Dalen J, Skaar K, Løkkeborg S, Misund OA, Østensen Ø, Fonn M, Haugland EK. 2004. Influence of seismic shooting on the lesser sandeel (*Ammodytes marinus*). ICES Journal of Marine Science 61(7):1165-1173.

Hayes SA, Josephson E, Maze-Foley K, Rosel PE, (eds.). 2017. U.S. Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico Marine Mammal Stock Assessments -- 2016. U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service, Northeast Fisheries Science Center, Woods Hole, MA. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-NE-241. 282 pp.

Kraus SD, Leiter S, Stone K, Wikgren B, Mayo C, Hughes P, Kenney RD, Clark CW, Rice AN, Estabrook B, Tielens J. 2016. Northeast Large Pelagic Survey Collaborative Aerial and Acoustic Surveys for Large Whales and Sea Turtles. Sterling, Virginia: US Department of the Interior, Bureau of Ocean Energy Management. OCS Study BOEM 2016-054. 117 pp.

Kraus SD, Kenney RD, Thomas L. 2019. A Framework for Studying the Effects of Offshore Wind Development on Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles. Report prepared for the Massachusetts Clean Energy Center, Boston, MA, 02110, and the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management. May 2019. 48 pp.

Leatherwood S, Caldwell DK, Winn HE, Schevill WE, Caldwell MC. 1976. Whales, dolphins, and porpoises of the western North Atlantic: a guide to their identification. U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service. NOAA Technical Report NMFS Circular 396. 183 pp.

Marine Acoustics, Inc. (MAI). 2018. Sound Source Verification: supporting Deepwater Wind's Skipjack Wind Farm Project off Maryland and Delaware. MAI 1046. TN 18-027.

Martin B, MacDonnell J, Chorney NE, Zeddies D. 2012. Sound Source Verification of Fugro Geotechnical Sources: Final Report: Boomer, Sub-Bottom Profiler, Multibeam Sonar, and the R/V Taku. Technical report by JASCO Applied Sciences for Fugro GeoServices Inc. JASCO Document 00413, Version 1.0 DRAFT. 31 pp.

Matthews LP, McCordic JA, Parks SE. 2014. Remote acoustic monitoring of North Atlantic right whales (*Eubalaena glacialis*) reveals seasonal and diel variations in acoustic behavior. PLoS One 9(3):e91367.

McCauley RD, Fewtrell J, Duncan AJ, Jenner C, Jenner MN, Penrose JD, Prince RIT, Adhitya A, Murdoch J, McCabe K. 2000. Marine seismic surveys—a study of environmental implications. APPEA Journal 40(1):692-708.

McCauley RD, Fewtrell J, Popper AN. 2003. High-intensity anthropogenic sound damages fish ears. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 113:638-642.

McDonald MA, Hildebrand JA, Wiggins SM, Thiele D, Glasgow D, Moore SE. 2005. Sei whale sounds recorded in the Antarctic. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 188(6):3941-3945.

Mead JG, Potter CW. 1995. Recognizing two populations of the bottlenose dolphin (*Tursiops truncatus*) of the Atlantic coast of North America-morphologic and ecologic considerations. IBI Reports 5:31-44.

Morano JL, Rice AN, Tielens JT, Estabrook BJ, Murray A, Roberts BL, Clark CW. 2012. Acoustically Detected Year-Round Presence of Right Whales in an Urbanized Migration Corridor. Conservation Biology 26(4):698-707.

Muir DCG, Wagemann R, Grift NP, Nortstrom RJ, Simon MA, Lien J. 1988. Organochlorine chemical and heavy metal contaminants in white-beaked dolphins (*Lagenorhynchus albirostris*) and pilot whales (*Globicephala melaena*) from the coast of Newfoundland, Canada. Archives of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology 17(5):613-629.

National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). 2010. Recovery plan for the fin whale (*Balaenoptera physalus*). U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service, Office of Protected Resources. Silver Spring, MD. 121 pp.

National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). 2012. Marine Mammal Acoustic Thresholds. https://www.westcoast.fisheries.noaa.gov/protected_species/marine_mammals/threshold_guidance.html. Accessed August 1, 2019.

National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). 2018a. 2018 Revisions to: Technical Guidance for Assessing the Effects of Anthropogenic Sound on Marine Mammal Hearing (Version 2.0): Underwater Thresholds for Onset of Permanent and Temporary Threshold Shifts. U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-OPR-59. 167 pp.

National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). 2018b. Manual for Optional User Spreadsheet Tool (Version 2.0) for: 2018 Technical Guidance for Assessing the Effects of Anthropogenic Sound on Marine Mammal Hearing (Version 2.0): Underwater Thresholds for Onset of Permanent and Temporary Threshold Shifts. Silver Spring, MD: U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. Silver Spring, MD. 109 pp.

National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). 2019a. Interim recommendations for sound source level and propagation analysis for high resolution geophysical sources. U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service, Office of Protected Resources. 19 September 2019. 3 pp.

National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). 2019b. Draft 2019 Marine Mammal Stock Assessment Report, U.S. Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico Draft Marine Mammal Stock Assessment. U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service. Draft published on 27 November 2019, 84 FR 65353. 399 pp.

National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). 2019c. 2017-2019 North Atlantic Right Whale Unusual Mortality Event. https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/national/marine-life-distress/2017-2020-north-atlantic-right-whale-unusual-mortality-event. Accessed 23 August 2019.

National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). 2019d. Reducing Ship Strikes to North Atlantic Right Whales. https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/national/endangered-species-conservation/reducing-ship-strikes-north-atlantic-right-whales. Accessed 2 September 2019.

National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). 2019e. 2016-2019 Humpback whale unusual mortality event along the Atlantic coast. https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/national/marine-life-distress/2016-2019-humpback-whale-unusual-mortality-event-along-atlantic-coast. Accessed 23 August 2019.

National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). 2019f. Fin Whale (*Balaenoptera physalus*) 5-Year Review: Summary and Evaluation. U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service, Office of Protected Resources. February 2019. 40 pp.

National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). 2019g. 2017–2019 Minke Whale Unusual Mortality Event along the Atlantic Coast. https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/national/marine-life-distress/2017-2020-minke-whale-unusual-mortality-event-along-atlantic-coast. Accessed 23 August 2019.

National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). 2019h. 2018–2019 Pinniped Unusual Mortality Event along the Northeast Coast. https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/new-england-mid-atlantic/marine-life-distress/2018-2019-pinniped-unusual-mortality-event-along. Accessed 23 August 2019.

National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA). 2019. NOAA Right Whale Sighting Advisory System Interactive Mapper. https://www.nefsc.noaa.gov/psb/surveys/MapperiframeWithText.html. Accessed 18 September 2019.

National Research Council. 2005. *Marine Mammal Populations and Ocean Noise: Determining When Noise Causes Biologically Significant Effects*. Committee on Characterizing Biologically Significant Marine Mammal Behavior. Washington, D.C.: The National Academies Press. 142 pp.

Noise Control Engineering and RPS Group. 2018. HRG Survey Equipment Acoustic Field Verification Report. Prepared for Terrasond on behalf of Orsted. Report by Noise Control Engineering and RPS, May 28, 2018.

Palka D. 2012. Cetacean Abundance Estimates in U.S. Northwestern Atlantic Ocean Waters from Summer 2011 Line Transect Survey. U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service, Northeast Fisheries Science Center, Woods Hole, MA. NEFSC Reference Document 12-29. 43 pp.

Palka DL, Chavez-Rosales S, Josephson E, Cholewiak D, Haas HL, Garrison L, Jones M, Sigourney D, Waring G, Jech M, Broughton E, Soldevilla M, Davis G, DeAngelis A, Sasso CR, Winton MV, Smolowitz RJ, Fay G, LaBrecque E, Leiness JB, Dettloff, Warden M, Murray K, Orphanides C. 2017. Atlantic Marine Assessment Program for Protected Species: 2010-2014. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Atlantic OCS Region. OCS Study BOEM 2017-071. 211 pp.

Pangeo Subsea. 2018. Acoustic corer sound source analysis and environmental impact for South Fork Wind Farm. RPT-08082-1. April 2, 2018. 56 pp.

Parks SE, Tyack PL. 2005. Sound production by North Atlantic right whales (*Eubalaena glacialis*) in surface active groups. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 117(5):3297-3306.

Parks SE, Hamilton PK, Kraus SD, Tyack PL. 2005. The gunshot sound produced by male North Atlantic right whales (*Eubalaena glacialis*) and its potential function in reproductive advertisement. Marine Mammal Science 21(3):458-475.

Payne PM, Selzer LA. 1989. The Distribution, Abundance and Selected Prey of the Harbor Seal, *Phoca Vitulina Concolor*, in Southern New England. Marine Mammal Science 5:173-192.

Payne PM, Heinemann DW, Selzer LA. 1990. A distributional assessment of cetaceans in the shelf and shelf edge waters of the northeastern United States based on aerial and shipboard surveys, 1978-1988. Report to U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service, Northeast Fisheries Science Center, Woods Hole, MA. 253 pp.

Payne PM, Nicholas JR, O'Brien L, Powers KD. 1986. The distribution of the humpback whale, *Megaptera novaeangliae*, on Georges Bank and in the Gulf of Maine in relation to densities of the sand eel, *Ammodytes americanus*. Fisheries Bulletin 84:271-277.

Pendleton DE, Pershing A, Brown MW, Mayo CA, Kenney RD, Record NR, Cole TV. 2009. Regional-scale mean copepod concentration indicates relative abundance of North Atlantic right whale. Marine Ecology Progress Series 378:211.

Perrin W. 2002. Common Dolphins. In: W Perrin, B Wursig, J Thewissen (Eds.), Encyclopedia of Marine Mammals. San Diego, California: Academic Press. pp. 4.

Perrin WF, Caldwell DK, Caldwell MC. 1994. Atlantic spotted dolphin *Stenella frontalis* (G. Cuvier, 1829). Handbook of Marine Mammals 5:173-190.

Popper AN, Hastings MC. 2009. The effects of human-generated sound on fish. Integrative Zoology 4(1):43-52.

Rankin S, Barlow J. 2005. Source of the North Pacific "boing" sound attributed to minke whales. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 118(5):3346-3351.

Rankin S, Barlow J. 2007. Vocalizations of the sei whale (*Balaenoptera borealis*) off the Hawaiian Islands. Bioacoustics 16:137-145.

Rasmussen MH, Miller LA. 2002. Whistles and clicks from white-beaked dolphins, *Lagenorhynchus albirostris*, recorded in Faxaflói Bay, Iceland. Aquatic Mammals 28(1):78-89.

Reeves RR. 2001. Overview of catch history, historic abundance and distribution of right whales in the western North Atlantic and in Cintra Bay, West Africa. Journal of Cetacean Research and Management 2:187-192.

Reeves RR, McClellan K, Werner TB. 2013. Marine mammal bycatch in gillnet and other entangling net fisheries, 1990 to 2011. Endangered Species Research 20(1):71-97.

Reeves RR, Rosa C, George JC, Sheffield G, Moore M. 2012. Implications of Arctic industrial growth and strategies to mitigate future vessel and fishing gear impacts on bowhead whales. Marine Policy 36(2):454-462.

Rice AN, Tielens JT, Estabrook BJ, Muirhead CA, Rahaman A, Guerra M, Clark CW. 2014. Variation of ocean acoustic environments along the western north Atlantic coast: a case study in context of the right whale migration route. Ecological Informatics 21:89-99.

Richardson W, Greene Jr. C, Malme C, Thomson D. 1995. *Marine mammals and noise*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press. 575 pp.

Risch D, Castellote M, Clark CW, Davis GE, Dugan PJ, Hodge LEW, Kumar A, Lucke K, Mellinger DK, Nieukirk S, Popescu CM, Ramp C, Read AJ, Rice AN, Silva MA, Siebert U, Stafford KM, Verdaat H, Van Parijs SM. 2014. Seasonal migrations of North Atlantic minke whales: novel insights from large-scale passive acoustic monitoring networks. Movement Ecology 2(24):1-17.

Roberts JJ. 2018.Roberts JJ, Mannocci L, Halpin PN, Rolland RM, Parks SE, Hunt KE, Castellote M, Corkeron PJ, Nowacek DP, Wasser SK, Kraus SD. 2012. Evidence that ship noise increases stress in right whales. Proceedings of Royal Society B 279(1737):2363-2368.

Roberts JJ, Best BD, Mannocci L, Fujioka E, Halpin PN, Palka DL, Garrison LP, Mullin KD, Cole TVN, Khan CB, McLellan WM, Pabst DA, Lockhart GG. 2016. Habitat-based cetacean density models for the U.S. Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico. Scientific Reports 6:22615.

Sabinsky PF, Tougaard J, Wahlberg M, Larsen ON. 2012. Seasonal, diel, tidal, and geographical variation in male harbour seal (*Phoca vitulina*) vocalizations in southern Scandinavia. In: 26th Annual Conference of the European Cetacean Society. 26-28 March 2012, Galway, Ireland.

Salisbury DP, Clark CW, Rice AN. 2016. Right whale occurrence in the coastal waters of Virginia, USA: Endangered species presence in a rapidly developing energy market. Marine Mammal Science 32(2):508-519.

Schneider DC, Payne PM. 1983. Factors affecting haul-out of harbor seals at a site in southeastern Massachusetts. Journal of Mammalogy 64(3):518-520.

Selzer LA, Payne PM. 1988. The distribution of white-sided, *Lagenorhynchus acutus* and common dolphins, *Delphinus delphis* vs. environmental features of the continental shelf of the northeastern United States. Marine Mammal Science 4(2):141-153.

Slabbekoorn H, Bouton N, van Opzeeland I, Coers A, ten Cate C, Popper AN. 2010. A noisy spring: the impact of globally rising underwater sound levels on fish. Trends in Ecology & Evolution 25(7):419-427.

Southall BJ, Bowles AE, Ellison WT, Finneran JJ, Gentry RL, Greene Jr. CR, Kastak D, Ketten DR, Miller JH, Nachtigall PE, Richardson WJ, Thomas JA, Tyack PL. 2007. Marine mammal noise exposure criteria: Initial scientific recommendations. Aquatic Mammals 33(44):411-521.

Southall BL, Finneran JJ, Reichmuth C, Nachtigall PE, Ketten DR, Bowles AE, Ellison WT, Nowacek DP, Tyack PL. 2019. Marine Mammal Noise Exposure Criteria: Updated Scientific Recommendations for Residual Hearing Effects. Aquatic Mammals 45(2):125-232.

Stewart BS, Clapham PJ, Powell JA. 2002. *Guide to marine mammals of the World*. National Audubon Society. 528 pp.

Subacoustech. 2017. Deepwater Wind Sound Source Verification. Unpublished (commercial in confidence) report submitted to Deepwater Wind, LLC. 17 July 2017. 20 pp.

Thompson PM, Hastie GD, Nedwell J, Barham R, Brookes KL, Cordes LS, Bailey H, McLean N. 2013. Framework for assessing impacts of pile-driving noise from offshore wind farm construction on a harbour seal population. Environmental Impact Assessment Review 43:73-85.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). 2019. West Indian manatee *Trichechus manatus*. https://www.fws.gov/southeast/wildlife/mammals/manatee/. Accessed 1 August 2019.

van der Hoop JM, Moore MJ, Barco SG, Cole TVN, Daoust PY, Henry AG, McAlpine DF, McLellan WA, Wimmer T, Solow AR. 2013. Assessment of management to mitigate anthropogenic effects on large whales. Conservation Biology 27(1):121-133.

Verfuss UK, Gillespie D, Gordon J, Marques TA, Miller B, Plunkett R, Theriault JA, Tollit DJ, Zitterbart DP, Hubert P, Thomas L. 2018. Comparing methods suitable for monitoring marine mammals in low visibility conditions during seismic surveys. Marine Pollution Bulletin 126:1-18.

Vester H, Hammerschmidt K, Timme M, Hallerberg S. 2014. Bag-of-calls analysis reveals group specific vocal repertoire in long-finned pilot whales. Quantitative Methods arXiv: 1410.4711.

Vu E, Risch D, Clark C, Gaylord S, Hatch L, Thompson M, Wiley D, Van Parijs S. 2012. Humpback whale song occurs extensively on feeding grounds in the western North Atlantic Ocean. Aquatic Biology 14(2):175-183.

Wardle CS, Carter TJ, Urquhart GG, Johnstone ADF, Ziolkowski AM, Hampson G, Mackie D. 2001. Effects of seismic air guns on marine fish. Continental Shelf Research 21(8):1005-1027.

Waring GT, Josephson E, Fairfield CP, Maze-Foley K, (eds.). 2007. U.S. Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico Marine Mammal Stock Assessments -- 2006. U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service, Northeast Fisheries Science Center, Wood Hole, MA. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-NE-201. 388 pp.

Waring GT, Josephson E, Maze-Foley K, Rosel PE, (eds.). 2010. U.S. Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico Marine Mammal Stock Assessments - 2010. U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service, Northeast Fisheries Science Center, Wood Hole, MA. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-NE-219. 609 pp.

Waring GT, Josephson E, Maze-Foley K, Rosel PE, (eds.). 2014. U.S. Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico Marine Mammal Stock Assessments - 2013. U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service, Northeast Fisheries Science Center, Wood Hole, MA. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-NE-228. 475 pp.

Waring GT, Josephson E, Maze-Foley K, Rosel PE, (eds.). 2015. U.S. Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico marine mammal stock assessments – 2014. U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service, Northeast Fisheries Science Center, Woods Hole, MA. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-NE-231. 370 pp.

Waring GT, Josephson E, Maze-Foley K, and Rosel PE (eds.). 2016. U.S. Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico. Marine Mammal Stock Assessments – 2015. U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service, Northeast Fisheries Science Center, Woods Hole, MA. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-NE-238. 512 pp.

Waring GT, Wood SA, Josephson E. 2012. Literature search and data synthesis for marine mammals and sea turtles in the U.S. Atlantic from Maine to the Florida Keys. New Orleans, LA: U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Gulf of Mexico OCS Region. OCS Study BOEM 2012-109. 456 pp.

Watkins WA, Daher MA, Reppucci GM, George JE, Martin DL, DiMarzio NA, Gannon DP. 2000. Seasonality and distribution of whale calls in the North Pacific. Oceanography 13:62-67.

Weisbrod AV, Shea D, Moore MJ, Stegemann JJ. 2000. Organochlorine exposure and bioaccumulation in the endangered Northwest Atlantic right whale (*Eubalaena glacialis*) population. Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry 19(3):654-666.

Whitlock MC, Schluter D. 2009. *The analysis of biological data*. Greenwood Village, Colorado: Roberts and Company Publishers. 704 pp.

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

Wingfield JE, O'Brien M, Lyubchich V, Roberts JJ, Halpin PN, Rice AN, Bailey H. 2017. Year-round spatiotemporal distribution of harbour porpoises within and around the Maryland wind energy area. PLoS One 12(5):e0176653.

Wood J, Southall BL, Tollit DJ. 2012. PG&E offshore 3-D Seismic Survey Project EIR – Marine Mammal Technical Draft Report. SMRU Ltd. SMRUL-NA0611ERM. 124 pp.

Wood LaFond S. 2009. Dynamics of Recolonization: a Study of the Gray Seal (*Halichoerus grypus*) in the Northeast U.S. Ph.D. Dissertation. University of Massachusetts, Boston. 83 pp.