

California Coastal Commission Statement for
The Report of the Advisory Committee on Acoustic Impacts on
Marine Mammals

to the

Marine Mammal Commission

Submitted by Committee Member:

Sara Wan
Executive Director
California Coastal Commission

Submission Date: 19 December 2005

The following statement reflects only the views of the individuals and organizations listed as submitting authors. The inclusion of this statement does not indicate support or endorsement by other members of the Advisory Committee on Acoustic Impacts on Marine Mammals or by the Marine Mammal Commission.

CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION

45 FREMONT STREET, SUITE 2000
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105-2219
VOICE AND TDD (415) 904-5200



The California Coastal Commission appreciates the opportunity to have had a representative on the Federal Advisory Committee on Acoustic Impacts on Marine Mammals. The California Coastal Commission is charged with overseeing the coastal zone of the State of California and protecting its valuable coastal resources, including marine mammals. The coastal and marine ecosystems of this State represent both an important economic interest and a vital spiritual one. The coastal and marine ecosystems and marine life within this State's sovereign waters and beyond support important commercial activities, including fishing and tourism. California residents and tourists alike enjoy the benefits and solace that comes from being able to see and appreciate the beauty and wonder of nature. Marine mammals represent a critically important part of this and play a special role in our society and as such deserve our protection.

The California Coastal Commission's regulatory authority over state waters and beyond into federal waters comes through both the California Coastal Act and the federal Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA). It is within the coastal waters of the states that U.S. strandings occur. It is thus critically important that the states have a say in what happens relative to this issue.

It is with that in mind that the California Coastal Commission is submitting this statement to the Marine Mammal Commission. It is unfortunate that consensus was not reached among the Advisory Committee members so that one comprehensive document could be submitted to Congress and we have not attempted to craft one. Instead we have commented only on those issues that were listed as disagreements at the final Plenary session.

Introduction

Anthropogenic noise is a recognized, but largely unregulated, form of ocean pollution that can deafen, disturb, injure, and kill marine life.¹ Many species of marine mammals are known to be highly sensitive to sound and rely upon sound to navigate, find food, locate mates, avoid predators, and communicate with one another. A combination of noise sources, including shipping, oil and gas exploration and production, dredging, construction, and military activities, has resulted in dramatic increases in noise levels throughout the oceans. Over the last ten years, a growing body of evidence has shown that some forms of ocean noise can kill, injure, and deafen whales and other marine mammals.² In particular, a sequence of marine mammal strandings and mortalities has been linked to exposure to mid-frequency sonar.³ There is also evidence that some affected animals do not strand but die at sea. This has increased public concern about the effects of anthropogenic noise on marine mammals, which has been acknowledged in a variety of domestic and international fora.

Marine mammals have evolved over millions of years and rely on sound for vital life functions and have specialized sensory capabilities to take advantage of the physics of sound in the ocean. Anthropogenic noise in the oceans has increased since the start of the industrial revolution and

increases in ambient noise levels,⁴ as well as individual sound sources, can cause adverse effects, the extent and type of which are not well understood. Military technology and scientific research using low frequency active acoustics attempting to cover large distances have specifically targeted the ecological sound niches that low frequency specialist whales have evolved to rely on, necessarily competing with those marine mammal species. Peer-reviewed scientific literature indicates that marine mammals are affected by exposure to anthropogenic noise in a variety of ways that can be harmful or even lethal. However, there are significant gaps in information available to understand and manage these effects. This is particularly the case because marine mammals are extremely difficult to study and the marine environment is extraordinarily complex and dynamic. In addition, this is a relatively new field of concern and the amount of research undertaken to date has been limited in scope and duration.

Much of the information needed to understand the impacts of noise on populations and individuals will remain unknown for decades, if not longer. In the face of much uncertainty, the California Coastal Commission and other agencies must make decisions about proposed activities. Given the current data gaps and the uncertainties in information available about impacts of sound on the marine environment, and the potential for harm to occur before it is detected, it is appropriate for managers to apply precaution when allowing necessary activities to proceed. The current statutes presume that a precautionary approach should be taken and place the burden of proof on the applicant proposing the action. This is necessary because scientific certainty is difficult to obtain on most issues but will be particularly elusive in this field. Because many of these species reproduce very slowly, requiring scientific certainty before taking protective measures could very well result in their extinction.

While much remains to be learned about marine mammals and their responses to noise, one method of determining if there is a correlation between intense noise events (sonar and seismic) would be to be able to have more accurate information about strandings coincident with noise events. However, stranding teams are not necessarily available to cover all areas where strandings occur and funds for quick, accurate, and unbiased review of strandings are insufficient. In addition, knowledge of military activities is not always available. As a result, only publicized mass strandings are reviewed to see if they are coincident with naval or other sound-producing activities. Additionally, there has been no attempt to look at single strandings to see if there may have been sound-producing activities in the area. There also is no standardized form for reporting the results of necropsies and the public is frequently not allowed to observe necropsies or have access to the data for long periods of time (e.g., 2005 North Carolina stranding event). A more coordinated and complete analysis of all stranding data should be conducted.

While anthropogenic noise is only one of many serious threats facing marine mammals, such as fisheries by-catch, habitat degradation, ocean pollution, whaling, vessel strikes, global warming, and others, it is too early in our investigations to know where this issue sits in a relative sense. Most likely the answer will depend upon the species and a more complete knowledge of both cumulative and synergistic effects of noise. Long-term cumulative impacts to populations and synergistic effects that may heighten the impacts of other threats may turn out to be the greatest impact of

noise on marine mammal populations. However, the indications are that this threat is significant enough to require efforts to reduce its potential impacts and should be taken seriously.

Extent of the Problem

How significant is the threat and what is the relative importance of sound?

There has been an attempt by some to downplay the significance of sound as a threat, particularly as it compares to other threats. However, it is impossible to say at this stage of our knowledge what the relative importance is. Underwater noise can prevent marine mammals from hearing their prey or predators, from avoiding dangers, from navigating or orienting toward important habitat, from finding mates, from contact with their young, and can cause them to leave important feeding and breeding habitat.⁵ Those who state that anthropogenic noise only affects a few individuals or who insist on an irrefutable burden of proof are looking at this from a very narrow perspective, i.e., considering only known atypical mass strandings where the existence of a sound source was known as a measure of the impact and requiring that there be physical evidence of trauma. This ignores that:

- 1) The majority of strandings likely go unreported, particularly in remote areas;
- 2) Mortalities that occur away from the coast are very difficult to detect since most whale carcasses sink immediately;⁶
- 3) Knowledge of whether or not a sound source may be present during known strandings may not be available;
- 4) Strandings of single whales where there is no other known cause of the stranding are not reviewed for a possible connection to sound;⁷
- 5) There may be cumulative and synergistic effects on individuals and populations that are difficult, if not impossible, to determine;
- 6) There may be significant impacts to a variety of biologically necessary functions;
- 7) Strandings are not the only possible impact of sound; and
- 8) Limiting the inclusion of strandings to those where there is proof of a cause and effect is inaccurate and misleading.

The significance of the impacts may vary with the species. Some species are more threatened by ship strikes, other by by-catch, and still others, such as beaked whales, by noise. We also know that human impacts on marine ecosystems interact to produce a magnified effect of other threats. There is no reason to believe that it is different with noise. Thus noise could, for instance, affect the ability of marine mammals to sense fishing gear or create stress that magnifies the impacts of pollution.

In conclusion, the impact of anthropogenic noise on marine mammals cannot be looked at in a simplistic way by only comparing the known number of mass strandings proven to be connected to sound to the total number of strandings, including those for which there is no explanation. The body of scientific literature on noise impacts on marine mammals is growing, pointing almost uniformly to a cause for concern. While the relative significance of this threat is yet to be determined, it is clear, even at this stage, that this threat should not be taken lightly.

Impact on populations

Impacts of noise on populations, even non-lethal impacts, can severely affect species survival. However, population impacts are difficult to detect, particularly where there is insufficient information about the population size and structure. Where the impacts are the result of long-term cumulative exposure, scientific observation and conclusions are particularly elusive but noise is believed to have contributed to the decline of several species of whales or their failure to recover.⁸ The NRC statement that “no scientific studies have conclusively demonstrated a link between exposure to sound and adverse effects on a marine mammal population”¹ is misleading at best, because there are also no scientific studies that conclusively demonstrate that there have been no effects on any marine mammal population. In other words, there is simply not sufficient information to make that conclusory statement. In addition, it ignores the information on noise-induced strandings of a well-studied local population of beaked whales that was either killed or did not return even five years after the sonar event believed to have caused the stranding.⁹ That local population impact, on a species about which we know little of the population numbers or structure, cannot be ignored as a possible population impact.

Additionally, the NRC conclusion ignores that:

- 1) in all but a few cetacean species our population estimates are too imprecise to be able to detect population declines;¹⁰
- 2) there have been no studies that have attempted to study population declines due to noise;
- 3) if we were able to detect a population decline, it would be difficult if not impossible to tie it to noise;
- 4) where we do know of population declines, most cannot be linked to one primary cause;¹¹ and
- 5) in instances where we have reason to believe there can be major impacts, such as in the case of known toxins, even those that accumulate in the tissues of marine mammals, it has not been possible to prove they are a cause of marine mammal decline.¹²

In conclusion, marine mammal population declines are difficult to document especially without accurate baseline population counts to start with. However, what we have learned in the very short time that attention has focused on these issues is that we have seriously underestimated the effects of noise on marine mammals. This indicates that the effects of anthropogenic noise could be far-ranging and severe and should not be discounted.

Degree of scientific uncertainty and the use of extrapolation

In the last few decades, knowledge of marine mammal biology has increased yet many aspects of marine mammal behavior, physiology, populations, and ecology remain unknown. An understanding of normal behavior and the biological significance of any resulting changes in behavior caused by sound exposure are critical to better answer questions regarding impacts. Unfortunately, much of the understanding of normal behavior required to answer these questions is unknown at this time.

¹ NRC 2005. Marine Mammal Populations and Ocean Noise: Determining When Noise Causes Biologically Significant Effects. National Academy Press Washington, D.C. 96 pp.

At this time there is still a significant amount of uncertainty about how marine mammals hear, how they use sound, and the impacts of noise on them. In fact, the data gaps are so substantial that it is difficult to draw any definitive conclusions on this subject, other than to state that there is a high degree of probability that sound may impact marine mammals in significant ways necessitating the use of precaution.

Listed below are just some of the areas where it is generally agreed that there is uncertainty:

- Eighty-three different species of cetaceans are currently recognized, and audiograms have been developed for only 11 species, all of which are odontocetes.
- The hearing of mysticete whales remains unmeasured.
- Uncertainty regarding the specific uses of sound by marine mammals (e.g., extent, context) makes it difficult to detect or interpret changes in behaviors associated with sound.
- We know relatively little about the extent of marine mammals' use of sound from natural sources (for navigation, prey detection, predator avoidance, or other uses).
- There is uncertainty about how marine mammals use sound to communicate or carry out other functions.
- The ranges and circumstances of effective communication using sound are also unclear.
- There is limited information available on what constitutes normal behavior for many species.
- There is a lack of baseline behavioral data making it difficult to assess the impact of sound or determine what would constitute a biologically significant disturbance.
- There is uncertainty about whether an animal hears the same types of sounds that it produces, and therefore whether it is appropriate to estimate an animal's audiogram by examining its sound production.
- There is uncertainty about whether or not sounds to which animals are relatively insensitive are still important to their survival.
- There is uncertainty about the pathways by which sound travels to the inner ear and about other mechanisms for hearing in marine mammals.
- There is uncertainty about the onset of auditory trauma in marine mammals, including which types and levels of sound exposures will induce trauma in which species.
- There are limited experimental data on TTS (temporary threshold shift) in marine mammals, and no experimental data on PTS (permanent threshold shift, i.e., deafness).
- It is uncertain whether increased sound levels in the oceans could cause auditory developmental problems for young marine mammals.
- We do not know whether marine mammals have natural mechanisms to protect their hearing. If they do have protective mechanisms, they may not work in the same way as in the ears of terrestrial mammals. If marine mammals do have protective mechanisms, we do not know whether or how they might fatigue.
- There is uncertainty about whether the auditory systems of mysticetes may be more likely than those of odontocetes to be affected by low- to mid-frequency sounds because mysticetes' vocalizations consist of these same frequencies.

- While masking is known to be a common, naturally occurring phenomenon, there is uncertainty about the specific conditions under which, and the extent to which, it occurs in marine mammals, and when it is significant.
- The full range of options available to marine mammals to overcome masking is not known.
- There is uncertainty about the potential of general, non-directional ambient noise to cause masking, which results from a lack of information about ambient noise levels.
- Uncertainties exist about baseline feeding rates and hunting success, mate-searching behavior, and predator avoidance affecting scientists' understanding of whether masking is likely to adversely affect the survival or reproductive success of an individual or population.
- Direct effects of masking are difficult to demonstrate in the field.
- The prevalence of non-auditory physiological sound effects (e.g., stress, neurosensory effects, effects on balance, tissue damage from acoustic resonance, gas bubble growth in tissues and blood and blast-trauma injury) in marine mammals and the relative vulnerability of different species to such effects are uncertain.
- Little is known about how sound might induce stress in marine mammals.
- There have been no studies to date specifically investigating these stresses in marine mammals.
- There is uncertainty about the possible role of acoustic resonance in beaked whale strandings associated with sound exposure.
- The relationship of sound characteristics to gas bubble growth is unclear.
- Disagreement currently exists over the possible role of gas bubble growth in beaked whale strandings.
- It is unclear what, if any, specialized adaptations deep diving marine mammals may have evolved to avoid decompression-type effects during their routine diving behaviors.
- The biological significance (e.g., consequences for health, survival, reproduction) of behavioral responses to sound is largely unknown.
- The long-term, cumulative impacts of sound exposure on behavior are also unknown, making it more difficult to determine the significance of observed behavioral changes over time.
- Little is known about the extent to which marine mammals can or do adapt their behavior to changes in anthropogenic sound.
- It is also uncertain how most marine mammal species may respond behaviorally to long-term increases in background noise levels.
- The characteristics of sound that trigger a behavioral reaction are often unknown.
- There are few direct data concerning the behavioral effects of sound on marine mammals.

Uncertainties about the effects of sound on marine mammals are driven by several fundamental problems. First, the lack of baseline behavioral data for most marine mammals makes it difficult to measure and interpret behavioral responses to sound. Second, there are fundamental, practical challenges inherent to studying marine mammal behavior in the wild such that some types of responses (even acute responses) are difficult to detect with currently available monitoring

capabilities. Third, even in cases where behavioral responses to sound have been documented, the mechanisms and implications of these changes are not always clear. Fourth, sample sizes in studies where behavioral changes are documented are often small, and the results are often specific to a particular location and scenario, making general conclusions difficult. In addition, even where behavioral changes are documented, interpreting the effects that are detected is extremely difficult, at best.

While the above is not meant to imply that we do not know anything about these issues, it highlights the significant gaps in our current understanding. We do not even know what the hearing range is for most cetaceans (only 11 out of the 83 known species), and we have no measurements on mysticetes at all. Most of what is known about the hearing range of these species comes from studies with one or a few individuals belonging to these 11 species. Extrapolation of these few data points is then used to determine the hearing range of the entire species. We know that there are great variations in the hearing ability and range of individuals within a species, and thus any extrapolation within the same species should include the probability of error and set possible bounds. To then use the extrapolated data to extrapolate again between species where there are no direct observations or experimental data is scientifically inaccurate and can only lead to erroneous conclusions. While extrapolation is a valid scientific tool, extrapolations must be used with great care and underlying assumptions must be clearly stated. More confidence is placed in extrapolations where comparisons are made between more closely related species or where sample size is larger. Use of extrapolations in this field at this early stage of our knowledge is justifiably controversial. Extrapolation increases in validity as the body of knowledge and extent of data increase in robustness. Until such time as there are a greater number of data points, i.e., individuals measured, including those that are not captive, the risks of drawing the wrong conclusions that could lead to serious management decision errors is too great to justify.

The degree of uncertainty that exists in this newly emerging field of science should not be used as a justification for postponing action to prevent environmental degradation. The potential for harm to occur before it is detected necessitates the use of a precautionary approach to the review and permitting of activities that involve the intentional production of anthropogenic sound.

Relationship Between Stranding and Sound

Level of relationship: cause/effect, correlated, associated

Much has been made of the need to assess the relationship between strandings and sound by defining whether or not the relationship is a coincidence, association, or is correlated or related by cause and effect. Some stakeholders believe that to fully understand the nature of any relationship (e.g., coincidence or correlation) of an acoustic event with a stranding, scientists need, at a minimum, good information on:

- The sound sources involved and the propagation of energy from those sources;
- The animals' physiological and metabolic status and injuries;
- The animals' potential causes of death based on necropsy findings;

- The spatial and temporal correspondence between the sound sources and the animals; and
- The stranding pattern (e.g., atypical strandings having two or more animals stranded over several hours spread over kilometers of coast, rather than at the same time and location; or strandings involving more than one species).

In practice, it is rare to have such complete information and requiring this level of information sets the standard at an unachievable level. Information available to draw conclusions about the causes of stranding events is limited, making it difficult to assess the relationship between strandings and sound. Requiring the determination of whether a stranding is related to sound by cause/effect, correlation, association, or coincidence as a prerequisite to listing it in a table of strandings is inappropriate and artificially narrows the list of strandings that may involve noise. When events, particularly ones that are rare, occur together repeatedly, data from such events can be used to determine a relationship between the two and should not be overlooked, even if a particular individual event cannot be proven to be correlated.

Number of relevant stranding or mortality events

Current understanding of the connection between sound and strandings has not advanced to the point where the relationship between sound exposure and mortality can be understood in terms of physiological, behavioral, and population-level responses, making it difficult to assess the magnitude of impacts. Recent attention directed towards marine mammal strandings and sound, and particularly the potential impacts of sound on beaked whales, argues for the need to highlight this topic.

The National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) maintains a database of marine mammal strandings in the U.S.¹³ Some conclude the database indicates that the effects of noise are relatively insignificant when considering the number of strandings known to be caused by anthropogenic noise. However, it is extremely misleading to use the figures from this database. The vast majority of the strandings in the database involve pinnipeds (seals and sea lions) not cetaceans, and to date no strandings of pinnipeds have been linked to noise. In addition, most of these are strandings of one or two individuals where noise is not even considered a possible cause, and therefore no attempt was made to look at the relationship between the stranding and noise. Because 60% of the strandings cannot be explained by any known cause¹⁴, it is also possible that a percentage of these could be sound-related and that for others sound was a contributing factor.

Anthropogenic sound has only recently emerged as a probable cause of some marine mammal strandings and, prior to the early 1990s, was not even looked at as a possible cause of strandings. In 1998, exposure to military sonar was postulated as the cause of a beaked whale stranding event in Greece in 1996.¹⁵ Similar events have occurred in the Bahamas Islands in 2000, Madeira in 2002 and the Canary Islands in 2002.¹⁶ Mass strandings of Cuvier's beaked whales are considered to be highly unusual. Since the early 1960s, when the Navy's mid-frequency tactical sonar was first deployed and the use of arrays began, more than 40 mass strandings of Cuvier's beaked whales have been reported worldwide, some together with naval maneuvers and the use of active sonar or other noise sources such as seismic surveys. Some of these strandings that occur together with a noise event are undisputed in their association with noise. In other cases stakeholders consider them to be

coincidental events. These stakeholders require that the exact source and level of noise be determined and also require evidence of the physiological condition of the animals, potential causes of death based on necropsy findings, the presence of a qualified biologist to document both the stranding and the noise event and the spatial and temporal correspondence between the sound source and the animals. Such information may be useful in determining a cause and effect relationship but is seldom available and raises the bar of proof to a level usually unattainable. It should not be necessary to prove a cause and effect, e.g., through a known mechanism, to be convinced that some strandings are linked with sonar. This is the manner in which the relationship between smoking and cancer and other diseases was elucidated. It is therefore necessary to include a very complete list of strandings, particularly of mass strandings, and all known possible sound sources operating in the area at the time, to enable a more accurate analysis of the potential connection between noise and strandings whether or not a cause and effect can be conclusively proved.

It is interesting to note that that a double standard is being used. These same stakeholders reject the use of extrapolation to determine received levels in a stranding, even with relatively good propagation models that are available, yet they accept extrapolation relative to hearing from a single odontocete to a mysticete.

The magnitude of the problem of acoustically-induced strandings remains unknown, but there are concerns that the number of these strandings identified may underestimate the number of animals affected. In general, an analysis of stranding data may underestimate the number of strandings related to sound events because: a) a substantial number of strandings, and especially mortalities at sea, may go undetected or undocumented; and b) a substantial proportion of any associated sound events may go undocumented (e.g., because of the absence of a standardized reporting system). Stranding detection is affected by factors such as their proximity to relatively populated areas (i.e., whether humans are likely to observe them). Animals that die at sea are seldom detected. The documentation of strandings depends on reporting efforts (e.g., by local stranding response networks) and the availability of qualified personnel to conduct necropsies or other analysis. In addition, the question of possible underestimation of acoustically-induced strandings is a particular concern for species other than beaked whales that may strand more regularly due to other causes. In these latter species, a connection to sound exposure may go undetected and their susceptibility to sound-related injury and mortality may be underestimated.

While much remains to be learned about marine mammals and their responses to noise, having more accurate information about strandings that occur coincident with noise events would help us determine if there is a correlation between the two. However, stranding teams are not necessarily available to cover all areas where strandings occur and funds for quick, accurate, and unbiased review of strandings are insufficient. In addition, knowledge of military activities is not always available and may be classified. As a result, only publicized mass strandings are reviewed to see if they are coincident with naval or other sound-producing activities and there has been no attempt to correlate single strandings of whales with noise events. There is also no standardized form for reporting the results of necropsies and the public is frequently not allowed to observe necropsies, or have access to the data for long periods of time (e.g., North Carolina stranding), making the

conclusions subject to suspicion by members of the public, particularly when public members are barred from observing while Navy-sponsored scientists conduct the necropsies (e.g., Haro Strait¹⁷).

It has taken 40 years to notice the connection between naval sonar and mass strandings of beaked whales, even though this is one of the most obvious connections. This underscores how easy it is to miss the connections between noise and a variety of impacts on marine mammals. Some stakeholders have attempted to limit the listing of strandings to the four events where there is very good evidence of the connection between strandings and anthropogenic noise. This paints a very deceptive picture of what may be happening. It is of particular importance that we not limit the list of strandings that may have a connection to sound sources. A complete list is necessary to more fully understand the magnitude of the problem and allow for an analysis to determine whether a statistical correlation of the relationship between noise and strandings exists. We have therefore included a more complete list of strandings (Table 1).

Table 1. Mass Strandings of Beaked Whales¹⁸
(Brownell et al. 2004; ICES 2005)

| Year | Location | Species (numbers) | Associated activity, when available |
|------|-----------------------|---|-------------------------------------|
| 1914 | New York, U.S. | Zc (2) | |
| 1960 | Sagami Bay, Japan | Zc (2) | US Fleet |
| 1963 | Gulf of Genoa, Italy | Zc (15+) | Naval maneuvers |
| 1963 | Sagami Bay, Japan | Zc (8-10) | US Fleet |
| 1964 | Sagami Bay, Japan | Zc (2) | US Fleet |
| 1965 | Puerto Rico | Zc (5) | |
| 1966 | Ligurian Sea, Italy | Zc (3) | Naval maneuvers |
| 1967 | Sagami Bay, Japan | Zc (2) | US Fleet |
| 1968 | Bahamas | Zc (4) | |
| 1974 | Corsica | Zc (3), striped dolphin (1) | Naval patrol |
| 1974 | Lesser Antilles | Zc (4) | Naval explosion |
| 1975 | Lesser Antilles | Zc (3) | |
| 1978 | Sagami Bay, Japan | Zc (9) | US Fleet |
| 1978 | Suruga Bay, Japan | Zc (4) | US Fleet |
| 1979 | Sagami Bay, Japan | Zc (13) | US Fleet |
| 1980 | Bahamas | Zc (3) | |
| 1981 | Bermuda | Zc (4) | |
| 1981 | Alaska, United States | Zc (2) | |
| 1983 | Galapagos | Zc (6) | |
| 1985 | Canary Islands | Zc (12+), Me (1) | Naval maneuvers |
| 1986 | Canary Islands | Zc (5), Me (1), <i>Ziphiid</i> sp. (1) | |
| 1987 | Canary Islands | Me (3) | |
| 1987 | Italy | Zc (2) | |
| 1967 | Suruga Bay, Japan | Zc (2) | |
| 1987 | Canary Islands | Zc (2) | |
| 1988 | Canary Islands | Zc (3), bottlenose whale (1), pygmy sperm whale (2) | Naval maneuvers |
| 1989 | Sagami Bay, Japan | Zc (3) | US Fleet |
| 1989 | Canary Islands | Zc (15+), Me (3), Md (2) | Naval maneuvers |
| 1990 | Suruga Bay, Japan | Zc (6) | US Fleet |
| 1991 | Canary Islands | Zc (2) | Naval maneuvers |
| 1991 | Lesser Antilles | Zc (4) | |
| 1993 | Taiwan | Zc (2) | |
| 1994 | Taiwan | Zc (2) | |

| Year | Location | Species (numbers) | Associated activity, when available |
|------|-----------------|--|-------------------------------------|
| 1996 | Greece | Zc (12) | Naval LFAS trials |
| 1997 | Greece | Zc (3) | |
| 1997 | Greece | Zc (9+) | Naval maneuvers |
| 1998 | Puerto Rico | Zc (5) | |
| 1999 | Virgin Islands | Zc (4) | Naval maneuvers |
| 2000 | Bahamas | Zc (9), Md (3), <i>Ziphiid</i> sp. (2), minke whale (2), <i>Balaenoptera</i> sp. (2), Atlantic spotted dolphin (1) | Naval mid-frequency sonar |
| 2000 | Galapagos | Zc (3) | Seismic research |
| 2000 | Madeira | Zc (3) | Naval mid-frequency sonar |
| 2001 | Solomon Islands | Zc (2) | |
| 2002 | Canary Islands | Zc (9), Me (1), Md (1), beaked whale spp. (3) | Naval mid-frequency sonar |
| 2002 | Mexico | Zc (2) | Seismic research |
| 2004 | Canary Islands | Zc (4) | Naval maneuvers |

Zc=*Ziphius cavirostris* (Cuvier's beaked whale); Md=*Mesoplodon densirostris* (Blainville's beaked whale); Me=*Mesoplodon europaeus* (Gervais' beaked whale)

Range of species involved: beaked whales, other?

While marine mammal species other than beaked whales have been involved in mass strandings associated with anthropogenic sound, the connection is more readily apparent with beaked whales, in part because beaked whales are not known to regularly mass strand due to other causes (e.g., disease). In comparison with beaked whales, other species of cetaceans such as pilot whales mass strand more regularly, and these events are often attributed to causes other than anthropogenic sound exposure. Because beaked whale mass strandings are so rare, these strandings are likely to lead to questions about their possible causes. However, while the connection is more obvious in the case of beaked whales, other cetaceans have also been involved in strandings associated with anthropogenic noise. Minke whales, (Bahamas 2000), pygmy sperm whales (Canary Islands 1988), and bottlenose whales (Canary Islands 1988) have stranded concurrent with beaked whales. In other instances, melon-headed whales (Hawaii 2004), harbor porpoises (Haro Strait 2003¹⁷), and humpback whales (Brazil 2002) have stranded in events that did not involve beaked whales. In addition to these, NMFS is still investigating whether the pilot whales, minke whales, and dwarf sperm whales that stranded in North Carolina (January 2005) had traumas consistent with acoustic impacts. It should be noted that NMFS has not provided any report on the North Carolina incident, which occurred over ten months ago, and has not provided a final report on the Bahamas 2000 stranding almost five years after the event. This limits the ability to draw any conclusions about these events and the involvement of species other than beaked whales.

Table 2. Associated Mass Strandings Involving Species Other Than Beaked Whales¹⁹
(Engel et al. 2004; Martin et al. 2004; NOAA and U.S. Navy 2001; NMFS 2005; Tomaszewski 2004)

| Year | Location | Species (numbers) | Associated activity (when available) |
|------|-------------------------------|---|--|
| 1988 | Canary Islands | Pygmy sperm whale (2), Zc (3), bottlenose whale (1) | Naval maneuvers |
| 2000 | Bahamas | Minke whale (2), <i>Balaenoptera</i> sp. (2), Atlantic spotted dolphin (1), Zc. (9), Md. (3), Ziphiid sp. (2) | Naval mid-frequency sonar |
| 2002 | Brazil | Humpback whale (8) | Seismic exploration |
| 2003 | Washington, United States | Harbor porpoise (14), Dall's porpoise (1) | Naval mid-frequency sonar |
| 2004 | Hawaii, United States | Melon-headed whale (~200) | Naval mid-frequency sonar |
| 2005 | North Carolina, United States | Long-finned pilot whale (34), dwarf sperm whale (2), minke whale (1) | Naval maneuvers; investigation pending |

Range of sound sources involved: sonar, airguns

Much has been made of the impact of Naval sonar, particularly mid-frequency sonar, and the connection to strandings, particularly of beaked whales. That there is a connection is clear.²⁰ Whether or not there is a connection to the strandings of other species is still a matter of disagreement, although for those non-beaked whale species stranding alongside beaked whales during a noise event, it would be hard to believe that there is no connection. It is unnecessary to dwell on this type of sound source as being the only one having impacts on marine mammals.

Other sources of sound, particularly seismic and shipping, should be of equal concern. Seismic surveys use sound that can travel across entire ocean basins. A single seismic survey in the northwest Atlantic was found to flood an area almost 100,000 square miles with one hundred fold greater than ambient noise levels, persisting so as to be nearly continuous for days.²¹ This form of intense underwater sound has been used for many years but has only recently undergone any scrutiny as to its possible impacts on marine mammals. Scripps Institution of Oceanography scientific research to study deep ocean temperatures to assist global climate change models (i.e., Acoustic Thermometry of Ocean Climate (ATOC)) was specifically intended to be both transoceanic and operational over decades. The U.S. Navy's Low Frequency Active Sonar (LFA) is intended to ensonify an underwater area of several million km² at greater than ambient levels.²²

In 2004, the International Whaling Commission's Scientific Committee concluded that increased sound from seismic surveys was "cause for serious concern."²³ Its conclusion was based on a substantial and growing body of evidence that shows that seismic pulses can kill, injure, and disturb a wide variety of marine animals, including whales, fish, and squid. Impacts range from strandings, to temporary or permanent hearing loss and abandonment of habitat and disruption of vital behaviors like mating and feeding. The IWC Scientific Committee expressed great concern about the effects of seismic surveys on blue, fin, and other endangered large whales,²⁴ particularly in their critical habitats, and some scientists have asserted that the persistent use of seismic surveys in areas known to contain large whales in significant numbers should be considered sufficient to cause population-level impacts.²⁵ The State of California (State Lands Commission) banned further high-

energy seismic surveys within its waters until such time as a programmatic Environmental Impact Report is completed, due to concerns about the impact of seismic surveys on fish eggs and larvae.²⁶

In 2002, in the Gulf of California, Mexico, two beaked whales (*Ziphius cavirostris*) were found to have stranded coincident with geophysical surveys that were being conducted in the area.²⁷ That same year, the stranding rate of adult humpback whales was unusually high compared with that of juvenile humpbacks along Brazil's Abrolhos Banks, where oil and gas surveys were conducted.²⁸ Studies suggest that substantial numbers of western Pacific gray whales, a population that is considered critically endangered, were displaced from important feeding grounds in response to seismic surveys off Russia's Sakhalin Island.²⁹ Other marine mammal species known to be affected by airgun arrays include sperm whales, whose distribution in the northern Gulf of Mexico has been observed to change in response to seismic operations;³⁰ bowhead whales, which have been shown to avoid survey vessels to a distance of more than twenty kilometers while migrating off the Alaskan coast;³¹ harbor porpoises, which have been seen to engage in dramatic avoidance responses at significant distances from an array³², and all small odontocetes in U.K. waters where sighting rates (combined) are significantly higher when air gun arrays are not shooting.³³

Until sufficient stranding teams are in place to report, monitor and correlate possible strandings that might be associated with the use of seismic surveys and until there is a long-term study on the possible cumulative and synergistic effects on populations it will not be possible to have an accurate picture of the extent of the problem, and it will remain a major concern.

While Navy sonar and seismic surveys are the most obvious and easily recognizable as causing direct adverse impacts to marine mammals, the effects of shipping also rise to the level of significance. Shipping, however, unlike sonar and seismic noise, is not a single source of noise that can be as easily studied. Shipping is diffuse and spread throughout the world's oceans, raising the ambient levels of sound. Shipping noise creates the same frequencies used by many marine species, including baleen whales.³⁴ The most probable impacts of shipping relate to the masking of biologically meaningful sounds, and to chronic and sublethal effects including disruptions to breeding, migration patterns, and communication. In addition, shipping noise may create stress that could contribute to a variety of synergistic impacts that affect the longevity of individuals and have possible long-term population impacts.

Other sources of anthropogenic sound in the oceans that are of significant concern include underwater explosives, anti-predator devices (e.g., acoustic harassment devices (or AHDs)) and whale watching boats. Whale watching boats have been linked to possible population-level impacts and are of particular concern because they are specifically directed at whales.³⁵

Mechanisms of injury: auditory, behavioral, non-auditory

There is currently considerable scientific debate about the mechanisms of injuries sustained by marine mammals that lead to strandings. While this is of obvious scientific interest and importance, it should not be considered important relative to the regulatory agencies' decisions regarding the management of sound-producing activities. Knowledge of the mechanisms of injury could result in a better understanding of how to mitigate for these lethal impacts. Until this knowledge gap is filled,

agencies must make decisions about allowing these activities to proceed. Regardless of how the injuries take place, the fact that sound sources cause them, affecting not only individuals but also possibly populations, must be factored into agencies' decisions about permitting and management.

Recommendations:

- 1) Provide funding to have sufficient stranding teams available to review and obtain information on strandings in a timely manner.
- 2) Increase the level of monitoring to detect strandings or mortalities at sea associated with noise events.
- 3) Develop a standardized form for the reporting of data from strandings, including consistent necropsy examinations to detect acoustically-related injuries.
- 4) Allow for a limited number of members of the public to be present during necropsies to increase the transparency of the process.
- 5) Require reporting of any activities involving sound in areas where there was a stranding, including date, time, and location of the activity.

Effectiveness of Current Management/Mitigation

What are the best practices?

Many sound-producing activities serve important social, economic, or other purposes, and effective management of their effects is therefore essential, particularly when prevention of adverse effects is not practicable. Addressing human-caused acoustic impacts on marine mammals through a comprehensive and transparent management system should be a high priority, and potential and known adverse effects associated with anthropogenic sound should be minimized in the marine environment. Scientists have not conclusively identified all situations in which anthropogenic sound will have adverse effects, but a range of mitigation and management techniques or approaches currently exist, that, if implemented, may reduce potential adverse effects.

The components of systems for managing the effects of sound on marine mammals include knowledge and research, risk assessment, permit and authorization processes, mitigation tools and monitoring, evaluation, enforcement, and compliance activities. Mitigation consists of a suite of tools designed to prevent, reduce, eliminate, or rectify the impacts of sound introduced into the environment. When considering the application of mitigation strategies, managers begin with the ultimate goal of preventing adverse effects (e.g., through source removal or exclusion zones). If that prevention is not practicable, they modify their strategies to minimize impacts on marine mammals (e.g., through source or exposure reduction) consistent with existing statutes. It is important to note that sound-producing activities may not be allowed to proceed in cases where mitigation is inadequate or impossible and the potential adverse effects warrant such action.

The application of fully integrated mitigation systems that bring together an appropriate combination of the tools at managers' disposal is likely to be the best way to maximize effective mitigation efforts. There is not, and probably never will be, a single "silver bullet" solution to designing and carrying out effective mitigation. The effectiveness of source removal is obvious but

the effectiveness of other commonly used mitigation measures (e.g., ramp-up and safety zones) has generally not been systematically assessed, and may vary greatly from one case to another. Certain mitigation tools, such as exclusion zones, are inherently effective. However, under certain circumstances, some of these may be impractical for the sound-producers. Mitigation tools currently available include:

- Operational procedures (such as ramp-ups and speed limits);
- Temporal, seasonal, and geographic restrictions; and
- Removal or modification of the sound sources (such as ship-quieting technologies and reductions in sound-producing activities).

Fundamentally, the primary goal of any management system must be to reduce or eliminate the intensity, and thus the potential for negative impacts, of noise sources by either not undertaking these activities to begin with, or through modifications to those activities (including the use of alternative, quieter technologies), and geographic and seasonal restrictions or exclusions.

Mitigation strategies that have the greatest potential for reducing risks to marine mammals include, as a matter of priority, reduction of source levels or source removal. Moreover, reducing overall sound levels is a general premise of mitigation, and should be a goal of any management system attempting to prevent adverse effects on marine mammals, and in so doing, pursuing targeted mitigation of discrete noise-producing activities. To this end, we highlight several proactive mitigation tools that we believe are the most effective and should be improved upon and employed expeditiously for managing the impacts of human-generated noise on marine mammals and their habitats.

Seasonal and geographic exclusions: Geographic areas or regions that are biologically important for marine mammals (i.e. breeding, feeding, calving and migratory habitats) should be off-limits to noise-producing activities on a seasonal or permanent basis. This tool is the most effective in preventing harmful effects of noise on marine mammals by excluding noise-producing activities from critical habitats during important biological activity.

Marine reserves. Designating and enforcing marine reserves can be an extremely effective tool for protecting marine mammals and other marine life from noise-producing activities. Commercial activity, such as oil and gas exploration and extraction and other habitat-altering activities, should be off limits in marine reserves.

Source removal, reduction and modification. Where forms of marine habitat protection such as marine reserves and seasonal restrictions are not possible, lowering noise levels or removing them altogether are possible options through the use of alternative technologies.

The above tools are inherently the most effective at reducing or eliminating the impacts to marine mammals, but there are also practical limitations on their use and they may not always be

“practicable” under current statutes. The use of safety zones with adequate monitoring is the next best level of protection that can and should be used.

Safety zones. Safety zones are centered around a sound source, rather than an animal. A safety zone is a specified distance from the source (generally based on an estimated received sound pressure level) that must be free of marine mammals before an activity can commence and/or must remain free of marine mammals during an activity.

The sizes of safety zones are typically determined using a variety of information, including prior observations of marine mammal impacts, sound propagation models, sound source information, real-time acoustic measurements, and consideration of other mitigation measures employed.

There are several limitations on the effectiveness of safety zones, including our lack of scientific knowledge about what levels of sound may be safe for a particular marine mammals species and thus the appropriate “received level” that is required to be set. In addition there are significant limitations on the ability to detect marine mammals prior to their entering the safety zone.

Safety zones are generally used in conjunction with marine mammal observers. These observers are individuals ranging from marine mammal biologists and trained observers to crewmembers who conduct visual surveys of marine mammals (i.e., watching for their presence or behavior) for various reasons including maintenance of marine mammal-free safety zones.

The limitations inherent in visual observations are well known. A variety of factors affect sighting rates. Effective visual observations are also generally limited to hours of daylight. Visual detection is also limited because it can only be achieved at or very near the water’s surface. Sighting rates in good conditions are much higher for species that spend more time at the surface, or for those that are more visible when they breathe. However, many cryptic species that spend very little time at the surface (e.g., deep diving beaked whales) are difficult to detect even under ideal conditions.

The limitations of using marine mammal observers to enforce a safety zone can be offset through the use of Passive Acoustic Monitoring (PAM), especially for some deep diving species, if they vocalize. There are some technical limitations to PAM; for example, stationary hydrophones or Acoustic Recording Devices (ARDs) are not particularly useful for monitoring a highly mobile sound source unless there is a bottom array covering the area. Using these methods together, it is still unlikely that 100% of all marine mammals will be detected.

While there are no known mitigation techniques that guarantee elimination of potential and known impacts — other than denying an activity or creating seasonal and geographic exclusion zones — management and regulatory agencies must deal with the need for requests for permits for sound-producing activities. They must therefore, consistent with current statutes, look to all possible mitigation tools to reduce the impact to the level of least practicable adverse impact.

Recommendations for Management and Mitigation:

- 1) The management agencies should identify, and implement immediately, mitigation measures that are effective for noise-producing activities (e.g., source reduction and removal; geographic and seasonal restrictions) while a sustained national research program that includes systematic study of the effectiveness of mitigation tools is being developed.
- 2) The agencies should work with the U.S. Navy, air gun users (including scientists, geophysical contractors, and oil and gas companies), and the shipping industry to prioritize and ensure the development and use of quieter technologies, and other source reduction tools or methods. In addition, management should be extended to unaddressed sources and activities that have the potential to produce adverse effects (including, but not limited to, commercial shipping, recreational watercraft use, whale watching, and the development and use of AHD (Acoustic Harassment Devices, e.g., sounds to keep mammals away from fishing areas), and ADD (Acoustic Deterrent Devices, e.g., use of sound to keep mammals from entangling in fishing nets).
- 3) The National Marine Fisheries Service and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (the Services) should examine novel applications of conservation tools such as designation of critical habitats, marine protected areas and ocean zoning to protect populations from chronic or episodic anthropogenic noise.
- 4) The Services should develop standardized and transparent systems and formats for the collection of monitoring data to be able to systematically take advantage of appropriate opportunities to collect data that can be used for statistical analysis, and facilitate the review, aggregation, and publication of data and results of those analyses.
- 5) The Services should establish training and certification programs to ensure that observers are qualified to conduct effective monitoring, enabling data to be utilized effectively.

Cost-effectiveness and practicality/practicability

Current statutes authorize the Services to issue permits for taking marine mammals that meet specific requirements, and to authorize small incidental takings of small numbers of marine mammals for activities “within a certain geographical region... during periods of not more than five consecutive years...” provided (1) that “the total of such taking... will have a negligible impact on such species or stock” and (2) that the agency “prescribes regulations setting forth... permissible methods of taking... effecting the least practicable adverse impact” on marine mammals. The MMPA has been working relatively well and there is no reason to believe it needs changing. The current statutes do not include cost or cost-effectiveness as a consideration in the application of mitigation to reduce the impact to the least practicable adverse impact. NMFS must provide meaningful protections for species regardless of the resulting economic costs. In addition, while some military exemptions may be warranted, broad-scale and unneeded military exemptions from the MMPA are not appropriate. This is critically important because the purpose of these statutes is to protect and preserve these species. To include cost and cost-effectiveness as considerations in the protection of species would undermine those protections and complicate the statutes to the point where requiring mitigations would become almost impossible. Protections provided for under the MMPA, NEPA, and ESA would become meaningless. There is no definition of what is meant by “cost-effective” and, as has been stated under the Mitigation Best Practices Section above, no

mitigations to date have been studied for their effectiveness. To determine if a mitigation is “cost effective” would first require a determination of the mitigation’s effectiveness relative to potential and known impacts to the species. It is clear that at this point there are huge data gaps and high uncertainty in all aspects of this field. It would first require a series of long-term studies to better understand marine mammals and to look at the impacts of noise along with a determination of the mitigation’s ability to reduce that impact. While we highly recommend that such studies be conducted, the results and ability to interpret them are decades away. In the meantime, decision-makers cannot be stripped of the only mechanisms they have at their disposal to reduce the potential and known impacts of anthropogenic sound on marine mammals.

Assignment of burden of proof: sound producers vs. regulators

The current regulatory system, NEPA (National Environmental Policy Act), MMPA (Marine Mammal Protection Act), ESA (Endangered Species Act), and CZMA (Coastal Zone Management Act), requires that the impacts of activities affecting marine mammals be reduced to the least practicable adverse impact and sets the burden of proof for determining what those impacts are with the sound producer.² This is essential to retain. Given the scientific uncertainty surrounding this issue, the difficulty in studying marine mammals, our expectation that the data gaps will not be filled perhaps for decades, and the likelihood that scientific certainty can be achieved in the near future, or ever, is very remote, the need to have those proposing an activity show that their activity can be mitigated to reduce the potential for impact is essential. If agencies are required to prove that a sound-producing activity causes harm before requiring reasonable protection through mitigation, no mitigations will be able to be required and serious and/or irreparable harm to these important species could occur.

Precautionary approach—addressing the uncertainty

Given the level of uncertainty, the data gaps, and the serious – even lethal – potential effects of sound on marine mammals, precaution is necessary to protect and conserve these species that have a special place and role in nature and in our culture. While there is no clear-cut, agreed upon definition of precaution or the precautionary approach, some level of precaution is appropriate, given the difficulty of studying marine mammals in the wild, our lack of knowledge of marine mammal populations, and the potential for harm to occur before it is detected. The current regulatory system, through provisions in NEPA, MMPA, and ESA, incorporates precaution. Scientific uncertainty should not be used as a justification for postponing action to protect these species. Failure to take a precautionary approach until scientific certainty is achieved, which may never be possible, and attempting to shift the current burden of proof from the applicant to the agencies, could result in direct population effects, leading to the extinction of some species.

² Under the ESA, the take (harm/harassment) of listed species is strictly prohibited and consultation is required under the regulations whenever a federal activity/permit “may affect” a listed species. Following consultation, “take” may be authorized only where the agency/applicant can “insure” that the authorized action “is not likely to jeopardize” the survival of the species or adversely modify its critical habitat. “Any person who wants to be shielded from Section 9 liability for a take by an exemption or take permit “shall have the burden of proving that the exemption or permit is applicable has been granted”. Taken together this puts the burden on anyone who wants to undertake an activity that could affect a listed species. The MMPA has language that similarly applies.

The California Coastal Commission believes that protecting marine mammals, which it considers to be coastal resources, is important to this State. As such the Coastal Commission applies precaution in its decision-making process in two ways. Under the CZMA, precaution is applied to mean that given uncertainties that might impact coastal resources the applicant is required to mitigate possible impacts to the maximum extent practicable and to monitor for impacts. Under the Coastal Act, if there is uncertainty the Coastal Commission takes the position that the applicant must avoid or mitigate the impacts to a negligible level. If avoidance is not possible, or if mitigation is not possible, or if it is unknown whether mitigation will work, then the Coastal Commission may deny the project. In each case, the Coastal Commission applies the generally accepted legal principal that the applicant bears the burden of proof that the proposed project/action will *not* impact coastal resources.

The California Coastal Commission believes that the current regulatory system should be retained and even strengthened to enable regulatory decision-makers the ability to factor in the current and evolving field of science that indicates that the impact of anthropogenic noise on marine mammals may be significant.

International or multi-lateral approach

Few marine mammals are restricted to the waters of any one country. While the problem of anthropogenic sound is international in scope, the California Coastal Commission's jurisdiction extends only to this State's waters, federal waters off its coast, and impacts on this State's coastal resources, i.e., marine mammals that pass through or live in or on California's coast. It is therefore beyond the scope of our jurisdiction to deal with marine mammals on an international level and we will not comment on this aspect of the problem.

Priorities and Conduct of Research

Diversification and distribution of research funding/Safeguards against bias in research

Bias in scientific research is recognized as a significant problem in all fields of research. The issue of bias in science is not a new one and is not specific to this field of inquiry. Many articles have been written on this subject and scientists and those who work with the scientific community have struggled over ways to deal with this issue. This issue becomes of even greater concern when there are limited sources of funding and the major sources are tied to those who have a vested interest in the outcome of the research. In addition, the very manner in which research funds are typically allocated may frustrate consideration of less damaging alternatives.

There is not now, nor has there ever been, such a thing as pure science. Science does not have absolutes and scientific certainty is relative. However, scientists strive to achieve as much independence and integrity in their work as possible, but they are human. Bias can affect the questions that are asked, the hypotheses posed, the method of research and analysis, which projects are funded, and the interpretations of the results and how they are presented. Bias can be unwittingly introduced or intentional. It is based on personal, social, political, and religious viewpoints. To attempt to deny that it is possible within this field of science, when it occurs in EVERY field of science, is to prevent taking steps to deal with and minimize it. An attempt to

ignore it and fail to put into place mechanisms to reduce it can only lead to greater suspicion on the part of the public. This causes a heightened perception of bias and serves no purpose. In addition, because we are aware that one of the principal issues regarding bias and the perception of bias comes from a direct connection between the source of funding and the user, it is necessary to distance the funding from the noise producer and diversify and distribute as much as possible the funding sources for research.³⁶

Some believe that peer review and ethical guidelines remove the possibility of bias, but this is not the case. While peer review helps, it does not solve the problem. Peer review does not remove many of the aspects of research that bias can affect as outlined above. It can be prone to bias itself (depending upon the reviewers), poor at detecting gross defects, almost useless for detecting fraud, and does not address the issue of which projects are funded.³⁷ In addition, the pre-publication “vetting” of manuscripts by the funder, actual interference by the sponsor into the research, or withholding of complete data by the researcher preventing independent analysis, are problems not solved by peer review. Other mechanisms must also be put in place to help reduce the problem.

One of the first questions always asked when reviewing any research is, who funded it? If the only source of funding is from those with an interest in seeing one point of view and that is the only research that has been published on that subject, then the research will too easily be dismissed as biased, even if it may be valid.³ As decision-makers involved in determining approval and mitigations we believe it is counterproductive to only have research that could be considered biased. If only sound producers and the agencies that regulate them fund all research, that research is subject to question and therefore could be of reduced use to decision-makers. Although we support the creation and funding of a national program to understand the impacts of sound on marine mammals, we do not support funding unless the issue of bias is dealt with explicitly.

There are numerous models for increasing funding diversity, independence, and public transparency. For instance, the National Oceanographic Partnership Program (NOPP) is a collaboration of fifteen federal agencies. NOPP brings the public and private sectors together to support larger, more comprehensive projects. Another model for achieving funding diversification is the National Whale Conservation Fund administered by the National Fish & Wildlife Foundation (NFWF). Legislation could establish a targeted fund at NFWF for research into the effects of undersea sound on marine mammals and other species. Still other models would be the establishment of jointly funded, independent non-profit organizations or expanded funding for federal research through NSF, NMFS, Fish & Wildlife Service, and the MMC.

The research programs should be well coordinated across the government and examine a range of issues relating to noise generated by scientific, commercial, and operational activities. Diversification can produce more comprehensive programs, improve opportunities for researchers, and reduce the perception that bias may occur. Also important in achieving these aims is the use of

³ ** NRC (2000), “sponsors of research need to be aware that studies funded and led by one special interest are vulnerable to concerns about conflict of interest. For example, research on the effects of smoking funded by U.S. National Institute of Health is likely to be perceived to be more objective than research conducted by the tobacco industry,” *Marine Mammals and Low Frequency Sound*, National Academy Press, Wash D.C. pg 84.

procedural mechanisms such as stakeholder and public participation, and alternative funding structures, such as quasi-independent agencies, that can further insulate decisions about research funding from dominant, sound-producing funders of research.

It is important to set up transparent safeguards and guidelines that aim to minimize the potential for bias or conflict of interest to occur and to expand study into important areas of research that are not as directly relevant to mission agencies' specific objectives and mandates. Transparency and credibility in research should be supported by mechanisms to create full post-publication access to research data. However, any such mechanisms would need to address concerns about the ownership of the data. Full disclosure of data is necessary to allow others to confirm that any unpublished data do not contradict the conclusions of a published study. Data issues already have been addressed for many subdisciplines in ocean sciences and there is no reason to believe why similar data issues cannot be addressed in this discipline.

We strongly urge that sufficient funding be put into place to study this form of pollution and its impacts, which we believe represents a substantial threat to marine mammal populations. Funding for this critically needed research should not be taken from other existing research programs. Any commitment must be a real one, which means that it is in addition to other programs.

What are priority research areas?

Baseline studies on marine population size, population structure, location of critical habitats, and highest concentrations of marine mammals and their behavior are the most pressing priorities. When projects come for permitting it is essential to know precise information about the species and their population size and structure to do an accurate risk assessment. There is a big difference in considering allowing a possible impact to a species that is threatened or endangered or one whose population is essentially unknown or may be structured in such a way as to have small, localized sub-populations, and species whose populations are relatively healthy. Without adequate knowledge of the population, regulatory agencies cannot determine whether the activity can be reduced to the least practicable impact and projects may be denied unnecessarily. Because managers are faced with making these decisions routinely and these decisions cannot wait for long-term studies to determine more precisely the nature of the impacts, this baseline research must proceed immediately. Having better information about the location of critical habitats, where the highest concentrations of marine mammals are located and at what times of year will make it easier for managers and regulatory bodies to determine whether or not exclusion zones and/or seasonal closures are appropriate.

Studies that should also be given high priority are those that will allow for a valid interpretation of what a biologically significant reaction to anthropogenic sound is. To conduct other research, i.e., to use Controlled Exposure Experiments (CEEs) to determine impacts, without knowing more fully what normal behavior is and what it means will not answer the questions we need answered (see additional discussion below). Current efforts to focus on understanding the effects of noise on marine mammals have not resulted in greater protection to them. More importantly, without a more complete understanding of the baseline behavior of un-impacted animals, it will be extremely difficult to ever gain even a moderately complete insight into the impacts and we believe that funds expended will not be efficiently used.

One avenue that is readily available to obtain baseline information through systematic and observational research, and that does not involve the introduction of additional sound into the environment, is to utilize ongoing permitted sound-producing activities. Many of these currently permitted sound-producing activities carry with them the requirement for monitoring and reporting of the monitoring. Unfortunately, there is no standardized form for obtaining the data required in a way that would make these data available for statistical analysis or for research purposes. Additionally, although required as part of the mitigation for the impacts of the activity, sound producers may, and frequently do, keep the actual data obtained as proprietary. This is inappropriate, given that these are mitigation requirements. If all data were required to be made public and if these data were collected in a systematic way, funds expended for the purpose of mitigation could have a dual benefit of providing answers to many questions and result in a significant saving on research funding.

Other areas of priority for research include:

- 1) Conduct more complete analysis of past and present stranding data, including obtaining more information on whether or not there were sound activities in the area at the time of the stranding, for both naval sonars and seismic surveys.
- 2) Develop more effective ways to do monitoring before, during and after noise activity as part of current mitigation required of sound producers so that such monitoring data can be analyzed for impacts. This also requires that pre-activity baseline information be available.

Relative importance of research and mitigation efforts

Research on the effectiveness of current mitigations, the improvement of current tools, and the development of additional tools needs to be given the highest priority. While much of what scientists are attempting to learn about marine mammals is of importance to science and our understanding of these species, managers and regulatory bodies such as the Coastal Commission need information immediately to be able to meet the mandates of current statutes and concerns about protection of these species. Basic research and understanding of animal physiology and behavior requires long-term studies. Answers do not come easily, quickly, or cheaply. In the interim, sound producers need to have some degree of certainty about their ability to get permits and regulators need to have information about the value and advisability of requiring mitigations. Given the high degree of probability that noise does cause adverse impact to marine mammals, regulators cannot wait for long-term answers and must have more information on mitigation as soon as possible.

Permitting and authorization for research

The Coastal Commission agrees that researchers who undertake research on or who incidentally take marine mammals in the course of sound-producing research are in need of timely, predictable, and cost-effective permitting and authorization processes that maintain or enhance current levels of protection for marine mammals under the statutory regimes of the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA) and other federal and state laws. The challenge is implementing an effective process that protects marine mammals while allowing much-needed research to be undertaken.

There are many issues of concern facing researchers and federal and state agencies. These include:

- 1) Inadequate resources available to conduct permitting and authorization processes in a timely and efficient manner;
- 2) The funds, time, and regulatory and scientific expertise needed by a researcher seeking to obtain a permit or authorization to conduct acoustic research that could impact marine mammals;
- 3) Lack of clarity regarding the applicability of other statutes like the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the Endangered Species Act (ESA) that may require documentation in addition to that required by the MMPA (Marine Mammal Protection Act);
- 4) Lack of clarity regarding when programmatic authorizations or permits are appropriate for repetitive activities that do not change significantly over time; and
- 5) The underlying circular situation in which the lack of information needed, in part, to make permitting and regulatory decisions is perpetuated by the challenges in permitting research activities that could help address those information needs.

To address this situation, there are several steps that could be taken by the Services, researchers, and funding entities to improve the permitting and authorization processes. The California Coastal Commission does not believe that there is any need for statutory changes for the permitting and authorization processes. In 1996 the California Coastal Commission was instrumental in convening the HESS (High Energy Seismic Survey) Team, one of whose primary purposes was to find ways to streamline the permit process for review of seismic surveys in federal OCS off the coast of California. Based on that experience the California Coastal Commission believes that the needs of the researchers for an improved and streamlined process could be accomplished within the current regulatory framework and existing statutes.

The following suggestions to improve the current process include:

- The Services should receive increased funding for their permitting and authorization divisions and that increased funding should be made available to all relevant federal and state agencies for their permitting and authorization divisions to meet compliance needs.
- The Services should adopt a more coordinated approach to:
 - i. Provide research funding entities and researchers with clear guidelines to use in determining whether or not a particular research activity requires an application under federal or state law;
 - ii. Provide standard background documents, application information, and references to reduce the cost and time of preparing applications; and
 - iii. Develop mechanisms, where appropriate, to collectively process and issue permits and authorizations that are similar based on species, region, or activity.

- The Services, research funding entities, and researchers should work together when appropriate:
 - i. To develop programmatic environmental impact statements and assessments and to identify mechanisms to collectively process and issue permits and authorizations especially for repetitive activities that do not change over time;
 - ii. To achieve better timing linkages between the process for authorization and permitting, securing funding, and scheduling research operations to minimize potential issues;
 - iii. To achieve a more comprehensive and coordinated approach to implementation of both the MMPA and the ESA among the Services; and
 - iv. To identify innovative ways to meet regulatory requirements through reductions in potential impacts on marine mammals.

Animal welfare aspects of research—ABR, CEE

There are two experimental techniques that raise significant controversy as to their effectiveness and their implications relative to the welfare of animals: ABRs (Auditory Brainstem Response) and CEEs (Controlled Exposure Experiments). While the Coastal Commission is concerned about the welfare of marine mammals and would not like to see anything done that could harm or kill any individual, its primary concern is to obtain information that will enable it to regulate activities that produce sound in such a way as to eliminate or minimize the effects of that sound. ABRs raise very serious issues regarding the ethical treatment of animals, particularly those that are stranded and in highly stressful situations. This technique provides for the determination of hearing abilities of animals and may also expand the knowledge base to include the hearing values of a variety of species that may likely not be kept in captive situations, but the use of this technique calls for ethical guidelines. The Coastal Commission does not have a position relative to the use of ABR as a technique except to express its concern about making certain that the welfare of an animal is carefully weighed against the possible benefits of using ABR. When using ABR the primary priority when dealing with stranded animals must be their welfare and not the research objective. Nothing should be allowed that will compromise an animal's ability to survive the stranding. With that in mind, the ultimate decision to use ABR or not must be left to those at the scene charged with the rescue and care of these animals.

CEEs, on the other hand, raise an entirely different set of both ethical and research questions. CEEs are experiments in which animals in the wild are exposed to controlled doses of sound for purposes of assessing their behavior or physiological responses.

CEEs are problematic because they introduce additional sound into the ocean and expose not only the target species and/or individuals to be studied, but many additional ones. By doing so, they place animals at risk. In addition, CEEs may tell us whether or not there is an effect, but a better understanding of the behavior and physiology of marine mammals is required to understand the significance of that effect. Thus even a well-designed experiment may not eliminate controversy over a particular activity or project, but may only shift the nature of the debate. Unfortunately, our ignorance regarding the biology and physiology of many marine mammal species is so great that the potential effects of noise and the sound exposures causing these effects is poorly understood. A top

priority for understanding what kinds of reactions may be most important for marine mammals exposed to noise must involve studies of baseline behavior of undisturbed animals prior to conducting other research. Until we have a greater understanding of what is a biologically significant response, CEEs may not give us the answers to our questions and thus should be used judiciously and then probably only in concert with other research or as part of a larger research program.

Given the controversial nature of CEEs and the ethical questions they raise, and because they are not a benign form of research, it is particularly important that when CEEs are used, they be carefully designed and their limitations acknowledged. If CEEs are to be used, it is important to have accurate information about the population status of both the target animals and any others that may be exposed. When endangered species or small local populations are involved, the use of CEEs could result in population effects and therefore should be avoided. In some cases, where the species is highly endangered or where there is little or no information about that population, CEEs should not be used, since the risk associated with the experiment may be too great.

For long-term effects, long-term research is required. It is not practical to use CEEs over long time periods or large spatial scales, i.e., the larger the area the more non-target species will be impacted. CEEs should use, as much as possible, sound exposures that are realistic and with the same characteristics of sound that the mammals are likely to be exposed to by ongoing sound operations. Further, for CEEs to be effective they must be preceded, as stated above, by baseline studies of behavior and physiology that enable the results of the experiments to be interpreted as to their significance. To eliminate possible bias and arguments that will make the research valueless for regulatory purposes, if CEEs are conducted, there should be agreement, in advance, as to what constitutes a biologically significant effect.

Lastly, research that can yield conclusive results with less risk of harm to the animals should be preferred. Systematic observations using ongoing sound-producing activities should be used in place of CEEs if they can provide similar information. Systematic studies of ongoing sound-producing activities can strengthen monitoring efforts required as mitigation, while retaining the benefit that such studies do not introduce additional sound directed at the mammals. The advantages of observational studies are increased as more attention is given to optimizing measurement methods and study designs with the greatest power to detect real effects and provide convincing results.

No single research approach solves all of our data needs. Monitoring will always be required for regulated activities, and if monitoring data are collected systematically, gathered, and analyzed, they can provide important information on effects. Long-term correlational studies can provide added detail on effects of ongoing activities, and are especially useful for long-term exposures or difficult to reproduce sounds, and CEEs can constitute one component of a larger research and management program, designed to give us additional information where controlled exposures are necessary.

Recommendations:

- 1) Anthropogenic sound with the potential to harm marine life should be eliminated where possible or otherwise minimized (e.g., through source reduction and removal; geographic and seasonal restrictions).
- 2) Given the likelihood that anthropogenic sound may have significant impacts on marine mammals, the degree of uncertainty regarding the nature and extent of those impacts, and the need to consider cumulative and synergistic effects, a precautionary approach should be taken with respect to management of marine mammals.
- 3) Anthropogenically caused acoustic impacts on marine mammals need to be addressed through a comprehensive and transparent management system. The management system should address chronic and acute anthropogenic noise, long-term and short-term effects, cumulative and synergistic effects, and impacts on individuals and populations.
- 4) The Services should receive increased funding for their permitting and authorization divisions and that increased funding should be made available to all relevant federal and state agencies for their permitting and authorization divisions to meet compliance needs.
- 5) Congress should provide funding to have sufficient stranding teams available to review and obtain information on strandings in a timely manner and to increase the level of monitoring to detect strandings or mortalities at sea associated with noise events.
- 6) The Services should develop a standardized form for the reporting of data from strandings, including consistent necropsy examinations to detect acoustically related injuries. The Services should allow for a limited number of members of the public to be present during necropsies to increase the transparency of the process.
- 7) Congress should require reporting of any activities involving sound in areas where there was a documented stranding, including date, time, and location of the activity.
- 8) The management agencies should identify and immediately implement mitigation measures that are effective for noise-producing activities (e.g., source reduction and removal; geographic and seasonal restrictions) as a part of a sustained national research program that includes systematic study of the effectiveness of various mitigation tools.
- 9) There should be a commitment to fund a national research program, with emphasis on baseline behavior, physiology, and population size, location, and structure. That program should have procedures in place to minimize bias and the perception of bias and should include diversification of funding, a prohibition on the pre-publication vetting by funders, and a requirement that all data obtained with public funds be publicly available.
- 10) The agencies should work with the U.S. Navy, air gun users (including scientists, geophysical contractors, and oil and gas companies), and the shipping industry to prioritize and ensure the development and use of quieter technologies, and other source reduction tools or methods. In addition, management should be extended to unaddressed sources and activities that have the potential to produce adverse effects (including, but not limited to, commercial shipping, recreational watercraft use, whale watching, and the development and use of AHD and ADDs).
- 11) The Services should examine novel applications of conservation tools such as designation of critical habitats, marine protected areas, and ocean zoning to protect populations from chronic or episodic anthropogenic noise.

- 12) The Services should develop standardized and transparent systems and formats for the collection of monitoring data to be able to systematically take advantage of appropriate opportunities to collect data that can be used for statistical analysis, and facilitate the review, aggregation, and publication of data and results of those analyses.
- 13) All data obtained as a result of mitigation monitoring requirements should be public.
- 14) The Services should establish training and certification programs to ensure that marine mammal observers are qualified to conduct effective monitoring, enabling data to be utilized for observational research.

Conclusion

Although we know that anthropogenic sound in the ocean is a serious threat, we do not have sufficient information at this time to understand the full extent of the problem. One of the biggest challenges faced in regulating the effects of noise is our ignorance of the characteristics and levels of sound exposures that may pose risks to marine mammals. Given the current state of our knowledge we must therefore take a precautionary approach in the regulation of noise. We must also expand our efforts to protect and preserve marine mammals by instituting and using effective mitigation measures – such as geographic exclusion zones – now, to keep marine mammals at a distance from noise sources that have the potential to harm or kill them. In addition, we must commit to understanding this problem better by funding a national research program. Only through a combined approach – precaution, mitigation, and research – can we assure that these very special resources will be here for the enjoyment of future generations.

Notes

1. See, for example, Frantzis, A. 1998. Does acoustic testing strand whales? *Nature* 392: 29; Jepson, P. D., Arbelo, , Deaville, R., Patterson, I. A. P., Castro, P., Baker, J. R., Degollada, E., Ross, H. M., Herráez, P., A. M. Pocknell, A.M., Rodríguez, F., E.Howie, F., Espinosa, A., Reid, R. J., Jaber, J. R., V. Martin, Cunningham, A. A. and Fernández, A. 2003. Gas bubble lesions in stranded cetaceans. *Nature* 425: 575–576.
2. International Whaling Commission, 2004 Scientific Committee (IWC/SC) Annex K: Report of the Stranding Working Group on Environmental Concerns. Annual IWS meeting, Sorrent Italy, 29 June–10 July, 56 pp.
3. Frantzis, A. 1998. Does acoustic testing strand whales? *Nature* 392:29; Evans and England 2001, NOAA and U.S. Navy 2001, Joint Interim Report; Bahamas Marine Mammal Stranding Event of 15-16 March 2000. NOAA. NOAA available on line at <http://www.nmgs.noaa.gov/orit,res/PR2H and S R p/I B R pdf> ; Evans, P.G. H., and Miller, L.A. 2004, Proceedings of the Workshop on Active Sonar and Cetaceans. Las Palmas, Gran Canaria, 8th March 2003, European Cetacean Society Newsletter, No. 42. Special Issue; Frantzis 1998; NOAA. 2004. Preliminary report: Multidisciplinary investigation of harbor porpoises (*Phocoena phocoena*) stranded in Washington State from 2 May – 2 June 2003 coinciding with the mid-range sonar exercises of the USS *SHOUP*; Fernandez, A 2004 Pathological findings in stranded beaked whales during the naval military maneuvers near the Canary Island, Proceedings of the Workshop on Active Sonar and Cetaceans. Las Palmas, Gran Canaria, 8th March 2003, European Cetacean Society; Fernandez, A., Edwards, J.F., Rodriguez, F., Espinosa de los Monteros, A., Herraiez, P., Castro, P., Jaber, J. R., Martin, V., and Arbelo, M. 2005. “Gas and fat embolic syndrome” involving a mass stranding of beaked whales (Family *Ziphiidae*) exposed to anthropogenic sonar signals. *Vet Pathol* 42:446–457.
4. See, for example, Andrew, R. K., Howe, B. M. and Mercer, J. A. and Dzieciuch, M. A. 2002. Ocean ambient sound: Comparing the 1960s with the 1990s for a receiver off the California coast. *Acoustic Research Letters Online* 3(2): 65-70; International Whaling Commission, 2004 Report of the Scientific Committee Annex K; Rise in sound levels: National Research Council 2003: *Sound and Marine Mammals* (Washington D.C. National Academies Press 2003); Rise in sound levels: National Research Council: *Sound and Marine Mammals* (Washington D.C. National Academies Press 2003); Friedman.
5. Richardson, W.J., Green, C.R. Jr., Malme, C.I., and Thomson, D.H. 1995. *Marine Mammals and Noise*. New York: Academic Press 576 pp.
6. Fernandez, Whitehead, H. and Reeves, R2005 Killer Whales and whaling: The scavaging hypotheses. *Biol. Lett.* (online) DOI: 10, 1098/rsbl.2005.0348.
7. National Marine Mammal Stranding Network, http://seahorse.nmfs.noaa.gov/msdbs/class/seahorse_public.htm.
8. National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). 2002. Status Review under the Endangered Species Act: Southern Resident Killer Whales (*Orcinus orca*). National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Technical Memorandum NMFS NWFSC-54, Seattle, WA. 131 pp.; Weller, D. W., Burdin, A. M., Wursig, B., Taylor, B. L., and Brownell, R. L., Jr. 2002. The western Pacific gray whale: a review of past exploitation, current status, and potential threats. *J. Cetacean Res. Manage* 4: 7-12.; Croll, D.A., C.W. Clark, A. Acevedo, B. Tershy, S. Flores, J. Gedamke, and J. Ur ban, 2002. “Only male fin whales sing loud songs,” *Nature* 417:809 (observing that rise in noise levels from seismic surveys, oceanographic research, and other activities could impede recovery in fin and blue whale populations).
9. Balcomb, K. C. and Claridge, D.E. 2001, A mass stranding of cetaceans caused by naval sonar in the Bahamas. *Bahamas J. Sci.* 8 (2):2-12.
10. Whitehead, H et al 2000. Science and the conservation, protection, and management of wild cetaceans. In *Cetacean Societies*. Mann, J., Connor, R.C., Tyack, P.L., and Whitehead, H. (Eds.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press., pp 308-332.
11. Perrin, W. F., Würsig, B., and Thewissen, J. G. M. (Eds.). 2002. *Encyclopedia of marine mammals*. New York: Academic Press.
12. Twiss, J. R. Jr., and Reeves, R. R. (Eds.) 1999. *Conservation and management of marine mammals*. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press.
13. National Marine Mammal Stranding Network, http://seahorse.nmfs.noaa.gov/msdbs/class/seahorse_public.htm.
14. National Marine Mammal Stranding Network, http://seahorse.nmfs.noaa.gov/msdbs/class/seahorse_public.htm.
15. Frantzis, A. 1998.

16. Evans and England 2001; Evans and Miller 2004, NOAA and US Navy 2001 Fernandez et. Al. 2005.
17. Personal communication: Ken Balcomb (Feb. 2004); personal communication Laurie Allen (Feb. 2004).
18. Brownell, R.L. Jr., Yamada, T., Mead, J.G., and Van Helden, A.L. m2004. Mass strandings of Cuviers beaked whales in Japan: U.S. Naval acoustic link: Paper. SC/56E37 presented to the IWC Scientific Committee, June 2004 (unpublished). 10pp (available from the Office of the Journal of Cetacean Research and Management); International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES) 2005. Report of the Ad-hoc Group on the Impacts of Sonar on Cetaceans and Fish (AGISC). ICES (M2005/ACE:01).
19. Engel et al. 2004; Martin, V., Servidio, A. and García, S. 2004. Mass strandings of beaked whales in the Canary Islands. In: Evans, P.G. H. and Miller, L. A. (Eds.). Proceedings of the Workshop on Active Sonar and Cetaceans. European Cetacean Society Newsletter, No. 42 (Special Issue), pp. 33-36.; NOAA and U.S. Navy 2001; NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-NWR-34, October 2004: Multidisciplinary investigation of stranded harbor porpoises (*Phocoena phocoena*) in Washington State with an assessment of acoustic trauma as a contributory factor (2May-2 June 2003) pp55; National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). 2005. Assessment of acoustic exposures on marine mammals in conjunction with USS *Shoup* active sonar transmissions in the Eastern Strait of Juan de Fuca and Haro Strait, Washington, 5 May 2003, Office of Protected Resources, 13 pp.; National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). 2005. Assessment of acoustic exposures on marine mammals in conjunction with USS *Shoup* active sonar transmissions in the Eastern Strait of Juan de Fuca and Haro Strait, Washington, 5 May 2003, Office of Protected Resources, 13 pp.; NMFS 2005; Tomaszeski, S. 2004. Presentation at the Third Plenary Meeting of the Advisory Committee on Acoustic Impacts on Marine Mammals, 27-29 July, San Francisco. [Available at:<http://mmc.gov/sound/plenary3/pdf/tomaszeski.pdf>].
20. See, for example, Frantzis 1998, NOAA and U.S. Navy 2001 Joint Interim Report; Bahamas Marine Mammal stranding event of 15-16 March 2000, NOAA (available on lien at http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/prot_res/PR2/H_and_S_R_P/I_B_R.pdf), Jepson et.al. 2003, Levine et al. 2004 Active sonar wave form. JSR-03-200. Report from MITRE Corporation, JASON program, for the Office of Naval Research.
21. See, for example, International Whaling Commission, 2004 Report of the Scientific Committee: Annex K. *See also* Niekirk, S.L., K.M. Stafford, D.K. Mellinger, R.P. Dziak, C.G. Fox, “Low-frequency whale and seismic airgun sounds recorded in the mid-Atlantic Ocean,” *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.* 115 (2004): pp. 1832-43 (describing significant propagation across mid-Atlantic to hydrophones located more than 3000 km away).
22. U.S. Navy documents show LFA ensonifying to a distance of out to 300 nm at 140 dB, which is several orders of magnitude above levels known to disturb gray whales (120 dB), and the area above 120 dB is likely over a million nm² (and up to approximately 3.9 million km²).
23. International Whaling Commission, 2004 Report of the Scientific Committee: Chairman’s Summary at § 12.2.5.1. Engel, M.H., M.C.C. Marcondes, C.C.A. Martins, F. O Luna, R.P. Lima, and A. Campos, “Are seismic surveys responsible for cetacean strandings? An unusual mortality of adult humpback whales in Abrolhos Bank, Northeastern coast of Brazil,” Paper submitted to the IWC Scientific Committee (2004) (SC/56/E28).
24. IWC 2004, Annex K.
25. IWC 2004, Annex K.
26. “High Energy Seismic Survey Review Process and Interim Operational Guidelines for Marine Surveys Offshore Southern California,” the High Energy Seismic Survey Team (HESS), for the California State Lands Commission and the U.S. Minerals Management Service Pacific OCS Region, September 1996 – February 1999.
27. Taylor, B., Barlow, J., Pitman, R., Balance, L., Klinger, T., DeMaster, D., Hildebrand, J., Urban, J., Palacios, D., and Mead, J. 2004. A call for research to assess risk of acoustic impact on beaked whale populations. Paper SC/56/E36 presented to IWC Scientific Committee, Sorrento, Italy (unpublished). [Available from the Office of the Journal of Cetacean Research and Management].
28. See, for example, Engel et.al. (2004).
29. See Würsig, B., D.W. Weller, A.M. Burdin, S.A. Blokhin, S.H. Reeve, A.L. Bradford, R.L. Brownell, Jr., “Gray whales summering off Sakhalin Island, Far East Russia: July-October 1997, A joint U.S.-Russian scientific investigation,” Final contact report to Sakhalin Energy Investment Company (1999); Weller, D.W., A.M. Burdin, B. Würsig, B.L.

- Taylor, and R.L. Brownell, Jr., "The western Pacific gray whale: A review of past exploitation, current status and potential threats," *J. Cetacean Res. Manage.* 4 (2002): pp. 7–12.
30. See, for example, Mate, B.R., K.M. Stafford, and D.K. Ljungblad, "A change in sperm whale (*Physeter macrocephalus*) distribution correlated to seismic surveys in the Gulf of Mexico," *J. Acoustical Soc. Am.* 96 (1994): pp. 3268–69 (sperm whales).
 31. Richardson, W.J. ed., "Marine Mammal and Acoustical Monitoring of Western Geophysical's Open-Water Seismic Program in the Alaskan Beaufort Sea, 1998" (1999) (LGL Rep. TA2230-3) (bowhead whales); Richardson, W.J., G.W. Miller, and C.R. Greene, Jr. 1999. Displacement of migrating bowhead whales by sounds from seismic surveys in shallow waters of the Beaufort Sea. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 106(4): 2281.[abstract only]; Malme et al., "Investigations of the potential effects of underwater noise from petroleum industry activities on migrating gray whale behavior," (1983) (BBN Rep 5366) (gray whales).
 32. Calambokidis, J., D.E. Bain and S.D. Osmek, "Marine Mammal Research and Mitigation in Conjunction with Air Gun Operation for the USGS 'SHIPS' Seismic Surveys in 1998" (1998) (Final report to Minerals Management Service).
 33. Stone, C.J. 2003 The effects of seismic activity on marine mammals in UK waters, 1998–2000. JNCC Report Number 323.
 34. Croll et. al 2002.
 35. Bejder, L. 2005, Linking short and long term effects of nature-based tourism on Cetaceans. Ph. D thesis Dalhousie Univ. Halifax, Nova Scotia.
 36. See, for example, Weilgart, L., Whitehead, H., Rendell, L., and Calambokidis, J. 2005. Signal-to-noise: funding structure versus ethics as a solution to conflict of interest. *Mar. Mamm. Sci.* 21 (4): 779–781.
 37. Smith, R 1999 Opening up BMJ Peer Review, *BMJ* 318:4–5.