

**CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION**

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



# W 27a

**DATE:** November 15, 2005

**TO:** Coastal Commissioners and Interested Parties

**FROM:** Peter M. Douglas, Executive Director  
Elizabeth A. Fuchs, Manager, Statewide Planning and Federal Consistency Division  
Mark Delaplaine, Federal Consistency Supervisor

**RE:** Recommendations to the Marine Mammal Commission's Advisory Committee on Acoustic Impacts on Marine Mammals

---

In 2003 the U.S. Congress directed the Marine Mammal Commission (MMC) to “fund an international conference or series of conferences to share findings, survey acoustic ‘threats’ to marine mammals, and develop means of reducing those threats while maintaining the oceans as a global highway of international commerce.”<sup>1</sup> The potential for human-generated (anthropogenic) sources of sound to affect marine mammals had been discussed in many forums in recent years, and had been the subject of four reports since 1994 from the National Research Council of the National Academy of Sciences. These previous efforts pointed to the need for more specific information about the effects of chronic and episodic sound on marine mammals and the means of reducing them.

To meet the Congressional directive, the MMC initially consulted with a variety of interested stakeholders and entered into an agreement with the U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution (Institute) to create a multi-stakeholder dialogue focused on addressing the potential impacts of anthropogenic sound on marine mammals. Working through a team of neutral facilitators, in November 2003 the MMC a 28-member Advisory Committee on Acoustic Impacts on Marine Mammals (Advisory Committee) whose charge was to:

- 1) Review and evaluate available information on the impacts of human-generated sound on marine mammals, marine mammal populations, and other components of the marine environment;

---

<sup>1</sup> Public Law 108-7

- 2) Identify areas of general scientific agreement and areas of uncertainty or disagreement related to such impacts;
- 3) Identify research needs and make recommendations concerning priorities for research in critical areas to resolve uncertainties or disagreements; and
- 4) Recommend management actions and strategies to help avoid and mitigate possible adverse effects of anthropogenic sounds on marine mammals and other components of the marine environment.

The MMC selected the Advisory Committee members to represent a balance of stakeholder interests, including: (a) entities whose activities introduce sound into the marine environment (the academic researchers, U.S. shipping industry, oil and gas industry, the U.S. Navy, and other government agencies); (b) environmental and animal welfare non-governmental organizations; (c) scientists with pertinent expertise; and (d) federal and state government agencies with responsibilities concerning or affecting marine mammals (California Coastal Commission, National Oceanic and Atmosphere Administration, Navy, Minerals Management Service, and Fish and Wildlife Service).

For the next year and a half, the Advisory Committee met in six plenary meetings, and numerous subcommittees and working group meetings also took place.

Advisory Committee members agreed at the outset on operating procedures, including the following:

*The Committee's charge is to develop recommendations to the MMC for inclusion in a report to Congress from the MMC. The MMC asks the Committee to develop as much consensus on these recommendations as is achievable. On issues where the Committee does not or cannot reach consensus, this will be noted and the MMC may develop, if it so chooses, its own recommendations to Congress on those issues.*

After extensive deliberations, the Advisory Committee found that it was unable to reach consensus on a report to the MMC. Significant differences of opinion on a number key issues remained unresolved at the Advisory Committee's final meeting in September 2005. Acknowledging this, Committee members agreed unanimously to discontinue efforts to reach agreement on a single consensus report to the MMC. They agreed instead to implement an alternative plan proposed by the MMC, consistent with the Committee's Operating Procedures as described above. The plan included preparation and submittal of no-more-than 30 page "non-consensus statements by individual Advisory Committee members or groups of members that express views on the issues discussed by the Advisory Committee in response to its charter." The statements were limited to no more than 30 pages each, and if they met the November 18, 2005, deadline for submittal to the MMC, the MMC would attach them in its own report to Congress.

The areas of disagreement included the following fundamental questions:

- How to characterize potential and actual threats to marine mammals from anthropogenic sound in the context of other threats (e.g., fishing bycatch), in

particular, the relative significance of anthropogenic sound compared to other threats to marine mammals about which more may be known;

- The inclusion of a discussion on the role of precaution in the face of uncertainties when managing and mitigating the impacts of anthropogenic sound on marine mammals; and
- The inclusion of language supporting the need for improvements in the identification and implementation of mitigation measures.

More specifically the list of disagreements includes:

- **Extent of the Problem**
  - How significant is the threat?
  - Relative importance of sound vs other threats
  - Impact on populations
  - Degree of scientific uncertainty and use of extrapolation
  - How to characterize acoustic energy – sound vs noise
- **Relationship between Stranding and Sound**
  - Level of relationship: cause/effect, correlated, associated
  - Number of relevant stranding or mortality events
  - Range of species involved: beaked whales, other?
  - Range of sound sources involved: sonar, airguns
  - Mechanisms of injury: auditory, behavioral, non-auditory
- **Effectiveness of Current Management / Mitigation**
  - What are best practices?
  - Cost effectiveness and practicality/practicability
  - Assignment of burden of proof: sound producers vs regulators
  - Precautionary approach –addressing the uncertainty
  - International or multi-lateral approach
- **Priorities and Conduct of Research**
  - What are priority research areas?
  - Relative importance of research and mitigation efforts
  - Diversification and distribution of research funding
  - Permitting and authorization for research
  - Animal Welfare aspects of research – CEE, ABR
  - Safeguards against bias in research

Attached is the Coastal Commission's statement to the MMC on those issues where there was disagreement, as listed above.

**Staff Recommendation and Motion.** The staff recommends that the Commission adopt the following motion:

**MOTION:** I move that the Commission forward the attached comments to the Marine Mammal Commission.

**Staff Recommendation:** The staff recommends a **YES** vote on the motion.

Attachment

**Coastal Commission Comments**  
**on the Effects of Anthropogenic Sound on Marine Mammals**

The California Coastal Commission is appreciative of 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 take place. 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 which 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.<sup>1</sup> 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.<sup>2</sup> In particular, a sequence of marine mammal strandings and mortalities has been linked to exposure to mid-frequency sonar.<sup>3</sup> 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 by 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, as well as individual sound sources can cause adverse effects, the extent and type of which are not well understood<sup>4</sup>. 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 that has been done 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 since scientific certainty is difficult to obtain on most issues but will be particularly elusive in this field. Since 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., North Carolina 2005 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 the relative importance of sound?***

There has been an attempt by some to downplay the significance of this 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<sup>5</sup>. 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 most probably go unreported, particularly in remote areas;
- 2) mortalities that occur away from the coast are impossible to detect<sup>6</sup>;
- 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<sup>7</sup>;
- 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 area of concern or possible impact; 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 from sensing 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 scientific body of 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 ones, 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 the lack of their recovery<sup>8</sup>. The NRC statement that “no scientific studies have conclusively demonstrated a link between exposure to sound and adverse effects on a marine mammal population.” (NRC 2005) is misleading at best, since 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 regarding a well-studied local population of beaked whales which was either killed or did not return even five years after the sonar event believed to have caused the stranding<sup>9</sup>. 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 the fact that:

- 1) in all but a few cetacean species our population estimates are too imprecise to be able to detect population declines in all but a few cetacean species<sup>10</sup>;
- 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 to noise;
- 4) where we do know of population declines, most cannot be linked to one primary cause; 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.

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.

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 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 terrestrial mammal ears. 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 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 stress 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 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.
- 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 understanding. We do not even know what the hearing range is in most cetaceans (only 11 out of the 83 known species), and 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 the 11 species. These data are then used to extrapolate to the entire species and then from one species to the next and then again from odontocetes to mysticetes, making even the agreed upon information on hearing open to question. We know that there are great variations in the hearing ability and range of individuals within a species thus any extrapolation within the same species should include the probability of error and set possible bounds. This is not, and cannot be done, with the limited observations available. To then extrapolate 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 the 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 field of knowledge increases 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 clearly 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 are 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 pre-requisite 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, this 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. The 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.

NMFS maintains a data base of marine mammal strandings in the U.S.<sup>11</sup>, and this has been pointed to as an indication that the effects of noise are relatively insignificant when considering the number of strandings known to be caused by anthropogenic noise. However, using the figures from this data base is extremely misleading. The vast majority of these 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. Since 60% of the strandings cannot be explained by any known cause<sup>12</sup>, there is also the possibility that a percentage of these could be sound related and that others could have had sound as 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<sup>13</sup>. Similar events have occurred in the Bahamas Islands, 2000, Madeira 2002 and the Canary Islands in 2002<sup>14</sup>. Strandings of Cuvier's beaked whales are considered to be highly unusual. Since the early 1960's, 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 connection of noise and strandings whether or not a cause and effect can be shown.

It is interesting to note that this sets a double standard. These same stakeholders refuse to allow 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). The detection of strandings 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 of 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 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, one method of determining if there is a correlation between intense noise events (sonar and seismic) and strandings 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 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 Strait)<sup>15</sup>.

It has taken 40 years to notice the connection between naval sonars 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 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 do not limit the list of strandings that may have a connection to sound sources in order to be more fully able to understand the magnitude of the problem and allow for an analysis to determine a statistical correlation of the relationship between noise and strandings. We have therefore included a more complete list of strandings.

Table 5.1 Mass Strandings of Beaked Whales<sup>15</sup>

Year	Location	Species (numbers)	Associated activity, when available
1914	New York, United States	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), Ziphiid sp. (1)	
1987	Canary Islands	Me (3)	
1987	Italy	Zc (2)	
1987	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)	
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 (8), Md (3), Ziphiid sp. (2), minke whale (1), <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, Me, Md (15-17 whales)	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 to 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 relatively more rare events, these strandings are more 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) bottlenose whales (Canary Islands 1988) have stranded concurrent with beaked whales. In other instances, melon-headed whales (Hawaii 2004), harbor porpoises (Haro Strait 2003), 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 N. Carolina (January 2005) had traumas consistent with acoustic impacts. It should be noted, that NMFS has not provided any report on the N. Carolina incident, which occurred over 10 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 5.2 Associated Mass Strandings Involving Species Other Than Beaked Whales**

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 (1), Balaenoptera sp. (2), Atlantic spotted dolphin (1), Zc. (8), 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, and the connection to strandings, particularly of beaked whales. That there is a connection is clear.<sup>16</sup> 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 in size with hundred fold greater than ambient noise levels, persisting so as to be nearly continuous for days<sup>17</sup>. 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 scientific research to study deep ocean temperatures to assist global climate change models (i.e., 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 km<sup>2</sup> at greater than ambient levels.<sup>18</sup>

In 2004, the International Whaling Commission's Scientific Committee concluded that increased sound from seismic surveys was "cause for serious concern."<sup>19</sup> Its conclusion was based on a substantial and growing body of evidence which 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, to 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<sup>20</sup>, 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<sup>21</sup>. The State of California has a ban on further seismic surveys within its sovereign waters, until such time as a programmatic EIR is done, due to concerns about the impact of seismic surveys on fish eggs and larvae.

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<sup>22</sup>. That same year, the adult humpback whales stranding rate was unusually high compared with that of juvenile humpbacks along Brazil's Abrolhos Banks, where oil-and-gas surveys were conducted<sup>23</sup>. 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<sup>24</sup>. 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<sup>25</sup>; bowhead whales, which have been shown to avoid survey vessels to a distance of more than twenty kilometers while migrating off the Alaskan coast<sup>26</sup>; and harbor porpoises, which have been seen to engage in dramatic avoidance responses at significant distances from an array<sup>27</sup>.

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, but it remains 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, is not a single source of noise that can be as easily studied. Shipping is diffuse and spread throughout the world's oceans, primarily raising the ambient levels of sound as the area of concern. Shipping noise creates the same frequencies used by many marine species, including baleen whales<sup>28</sup>. The most probable impacts of shipping relate to the masking of biologically meaningful sounds, and to chronic and sub-lethal 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(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<sup>29</sup>.

#### ***Mechanisms of injury: auditory, behavioral, non-auditory***

There is currently considerable scientific debate about the mechanisms of the 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 could conceivably result in a better understanding of how to mitigate for these lethal impacts, but that is, at best, far in the future. In the meantime, 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 possibly populations, must be factored into the agency decisions about permitting and management.

#### **Recommendations:**

- Provide funding to have sufficient standing teams available to review and obtain information on strandings in a timely manner.
- Increase the level of monitoring to detect strandings or mortalities at sea associated with noise events.
- Develop a standardized form for the reporting of data from strandings, including consistent necropsy examinations to detect acoustically-related injuries.
- Allow for a limited number of members of the public to be present during necropsies to increase the transparency of the process.
- 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. Science has not been able to conclusively identify 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 toward preventing adverse effects to 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 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 who are individuals (ranging from marine mammal biologists and trained observers to crew members) who conduct visual surveys of marine mammals (i.e., watching for their presence or behavior) for various reasons including maintaining marine mammal-free safety zones.

The limitations inherent in visual observations are well known. Sighting rates are affected by a variety of factors. Effective visual observations are also generally limited

to hours of daylight. Visual detection is also limited by the fact that 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 those which 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 hard to spot even under ideal conditions.

The limitations of using marine mammal observers to enforce a safety zone can be supplemented through the use of Passive Acoustic Monitoring (PAM), especially for some deep diving species, if they vocalize. There are some technical limitations to PAM, such as the fact that 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 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, other than denying an activity or creating seasonal and geographic exclusion zones, there are no known mitigation techniques that guarantee elimination of potential and known impacts, management and regulatory agencies must deal with the need for requests for permits for sound-producing activities. They must therefore look to all possible mitigation tools to, consistent with current statutes, 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) as 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 un-addressed 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 ADDs (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 application 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 facilitating 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 meets 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, broadscale and unneeded military exemptions from the MMPA are not appropriate. This is critically important, since 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, MMPA, ESA, CZMA 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. This is essential to retain. Given the scientific uncertainty surrounding this issue, the difficulty in studying marine mammals, the data gaps that will not be filled, perhaps for decades, 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 happen.

***Precautionary approach-addressing the uncertainty***

Given the level of uncertainty, the data gaps and the fact that the impacts of sound may have serious, even lethal effects, the use of precaution is necessary to protect and conserve 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 has precaution embedded in it, and the lack of scientific certainty 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.

The California Coastal Commission believes that protecting these species, whom it considers to be coastal resources, is important to this State. As such it 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 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 the mitigation will work, then the commission may deny the project. In each case, the commission requires the burden of proof that the proposed project/action will not impact coastal resources be with the applicant.

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 this 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 to their work as possible, but they are human. Bias creeps into everything we do and comes from all sides and points of view. Bias can affect the questions that are asked, the hypothesis 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 not. 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.

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<sup>30</sup>. In addition, the pre-publication "vetting" of manuscripts by the funder, actual interference by the sponsor into the research, 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. As decision makers involved in determining approval and mitigations we believe it is counter-productive to only have research that could be considered biased. If all research is funded only by sound producers and the agencies that regulate them, it is subject to question and therefore is of



little 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. Spending taxpayer dollars on research that can be questioned is counter-productive.

There are numerous models for increasing funding diversity, independence, and public transparency. For instance, the National Oceanographic Partnership Program (NOPP) which 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 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 it could not be in this discipline.

Whatever mechanisms are set in place to address this issue, 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. We strongly urge that sufficient funding be put into place to study this form of pollution and its impacts, which we believe represent a substantial threat to marine mammal populations.

**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 whose population 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 find that the activity can be reduced to the least practicable impact and projects may be denied. Since 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 of the location of critical habitats and 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 exclusions 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 CEEs (Controlled Exposure Experiment) 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 under Animal Welfare aspects of research- CEE, ABR (Auditory Brainstem Response)). Current efforts to focus on understanding the effects of noise on marine mammals have not resulted in greater protection to them. It will be extremely difficult to ever gain even a moderately complete or full insight into the impacts and at best will take decades. More importantly, without a more complete understanding of the baseline behavior or un-impacted animals, 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 on-going 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 that 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 that 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. Conducting 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, both naval and seismic surveys.

2. Developing more effective ways to do monitoring pre, during and post noise activity as part of current mitigation required of sound producers so that such monitoring data can be used to analyze for impacts. This also requires that prior-to 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 ones, 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 that may require additional documentation;
4. lack of clarity regarding when programmatic authorizations or permits are appropriate for repetitive activities that do not change significantly over time;
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 includes the recommendations that:

- 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. providing 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. providing standard background documents, application information and references to reduce the cost and time of preparing applications; and
  - iii. developing 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 among 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 Marine Mammal Protection Act and the Endangered Species Act 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- CEE, ABR**

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 experiment). While the 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 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 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, because they are not a benign form of research, it is particularly important that when CEEs are used, they be carefully designed and that their limitations be 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 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 on-going sound operations and they should never expose animals to sound levels that can be expected to cause injury. 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 when more attention is given to optimizing measurement methods and study designs with the greatest power to detect real effects and provide convincing results.

No one 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 comprise 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 of 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. Provide funding to have sufficient standing 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. Develop a standardized form for the reporting of data from strandings, including consistent necropsy examinations to detect acoustically-related injuries. Allow for a limited number of members of the public to be present during necropsies to increase the transparency of the process.
7. Require reporting of any activities involving sound in areas where there was a 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 shipping 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 un-addressed 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 application 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 facilitating 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

While 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 problems with 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 now, such as geographic exclusion zones, to keep marine mammals at a distance from noise sources that have the potential to harm or kill them. In addition, we must undertake a commitment towards understanding this problem better by funding a national research program. Only by this combined approach, precaution, mitigation and research, can we assure that these very special resources will be here for the enjoyment of future generations.

<sup>1</sup>See, for example, Frantzis, A. 1998. Does Acoustic testing strand whales? *Nature* 392: 29; Jepson, P. D., M.Arbelo, Deaville, R., Patterson, I. A. P., Castro, P., Baker, J. R., Degollada, E., Ross, H. M., P.Herráez, A. M. Pocknell, 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

<sup>2</sup>International Whaling Commission, 2004 Report of the Scientific Committee

<sup>3</sup>Frantzis, A. 1998- Does acoustic testing strand whales? *Nature* 392:29; Evans and England 2001, Joint Interim Report; Bahamas Marine Mammal Stranding Event of 15-16 March 2000. NOAA; Evans and Miller 2004, proceedings of the Workshop on Active Sonar and Cetaceans. Las Palmas, Gran Canaria, 8<sup>th</sup> March 2003, European Cetacean Society Newsletter, No. 42. Special Issue Frantzis 1998, NOAA & US Navy 2004; Fernandez, A 2004 Pathological findings in stranded beaked whles during the naval military maneuvers near the Canary Island, Proceedings of the Workshop on Active Sonar and Cetaceans. Las Palmas, Gran Canaria, 8<sup>th</sup> March 2003, European Cetacean Society.

<sup>4</sup>See, for example, Andrew, R. K., Howe, B. M. and Mercer, J. 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, at § 6.4; Rise in sound levels: National Research Council: *Sound and Marine Mammals* (Washington D.C. National Academies Press 2003)

<sup>6</sup>-Fernandez, Whitehead & Reeves 2005 (should be 6)

<sup>7</sup>National Marine Mammal Stranding Network,  
[http://seahorse.nmfs.noaa.gov/msdbs/class/seahorse\\_public.htm](http://seahorse.nmfs.noaa.gov/msdbs/class/seahorse_public.htm)

<sup>8</sup>NMFS 2002; Weller et al 2002; Croll, D.A., C.W. Clark, A. Acevedo, B. Tershy, S. Flores, J. Gedamke, and J. Urban, "Bioacoustics: Only male fin whales sing loud songs," *Nature* 417 (2002): p. 809 (observing that rise in noise levels from seismic surveys, oceanographic research, and other activities could impede recovery in fin and blue whale populations).

<sup>9</sup>- Balcomb and Claridge 2001

<sup>10</sup> Whitehead et al 2000

<sup>11</sup> National Marine Mammal Stranding Network,  
[http://seahorse.nmfs.noaa.gov/msdbs/class/seahorse\\_public.htm](http://seahorse.nmfs.noaa.gov/msdbs/class/seahorse_public.htm)

<sup>12</sup>National Marine Mammal Stranding Network,  
[http://seahorse.nmfs.noaa.gov/msdbs/class/seahorse\\_public.htm](http://seahorse.nmfs.noaa.gov/msdbs/class/seahorse_public.htm)

<sup>13</sup>-Frantzis, A. 1998



<sup>14</sup>-Evans and England 2001; Evans and Miller 2004, NOAA & US Navy 2004; Fernandex, A 2004

<sup>15</sup> Personal communication: Ken Balcomb

<sup>16</sup>See, for example, Frantzis 1998, NOAA and U.S. Navy 2001, Jepson et.al 2003, Levine et al. 2004

<sup>17</sup> See for example, International Whaling Commission, 2004 Report of the Scientific Committee: Annex K. See also Nieu Kirk, 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 3000km away).

<sup>18</sup>.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 nm<sup>2</sup> (and up to approximately 3.9 million km<sup>2</sup>).

<sup>19</sup> 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).

<sup>20</sup>International Whaling Commission, 2004 Report of the Scientific Committee: Chairman's Summary at § 12.2.5.1.

<sup>21</sup> IWC 2004

<sup>22</sup>Hildebrand, J., "Impacts of anthropogenic sound on cetaceans," Paper submitted to the IWC Scientific Committee (2004) (SC/56/E13).

<sup>23</sup>- See for example: Engel, M.H., M.C.C. Marcondes, C.C.A. Martins, F. O Luna, R.P. Lima, and A. Campos (2004) .

<sup>24</sup>- 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.

<sup>25</sup>-See, e.g., 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);

<sup>26</sup>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);


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);

<sup>27</sup>-Dr. David Bain, U. Washington (Nov. 10, 2003) (harbor porpoises).

28

29

<sup>30</sup>Smith '99





SCRIPPS INSTITUTION OF OCEANOGRAPHY  
DEPUTY DIRECTOR FOR RESEARCH, ASSOC. VICE CHANCELLOR-MARINE AFFAIRS  
DIRECTOR, UCSD CENTER FOR EARTH OBSERVATIONS & APPLICATIONS  
PRESIDENT, AMERICAN GEOPHYSICAL UNION

9500 GILMAN DRIVE  
LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92093-0210  
TEL: (858) 534-2836  
FAX: (858) 453-0167

November 16, 2005

Meg Caldwell  
Chair  
California Coastal Commission  
45 Fremont Street, Suite 2000  
San Francisco, CA 94105

WZTa

RE: Coastal Commission Comments on the Effects of Anthropogenic Sound on Marine Mammals, Agenda Item 27.a.


Dear Chairwoman Caldwell:

Thank you for the opportunity to address the Coastal Commission Comments on the Effects of Anthropogenic Sound on Marine Mammals, Item 27.a. on the Commission's agenda. I wish to express concerns regarding the accuracy and conclusions of this report

As much as everyone would like to have "proof" from science, science is inherently, studiously uncertain. The practice of science is based on theories and not laws. Science, by its very nature, cannot promote or provide certainty. This is what distinguishes science from faith or spiritual values, which demand certainty. Seeking answers in one regime based on practices in the other is fraught with hazard as clearly demonstrated by the confrontation of the theory of evolution by the belief system of creationism and intelligent design.

Scripps Institution of Oceanography endorses the unanimous report of the Research Caucus of the Marine Mammal Commission Advisory Committee, which is in draft form and will be forwarded to the Commission upon final approval. This is expected no later than December 10, 2005. We urge Commission members to consider this report before adopting the comments before you.

At present, the most thorough and accurate summaries of the state of knowledge and understanding of the issue of marine mammals and anthropogenic sound is contained in the four excellent reports published by the National Research Council in 1994, 2000, 2003, and 2005. These reports describe the state of scientific knowledge on the issue of marine mammals and anthropogenic sound, the progress that has been made in understanding the issue over the last ten years, and recommendations for future research. These reports are thoroughly researched documents produced by balanced panels of scientific experts in the relevant fields. Independent experts anonymously reviewed the reports for scientific accuracy. Thus, these reports represent nearly a decade of balanced and comprehensive studies of our knowledge of anthropogenic sound and its potential



impacts on marine mammals. That virtually no discussion of the findings of the NRC reports is included in the report being considered for approval by the Commission undermines the credibility of the report.


We in fact believe that the report being considered is inconsistent with the scientific conclusions in the NRC reports and seriously misrepresents the state of knowledge and understanding of this issue. The section "Defining the Problem" on pages 13–15 of NRC (2005) provides an excellent brief summary of the current state of knowledge. The summary statement provided in NRC (2005) is:

"On the one hand, sound may represent only a second-order effect on the conservation of marine mammal populations; on the other hand, what we have observed so far may be only the first early warning or 'tip of the iceberg' with respect to sound and marine mammals."

The U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy (2004) also considered the issues related to protecting marine mammals, including those related to anthropogenic sound. Their recommendations are fully consistent with those made in the National Research Council (NRC) reports. We believe that the findings and recommendations in these reports provide excellent guidance for the way forward. Whether the Commission agrees or disagrees with the recommendations in these earlier reports, we believe that it is essential for the findings and recommendations in the Commission report to be put in the context provided by these earlier reports.

The Marine Mammal Commission extended the deadline for members of the Advisory Committee on Acoustic Impacts on Marine Mammals to submit individual or caucus statements until 1 February 2006. We urge the Coastal Commission to take the time to ensure that their report is informed by the best possible science before voting on whether or not to endorse the report. We will be happy to provide additional scientific information.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "John A. Orcutt", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

John A. Orcutt



National Research Council (1994). *Low-Frequency Sound and Marine Mammals: Current Knowledge and Research Needs*, National Academy Press, Washington, D.C., 75 pp.

National Research Council (2000). *Marine Mammals and Low-Frequency Sound: Progress Since 1994*, National Academy Press, Washington, D.C., 146 pp.

National Research Council (2003). *Ocean Noise and Marine Mammals*, National Academy Press, Washington, D.C., 192 pp.

National Research Council (2005). *Marine Mammal Populations and Ocean Noise: Determining When Noise Causes Biologically Significant Effects*, National Academy Press, Washington, D.C., 126 pp.

U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy (2004). *An Ocean Blueprint for the 21st Century: Final Report of the U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy*, U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy, Washington, D.C., 522 pp.





LOIS CAPPS  
23RD DISTRICT, CALIFORNIA

1707 LONGWORTH HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING  
WASHINGTON, DC 20515-0522  
(202) 225-3601

COMMITTEE ON  
ENERGY AND COMMERCE

COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET



W27a

**Congress of the United States**  
**House of Representatives**

November 15, 2005

- DISTRICT OFFICES:
- 1411 MARSH STREET, SUITE 205  
SAN LUIS OBISPO, CA 93401  
(805) 546-8348
  - 1216 STATE STREET, SUITE 403  
SANTA BARBARA, CA 93101  
(805) 730-1710
  - 141 SOUTH A STREET, SUITE 204  
OXNARD, CA 93030  
(805) 385-3440

Meg Caldwell  
California Coastal Commission  
45 Fremont Street, Suite 2000  
San Francisco, CA 94105

Dear Chair Caldwell:

I am writing to express my support for the Coastal Commission's draft Comments on the Effects of Anthropogenic Sound on Marine Mammals, and urge the Commissioners to approve the comments and forward them to the Marine Mammal Commission.

Like you, I am concerned about the dangers of human generated sound in the marine environment. The growing range and scale of underwater noise emissions, including increases in commercial shipping traffic, recreational boating, intense active sonars, air guns used for seismic surveys for oil and gas development, and other ocean related activities, pose a significant threat to marine mammals, fish and other ocean wildlife. As you know, an increasing body of research confirms that the intense sound produced by these noise sources can induce a range of adverse effects in marine species.


In my view, the Coastal Commission's draft Comments recognize the complexity of the issues surrounding the impacts to marine mammals from underwater sound. I am supportive of the Coastal Commission's precautionary approach, and believe it should be applied transparently to noise generated for military, commercial, recreational, industrial and scientific purposes. Further, these comments will enhance the Marine Mammal Commission's ability to review and evaluate all information about the impacts of human-generated sound in the marine environment.

The Coastal Commission has played and should continue to play a critical role in increasing our understanding of the effects of underwater sound on marine mammals. I look forward to working with you on this and other issues that protect California's unique coastal and marine resources.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this important issue.

Sincerely,

LOIS CAPPS  
Member of Congress



November 14, 2005



**W 27a**  
**RECEIVED**  
**NOV 14 2005**  
CALIFORNIA  
COASTAL COMMISSION

California Coastal Commission  
45 Fremont Street, Suite 2000  
San Francisco, CA 94105  
Fax 415 904-5400

**Re: Recommendations to the Marine Mammal Commission's Advisory  
Committee on Acoustic Impacts on Marine Mammals (W 27a)**

Dear Honorable Commissioners:

This letter is submitted to communicate the support by the Environmental Defense Center (EDC), for the Coastal Commission's draft Comments on the Effects of Anthropogenic Sound on Marine Mammals ("the comments"), and our recommendation that the Coastal Commission approve the comments and forward them to the Marine Mammal Commission (MMC). EDC is a Santa Barbara-based not-for-profit, public interest law firm focused on the enhancement of natural assets and quality of life in the Central and South Coast regions.

EDC maintains an especially strong and active interest in the conservation of the unique and precious natural resources in and around California's Channel Islands marine protected areas (MPA), protected by several State and Federal designations. These MPA's harbor some of the most productive and diverse ecological communities in the world. They are also threatened by an expanding diversity and magnitude of industrialization of the Santa Barbara Channel area, such as the steady increase in commercial shipping, the potential for expanded hydrocarbon prospecting and extraction, liquefied natural gas processing, open ocean aquaculture, growing recreational boat traffic, and ongoing naval exercises in nearby Sea Ranges. All such activities are known to emit sound, either intentionally or not, into the underwater environment; such emissions are increasingly recognized by scientists as potentially having harmful to fatal impact to many marine species, from marine mammals and fishes, to birds and invertebrates.


EDC believes that improving our understanding of the acoustic emissions from this growing industrialization, and working to minimize them, is important for conservation and enhancement of the invaluable marine resources of the Channel Islands area. Our work on this issue resulted in a 2004 report assessing the threat posed by anthropogenic

November 14, 2005  
California Coastal Commission: Comments to MMC  
Page 4


analyzing ecological trends such as the population dynamics of marine mammals, and perhaps even in developing "noise budgets" for certain areas of extreme ecological importance in longer-term future. For example, the Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary, NOAA Fisheries and the Scripps Institute are working to develop an acoustical monitoring project for the Sanctuary to accomplish some of these goals and would benefit from the support of the Coastal Commission and the MMC.

In conclusion, EDC would like to thank the Coastal Commission for its attention to this issue, and for properly identifying anthropogenic noise as an important factor in the conservation of California's wealth of marine resources. We encourage the Commission to act on the matter by adopting the comments and forwarding them to the MMC.

Sincerely,



Linda Krop  
Chief Counsel



Shiva Polefka  
Marine Conservation Analyst

*DeLapina*  
November 4, 2005

Mr. Peter Douglas, Executive Director  
California Coastal Commission  
45 Fremont Street, Suite 2000  
San Francisco, CA 94105-2219  
FAX (415) 904-5400

**W 27a**  
**RECEIVED**  
NOV 07 2005  
CALIFORNIA  
COASTAL COMMISSION

Re: November 16<sup>th</sup> Meeting of CCC, Item 27(a)

Dear Members:

Please add my comments to the record on this discussion item regarding the establishment of standards for noise pollution in the coastal waters of California, especially with regard to rulemaking being done by the Marine Mammal Commission on this subject.

I have followed the issue of noise pollution in the ocean since 1999, and I am convinced that our nation is leading the world in destroying marine life with our noisy commercial, industrial and military activities in the ocean, including sonars, offshore oil drilling and seismic oil prospecting, and even excessively loud engines. In the last ten years dolphins and whales have been killed many places where very loud noises from military sonars and seismic testing were occurring around the world (Sea of Cortez, Puget Sound, Bermuda, Canary Islands, the banks of the Carolinas, to name a few). Necropsies have shown lethal injuries to the animals that are consistent with physiological and behavioral responses due to the stimulus of exceedingly loud sound. Our current laws should protect marine mammals, but experimental studies show that fish and invertebrates are likely suffering destruction from the same forms of noise pollution. Only through the marine mammals can we make any efforts to protect the entire marine world from human-created harm from human-created sounds.

I urge the Commission to notify the Marine Mammal Commission that you are aware of the serious impacts loud ocean noise have on marine mammals. Your responsibility to protect the resources within our California Coastal Zone requires that you actively seek to reduce this source of harm. I urge the CCC to immediately ask the Marine Mammal Commission to set limitations on the amount of sound that industrial, commercial, and military activities are permitted to create in the California Coastal Zone, in the range of less than 130 dB at source, rather than raising the permitted level above 160 dB, as has been proposed. Those who say we need more research are a part of the problem, not the solution. We know we are killing the oceans. Only we can stop the killing.

*Kay Stewart*  
Kay Stewart, San Diego

MA, biology, CSU Fresno (thesis on marine conservation/Moss Landing Marine Labs)  
Scripps Institute of Oceanography (three years, zooplankton research)  
Oregon Dept Fish and Wildlife (two years, fisheries resource management)  
U.S. Forest Service PNW (seven years, fisheries resource management)

