

# **Appendix II-L**

Hydroacoustic Modeling Report

**March 2024**

## **Underwater Acoustic Assessment of Pile Driving and Related Sound-Producing Construction Activities at the Atlantic Shores Offshore Wind North Project, BOEM Lease Area OCS-A-0549**

**Prepared For:**

Atlantic Shores Offshore Wind

Version 2.3 December 8 , 2023



2 Corporate Place, Suite 105: Middletown, RI 02842 / 401-847-7508 (phone) 401-847-7864 (fax)

*Research – Operations – Engineering – Design - Analysis*

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**







#### **LIST OF TABLES**





[Table 26. Acoustic Ranges \(m\) \(95th Percentile\) to the PTS Thresholds for Marine Mammals](#page-99-0)  [\(NMFS, 2018\) and Sea Turtles \(DoN, 2017\) from Unmitigated Impact Pile Driving for the](#page-99-0)  [Installation or Removal of the Conductor Barrel at the Monmouth, NJ and Wolfe's P](#page-99-0)ond, NY [Modeling Sites for Four Representative Months. The Peak \(Lpk\) Thresholds are Unweighted](#page-99-0)  [While the SEL \(LE\) Thresholds are Weighted According to the Hearing Group and are](#page-99-0)  [Accumulated over 24-hrs These Ranges are Based on the Assumption of 10 Hours of Pile](#page-99-0)  [Driving, Which is the Installation of a Single Conductor Barrel.](#page-99-0) ..83

[Table 27. Acoustic Ranges \(m\) \(95th Percentile\) to the PTS \(Peak and SEL\) and TTS Thresholds](#page-100-0)  [for Fish \(Popper et al. 2014\) from Unmitigated Impact Pile Driving for the Installation or](#page-100-0)  [Removal of the Conductor Barrel at the Monmouth, NJ and Wolfe's Pond, NY](#page-100-0) Modeling Sites for [Four Representative Months. The SEL \(LE\) and Peak Injury \(Lpk\) Thresholds are Unweighted.](#page-100-0)  [These Ranges are Based on the Assumption of 10 Hours of Pile Driving, Which is the Installation](#page-100-0)  [of a Single Conductor Barrel..84](#page-100-0)

Table 28. Acoustic Ranges (m) (95<sup>th</sup> Percentile) to Injury Thresholds for Fish (FHWG, 2008) from [Unmitigated Impact Pile Driving for the Installation or Removal of the Conductor Barrel at the](#page-101-0)  [Monmouth, NJ and Wolfe's Pond, NY Modeling Sites for Four Representative Months. The Peak](#page-101-0)   $(L_{pk})$  and SEL (L<sub>E</sub>) thresholds are unweighted. These Ranges are Based on the Assumption of 10 [hours of Pile Driving, Which is the Installation of a Single Conductor Barrel.](#page-101-0) .............................85

Table 29. Acoustic Ranges (m) (95<sup>th</sup> Percentile) to Behavioral Thresholds for Marine Mammals [\(NOAA, 2005\), Sea Turtles \(DoN, 2017\), and Fishes \(GARFO, 2022\) from Unmitigated Impact Pile](#page-101-1)  [Driving for the Installation or Removal of the Conductor Barrel at the Monmouth, NJ and](#page-101-1)  Wolfe's Pond, NY M[odeling Sites for Four Representative Months.](#page-101-1) ...85

[Table 30. Acoustic Ranges \(m\) \(95th Percentile\) to PTS and Behavioral Thresholds for Marine](#page-102-0)  [Mammals and Sea Turtles Resulting from Unmitigated Vibratory Pile Driving for the Atlantic](#page-102-0)  [Shores North Cofferdam Installation and Removal at the Monmouth, NJ and W](#page-102-0)olfe's Pond, NY [Modeling Sites for Four Representative Months. Ranges Were Determined Assuming 43.4](#page-102-0)  [Minutes of Daily Activity at the Wolfe's Pond, NJ Location and 109.2 Minutes at the Monmouth,](#page-102-0)  NY Location. [..86](#page-102-0)

[Table 31. Acoustic Ranges \(m\) \(95th Percentile\) to the PTS, TTS, and Behavioral Thresholds for](#page-103-0)  [Fish Resulting from Unmitigated Vibratory Pile Driving for the Atlantic Shores North Cofferdam](#page-103-0)  [Installation or Removal at the Monmouth, NJ and Wolfe's Pond, NY M](#page-103-0)odeling Sites for Four [Representative Months. Ranges Were Determined Assuming 43.4 Minutes of Daily Activity at](#page-103-0)  [the Wolfe's Pond Location and 109.2 Minutes at the Monmouth Location.](#page-103-0)...............................87

[Table 32. Acoustic Ranges \(m\) \(95th Percentile\) to PTS and Behavioral Thresholds for Marine](#page-104-0)  [Mammals and Sea Turtles Resulting from Unmitigated Vibratory Pile Driving for the Atlantic](#page-104-0)  [Shores North Goal Post Installation and Removal at the Monmouth, NJ and Wolfe's Pond, NY](#page-104-0)  [Modeling Sites for Four Representative Months. Ranges Were Determined Assuming 4 Hours of](#page-104-0)  Daily Activity at Either Location. [...88](#page-104-0)

[Table 33. Acoustic Ranges \(m\) \(95th Percentile\) to the PTS, TTS, and Behavioral Thresholds for](#page-105-0)  [Fish Resulting from Unmitigated Vibratory Pile Driving for the Atlantic Shores North Goal Post](#page-105-0)  [Installation or Removal at the Monmouth, NJ and Wolfe's Pond, NY M](#page-105-0)odeling Sites for Four



[Pin Piles\) in a 24-hr Period at the Atlantic Shores North Deep Model Site \(Model Scenario 3\).104](#page-120-0)

[Table 46. PTS Exposure Ranges \(m\) for Unmitigated and Mitigated \(Three Sound Attenuation](#page-121-0)  [Levels\) Impact Pile Driving of an OSS Jacket Foundation \(Comprised of Four 5-m Post-Piled Pin](#page-121-0)  [Piles\) in a 24-hr Period at the Atlantic Shores North Shallow Model Site \(Model Scenario 4\).](#page-121-0) .105

[Table 47. Behavior Exposure Ranges \(m\) for Unmitigated and Mitigated \(Three Sound](#page-122-0)  [Attenuation Levels\) Impact Pile Driving of an OSS Jacket Foundation \(Comprised of Four 5-m](#page-122-0)  [Post-Piled Pin Piles\) in a 24-hr Period at the Atlantic Shores North Shallow Model Site \(Model](#page-122-0)  Scenario 4). [...106](#page-122-0)

[Table 48. PTS Exposure Ranges \(m\) for Unmitigated and Mitigated \(Three Sound Attenuation](#page-123-0)  [Levels\) Impact Pile Driving of an OSS Jacket Foundation \(Comprised of Four 5-m Post-Piled Pin](#page-123-0)  [Piles\) in a 24-hr Period at the Atlantic Shores North Deep Model Site \(Model Scenario 4\).](#page-123-0) .....107

[Table 49. Behavior Exposure Ranges \(m\) for Unmitigated and Mitigated \(Three Sound](#page-124-0)  [Attenuation Levels\) Impact Pile Driving of an OSS Jacket Foundation \(Comprised of Four 5-m](#page-124-0)  [Post-Piled Pin Piles\) in a 24-hr Period at the Atlantic Shores North Deep Model Site \(Model](#page-124-0)  Scenario 4). [...108](#page-124-0)

[Table 50. Overall Acoustic Exposure Estimates of Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles for the](#page-125-0)  [Atlantic Shores North Project Based on Impact Pile Driving Installation Schedule 1 \(15-m](#page-125-0)  [Monopiles and OSS Jackets, Which Include Four Post-Piled Pin Piles\), Assuming that all](#page-125-0)  [Foundations are Installed at Either the Deep or the Shallow Model Site..................................109](#page-125-0)

[Table 51. Overall Acoustic Exposure Estimates of Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles for the](#page-127-0)  [Atlantic Shores North Project Based on Impact Pile Driving Installation Schedule 1 \(10-m](#page-127-0)  [Monopiles and OSS Jackets, Which Include Four Post-Piled Pin Piles\), Assuming that all](#page-127-0)  [Foundations are Installed at Either the Deep or the Shallow Model Site..................................111](#page-127-0)

[Table 52. Overall Acoustic Exposure Estimates of Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles for the](#page-129-0)  [Atlantic Shores North Project Based on Impact Pile Driving Installation Schedule 2 \(Jackets and](#page-129-0)  OSS Jackets, Which Each Include Four Pre- [and Post-Piled Pin Piles, Respectively\), Assuming that](#page-129-0)  [all Foundations are Installed at Either the Deep or the Shallow Model Site.](#page-129-0) ............................113

[Table 56. Seasonal Acoustic Exposure Estimates of Marine Mammals Based on Cofferdam](#page-138-0)  [Installation or Removal via Vibratory Pile Driving at the Atlantic Shores North Monmouth, NJ](#page-138-0)  [Representative Cofferdam Model Site, with No Sound Attenuation Applied.](#page-138-0) ..........................122

[Table 57. Seasonal Acoustic Exposure Estimates of Marine Mammals Based on Cofferdam](#page-140-0)  [Installation or Removal via Vibratory Pile Driving at the Atlantic Shores North Wolfe's Pond, NY](#page-140-0)  [Representative Cofferdam Model Site, with No Sound Attenuation Applied.](#page-140-0) ..........................124

[Table 58. Overall Acoustic Exposure Estimates of Marine Mammals Based on Installation and](#page-142-0)  [Extraction of Six Cofferdams \(Four in NJ and Two in NY\) via Vibratory Pile Driving during the](#page-142-0)  Project, with No Sound Attenuation Applied. [...126](#page-142-0)

[Table 59. Seasonal Acoustic Exposure Estimates of Marine Mammals Based on Goal Post](#page-144-0)  [Installation or Removal via Vibratory Pile Driving at the Atlantic Shores North Monmouth, NJ](#page-144-0)  [Representative Model Site, with No Sound Attenuation Applied.](#page-144-0) ..128



[Atlantic Shores North Project Based on Impact Pile Driving Installation Schedule 2 \(Jackets and](#page-206-0) 



[Atlantic Shores North Project Based on Maximum Case Impact Pile Driving Installation \(15-m](#page-209-0)  [Monopiles and Maximum Exposures Per Species from Either Model Site\)...............................193](#page-209-0)

## **LIST OF FIGURES**





#### **ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS**







## <span id="page-17-0"></span>**1 INTRODUCTION**

Atlantic Shores Offshore Wind, LLC (Atlantic Shores) is a 50/50 joint venture between EDF-RE Offshore Development, LLC (an indirect, wholly owned subsidiary of EDF Renewables, Inc. [EDF Renewables]) and Shell New Energies US LLC (Shell). Atlantic Shores has submitted a Construction and Operations Plan (COP) to the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management (BOEM) for the development of offshore wind energy generation known as the Atlantic Shores North Project (the Project) within the Lease Area OCS-A 0549 (Lease Area). The purpose of the Project is to develop offshore wind energy generation facilities within BOEM Lease Area OCS-A 0549 to provide clean, renewable energy to the Northeastern U.S. by the mid-to-late 2020s.

Atlantic Shores' proposed offshore wind energy generation facilities will be located in Lease Area OCS-A 0549, which is 81,129 acres (328.3 square kilometers [km<sup>2</sup>]) in area (Figure 1). Lease Area OCS-A 0549 is located north of and is adjacent to Atlantic Shores' Lease Area OCS-A 0499. At its closest point, the Lease Area is approximately 8.4 miles (mi) (13.5 kilometers [km]) from the New Jersey coast and approximately 60 mi (96.6 km) from the New York State coast. Multiple proposed landfall sites where the cables from the offshore wind farm come to shore have been proposed along the New Jersey and New York shorelines (Figure 2).

The construction and operation of the Project has the potential to cause acoustic harassment to marine species, in particular marine mammals, sea turtles, and fish populations. Marine Acoustics, Inc. (MAI) was contracted by Atlantic Shores to model and assess the sources of underwater noise generated during the construction and installation of the Project and the effect of sound attenuation methods as a means of mitigation. The objective of this modeling study was to predict the ranges to acoustic thresholds of marine mammals, sea turtles, and fish and the potential injury and behavioral acoustic exposures of marine mammals and sea turtles during construction of the Project. This report includes information relevant to the assessment of specific noise-producing construction related activities and their potential to affect protected marine animals that may occur in the Project area.

#### <span id="page-17-1"></span>**1.1 PROJECT SUMMARY**

Atlantic Shores' Lease Area is located on the Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) within the New Jersey Wind Energy Area (NJWEA), which was identified by BOEM as suitable for offshore renewable energy development through a multi-year, public environmental review process. Atlantic Shores' proposed offshore wind energy generation facilities will be located in Lease Area OCS-A 0549. Lease Area OCS-A 0549 is located north of and is adjacent to Atlantic Shores' Lease Area OCS-A 0499. The construction activities covered in this report include impact pile driving of monopiles and pin piles for jackets within the lease area and of conductor barrel piles at nearshore locations as well as vibratory pile driving of sheet piles for cofferdams and steel piles for goal posts at nearshore locations. The lease area is located in federal waters of the Atlantic Ocean that range in depth from 20.2 to 29.7 meters (m).

ASOW may potentially install up to 157 wind turbine generators (WTGs), eight offshore substations (OSSs) (three large, four medium, or eight small OSSs), and one Meteorological Tower (Met Tower) within the OCS0-A-0549 Lease Area over a two-year construction period. ASOW is also considering installing up to six cofferdams at nearshore landing sites in New



**Figure 1. BOEM Lease Area OCS-A-0549 for the Atlantic Shores North Project.**



**Figure 2. Potential Nearshore Landfall and Model along the New Jersey and New York Shoreline for Cofferdam, Conductor Barrel, and Goal Post Installations and Removals for the Atlantic Shores North Project** 

Jersey and/or New York where export cable lines come ashore. Three of the landfall sites identified for the cofferdam installation are in New Jersey while three additional landfall sites for the cofferdam installation are in New York (Figure 2).

As an alternative to cofferdam installation, ASOW is considering installing up to 11 conductor barrels and associated goal post structures at nearshore landing sites in New Jersey and/or New York where export cable lines come ashore. The conductor barrels and goal posts would be installed at the same New York and New Jersey landfall locations considered for the cofferdam installation (Figure 2).

The WTGs, OSSs, and Met Tower foundations will be installed by impact pile driving of either monopile and/or jacket pin piles. The maximum number of piles for the OSSs will be associated with the three-large OSS option, as each may require up to 24 piles, with three piles for each of the eight platform legs. Up to eight cofferdams are to be installed via vibratory pile driving, or up to 11 conductor barrels via impact pile driving and 11 goal posts via vibratory pile driving

Other potential noise-producing activities during the construction period of the Atlantic Shores North Project include high-resolution geophysical (HRG) surveys, and construction vessel support and transport. All these noise-producing activities also have the potential to affect marine species if the sound levels exceed the regulatory threshold criteria at which effects are recognized. Mitigation measures to lessen or abrogate potential effects on marine species are planned during the construction phase of the Project.

#### <span id="page-20-0"></span>**1.2 MODELING AND ANALYSIS SCOPE**

The primary activities that are expected to generate underwater sound during the construction and installation of the proposed Project are impact and vibratory pile driving. The modeling and associated analysis included in this report focuses on impact and vibratory pile driving noise producing activities, including impact pile driving of 10-m and 15-m monopile foundations, 5-m pre- and post-piled piles for jacket foundations, or 1.54-m steel pipes for conductor barrels, as well as vibratory piling of sheet piles for cofferdams or 0.3-m steel pipes for goal posts.

Specific scenarios of impact and vibratory pile driving activities were modeled to assess the resulting unweighted and frequency-weighted broadband underwater acoustic fields. The acoustic ranges to physiological and behavioral auditory thresholds for marine mammals, fishes, and sea turtles were determined from these broadband sound fields. Animat modeling was performed to assess the resultant acoustic exposures of marine mammal and sea turtle species from impact pile driving sources in the Project area. Animat-based exposure ranges to the regulatory thresholds and acoustic exposures were estimated from the output of the animat modeling for impact pile driving. Acoustic exposures associated with vibratory pile driving for cofferdam or goal post installation and removal were determined using the acoustic ranges to physiological and behavioral auditory thresholds and calculating the ensonified areas to each threshold and factoring in the marine mammal densities. The appropriate regulatory thresholds described in Section 4 have been used as the basis from which to estimate acoustic exposures of marine mammals and sea turtles.

#### <span id="page-21-0"></span>**1.2.1 Monopile Foundations**

For the Project, ASOW proposes to potentially install 10-m and 15-m monopiles by impact pile driving with a Menck 4400 hammer. The hammer ram mass of the Menck 4400 hammer is 220 tons. One monopile of either pile diameter is planned to be driven per day. Monopiles would potentially be used in the WTG and Met Tower foundations.

#### <span id="page-21-1"></span>**1.2.2 Piled Jacket Foundations**

ASOW is proposing to install 5-m post-piled jacket piles for the foundations of the OSSs using a IHC S2500 hammer. The hammer ram mass of the IHC S2500 is 100 tons. Four post-piled jacket piles are planned to be driven per day. Instead of installing monopiles, ASOW may alternatively install 5-m pre-piled jacket piles as the foundations for the WTGs and Met Tower, using the same IHC S2500 hammer, and installing four pre-piled piles per day.

Although ASOW may install up to eight OSSs (three large, four medium, or eight small OSSs), modeling considered only the three large OSSs since installation of the large OSSs would include the largest number of pin piles and the greatest number of pile driving installation days, which together represent the maximum OSS installation scenario.

#### <span id="page-21-2"></span>**1.2.3 Cofferdams**

ASOW is planning on installing ZZ46-700 sheet piles (width of 700 millimeters (mm) and varying lengths (14.3 m or 24.2 m)) at five potential cofferdam locations between New Jersey and New York (Figure 2) with vibratory pile driving using an APE 200T hammer. Two representative modeling locations have been selected for modeling of cofferdam installation, one per state, to capture the range of water depths and habitats at the potential installation locations, with one model site selected per state. The Monmouth location was modeled as the representative New Jersey location and the Wolfe's Pond location was modeled at the representative New York location (the Lemon Creek landfall location is adjacent to the Wolfe's Pond location).

#### <span id="page-21-3"></span>**1.2.4 Conductor Barrel and Goal Posts**

ASOW is planning on installing 1.54-m diameter steel pipes as part of the conductor barrel at potential landfall locations in New Jersey and/or New York (Figure 2). The conductor barrel will be comprised of five 6.1-m sections of pipe to result in a total length of 30.5 m. The 1.54-m pipes will be installed on an angle of approximately 12° to the seafloor using a Grundoram Taurus pneumatic hammer. The conductor barrel is supported by a goal post structure comprised of two 0.3-m steel pipes installed vertically into the seafloor and an I-beam welded horizontally between the two vertical piles. The goal post 0.3-m steel pipes will be installed via vibratory pile driving using an APE 200T hammer.

Two representative modeling locations were selected for modeling of the conductor barrel and goal post installation, one per state, to capture the range of water depths and habitats at the potential installation locations, with one model site selected per state. The Monmouth location was modeled as the representative New Jersey location and the Wolfe's Pond location was modeled at the representative New York location (the Lemon Creek landfall location is adjacent to Wolfe's Pond location).

#### <span id="page-22-0"></span>**1.2.5 Planned Construction Schedule**

ASOW is proposing two possible construction installation schedules for the wind turbine foundations, one schedule in which both monopiles and post- piled pin piles (for OSS jacket) are installed and a second schedule in which only pre- and post-piled pin piles are installed, both over a two-year construction installation period (Table 1). Regardless of the construction schedule selected, proposed pile driving construction activities are only being planned from May through December annually, although in Year 2, construction activities are planned to be completed by August. The same number of foundations (161 foundations) are proposed to be installed in either schedule (Table 1).

Under Schedule 1, in Year 1, ASOW estimates that a total of 107 (either 10-m and 15-m) monopiles and 48 (5-m) post-piled OSS jacket piles would be installed, for a total of 109 foundations; in Year 2, 51 monopiles and 24 post-piled OSS jacket piles would be installed with an associated total of 52 foundations installed (Table 1). The large OSSs may require up to 24 post-piled jacket piles per foundation, which is why the installation of 48 post-piles in Year 1 during June and August results in the installation of two foundations. In the Year 1 schedule, monopiles would be installed for the WTGs and Met Tower.

Year 1 of Schedule 2 includes the installation of 107 jacket foundations with 4 pre-piled 5-m pin piles per foundation and 48 5-m post-piled jacket piles, 24 per foundation, for a total of 109 foundations. In Year 2, 51 pre-piled jacket foundations and 24 post-piled piles would be installed for a total of 52 foundations (Table 1). The pre-piled piles would be the foundations for the WTGs and Met Tower while the post-piled piles would also be used for the OSS foundations.

Two potential installation schedules for cofferdams were also assessed. One schedule called for eight cofferdams to be installed at the New Jersey locations while the second schedule called for four cofferdams to be installed at the New Jersey locations and two to be installed at the New York locations. Two representative cofferdam modeling locations were used to represent a New York and a New Jersey location.

Cofferdam installation and extraction are conservatively expected to take two days per cofferdam, with approximately 55 sheet piles being installed per day at any of the locations. Up to six cofferdams will be installed and extracted, with up to four at a New Jersey nearshore location and two at a New York nearshore location. The installation of the cofferdams was modeled in the winter and extraction of the cofferdams was modeled in the spring, which resulted in 12 days of vibratory piling in both winter and spring. At the New Jersey cofferdam locations, each pile is estimated to take 119.1 seconds to install for a total of 109.2 minutes of installation per day. At the New York cofferdam locations, each pile is estimated to take 47.3 seconds to install for a total of 43.4 minutes of installation per day.

The installation schedule for the conductor barrel and goal posts called for eight conductor barrels/goal posts to be installed at the New Jersey locations and three conductor barrels/goal posts to be installed at the New York locations. Two representative modeling locations were used to represent a New York and a New Jersey location.

<span id="page-23-1"></span>



Conductor barrel installation and extraction were estimated to take one day per conductor barrel for a total of 10 hours per barrel. Goal post installation and extraction were estimated to take one day per goal post, with each goal post consisting of two 12-inch piles. Each pile would take 2 hours to install/extract, for a total of 4 hours per goal post. The installation of the conductor barrels and goal posts was modeled in the winter and extraction was modeled in the spring.

#### <span id="page-23-0"></span>**1.3 SECONDARY SOUND SOURCES DURING CONSTRUCTION**

In addition to impact and vibratory pile driving, other construction related noise-producing activities include vessel traffic or presence and HRG survey activities. Noise effects associated with HRG surveys are covered in Section 7.2 of the COP, so no assessment nor information on HRG surveys is included herein. A qualitative assessment of vessel noise has been included.

During a typical construction workday for the Project, support, transport, and supply vessels related to Project construction will be operating in and about the lease area. Vessels will travel to and from the Lease Area for bunkering and provisioning and may remain at construction sites within the lease area for days or weeks at a time. The actual number of vessels will depend on the Project components' final design and construction schedule as well as compliance with

The Jones Act (U.S. Public Law 66-261)<sup>1</sup>. Intra- and interstate vessel transportation is regulated by The Jones Act, a U.S. Federal law that regulates maritime commerce and requires that vessels transporting cargo must be American made and operated and manned by a majority crew of U.S. citizens. Compliance with this Act may affect Project logistics, including the number of vessels available to operate on the Project at a given time.

Marine species in the Project area are expected to be already habituated to the presence, movements, and noise associated with routine ship traffic in the Project area. Sound produced by Project vessels would be similar to that produced by existing and ongoing vessel noise. The vessels operating within the lease area are expected to be slow-moving or stationary vessels; stationary vessels may operate their engines to maintain their position as required by their purpose.

Most of the underwater sound generated by ships is low frequency (LF) (<1,000 Hertz [Hz]), with most ship noise resulting from propeller cavitation that dominates the <200 Hz frequency range (Ross, 1976). The noise that ships produce results not only from the type of engine and propeller systems used but also from the speeds at which the ships travel. Generally, larger (>100 m), faster moving vessels generate more intense LF underwater sound than smaller, slower moving vessels or boats (Frankel and Gabriele, 2017; Southall et al., 2018). During activities for which ships must remain stationary or move very slowly, thrusters are typically used for dynamic positioning (DP), usually for relatively short durations. The type of sound and associated levels resulting from DP are similar to those generated by transiting vessels.

#### <span id="page-24-0"></span>**2 ACOUSTIC AND ANIMAT MODELING AND ANALYSIS METHODS**

Both acoustic and animat modeling and analysis of the planned impact and vibratory pile driving sources were conducted for pile driving activities associated with the Project. This section describes the methodology, model inputs, model assumptions, and operational scenarios that were utilized for both types of modeling and associated analyses. Unless otherwise noted, pile driving operational information was supplied by Atlantic Shores.

#### <span id="page-24-1"></span>**2.1 MODELING AREA LOCATIONS**

Two representative model locations within the Lease Area were selected for the modeling of the Project's impact pile driving scenarios (Figure 1). Since the seafloor, substrate, and water column characteristics across the lease area are relatively consistent, lease area bathymetry was the basis for selecting representative model locations. The seafloor of the lease area is relatively flat and slopes seaward (east) over the Lease Area from 20.2 to 29.7 m in water depth. Water depths within the lease area boundary at a 3-arc-second resolution were extracted and plotted as a histogram that depicted the 5<sup>th</sup> and 95<sup>th</sup> percentile water depths. The 5<sup>th</sup> percentile water depth, or 20.7 m, and the 95<sup>th</sup> percentile water depth, or 27.5 m, were selected as the shallow- and deep-water depths of the model sites, respectively. Two

<sup>1</sup> The Jones Act is Section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act that provides for the promotion and maintenance of the U.S. merchant marine and specifically requires that goods transported by water between U.S. ports be carried in ships constructed in the U.S., fly the U.S. flag, are owned by U.S. citizens, and are crewed by U.S. citizens.

geographic points coinciding with these water depths in the northern and southern parts of the lease area were chosen (Table 2; Figure 1).

<b>Modeling Site</b>	<b>Water Depth (m)</b>	Latitude (°N)	Longitude $(^{\circ}W)$
1 (Shallow)	20.7	39.5742	74.0425
2 (Deep)	27.5	39.3558	73.9667

<span id="page-25-1"></span>**Table 2. Model Site Locations for Impact Pile Driving Within the Atlantic Shores Lease Area OCS-A-0549.**

Of Atlantic Shore's five possible cofferdam sites along the coasts of New Jersey and New York (Figure 2), one site in each state was selected for modeling of vibratory sheet pile installation of the cofferdams (Table 3). The Lemon Creek/ Wolfe's Pond location off southwestern Staten Island, NY was selected because it is representative of a shallow location, and the Monmouth, NJ site was selected because of its location in deeper water. The two model sites are thus representative of the possible range in water depths and coastal environmental conditions of Atlantic Shore's possible cofferdam locations in New York and New Jersey. These same modeling locations were used for the conductor barrel and goal post modeling.

#### <span id="page-25-2"></span>**Table 3. Landfall Model Site Locations of Cofferdams, Conductor Barrels, and Goal Posts for the Atlantic Shores North Project.**



## <span id="page-25-0"></span>**2.2 MODELING SCENARIOS**

Seven modeling and analysis scenarios (Table 4) were selected to represent the scope of the impact and vibratory pile driving operations for the Project, representing the planned installation of three types of structures: WTGs, OSSs, and the Met Tower at two model locations within the Lease Area. Modeling all four possible impact pile driving operational scenarios allows ASOW maximum operational flexibility. The cofferdam scenario assessed the installation and removal of cofferdams by vibratory pile driving at two model sites, one each located off the shoreline of New Jersey and New York (Table 3). The conductor barrel scenario assessed the installation and removal of conductor barrels by impact pile driving and the goal post scenario assessed the installation and removal of the goal posts by vibratory pile driving.

Two monopile diameters (10-m and 15-m) were modeled and both would be impact driven using the Menck 4400 hammer. For monopile Scenarios 1 and 2, only one monopile is planned to be driven per day. The monopiles would be installed for the WTG and Met Tower foundations.



#### <span id="page-26-0"></span>**Table 4. Impact and Vibratory Pile Driving Model Scenarios for the Atlantic Shores North Project.**

Two pin pile scenarios were modeled, one for 5-m pre-piled and one for 5-m post-piled jacket foundations (Table 2). The 5-m pre- or post-piled pin piles would be impact driven using the IHCS 2500 hammer. For either pin pile scenario, four piles would be driven per day. The postpiled Scenario 4 would be used to install the OSS foundation while the pre-piled Scenario 3 could be used to install the WTG or Met Tower foundations.

Cofferdams are planned to be installed via vibratory pile driving at multiple locations along the New Jersey and New York coastline (Figure 2). Two representative modeling locations were selected for modeling of cofferdam sheet pile installation to capture the range of water depths and habitats at the potential installation locations, with one model site selected each in nearshore New Jersey (NJ) and New York (NY) states. The ZZ46-700 sheet piles, which are 700 mm wide, and 24.2 m (NY sites) and 14.3 m (NJ sites) long will be driven to a penetration depth of 10 m by vibratory piling using an APE 200T hammer (Table 4).

The conductor barrel and goal posts will be installed as an alternative to the cofferdams, so the modeling locations were the same as those used for the cofferdams (Table 3). The conductor barrel will be installed via impact pile driving. The goal post, which will be installed via vibratory pile driving, is a support structure for the conductor barrel.

#### <span id="page-27-0"></span>**2.3 ACOUSTIC MODELING**

For acoustic propagation modeling, information related to the spectral characteristics of the acoustic sources and various environmental parameters are necessary. Where available, direct measurements were used in the modeling. When direct measurements were not available, proxies or databases were utilized to provide the best representative input into the modeling. The acoustic model inputs are described in this section, along with the modeling and analysis approach used for the ASOW North Project.

#### <span id="page-27-1"></span>**2.3.1 2.3.1 Impact Pile Driving Source Characteristics**

#### *2.3.1.1 Monopile and Pin Pile Spectra for Foundations*

Representative source spectra for use in the acoustic propagation modeling of the planned monopiles and pin piles for the Atlantic Shores North Project were based on spectra derived and modeled by JASCO Applied Sciences for the Atlantic Shores North Project (Weirathmueller et al., 2022). The JASCO modeled source spectra were the most comparable spectral inputs available for the Project and were generated by JASCO using a combination of the GRLWEAP 2010 wave equation model and their Pile Driving Source Model (Weirathmueller et al., 2022). The parameters used in JASCO's modeling were evaluated against the current planned Atlantic Shores North Project parameters to evaluate the use of the JASCO modeled spectra as a proxy for the Project's impact pile driving source spectra (Table 5).

The JASCO modeling effort used similar pile diameters and the same hammer makes and models at similar strike energies as the MAI modeling effort for the Project. JASCO modeled spectra at two modeling locations near the Project area with water depths of 19 m and 28.1 m. MAI's modeling was performed at different modeling sites to ensure the sites are within the lease area; however, the water depth differences between the MAI and JASCO modeling sites are considered negligible.

To derive representative spectra for the monopile and pin piles in the Project, MAI scaled the JASCO-generated model results using the relationships presented in von Pein et al. (2022). This method of scaling is a practical approach to estimate spectra of impact driven piles based on differences in strike energy, pile diameter, water depth, and hammer ram weight. The scaling

<span id="page-28-0"></span>



does not account for differences in sediment properties or hammer configurations apart from the ram weight. However, discrepancies due to these parameters can be minimized by scaling from spectra with similar soil parameters and hammer configurations. MAI chose to use JASCO's modeled spectra in the scaling due to the similarities with the Project in terms of sediment properties, water depths, pile diameters, hammer types, and proximity of the modeling locations.

#### ➢ **Monopile Spectra**

The 10-m and 15-m monopiles planned for installation during the Project will be impact driven using the Menck 4400 hammer. Although the maximum hammer energy of the Menck 4400 hammer is 4,400 kiloJoules (kJ), the pile installation is expected to be achieved using the lower energy levels of 1,291, 1,937, 2,581, and 3,066 kJ for the 10-m monopile, and 1,260, 1,897, 2,536, and 3,015 kJ for the 15-m monopile. Thus, these are the hammer energy levels used in acoustic modeling.

Modeled spectra for the 12- and 15-m monopiles at a maximum strike energy of 4,400 kJ using the same Menck 4400 hammer were extracted from JASCO's modeling report for Atlantic Shores North (Weirathmueller et al., 2022) (Table 5). To represent the 15-m diameter monopile for the Project, the JASCO modeled spectrum of the 15-m monopile was scaled down using the energy scaling presented in von Pein et al. (2022) to represent the strike energies of 1,260, 1,897, 2,536, and 3,015 kJ being used in the Project. To represent the 10-m diameter monopile at 1,291, 1,937, 2,581, and 3,066 kJ planned for use on the Project, the JASCO modeled spectrum of the 12-m monopile was scaled down to represent the smaller diameter monopile to be used in the Project and the lower hammer energy levels (von Pein et al., 2022). The resulting spectra used in this modeling effort are shown in Figure 3.



**Figure 3. Decidecade band Sound Energy Level (SEL) Source Levels for 10-m (blue) and 15-m (Red) Diameter Monopiles at a Strike Energies of 3,066 and 3,015 kJ, respectively, at the modeling locations for the Atlantic Shores North Project.**

#### ➢ **Pin Pile Spectra**

The 5-m pre- and post-piled pin piles planned for the Project will be impact driven at a maximum strike energy of 1,904 kJ using the IHC S2500 hammer. The modeled spectra for the 5-m pre-piled pin piles at a maximum strike energy of 2,500 kJ using the same IHC S2500 hammer were extracted from JASCO's modeling report (Weirathmueller et al., 2022).

To represent the 5-m diameter pre-piled pin pile at 1,904 kJ for the Project (Figure 4), the JASCO modeled spectrum of the 5-m pin pile was scaled down to represent the lower strike energy using the von Pein et al. (2022) scaling for hammer energy. For the spectrum of the post-piled 5-m piles, the received levels will be increased by 2 dB from JASCO's pre-piled pin pile spectrum (Bellmann et al., 2020).

#### **2.3.1.1 2.3.1.2 Conductor Barrel Spectrum**

Four measured spectra from CalTrans (2020) were considered as proxies for modeling of the impact pile driving installation of conductor barrels at the Wolfe's Pond and Monmouth locations. These measurements were chosen as proxies due to similarities between the pile sizes and water depths between the measurements and the conductor barrel planned for the ASOW project. One of the measured spectra was for impact-driven installation of a 1.01 m diameter steel pipe in 13 m water depth with a Delmag D80 hammer. The other three measured spectra were from three 2.4 m (inner) diameter piles in 10 m water depth using a Menck MHU1700T impact hammer. The four spectra included frequencies up to ~5 kiloHertz (kHz) and were averaged to create a single proxy spectrum in decidecade bands. For frequencies greater than those available in the measurements described here, a 6 dB/octave falloff was assumed (ITAP (2020)). The average spectrum described above was scaled to a broadband source level of SEL SL 209 dB re 1  $\mu$ Pa<sup>2</sup> m<sup>2</sup> s, which was determined via the relationship with diameter from ITAP (2020), after scaling the relationship from a range of 750



**Figure 4. Decidecade Band Sound Energy Level (SEL) Source Levels for the 5-m Diameter Pre-Piled Pin Pile at a Hammer Strike Energy of 1,904 kJ for the Atlantic Shores North Project at the two modeling locations.**

m to a range of 1 m with a 15 x  $log_{10}$  (range) assumption. This scaled spectrum was used as a representative spectrum for the modeling of the conductor barrel for the Atlantic Shores North Project (Figure 5).



**Figure 5. Decidecade Band Sound Energy Level (SEL) Source Levels for the 1.5-m Diameter Pile as Part of the Conductor Barrel for the Atlantic Shores North Project.**

### <span id="page-31-0"></span>**2.3.2 2.3.2 Vibratory Pile Driving Source Characteristics**

2.3.2.1 Cofferdam SpectrumA representative spectrum was derived for use in the acoustic modeling of sheet piles installed via vibratory pile driving as part of cofferdam installation based on measurements presented in Illingworth and Rodkin (2017). The sheet piles proposed for the Project are ZZ46-700 piles with an expected width of 700 mm, which will be driven to a final penetration depth of 10 m using an APE 200T hammer.

Illingworth and Rodkin (2017) presented underwater acoustic measurements of 1.22 m sheet piles (comprised of four individual 30.5-centimeter pieces) installed via vibratory pile driving using an APE 300 hammer with an eccentric moment of 66.25 kilogram meter (kg-m) near Naval Station Mayport in Jacksonville, FL. One-second broadband RMS SPL sound levels were averaged at distances varying between 8 to 12 m, with an overall average RMS SPL level of 153  $dB$  re 1 µPa for 1-second normalized to a range of 10 m based on average attenuation rates. Given the 10-m normalization, Illingworth and Rodkin (2017) concluded that the average transmission loss (TL) could be described by the relationship  $13* log_{10}(r2/r1)$ , which was used to scale the spectrum to 1 m. This scaling resulted in the broadband level of 170 dB re 1  $\mu$ Pa m.

A representative spectrum for the Atlantic Shores vibratory pile driving of the cofferdams was derived using the Illingworth and Rodkin (2017) measured spectrum and transmission loss relationship. The measured spectrum at a 10 m range was corrected to a range of 1 m using the estimated transmission loss  $(13<sup>*</sup> \log_{10}(range))$  to determine a representative source spectrum to use for the Project (Figure 6). The resulting broadband source level ( $L_{p,rms}$ ) is 170 dB re 1  $\mu$ Pa m.

## **2.3.2.1 2.3.2.2 Goal Post Spectrum**

A representative spectrum was derived for use in the acoustic modeling of 12-inch piles installed via vibratory pile driving as part of goal post installation based on measurements presented in Illingworth & Rodkin, Inc (2020). Measurements that were made during vibratory installation of two 20-inch diameter steel piles were presented in Illingworth & Rodkin, Inc. (2020). The approximate water depth for the installation location for the 20-inch piles was 6 m, which is similar to the water depths at the modeled locations of Wolfe's Pond and Monmouth. The hammer make and model were not provided in the Illingworth and Rodkin (2020) report. Median third-octave band spectral levels for each of the two pile installations (Figures B-2 and B-3 of Illingworth and Rodkin [2020]) were scaled to a matching broadband level and then averaged to create a proxy source spectrum for vibratory installation of the goal posts.

The broadband source level was determined by using the proxy spectrum and scaling it by the relationship between diameter and broadband level from Remmers andBellmann (2021), after scaling the relationship from a range of 750 m to a range of 1 m with a 15 x  $log_{10}$  (range) assumption. The average spectrum for the 20-inch piles was scaled to a broadband level of SPL

SL 184 dB re 1  $\mu$ Pa m. This scaled spectrum was used as a representative spectrum for the modeling of the goal posts barrel for the Atlantic Shores North Project (Figure 7).



**Figure 6. Decidecade Band Sound Pressure Level (SPL) Source Levels for the Cofferdam Sheet Piles Being Installed/Removed by Vibratory Pile Driving on the Atlantic Shores North Project.**

#### <span id="page-32-0"></span>**2.3.3 Acoustic Propagation Modeling Inputs**

Environmental parameters relevant to the model sites and lease area are a necessary input for the modeling of the acoustic source propagation. Described in this section are the environmental parameter inputs for the acoustic modeling of the impact pile driving sources.

#### **2.3.3.1 Bathymetry**

Bathymetric data for the Project area were obtained from the Coastal Relief Model (NOAA-NGDC, 1999) at a spatial resolution of 3 arc-seconds (approximately 90 m). The bathymetry data were extracted along radials in 10° increments emanating from each model location to the maximum modeled range, which for the Atlantic Shores Project is 150 km; the maximum modeled range can vary with season (month) and geographic location. The bathymetric data were extracted in range intervals of 25 m.

#### **2.3.3.2 Sediment Characteristics and Geoacoustic Model**

The geoacoustic parameters used in the acoustic modeling of the impact pile driving sources were derived from the geotechnical parameters of boring logs from within the Project lease area (Fugro USA Marine, 2022). Seafloor sediments of the Project lease area are characterized by alternating layers of sand and clay, with sand on the top of the seabed. The measured bulk



**Figure 7. Decidecade Band Sound Pressure Level (SPL) Source Levels for the 0.3 m Diameter Piles Being Installed by Vibratory Pile Driving as Part of the Goal Post Installation/Removal on the Atlantic Shores North Project.**

density and grain sizes at varying depths were extracted from Fugro USA Marine (2022) and a regression line was fit to these data.

The regression lines for grain size and density were used as inputs to the Buckingham (2005) geoacoustic model that was used to estimate the compressional wave velocity, attenuation, and the shear wave attenuation (Table 6) for the Project area. The shear wave velocity was calculated using the power law formula from Jensen et al. (2011) (Table 6).

The geoacoustic parameters used in the acoustic modeling of the cofferdams were representative of a sandy bottom. The sediment information was provided to MAI by Atlantic Shores, and MAI used the values and power law formula from Jensen et al. (2011) for sand to derive the geoacoustic model.

#### **2.3.3.3 Sound Velocity Profile**

For the impact pile driving modeling, sound velocity profiles (SVPs) for each month from May to December for each of the shallow and deep modeling sites were extracted from the GDEM-V 3.0 database (Carnes, 2009) (Figure 8). Based on a sensitivity study of the SVPs, three representative months were selected for modeling of the two model sites. The SVPs were grouped to roughly approximate seasons (summer: May to August; fall: September to November; and winter: December) according to similarity in the propagation loss versus range and water depth. For each of the approximate season groups, the most conservative month (i.e., the month in which the propagation loss increased most slowly in range) was selected. The



#### <span id="page-34-1"></span>**Table 6. Geoacoustic Model Output Used in the Acoustic Modeling for the Atlantic Shores North Project.**

SVPs of these most conservative and representative months of May, October, and December were used in the acoustic propagation modeling for both the shallow and deep model sites.

For the cofferdam modeling, SVPs were extracted from the GDEM-V 3.0 database (Carnes, 2009) and representative months of April, July, October, and December were used in the acoustic propagation modeling for both the NJ and NY model sites. Modeling for the cofferdams encompassed all seasons.

#### <span id="page-34-0"></span>**2.4 ACOUSTIC PROPAGATION MODELING APPROACH FOR IMPACT PILE DRIVING**

The primary source of underwater sound due to impact pile driving is a result of the compression of the pile during each hammer strike. The hammer strike produces an elastic wave in the pile that deforms the pile wall. The pile is compressed in the vertical (axial) dimension and expands in the horizontal (radial) dimension. This deformation or "bulge" travels down the pile at a speed close to the compressional wave speed in steel--which is faster than the speed of sound in seawater—resulting in a radiated acoustic Mach wave. The angle of the initial Mach cone relative to the pile axis (Equation 1) is dependent on the ratio of the sound speed in water  $(c_w)$  to the propagation speed of the radial deformation down the pile, which is approximated by the compressional wave speed in steel  $(c_p)$  (Reinhall and Dahl, 2011):

$$
\theta = \sin^{-1}(c_w/c_p) \tag{1}
$$



**Figure 8. Sound Velocity Profiles for each Month of the May to December Pile Driving Construction Period at the Shallow Model Site in the OCS-A-0549 Lease Area for the Atlantic Shores North Project.**

As the deformation travels down the pile, the resultant Mach wave propagates away at a downward angle; after reflection from the pile toe, the deformation travels back up the pile, producing an upward-going Mach wave. The amplitude of the deformation (and radiated acoustic wave in the water) is reduced with each successive reflection from the ends of the pile.

The sound pressure level associated with an up-going Mach wave is approximately 7 dB lower than that of the first down-going Mach wave. The second down-going Mach wave is further reduced, to a level 9 dB lower than the first (Dahl and Reinhall, 2013; Reinhall and Dahl, 2011).

MAI's acoustic modeling procedure accounts for the first down- and up-going Mach waves and neglects waves due to further reflections from the pile ends; elastic waves that are produced in the sediment by the deformation traveling along the pile are also neglected but the propagation of the water-borne acoustic waves in the sediment are included in the modeling, with modeling of shear attenuation as an effective additional compressional attenuation. The level of the up-going Mach wave is reduced by 7 dB in the modeling, further described below.

In the acoustic modeling of the impact pile driving sources for the Project, the pile is represented as a vertical line array. Vertical directionality of the propagating Mach wave is
## *Underwater Acoustic Assessment of Noise-Producing Construction Activities at the Atlantic Shores Offshore Wind North*

included in the model by specifying a beam-pattern from which the starting field for the parabolic equation is calculated; this starting field consists of a summation over the product of modes that solves an associated homogeneous waveguide problem (i.e., sine functions) and amplitudes given by the angular dependence of the beam-pattern. The pile beam-pattern was calculated for a vertical line array of elements with 1-m spacing from the sea surface to the seafloor. This representative array was used to compute a frequency-specific beam-pattern, steered at an angle equal to the Mach cone angle, which was then input into the Navy Standard Parabolic Equation (NSPE). The NSPE is an implementation of the RAM PE model (Collins, 1993), and includes the option to compute a starting field from an input beam-pattern, as described above.

The Mach cone angle has been measured at 17° (Reinhall and Dahl, 2011). However, the angle can vary between approximately 15 $^{\circ}$  and 19 $^{\circ}$  depending on the precise values of  $c_w$  and  $c_p$ (Equation 1) (Dahl et al., 2015). With the Mach angle being dependent on the material properties of the pile and the sound speed in water, MAI approximated an angle of 16° for use in the acoustic modeling of the impact pile driving scenarios. This 16° angle was applied to steer the beam pattern relative to the pile axis.

This process was followed for each third-octave center frequency in the bands from 10 Hz to 25 kHz. Radials were run at 10° bearing intervals to a maximum range of 150 km. The third-octave band source levels were added to each transmission loss (TL) value to produce a received level value at each range, depth, and bearing point. TL values were computed similarly for the upward going Mach wave, with the beam-pattern steered upward at an angle equal to the Mach cone angle. The third-octave band source levels were reduced by 7 dB, then added to the TL values to again produce a received level value at each range, depth, and bearing point.

Finally, the combined up- and down-going sound fields for each frequency were summed as intensities to generate a representative broadband sound field. This process was followed for each radial around the pile driving source to produce an N x two-dimensional grid of received sound levels in range, depth, and bearing. The resulting predicted acoustic sound exposure level (SEL) field was weighted using the low frequency (LF), mid-frequency (MF), high frequency (HF), pinnipeds in water (PW), and sea turtle (TU) weighting functions (NMFS, 2018). The peak level is derived using the relationship from Lippert et al. (2015). The sound pressure level (root mean square (SPL<sub>rms</sub>) sound fields were derived using the relationship:

$$
SEL = SPI_{rms} + 10 \times log_{10}(T)
$$
, where T = 0.1 s. (2)

## **2.4.1 Acoustic Propagation Modeling Assumptions**

The following assumptions were made for the acoustic modeling of the impact modeling scenarios:

• Two representative modeling locations were used in the acoustic modeling within the lease area as well as the landfall locations. The shallow and deep lease area model sites were representative of conditions throughout the wind energy area (WEA), while the Monmouth, NJ and Wolfe's Pond, NY landfall sites are representative of the nearshore conditions;

- Sound velocity profiles from May, October, and December were used in the acoustic modeling;
- Monthly mean sound velocity profiles were used to represent average conditions. On any given day, the SVP may differ from the modeled SVP, altering the acoustic propagation;
- The monopile diameters of 10-m and 15-m were modeled with a maximum strike energy of 3,066 and 3,015 kJ, respectively. Installation of only one monopile per day of any diameter was used in the modeling;
- The 5-m pre- and -post-piled skirt piles were modeled with a maximum strike energy of 1,904 kJ. Installation of four pin piles per day was considered;
- a. Impact driven piles were modeled as a vertical line array; and
- b. Source characteristics for the monopile and pin pile hammer sources were based on source spectra derived by JASCO (Weirathmueller et al., 2022) for the Project area. The actual source spectra produced during installation by impact pile driving may differ from the modeled source spectrum herein.
- c. Conductor barrels:
	- a. 1 day of installation/extraction per barrel;
	- b. Each barrel will require 10 hours to install/extract;
	- c. The installation was modeled in winter and extraction modeled in spring; and
	- d. Source characteristics were based on four measured spectrum from CalTrans (2020) and then scaled for the 1.5-m diameter pile as part of the conductor barrel. The actual source spectra produced during installation by vibratory pile driving may differ from the modeled source spectrum herein.

# **2.5 ACOUSTIC PROPAGATION MODELING APPROACH FOR VIBRATORY PILE DRIVING**

The NSPE was used for the acoustic propagation modeling. The sheet pile was represented as an omnidirectional point source located at the mid water column depth. The model was run for each third-octave center frequency in the bands from 10 Hz to 25 kHz. Radials were run at 10° bearing intervals to a maximum range of 100 km. The third-octave band source levels were added to each TL value to produce a received level value at each range, depth, and bearing point.

The received level fields for each frequency were summed as intensities to generate a representative broadband sound field. This process was followed for each of N radials around the source location to produce an N x two-dimensional grid of received sound levels in range, depth, and bearing. The SEL field was derived using the relationship:

$$
SPL_{rms} = SEL - 10 \times log_{10}(T), where T = 1 s
$$
 (3)

In this case, the SEL = SPL<sub>rms</sub>. The resulting predicted acoustic SEL field was weighted using the LF, MF, HF, PW, and TU weighting functions (NMFS, 2018).

## **2.5.1 Acoustic Propagation Modeling Assumptions for Vibratory Pile Driving**

The following assumptions were made for the acoustic modeling of the vibratory modeling scenarios:

- Two representative modeling landfall locations were used in the acoustic modeling. These model sites were representative of the range of conditions at the potential landfall installation locations;
- Sound velocity profiles from April, July, October, and December were used in the acoustic modeling;
- Monthly mean sound velocity profiles were used to represent average conditions. On any given day, the SVP may differ from the modeled SVP, altering the acoustic propagation;
- Cofferdams
	- a. Conservative estimate assumed 2 days of installation/extraction per cofferdam;
	- b. Assumed 43.4 minutes of daily hammer time at the NY modeling site (Wolfe's Pond) and 109.2 minutes of daily hammer time at the NJ modeling site (Monmouth);
	- c. Sheet piles were modeled as an omnidirectional point source located at mid water column depth; and
	- d. Source characteristics for the sheet pile source were based on measurements from Illingworth and Rodkin (2017). The actual source spectra produced during installation by vibratory pile driving may differ from the modeled source spectrum herein.
- Goal Posts
	- a. Assumed 1 day of installation/extraction per goal post;
	- b. Each goal post consisted of two 0.3 m piles;
	- c. Each pile required 2 hours to install/extract for a total of 4 hours per goal post; and
	- d. Source characteristics for the source were based on measurements from Illingworth and Rodkin (2020). The actual source spectra produced during installation by vibratory pile driving may differ from the modeled source spectrum herein.

# **2.6 SOUND LEVEL REDUCTION DUE TO MITIGATION**

Various sound reduction levels were assessed to determine the potential effects of sound attenuation methods as a means of mitigation. Broadband sound reduction levels of 6, 10, and 15 dB were modeled to determine the effects on ranges to regulatory thresholds of marine mammals, sea turtles, and fish and acoustic exposures of marine mammals and sea turtles. No mitigation was modeled for the cofferdam installation.

# **2.7 IMPLEMENTATION OF PILE INSTALLATION SCHEDULE**

The pile progression schedule (Table 7) was accounted for when calculating the acoustic ranges to the regulatory thresholds for marine mammals, sea turtles, and fishes. For the 10-m and 15 m monopile scenarios (Table 2), one monopile (of either diameter) per day will be installed with a total of 5,448 and 10,110 hammer blows per day, respectively. For both the 5-m pre- and

**Table 7. The Planned Hammer Strike Energy Progression and Installation Duration Used in the Modeling of Impact and Vibratory Pile Driving for the Atlantic Shores North Project. Values for Blows per Minute are Rounded to the Nearest Integer.**



**Table 7. The Planned Hammer Strike Energy Progression and Installation Duration Used in the Modeling of Impact and Vibratory Pile Driving for the Atlantic Shores North Project. Values for Blows per Minute are Rounded to the Nearest Integer.**



post-piled skirt pile scenarios, four pin piles will be installed each day with a total of 6,195 hammer blows per pile and 24,780 hammer blows per day, respectively. Note that the number of blows per minute are rounded to the nearest integer as a fractional blow is not physically possible.

At the landfall site, conductor barrel installation and removal, one conductor barrel per day will be installed with a total of 108,000 blows per day. For cofferdam and goal post installation and removal, hammer energy will be 2.13 kN and 55 sheets per day will be installed via vibratory pile driving for cofferdams and a single goal post comprised of 2 piles will be installed daily via vibratory pile driving.

## **2.8 ANIMAT MODELING APPROACH**

Animat modeling was conducted to determine acoustic exposures of marine mammals and sea turtles from impact pile driving. The potential acoustic exposures of protected marine mammals and sea turtles were estimated using the Acoustic Integration Model© (AIM). AIM is a Monte Carlo‐based statistical model (Frankel et al., 2002) in which many repeated simulations provide the probability of an outcome. AIM simulations create realistic animal movement tracks that, collectively, provide a reasonable representation of the movements of the animals in a population. Animats, or simulated animals, are programmed with a range of movement parameters, such as minimum and maximum swim speeds or dive depths (Table B-1; Appendix B). The underlying statistical distribution for these parameters is uniform, except for speed. Speed can be specified with a truncated normal (eight standard deviations between the minimum and maximum speed) or a gamma distribution as best fits the data for that animat. Multiple behavioral states can be included for each species or species group to best represent real animal movement.

The AIM model simulated the four‐dimensional (range, depth, bearing, and time) movements of marine mammals and sea turtles during impact and vibratory pile driving. Animats were randomly distributed in a model box. Animats were further limited within this modeling box by the coastline and the minimum water depth at which each species is known to occur based on the available scientific literature (Appendix B, Table B-1). The simulated animat movements were integrated with the acoustic propagation modeling outputs of the sound fields for the Project's planned impact and vibratory pile driving to predict exposure histories for each simulated animal over a 24‐hour period.

The modeled marine mammal and sea turtle animats were set to populate the simulation area with representative, nominal densities (e.g., 0.25 animats/km<sup>2</sup>) that are typically higher than those estimated for the species in the real-world marine environment from the Marine Geospatial Ecology Laboratory (MGEL) (2022) database and DiMatteo et al. (2023) for marine mammal and sea turtle densities, respectively. This "over population" of the modeling environment increases the sample size and ensures that the result of the animat model simulation is not unduly influenced by the chance placement of a small number of simulated marine mammals. To obtain final exposure estimates, the modeled results are normalized by the ratio of the modeled animat density to the real-world marine mammal or sea turtle density estimates, allowing for greater statistical power without overestimating exposures.

## *Underwater Acoustic Assessment of Noise-Producing Construction Activities at the Atlantic Shores Offshore Wind North*

An AIM simulation consists of a user-specified number of steps forward in time at which the received sound level and three-dimensional position of the animat were recorded to calculate acoustic exposure estimates. The predicted sound received level is sampled by AIM every 30 seconds. Animats sample the entire water column, even in shallow waters, when a 30-second timestep is used in the AIM simulations. Histogram counts of animat depth in 1-m depth bins illustrate that an example harbor porpoise during a 24-hr simulation using a 30-second time step appropriately sample all depths (Figure 9). For an AIM time step, an animat is moved according to the rules describing its behavior. At the end of each time step, each animat "evaluates" its environment, potentially including its three-dimensional location and water depth.





To maximize sample size, AIM simulations are run with the source operating continuously for the entire modeling period. These results are then sampled to reflect the actual operating characteristics of the source. For example, to predict the exposures created by driving a monopile (nominally 2 hours), a 24-hour exposure history would be produced. Then multiple 2 hour time periods would be sequentially extracted from that simulation output (e.g., 0 to 2 hours, 2 to 4 hours). Thus, multiple sequential estimates were produced for each model scenario, and the mean value of exposure levels were reported.

AIM simulations were run for each marine mammal or sea turtle species or group for each impact or vibratory piling source scenario at all model site locations and months. Histories of each species/group's acoustic exposure for each of the acoustic sources are the result when all AIM simulations are completed.

## **2.8.1 Animal Aversion**

In animat modeling, the simulated animals respond to the user specified boundaries set for various environmental parameters. If an environmental variable has exceeded the userspecified boundary value (e.g., water too shallow), then the animat will alter its course to react to the environment. These animat responses to the environmental limits are entitled "aversions." Several potential aversion variables that can be used to build an animats' behavioral pattern. The aversions programmed for the Project's AIM modeling was for water depth, which was based on available scientific literature for each species (Table B-1, Appendix B).

# **2.8.2 Animat Modeling Assumptions**

Modeling with AIM for the Project was based on a number of conservative assumptions:

- Depth limitations (aversions) were set for each simulated species based on the movement parameters available in scientific literature (Table B-1, Appendix B); no other aversions were applied;
- Although the migratory state of species is considered in terms of their potentially differing swim or dive parameters during migration, the animats for migrating species are not programmed differently since the duration of the model event is 24 hours and the duration of any single exposure estimate is no longer than 7.5 hours; and
- Marine mammal densities were extracted from MGEL (2022) while sea turtle densities were extracted from DiMatteo et al. (2023) for the Project area.

# **3 CALCULATION OF ACOUSTIC EXPOSURE AND RANGE TO REGULATORY THRESHOLDS**

# **3.1 ACOUSTIC AND EXPOSURE RANGE TO REGULATORY THRESHOLD ESTIMATES**

# **3.1.1 Estimation of Acoustic Ranges to Regulatory Thresholds**

To compute the ranges to regulatory thresholds, the modeled SEL sound fields were converted to cumulative 24-hour (hr) SEL sound fields. For the impact pile driving scenarios, the different strike energy levels and the number of expected hammer blows at each energy (Table 7) were used to convert between the single strike SEL (SEL<sub>ss</sub>) and the cumulative SEL (SEL<sub>cum</sub>) using the following, where N is the number of pile strikes at each strike energy level:

$$
SEL_{cum} = SEL_{ss} + 10\log_{10} N\tag{4}
$$

For the vibratory pile driving scenarios, the 1 sec SEL (SEL<sub>1s</sub>) was converted to the SEL<sub>cum</sub> using the following, where  $T_{event}$  is the duration of the event in seconds.

$$
SEL_{cum} = SEL_{1s} + 10 \log_{10} T_{event} \tag{5}
$$

## *Underwater Acoustic Assessment of Noise-Producing Construction Activities at the Atlantic Shores Offshore Wind North*

The maximum received level-over-depth at each range step and along each radial was taken and the maximum range to each acoustic threshold was determined along each radial. The 95<sup>th</sup> percentile of these ranges was calculated and is the acoustic range reported for the Project. The 95<sup>th</sup> percentile range is a representation of the range to each threshold that eliminates major outliers and better represents all the modeled radials. All acoustic ranges presented to regulatory threshold are the 95<sup>th</sup> percentile range. Since these values are taken from static sound fields, the SEL ranges reflect the acoustic ranges to stationary virtual receivers.

## **3.1.2 Estimation of Exposure Ranges to Regulatory Thresholds**

An alternative method for estimating the range to regulatory threshold is based on the results of animat movement modeling rather than acoustic propagation modeling. The basic approach of the exposure range method includes convolving the four-dimensional representation of animal movements (space and time) with the appropriate frequency-weighted sound field predicted for the pile type and model location(s). As each animat moves through the sound field, the predicted received sound level is recorded, along with the distance of the animat from the sound source.

The SEL<sub>cum</sub> and maximum SPL<sub>rms</sub> for each animat is calculated over a day (24 hours). The modeled animats that have a predicted SEL<sub>cum</sub> or SPL<sub>rms</sub> that exceeds the regulatory thresholds for the modeled taxa are identified, and the range to the closest point of approach (CPA) (i.e., minimum distance between each animat and the acoustic pile driving source) that exceeds an acoustic threshold is determined, producing a distribution of ranges. The 95<sup>th</sup> percentile of these distances is defined as the animat-based exposure range. These ranges to thresholds supplement the purely acoustically derived range to thresholds, which are based upon the assumption that the animals (receivers) are stationary for the duration of the simulation.

# **3.2 ACOUSTIC EXPOSURE ESTIMATION**

## **3.2.1 Impact Pile Driving Scenarios**

The acoustic exposure history for each animat modeled for impact pile driving of the monopiles and pin piles was analyzed to produce the metrics of maximum root- mean square sound pressure level, cumulative sound exposure level, and peak sound pressure level. These modeled acoustic exposure estimates were then scaled by the ratio of real-world density estimates to the modeled animat density. The regional real-world marine mammal densities were the average monthly (or annual in some cases) densities (MGEL, 2022) while the regional sea turtle densities were seasonal estimates (DiMatteo et al., 2023).

The application of the real-world density and density scaling results in the predicted number of acoustic exposures for each species or species group for each pile driven. Summing the number of exposures above the relevant threshold provides an estimate of the number of regulatory exposures. The density-scaled acoustic exposures provided the per-foundation daily exposure estimates and were determined by month using the corresponding monthly animal density. The daily exposures were multiplied by the planned number of piles to be driven each month to determine the total number of acoustic exposures per month of the entire construction period. The monthly takes for each foundation type were combined to derive monthly acoustic exposures, which were then combined for annual acoustic exposures based on the annual

installation schedules. The annual takes were then combined for an overall acoustic exposure per species.

## **3.2.2 Vibratory Pile Driving Scenarios**

Acoustic exposures due to the vibratory pile driving for cofferdam and goal post installation were estimated using the zone of influence (ZOI). The ZOI is the ensonified area around a sound source, which was determined through acoustic propagation modeling. The ZOI was calculated according to the following, where r is the largest 95<sup>th</sup> percentile range to the acoustic threshold at each model site:

$$
ZOI = \pi r^2 \tag{6}
$$

With these modeling locations being close to shore, the ZOI extends over land. The area over land was excluded from the exposure calculation.

The ZOI was incorporated with the marine animal densities ( $\rho_{animal}$ ) to estimate the number of potential acoustic exposures for each species at each model site according to the following, where the # days is the number of expected days of vibratory pile driving:

$$
A\text{coustic Exposures} = ZOI * \rho_{animal} * # \text{ days} \tag{7}
$$

Per season, per cofferdam and goal post as well as overall acoustic exposures (PTS and behavioral) were calculated.

# **4 REGULATORY CRITERIA AND GUIDANCE: ACOUSTIC THRESHOLDS USED TO EVALUATE POTENTIAL IMPACTS TO MARINE MAMMALS, SEA TURTLES, AND FISH**

## **4.1 MARINE MAMMALS**

Under the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA), the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) is allowed, upon request, to authorize the incidental, but not intentional, "taking" of small numbers of marine mammals by U.S. citizens or agencies who engage in a specified activity (other than commercial fishing) within a specified geographical region. The term "take," as defined in Section 3 (16 U.S. Code [U.S.C.] section 1362 (13)) of the MMPA, means "to harass, hunt, capture, or kill, or attempt to harass, hunt, capture, or kill any marine mammal." "Harassment" was further defined in the 1994 amendments to the MMPA, with two levels of harassment: Level A and Level B. By definition, Level A harassment is any act of pursuit, torment, or annoyance that has the potential to injure a marine mammal or marine mammal stock, while Level B harassment is any act of pursuit, torment, or annoyance that has the potential to disturb a marine mammal or marine mammal stock in the wild by causing disruption of behavioral patterns, including, but not limited to, migration, breathing, nursing, breeding, feeding, or sheltering.

NMFS has provided guidance for assessing the physiological impacts (Level A) of anthropogenic sound on marine mammals under their regulatory jurisdiction, which includes whales, dolphins, seals, and sea lions (NMFS, 2018). The guidance specifically defines hearing groups, develops auditory weighting functions, and identifies the received levels or acoustic threshold levels, above which individual marine mammals are predicted to experience changes in their hearing

sensitivity (permanent threshold shift [PTS] or temporary threshold shift [TTS]) for acute, incidental exposure to underwater sound. Southall et al. (2019) published consistent weighting functions and threshold levels for marine mammal species included in the NMFS (2018) guidance but included all marine mammal species (not just those under NMFS jurisdiction) for all noise exposures (both under water and in air), as well as updating the hearing groups. Unless otherwise noted, the following information on marine mammal hearing groups follows the NMFS (2018) definitions and nomenclature.

# **4.1.1 Marine Mammal Hearing Groups**

Marine mammal hearing groups are defined as (NMFS, 2018; Southall et al., 2019):

- Low-frequency (LF) Cetaceans—this group consists of the mysticetes (baleen whales) with a collective generalized hearing range of 7 Hz to 35 kilohertz (kHz);
- Mid-frequency (MF) Cetaceans—includes most of the dolphins, all toothed whales except for *Kogia* spp., and all the beaked and bottlenose whales with a generalized hearing range of approximately 150 Hz to 160 kHz (renamed high-frequency cetaceans by Southall et al. (2019) because their best hearing sensitivity occurs at frequencies of several tens of kHz or higher);
- High-frequency (HF) Cetaceans—incorporates all the true porpoises, the river dolphins, plus *Kogia* spp., *Cephalorhynchus* spp. (genus in the dolphin family Delphinidae), and two species of *Lagenorhynchus* (Peale's and hourglass dolphins) with a generalized hearing range estimated from 275 Hz to 160 kHz (renamed very high-frequency cetaceans by Southall et al. (2019) since some of these species have best hearing sensitivity at frequencies exceeding 100 kHz);
- Phocids Underwater (PW)—consists of true seals with a generalized underwater hearing range from 50 Hz to 86 kHz (renamed phocid carnivores in water by Southall et al. 2019); and
- Otariids Underwater (OW)—includes sea lions and fur seals with a generalized underwater hearing range from 60 Hz to 39 kHz (termed other marine carnivores in water by Southall et al. (2019) and includes otariids, as well as walrus [Family Odobenidae], polar bear, and sea and marine otters [Family Mustelidae]). No otariid pinnipeds occur in the waters of the Atlantic Shores North Project, therefore this suite of species was not included within the analysis.

Within their generalized hearing ranges, the ability to hear sounds varies with frequency, as demonstrated by examining audiograms of hearing sensitivity (NMFS, 2018; Southall et al., 2019).

# **4.1.2 Auditory Weighting Functions**

To reflect higher noise sensitivities at specific sound frequencies, auditory weighting functions were developed for each functional hearing group that reflected the best available data on hearing ability (composite audiograms), susceptibility to noise-induced hearing loss, impacts of noise on hearing, and data on equal latency (Figure 10) (DoN, 2017). These weighting functions are applied to individual sound received levels to reflect the susceptibility of each hearing group to noise-induced threshold shifts, which is not the same as the range of best hearing.



#### **4.1.3 Auditory Injury Exposure Criteria**



Although NMFS (2018) defined acoustic threshold levels at which PTS and TTS are predicted to occur for each marine mammal hearing group for impulsive and continuous signals, only information about the PTS injury exposure criteria for marine mammals are presented herein. Continuous sound signals do not have the high peak pressure with rapid rise time and decay characteristic of impulsive sounds; instead, the pressure (i.e., intensity) of continuous signals is more consistent throughout the signal. The PTS acoustic threshold levels are defined using metrics of the cumulative sound exposure level (SEL) over a 24-hr period and the peak sound pressure level. For the cumulative SEL, the appropriate frequency weighting for each hearing group is applied, which is reflected in the subscript of each threshold (e.g., the LF cetacean threshold is identified as  $L_{E,LC}$ ). The cumulative SEL metric considers both received level and duration of exposure over the duration of the activity within a 24-hr period. Impulsive sounds are assessed against the SEL and peak thresholds, whereas non-impulsive sounds are assessed only against an SEL threshold (Table 8).

## **Table 8. Acoustic Threshold Levels for Marine Mammal Injurious (PTS Onset) Harassment (MMPA Level A; NMFS, 2018) and Behavioral Harassment (NOAA, 2005) Associated with Impulsive and Non-Impulsive (Continuous) Sound.**



\*Dual metric thresholds for impulsive sounds: The metric to be used is whichever results in the largest isopleth for calculating PTS onset. If a non-impulsive sound has the potential of exceeding the peak sound pressure level thresholds associated with impulsive sounds, these thresholds are recommended for consideration.

The peak PTS sound pressure levels ( $L_{pk}$ ) have a reference value of 1  $\mu$ Pa while the cumulative sound exposure level (L<sub>E</sub>) has a reference value of 1  $\mu$ Pa<sup>2</sup>s. The subscript "flat" indicates sound pressures are unweighted. The subscript associated with cumulative sound exposure level thresholds indicates the designated marine mammal (LF, MF, and HF cetaceans and PW pinnipeds) auditory weighting function. The accumulation period for SEL thresholds is indicated in hours in the subscript (e.g.,  $L_{E, 24h}$ ).

## **4.1.4 Behavioral Response Exposure Criteria**

The behavioral threshold for marine mammals, which is part of MMPA Level B harassment along with TTS<sup>2</sup>, is defined by NMFS as 120 dB re 1  $\mu$ Pa (L<sub>P</sub>) for continuous sources, such as vibratory pile driving, and 160 dB re 1  $\mu$ Pa (L<sub>P</sub>) for impulsive sources, such as impact pile driving (NOAA, 2005) (Table 8).

## **4.2 SEA TURTLES**

## **4.2.1 Auditory Weighting Functions**

To reflect higher noise sensitivities at specific sound frequencies, auditory weighting functions for sea turtles were developed that reflected the best available data on hearing ability (composite audiograms), susceptibility to noise-induced hearing loss, impacts of noise on

<sup>2</sup> NMFS considers behavioral effects to be the onset of MMPA Level B harassment while TTS is upper Level B harassment.

hearing, and data on equal latency (Figure 10) for sea turtles (DoN, 2017). These weighting functions are applied to individual sound received levels to reflect the susceptibility to noiseinduced threshold shifts, which is not the same as the range of best hearing.

## **4.2.2 Auditory Injury and Behavior Exposure Criteria**

For sea turtles, the U.S. Navy's *Criteria and Thresholds for U.S. Navy Acoustic and Explosive Effects Analysis (Phase III)* technical report ( DoN, 2017) outlines both peak and cumulative SEL thresholds to assess PTS injury as well as behavior in sea turtles (Table 9).



## **Table 9. Acoustic Threshold Levels for Physiologic and Behavioral Acoustic Effects to Sea Turtles (DoN, 2017).**

The cumulative SEL metric is assessed with the appropriate frequency weighting for sea turtles (Figure 8). The sea turtle injury criteria are incorporated into the effects guidance on sea turtles published by the National Fisheries Marine Fisheries Service's (NMFS's) Greater Atlantic Regional Fisheries Office (GARFO).

# **4.3 FISHES**

In a cooperative effort between federal and state agencies, interim criteria were developed to assess the potential for injury to fishes exposed to impact pile driving sounds. These noise injury thresholds have been established by the Fisheries Hydroacoustic Working Group, which was assembled by NMFS with thresholds subsequently adopted by NMFS (FHWG, 2008). GARFO has applied these standards for assessing the potential effects to fish species and sea turtles listed under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) that have been exposed to elevated levels of underwater sound produced during pile driving (GARFO, 2019). These noise thresholds are based on sound levels that have the potential to produce injury or illicit behavioral responses from fishes (Table 10). Separate criteria are provided in GARFO (2019) for fishes weighing less than and more than two grams.

A Working Group organized under the American National Standards Institute-Accredited Standards Committee S3, Subcommittee 1, Animal Bioacoustics, also developed sound exposure guidelines for fish and sea turtles (Table 10; Popper et al., 2014). This working group identified three types of fish, depending on how they might be affected by underwater sound. The categories include fishes with no swim bladder or other gas chamber (e.g., dab and other flatfish); fishes with swim bladders in which hearing does not involve the swim bladder or other



## **Table 10. Acoustic Threshold Levels for Physiologic Impacts to Fishes (FHWG 2008, GARFO 2019, Popper et al. 2014).**

\*FHWG 2008; \*\*Popper et al. 2014; + GARFO 2019 (for salmon and sturgeon)

gas volume (e.g., salmonids); and fishes with a swim bladder that is involved in hearing (e.g., channel catfish). GARFO (2019) defined the behavioral impact threshold for fish as 150 dB re 1 µPa (Table 11).

Group	<b>Behavioral threshold</b> (dB re 1 µPa, unweighted)
Small fish (mass <2g)	150
Large Fish (mass $\geq$ 2 g)	150

**Table 11. Acoustic Threshold Levels for Behavioral Impacts to Fishes (GARFO, 2019).** 

# **5 MODELED MARINE MAMMALS AND SEA TURTLES**

Sixteen species of marine mammals and four species of sea turtles that may potentially occur in the waters of the Project area and nearshore waters, at least seasonally were modeled, although many more marine mammals may occur in the region, particularly in deeper, offshore waters (Tables 12 to 16). These 20 marine species were assessed for potential impacts associated with exposure to underwater acoustic impacts associated with Project pile driving

**Table 12. Potentially Occurring Marine Mammals and Their Respective Monthly (or Annual) Mean Densities (Marine Geospatial Ecology Laboratory [MGEL], 2022) in the 7.1-km Buffered Lease Area 0549 During the Annual Impact Pile Driving Construction Period (May Through December) for the Atlantic Shores North Project; Some Species Were Modeled as a Group.**



**Table 12. Potentially Occurring Marine Mammals and Their Respective Monthly (or Annual) Mean Densities (Marine Geospatial Ecology Laboratory [MGEL], 2022) in the 7.1-km Buffered Lease Area 0549 During the Annual Impact Pile Driving Construction Period (May Through December) for the Atlantic Shores North Project; Some Species Were Modeled as a Group.**



1 Densities in the MGEL 2022 database are only available for the Pilot Whale and Seal guilds and not for the individual species so these densities were scaled by the ratio of their abundances; additionally, densities for the Pilot Whale guild are only available annually and not monthly.

**Table 13. Potentially Occurring Sea Turtle Species and their Respective Seasonal Mean Densities (DiMatteo et al. 2023) in the Buffered Lease Area 0549 During the Annual Construction Period of the Atlantic Shores North Project; All Sea Turtle Species Modeled as a Representative Group.**



#### **Table 14. Potentially Occurring Marine Mammals and Their Respective Monthly (or Annual) Mean Densities (Marine Geospatial Ecology Laboratory, 2022) in the Wolfe's Pond (WP), NY and Monmouth (Mon), NJ Buffered Cofferdam Model Areas Used in the Vibratory Pile Driving Modeling for the Atlantic Shores North Project.**



#### **Table 14. Potentially Occurring Marine Mammals and Their Respective Monthly (or Annual) Mean Densities (Marine Geospatial Ecology Laboratory, 2022) in the Wolfe's Pond (WP), NY and Monmouth (Mon), NJ Buffered Cofferdam Model Areas Used in the Vibratory Pile Driving Modeling for the Atlantic Shores North Project.**



\*Densities in the MGEL 2022 database are only available for Pilot Whale and Seal guilds/groups and not for the individual species, so these densities were scaled by the ratio of their abundances to derive individual densities for both species of pilot whales and the seals; additionally, densities for the Pilot Whale guild are only available annually and not monthly

#### **Table 15. Potentially Occurring Marine Mammals and Their Respective Monthly (or Annual) Mean Densities (Marine Geospatial Ecology Laboratory, 2022) in the Wolfe's Pond (WP), NY and Monmouth (Mon), NJ Buffered Conductor Barrel Model Areas Used in the Impact Pile Driving Modeling for the Atlantic Shores North Project.**



#### **Table 15. Potentially Occurring Marine Mammals and Their Respective Monthly (or Annual) Mean Densities (Marine Geospatial Ecology Laboratory, 2022) in the Wolfe's Pond (WP), NY and Monmouth (Mon), NJ Buffered Conductor Barrel Model Areas Used in the Impact Pile Driving Modeling for the Atlantic Shores North Project.**



\*Densities in the MGEL 2022 database are only available for Pilot Whale and Seal guilds/groups and not for the individual species, so these densities were scaled by the ratio of their abundances to derive individual densities for both species of pilot whales and the seals; additionally, densities for the Pilot Whale guild are only available annually and not monthly

**Table 16. Potentially Occurring Marine Mammals and Their Respective Monthly (or Annual) Mean Densities (Marine Geospatial Ecology Laboratory, 2022) in the Wolfe's Pond (WP), NY and Monmouth (Mon), NJ Buffered Goal Post Model Areas Used in the Vibratory Pile Driving Modeling for the Atlantic Shores North Project.**



**Table 16. Potentially Occurring Marine Mammals and Their Respective Monthly (or Annual) Mean Densities (Marine Geospatial Ecology Laboratory, 2022) in the Wolfe's Pond (WP), NY and Monmouth (Mon), NJ Buffered Goal Post Model Areas Used in the Vibratory Pile Driving Modeling for the Atlantic Shores North Project.**



\*Densities in the MGEL 2022 database are only available for Pilot Whale and Seal guilds/groups and not for the individual species, so these densities were scaled by the ratio of their abundances to derive individual densities for both species of pilot whales and the seals; additionally, densities for the Pilot Whale guild are only available annually and not monthly

## *Underwater Acoustic Assessment of Noise-Producing Construction Activities at the Atlantic Shores Offshore Wind North*

activities. Some of these species were modeled as species' groups rather than individual species: pilot whales (inclusive of long-finned and short-finned pilot whales), seals (inclusive of harbor and gray seals), and sea turtles (including green, Kemp's ridley, leatherback, and loggerhead turtles). Although sea turtles were modeled as a group, the dive and swim parameters of the leatherback turtle were used as the basis for the movement parameters in the animat modeling of the turtle group due to the extensive movement information available for this species compared to the other turtle species. However, individual sea turtle species' seasonal densities were applied to the turtle modeling results to calculate individual's acoustic exposures by turtle species. Additionally, although seals and pilot whales were modeled as species' groups, individual densities were applied to each species based scaling of their individual abundances.

Following are descriptions of each of the modeled marine mammal and sea turtle species, highlighting those aspects of their occurrence, population estimates, behavior, movements, or hearing that are relevant to animat modeling and acoustic exposure estimation.

### **5.1 MODELED MARINE MAMMALS**

### **5.1.1 Mysticetes**

Mysticetes, or baleen whales, are members of the low frequency hearing group of marine mammals. Five mysticete species potentially occur in the waters of the Project area, four of which are listed under the MMPA and some of which are additionally listed under the ESA.

### **5.1.1.1 Common Minke Whale (***Balaenoptera acutorostrata***)**

Common minke whales are smaller baleen whales, reaching only about 8 to 9 m in length (Jefferson et al., 2015). Minke whales are widely distributed in tropical to polar waters of the Atlantic, Pacific, and Indian oceans, most often observed in coastal/neritic and inshore waters but infrequently also occurring in pelagic waters. In U.S. Atlantic waters, a strong seasonal component to minke whale's distribution exists in both the continental shelf and in deeper, off shelf waters, with minke whales occurring more commonly in shelf waters in spring and fall while from September through April, these whales are found in deeper, offshore waters (Hayes et al., 2022). Common minke whales are thought to be migratory, at least in some areas, moving from high latitude feeding grounds to lower latitude breeding grounds, although these migratory pathways are poorly understood (Cooke, 2018). Common minke whales potentially occurring in the waters of the Project area are most likely be part of the Canadian East Coast stock, which is estimated to include 21,968 whales (Hayes et al., 2023).

Tagged minke whales have been recorded diving to a maximum depth of 150 m but typically dive no deeper than 120 m (Kvadsheim et al., 2017). Common minke whale dives typically are between 1 and 6 minutes (min) in duration (Stern, 1992; Joyce et al., 1989; Stockin et al., 2001). The mean swim speed for minke whales in Monterey Bay was 8.3 kilometers per hour (kph) (Stern, 1992), but Blix and Folkow (1995) reported a "cruising" speed of minke whales at 11.7 kph.

Although the hearing sensitivity of minke whales has not been directly measured (Ketten, 2000) models of their middle ears predicts their best hearing overlaps with their vocalization

frequency range (Tubelli et al., 2012). Minke whales produce a variety of sounds, primarily moans, clicks, downsweeps, ratchets, thump trains, grunts, and "boings" in the 80 Hz to 20 kHz range, and the signal features of their vocalizations consistently include LF, short-duration downsweeps from 250 to 50 Hz (Edds-Walton, 2000, Mellinger et al., 2000, Risch et al., 2014).

## **5.1.1.2 Fin Whale (***Balaenoptera physalus***)**

Fin whales are listed as endangered under the ESA throughout their range. Fin whales are the second largest whale species, with males reaching 25 m and females reaching 26 m in length. Fin whales are a cosmopolitan species, only avoiding ice covered and tropical waters. Migratory patterns of the fin whale in the northern hemisphere are not well understood, but in the North Atlantic, some individual fin whales are known to remain at high latitudes year-round, while others remain at low latitudes throughout the year. Fin whales in the Project area are members of the Western North Atlantic stock, which has been estimated to include 6,802 individuals (Hayes et al., 2023).

Fin whales dive for a mean duration of 4.2 min at depths averaging 60 m (Croll et al., 2001; Panigada et al., 2004). The deepest dive recorded for a fin whale was to a depth of 1,470 m but dives to <100 m are more routine (Panigada et al., 1999). Swimming speeds average between 9.2 and 14.8 kph (Aguilar and García-Vernet, 2018). Watkins (1981) reported bursts of speed in fin whales up to 20 kph.

No direct measurement of fin whale hearing sensitivity has been made. Cranford and Krysl (2015) generated synthetic audiograms of a small fin whale and suggested that the fin whale hears sound through bone conduction via its skull; they suggested that sound waves interact in the skull to produce deformations that induce motion in the ear complex, which results in best hearing in the low frequency range. Fin whales produce a variety of LF sounds that range in frequency from 10 to 200 Hz ( Cranford and Krysl, 2015; Edds, 1988; Watkins, 1981; Watkins et al., 1987). Fin whales produce well-known "20 Hz pulses" and most of their vocalizations are below 100 Hz (Watkins et al. 1987). Males can produce these pulses in a repeated pattern that functions as song, a presumed reproductive display (Morano et al., 2012). Fin whales are known to respond to anthropogenic noise such as shipping vessel noise, airguns, and small vessel noise (Jahoda et al., 2003, Castellote et al., 2012).

# **5.1.1.3 Humpback Whale (***Megaptera novaeangliae***)**

The worldwide ESA status of the humpback whale was revised, with 14 worldwide distinct population segments (DPSs) identified. Humpback whales occurring in the Project area are part of the West Indies DPS, which is not listed under the ESA.

Humpback whales are a medium sized baleen whale, with typical adult sizes of 15 to 16 m. They are a cosmopolitan species found in all ocean basins. All populations, except that of the Arabian Sea, migrate seasonally between high latitude feeding grounds and low latitude reproductive areas, where calving is known to occur. Northwest Atlantic humpbacks migrate from their summer feeding grounds off the northeastern U.S. and Canada to their winter mating and calving groups in the West Indies of the Caribbean. Humpback whales occurring in the Project area are part of the Gulf of Maine stock, which is estimated at a population size of 1,396 whales (Hayes et al., 2023).

## *Underwater Acoustic Assessment of Noise-Producing Construction Activities at the Atlantic Shores Offshore Wind North*

Dive times of humpback whales have been recorded from 3 to 4 min in duration (Dolphin, 1987; Strong, 1990), but Burrows et al. (2016) reported dive times that ranged from 7.5 to 9.6 min, with a mean of 6.0 min. Dive times on the wintering grounds can be much longer, with singing humpbacks typically diving between 10 and 25 min in duration (Chu, 1988). The deepest recorded humpback dive is 240 m, with most dives ranging between 60 and 120 m (Hamilton et al., 1997). During their long-distance migrations, humpback whales swim at speeds ranging from 1.3 to 14.2 kph (Cerchio et al., 2016; Guzman and Félix, 2017; Kennedy et al., 2014).

Hearing has not been measured in humpback whales, but they were the first whale known to produce songs. Vocalizations span from 10 Hz to more than 24 kHz (Frankel et al., 1995, Au et al., 2006, Zoidis et al., 2008) but most of the energy is concentrated below 2 kHz. Humpback whales are known to react to anthropogenic sound (Frankel and Clark, 2000, Fristrup et al., 2003, Dunlop et al., 2018). Like some other whale species, they have shown the ability to at least partially compensate for increases in masking noise by increasing their source level (Dunlop et al. 2014).

## **5.1.1.4 North Atlantic Right Whale (***Eubalaena glacialis***)**

The North Atlantic right whale (NARW) is listed as endangered under the ESA. NARW are a large slow-moving whale that typically grows to a length of 13 to 16 m. NARWs are found in temperate to subpolar waters of the North Atlantic Ocean (Jefferson et al., 2015), where they most commonly occur in coastal and continental shelf waters from Florida to Newfoundland. The NARW population migrates between its winter southeast U.S. calving grounds (primarily coastal waters off eastern Florida and Georgia) and its summer feeding grounds from New England north to the Canadian Maritimes and the Gulf of St. Lawrence (Kenney, 2018). Passive acoustic monitoring has shown the year-round occurrence of NARW in the waters of the Gulf of Maine, New Jersey, and Virginia (Hayes et al., 2022). Shifting patterns in the habitat use by NARW over the last two decades is likely due to the changing distributions of their prey (Meyer-Gutbrod and Greene, 2014). The current estimated population of the Western North Atlantic stock of NARW is 338 whales (Hayes et al., 2023).

Baumgartner and Mate (2003) found that the average foraging dive time of a NARW was 12.2 min, with a maximum dive of 16.3 min, while the average dive depth was 121 m, with a maximum depth of 174 m. The maximum dive depth recorded by NARWs was 306 m (Mate et al., 1992). In the waters of Florida winter ground, right whales averaged speeds of 1.3 kph (Hain et al., 2013).

NARW are low-frequency hearing specialists. Their predicted hearing ranges from 10 to 22,000 Hz (Parks et al. 2007b). Their vocalizations have most of their energy below 2,000 Hz (Parks et al., 2011). The characteristics of NARW vocalizations have been shown to change in response to increased noise (Parks et al. 2011, Parks et al. 2007a).

## **5.1.1.5 Sei Whale (***Balaenoptera borealis***)**

The sei whale is listed as endangered under the ESA. Sei whales occur in temperate, oceanic waters of all world oceans, occurring very uncommonly in neritic waters (Horwood, 2018). Adult sei whales can obtain lengths of 18 m (Jefferson et al., 2015). The sei whale is migratory, seasonally traveling between low latitude calving grounds to high latitude foraging grounds,

## *Underwater Acoustic Assessment of Noise-Producing Construction Activities at the Atlantic Shores Offshore Wind North*

although these migrations may not be as extensive as that of other mysticetes (Jefferson et al., 2015). In the northwestern Atlantic Ocean, sei whales range from the cool, continental shelf edge waters of the northeastern U.S. to Newfoundland, Canada; the greatest numbers of sei whales in U.S. eastern waters occur in spring (Hayes et al., 2022). Acoustic recordings indicate that sei whales occur year-round in the waters of the New York Bight and southern New England (Davis et al., 2020). Sei whales occurring in the Project area are members of the Nova Scotia stock, with an estimated population of 6,292 whales (Hayes et al., 2023).

Ishii et al. (2017) documented foraging sei whales diving to 57 m during the day and to no more than 12.2 m at night, with maximum durations of 12 min. Dive times of sei whales range from 0.75 to 15 min, with a mean duration of 1.5 min (Schilling et al., 1992). When foraging, sei whales make shallow dives of 20 to 30 m, followed by a deep dive up to 15 min in duration (Gambell, 1985). Mean swim speeds during migration range from 6.2 to 7.4 kph while offmigration swim speeds are about 3.6 to 6 kph (Prieto et al., 2014; Ishii et al., 2017). The maximum speed of sei whales of 27.4 kph has been reported (Olsen et al., 2009).

No direct measurements of sei whale hearing sensitivity exist (Ketten, 2000; Thewissen, 2002). Sei whale vocalizations are the least studied of all the rorquals. Rankin and Barlow (2007) recorded sei whale vocalizations in Hawaii and reported that all vocalizations were downsweeps, ranging from on average from 100.3 to 446 Hz for "high frequency" calls and from 39.4 to 21.0 Hz for "low frequency" calls. In another study, McDonald et al. (2005) recorded sei whales with an average call frequency of 433 Hz. A series of sei whales frequencymodulated calls have been recorded south of New Zealand with a frequency range of 34 to 87 Hz (Calderan et al., 2014).

## **5.1.2 Odontocetes**

Odontocetes, or toothed whales, include all dolphins and porpoises as well as the sperm whale and smaller whale species. Nine odontocete species potentially occur in the waters of the Project area. Most odontocetes are in the mid-frequency cetacean (MFC) hearing group but species like the harbor porpoise, with higher frequency hearing ranges, are part of the high frequency cetacean (HFC) hearing group.

# **5.1.2.1 Atlantic Spotted Dolphin (***Stenella frontalis***)**

Atlantic spotted dolphins are about 1.5 to 2.3 m in length and are found only in the tropical and warm-temperate waters of the Atlantic Ocean and associated seas and occur commonly in the waters off the southeastern U.S. and the Gulf coasts, in the Caribbean, and off West Africa (Jefferson et al., 2015). They inhabit waters usually about 200 m in depth but may occasionally swim closer to shore to feed. Atlantic spotted dolphins occurring in the Project area are part of the Western North Atlantic stock, which is estimated to include 39,921 individuals (Hayes et al., 2023).

Atlantic spotted dolphins have been recorded diving to 40 to 60 m of water depth, with an average dive time of around 6 min, and most, if not all dives with a duration of less than10 min in duration (Perrin, 2009a). Davis et al. (1996) reported that 94% of a tracked Atlantic spotted dolphin were to less than 40 m and all recorded dives were of short duration (2 min).

No current hearing data on Atlantic spotted dolphins exist. Atlantic spotted dolphins produce a variety of sounds, including whistles, whistle-squawks, buzzes, burst-pulses, synch pulses, barks, screams, squawks, tail slaps, and echolocation clicks. Like other odontocetes, they produce broadband, short duration echolocation signals. Their broadband clicks have peak frequencies between 60 and 120 kHz and their whistles range in frequency from 1 to 23 kHz and with a duration less than one second (Azevedo et al., 2010; Lammers et al., 2003).

# **5.1.2.2 Atlantic White-sided Dolphin (***Lagenorhynchus acutus***)**

Atlantic white-sided dolphins are about 2.4 to 2.7 m in length and occur only in the coldtemperate to subpolar waters of the North Atlantic Ocean, typically in continental shelf waters up to 100 m (Jefferson et al., 2015). In the western North Atlantic, this species' range extends from the waters off western Greenland to the New York Bight, with occasional winter sightings as far south as North Carolina (Hayes et al., 2020). Atlantic white-sided dolphins potentially occurring in the waters of the Project area are part of the Western North Atlantic stock, which has an estimated population of 93,233 dolphins (Hayes et al., 2023).

Atlantic white-sided dolphins are probably not deep divers. A tagged dolphin dove for an average of 38.8 sec, with 76% of its dives lasting less than 1 minute; this dolphin also swam at an average speed of 5.7 kph (Mate et al., 1994). The maximum dive time recorded from a tagged white-sided dolphin is 4 min (Cipriano, 2009).

No hearing data are available on the Atlantic white-sided dolphin. Whistle vocalizations of Atlantic white-sided dolphins have been recorded with a dominant frequency of 6 to 15 kHz (Richardson et al., 1995). The average estimated SL for an Atlantic white-sided dolphin is approximately 154 dB re 1  $\mu$ Pa @ 1 m (Croll et al., 1999).

# **5.1.2.3 Common Bottlenose Dolphin (***Tursiops truncatus***)**

The common bottlenose dolphin is typically 2 to 3.9 m in length. Common bottlenose dolphins are distributed worldwide in temperate to tropical waters and occur in diverse habitats ranging from inshore to open ocean waters (Scott and Chivers 1990, Sudara and Mahakunayanakul 1998, Wells and Scott 2009). Common bottlenose dolphins in the U.S. Atlantic waters are divided into multiple offshore, estuarine, and coastal migratory stocks. Hayes et al. (2021) defines the boundary between the Western North Atlantic, Northern Migratory Coastal stock and the Western North Atlantic, Offshore stock of common bottlenose dolphins as the 20-m isobath north of Cape Hatteras, NC. Thus, in the waters of the Project area, two stocks of common bottlenose dolphins may occur, the Western North Atlantic Offshore and Northern Migratory Coastal stocks. The estimated abundance of common bottlenose dolphins in the Offshore stock is 62,851 individuals while the Northern Coastal Migratory stock consists of 6,639 individuals (Hayes et al., 2023).

Dive times for bottlenose dolphins range from 38 sec to 1.2 min, with dives having been recorded to last as long as 10 min (Croll et al., 1999; Mate et al., 1995). Wild offshore bottlenose dolphins were reported to dive to depths greater than 450 m (Klatsky et al., 2007). The deepest dive recorded for a bottlenose dolphin is 535 m by a trained individual (Ridgway, 1986). Sustained swim speeds for bottlenose dolphins' range between 4 and 20 kph although they may reach speeds as high as 54 kph (Lockyer and Morris, 1987).

Bottlenose dolphins hear underwater sounds in the range of 150 Hz to 135 kHz (Johnson, 1967; Ljungblad et al., 1982). Their best underwater hearing occurs between 15 and 110 kHz, with the threshold level range is 42 to 52 dB RL (Au, 1993). Nachtigall et al. (2000) more recently measured the range of highest sensitivity as between 25 and 70 kHz, with peaks in sensitivity at 25 and 50 kHz. Bottlenose dolphins produce a variety of whistles, echolocation clicks, lowfrequency narrow, "bray" and burst-pulse sounds with frequencies as low as 50 Hz and as high as 150 kHz with dominant frequencies at 0.3 to 14.5 kHz, 25 to 30 kHz, and 95 to 130 kHz (Janik 2000).

# **5.1.2.4 Harbor Porpoise (***Phocoena phocoena***)**

Harbor porpoises are small, coastal odontocetes that are common in the waters of the northern hemisphere. They reach a maximum size of about 1.5 m and are typically difficult to spot at the sea surface due to their small size and very short surface durations. Harbor porpoises occur in cool temperate to subpolar waters of the North Atlantic and Pacific oceans, typically in shallow, nearshore waters that are less than 100 m in depth (Jefferson et al., 2015). Harbor porpoises in the Project area are part of the Gulf of Maine/Bay of Fundy stock, which has an estimated abundance of 95,543 individuals (Hayes et al., 2023).

Maximum swim speeds for harbor porpoises range from 16.6 and 22.2 kph (Gaskin et al., 1974). Dive times range between 0.7 and 1.7 min with a maximum dive duration of 9 min (Westgate et al., 1995). The majority of dives range from 20 to 130 m, although maximum dive depths have reached 226 m (Westgate et al., 1995).

Harbor porpoises are classified as high frequency hearing specialists and produce narrowband high-frequency echolocation clicks (Madsen et al., 2005). Harbor porpoises can hear frequencies in the range of 100 Hz to 140 kHz (Kastelein et al., 2002; Kastelein et al., 2015; Villadsgaard et al., 2007). Kastelein et al. (2002) determined the best range of hearing for a twoyear-old male was 16 to 140 kHz; this harbor porpoise also demonstrated the highest upper frequency hearing of all odontocetes presently known (Kastelein et al., 2002). Harbor porpoises produce click and whistle vocalizations that cover a wide frequency range, from 40 Hz to at least 150 kHz (Verboom and Kastelein, 1995). Variations in click trains apparently represent different functions based on the frequency ranges associated with each activity.

## **5.1.2.5 Pilot Whales (Long-finned Pilot Whale [***Globicephala melas***] and Short-finned Pilot Whale [***Globicephala macrorhynchus***])**

Both the short- and long-finned pilot whales occur in the North Atlantic Ocean. Adult pilot whales reach lengths of about 6.5 m. Sightings of pilot whales in the western North Atlantic occur primarily near the continental shelf break from Florida to the Nova Scotian Shelf (Mullin & Fulling, 2003). Pilot whales tend to concentrate in areas of high bathymetric relief or strong thermal fronts and are typically found almost exclusively along the continental shelf edge and slope regions ( Hamazaki, 2002). In the North Atlantic Ocean, long-finned pilot whales occur from Iceland, Greenland, and the Barents Sea south to North Carolina and North Africa, while short-finned pilot whales have a more tropical and subtropical distribution, ranging from North Carolina through the wider Caribbean Sea and Gulf of Mexico(Hayes et al. 2022); the species' ranges overlap in mid-Atlantic waters. Pilot whales in the Project area could be either the

## *Underwater Acoustic Assessment of Noise-Producing Construction Activities at the Atlantic Shores Offshore Wind North*

Western North Atlantic stocks of short- or long-finned species of pilot whales, which have abundances of 28,924 whales and 39,215 whales, respectively (Hayes et al., 2023).

Pilot whales generally have swim speeds ranging between 12 to 12 kph (Shane, 1995). Longfinned pilot whales swim at an average speed of 3.3 kph (Nelson and Lien, 1996), while shortfinned pilot whales swim at speeds ranging between 7 and 9 kph (Norris and Prescott, 1961); short-finned pilot whale can perform underwater 'sprints' with velocities ranging up to 32.4 kph that are associated with foraging attempts (Aguilar Soto et al., 2008). Both short-finned and long-finned pilot whales are considered deep divers. Dive depths of long-finned pilot whales range from 16 m during the day to 648 m during the night, with dive durations varying between 2 and 13 min (Baird et al., 2002). Short-finned pilot whales off Tenerife, Canary Islands dove repeatedly to 300 m, with very few dives between 300 and 500 m, and many dives with a maximum depth between 500 and 1,019 m (Aguilar de Soto, 2008). Generally, dive times increase with dive depth, to a maximum duration of 21 min (Ridgway, 1986).

The best hearing sensitivity for a captive pilot whale was measured between 40 and 56 kHz with the upper limit of functional hearing between 80 and 100 kHz. Pilot whales echolocate with a precision like bottlenose dolphins. Short-finned pilot whales produce sounds as low as 280 Hz and as high as 100 kHz, with dominant frequencies between 2 to 14 kHz and 30 to 60 kHz (Caldwell and Caldwell, 1969; Fish and Turl, 1976; Scheer et al., 1998). The mean frequency of calls produced by short-finned pilot whales is 7,870 Hz, much higher than the mean frequency of calls produced by long-finned pilot whales (Rendell et al., 1999). Echolocation abilities have been demonstrated during click production (Evans, 1973). SLs of clicks have been measured as high as 180 dB (Fish and Turl, 1976).

# **5.1.2.6 Risso's Dolphin (***Grampus griseus***)**

Risso's dolphin's range in length from 2.6 to 3.9 m. These dolphins inhabit deep oceanic and continental slope waters worldwide, from tropical to temperate waters of both hemispheres (Leatherwood et al., 1980; Baird, 2009). They appear, however, to have a strong preference for temperate waters between 30° and 45° in latitude (Jefferson et al., 2015). Little to nothing is known about the movement or migration patterns of Risso's dolphins. Risso's dolphins in the Project area are part of the Western North Atlantic stock, which is comprised of 35,215 individuals (Hayes et al., 2023).

Dive times up to 30 min have been reported for Risso's dolphins (Jefferson et al., 2015). Out of 37 foraging dives observed from tagged Risso's dolphins, 57% were in shallow water depths (<90 m) while only 12% were to deep water depths (350 to 450 m) (Arranz et al., 2018). Typical Risso's dolphin swimming speeds range from 2 to 12 kph (Shane, 1995), but a tagged Risso's dolphin in the Gulf of Mexico swam average speeds of 7.19 kph and dove to 400 to 500 m (Wells et al., 2009).

Audiograms for Risso's dolphins indicate that their hearing ranges in frequency from 1.6 to 110 kHz, with optimal hearing occurring between 4 and 80 kHz (Nachtigall et al., 1995). Risso's dolphins produce sounds as low as 0.1 kHz and as high as 65 kHz. Their dominant vocalizing frequencies are between 2 to 5 kHz and 65 kHz (Corkeron & Van Parijs, 2001; Watkins, 1967;

Au, 1993). Risso's dolphins produce tonal whistles, burst-pulse sounds, echolocation clicks, and a hybrid burst-pulse tonal signal (Corkeron and Van Parijs, 2001).

# **5.1.2.7 Short-beaked Common Dolphin (***Delphinus delphis)*

The common dolphin is one of the most abundant dolphins in the world. It reaches lengths of about 1.8 m. Common dolphins are distributed worldwide in temperate, tropical, and subtropical oceans, primarily along continental shelf and steep bank regions where upwelling occurs (Jefferson et al., 2015). Short-beaked common dolphins seem to be most common north of 50°N in the Atlantic Ocean (Croll et al., 1999). In the Project area, short-beaked common dolphins are designated as members of the Western North Atlantic stock, which consists of 172,974 dolphins (Hayes et al., 2023).

Swim speeds for common dolphins have been measured at 5.8 kph with maximum speeds ranging from 16.2 kph to 37.1 kph (Croll et al., 1999; Hui, 1987). Dive depths range between 9 and 200 m, with a majority of dives from 9 to 50 m (Evans, 1994). The deepest dive recorded for common dolphins was 260 m (Evans, 1971) with a maximum dive duration documented at 5 min (Heyning and Perrin, 1994).

Little is known about hearing in the common dolphin. The hearing threshold of a common dolphin was measured with an auditory range from 10 to 150 kHz, with greatest sensitivity between 60 and 70 kHz (Popov and Klishin, 1998). Common dolphins produce sounds as low as 0.2 kHz and as high as 150 kHz, with dominant frequencies at 0.5 to 18 kHz and 30 to 60 kHz (Au 1993; Moore & Ridgway, 1995). Signal types consist of clicks, squeals, whistles, and creaks (Evans, 1994). The whistles of common dolphins range between 3.5 and 23.5 kHz (Ansmann et al., 2007). Most of the energy of echolocation clicks is concentrated between 15 and 100 kHz (Croll et al., 1999). In the North Atlantic, the mean SL of common dolphin whistles was estimated at about 143 dB with a maximum of 154 dB (Croll et al., 1999).

# **5.1.2.8 Sperm Whale (***Physeter macrocephalus***)**

The sperm whale is the largest toothed whale, with males averaging 16 m while females are smaller at only about 12 m in length (Jefferson et al., 2015). Sperm whales are primarily found in deeper (1,000 m) ocean waters and distributed in polar, temperate, and tropical waters of the world's oceans. In the waters of the U.S. Atlantic, sperm whales are distributed from the continental shelf edge and slope to open ocean waters and are often associated with the Gulf Stream and its features. Sperm whales potentially occurring in the Project area are part of the North Atlantic stock, which includes 4,349 whales (Hayes et al., 2023).

Sperm whales may make the longest and deepest dives of any mammal, with the maximumrecorded dive reaching 1,500 m (Davis et al., 2007), although examination of stomach contents of sperm whales suggests that sperm whales may dive as deep as 3,200 m (Clarke, 1976). Foraging dives to depths of 294 to 1,433 m and non-foraging dives to a water depth of 500 m were recently measured (Guerra et al., 2017; Joyce et al., 2017). In general, dive durations range between 18.2 to 65.3 min (Watkins et al., 2002). Sperm whale's surface speeds generally average 1.3 to 4 kph, with maximum speeds of about 9.4 kph (Jochens et al., 2008; Lockyer, 1997; Watkins et al., 2002; Whitehead, 2018), although Lockyer (1997) reported dive swim rates ranging up to 10.1 kph.

The measured hearing of a stranded sperm whale calf suggested an auditory range of 2.5 to 60 kHz, with best hearing sensitivity between 5 and 20 kHz (Ridgway & Carder, 2001). Measurements of evoked response data from one stranded sperm whale have shown a lower limit of hearing near 100 Hz (Gordon et al., 1996). Sperm whales produce broadband clicks with energy from less than 100 Hz to 30 kHz (Goold and Jones, 1995; Møhl et al., 2000; Thode et al., 2002; Weilgart and Whitehead, 1997). Regular click trains and creaks have been recorded from foraging sperm whales and may be produced as a function of echolocation. A series of short clicks, termed "codas," have been associated with social interactions and are thought to play a role in communication.

# **5.1.3 Pinnipeds**

# **5.1.3.1 Gray Seal (***Halichoerus grypus***)**

Gray seals are between 2 to 3 m in length and occur in coastal temperate to sub-polar waters of the North Atlantic Ocean and Baltic Sea (Jefferson et al., 2015). In the northwestern Atlantic, gray seals occur principally in coastal waters of eastern Canada (Labrador) to the northeastern U.S. (New Jersey) but may occasionally occur extralimitally further south (Hayes et al., 2020). Gray whales that may potentially occur in the Project area are part of the Western North Atlantic stock that consists of 27,300 seals (Hayes et al., 2023).

Swim speeds of gray seals average 4.5 kph. Gray seals dives are short, between 4 and 10 min, with a maximum dive duration recorded at 30 min (Hall and Thompson, 2009). A maximum dive depth of over 300 m has been recorded for this species, but most dives are relatively shallow, from 60 to 100 m to the seabed (Hall and Thompson, 2009).

Gray seals' underwater hearing range has been measured from 2 kHz to 90 kHz, with best hearing between 20 kHz and 50 to 60 kHz (Ridgway and Joyce, 1975). Gray seals produce in-air sounds at 100 Hz to 16 kHz, with predominant frequencies between 100 Hz and 4 kHz for seven characterized call types, and up to 10 kHz for "knock" calls (Asselin et al., 1993). Oliver (1978) has reported sound frequencies as high as 30 and 40 kHz for these seals.

# **5.1.3.2 Harbor Seal (***Phoca vitulina***)**

Harbor seals are also known as common seals and are one of the most widely distributed pinnipeds in the world and the most common seal in U.S. Atlantic waters. They are typically less than 2 m in length and occur principally in temperate to polar coastal waters of North America, Europe, and eastern Asia (Jefferson et al., 2015). In the northwestern Atlantic Ocean, harbor seals occur from eastern Canada through Maine waters year-round and seasonally southward to southern New England and mid-Atlantic waters (Schroeder, 2000; Rees et al., 2016; Toth et al., 2018). The Western North Atlantic stock of harbor seals consists of 61,336 seals (Hayes et al., 2023).

Harbor seals were recorded swimming from 4.1 to 4.5 kph during dives in the St. Lawrence Estuary (Lesage et al. 1999). Maximum swim speeds for harbor seals have been recorded over 13 kph (Bigg, 1981). In general, harbor seals dive for less than 10 min and above 150 m of water depth (Jefferson et al., 2015). Lesage et al. (1999) found that more than half of harbor seals dives in the St. Lawrence Estuary were to water depths less than 4 m and dives to waters

greater than 4 m were predominantly foraging dives. Hastings et al. (2004) found that most harbor seal dives in the Gulf of Alaska were less than 4 min in duration and to water depths less than 20 m. The deepest diving harbor seal was reported to have dove to a water depth of 481 m, with the longest dive lasting 35 min (Eguchi and Harvey, 2005).

The harbor seal can hear sounds in the range of 75 Hz to a maximum of 180 kHz (Kastak and Schusterman, 1998; Terhune, 1991). Underwater hearing thresholds are  $\sim$  53 dB @ 4 kHz (Kastelein et al., 2010). Harbor seals produce a variety of sounds including clicks, groans, grunts, and creaks that range in frequency from 0.1 to 7 kHz, although clicks can range from 8 to more than 150 kHz, with dominant frequencies between 12 and 40 kHz (Hanggi and Schusterman, 1994), Richardson et al., 1995).

# **5.2 MODELED SEA TURTLES**

Four species of sea turtles potentially occur in the waters of the Project area, at least seasonally. These sea turtles are all classified as either threatened or endangered under the ESA.

# **5.2.1 Green Turtle (***Chelonia mydas***)**

Eleven distinct population segments (DPSs) for the green turtle have been designated worldwide as either threatened or endangered under the ESA (NOAA, 2016). Green turtles potentially occurring in the project area are part of the North Atlantic DPS, which is listed as threatened. The ESA critical habitat in the coastal waters around Culebra Island, Puerto Rico and its outlying keys established in 1998 remains in effect for the North Atlantic DPS. The global population of the green turtle is estimated at 570,926 turtles, while the North Atlantic DPS has an estimated population of 167,424 individuals (NOAA, 2016).

Green turtles are widespread throughout tropical, subtropical, and warm-temperate waters of the Atlantic, Pacific, and Indian oceans and Mediterranean Sea between 30° N and 30°S (Lazell, 1980). Except during the juvenile lifestage and adult migrations when green turtles are found in the oceanic environment, green turtles principally inhabit the neritic zone, typically occurring in nearshore and inshore waters where they forage primarily on sea grasses and algae (Mortimer, 1982). The nesting of green turtles occurs on nearly 1,800 nesting beaches worldwide in over 80 countries (Hirth, 1997; Pike, 2013).

Green turtles typically make shallow and short-duration dives to no more than 30 m for <23 min but dives more than 138 m and for durations of 307 min have been recorded, with these deeper dives usually occurring during winter (Blanco et al., 2013, Hays et al., 2000, Hochscheid et al., 1999, Rice and Balazs, 2008). Godley et al. (2002) reported travel speeds for green turtles ranging from 0.6 to 2.8 kph, with faster swim speeds associated with traverse across deeper, open waters. Song et al. (2002) reported average swimming speeds ranging from 1.4 to 3 kph for migrating green turtles.

Juvenile green sea turtles have a narrow range of low frequency underwater hearing, from 50 to 1,600 Hz, with the best sensitivity between 200 and 400 Hz and an averaged threshold of 95 to 96 dB re 1 µPa (RMS) (Piniak et al., 2016). Ketten and Bartol (2006) found that juvenile green turtles exhibited a somewhat broader hearing range than sub-adult green turtles, whose hearing was measured at 100 to 500 Hz. Charrier et al. (2022) observed that juvenile green turtles produce 10 different types of sound that can be classified as pulses, calls, squeaks, and frequency modulated sounds, with the frequency characteristics of the generated sounds in the range of their measured hearing.

# **5.2.2 Kemp's Ridley Turtle (***Lepidochelys kempii***)**

The Kemp's ridley turtle is the rarest sea turtle worldwide and has the most restricted distribution. The Kemp's ridley turtle is listed as endangered throughout their range under the ESA with no designated critical habitat. Although abundance information for the Kemp's ridley turtle is sparse, the 2012 estimated population of female Kemp's ridley turtles 2 years and older was 248,307 turtles with 10,987 nests reported in 2014 (NMFS and USFWS, 2015).

Kemp's ridley turtles are found primarily in the neritic waters along the U.S. and Mexico coasts of the Gulf of Mexico and western North Atlantic Ocean (Byles and Plotkin 1994, Marquez-M. 1994, Plotkin 2003). Adult females make relatively short annual migrations from their feeding grounds in the western Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico to their principal nesting beach at Rancho Nuevo, Mexico. Unique among sea turtles, adult males are non-migratory, remaining resident in coastal waters near Rancho Nuevo year-round. In contrast, juvenile Kemp's ridleys make longer migrations between their winter-feeding grounds in the Gulf of Mexico and Florida to their summer feeding grounds in coastal waters and embayments of the U.S. East Coast. Kemp's ridley turtles participate in arribada nesting, with the major arribada nesting site at Rancho Nuevo; however, solitary nesting has been recorded at 10 beaches along 193 km of Mexican shoreline in Tamaulipas and another 20 mi (32 km) in Veracruz, Mexico.

Kemp's ridleys make shallow dives (<164 ft [<50 m]) of short duration (12 to 18 min) (Lutcavage and Lutz 1997). Renaud (1995) reported the mean dive duration as 33.7 min, with 84 percent of the submergences <60 min. Mean swimming speeds were reported to range from 0.4 to 0.7 kt (0.7 to 1.3 kph), with over 95% of the actual velocity values <2.7 kt (<5 kph) (Renaud, 1995).

Kemp ridley turtles appear to have the most restricted hearing range (100 to 500 Hz) with their best hearing sensitivity between 100 and 200 Hz(Ketten & Bartol. 2006). Ferrara et al. (2019) found that Kemp's ridley hatchlings produced underwater sounds, most of which showed peak frequencies between 560 and 750 Hz, which is above the hearing range measured by Ketten and Bartol (2006).

# **5.2.3 Leatherback Turtle (***Dermochelys coriacea***)**

The leatherback turtle is the largest turtle in the world and one of the largest living reptiles. As a species, the leatherback is listed endangered throughout its range under the ESA. Critical habitat for the leatherback turtle has been designated in the Caribbean Sea waters adjacent to Sandy Point Beach, St. Croix, U.S. Virgin Islands, as well as in the northeast Pacific Ocean waters from California to Washington (NOAA 1979, 2012). Nel (2012) reported the worldwide leatherback abundance as 57,147 to 61,256 nests annually. The subpopulation of leatherback turtles in the northwest Atlantic Ocean is the largest in the world, with an estimated 34,000 to

94,000 individuals (The Turtle Expert Working Group, 2007) and 50,842 nests per year (Wallace et al., 2013).

Leatherbacks are the most pelagic and most widely distributed of any sea turtle and can be found circumglobally in temperate and tropical oceans (Spotila, 2004). The largest Atlantic nesting sites are located in Gabon, Africa and Trinidad, Caribbean Sea (Wallace et al., 2013). Highly migratory, leatherbacks in the western Atlantic travel north in the spring, following the Gulf Stream and feeding opportunistically, arriving in continental shelf and coastal waters off New England and Atlantic Canada where they remain through October. In the fall, some leatherbacks head south essentially retracing their offshore migratory route while others cross the Atlantic to Great Britain and migrate south along the eastern Atlantic (James et al., 2005).

Leatherback turtles make the deepest dives of any sea turtle, with the deepest dive recorded at 4,198 ft (1,280 m) (Doyle et al., 2008). Their longest duration dive was 86.5 min, but most dives are no more than 40 min (Byrne et al., 2009; López-Mendilaharsua et al., 2009; Sale et al., 2006). Hougthon et al. (2008) found that 99.6 percent of leatherback dives were to water depths less than 300 m while only a 0.4 percent were to deeper water depths, with the dives to waters >300 m occurring principally during the day and during migrational transit. In the Atlantic, Hays et al. (2004) determined that migrating and foraging adult leatherbacks spent 71 to 94 percent of their diving time at depths from 70 to 110 m. The modal speeds of swimming leatherback turtles ranged between 2 to 3 kph with absolute maximum speeds in the range of 6.5 to 10 kph (Eckert, 2002). Inter-nesting leatherback turtles swam at speeds ranging from 1.25 to 2.5 kph (Byrne et al., 2009).

Leatherback hatchlings can hear both underwater and in air, and were found to detect sound from 50 to 1,200 Hz underwater, with best hearing sensitivty was between 100 and 400 Hz with a threshold of 84 dB re  $1\mu$ Pa<sup>2</sup> at 300 Hz (Dow Piniak et al., 2012). Cook and Forest (2005) noted that female leatherbacks make broadband sounds when ashore during nesting, including breath noises, grunts, and gular pumps that ranged in frequency from 300 to 500 Hz. Hatchlings also produce sounds when in their nests but no underwater sound production by any lifestage of leatherbacks has been documented Ferrara et al. (2014).

# **5.2.4 Loggerhead Turtle (***Caretta caretta***)**

Five loggerhead DPS are listed as endangered under the ESA while four DPS are listed as threatened (NOAA and USFWS 2011). Only members of the threatened Northwest Atlantic Ocean DPS occur in the project area. In 2014, critical habitat was designated for the Northwest Atlantic Ocean DPS in the northwestern Atlantic Ocean and the Gulf of Mexico that includes nearshore reproductive habitat, winter habitat, breeding areas, constricted migratory corridors, and *Sargassum* habitat (NOAA, 2014). Critical habitat for the Northwest Atlantic Ocean DPS additionally includes 38 marine areas along the coastlines and offshore of North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Louisiana, and Texas (DoI, 2014). Casale and Tucker (2017) estimated the minimum global population of loggerhead turtles as 200,246 individuals. One of the two major global populations occurs in southeastern U.S. and northern Gulf of Mexico waters, with the number of U.S. nests estimated at approximately 68,000 to 90,000 nests per
year. The largest concentration of loggerhead female turtles in the Northwest Atlantic DPS nest along the coast of Florida. The most recent Florida count of 53,000 loggerhead nests was reported in 2019, down from the 2016 count of 65,807 nests (FFWCC, 2019). The nesting population in Florida had declined sharply, but since 2007, the nesting population of female loggerheads in Florida has increased by 65 percent (FFWCC, 2019).

Loggerhead turtles are found in coastal to oceanic temperate, tropical, and subtropical waters of the Atlantic, Pacific, and Indian oceans and the Mediterranean Sea (Dodd, 1988). Although loggerhead turtles are highly migratory, no movements across the equator are known, and loggerheads migrate hundreds to thousands of miles between feeding and nesting grounds.

Howell et al. (2010) found that more than 80 percent the time, loggerheads in the North Pacific Ocean dove to water depths <5 m, but 90 percent of their time was spent diving to depths <15 m). Even as larger juveniles and adults, loggerheads' routine dives are only to 9 to 22 m (Lutcavage and Lutz, 1997). Migrating male loggerheads along the U.S. East Coast dove to water depths of 20 to 40 m (Arendt et al., 2012). An adult loggerhead made the deepest recorded dive to 764 ft (233 m), staying submerged for 8 min (Sakamoto et al., 1990). The longest duration dive by a loggerhead turtle was 614 min during deep-bottom resting dives (Broderick et al. 2007). Sakamoto et al. (1990) reported loggerhead diving speeds ranging from 0.75 to 3.5 kph, while migrating females swam at minimum speeds of 0.75 to 1.7 kph (Godley et al., 2003).

The underwater hearing of a single adult loggerhead was measured from 50 to 3200 Hz using auditory evoked potential methods and from 50 to 1131 Hz using behavioral methods (Martin et al. 2012). Bartol and Bartol (2011) found that the hearing range using both auditory evoked potential and behavioral methods was the same, 50 to 1,200 Hz, in both post-hatchling and juvenile loggerhead turtles.

### **5.3 MARINE MAMMAL AND SEA TURTLE DENSITY DERIVATION**

Population estimates are a necessary part of the analysis process to estimate the effect that acoustic exposure has on the potentially occurring protected marine mammals and sea turtles in an area. Density estimates for each marine mammal species (or species group) were derived for each month (or annually for some species) while sea turtle density estimates were only available by season.

For use in impact pile driving modeling, marine mammal and sea turtle densities were estimated for the buffered Atlantic Shores North Lease Area 0549. The buffer distance applied to the perimeter of Lease Area 0549 was the largest acoustic range to a regulatory threshold for the pile driving hammer sources proposed for use in the project, which was 7.1 km (4.4 miles). This distance of 7.1 km was buffered (i.e., added) onto the outer lease area boundary (Figure 11), and marine mammal and sea turtle densities were derived for all impact pile driving construction activities by taking the mean of the monthly densities in all grid cells within this buffered area.

For use in the landfall modeling and analysis for the cofferdam/conductor barrel/goal post, marine mammal densities were estimated for the buffered model sites at Wolfe's Pond, NY and Monmouth, NJ. The buffer distances of 1,650 m



**Figure 11. MGEL (2022) June Density Surface Showing the5-km Density Grid Cells for the Common Bottlenose Dolphin in the 7.1-km Buffered Lease Area for the Atlantic Shores North Project; Only the Grid Cells Within the Buffered Lease Area Are Included in the Monthly Density Estimate.**



**Figure 12. MGEL (2022) March Density Surface Showing the5-km Density Grid Cells for the Humpback Whale in the 2,050-m Buffered Monmouth, NJ Cofferdam Model Area for the Atlantic Shores North Project; Only the Grid Cells Within the Buffered Area Are Included in the Monthly Density Estimate.**

and 2,050 m, respectively, were applied to the Wolfe's Pond and Monmouth model sites for the cofferdam modeling (Figure 12). The buffer distances of 2,985 m and 12,385 m, respectively, were applied to the Wolfe's Pond and Monmouth model sites for the goal post modeling. The buffer distances of 400 m and 820 m, respectively, were applied to the Wolfe's Pond and Monmouth model sites for the conductor barrel modeling. These buffer distances represent the largest acoustic range to a regulatory threshold for each model site. Marine mammal densities were derived at these representative model sites by taking the mean of the monthly densities in all grid cells that are within the buffered areas.

# **5.3.1 Marine Mammal Density Derivation**

The Marine Geospatial Ecology Laboratory (MGEL) (2022) marine mammal density estimates represent the best available marine mammal data for the Project area; the methodology by which the MGEL densities were derived is described in Roberts et al. (2016). MGEL monthly (or annual for some species) density data are delineated in 5 km square grid cells in U.S. Atlantic waters and by species or species groups with discrete density designated for each monthly (or annual) grid cell within the MGEL datasets. To determine the marine mammal densities for the Project area or the cofferdam model areas, marine mammal densities were compiled for the buffered areas for all pile driving activities. The MGEL grid cell densities within the buffered lease area or model areas were averaged for each month to provide mean monthly densities for each marine mammal species/species group (or an annual density); only grid cells within the boundary of the buffered lease or model areas were included in the density estimate (Figures 9 and 10).

For the pilot whales, only annual density estimates are available in MGEL (2022), as insufficient information on their populations is available to derive monthly density estimates. For the pilot whales species, the annual mean density estimate was used as an input for each month of the modeling periods. Additionally, in the MGEL density dataset, densities are only available for the generalized groups of seals and pilot whales rather than for the individual species of harbor and gray seals as well as short-finned and long-finned pilot whales. To obtain density estimates for each of these individual species that were treated as a group in the MGEL 2022 database, the MGEL (2022) group density (i.e., seals or pilot whales densities) was scaled by the abundances of each of the individual species (Hayes et al. 2023), using the following equation, with the harbor seal as an example:

$$
\rho_{\text{harbor seal}} = \rho_{\text{MGEL}(\text{both})} * (\text{a}_{\text{harbor seal}} / (\text{a}_{\text{harbor seal}} + \text{a}_{\text{gray seal}}))
$$
\n(8)

where ρ represents density and *a* represents abundance. These abundance-scaled density estimates provide realistic and species-specific density estimates annually or monthly for each of the grouped species.

Two stocks of common bottlenose dolphin (Northern Migratory Coastal and Offshore) are present within the Project area, but density estimates are only available in the MGEL density data for the bottlenose species in its entirety. Hayes et al. (2021) defines the boundary between the Western North Atlantic, Northern Migratory Coastal stock and the Western North Atlantic, Offshore stock of common bottlenose dolphins as the 20-m isobath north of Cape Hatteras, NC.

Thus, the 20-m isobath was used to define and differentiate the stock boundaries of the common bottlenose within the MGEL (2022) data and derive density estimates for each stock of the bottlenose dolphin. The 20-m isobath transects only the western portion of the lease area (Figure 9). All bottlenose dolphin density grids cells <20 m in the buffered lease area were used to calculate the monthly density estimates of the Northern Migratory Coastal stock of bottlenose dolphins while all density grid cells >20 m in the buffered lease area were used to calculate the density of the Offshore stock of bottlenose dolphins (Table 12). Since both landfall model sites are in shallow waters <20-m in depth, all bottlenose dolphins occurring in the landfall model areas (for cofferdam, conductor barrel, and goal post modeling) were attributed solely to the Northern Migratory Coastal stock of bottlenose dolphins (Tables 14, 15, and 16).

# **5.3.2 Sea Turtle Density Derivation**

The best available sea turtle densities for the Project area are available from Duke University's MGEL, (DiMatteo et al. 2023) (Table 13), which were prepared for the U.S. Navy for the Atlantic U.S. waters. The densities were available in 10 x10 kilometer grid cells, the resolution of which aligned with the environmental covariates used in the density modeling. The sea turtle density estimates in each grid cell represent the monthly mean, averaged for the period from 2003 to 2019, except for the green turtle, which covered the period from 2010 to 2019. Densities were estimated using a density surface model that correlated local abundances observed during systematic line transect surveys with environmental conditions observed at that same location and time. For unsurveyed areas and times, densities were estimated by extrapolation.

# **5.4 PROTECTED MARINE HABITATS**

# **5.4.1.1 Essential Fish Habitat**

Essential fish habitat (EFH) for species of managed species of fish and invertebrates is found in the Project area. The Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSFCMA) ensure protection of marine habitat essential to the production of federally managed marine and anadromous species within the U.S. EEZ. Congress defined EFH as "those waters and substrate necessary to fish for spawning, breeding, feeding, or growth to maturity" (16 U.S.C. §1802[10]). Soft bottom, hard bottom, and pelagic types of EFH have been designated in the region in which the Project area is located. Various lifestages of species that utilize these types of occurring habitat have EFH designated by a fishery management council. A full description of the EFH designated for the Project area may be found in the COP for the Atlantic Shores North Project.

# **6 RESULTS**

The following sections include the results of all acoustic and animat modeling conducted on impact and vibratory pile driving activities planned for the Project area.

# **6.1 OTHER SOUND SOURCES**

Noise associated with construction vessels operating in the project area may affect the ambient noise environment episodically. The actual number of construction-related vessels operating in the Project area is unknown at this time and will depend on the Project's final construction schedule. As noted, vessels will make trips to and from the Project area for bunkering and

provisioning and may otherwise remain in the Project area for days or weeks at a time. Marine animals in the Project area are expected to be already habituated to the types and levels of sounds produced by the Project's construction vessel traffic, given the relatively high level of existing vessel traffic in the area. Sound produced by transiting Project vessels would be like existing, ongoing vessel noise. Much of vessel activity and their associated sounds would be from slow-moving or stationary vessels when thrusters may be used for relatively short durations of station-keeping. The sound levels resulting from station-keeping are similar to those due to transiting vessels.

Like most ocean areas near any continental margins, the ambient noise environment of the Project area is dominated by noise from ships. Most of the underwater sound generated by ships is low frequency (<1,000 Hz), with most ship noise resulting from propeller cavitation that dominates the <200 Hz frequency range (Ross, 1976). The noise ships produce results not only from the type of engine and propeller systems used but also from the speeds at which the ships travel. Generally, larger (>328 ft [100 m]), faster moving vessels generate more intense LF underwater sound than smaller, slower moving vessels or boats (Frankel and Gabriele, 2017; Southall et al., 2018).

Most research on ship noise is from large vessels, fishing vessels, or small boats. Underwater sound from smaller fishing vessels (15 to 46 m), which would be of comparable size to the construction vessels likely to be operating in the Project area during the construction season can travel at speeds from 13 to 18.4 kph. Sounds from small fishing vessels with frequencies ranging from 1.1 to 1.9 kHz have been reported with peak received levels of 137.6 131.2 dB re 1 μPa (Amron et al., 2021). Parsons et al. (2021) reported that estimated source levels for fishing vessels ranged from 145 to 195 dB re 1 μPa-m. While the construction vessels will produce some underwater noise, the lower speed at which the vessels will typically operate in the Project area is likely result in the addition of only transient and low levels of noise that will be limited to small areas with the overall Project area. These levels will add less to the ambient noise environment than the majority of other ocean-going vessels.

#### **6.1.1 Potential for Noise Effects on Protected Marine Essential Fish Habitat**

Adverse impacts to EFH are defined as "any impact that reduces quality and/or quantity of EFH"; adverse impacts include direct or indirect physical, chemical, or biological alterations of the waters or substrate and loss of, or injury to, benthic organisms, prey species and their habitat, and other ecosystem components, if such modifications reduce the quality and/or quantity of EFH (50 CFR §600). Vessel noise generated by the construction vessels operating in the Project area would be low frequency and only added to the ambient noise environment for very brief time periods. Thus, the effect of construction vessel noise is to ephemerally increase the ambient noise environment in very limited areas.

There is no potential for physical or chemical alterations of the water or substrate from sound transmissions, and there is no potential for loss of or injury to benthic organisms or prey species since they have little or no sensitivity to low frequency sound. Therefore, there is little to no potential for impacts to the quality or quantity of EFH from the ephemeral addition and limited areas of construction vessel noise. Thus, no adverse impacts on any type of EFH are reasonably expected from exposure to construction vessel noise.

## **6.2 MODELED ACOUSTIC SOURCE LEVELS**

The source levels for the unmitigated impact pile driving of 10-m and 15-m monopiles, 5-m preand post-piled pin pile, and vibratory pile driving of sheet piles were derived, as detailed in Sections 2.3.1 and 2.3.2 (Table 17).



#### **Table 17. Broadband Source Levels of the Maximum Modeled Hammer Strike Energies of each Impact and Vibratory Pile Driving Source and Scenario.**

# **6.3 MODELED RANGES TO ACOUSTIC THRESHOLDS FOR IMPACT PILE DRIVING OF FOUNDATIONS**

Acoustic ranges to the regulatory thresholds for marine mammals, sea turtles, and fish have been calculated based on the results of the acoustic modeling for all impact pile driving scenarios for each of the two model sites. A description of how these ranges were calculated is provided in Section 3.1.1.

### **6.3.1 PTS Injury Acoustic Ranges for Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles**

Acoustic ranges to marine mammal and sea turtle regulatory thresholds were calculated for the unmitigated and mitigated (three sound attenuation levels of 6, 10, and 15 dB) sound levels for each model site (shallow and deep). Acoustic ranges to the 95<sup>th</sup> percentile for marine mammals and sea turtles to PTS thresholds for the shallow and deep model sites (Tables 18 and 19, respectively) and have been derived.

### **6.3.2 PTS Injury and TTS Acoustic Ranges for Fish**

Acoustic ranges to fish regulatory thresholds were calculated for the unmitigated and mitigated (three sound attenuation levels of 6, 10, and 15 dB) sound levels for each model site (shallow and deep). Acoustic ranges to the 95<sup>th</sup> percentile for marine mammals and sea turtles to PTS and TTS thresholds for the shallow (Tables 20 and 21) and deep model (Tables 22 and 23) sites, respectively have been derived.

#### **6.3.3 Behavioral Acoustic Ranges for Marine Mammals, Sea Turtles, and Fish**

Acoustic ranges to the behavior regulatory thresholds for marine mammals, sea turtles, and fishes were calculated for the unmitigated and mitigated (three sound attenuation levels of 6, 10, and 15 dB) sound levels for each model site (shallow and deep). Acoustic ranges to the 95<sup>th</sup> percentile for the behavior thresholds for the shallow and deep model sites (Tables 24 and 25, respectively) have been derived for marine mammals, sea turtles, and fish.

# **6.4 MODELED RANGES TO ACOUSTIC THRESHOLDS FOR IMPACT PILE DRIVING OF CONDUCTOR BARREL**

Acoustic ranges to the regulatory thresholds for marine mammals, sea turtles, and fish have been calculated based on the results of the acoustic modeling for the impact pile driving of the conductor barrel at two model sites. A description of how these ranges were calculated is provided in Section 3.1.1.

Acoustic ranges to marine mammal and sea turtle regulatory thresholds were calculated for the unmitigated sound levels for each model site (Monmouth and Wolfe's Pond) (Table 26). Acoustic ranges to fish regulatory thresholds were calculated for the unmitigated sound levels for each model site (Monmouth and Wolfe's Pond) (Tables 27 and 28). Acoustic ranges to the behavioral regulatory thresholds for marine mammals, sea turtles, and fishes were calculated for the unmitigated sound levels for each model site (Table 29).

## **6.5 MODELED RANGES TO ACOUSTIC THRESHOLDS FOR VIBRATORY PILE DRIVING**

### **6.5.1 Cofferdam Installation/Extraction**

Acoustic ranges to the regulatory thresholds for marine mammals, sea turtles, and fish have been calculated based on the results of the acoustic modeling for the vibratory pile driving of the cofferdam for each of the two model sites. A description of how these ranges were calculated is provided in Section 3.1.1.

**Table 18. Acoustic Ranges (m) (95th Percentile) for Impact Pile Driving at the Shallow Model Site to the Unmitigated and Mitigated (Three Sound Attenuation Levels) PTS Thresholds for Marine Mammals (NMFS, 2018) and Sea Turtles (DoN, 2017) for the Atlantic Shores North Construction Period. The Peak (Lpk) Thresholds are Unweighted While the SEL (LE) Thresholds are Weighted According to the Hearing Group and are Accumulated over 24-hrs.**



**Table 18. Acoustic Ranges (m) (95th Percentile) for Impact Pile Driving at the Shallow Model Site to the Unmitigated and Mitigated (Three Sound Attenuation Levels) PTS Thresholds for Marine Mammals (NMFS, 2018) and Sea Turtles (DoN, 2017) for the Atlantic Shores North Construction Period. The Peak (Lpk) Thresholds are Unweighted While the SEL (LE) Thresholds are Weighted According to the Hearing Group and are Accumulated over 24-hrs.**



\*LFC= low frequency cetaceans; MFC=mid-frequency cetaceans; HFC=high frequency cetaceans; PW=phocid pinnipeds in water; TU=sea turtles

**Table 19. Acoustic Ranges (m) (95th Percentile) for Impact Pile Driving at the Deep Model Site to the Unmitigated and Mitigated (Three Sound Attenuation Levels) PTS Thresholds for Marine Mammals (NMFS, 2018) and Sea Turtles (DoN, 2017) for the Atlantic Shores North Construction Period. The Peak (Lpk) Thresholds are Unweighted While the SEL (LE) Thresholds are Weighted According to the Hearing Group and are Accumulated over 24-hrs.**



**Table 19. Acoustic Ranges (m) (95th Percentile) for Impact Pile Driving at the Deep Model Site to the Unmitigated and Mitigated (Three Sound Attenuation Levels) PTS Thresholds for Marine Mammals (NMFS, 2018) and Sea Turtles (DoN, 2017) for the Atlantic Shores North Construction Period. The Peak (Lpk) Thresholds are Unweighted While the SEL (LE) Thresholds are Weighted According to the Hearing Group and are Accumulated over 24-hrs.**



\*LFC= low frequency cetaceans; MFC=mid-frequency cetaceans; HFC=high frequency cetaceans; PW=phocid pinnipeds in water; TU=sea turtles

**Table 20. Acoustic Ranges (m) (95th Percentile) for Impact Pile Driving at the Shallow Model Site to the Unmitigated and Mitigated (Three Sound Attenuation Levels) PTS (Peak and SEL) and TTS Thresholds for Fish for the Atlantic Shores North Construction Period (Popper et al. 2014). The SEL (LE) and Peak Injury (Lpk) Thresholds are Unweighted.**



**Table 20. Acoustic Ranges (m) (95th Percentile) for Impact Pile Driving at the Shallow Model Site to the Unmitigated and Mitigated (Three Sound Attenuation Levels) PTS (Peak and SEL) and TTS Thresholds for Fish for the Atlantic Shores North Construction Period (Popper et al. 2014). The SEL (LE) and Peak Injury (Lpk) Thresholds are Unweighted.**



**Table 20. Acoustic Ranges (m) (95th Percentile) for Impact Pile Driving at the Shallow Model Site to the Unmitigated and Mitigated (Three Sound Attenuation Levels) PTS (Peak and SEL) and TTS Thresholds for Fish for the Atlantic Shores North Construction Period (Popper et al. 2014). The SEL (LE) and Peak Injury (Lpk) Thresholds are Unweighted.**



#### **Table 21. Acoustic Ranges (m) (95th Percentile) for the Impact Pile Driving at the Shallow Model Site to Injury Thresholds for Fish (FHWG, 2008) for the Atlantic Shores North Construction Period. The Peak (LE) and Peak Injury (Lpk) thresholds are unweighted.**



### **Table 21. Acoustic Ranges (m) (95th Percentile) for the Impact Pile Driving at the Shallow Model Site to Injury Thresholds for Fish (FHWG, 2008) for the Atlantic Shores North Construction Period. The Peak (LE) and Peak Injury (Lpk) thresholds are unweighted.**



**Table 22. Acoustic Ranges (m) (95th Percentile) for Impact Pile Driving of the Deep Model Site to the Unmitigated and Mitigated (Three Sound Attenuation Levels) PTS (Peak and SEL) and TTS Thresholds for Fish for the Atlantic Shores North Construction Period (Popper et al. 2014). The SEL (LE) and Peak Injury (Lpk) Thresholds are Unweighted.**



**Table 22. Acoustic Ranges (m) (95th Percentile) for Impact Pile Driving of the Deep Model Site to the Unmitigated and Mitigated (Three Sound Attenuation Levels) PTS (Peak and SEL) and TTS Thresholds for Fish for the Atlantic Shores North Construction Period (Popper et al. 2014). The SEL (LE) and Peak Injury (Lpk) Thresholds are Unweighted.**



**Table 22. Acoustic Ranges (m) (95th Percentile) for Impact Pile Driving of the Deep Model Site to the Unmitigated and Mitigated (Three Sound Attenuation Levels) PTS (Peak and SEL) and TTS Thresholds for Fish for the Atlantic Shores North Construction Period (Popper et al. 2014). The SEL (LE) and Peak Injury (Lpk) Thresholds are Unweighted.**



#### **Table 23. Acoustic Ranges (m) (95th Percentile) for Impact Pile Driving at the Deep Model Site to Injury Thresholds for Fish (FHWG, 2008) for the Atlantic Shores North Construction Period. The Peak (Lpk) and SEL (LE) thresholds are unweighted.**



#### **Table 23. Acoustic Ranges (m) (95th Percentile) for Impact Pile Driving at the Deep Model Site to Injury Thresholds for Fish (FHWG, 2008) for the Atlantic Shores North Construction Period. The Peak (Lpk) and SEL (LE) thresholds are unweighted.**



Acoustic ranges to marine mammal and sea turtle regulatory thresholds were calculated for each model site (Monmouth, NJ and Wolfe's Pond, NY). Acoustic ranges to the 95<sup>th</sup> percentile for marine mammals and sea turtles to PTS and behavioral thresholds for each model site for each modeled month (Table 30) and for fish to PTS, TTS, and behavioral thresholds (Table 31) have been derived for four representative months.

# **6.5.2 Goal Post Installation/Extraction**

Acoustic ranges to the regulatory thresholds for marine mammals, sea turtles, and fish have been calculated based on the results of the acoustic modeling for the vibratory pile driving of the goal post for each of the two model sites. A description of how these ranges were calculated is provided in Section 3.1.1.

Acoustic ranges to marine mammal and sea turtle regulatory thresholds were calculated for each model site (Monmouth, NJ and Wolfe's Pond, NY). Acoustic ranges to the 95<sup>th</sup> percentile for marine mammals and sea turtles to PTS and behavioral thresholds for each model site for each modeled month (Table 32) and for fish to PTS, TTS, and behavioral thresholds (Table 33) have been derived for four representative months.

#### **Table 24. Acoustic Ranges (m) (95th Percentile) for impact Pile Driving at the Shallow Model Site to Behavioral Thresholds for Marine Mammals (NOAA, 2005), Sea Turtles (DoN, 2017), and Fishes (GARFO, 2022) for the Atlantic Shores North Construction Period.**



### **Table 24. Acoustic Ranges (m) (95th Percentile) for impact Pile Driving at the Shallow Model Site to Behavioral Thresholds for Marine Mammals (NOAA, 2005), Sea Turtles (DoN, 2017), and Fishes (GARFO, 2022) for the Atlantic Shores North Construction Period.**



**Table 25. Acoustic Ranges (m) (95th Percentile) for Impact Pile Driving at the Deep Model Site to Behavioral Thresholds for Marine Mammals (NOAA, 2005), Sea Turtles (DoN, 2017), and Fishes (GARFO, 2022) for the Atlantic Shores North Construction Period.**



**Table 25. Acoustic Ranges (m) (95th Percentile) for Impact Pile Driving at the Deep Model Site to Behavioral Thresholds for Marine Mammals (NOAA, 2005), Sea Turtles (DoN, 2017), and Fishes (GARFO, 2022) for the Atlantic Shores North Construction Period.**



**Table 26. Acoustic Ranges (m) (95th Percentile) to the PTS Thresholds for Marine Mammals (NMFS, 2018) and Sea Turtles (DoN, 2017) from Unmitigated Impact Pile Driving for the Installation or Removal of the Conductor Barrel at the Monmouth, NJ and Wolfe's Pond, NY Modeling Sites for Four Representative Months. The Peak (Lpk) Thresholds are Unweighted While the SEL (LE) Thresholds are Weighted According to the Hearing Group and are Accumulated over 24-hrs These Ranges are Based on the Assumption of 10 Hours of Pile Driving, Which is the Installation of a Single Conductor Barrel.** 



**Table 27. Acoustic Ranges (m) (95th Percentile) to the PTS (Peak and SEL) and TTS Thresholds for Fish (Popper et al. 2014) from Unmitigated Impact Pile Driving for the Installation or Removal of the Conductor Barrel at the Monmouth, NJ and Wolfe's Pond, NY Modeling Sites for Four Representative Months. The SEL (LE) and Peak Injury (Lpk) Thresholds are Unweighted. These Ranges are Based on the Assumption of 10 Hours of Pile Driving, Which is the Installation of a Single Conductor Barrel.**



**Table 28. Acoustic Ranges (m) (95th Percentile) to Injury Thresholds for Fish (FHWG, 2008) from Unmitigated Impact Pile Driving for the Installation or Removal of the Conductor Barrel at the Monmouth, NJ and Wolfe's Pond, NY Modeling Sites for Four Representative Months. The Peak (Lpk) and SEL (LE) thresholds are unweighted. These Ranges are Based on the Assumption of 10 hours of Pile Driving, Which is the Installation of a Single Conductor Barrel.**



**Table 29. Acoustic Ranges (m) (95th Percentile) to Behavioral Thresholds for Marine Mammals (NOAA, 2005), Sea Turtles (DoN, 2017), and Fishes (GARFO, 2022) from Unmitigated Impact Pile Driving for the Installation or Removal of the Conductor Barrel at the Monmouth, NJ and Wolfe's Pond, NY Modeling Sites for Four Representative Months.**



**Table 30. Acoustic Ranges (m) (95th Percentile) to PTS and Behavioral Thresholds for Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles Resulting from Unmitigated Vibratory Pile Driving for the Atlantic Shores North Cofferdam Installation and Removal at the Monmouth, NJ and Wolfe's Pond, NY Modeling Sites for Four Representative Months. Ranges Were Determined Assuming 43.4 Minutes of Daily Activity at the Wolfe's Pond, NJ Location and 109.2 Minutes at the Monmouth, NY Location.** 



**Table 31. Acoustic Ranges (m) (95th Percentile) to the PTS, TTS, and Behavioral Thresholds for Fish Resulting from Unmitigated Vibratory Pile Driving for the Atlantic Shores North Cofferdam Installation or Removal at the Monmouth, NJ and Wolfe's Pond, NY Modeling Sites for Four Representative Months. Ranges Were Determined Assuming 43.4 Minutes of Daily Activity at the Wolfe's Pond Location and 109.2 Minutes at the Monmouth Location.**



**Table 32. Acoustic Ranges (m) (95th Percentile) to PTS and Behavioral Thresholds for Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles Resulting from Unmitigated Vibratory Pile Driving for the Atlantic Shores North Goal Post Installation and Removal at the Monmouth, NJ and Wolfe's Pond, NY Modeling Sites for Four Representative Months. Ranges Were Determined Assuming 4 Hours of Daily Activity at Either Location.** 



**Table 33. Acoustic Ranges (m) (95th Percentile) to the PTS, TTS, and Behavioral Thresholds for Fish Resulting from Unmitigated Vibratory Pile Driving for the Atlantic Shores North Goal Post Installation or Removal at the Monmouth, NJ and Wolfe's Pond, NY Modeling Sites for Four Representative Months. Ranges Were Determined Assuming 4 Hours of Daily Activity at Either Location.** 



### **6.6 EXPOSURE-BASED RANGES TO THRESHOLDS FOR IMPACT PILE DRIVING**

Exposure-based ranges to regulatory thresholds for marine mammals and sea turtles were calculated for the unmitigated and mitigated (three sound attenuation levels of 6, 10, and 15 dB) sound levels for each model site (shallow and deep) based on the animat modeling of marine mammal and sea turtle acoustic exposures to impact pile driving sources. Exposurebased ranges to the 95<sup>th</sup> percentile for injury and behavior thresholds for the shallow and deep model sites for each impact pile driving model scenario have been derived for marine mammals and sea turtles (Tables 34 through 49).

# **6.7 ACOUSTIC EXPOSURE ESTIMATES FOR MARINE MAMMALS AND SEA TURTLES**

## **6.7.1 Impact Pile Driving of Foundations**

The number of annual, unmitigated and mitigated (6-, 10-, and 15-dB sound level reduction) acoustic exposure estimates of marine mammals and sea turtles for each of the two years of impact pile driving (monopile and pin piled) construction have been derived for each of the two proposed construction schedules (Table 1) and each model site (Appendix C; Tables C-1 to C-10). These annual acoustic exposures were combined to produce overall, or total, acoustic exposure estimates of marine mammals and sea turtles for unmitigated and mitigated (three sound attenuation levels) for Schedules 1 and 2 (Tables 50 to 52), using the largest acoustic exposures per species from the shallow and deep model sites. Since either of the monopiles (10-m or the 15-m) may be used for Schedule 1, acoustic exposures were estimated separately for both the 10-m and 15-m monopiles for Schedule 1 (Tables 50 and 52). Overall, the highest acoustic exposures were associated with the 15-m monopile for Schedule 1 (Table 50).

# **6.7.2 Impact Pile Driving of Conductor Barrels**

The number of seasonal, unmitigated acoustic exposure estimates of marine mammals for impact pile driving at each of the two representative model sites have been estimated for the installation or extraction of a single conductor barrel (Tables 53 and 54). The overall acoustic exposures for the installation and extraction of all 11 conductor barrels (eight in NJ and three in NY) have also been estimated (Table 55). Although all seasons were modeled for conductor barrel installation/extraction, the calculation of the overall acoustic exposures assumed that installation would occur in winter and extraction would occur in spring. These seasons were chosen for installation and extraction to allow for maximum flexibility in the installation and extraction since these seasons generally have the highest acoustic exposures. Acoustic exposures associated with impact pile driving for conductor barrel installation or removal have been reported herein to two decimal places, so that it appears that most species have 0.00 acoustic exposures or no exposures whereas the actual exposures are typically very, very small and would only be represented if exposures were reported to the fifth or sixth decimal place.

Acoustic exposures for sea turtles due to impact pile driving for conductor barrels were not calculated as sea turtle species are not reasonably expected to be present in the model areas during the modeled seasons of winter and spring. As cold-blooded animals, sea turtles depend upon the temperature of their surrounding environment to maintain their body temperatures. Winter and spring water temperatures off New Jersey and New York are too cold for sea turtle survival, so sea turtles migrate southward into warmer ocean environments during these seasons, only returning northward as the ocean temperatures begin warming.
**Table 34. PTS Exposure Ranges (m) for Unmitigated and Mitigated (Three Sound Attenuation Levels) Impact Pile Driving of a 10-m Monopile at the Atlantic Shores North Shallow Model Site (Model Scenario 1).**

## **Table 35. Behavior Exposure Ranges (m) for Unmitigated and Mitigated (Three Sound Attenuation Levels) Impact Pile Driving of a 10-m Monopile at the Atlantic Shores North Shallow Model Site (Model Scenario 1).**







**Table 37. Behavior Exposure Ranges (m) for Unmitigated and Mitigated (Three Sound Attenuation Levels) Impact Pile Driving of a 10-m Monopile at the Atlantic Shores North Deep Model Site (Model Scenario 1).**







**Table 38. PTS Exposure Ranges (m) for Unmitigated and Mitigated (Three Sound Attenuation Levels) Impact Pile Driving of a 15-m** 

Loggerhead turtle

0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 911 218 23 0 766 214 13 0 1001 153 0 0 0 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 1911 1218 123 10 1766 1214 13 10 11001 153 10 10

## **Table 39. Behavior Exposure Ranges (m) for Unmitigated and Mitigated (Three Sound Attenuation Levels) Impact Pile Driving of a 15-m Monopile at the Atlantic Shores North Shallow Model Site (Model Scenario 2).**





**Table 40. PTS Exposure Ranges (m) for Unmitigated and Mitigated (Three Sound Attenuation Levels) Impact Pile Driving of a 15-m Monopile at the Atlantic Shores North Deep Model Site (Model Scenario 2).**

**Table 41. Behavior Exposure Ranges (m) for Unmitigated and Mitigated (Three Sound Attenuation Levels) Impact Pile Driving of a 15-m Monopile at the Atlantic Shores North Deep Model Site (Model Scenario 2).**



#### **Table 42. PTS Exposure Ranges (m) for Unmitigated and Mitigated (Three Sound Attenuation Levels) Impact Pile Driving of a Jacket Foundation (Comprised of Four 5-m Pre-Piled Pin Piles) in a 24-hr Period at the Atlantic Shores North Shallow Model Site (Model Scenario 3).**



#### **Table 43. Behavior Exposure Ranges (m) for Unmitigated and Mitigated (Three Sound Attenuation Levels) Impact Pile Driving of a Jacket Foundation (Comprised of Four 5-m Pre-Piled Pin Piles) in a 24-hr Period at the Atlantic Shores North Shallow Model Site (Model Scenario 3).**



#### **Table 44. PTS Exposure Ranges (m) for Unmitigated and Mitigated (Three Sound Attenuation Levels) Impact Pile Driving of a Jacket Foundation (Comprised of Four 5-m Pre-Piled Pin Piles) in a 24-hr Period at the Atlantic Shores North Deep Model Site (Model Scenario 3).**



#### **Table 45. Behavior Exposure Ranges (m) for Unmitigated and Mitigated (Three Sound Attenuation Levels) Impact Pile Driving of a Jacket Foundation (Comprised of Four 5-m Pre-Piled Pin Piles) in a 24-hr Period at the Atlantic Shores North Deep Model Site (Model Scenario 3).**



#### **Table 46. PTS Exposure Ranges (m) for Unmitigated and Mitigated (Three Sound Attenuation Levels) Impact Pile Driving of an OSS Jacket Foundation (Comprised of Four 5-m Post-Piled Pin Piles) in a 24-hr Period at the Atlantic Shores North Shallow Model Site (Model Scenario 4).**



#### **Table 47. Behavior Exposure Ranges (m) for Unmitigated and Mitigated (Three Sound Attenuation Levels) Impact Pile Driving of an OSS Jacket Foundation (Comprised of Four 5-m Post-Piled Pin Piles) in a 24-hr Period at the Atlantic Shores North Shallow Model Site (Model Scenario 4).**



#### **Table 48. PTS Exposure Ranges (m) for Unmitigated and Mitigated (Three Sound Attenuation Levels) Impact Pile Driving of an OSS Jacket Foundation (Comprised of Four 5-m Post-Piled Pin Piles) in a 24-hr Period at the Atlantic Shores North Deep Model Site (Model Scenario 4).**



**Table 49. Behavior Exposure Ranges (m) for Unmitigated and Mitigated (Three Sound Attenuation Levels) Impact Pile Driving of an OSS Jacket Foundation (Comprised of Four 5-m Post-Piled Pin Piles) in a 24-hr Period at the Atlantic Shores North Deep Model Site (Model Scenario 4).**



**Table 50. Overall Acoustic Exposure Estimates of Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles for the Atlantic Shores North Project Based on Impact Pile Driving Installation Schedule 1 (15-m Monopiles and OSS Jackets, Which Include Four Post-Piled Pin Piles), Assuming that all Foundations are Installed at Either the Deep or the Shallow Model Site.**



**Table 50. Overall Acoustic Exposure Estimates of Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles for the Atlantic Shores North Project Based on Impact Pile Driving Installation Schedule 1 (15-m Monopiles and OSS Jackets, Which Include Four Post-Piled Pin Piles), Assuming that all Foundations are Installed at Either the Deep or the Shallow Model Site.**



**Table 51. Overall Acoustic Exposure Estimates of Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles for the Atlantic Shores North Project Based on Impact Pile Driving Installation Schedule 1 (10-m Monopiles and OSS Jackets, Which Include Four Post-Piled Pin Piles), Assuming that all Foundations are Installed at Either the Deep or the Shallow Model Site.**



**Table 51. Overall Acoustic Exposure Estimates of Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles for the Atlantic Shores North Project Based on Impact Pile Driving Installation Schedule 1 (10-m Monopiles and OSS Jackets, Which Include Four Post-Piled Pin Piles), Assuming that all Foundations are Installed at Either the Deep or the Shallow Model Site.**



**Table 52. Overall Acoustic Exposure Estimates of Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles for the Atlantic Shores North Project Based on Impact Pile Driving Installation Schedule 2 (Jackets and OSS Jackets, Which Each Include Four Pre- and Post-Piled Pin Piles, Respectively), Assuming that all Foundations are Installed at Either the Deep or the Shallow Model Site.**



**Table 52. Overall Acoustic Exposure Estimates of Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles for the Atlantic Shores North Project Based on Impact Pile Driving Installation Schedule 2 (Jackets and OSS Jackets, Which Each Include Four Pre- and Post-Piled Pin Piles, Respectively), Assuming that all Foundations are Installed at Either the Deep or the Shallow Model Site.**



<b>Marine</b>	<b>Marine Mammal</b> <b>Species</b>		<b>Seasonal Exposures Per Day and Per Conductor Barrel</b>											
<b>Mammal</b>			PTS $(L_E)$				PTS $(L_{pk})$				Behavior $(L_p)$			
<b>Hearing</b> Group			Winter	<b>Spring</b>	<b>Summer</b>	Fall	Winter	<b>Spring</b>	<b>Summer</b>	Fall	Winter	<b>Spring</b>	<b>Summer</b>	Fall
Low Frequency Cetaceans (LFC)	Common minke whale		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Fin whale		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Humpback whale		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	North Atlantic right whale		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Sei whale		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
MF Cetaceans (MFC)	Atlantic spotted dolphin		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Atlantic white sided dolphin		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Common Bottlenose dolphin	Western North Atlantic Northern Migratory Coastal Stock	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.04
	Long finned pilot whale		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Risso's dolphin		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Short-beaked common dolphin		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Short-finned pilot whale		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Sperm whale		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
High Frequency	Harbor porpoise		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

**Table 53. Seasonal Acoustic Exposure Estimates of Marine Mammals Based on Conductor Barrel Installation or Removal via Impact Pile Driving at the Atlantic Shores North Monmouth, NJ Representative Model Site, with No Sound Attenuation Applied.**





<b>Marine</b>	<b>Marine Mammal</b> <b>Species</b>		Seasonal Exposures Per Day and Per Conductor Barrel											
<b>Mammal</b>			$PTS(L_E)$				$PTS(L_{pk})$				<b>Behavior (L<sub>p</sub>)</b>			
<b>Hearing</b> Group			Winter	<b>Spring</b>	<b>Summer</b>	Fall	Winter	<b>Spring</b>	<b>Summer</b>	Fall	Winter	<b>Spring</b>	<b>Summer</b>	Fall
Low Frequency Cetaceans (LFC)	Common minke whale		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Fin whale		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Humpback whale		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	North Atlantic right whale		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Sei whale		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
<b>MF</b> Cetaceans (MFC)	Atlantic spotted dolphin		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Atlantic white sided dolphin		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Common <b>Bottlenose</b> dolphin	Western North Atlantic Northern Migratory Coastal Stock	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Long finned pilot whale		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Risso's dolphin		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Short-beaked common dolphin		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Short-finned pilot whale		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Sperm whale		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
High Frequency	Harbor porpoise		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

**Table 54. Seasonal Acoustic Exposure Estimates of Marine Mammals Based on Conductor Barrel Installation or Removal via Impact Pile Driving at the Atlantic Shores North Wolfe's Pond, NY Representative Model Site, with No Sound Attenuation Applied.**





**Table 55. Overall Acoustic Exposure Estimates of Marine Mammals Based on Installation and Extraction of 11 Conductor Barrels (Eight in NJ and Three in NY) via Impact Pile Driving during the Project, with No Sound Attenuation Applied.**



**Table 55. Overall Acoustic Exposure Estimates of Marine Mammals Based on Installation and Extraction of 11 Conductor Barrels (Eight in NJ and Three in NY) via Impact Pile Driving during the Project, with No Sound Attenuation Applied.**



# **6.7.3 Vibratory Pile Driving of Cofferdam**

The number of seasonal, unmitigated acoustic exposure estimates of marine mammals for vibratory pile driving at each of the two representative cofferdam model sites have been estimated for the installation or extraction of a single cofferdam (Tables 56 and 57). The overall acoustic exposures for the installation and extraction of all six cofferdams (four in NJ and two in NY) have also been estimated (Table 58). Although all seasons were modeled for cofferdam installation/extraction, the calculation of the overall acoustic exposures assumed that installation would occur in winter and extraction would occur in spring. These seasons were chosen for installation and extraction to allow for maximum flexibility in the installation and extraction of cofferdams since these seasons generally have the highest acoustic exposures. Acoustic exposures associated with vibratory pile driving for cofferdam installation or removal have been reported herein to two decimal places, so that it appears that most species have 0.00 acoustic exposures or no exposures whereas the actual exposures are typically very, very small and would only be represented if exposures were reported to the fifth or sixth decimal place.

Acoustic exposures for sea turtles due to vibratory pile driving for cofferdams were not calculated as sea turtle species are not reasonably expected to be present in the cofferdam model areas during the modeled seasons of winter and spring. As cold-blooded animals, sea turtles depend upon the temperature of their surrounding environment to maintain their body temperatures. Winter and spring water temperatures off New Jersey and New York are too cold for sea turtle survival, so sea turtles migrate southward into warmer ocean environments during these seasons, only returning northward as the ocean temperatures begin warming.

# **6.7.4 Vibratory Pile Driving of Goal Posts**

The number of seasonal, unmitigated acoustic exposure estimates of marine mammals for vibratory pile driving at each of the two representative model sites have been estimated for the installation or extraction of a single goal post (Tables 59 and 60). The overall acoustic exposures for the installation and extraction of all 11 goal posts (eight in NJ and three in NY) have also been estimated (Table 61). Although all seasons were modeled for goal post installation/extraction, the calculation of the overall acoustic exposures assumed that installation would occur in winter and extraction would occur in spring. These seasons were chosen for installation and extraction to allow for maximum flexibility in the installation and extraction since these seasons generally have the highest acoustic exposures. Acoustic exposures associated with vibratory pile driving for goal post installation or removal have been reported herein to two decimal places, so that it appears that most species have 0.00 acoustic exposures or no exposures whereas the actual exposures are typically very, very small and would only be represented if exposures were reported to the fifth or sixth decimal place.

Acoustic exposures for sea turtles due to vibratory pile driving for goal posts were not calculated as sea turtle species are not reasonably expected to be present in the model areas during the modeled seasons of winter and spring. As cold-blooded animals, sea turtles depend upon the temperature of their surrounding environment to maintain their body temperatures.

#### **Table 56. Seasonal Acoustic Exposure Estimates of Marine Mammals Based on Cofferdam Installation or Removal via Vibratory Pile Driving at the Atlantic Shores North Monmouth, NJ Representative Cofferdam Model Site, with No Sound Attenuation Applied.**



#### **Table 56. Seasonal Acoustic Exposure Estimates of Marine Mammals Based on Cofferdam Installation or Removal via Vibratory Pile Driving at the Atlantic Shores North Monmouth, NJ Representative Cofferdam Model Site, with No Sound Attenuation Applied.**



#### **Table 57. Seasonal Acoustic Exposure Estimates of Marine Mammals Based on Cofferdam Installation or Removal via Vibratory Pile Driving at the Atlantic Shores North Wolfe's Pond, NY Representative Cofferdam Model Site, with No Sound Attenuation Applied.**



**Table 57. Seasonal Acoustic Exposure Estimates of Marine Mammals Based on Cofferdam Installation or Removal via Vibratory Pile Driving at the Atlantic Shores North Wolfe's Pond, NY Representative Cofferdam Model Site, with No Sound Attenuation Applied.**



#### **Table 58. Overall Acoustic Exposure Estimates of Marine Mammals Based on Installation and Extraction of Six Cofferdams (Four in NJ and Two in NY) via Vibratory Pile Driving during the Project, with No Sound Attenuation Applied.**



#### **Table 58. Overall Acoustic Exposure Estimates of Marine Mammals Based on Installation and Extraction of Six Cofferdams (Four in NJ and Two in NY) via Vibratory Pile Driving during the Project, with No Sound Attenuation Applied.**


#### **Table 59. Seasonal Acoustic Exposure Estimates of Marine Mammals Based on Goal Post Installation or Removal via Vibratory Pile Driving at the Atlantic Shores North Monmouth, NJ Representative Model Site, with No Sound Attenuation Applied.**





**Table 60. Seasonal Acoustic Exposure Estimates of Marine Mammals Based on Goal Post Installation or Removal via Vibratory Pile Driving at the Atlantic Shores North Wolfe's Pond, NY Representative Model Site, with No Sound Attenuation Applied.**

**Table 60. Seasonal Acoustic Exposure Estimates of Marine Mammals Based on Goal Post Installation or Removal via Vibratory Pile Driving at the Atlantic Shores North Wolfe's Pond, NY Representative Model Site, with No Sound Attenuation Applied.**



#### **Table 61. Overall Acoustic Exposure Estimates of Marine Mammals Based on Installation and Extraction of 11 Goal Posts (Eight in NJ and Three in NY) via Vibratory Pile Driving during the Project, with No Sound Attenuation Applied.**



Winter and spring water temperatures off New Jersey and New York are too cold for sea turtle survival, so sea turtles migrate southward into warmer ocean environments during these seasons, only returning northward as the ocean temperatures begin warming.

## **7 DISCUSSION**

## **7.1 SOUND ATTENUATION LEVELS FOR MITIGATION**

## **7.2 SOURCES OF UNCERTAINTY**

Sources of uncertainties inherent in the modeling presented herein include animal densities, animal movements, and the pile driving spectrum.

## **7.2.1 Animal Density**

Animal density estimates are a source of uncertainty in modeling and analysis as they can result in large effects on the calculated number of acoustically exposed animals. The fidelity of animal density estimates improves as additional population level data are collected and both collection and analysis methodologies are refined.

Marine mammal density estimates used in this analysis were taken from the MGEL (2022), the methodology of which is based on Roberts et al. (2016). Sea turtle density estimates are based on DiMatteo et al. (2023), which represent recently updated density models for the Project area and Atlantic waters. These density estimates for marine mammals and sea turtles are the most recent and best available data for the Project area. Both density datasets were extrapolated over large ocean areas and averaged monthly or seasonally.

### **7.2.2 Animal Movements**

The movement parameters used to create the animat paths during the AIM simulations are based on the most recent and most complete reported values of real sea turtle and marine mammal swim and diving behavior (Appendix B, Table B-1). However, the recorded range of behavior may not be complete as little information is known about the movements of some marine mammal and sea turtle species. This uncertainty is considered to have a small potential to affect the number of exposed animals.

# **7.2.3 Source Spectra**

The derivation of pile driving source spectra for the pile driving hammers used for both impact and vibratory pile driving relied on modeled information or use of surrogate data for similar hammers and pile diameters. Although these source spectra represent the best available estimations for the Project scenarios, they would never be as robust as measured source data.

# **7.2.4 Acoustic Propagation Modeling**

The Project will span multiple seasons, with the modeled construction period represented by three seasons or monthly periods, although the third season only is represented by one month (December). Two sites within the Project lease area were selected to best represent the environment of the Project area as there is little bathymetric difference across the Project area while two nearshore model sites were selected to represent the vibratory pile driving to install or remove cofferdams.

### **8 LITERATURE CITED**

- Aguilar, A., & García-Vernet, R. (2018). Fin whale *Balaenoptera physalus*. Pages 368-371 in B. Wursig, J.G.M. Thewissen, & K.M. Kovacs, (Eds). *Encyclopedia of marine mammals, 3rd ed*. San Diego, California: Academic Press.
- Aguilar Soto, N., et al. (2008). Cheetahs of the deep sea: Deep foraging sprints in short-finned pilot whales off Tenerife (Canary Islands). *Journal of Animal Ecology, 77*(5): 936 - 947.
- Amron, A., R.R. Hidayat, M.D.N. Meinita, and M. Trenggono. (2021). Underwater noise of traditional fishing boats in Cilacap waters, Indonesia. *Heliyon* 7: e08364. [https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e08364.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e08364)
- Ansmann, I. C., Goold, J. C., Evans, P. G. H., Simmonds, M., & Keith, S. G. (2007). Variation in the whistle characteristics of short-beaked common dolphins, Delphinus delphis, at two locations around the British Isles. *Journal of the Marine Biological Association of the United Kingdom, 87*(01), 19-26.
- Arendt, M. D., Segars, A. L., Byrd, J. I., Boynton, J., Schwenter, J. A., Whitaker, J. D., & Parker, L. (2012). Migration, distribution, and diving behavior of adult male loggerhead sea turtles (*Caretta caretta*) following dispersal from a major breeding aggregation in the Western North Atlantic. *Marine Biology, 159*(1), 113-125. doi:10.1007/s00227-011-1826-0.
- Arranz, P., Benoit-Bird, K. J., Southall, B. L., Calambokidis, J., Friedlaender, A. S., & Tyack, P. L. (2018). Risso's dolphins plan foraging dives. *Journal of Experimental Biology, 221*, jeb165209. doi:10.1242/jeb.165209.
- Asselin, S., Hammill, M. O., & Barrette, C. (1993). Underwater vocalizations of ice breeding grey seals. *Canadian Journal of Zoology, 71*, 2211-2219.
- Au, W. W. L. (1993). *The sonar of dolphins*. Springer-Verlag, New York.
- Au, W. W. L. (1993). *The sonar of dolphins*. Springer-Verlag, New York.
- Au, W. W. L., A. A. Pack, M. O. Lammers, L. M. Herman, M. H. Deakos, & K. Andrews. (2006). Acoustic properties of humpback whale songs. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 120*:1103-1110.
- Azevedo, A. F., Flach, L., Bisi, T. L., Andrade, L. G., Dorneles, P. R., & Lailson-Brito, J. (2010). Whistles emitted by Atlantic spotted dolphins (*Stenella frontalis*) in southeastern Brazil. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 127*(4), 2646-2651. doi:DOI: 10.1121/1.3308469
- Baird, R. W. (2009). Risso's dolphin *Grampus griseus*. Pages 975-976 *in* W. F. Perrin, B. Würsig and J. G. M. Thewissen eds. *Encyclopedia of marine mammals.* Academic Press, New York.
- Baird, R. W., Borsani, J. F., Hanson, M. B., & Tyack, P. L. (2002). Diving and night-time behavior of long-finned pilot whales in the Ligurian Sea. *Marine Ecology Progress Series, 237*, 301- 305.
- Bartol, S.M., & Bartol, I.K. (2011). *Hearing capabilities of loggerhead sea turtles (Caretta caretta) throughout ontogeny: An integrative approach involving behavioral and electrophysiological techniques*. Final report; JIP Grant No.22 07-14. E&P Sound and Marine Life Programme. 37 pages.
- Baumgartner, M., & Mate, B. (2003). The foraging ecology of North Atlantic right whales and its potential energetic implications. Paper presented at the Abstracts, Fifteenth Biennial Conference on the Biology of Marine Mammals. 14-19 December 2003. pp. 12).
- Bellmann, M. A., May, A., Wendt, T., Gerlach, S., Remmers, P., & Brinkmann, J. (2020). Underwater noise during percussive pile driving: Influencing factors on pile-driving noise and technical possibilities to comply with noise mitigation values. Supported by the Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMU). Commissioned and managed by the Federal Maritime and Hydrographic Agency (BSH). Retrieved from Oldenburg, Germany:
- Bigg, M. (1981). Harbour seal *Phoca vitulina* and *P. largha*. In S. H. Ridgway & R. J. Harrison (Eds.). *Handbook of marine mammals*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Blanco, G. S., Morreale, S. J., Seminoff, J. A., Paladino, F. V., Piedra, R., & Spotila, J. R. (2013). Movements and diving behavior of internesting green turtles along Pacific Costa Rica. *Integrated Zoology 8*(3), 293-306. doi:10.1111/j.1749-4877.2012.00298.x.
- Blix, A. S., & Folkow, L. P. (1995). Daily energy expenditure in free living minke whales. Acta Physiologica Scandinavica, 153(1), 61-66. doi: 10.1111/j.1748-1716.1995.tb09834.x.
- Broderick, A. C., Coyne, M. S., Fuller, W. J., Glen, F., & Godley, B. J. (2007). Fidelity and overwintering of sea turtles. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B, 274*, 1533–1538. doi:10.1098/rspb.2007.0211.
- Buckingham, M. J. (2005). Compressional and shear wave properties of marine sediments: Comparisons between theory and data. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 117*:137-152. doi.org/10.1121/1.1810231.
- Burrows, J. A., Johnston, D. W., Straley, J. M., Chenoweth, E. M., Ware, C., Curtice, C., . . . *Friedlaender, A. S. (2016). Prey density and depth affect the fine-scale foraging behavior* of humpback whales Megaptera novaeangliae in Sitka Sound, Alaska, USA. Marine Ecology Progress Series, 561, 245-260. doi: 10.3354/meps11906.
- Byles, R. A., & Plotkin, P. T. (1994). Comparison of the migratory behavior of the congeneric sea turtles *Lepidochelys olivacea* and *L. kempii*. In B. A. Schroeder, & Witherington, B.E. (compilers) (Ed.), *Proceedings of the Thirteenth Annual Symposium on Sea Turtle Biology and Conservation (NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SEFSC-341)* (pp. 39). Jekyll Island, GA: Southeast Fisheries Science Center, National Marine Fisheries Service.
- Byrne, R., Fish, J., Doyle, T. K., & Houghton, J. D. R. (2009). Tracking leatherback turtles (*Dermochelys coriacea*) during consecutive inter-nesting intervals: Further support for direct transmitter attachment. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology, 377*(2), 68-75. doi:10.1016/j.jembe.2009.06.013.
- Calderan, S., Miller, B., Collins, K., Ensor, P., Double, M., Leaper, R., & Barlow, J. (2014). Lowfrequency vocalizations of sei whales (*Balaenoptera borealis*) in the Southern Ocean. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 136*(6), EL418-EL423. doi:10.1121/1.4902422.
- Caldwell, M. C., & D. K. Caldwell. (1969). Simultaneous but different narrow-band sound emissions by a captive eastern Pacific pilot whale, *Globicephala scammoni*. Mammalia 33:505-508.
- Carnes, M. R. 2009. Description and evaluation of GDEM-V 3.0. Naval Research Laboratory. 24 pp.
- Casale, P., & Tucker, A.D. (2017). *Caretta caretta. The IUCN red list of threatened species 2017*: e.T3897A119333622. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2017- 2.RLTS.T3897A119333622.en>.
- Castellote, M., C. W. Clark, & M. O. Lammers. (2012). Acoustic and behavioural changes by fin whales (*Balaenoptera physalu*s) in response to shipping and airgun noise. *Biological Conservation, 147*:115-122.
- Cerchio, S., Trudelle, L., Zerbini, A. N., Charrassin, J. B., Geyer, Y., Mayer, F. X., . . . Rosenbaum, H. C. (2016). Satellite telemetry of humpback whales off Madagascar reveals insights on breeding behavior and long-range movements within the southwest Indian Ocean. *Marine Ecology Progress Series, 562*, 193-209. doi: 10.3354/meps11951.
- Charrier, I., Jeantet, L., Maucourt, L., Régis, S., Lecerf, N., Benhalilou, A., & Chevallier, D. (2022). First evidence of underwater vocalizations in green sea turtles *Chelonia mydas. Endangered Species Research 48, 31-41*. doi: 10.3354/esr01185.
- Chu, K. C. (1988). Dive times and ventilation patterns of singing humpback whales (Megaptera novaeangliae). *Canadian Journal of Zoology, 66*(6), 1322-1327.
- Cipriano, F. (2009). Atlantic white-sided dolphin *Lagenorhynchus acutus*. Pages 56-58 in W. F. Perrin, B. Würsig, & J. G. M. Thewissen (Eds.). *Encyclopedia of marine mammals* (2nd ed.). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Clarke, M. R. (1976). Observations on sperm whale diving. *Journal of the Marine Biological Association of the United Kingdom, 56*, 809-810.
- Collins, M. D. (1993). A split-step Padé solution for the parabolic equation method. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 93*(4), 1736-1742. doi:10.1121/1.406739
- Cook, S. L., & Forrest, T. G. (2005). Sounds produced by nesting leatherback sea turtles (*Dermochelys coriacea*). *Herpetological Review, 36*(4), 387-390.
- Cooke, J. G. (2018). *Balaenoptera acutorostrata*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2018: e.T2474A50348265.
- Corkeron, P. J., & S. M. Van Parijs. (2001). Vocalizations of eastern Australian Risso's dolphins, *Grampus griseus*. *Canadian Journal of Zoology 79*:160-164.
- Cranford, T. W., & Krysl, P. (2015). Fin whale sound reception mechanisms: Skull vibration enables low-frequency hearing. *PLoS ONE, 10*(1), e0116222. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0116222.
- Croll, D. A., Tershy, B. R., Acevedo, A., & Levin, P. (1999). Marine vertebrates and low frequency sound. Technical report for LFA EIS. Prepared by Marine Mammal and Seabird Ecology Group, Institute of Marine Sciences, University of California, Santa Cruz, CA.
- Croll, D. A., Acevedo-Gutierrez, A., Tershy, B. R., & Urban-Ramirez, J. (2001). The diving behavior of blue and fin whales: is dive duration shorter than expected based on oxygen stores? Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology - Part A: Molecular and Integrative Physiology, 129(4), 797-809.
- Dahl, P. H., & Reinhall, P. G. (2013). Beam forming of the underwater sound field from impact pile driving. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 134*(1), EL1-EL6. doi:10.1121/1.4807430
- Dahl, P. H., de Jong, C. A. F., & Popper, A. N. (2015). The underwater sound field from impact pile driving and its potential effects on marine life. *Acoustics Today, 11*(2), 18-25.
- Davis, R. W., Jaquet, N., Gendron, D., Markaida, U., Bazzino, G., & Gilly, W. (2007). Diving behavior of sperm whales in relation to behavior of a major prey species, the jumbo squid, in the Gulf of California, Mexico. *Marine Ecology Progress Series, 333*, 291-302.
- Davis, R. W., Worthy, G. A. J., Würsig, B., & Lynn, S. K. (1996). Diving behavior and at-sea movements of an Atlantic spotted dolphin in the Gulf of Mexico. *Marine Mammal Science, 12*(4), 569-581.
- Davis, G. E., Baumgartner, M. F., Corkeron, P. J., Bell, J., Berchok, C., Bonnell, J. M., . . . Van Parijs, S. M. (2020). Exploring movement patterns and changing distributions of baleen whales in the western North Atlantic using a decade of passive acoustic data. *Global Change Biology*, 1-29. doi:10.1111/gcb.15191.
- DiMatteo, A., Roberts, J.J., Jones, D., Garrison, L., Hart, K.M., Kenney, R.D., Khan, C., McLellan, W.A., Lomac-MacNair, K., Palka, D., Rickard, M.E., Roberts, K., Zoidis, A.M., and Sparks, L. (2023). Sea turtle density surface models along the United States Atlantic coast; Version 1. Prepared for Naval Undersea Warfare Center Division Newport, Department of the Navy, by Duke University Marine Geospatial Ecology Laboratory. Technical Report in Preparation.
- Dodd, C. K. (1988). Synopsis of the biological data on the loggerhead sea turtle *Caretta caretta*  (Linnaeus 1758). *U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Biological Report, 88*(14), 1-110.
- DoI (Department of the Interior). (2014.) Endangered and threatened wildlife and plants; Designation of critical habitat for the northwest Atlantic Ocean distinct population segment of the loggerhead sea turtle; Final rule. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior. *Federal Register 79*(132), 39756-39854.
- DoN (Department Of Navy). (2017). Criteria and thresholds for U.S. Navy acoustic and explosive effects analysis (Phase III) (Technical report). San Diego, CA: SSC Pacific, US Navy. 194 pages.
- Dolphin, W. F. (1987). Dive behavior and estimated energy expenditure of foraging humpback whales in southeast Alaska. *Canadian Journal of Zoology, 65*(2), 354-362.
- Dow Piniak, W. E., S. A. Eckert, C. A. Harms, & E. M. Stringer. (2012). *Underwater hearing sensitivity of the leatherback sea turtle (Dermochelys coriacea): Assessing the potential effect of anthropogenic noise*. Bureau of Ocean Energy Management Headquarters, Herndon, Virginia. OCS Study BOEM 1156. 35 pages.
- Doyle, T. K., Houghton, J. D. R., O'Súilleabháin, P. F., Hobson, V. J., Marnell, F., Davenport, J., & Hays, G. C. (2008). Leatherback turtles satellite-tagged in European waters. *Endangered Species Research, 4*, 23-31. doi: 10.3354/esr00076.
- Dunlop, R. A., D. H. Cato, & M. J. Noad. (2014). Evidence of a Lombard response in migrating humpback whales (*Megaptera novaeangliae*). *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 136*:430.
- Dunlop, R. A., M. J. Noad, R. D. Mccauley, E. Kniest, R. Slade, D. Paton, & D. H. Cato. (2018). A behavioural dose-response model for migrating humpback whales and seismic air gun noise. *Marine Pollution Bulletin, 133*:506-516.
- Eckert, S. A. (2002). Swim speed and movement patterns of gravid leatherback sea turtles (*Dermochelys coriacea*) at St Croix, US Virgin Islands. *Journal of Experimental Biology, 205*(23), 3689-3697.
- Edds, P. L. (1988). Characteristics of finback *Balaenoptera physalus* vocalizations in the St. Lawrence Estuary. *Bioacoustics, 1*:131-149.
- Edds-Walton, P. L. (2000). Vocalisations of minke whales (*Baleanoptera acutorostrata*) in the St. Lawrence Estuary. *Bioacoustics, 1*:31-50.
- Eguchi, T., & Harvey, J. T. (2005). Diving behavior of the Pacific harbor seal (*Phoca vitulina richardii*) in Monterey Bay, California. *Marine Mammal Science, 21*(2), 283-295.
- Evans, W. E. (1971). Orientation behavior of delphinids: Radio telemetric studies*. Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, 188*, 142-160.
- Evans, W. E. (1973). Echolocation by marine delphinids and one species of fresh-water dolphin. The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 54:191-199.
- Evans, W. E. (1994). Common dolphin, white-bellied porpoise Delphinus delphis Linnaeus, 1758. Pages 191-224 in .H. Ridgeway and R. Harrison, (Eds.). Handbook of marine mammals. Volume 5: The first book of dolphins. New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Ferrara, C. R., Vogt, R. C., Harfush, M. R., Sousa-Lima, R. S., Albavera, E., & Tavera, A. (2014). First evidence of leatherback turtle (*Dermochelys coriacea*) embryos and hatchlings emitting sounds. *Chelonian Conservation and Biology, 13*(1), 110–114.
- Ferrara, C.R., Vogt, R.C., Sousa-Lima, R.S., Lenz, A., & Morales-Mavil, J.E. (2019). Sound communication in embryos and hatchlings of *Lepidochelys kempii*. Chelonian Conservation Biology 18, 279−283.
- FFWCC (Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission). (2019). Index nesting beach survey totals (1989-2019). Retrieved from http://myfwc.com/research/wildlife/seaturtles/nesting/beach-survey-totals/.
- FHWG (Fisheries Hydroacoustics Working Group). (2008). *Agreement in principle for interim citeria for injury to fish from pile driving activities.* Technical/Policy Meeting June 11, 2008, Vancouver, Washington.
- Fish, J. F., & C. W. Turl. (1976). *Acoustic source levels of four species of small whales.* Undersea Sciences Department, Naval Undersea Center. 13 pp.
- Frankel, A. S., & C. W. Clark. (2000). Behavioral responses of humpback whales (*Megaptera novaeangliae*) to full-scale ATOC signals. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 108*:1930-1937.
- Frankel, A. S., & Gabriele, C. M. (2017). Predicting the acoustic exposure of humpback whales from cruise and tour vessel noise in Glacier Bay, Alaska, under different management strategies. *Endangered Species Research, 34*, 397-415. doi:10.3354/esr00857.
- Frankel, A. S., C. W. Clark, L. M. Herman, & C. M. Gabriele. (1995). Spatial distribution, habitat utilization, and social interactions of humpback whales, *Megaptera novaeangliae*, off Hawai'i, determined using acoustic and visual techniques. *Canadian Journal of Zoology, 73*:1134-1146.
- Fristrup, K. M., L. T. Hatch, & C. W. Clark. (2003). Variation in humpback whale (*Megaptera novaeangliae*) song length in relation to low-frequency sound broadcasts. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 113*:3411-3424.

- Fugro USA Marine. (2022). Measured and derived geotechnical parameters and final results: Lease area OCS-A 0549, soil boring locations/deep CPTs, Atlantic Shores Offshore Wind seabed geotechnical investigation; Final report. Document number 02.21020004-6 02. Prepared for Atlantic Shores Offshore Wind LLC. Houston, TX: Fugro USA Marine, Inc. 1,891 pp.
- Gambell, R. (1985). Sei whale *Balaenoptera borealis* Lesson, 1828. In S. H. Ridgway & R. Harrison (Eds.), *Handbook of marine mammals (Vol. 3: The sirenians and baleen whales*, pp. 155-170). San Diego, California: Academic Press.
- GARFO (Greater Atlantic Regional Fisheries Office). (2019). GARFO acoustics tool: Analyzing the effects of pile driving on ESA-listed species in the Greater Atlantic Region.
- Gaskin, D. E., Arnold, P. W., & Blair, B. A. (1974). *Phocoena phocoena*. Mammalian Species, 42, 1-8.
- Godley, B. J., Richardson, S., Broderick, A. C., Coyne, M. S., Glen, F., & Hays, G. C. (2002). Longterm satellite telemetry of the movements and habitat utilisation by green turtles in the Mediterranean. *Ecography, 25,* 352-362.
- Godley, B. J., Broderick, A. C., Glen, F., & Hays, G. C. (2003). Post-nesting movements and submergence patterns of loggerhead marine turtles in the Mediterranean assessed by satellite tracking. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology, 287*(1), 119-134.
- Goold, J. C., & Jones, S. E. (1995). Time and frequency domain characteristics of sperm whale clicks. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 98*(3), 1279-1291.
- Guerra, M., Hickmott, L., van der Hoop, J., Rayment, W., Leunissen, E., Slooten, E., & Moore, M. (2017). Diverse foraging strategies by a marine top predator: Sperm whales exploit pelagic and demersal habitats in the Kaikōura submarine canyon. *Deep Sea Research Part I: Oceanographic Research Papers, 128*, 98-108. doi:10.1016/j.dsr.2017.08.012.
- Guzman, H. M., & Félix, F. (2017). Movements and habitat use by Southeast Pacific humpback whales (*Megaptera novaeangliae*) satellite tracked at two breeding sites. *Aquatic Mammals, 43*(2), 139-155. doi: 10.1578/am.43.2.2017.139.
- Hain, J. H. W., Hampp, J. D., McKenney, S. A., Albert, J. A., & Kenney, R. D. (2013). Swim speed, behavior, and movement of North Atlantic right whales (*Eubalaena glacialis*) In coastal waters of northeastern Florida, USA. *PLoS ONE, 8*(1; e54340), 1-9. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0054340.g002.
- Hall, A., & Thompson, D. (2009). Gray seal: *Halichoerus grypus. Pages 500-503 in* Perrin, W.F., Würsig, B., & Thewissen, J.G.M. (Eds). *Encyclopedia of marine* mammals, 2nd Ed. Academic Press, New York, NY.
- Hamazaki, T. (2002). Spatiotemporal prediction models of cetacean habitats in the mid-western North Atlantic Ocean (from Cape Hatteras, North Carolina, U.S.A. to Nova Scotia, Canada). *Marine Mammal Science, 18*(4), 920-937.
- Hamilton, P. K., Stone, G. S., & Martin, S. M. (1997). Note on a deep humpback whale *Megaptera novaeangliae* dive near Bermuda. *Bulletin of Marine Science, 61*(2). 491-494.
- Hanggi, E. B., & Schusterman, R. J. (1994). Underwater acoustic displays and individual variation in male harbour seals *Phoca vitulina*. *Animal Behaviour, 48*(6), 1275-1283.
- Hastings, K. K., Frost, K. J., Simpkins, M. A., Pendleton, G. W., Swain, U. G., & Small, R. J. (2004). Regional differences in diving behavior of harbor seals in the Gulf of Alaska. *Canadian Journal of Zoology, 82*(11), 1755-1773. doi:10.1139/z04-145.
- Hayes, S. A., Josephson, E., Maze-Foley, K., & Rosel, P. E. (2020). US Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico marine mammal stock assessments - 2019 (NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-NE-264). Woods Hole, MA: Northeast Fisheries Science Center, National Marine Fisheries Service. 479 pages.
- Hayes, S. A., Josephson, E., Maze-Foley, K., Rosel, P. E., & Turek, J., (Eds). (2021). US Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico marine mammal stock assessments - 2020 (NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-NE-271). Woods Hole, MA: Northeast Fisheries Science Center, National Marine Fisheries Service. 403 pages.
- Hayes, S. A., Josephson, E., Maze-Foley, K., Rosel, P. E., & Wallace, J., (Eds). (2022). *U.S. Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico marine mammal stock assessments 2021*. Woods Hole, MA: Northeast Fisheries Science Center, National Marine Fisheries Service. 386 pages.
- Hayes, S. A., Josephson, E., Maze-Foley, K., Rosel, P. E., & Wallace, J., (Eds). (2023). *Draft U.S. Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico marine mammal stock assessments 2022*. Woods Hole, MA: Northeast Fisheries Science Center, National Marine Fisheries Service. 147 pages.
- Hays, G. C., Hochscheid, S., Broderick, A. C., Godley, B. J., & Metcalfe, J. D. (2000). Diving behaviour of green turtles: Dive depth, dive duration and activity levels. *Marine Ecology Progress Series, 208*, 297-298.
- Hays, G. C., Houghton, J. D. R., & Myers, A. E. (2004). Pan-Atlantic leatherback turtle movements. *Nature, 429*, 522.
- Heyning, J.E., & Perrin, W.F. (1994). Evidence for two species of common dolphins (genus *Delphinus*) from the eastern North Pacific. *Contributions in Science, 442*, 1-35.
- Hirth, H. F. (1997). *Synopsis of the biological data on the green turtle Chelonia mydas (Linnaeus 1758). Biological Report, 97*(1). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 120 pages.
- Hochscheid, S., Godley, B. J., Broderick, A. C., & Wilson, R. P. (1999). Reptilian diving: Highly variable dive patterns in the green turtle *Chelonia mydas*. *Marine Ecology Progress Series, 185*, 101-112.
- Horwood, J. (2018). Sei whale (*Balaenoptera borealis*). In B. Würsig, J. G. M. Thewissen, & K. Kovacs (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of marine mammals* (3rd ed., pp. 845-847). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Houghton, J. D. R., Doyle, T. K., Davenport, J., Wilson, R. P., & Hays, G. C. (2008). The role of infrequent and extraordinary deep dives in leatherback turtles (*Dermochelys coriacea*). *The Journal of Experimental Biology, 211*, 2566-2575. doi:10.1242/jeb.020065.
- Howell, E. A., Dutton, P. H., Polovina, J. J., Bailey, H., Parker, D. M., & Balazs, G. H. (2010). Oceanographic influences on the dive behavior of juvenile loggerhead turtles (*Caretta caretta*) in the North Pacific Ocean. *Marine Biology, 157*, 1011–1026. doi: 10.1007/s00227-009-1381-0.
- Hui, C. A. (1987). Power and speed of swimming dolphins. *Journal of Mammalogy, 68*(1), 126- 132.
- Illingworth & Rodkin, Inc. (2017). *Pile-driving noise measurments at Atlantic Fleet naval installations: 28 May 2013-28 April 2016.* Retrieved from https://www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/files/4814/9089/8563/Piledriving\_Noise\_Measurements\_Final\_Report\_12Jan2017.pdf.
- Illingworth & Rodkin, Inc. (2020). *Pile driving noise measurements for Chevron Long Wharf Maintenance and Efficiency Project*. Retrieved from https://media.fisheries.noaa.gov/dammigration/cachevronrichmond\_2019iha\_acousticmonrep\_opr1.pdf.
- Ishii, M., Murase, H., Fukuda, Y., Sawada, K., Sasakura, T., Tamura, T., . . . Mitani, Y. (2017). Diving behavior of sei whales *Balaenoptera borealis* relative to the vertical distribution of their potential prey. *Mammal Study, 42*(4), 191–199. doi:10.3106/041.042.0403
- ISO (International Standards Organization). (2017). *Underwater acoustics--terminology*. (ISO 18405:2017(E)). Geneva, Switzerland: International Standards Organization. 11 pages.
- Jahoda, M., C. L. Lafortuna, N. Biassoni, C. Almirante, A. Azzellino, S. Panigada, M. Zanardelli, & S. G. N. Di. (2003). Mediterranean fin whale's (*Balaenoptera physalus*) response to small vessels and biopsy sampling assessed through passive tracking and timing of respiration. *Marine Mammal Science, 19*:96-110.
- James, M. C., Eckert, S. A., & Myers, R. A. (2005). Migratory and reproductive movements of male leatherback turtles (*Dermochelys coriacea*). *Marine Biology, 147*(4), 845-853.
- Janik, V. M. (2000). Food-related bray calls in wild bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*). *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences 267*:923-927.
- Jefferson, T. A., M. A. Webber, & R. L. Pitman. (2015). Marine mammals of the world: A comprehensive guide to their identification. San Diego, California, Elsevier Press.
- Jensen, F. B., W. A. Kuperman, M. B. Porter, & H. Schmidt. (2011). *Computational ocean acoustics*. Springer-Verlag, New York.
- Jochens, A., Biggs, D., Benoit-Bird, K., Engelhardt, D., Gordon, J., Hu, C., . . . Würsig, B. (2008). *Sperm whale seismic study in the Gulf of Mexico: Synthesis report*. New Orleans, LA: Gulf of Mexico OCS Region, Minerals Management Service. 341 pages.
- Johnson, C. S. (1967). Sound detection thresholds in marine mammals. Pages 247-260 in W. N. Tavolga ed. *Marine bio-acoustics*. Pergamon Press, New York.
- Joyce, G., Øien, N., Calmabokidis, J., & Cubbage, J. C. (1989). Surfacing rates of minke whales in Norwegian waters. Reports of the International Whaling Commission, 39, 431-434.
- Joyce, T. W., Durban, J. W., Claridge, D. E., Dunn, C. A., Fearnbach, H., Parsons, K. M., . . . Ballance, L. T. (2017). Physiological, morphological, and ecological tradeoffs influence vertical habitat use of deep-diving toothed-whales in the Bahamas. *PLoS ONE, 12*(10), e0185113. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0185113.
- Kastak, D., & Schusterman, R. J. 1998. Low-frequency amphibious hearing in pinnipeds: Methods, measurements, noise, and ecology. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 103*(4), 2216-2228.
- Kastelein, R.A., Bunskoek, P., Hagedoorn, M., Au, W.W.L, & de Haan, D. (2002). Audiogram of a harbor porpoise (Phocoena phocoena) measured with narrow-band frequencymodulated signals. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 112*(1), 334-344.
- Kastelein, R. A., Hoek, L., Wensveen, P. J, Terhune, J. M., & de Jong, C. A. F. (2010). The effect of signal duration on the underwater hearing thresholds of two harbor seals (*Phoca vitulina*) for single tonal signals between 0.2 and 40 kHz. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 127*(2), 1135-1145.
- Kastelein, R. A., Schop, J., Hoek, L., & Covi, J. (2015). Hearing thresholds of a harbor porpoise (Phocoena phocoena) for narrow-band sweeps. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 138*(4), 2508. doi:10.1121/1.4932024.
- Kennedy, A. S., Zerbini, A. N., Vásquez, O. V., Gandilhon, N., Clapham, P. J., & Adam, O. (2014). Local and migratory movements of humpback whales (Megaptera novaeangliae) satellite-tracked in the North Atlantic Ocean. Canadian Journal of Zoology, 92(1), 9-18. doi: 10.1139/cjz-2013-0161.
- Kenney, R.D. (2018). Right whales, Eubalaena glacialis, E. japonica, and E. australis. In B. Wursig, & J. G. M. Thewissen, and K.M. Kovacs (Eds.), Encyclopedia of marine mammals (3rd ed., pp. 816-822). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Ketten, D. and S. M. Bartol. (2006). *Functional measures of sea turtle hearing*. ONR Final Project Report, ONR Award N00014-02-1-0510. Office of Naval Research.
- Ketten, D., Dolphin, W., Quick, A., Mumford, S., Chittick, E., & Melvin, E. (2000). Acoustic fatheads: Parallel evolution of underwater sound reception mechanisms in dolphins, seals, turtles, and sea birds. Paper presented at the Conference of Association for Research in Otolaryngology.
- Klatsky, L. J., Wells, R. S., & Sweeney, J. C. (2007). Offshore bottlenose dolphins (Tursiops truncatus): Movement and dive behavior near the Bermuda Pedestal. Journal of Mammalogy, 88(1), 59–66.
- Kvadsheim, P. H., DeRuiter, S., Sivle, L. D., Goldbogen, J., Roland-Hansen, R., Miller, P. J. O., Lam, F. A., Calambokidis, J., Friedlaender, A., Visser, F., Tyack, P. L., Kleivane, L., & Southall, B. (2017). Avoidance responses of minke whales to 1-4kHz naval sonar. Marine Pollution Bulletin 121, 60-68.
- Lammers, M. O., L. Au, W. W., & Herzing, D. L. (2003). The broadband social acoustic signaling behavior of spinner and spotted dolphins. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 114*(3), 1629-1639.
- Lazell, J. D. (1980). New England waters: Critical habitat for marine turtles. *Copeia, 1980*, 290- 295.
- Leatherwood, S., W. F. Perrin, V. L. Kirby, C. L. Hubbs and M. Dahlheim. (1980). Distribution and Movements of Risso's Dolphin *Grampus griseus* in the Eastern North Pacific. *Fishery Bulletin, 77*:951-964.
- Lesage, V., Hammill, M. O., & Kovacs, K. M. (1999). Functional classification of harbor seal (*Phoca vitulina*) dives using depth profiles, swimming velocity, and an index of foraging success. *Canadian Journal of Zoology, 77*, 74-87.
- Lippert, T., M. Galindo-Romero, A. N. Gavrilov and O. Von Estorff. (2015). Empirical estimation of peak pressure level from sound exposure level. Part II: Offshore impact pile driving noise. The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 138:EL287.
- Ljungblad, D. K., P. D. Scoggins and W. G. Gilmartin. (1982). Auditory thresholds of a captive Eastern Pacific bottlenose dolphin, *Tursiops spp. The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 72*:1726-1729.
- Lockyer, C. (1997). Diving behaviour of the sperm whale in relation to feeding. *Bulletin de L'Institut Royal des Sciences Naturelles de Belgique Biologie, 67*(SUPPL), 47-52.
- Lockyer, C., & Morris, R. (1987). Observations on diving behaviour and swimming speeds in a wild juvenile *Tursiops truncatus*. *Aquatic Mammals, 13.1*, 31-35.
- López-Mendilaharsua, M., Rocha, C. F. D., Domingo, A., Wallace, B. P., & Miller, P. (2009). Prolonged deep dives by the leatherback turtle *Dermochelys coriacea*: Pushing their aerobic dive limits. *Marine Biodiversity Records, 2*, e35. doi:10.1017/S1755267208000390.
- Lutcavage, M. E., & Lutz, P. L. (1997). Diving physiology. In P. L. Lutz and J. A. Musick (Eds.). *The biology of sea turtles*. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.
- Madsen, P. T., D. A. Carder, K. Bedholm and S. H. Ridgway. (2005). Porpoise clicks from a sperm whale nose - Convergent evolution of 130 kHz pulses in toothed whale sonars? Bioacoustics 15:195-206.
- Marquez-M., R., compiler. (1994). *Synopsis of biological data on the Kemp's ridley turtle, Lepidochelys kempi (Garman, 1880)*. Miami, FL: Southeast Fisheries Center, National Marine Fisheries Service.
- Marine Geospatial Ecology Laboratory (MGEL). (2022). Habitat-based marine mammal density models for the U.S. Atlantic: 2022. Accessed and data retrieved June 2022 from [<https://seamap.env.duke.edu/models/Duke/EC/>](https://seamap.env.duke.edu/models/Duke/EC/). Duke University, Marine Geospatial Ecology Laboratory.
- Martin, K. J., S. C. Alessi, J. C. Gaspard, A. D. Tucker, G. B. Bauer and D. A. Mann. (2012). Underwater hearing in the loggerhead turtle (*Caretta caretta*): a comparison of behavioral and auditory evoked potential audiograms. *Journal of Experimental Biology, 215*:3001-3009.
- Mate, B. R., Nieukirk, S., Mesecar, R., & Martin, T. (1992). *Application of remote sensing methods for tracking large cetaceans: North Atlantic right whales (Eubalaena glacialis)* (OCS MMS 91-0069). Herndon, VA: Alaska and Atlantic Regional Office, Minerals Management Service. 170 pages.
- Mate, B. R., Stafford, K. M., Nawojchik, R., & Dunn, J. L. (1994). Movements and dive behavior of a satellite-monitored Atlantic white-sided dolphin (*Lagenorhynchus acutus*) in the Gulf of Maine. *Marine Mammal Science, 10*(1), 116-121.
- Mate, B. R., Rossbach, K. A., Nieukirk, S. L., Wells, R. S., Irvine, A. B., Scott, M. D., & Read, A. J. (1995). Satellite-monitored movements and dive behavior of a bottlenose dolphin (*Tursiops truncatus*) in Tampa Bay, Florida. *Marine Mammal Science, 11*(4), 452-463.
- McDonald, M. A., Hildebrand, J. A., Wiggins, S. M., Thiele, D., Glasgow, D., & Moore, S. E. (2005). Sei whale sounds recorded in the Antarctic. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 118*(6), 3941-3945.
- Mellinger, D. K., C. D. Carson and C. W. Clark. (2000). Characteristics of minke whale (*Balaenoptera acutorostrata*) pulse trains recorded near Puerto Rico. *Marine Mammal Science, 16*:739-756.
- Meyer-Gutbrod, E. L. and C. H. Greene. (2014). Climate-associated regime shifts drive decadalscale variability in recovery of North Atlantic right whale population. *Oceanography, 27*:148-153.
- Møhl, B., Wahlberg, M., Madsen, P. T., Miller, L. A., & Surlykke, A. (2000). Sperm whale clicks: Directionality and source level revisited. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 107*(1), 638-648.
- Moore, S. E. and S. H. Ridgway. (1995). Whistles produced by common dolphins from the Southern California Bight. *Aquatic Mammals 21*:55-63.
- Morano, J. L., D. P. Salisbury, A. N. Rice, K. L. Conklin, K. L. Falk and C. W. Clark. (2012). Seasonal and geographical patterns of fin whale song in the western North Atlantic Ocean. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 132*:1207-1212.
- Mullin, K. D. and G. L. Fulling. (2003). Abundance of cetaceans in the southern U.S. North Atlantic Ocean during summer 1998. *Fishery Bulletin, 101*:603-613.
- Nachtigall, P. E., W. W. L. Au, J. L. Pawloski and P. W. B. Moore. (1995). Risso's dolphin (*Grampus griseus*) hearing thresholds in Kaneohe Bay, Hawaii. Pages 49-53 *Sensory systems of aquatic mammals.* De Spil Publication, Woerden, Netherlands: .
- Nachtigall, P. E., D. W. Lemonds and H. L. Roitblat. (2000). Psychoacoustic studies of dolphin and whale hearing. *Hearing by whales and dolphins.* Springer-Verlag, New York, New York.
- Nelson, D., & Lien, J. (1996). The status of the long-finned pilot whale, *Globicephala melas*, in Canada. *Canadian Field-Naturalist, 110*(3), 511-524.
- NMFS (National Marine Fisheries Service). (2018). 2018 revision to: Technical guidance for assessing the effects of anthropogenic sound on marine mammal hearing; Underwater thresholds for onset of permanent and temporary threshold shifts (Version 2.0). Silver Spring, MD: National Marine Fisheries Service. 178 pp.
- NMFS (National Marine Fisheries Service), & USFWS (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service). (2015). *Kemp's ridley sea turtle (Lepidochelys kempii) 5-year review: Summary and evaluation*. Silver Spring, MD: Office of Protected Resources, National Marine Fisheries Service and Southwest Region, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 63 pages.
- NOAA (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration). (1979). Determination of critical habitat for the leatherback sea turtle. National Marine Fisheries Service; National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. *Federal Register, 44*(58), 17710-17712.
- NOAA (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration). (2005). Endangered fish and wildlife: Notice of intent to prepare an environmental impact statement. *Federal Register 70*(7), 1871-1875.
- NOAA (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration). (2012). Endangered and threatened species: Final rule to revise the critical habitat designation for the endangered leatherback sea turtle; Final rule. *Federal Register, 77*(17), 4170-4201.

- NOAA. (2014). Endangered and threatened species: Critical habitat for the Northwest Atlantic Ocean loggerhead sea turtle distinct population segment (DPS) and determination regarding critical habitat for the North Pacific Ocean Loggerhead DPS; Final rule. *Federal Register, 79*(132), 39856-39912.
- NOAA. (2016). Endangered and threatened wildlife and plant species: Final rule to list eleven distinct population segments of the green sea turtle (Chelonia mydas) as endangered or threatened and revision of current listings under the Endangered Species Act; Final rule. National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. *Federal Register, 81*(66), 20058-20090.
- NOAA-NGDC (NOAA National Geophysical Data Center). (1999). U.S. Coastal Relief Model Vol.1- Northeast Atlantic. NOAA National Centers for Environmental Information. https://doi.org/10.7289/V5MS3QNZ. Accessed 2020.
- (NRC) National Research Council. (2003). *Ocean Noise and Marine Mammals*. Washington, D.C.: The National Academies Press.
- Nel, R. (2012*). Assessment of the conservation status of the leatherback turtle in the Indian Ocean and South-East Asia*. Bangkok, Thailand: IOSEA Marine Turtle MoU Secretariat. 41 pages.
- Normandeau Associates Inc. and APEM Inc. (2018). *Digital aerial baseline survey of marine wildlife in support of offshore wind energy: Summer 2018 taxonomic analysis summary report*. Report by Normandeau Associates Inc. and APEM Inc. for New York State Energy Research and Development Authority. https://remote.normandeau.com/ docs/NYSERDA Summer 2018 Taxonomic Analysis Summary Report.pdf.
- Normandeau Associates Inc. and APEM Ltd. (2019). *Digital aerial baseline survey of marine wildlife in support of offshore wind energy: Summer 2016–spring 2018*; *Fourth interim report*. Second annual report by Normandeau Associates Inc. and APEM Ltd. for New York State Energy Research. 149 p. https://remote.normandeau.com/ docs/NYSERDA 2016-2018 4th Semi-Annual report.pdf.
- Normandeau Associates Inc. and APEM Inc. (2019a). *Digital aerial baseline survey of marine wildlife in support of offshore wind energy: Spring 2019 taxonomic analysis summary report*. Report by Normandeau Associates Inc. and APEM Inc. for New York State Energy Research and Development Authority. https://remote.normandeau.com/docs/ NYSERDA\_Spring\_2019\_Taxonomic\_Analysis\_Summary\_Report.pdf.
- Normandeau Associates Inc. and APEM Inc. (2019b). *Digital aerial baseline survey of marine wildlife in support of offshore wind energy: Fall 2018 taxonomic analysis summary report*. Report by Normandeau Associates Inc. and APEM Inc. for New York State Energy Research and Development Authority. https://remote.normandeau.com/docs/ NYSERDA\_ Fall\_2018\_Taxonomic\_Analysis\_Summary\_Report.pdf.
- Normandeau Associates Inc. and APEM Inc. (2020). *Digital aerial baseline survey of marine wildlife in support of offshore wind energy: Winter 2018-2019 taxonomic analysis summary report*. Report by Normandeau Associates Inc. and APEM Inc. for New York State Energy Research and Development Authority. https://remote.normandeau.com/ docs/NYSERDA\_Winter\_2018\_19\_Taxonomic\_Analysis\_Summary\_Report.pdf.
- Norris, K. S., & Prescott, J. H. (1961). Observations on Pacific cetaceans of Californian and Mexican waters. *University of California Publications in Zoology, 63*(4), 291-402.
- Oliver, G. W. (1978). Navigation in mazes by a grey seal, *Halichoerus grypus* (Fabricus) *Behaviour, 67*(1/2), 97-114.
- Olsen, E., Budgell, W. P., Head, E., Kleivane, L., Nøttestad, L., Prieto, R., . . . Øien, N. (2009). First satellite-tracked long-distance movement of a sei whale (*Balaenoptera borealis*) in the North Atlantic. Aquatic Mammals, 35(3), 313-318. doi:10.1578/am.35.3.2009.313.
- Panigada, S., Zanardelli, M., Canese, S., & Jahoda, M. (1999). How deep can baleen whales dive? Marine Ecology Progress Series, 187, 309-311. doi: 10.3354/meps187309.
- Panigada, S., Notabartolo di Sciara, G., Zanardelli, M., Airoldi, S., Borsani, J. F., Jahoda, M., . . . Revelli, E. (2004). Distribution and occurrence of fin whales in the Ligurian Sea between 1990-99. European Research on Cetaceans, 15, 194.
- Parks, S. E., C. W. Clark and P. L. Tyack. (2007a). Short- and long-term changes in right whale calling behavior: The potential effects of noise on acoustic communication. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 122*:3725-3731.
- Parks, S. E., D. R. Ketten, J. T. O'malley and J. Arruda. (2007b). Anatomical predictions of hearing in the North Atlantic right whale. *The Anatomical Record: Advances in Integrative Anatomy and Evolutionary Biology, 290*:734-744.
- Parks, S. E., M. Johnson, D. Nowacek and P. L. Tyack. (2011). Individual right whales call louder in increased environmental noise. *Biology Letters, 7*:33-35.
- Parsons, M.J.G., C. Erbe, M.G. Meekan, and S.K. Parsons. (2021). A review and meta-analysis of underwater noise radiated by small (<25 m Length) vessels. *Journal of Marine Science and Engineering* 9: 827[. https://doi.org/10.3390/jmse9080827.](https://doi.org/10.3390/jmse9080827)
- Perrin, W. F. (2009a). Atlantic spotted dolphin Stenella frontalis. In W. F. Perrin, B. Würsig, & J. G. M. Thewissen (Eds.), Encyclopedia of marine mammals (2nd ed., pp. 54-56). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Pike, D. A. (2013). Climate influences the global distribution of sea turtle nesting. *Global Ecology and Biogeography, 22*, 555–566. doi:10.1111/geb.12025.
- Piniak, W. E., D. A. Mann, C. A. Harms, T. T. Jones and S. A. Eckert. 2016. Hearing in the Juvenile green sea turtle (*Chelonia mydas*): A Comparison of underwater and aerial hearing using auditory evoked potentials. *PLoS One, 11:*e0159711.
- Plotkin, P. T. (2003). Adult migrations and habitat. Pages 225-241 in P. L. Lutz, J. A. Musick, & J. Wyneken, (Eds.). *The biology of sea turtles, Vol 2*. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.
- Popov, V. V., & Klishin, V. O. (1998). EEG study of hearing in the common dolphin, *Delphinus delphis*. *Aquatic Mammals, 24*(1), 13-20.
- Popper, A. N., Hawkins, A. D., Fay, R. R., Mann, D. A., Bartol, S., Carlson, T. J., . . . Tavolga, W. N. (2014). *Sound exposure guidelines for fishes and sea turtles: A technical report*. Prepared by ANSI-accredited Standards Committee S3/SC1 and registered with ANSI (Vol. ASA S3/SC1.4 TR-2014): ASA Press and Springer.
- Prieto, R., Silva, M. A., Waring, G. T., & Gonçalves, J. M. A. (2014). Sei whale movements and behaviour in the North Atlantic inferred from satellite telemetry. Endangered Species Research, 26, 101-113. doi:10.3354/esr00630
- Rankin, S., & Barlow, J. (2007). Vocalizations of the sei whale *Balaenoptera borealis* off the Hawaiian Islands. *Bioacoustics, 16*, 137-145.
- Rees, D.R., D.V. Jones and B.A. Bartlett. (2016). Haul-out counts and photo-identification of pinnipeds in Chesapeake Bay, Virginia: 2015/16 Annual Progress Report; Final report. Prepared for U.S. Fleet Forces Command, Norfolk, Virginia. 15 November 2016.
- Reinhall, P. G., & Dahl, P. H. (2011). Underwater Mach wave radiation from impact pile driving: Theory and observation. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 130*(3), 1209– 1216. doi:10.1121/1.3614540.
- Renaud, M. L. (1995). Movements and submergence patterns of Kemp's ridley turtles (*Lepidochelys kempii*). *Journal of Herpetology, 29*, 370-374.
- Rendell, L. E., J. Matthews, A. Gill, J. Gordon and D. W. Macdonald. (1999). Quantitative analysis of the tonal calls of five odontocete species. *Journal of Zoology 249*:403-410.
- Rice, M. R., & Balazs, G. H. (2008). Diving behavior of the Hawaiian green turtle (*Chelonia mydas*) during oceanic migrations. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology, 356*(1-2), 121-127. doi:10.1016/j.jembe.2007.12.010.
- Richardson, W. J., C. R. Greene, C. I. Malme and D. H. Thomson. (1995). *Marine mammals and noise*. Academic Press, San Diego.
- Ridgway, S. H. (1986). Diving by cetaceans. Pages 33-62 in A. O. Brubakk, J. W. Kanwisher, & G. Sundness, (Eds.). *Diving in animals and man*. Trondheim, Norway: The Royal Norwegian Society of Science and Letters.
- Ridgway, S. H., & Carder, D. A. (2001). Assessing hearing and sound production in cetaceans not available for behavioral audiograms: Experiences with sperm, pygmy sperm, and gray whales. *Aquatic Mammals, 27*(3), 267-276.
- Ridgway, S. H., & Joyce, P. L. (1975). Studies on seal brain by radiotelemetry. *Rapports et Proces-Verbaux des Reunions Conseil International pour l'Exploration de la Mer, 169,* 81- 91.
- Risch, D., N. J. Gales, J. Gedamke, L. Kindermann, D. P. Nowacek, A. J. Read, U. Siebert, I. C. Van Opzeeland, S. M. Van Parijs and A. S. Friedlaender. (2014). Mysterious bio-duck sound attributed to the Antarctic minke whale (*Balaenoptera bonaerensis*). *Biology Letters, 10*:20140175.
- Roberts, J.J., B.D. Best, L. Mannocci, E. Fujioka, P.N. Halpin, D.L. Palka, L.P. Garrison, K.D. Mullin, T.V.N. Cole, C.B. Khan, W.M. McLellan, D.A. Pabst, and G.G. Lockhart. (2016). Habitatbased cetacean density models for the U.S. Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico. *Scientific Reports,* 6(22615). doi: 10.1038/srep22615.
- Ross, D. (1976). *Mechanics of underwater noise*. New York, NY: Pergamon.
- Sakamoto, W., Uchida, I., Naito, Y., Kureha, K., Tujimura, M., & Sato, K. (1990). Deep diving behavior of the loggerhead turtle near the frontal zone. *Nippon Suisan Gakkaishi, 56*(9), 1435-1443.
- Sale, A., Luschi, P., Mencacci, R., Lambardi, P., Hughes, G. R., Hays, G. C., Benvenuti, S., & Papi, F. (2006). Long-term monitoring of leatherback turtle diving behaviour during oceanic movements. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology, 328*(2), 197-210. doi:10.1016/j.jembe.2005.07.006.
- Scheer, M., B. Hofmann and P. I. Behr. (1998). Discrete pod-specific call repertoires among short-finned pilot whales (*Globicephala macrorhynchus*) off the SW coast of Tenerife, Canary Islands. Abstracts of the World Marine Mammal Science Conference. Monaco.
- Schilling, M. R., Seipt, I., Weinrich, M. T., Frohock, S. E., Kuhlberg, A. E., & Clapham, P. J. (1992). Behavior of individually-identified sei whales *Balaenoptera borealis* during an episodic influx into the southern Gulf of Maine in 1986. *Fishery Bulletin, 90*, 749-755.
- Schroeder, C.L. (2000). *Population status and distribution of the harbor seal in Rhode Island waters*. M.Sc. Thesis. University of Rhode Island, Kingston, RI. 197pp.
- Scott, M. D. and S. J. Chivers. (1990). Distribution and herd structure of bottlenose dolphins in the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean. Pages 387-402 *in* S. Leatherwood and R. R. Reeves eds. The bottlenose dolphin. Academic Press, San Diego.
- Shane, S. H. (1995). Behavior patterns of pilot whales and Risso's dolphins off Santa Catalina Island, California. *Aquatic Mammals, 21*(3), 195-197.
- Song, X., Wang, H., Wang, W., Gu, H., Chan, S., & Jiang, H. (2002). Satellite tracking of postnesting movements of green turtles *Chelonia mydas* from the Gangkou Sea Turtle National Nature Reserve, China, 2001. *Marine Turtle Newsletter, 97*, 8-9.
- Southall, B., Hatch, L., Scholik-Schlomer, A., Bergmann, T., Jasny, M., Metcalf, K., . . . Perera, M. E. (2018). Reducing noise from large commercial ships; Progress and partnerships. *Proceedings of the Marine Safety and Security Council, Spring 2018*, 58-65.
- Southall, B. L., Finneran, J. J., Reichmuth, C., Nachtigall, P. E., Ketten, D. R., Bowles, A. E., . . . Tyack, P. L. (2019). Marine mammal noise exposure criteria: Updated scientific recommendations for residual hearing effects. Aquatic Mammals, 45(2), 125-232. doi:10.1578/AM.45.2.2019.125.
- Spotila, J. R. (2004). *Sea turtles: A complete guide to their biology, behavior, and conservation*. Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press.
- Stern, S. J. (1992). Surfacing rates and surfacing patterns of minke whales (*Balaenoptera acutorostrata*) off central California, and the probability of a whale surfacing within visual range. *Report of the International Whaling Commission, 42*, 379-385.
- Stockin, K. A., Fairbairns, R. S., Parsons, E. C. M., & Sims, D. W. (2001). Effects of diel and seasonal cycles on the dive duration of the minke whale (*Balaenoptera acutorostrata*). *Journal of the Marine Biological Association of the United Kingdom, 81*(1), 189-190. doi: 10.1017/S0025315401003630.
- Strong, C. (1990). *Ventilation patterns and behavior of Balaenopterid whales in the Gulf of California, Mexico.* Master's thesis, California State University, Moss Landing.
- Sudara, S. and S. Mahakunayanakul. (1998). Distribution and river intrusion of dolphins in the inner Gulf of Thailand. World Marine Mammal Science Conference. Monaco.
- Terhune, J. M. (1991). Masked and unmasked pure tone detection thresholds of a harbour seal listening in air. *Canadian Journal of Zoology, 69*, 2059-2066.
- The Turtle Expert Working Group. (2007). *An assessment of the leatherback turtle population in the Atlantic Ocean.* NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SEFSC-555. Miami, FL: Southeast Fisheries Science Center, National Marine Fisheries Service.
- Thewissen, J. G. M. (2002). Hearing. In W. F. Perrin, B. Würsig, & J. G. M. Thewissen (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of marine mammals* (pp. 570-774). San Diego, California: Academic Press.
- Thode, A., Mellinger, D. K., & Martinez, A. (2002). Passive three-dimensional tracking of sperm whales using two towed arrays during the 2001 SWAMP cruise. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 112(*5, Part 2), 2399.
- Toth, J., S. Evert, E. Zimmermann, M. Sullivan, L. Dotts, K.W. Able, R. Hagan and C. Slocum. (2018). Annual residency patterns and diet of *Phoca vitulina concolor* (Western Atlantic harbor seal) in a southern New Jersey estuary. *Northeastern Naturalist, 25*(4):611–626.
- Tubelli, A. A., A. Zosuls, D. R. Ketten, M. Yamato and D. C. Mountain. 2012. A prediction of the minke whale (Balaenoptera acutorostrata) middle-ear transfer function. The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 132:3263-3272.

- Verboom, W. C., & Kastelein, R. A. (1995). Acoustic signals by harbour porpoises (Phocoena phocoena). In P. E. Nachtigall, J. Lein, W. W. L. Au, & A. J. Read, (Eds.). Harbour porpoises, laboratory studies to reduce bycatch. Woerden, The Netherlands: DeSpil Publishers.
- Villadsgaard, A., Wahlberg, M., & Tougaard, J. (2007). Echolocation signals of wild harbour porpoises, *Phocoena phocoena. The Journal of Experimental Biology, 210*(1), 56-64.
- von Pein, J., Lippert, T., Lippert, S., & Estorff, O. v. (2022). Scaling laws for unmitigated pile driving: Dependence of underwater noise on strike energy, pile diameter, ram weight, and water depth. *Applied Acoustics, 198*, 108986. doi:10.1016/j.apacoust.2022.108986.
- Wallace, B. P., Tiwari, M., & Girondot, M. (2013). *Dermochelys coriacea. The IUCN red list of threatened species 2013*: e.T6494A43526147. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2013-2.RLTS.T6494A43526147.en> and <http://www.iucnredlist.org/attachments/2299>.
- Watkins, W. A. (1967). The harmonic interval fact or artifact in spectral analysis of pulse trains. Pages 15-43 *in* W. N. Tavolga ed. *Marine Bio-acoustics.* Pergamon Press.
- Watkins, W. A. (1981). Activities and underwater sounds of fin whales. *The Scientific Reports of the Whales Research Institute, 83*-117.
- Watkins, W. A., Daher, M. A., DiMarzio, N. A., Samuels, A., Wartzok, D., Fristrup, K. M., . . . Maiefski, R. R. (2002). Sperm whale dives tracked by radio tag telemetry. *Marine Mammal Science, 18*(1), 55-68.
- Watkins, W. A., P. Tyack and K. E. Moore. (1987). The 20-Hz signals of finback whales (*Balaenoptera physalus*). *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 82*:1901- 1912.
- Weilgart, L., & Whitehead, H. (1997). Group-specific dialects and geographical variation in coda repertoire in South Pacific sperm whales. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology, 40*, 277- 285.
- Weirathmueller, M.J., E.T. Küsel, K.E. Zammit, E.C.R. Ozanich, A. M. Muellenmeister, S.L. Denes, S.G. Dufault, S. Murphy, K.E. Limpert, and D.G. Zeddies. (2022). Atlantic Shores North Acoustic and Exposure Modeling. Document 02740, Version 1.0. Technical report by JASCO Applied Sciences for Atlantic Shores Offshore, LLC.
- Wells, R. S. and M. D. Scott. (2009). Common bottlenose dolphin *Tursiops truncatus*. Pages 249- 255 *in* W. F. Perrin, B. Würsig and J. G. M. Thewissen eds. *Encyclopedia of Marine Mammals.* Academic Press.
- Wells, R. S., Manire, C. A., Byrd, L., Smith, D. R., Gannon, J. G., Fauquier, D., & Mullin, K., (2009). Movements and dive patterns of a rehabilitated Risso's dolphin, Grampus griseus, in the Gulf of Mexico and Atlantic Ocean. *Marine Mammal Science, 25*(2), 420–429.

- Westgate, A. J., Read, A. J., Berggren, P., Koopman, H. N., & Gaskin, D. E. (1995). Diving behaviour of harbour porpoises, *Phocoena phocoena*. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences, 52*, 1064-1073.
- Whitehead, H. (2018). Sperm whale. *In* B. Würsig, J. G. M. Thewissen, & K. Kovacs (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of marine mammals* (3rd ed., pp. 919-925). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Zoidis, A. M., M. A. Smultea, A. S. Frankel, J. Hopkins, A. Day, S. Ertl, A. Whitt and D. Fertl. (2008). Sounds attributed to humpback whale (*Megaptera novaeangliae*) calves recorded in Hawai'i. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 123*:1737-1746.

### **9 LIST OF PREPARERS**



## **APPENDIX A: ACOUSTIC CONCEPTS AND TERMINOLOGY**

This section provides a review of some of the relevant concepts in acoustics, particularly underwater acoustics, to assist readers in understanding some of the concepts and terminology used in this report. Sound is the result of particles vibrating to create mechanical waves that travel through a medium, such as air or water. These waves create pressure changes that vary in space and time, resulting in time-varying pressure disturbances that oscillate above and below the ambient pressure.

The intensity of a plane sound wave in the far field is proportional to the square of its pressure (*p*):

$$
I=p^2/\rho c
$$

where  $\rho$  is the density of the medium (e.g., water) and  $c$  is the speed of sound in that medium.

Two types of level are in widespread use in underwater acoustics, the level of a field quantity and the level of a power quantity. In underwater acoustics, it is conventional to express both types of level in decibels (dB). When expressed in decibels, the level  $L_F$  of a field quantity F is:

$$
LF = 20 \log_{10}(F/F_0) \text{ dB}
$$

where  $F_0$  is the reference value of the field quantity. Similarly, the level L<sub>P</sub> of a power quantity P is

$$
L_P = 10 \log_{10}(P/P_0) \, dB
$$

Where  $P_0$  is the reference value of the power quantity.

Care must be taken when reporting and reading sound levels in decibels to ensure that measurements are properly described. To compare sound levels given in decibels to one another, a standard reference intensity or reference pressure must be used. In underwater acoustics, the standard reference pressure  $(p_0)$  for SPL is 1 microPascal ( $\mu$ Pa) and the decibel level is expressed as "dB re  $1 \mu$ Pa".

In addition to units, the acoustic measurement type must be considered. Measurement type refers to how the pressure was measured. Changing the" type" of measurement can significantly change the reported sound level of a given continuous sound (e.g., peak-to-peak (pk-pk) versus zero-to peak (0-pk) versus root-mean-square (RMS)). RMS, 0-pk, and pk-pk sound pressure levels (SPL<sub>rms</sub>, SPL<sub>0-pk</sub>, SPL<sub>pk-pk</sub>, respectively) are the most common sound measurement types. RMS measures are essentially an average of the intensity over a given amount of time. RMS measures are most appropriate for longer (i.e., non-impulsive) signals but are considered in impact assessments as described below. Impulsive signals, such as those from impact pile driving, are often quantified as 0-pk or pk-pk measurements.

Real-world measured acoustic signals include noise, making it difficult to define a start and end point of an impulsive signal. A typical approach to deal with this issue is to use the portion (in time) of the signal that includes from the  $5<sup>th</sup>$  to the 95<sup>th</sup> percentile of the energy in the signal.

Zero-to-peak or peak-peak measurements simply measure the maximum absolute amplitude of the signal, without consideration of the duration of the signal and avoid this problematic issue. Sound exposure level (SEL), another common measurement type, also avoids the problem by specifying a fixed time value.

SEL, appropriate for all signal types, is the integral over a specified time interval of the sound energy produced from a source. These values are reported with units of dB re 1  $\mu$ Pa<sup>2</sup>s where s is seconds. SEL can be the energy accumulated over a given time period, indicated as  $L_E$ (cum), or it can be the energy integrated over a single pile driving strike (single strike), indicated as  $L_E(ss)$ .

The statistical average of a certain acoustic signal (including noise) as analyzed in terms of its frequency content, is called its spectrum. Spectral density describes the distribution over frequency of the power (applicable to continuous signals) or energy (applicable to finiteduration signals) in a signal. Power spectral densities are reported in dB re  $1\mu$ Pa<sup>2</sup>/Hz and energy spectral densities in dB re  $1\mu$ Pa<sup>2</sup>s/Hz. Integration of spectral density over a frequency band describes the total power or energy in that band and is referred to as a "band level". Band levels are frequently presented in third-octave bands in bioacoustics to approximate the bandwidths of mammalian auditory systems (Figures A-1 and A-2). SPL band levels are reported in dB re 1µPa and SEL band levels in dB re 1µPa<sup>2</sup>s. Broadband levels sum the band levels over a specified frequency range and are reported in dB referenced to the same reference levels as the band levels. Figure A-2 shows an example of third-octave band levels and the associated broadband level.



**Figure A-1. Comparison of a spectral (blue) level and it associated third-octave band level (red) spectra.**

### **SOUND METRIC DEFINITIONS**

• **RMS Sound Pressure Level (SPLrms or LP)**—Defined as an integral over a specified time interval (*T*) of squared sound pressure time series (*p(t)*) divided by the duration of the time interval and the reference pressure (*pref*) for a specified frequency range.



**Figure A-2. Comparison of spectral and associated broadband source levels. A sample sound spectrum is shown in blue, which has a maximum spectral level of 130 dB re 1Pa<sup>2</sup> /Hz. The broadband level is the integration of all the energy from all frequencies, which in this example is 139 dB re 1µPa.**

Continuous sources, such as vibratory piling driving, thruster operations, and shipping are commonly described in terms of an RMS sound pressure level  $(L_p)$ .

$$
L_P
$$
(dB re 1 µPa) = 20  $log_{10} \left( \sqrt{\frac{1}{T_{90}} \int_{T_{90}} p^2(t) dt} / p_{ref} \right)$ 

For impulsive signals, such as from impact pile driving, the measurement period is defined as the time period that contains 90 percent of the sound energy  $(T=T_{90})$  (Madsen, 2005).

• Sound Exposure Level (SEL or L<sub>E</sub>)-Sound exposure level (SEL) specifies the sound pressure over a time interval or event and for a specified frequency range and is expressed in dB re 1 μPa<sup>2</sup>s. The SEL for a single event is computed from the time-integral of the squared pressure over a specified time period, *T*:

$$
L_{E} (\text{dB re 1 }\mu\text{Pa}^{2} \cdot \text{s}) = 10 \log_{10} \left( \int_{T} p^{2}(t) dt / p_{ref}^{2} \right)
$$

Where L<sub>E</sub> represents the total acoustic energy received at a given location.

Unless otherwise stated, SELs for pulse noise sources (i.e., impact hammer pile driving) presented in this report refer to a single pulse. The time period, *T*, used here for impulsive sources is 0.1 s; which leads to the following conversion between SEL and SPL:

$$
SEL = SPL_{rms} + 10 \times log_{10}(0.1) = SPL_{rms} - 10
$$

 $L<sub>E</sub>$  can be calculated as a cumulative metric over periods with multiple acoustic events. In the case of impulsive sources like impact piling,  $L_{E}$  can represent the summation of energy from multiple pulses, which is written  $L_E$  (cum), denoting that it represents the cumulative sound exposure over some duration. The sound exposure level over a 24-hour period is often used in the assessment of marine mammal and fish behavior, and is written as  $L_{E, 24h}$ .

The cumulative SEL (dB re 1  $\mu$ Pa<sup>2</sup>·s) can be computed by summing (in linear units) the L<sub>E</sub> of the N individual events**:**

$$
\mathsf{L}_\mathsf{E}\left({\mathsf{cum}}\right) = 10\,log_{10}\left(\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^{N} 10^{\frac{L_{E_i}}{10}}\right)
$$

• **Peak Level (Lpk)—**Maximum noise level over a given event is expressed as Lpk. and is calculated using the maximum variation of the absolute value of the pressure from zero within the wave. The peak level is commonly used as a descriptor for impulsive sound sources. The Lpk can be calculated using the formula below where *t* is time:

$$
\mathsf{L}_{\mathsf{pk}}\big(\mathsf{dB}\;\mathsf{re}\; \mathsf{1}\;\mathsf{\mu Pa}\big) = 20\;log_{10}\left[\frac{max(|p(t)|)}{p_{ref}}\right]
$$

Pulses are characterized by a relatively rapid rise from ambient pressure to a maximal pressure value followed by a decay period that may include a period of diminishing, oscillating maximal and minimal pressures.

• **Sound Exposure Spectral Density**—The SEL integral over time can also be written (Parseval's Theorem) as the integral over frequency of the sound exposure spectral density, *Ef*. *E<sup>f</sup>* is single-sided (i.e., includes only positive frequencies), while P(f) is double-sided (i.e., includes both positive and negative frequencies). It is for this reason that the bounds change for the integral over *E<sup>f</sup>* in the following equation:

$$
\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} p^2(t)dt = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |P(f)|^2 df = \int_{0}^{\infty} E_f df
$$

P(f) is the Fourier transform of p(t).

Source levels are presented in this report in sound exposure band levels—i.e., the integral of  $E_f$  over third-octave bands--reported in dB re 1 µPa<sup>2</sup>·m<sup>2</sup>s, at a reference distance of 1 m.

# **Literature Cited**

Madsen, P. T. (2005). Marine mammals and noise: Problems with root mean square sound pressure levels for transients. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 117*(6), 3952-3957.

# **Appendix B: Animat Modeling Parameters**

### **B-1. Parameters that Define Animat Movement in AIM**

Animals move through four dimensions: three-dimensional space and time. Several parameters are used in AIM to produce simulated movements that accurately represent expected real animal movement patterns. This section provides short descriptions of the various parameters, with nominal values as examples of how the parameters are implemented in AIM. The actual values used in the animat modeling of the pile driving activities for the Project and the literature from which that information was obtained are detailed in this appendix (Table B-1). Table B-1 represents a portion of MAI's ongoing effort to review existing literature and obtain relevant dive and swim information for marine mammal and sea turtle species. When scientific papers or reports contain numeric descriptions of movement behaviors (e.g., dive times), these numeric values are added to MAIs Animat Movement Library. This compendium of movement values for each marine mammal and sea turtle species are then interpreted by an MAI subject matter expert to derive a set of summary values that represent each species/modeling group/behavioral state.

### **B-2. Marine Mammal Diving Patterns**

Diving parameters, such as time limits, depth limits, heading variance, and speed, are specified for each animat in the AIM model (Figure B-1). As an example, a dive pattern is presented that consists of a shallow, respiratory sequence (Figure B-1) followed by a deeper, longer dive (bottom row of Figure B-1). The horizontal component of the dive is handled with the "heading variance" term, which allows the animal to change course up to a certain number of degrees at each movement step. For this example, the animal can change course 20° during a shallow dive and 10° during a deep dive (Figure B-1). Using the defined diving parameters, AIM generates realistic dive patterns (Figure B-2).



**Figure B-1. Example of AIM marine mammal movement parameters, with the top row showing the parameters of a shallow, respiratory dive (diving from surface to 5 m for 5 to 8 min) and the bottom row showing a deeper, longer dive (diving between 50 and 75 m for 10 to 15 min).**

### **B-3. Aversions**

In addition to movement patterns, animats can be programmed to avoid certain environmental characteristics (Figure B-3). For example, aversions can be used to constrain an animal to a particular depth regime. (e.g., an animat can be constrained to waters between 2,000 and 5,000 m deep). An animat will continue to turn until the aversion is satisfied. In this example,



**Figure B-2. Marine mammal dive pattern based on animat data in Figure B-1. The animat makes a shallow dive from the surface to 5 m for approximately 6 min, surfaces, and then makes a deep dive to 60 m for about 5 min, changes depth to 50 m for another 5 min, and then surfaces.**

	Physics Movement Aversions/Attractions Acoustics Representation										
Data Type	$\leq$ 0 $\geq$	Value	Units	AND / OR	$\leq$ 0 $\geq$	Value	Units	Reaction A Delta Value Delta Seco Animats/K			
llSound Re… lGreater T… .		150.0	ldΒ	And	llanore	IO.O	dВ	180.0	0.0	300.0	-1.0
	∥Sea Depth   Greater T…  -2000.0		Imeters	lOr	$ $ Less Then $ $ -5000.0		lmeters.	20.0	10.0	l0.0	$6.0E - 4$
<b>Raise Priority</b> <b>Lower Priority</b> <b>Delete Aversion</b> <b>New Aversion</b>											

**Figure B-3. Example of depth aversion parameters for modeling of marine mammal movements.**

animat makes 20° turns in water depths shallower than 2,000 m or deeper than 5,000 m to remain within that depth range.

#### **B-4. Heading Variance**

There is little data that summarizes movement in terms of heading variance, or the amount the course of the animal changes per unit time. Therefore, the default value used in the modeling is 30 degrees. Exceptions are made for migratory animals, which tend to have more linear travel; therefore, these animals typically are assigned a value of 10 degrees. Foraging animals tend to have less linear travel, as they may be trying to remain within a food patch. Therefore, foraging animals are assigned a higher heading variance value, typically 45 to 60 degrees.

These types of data have been reported in the literature as "linearity", "tortuosity" and "meander" (Soule and Wilcock, 2013). "Meander" is defined as the ratio of the total distance along the smoothed path to the net distance traveled; a value of 1 would indicate a straight path.

#### **B-5. Residency**

The amount of time that an animal spends in an area can have a tremendous influence on how the animal samples an acoustic field. For example, individuals displaying high residency in the

area of a localized noise source will experience higher exposures than animals that transit once through that area. However, since the animat exposure models are run for a 24-hour period, in accordance with the NMFS 24-hour reset rule, the effect of residency in animat modeling is minimized.

#### **B-6. Parameters of Marine Mammal Movement Behaviors Used in Impact Analysis**

Dive and swim speed information for each marine mammal or marine mammal group is a critical component of accurately and realistically modeling marine mammal movements when assessing potential exposure to underwater acoustic sound. All parameters except speed use a uniform distribution between the minimum and maximum values. Speed parameters include the minimum and maximum as well as the statistical distribution used to select speed values. Options include a normal distribution and a gamma distribution. When gamma distributions are specified, they are typically the result of fitting to an existing dataset. The mean of the normal distribution is also the mean of the minimum and maximum speed. The minimum and maximum values are four standard deviations below or above the distribution mean. Dive and swim parameters for marine mammals potentially occurring in the Project modeled area are summarized in Table B-1.

**Table B-1. Animat movement (dive and swim) parameters of the marine mammal and sea turtle species of interest in the modeling area for the Atlantic Shores North Project; multiple entries in a single cell represent multiple modeled diving states of the species. The underlying statistic distribution is uniform for all parameters except speed, which uses either a normal or user-specified gamma distribution. Literature references for each type of information are listed numerically in the row below the relevant species, with full literature citations in numerical order following this tabular information.**










\*\*Leatherback turtle's dive/swim information was used to represent all commonly occurring sea turtle species in the project area since more information on their dive and swim behaviors is available.

# **Table B-1 Literature Cited (Numerically As Presented In Table B-1)**

- 1. Kopelman, A.H. and S.S. Sadove. (1995). Ventilatory rate differences between surfacefeeding and non-surface-feeding fin whales *(Balaenoptera physalus)* in the waters off eastern Long Island, New York, U.S.A., 1981-1987. *Marine Mammal Science, 11*(2): 200- 208.
- 2. Stone, G. S., Katona, S. K., Mainwaring, A., Allen, J. M., & Corbett, H. D. (1992). Respiration and surfacing rates of fin whales (*Balaenoptera physalus*) observed from a lighthouse tower. *Reports of the International Whaling Commission, 42*, 739-745.
- 3. Witteveen, B. H., De Robertis, A., Guo, L., & Wynne, K. M. (2015). Using dive behavior and active acoustics to assess prey use and partitioning by fin and humpback whales near Kodiak Island, Alaska. *Marine Mammal Science, 31*(1), 255-278. doi:10.1111/mms.12158.
- 4. Keen, E. M., Falcone, E. A., Andrews, R. D., & Schorr, G. S. (2019). Diel dive behavior of fin whales (*Balaenoptera physalus*) in the Southern California Bight. *Aquatic Mammals, 45*(2), 233-243. doi:10.1578/am.45.2.2019.233.
- 5. Goldbogen, J., Calambokidis, J., Shadwick, R. E., Oleson, E. M., McDonald, M. A., & Hildebrand, J. A. (2006). Kinematics of foraging dives and lunge-feeding in fin whales. *The Journal of Experimental Biology, 209*(7), 1231-1244. doi:10.1242/jeb.02135.
- 6. Croll, D.A., et al. (2001). *The diving behavior of blue and fin whales: is dive duration shorter than expected based on oxygen stores?* Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology - Part A: Molecular & Integrative Physiology, 129(4): 797-809.
- 7. Charif, R.A., et al. (2002). *Estimated source levels of fin whale (Balaenoptera physalus) vocalizations: Adjustments for surface interference.* Marine Mammal Science, 18(1): 81- 98.
- 8. Panigada, S., et al., (1999). *How deep can baleen whales dive?* Marine Ecology Progress Series, 187: 309-311.
- 9. Harrison, R. and G.L. Kooyman. (1981).*Diving in marine mammals*. Carolina Biology Readers. Vol. 6., Carolina Biological Supply,16.
- 10. Ramirez, N., D. Schulte, and J. Kennedy. (2006). *Finback whale (Balaenoptera physalus) behavior on Jeffreys Ledge in the Gulf Of Maine*. In *ECS 2006*. Gydnia, Poland.
- 11. Soule, D.C. and W.S. Wilcock. (2013). *Fin whale tracks recorded by a seismic network on the Juan de Fuca Ridge, Northeast Pacific Ocean.* The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 133(3): 1751-61.
- 12. Panigada, S., et al. (2017). *Satellite tagging of Mediterranean fin whales: working towards the identification of critical habitats and the focussing of mitigation measures.* Sci Rep, 7(1): 3365.

- 13. Watkins, W.A. (1981). *Activities and underwater sounds of fin whales.* The Scientific Reports of the Whales Research Institute, (33): 83-117.
- 14. McDonald, M.A., J.A. Hildebrand, and S.C. Webb. (1995). *Blue and fin whales observed on a seafloor array in the Northeast Pacific.* The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 98(2): 712-721.
- 15. Jimenez Lopez, M.E., et al. (2019). *Fin whale movements in the Gulf of California, Mexico, from satellite telemetry.* PLoS One, 14(1): e0209324.
- 16. Nichol, L.M., et al. (2017). *Risk of lethal vessel strikes to humpback and fin whales off the west coast of Vancouver Island, Canada.* Endangered Species Research, 32: 373-390.
- 17. Di Sciara, G.N., et al. (1993). *Cetaceans in the central Mediterranean Sea: Distribution and sighting frequencies.* Bolletino di zoologia, 60(1): 131-138.
- 18. Woodley, T.H. and D.E. Gaskin. (1996). *Environmental characteristics of North Atlantic right and fin whale habitat in the lower Bay of Fundy, Canada.* Canadian Journal of Zoology, 74(1): 75-84.
- 19. Panigada, S., et al. (2005). *Fin whales (Balaenoptera physalus) summering in the Ligurian Sea: distribution, encounter rate, mean group size and relation to physiographic variables.* Journal of Cetacean Research and Management, 7(2): 137-145.
- 20. Dolphin, W.F. (1987). *Ventilation and dive patterns of humpback whales, Megaptera novaeangliae, on their Alaskan feeding grounds.* Canadian Journal of Zoology, 65(1): 83- 90.
- 21. Goldbogen, J.A., et al. (2008). *Foraging behavior of humpback whales: kinematic and respiratory patterns suggest a high cost for a lunge.* The Journal of Experimental Biology, 211(23): 3712-3719.
- 22. Burrows, J.A., et al. (2016). *Prey density and depth affect the fine-scale foraging behavior of humpback whales Megaptera novaeangliae in Sitka Sound, Alaska, USA.* Marine Ecology Progress Series, 561: 245-260.
- 23. Dolphin, W.F. (1988). *Foraging dive patterns of humpback whales Megaptera novaeangliae in Southeast Alaska USA: A cost-benefit analysis.* Canadian Journal of Zoology, 66(11): 2432-2441.
- 24. Witteveen, B.H., et al. (2008). *Investigation of foraging habits and prey selection by humpback whales (Megaptera novaeangliae) using acoustic tags and concurrent fish surveys.* Marine Mammal Science, 24(3): 516-534.
- 25. Hamilton, P.K., G.S. Stone, and S.M. Martin. (1997). *Note on a deep humpback whale Megaptera novaeangliae dive near Bermuda.* Bulletin of Marine Science, 61(2): 491-494.
- 26. Dalla Rosa, L., et al. (2008). *Movements of satellite-monitored humpback whales on their feeding ground along the Antarctic Peninsula.* Polar Biology, 31(7): 771-781.

- 27. Kennedy, A.S., et al. (2014). *Individual variation in movements of satellite-tracked humpback whales Megaptera novaeangliae in the eastern Aleutian Islands and Bering Sea.* Endangered Species Research, 23(2): 187-195.
- 28. Gabriele, C.M., et al. (1996). *Fastest documented migration of a North Pacific humpback whale.* Marine Mammal Science, 12(3): 457-464.
- 29. Dolphin, W.F. (1987). *Dive behavior and estimated energy expenditure of foraging humpback whales in southeast Alaska.* Canadian Journal of Zoology, 1 65(2): 354-362.
- 30. Baker, C.S. and L.M. Herman. (1989).*The behavioral responses of summering humpback whales to vessel traffic: Experimental and opportunistic observations*. p. 84.
- 31. Chaudry, F.A. (2006). *A comparison of east Australian humpback whale migratory behaviour between the northern and southern migrations*. In *ECS 2006*. Gydnia, Poland.
- 32. Cartwright, R., et al. (2012). *Between a rock and a hard place: habitat selection in female-calf humpback whale (Megaptera novaeangliae) pairs on the Hawaiian breeding grounds.* PloS one, 7(5): e38004.
- 33. Felix, F. and B. Haase. (2005). *Distribution of humpback whales along the coast of Ecuador and management implications.* Journal of Cetacean Research and Management, 7(1): 21-31.
- 34. Stern, S.J. (1992). *Surfacing rates and surfacing patterns of minke whales (Balaenoptera acutorostrata) off central California, and the probability of a whale surfacing within visual range.* The Report of the International Whaling Commission, 42: 379-385.
- 35. Olsen, E. and J.C. Holst. (2001). *A note on common minke whale (Balaenoptera acutorostrata) diets in the Norwegian Sea and the North Sea.* Journal of Cetacean Research and Management, 3(2): 179-183.
- 36. Kvadsheim, P.H., et al. (2017). *Avoidance responses of minke whales to 1-4kHz naval sonar.* Marine Pollution Bulletin, 121(1-2): 60-68.
- 37. Friedlaender, A.S., et al. (2014). *Feeding rates and under-ice foraging strategies of the smallest lunge filter feeder, the Antarctic minke whale (Balaenoptera bonaerensis).* The Journal of experimental biology, 217(Pt 16): 2851-4.
- 38. Risch, D., et al.. (2014). *Mysterious bio-duck sound attributed to the Antarctic minke whale (Balaenoptera bonaerensis).* Biology Letters, 10(4): 20140175.
- 39. Joyce, G., et al. (1989). *Surfacing rates of minke whales in Norwegian waters.* Rep Int Whal Commn 39: 431-434.
- 40. Stockin, K.A., et al. (2001). *Effects of diel and seasonal cycles on the dive duration of the minke whale (Balaenoptera acutorostrata).* Journal of the Marine Biological Association of the United Kingdom, 81(1): 189-190.

- 41. Øien, N., L. Folkow, and C. Lydersen. (1990). *Dive time experiments on minke whales in Norwegian waters during the 1988 season.* Reports of the International Whaling Commission, 40: 337-341.
- 42. Christiansen, F., et al. (2015). *Structure and dynamics of minke whale surfacing patterns in the gulf of st. Lawrence, Canada.* PLoS One, 10(5): e0126396.
- 43. Ford, J.K.B., et al. (2005). *Killer whale attacks on minke whales: Prey capture and antipredator tactics.* Marine Mammal Science, 21(4): 603-618.
- 44. Blix, A.S. and L.P. Folkow. (1995). *Daily energy expenditure in free living minke whales.* Acta Physiologica Scandinavica, 153(1): 61-66.
- 45. Ingram, S.N., et al. (2007). *Habitat partitioning and the influence of benthic topography and oceanography on the distribution of fin and minke whales in the Bay of Fundy, Canada.* Journal of the Marine Biological Association of the UK, 87(01): 149-156.
- 46. Robinson, K.P., M.J. Tetley, and E.G. Mitchelson-Jacob. (2009). *The distribution and habitat preference of coastally occurring minke whales (Balaenoptera acutorostrata) in north-east Scotland.* Journal of Coastal Conservation, 13(1): 39-48.
- 47. Winn, H.E., et al. (1995). *Dive patterns of tagged right whales in the Great South Channel.* Cont. Shelf. Res., 15(4/5): 593-611.
- 48. Nousek McGregor, A.E. (2010). *The cost of locomotion in North Atlantic right whales (Eubalaena glacialis)*, in *Department of Marine Science and Conservation*. Duke University.
- 49. Baumgartner, M.F. and B.R. Mate. (2003). *Summertime foraging ecology of North Atlantic right whales.* Marine Ecology Progress Series, 264: 123-135.
- 50. Nowacek, D.P., M.P. Johnson, and P.L. Tyack. (2004). *North Atlantic right whales (Eubalaena glacialis) ignore ships but respond to alerting stimuli.* Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences, 271(1536): 227-231.
- 51. Mate, B.R., et al. (1992). *Application of remote sensing methods for tracking large cetaceans: North Atlantic right whales (Eubalaena glacialis)*. U.S. Departmant of the Interior, Minerals Management Service, Alaska and Atlantic OCS Regional Offices, Herndon, Virginia. Herndon, VA: U.S. Departmant of the Interior, Minerals Management Service, Alaska and Atlantic OCS Regional Offices, Herndon, Virginia. : Herndon, Virginia.
- 52. Argüelles, M.B., et al. (2016). *Diving Behavior of Southern Right Whales (Eubalaena australis) in a Maritime Traffic Area in Patagonia, Argentina.* Aquatic Mammals, 42(1): 104-108.
- 53. Thode, A., et al. (2017). *Using nonlinear time warping to estimate North Pacific right whale calling depths in the Bering Sea.* The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 141(5): 3059.

- 54. Crance, J.L., C.L. Berchok, and J.L. Keating. (2017). *Gunshot call production by the North Pacific right whale Eubalaena japonica in the southeastern Bering Sea.* Endangered Species Research, 34: 251-267.
- 55. Hain, J.H.W., et al. (2013). *Swim Speed, Behavior, and Movement of North Atlantic Right Whales (Eubalaena glacialis) in Coastal Waters of Northeastern Florida, USA.* PloS One, 8(1).
- 56. Mate, B.R., S.L. Nieukirk, and S.D. Kraus. (1997). *Satellite-monitored movements of the northern right whale.* The Journal of Wildlife Management, 61(4): 1393-1405.
- 57. Morano, J.L., et al. (2012). *Acoustically detected year-round presence of right whales in an urbanized migration corridor.* Conservation biology : the journal of the Society for Conservation Biology, 26(4): 698-707.
- 58. Gowan, T.A. and J.G. Ortega-Ortiz. (2014). *Wintering habitat model for the North Atlantic Right Whale (Eubalaena glacialis) in the southeastern United States.* PloS One, 9(4): e95126.
- 59. Notarbartolo di Sciara, G. (1983). *Bryde's whales (Balaenopteraa edeni, 1878) off eastern Venezuela (Cetacea, Balaenopteridae)*. p. 1-28.
- 60. Alves, F., et al. (2010). *Bryde's whale (Balaenoptera brydei) stable associations and dive profiles: New insights into foraging behavior.* Marine Mammal Science, 26(1): 202-212.
- 61. Newhall, A.E., et al. (2012). *Long distance passive localization of vocalizing sei whales using an acoustic normal mode approach.* The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 131(2): 1814-25.
- 62. Ishii, M., et al. (2017). *Diving Behavior of Sei Whales Balaenoptera borealis Relative to the Vertical Distribution of Their Potential Prey.* Mammal Study, 42(4): 1-9.
- 63. Schilling, M.R., et al. (1992). *Behavior of individually-identified sei whales Balaenoptera borealis during an episodic influx into the southern gulf of maine in 1986.* Fishery Bulletin, 90(4): 749-755.
- 64. Helble, T.A., et al. (2016). *Swim track kinematics and calling behavior attributed to Bryde's whales on the Navy's Pacific Missile Range Facility.* The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 140(6): 4170-4177.
- 65. Cummings, W.C. (1985). *Bryde's whale Balaenoptera edeni Anderson, 1878*, in *Handbook of marine mammals, Vol. 3: The sirenians and baleen whales*, S.H. Ridgway and R. Harrison, Editors. Academic Press: London. p. 137-154.
- 66. Silber, G.K., M.W. Newcomer, and H.M. Pérez-Cortés. (1990). *Killer Whales (Ornicus orca) attack and kill a Bryde's whale (Balaenoptera edeni).* Canadian Journal of Zoology, 68: 1603-1606.
- 67. Murase, H., et al. (2016). *Satellite tracking of Bryde's whales Balaenoptera edeni in the offshore western North Pacific in summer 2006 and 2008.* Fisheries Science, 82(1): 35- 45.



277.



96. Schorr, G. S., Baird, R. W., Hanson, M. B., Webster, D. L., McSweeney, D. J., & Andrews, R. D. (2009). Movements of satellite-tagged Blainville's beaked whales off the island of Hawai'i. *Endangered Species Research, 10*, 203-213. doi: 10.3354/esr00229.

- 97. Johnson, M., et al. (2008). *Echolocation behaviour adapted to prey in foraging Blainville's beaked whale (Mesoplodon densirostris).* Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 275(1631): 133-139.
- 98. Houston, J. (1991). *Status of Cuvier's beaked whale, Ziphius cavirostris, in Canada.* Can. Field Nat., 105(2): 215-218.
- 99. Weir, C.R. (2000). *Sightings of beaked whales species (Cetacea: Ziphiidae) in the waters to the north and west of Scotland and the Faroe Islands.* European Research on Cetaceans, 14: 239-243.
- 100. MacLeod, C.D. and A.F. Zuur. (2005). *Habitat utilization by Blainville's beaked whales off Great Abaco, northern Bahamas, in relation to seabed topography.* Marine Biology, 147(1): 1-11.
- 101. Henderson, E.E., et al. (2016). *Occurrence and habitat use of foraging Blainville's beaked whales (Mesoplodon densirostris) on a U.S. Navy Range in Hawaii.* Aquatic Mammals, 42(4): 549-562.
- 102. Mate, B.R., et al. (1995). *Satellite-monitored movements and dive behaviour of a bottlenose dolphin (Tursiops truncatus) in Tampa Bay, Florida.* Marine Mammal Science, 11(4): 452-463.
- 103. Lockyer, C. and R. Morris. (1987). *Observations on diving behavior and swimming speeds in a wild juvenile Tursiops truncatus.* Aquatic Mammals, 13(1): 31-35.
- 104. Lockyer, C. and R.J. Morris, *The history and behavior of a wild, sociable bottlenose dolphin (Tursiops truncatus) off the north coast of Cornwall (England, UK).* Aquatic Mammals, 1986. 12(1): p. 3-16.
- 105. Kooyman, G.L. and H.T. Andersen. (1969). *Deep diving*, in *Biology of marine mammals*, H.T. Andersen, Editor. Academic Press. p. 65-94.
- 106. Klatsky, L.J., R.S. Wells, and J.C. Sweeney. (2007). *Offshore bottlenose dolphins (Tursiops truncatus): movement and dive behavior near the Bermuda pedestal.* Journal of Mammalogy, 88(1): 59-66.
- 107. Harzen, S.E. (2002).*Use of an electronic theodolite in the study of movements of the bottlenose dolphin (Tursiops truncatus) in the Sado Estuary, Portugal.* Aquatic Mammals, 28(3): 251-260.
- 108. Rohr, J.J., F.E. Fish, and J.W. Gilpatrick. (2002). *Maximum swim speeds of captive and free-ranging delphinids: Critical analysis of extraordinary performance.* Marine Mammal Science, 18(1): 1-19.
- 109. Ridoux, V., et al. (1997). *A video sonar as a new tool to study marine mammals in the wild: measurements of dolphin swimming speed.* Marine Mammal Science, 13(2): 196- 206.
- 110. Würsig, B. and M. Würsig. (1979). *Behavior and Ecology of the bottlenose dolphin, (Tursiops truncatus) in the South Atlantic.* Fishery Bulletin, 77(2): 399-412.
- 111. Wells, R.S., et al. (1999). *Long distance offshore movements of bottlenose dolphins.* Marine Mammal Science, 15(4): 1098-1114.
- 112. Garrison, L.P., et al. (2003). *Abundance of the coastal morphotype of bottlenose dolphin Tursiops truncatus, in U.S. continental shelf waters between New Jersey and Florida during winter and summer 2002. NMFS/SEFSC report prepared and reviewed for the Bottlenose Dolphin Take Reduction Team. Available from: Southeast Fisheries Science Center, 75 Virginia Beach Dr., Miami, FL 33149.*
- 113. Evans, W.E. (1994). *Common Dolphin, white bellied porpoise (Delphnis delphis, LInnaeus, 1758).* in *Handbook of Marine Mammals*, S. Ridgway and R. Harrison, Editors. Academic Press. p. 191-224.
- 114. Evans, W.E. (1971). *Orientation behavior of delphinids: radio telemetric studies.* Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, 188: 142-160.
- 115. Heyning, J.E. and W.F. Perrin. (1994). *Evidence for two species of common dolphins (genus Delphinus) from the eastern North Pacific.* Contributions in Science, 442: 1-35.
- 116. Hui, C.A. (1987). *Power and speed of swimming dolphins.* Journal of Mammalogy, 68(1): 126-132.
- 117. Wiggins, S.M., et al. (2013). *Tracking dolphin whistles using an autonomous acoustic recorder array.* The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 133(6): 3813-8.
- 118. Selzer, L.A. and P.M. Payne. (1988). *The distribution of white-sided (Lagenorhynchus acutus) and common dolphins (Delphinus delphis) vs. environmental features of the continental shelf of the northeastern United States.* Marine Mammal Science, 4(2): 141- 153.
- 119. Cañadas, A., R. Sagarminaga, and T.S. Garcia. (2002). *Cetacean distribution related with depth and slope in the Mediterranean waters off southern Spain.* Deep Sea Research Part I Oceanographic Research Papers, 49(11): 2053-2073.
- 120. Otani, S. (2000). *Diving behavior and swimming speed of a free-ranging harbor porpoise, Phocoena phocoena.* Marine Mammal Science, 16(4): 811-814.
- 121. van Beest, F.M., et al. (2018). *Environmental drivers of harbour porpoise fine-scale movements.* Marine Biology, 165(95).
- 122. Westgate, A.J., et al. (1995). *Diving behaviour of harbour porpoises, Phocoena phocoena.* Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences, 52(5): 1064-1073.
- 123. Linnenschmidt, M., et al. (2013). *Biosonar, dive, and foraging activity of satellite tracked harbor porpoises (Phocoena phocoena).* Marine Mammal Science, 29(2): E77-E97.
- 124. Kastelein, R.A., S. Van de Voorde, and N. Jennings. (2018). *Swimming Speed of a Harbor Porpoise (Phocoena phocoena) During Playbacks of Offshore Pile Driving Sounds.* Aquatic Mammals, 44(1): 92-99.

- 125. Carretta, J.V., K.A. Forney, and J.L. Laake. (2001). *Abundance and depth distribution of harbor porpoise (Phocoena phocoena) in northern California determined from a 1995 ship survey.* Fishery Bulletin, 99(1): 29-39.
- 126. Calambokidis, J., C., et al. (1990). *Harbor porpoise studies in the Gulf of the Farallones. Final contract report CX 8000-8-0001 to the Gulf of the Farallones National Marine Sanctuary, 57 p. Fort Mason Center, Bldg. 201, San Francisco, CA 94123*.
- 127. Marubini, F., et al. (2009). *Habitat preferences and interannual variability in occurrence of the harbour porpoise Phocoena phocoena off northwest Scotland.* Marine Ecology Progress Series, 381: 297-310.
- 128. Noren, D.P. and D.D.W. Hauser. (2016). *Surface-Based Observations Can Be Used to Assess Behavior and Fine-Scale Habitat Use by an Endangered Killer Whale (Orcinus orca) Population.* Aquatic Mammals, 42(2): 168-183.
- 129. Nøttestad, L., A. Ferno, and B.E. Axelsen. (2002). *Digging in the deep: Killer whales' advanced hunting tactic.* Polar Biology, 25(12): 939-941.
- 130. Baird, R.W. (1994). *Foraging behavior and ecology of transient killer whales (Orcinus orca)*. Simon Fraser University. p. 159.
- 131. Baird, R.W., M.B. Hanson, and L.M. Dill. (2005). *Factors influencing the diving behaviour of fish-eating killer whales: sex differences and diel and interannual variation in diving rates.* Canadian Journal of Zoology, 83(2): 257-267.
- 132. Reisinger, R.R., et al. (2015). *Movement and diving of killer whales (Orcinus orca) at a Southern Ocean archipelago.* Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology, 473: 90-102.
- 133. Miller, P.J.O.M., A.D. Shapiro, and V.B. Deecke. (2010). *The diving behaviour of mammal-eating killer whales (Orcinus orca): variations with ecological not physiological factors.* Canadian Journal of Zoology, 88(11): 1103-1112.
- 134. Kriete, B. (2002). *Bioenergetic changes from 1986 to 2001 in the southern resident killer whale population, Orcinus orca*. Orca Relief Citizens' Alliance. p. 26.
- 135. Williams, R., et al. (2002). *Behavioural responses of male killer whales to a 'leapfrogging' vessel.* Journal of Cetacean Research and Management, 4(3): 305-310.
- 136. Bain, D., E., et al. (2005). *Effects of Vessels on behavior of southern resident killer whales (Orcinus spp.)*. in *15th Biennial Conference on the Biology of Marine Mammals*.
- 137. Baird, R.W. (2005). *Sightings of dwarf (Kogia sima) and pygmy (K. breviceps) sperm whales from the main Hawaiian Islands.* Pacific Science, 59(3): 461-466.
- 138. Breese, D. and B.R. Tershy. (1993). *Relative abundance of Cetacea in the Canal de Ballenas, Gulf of California.* Marine Mammal Science, 9(3): 319-324.
- 139. Baumgartner, M.F., et al. (2001). *Cetacean habitats in the northern Gulf of Mexico.* Fishery Bulletin Seattle, 99(2): 219-239.

- 140. Hohn, A., et al. (1995). *Radiotracking of a rehabilitated pygmy sperm whale*. in *Eleventh biennial conference on the biology of marine mammals*. Orlando, FL.
- 141. Scott, M.D., et al. (2001). *A note on the release and tracking of a rehabilitated pygmy sperm whale (Kogia breviceps).* Journal of Cetacean Research and Management, 3(1): 87-94.
- 142. Dolar, L. and W. Perrin. (2003). *Dwarf sperm whale (Kogia sima) habitats in the Philippines*. in *15th Biennial conference on the biology of marine mammals*. Greensboro, NC.
- 143. Mate, B.R., et al. (2005). *Movements and dive habits of a satellite-monitored longfinned pilot whale (Globicephala melas) in the northwest Atlantic.* Marine Mammal Science, 21(1): 136-144.
- 144. Baird, R.W., et al. (2002). *Diving and night-time behavior of long-finned pilot whales in the Ligurian Sea.* Marine Ecology Progress Series, 237: 301-305.
- 145. Nawojchik, R., D.J. St Aubin, and A. Johnson. (2003). *Movements and dive behavior of two stranded, rehabilitated long-finned pilot whales (Globicephala melas) in the northwest Atlantic.* Marine Mammal Science, 19(1): 232-239.
- 146. Aoki, K., et al. (2017). *High diving metabolic rate indicated by high-speed transit to depth in negatively buoyant long-finned pilot whales.* Journal Of Experimental Biology, 220(Pt 20): 3802-3811.
- 147. Alves, F., et al. (2013). *Daytime dive characteristics from six short-finned pilot whales Globicephala macrorhynchus off Madeira Island.* Arquipelago - Life and Marine Sciences.
- 148. Aguilar Soto, N., et al. (2008). *Cheetahs of the deep sea: deep foraging sprints in shortfinned pilot whales off Tenerife (Canary Islands).* Journal of Animal Ecology, 77(5): 936 - 947.
- 149. Heide-Jørgensen, M.P., et al. (2002). *Diving behaviour of long-finned pilot whales Globicephala melas around the Faroe Islands.* Wildlife Biology, 8(4): 307-313.
- 150. Shane, S.H. (1995). *Behavior patterns of pilot whales and Risso's dolphins off Santa Catalina Island, California.* Aquatic Mammals, 21(3): 195-197.
- 151. Norris, K.S. and J.H. Prescott. (1961). *Observations on Pacific cetaceans of Californian and Mexican waters.* University of California Publications in Zoology, 63: 291-402.
- 152. Miller, P. (2012). *The severity of behavioral changes observed during experimental exposures of killer (Orcinus orca), long-finned pilot (Globicephala melas), and sperm (Physeter macrocephalus) whales to naval sonar.* Aquatic Mammals, 38(4): 362-401.
- 153. Thorne, L.H., et al. (2017). *Movement and foraging behavior of short-finned pilot whales in the Mid-Atlantic Bight: importance of bathymetric features and implications for management.* Marine Ecology Progress Series, 584: 245-257.
- 154. Bearzi, G., et al. (2011). *Risso's dolphin Grampus griseus in the Mediterranean Sea.* Mammalian Biology, 76: 385-400.
- 155. Arranz, P., et al. (2018). *Risso's dolphins plan foraging dives.* Journal of Experimental Biology, 221(Pt 4).
- 156. Wells, R.S., et al. (2009). *Movements and dive patterns of a rehabilitated Risso's dolphin, Grampus griseus, in the Gulf of Mexico and Atlantic Ocean.* Marine Mammal Science, 25(2): 420-429.
- 157. Olavarria, C., L.A. Aguayo, and R. Bernal. (2001). *Distribution of Risso's dolphin (Grampus griseus, Cuvier 1812) in Chilean waters.* Revista de Biologia Marina y Oceanografia, 36(1): 111-116.
- 158. Miyazaki, N. and W.F. Perrin. (1994). *Rough-toothed dolphin Steno bredanensis (Lesson, 1828)*, in *Handbook of marine mammals, Volume 5: The first book of dolphins*, S.H. Ridgway and R. Harrison, Editors. Academic Press: London. p. 1-21.
- 159. Ritter, F. (2002). *Behavioural observations of rough-toothed dolphins (Steno bredanensis) off La Gomera, Canary Islands (1995-2000), with special reference to their interactions with humans.* Aquatic Mammals, 28(1): 46-59.
- 160. Watkins, W.A., et al. (1987). *Steno bredaneisis in the Mediterranean Sea.* Marine Mammal Science, 3(1): 78-82.
- 161. Gannier, A. and K.L. West. (2005). *Distribution of the Rough-Toothed Dolphin (Steno bredanensis) around the Windward Islands (French Polynesia).* Pacific Science, 59(1): 17- 24.
- 162. Jaquet, N., S. Dawson, and E. Slooten. (2000). *Seasonal distribution and diving behaviour of male sperm whales off Kaikoura: Foraging implications.* Canadian Journal of Zoology, 78(3): 407-419.
- 163. Watwood, S.L., et al., *Deep-diving foraging behaviour of sperm whales (Physeter macrocephalus).* Journal of Animal Ecology, 2006. 75(3): p. 814-825.
- 164. Miller, P.J.O., et al. (2004). *Swimming gaits, passive drag and buoyancy of diving sperm whales Physeter macrocephalus.* The Journal of Experimental Biology, 207(11): 1953- 1967.
- 165. Watkins, W.A., et al.. (2002). *Sperm whale dives tracked by radio tag telemetry.* Marine Mammal Science, 18(1): 55-68.
- 166. Papastavrou, V., S.C. Smith, and H. Whitehead. (1989). *Diving behavior of the sperm whale Physeter macrocephalus off the Galapagos Islands, Ecuador.* Canadian Journal of Zoology, 67(4): 839-846.
- 167. Jochens, A., et al. (2008). *Sperm whale seismic study in the Gulf of Mexico, Synthesis Report*. p. 341.
- 168. Aoki, K., et al. (2007). *Diel diving behavior of sperm whales off Japan* Marine Ecology Progress Series, 349: 277-287.
- 169. Davis, R.W., et al. (2007). *Diving behavior of sperm whales in relation to behavior of a major prey species, the jumbo squid, in the Gulf of California, Mexico.* Marine Ecology Progress Series, 333: 291-302.
- 170. Teloni, V., et al. (2008). *Shallow food for deep divers: Dynamic foraging behavior of male sperm whales in a high latitude habitat.* Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology, 354(1): 119-131.
- 171. Palka, D. and M. Johnson. (2007). *Cooperative research to study dive patterns of sperm whales in the Atlantic Ocean*. Minerals Management Service, Gulf of Mexico Region.
- 172. Guerra, M., et al. (2017). *Diverse foraging strategies by a marine top predator: Sperm whales exploit pelagic and demersal habitats in the Kaikōura submarine canyon.* Deep Sea Research Part I: Oceanographic Research Papers, 128: 98-108.
- 173. Jaquet, N. and H. Whitehead. (1999). *Movements, distribution and feeding success of sperm whales in the Pacific Ocean, over scales of days and tens of kilometers.* Aquatic Mammals, 25(1): 1-13.
- 174. Whitehead, H. (2016). *Consensus movements by groups of sperm whales.* Marine Mammal Science, 32(4): 1402-1415.
- 175. Irvine, L., et al. (2017). *Sperm whale dive behavior characteristics derived from intermediate-duration archival tag data.* Ecology and Evolution, 7(19): 7822-7837.
- 176. Whitehead, H., S.C. Smith, and V. Papastavrou. (1989). *Diving behavior of the sperm whales, (Physeter macrocephalus), off the Galapagos Islands.* Can. J. Zool., 67(4): 839- 846.
- 177. Lockyer, C. (1997). *Diving behaviour of the sperm whale in relation to feeding.* Bulletin de l'Institut Royal des Sciences Naturelles de Belgique Biologie, 67(SUPPL): 47-52.
- 178. Wahlberg, M. (2002). *The acoustic behaviour of diving sperm whales observed with a hydrophone array.* Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology, 281(1-2): 53-62.
- 179. Watkins, W.A., et al. (1999). *Sperm whale surface activity from tracking by radio and satellite tags.* Marine Mammal Science, 15(4): 1158-1180.
- 180. Whitehead, H., S. Brennan, and D. Grover. (1992). *Distribution and behavior of male sperm whales on the Scotian Shelf, Canada.* Canadian Journal of Zoology, 70(5): 912-918.
- 181. Scott, T.M. and S.S. Sadove. (1997). *Sperm Whale, Physeter macrocephalus, sightings in the shallow shelf waters off Long Island, New York.* Marine Mammal Science, 13(2): 317- 320.
- 182. Jaquet, N. and D. Gendron. (2002). *Distribution and relative abundance of sperm whales in relation to key environmental features, squid landings and the distribution of other cetacean species in the Gulf of California, Mexico.* Marine Biology, 141(3): 591-601.

- 183. Thompson, D., et al. (1991). *Movements, diving and foraging behaviour of grey seals (Halichoerus grypus).* Journal of Zoology, London, 224(2): 223-232.
- 184. Goulet, A.M., M.O. Hammill, and C. Barrette. (2001). *Movements and diving of grey seal females (Halichoerus grypus) in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, Canada.* Polar Biology, 24(6): 432-439.
- 185. Thompson, D. and M.A. Fedak. (1993). *Cardiac responses of grey seals during diving at sea.* Journal of Experimental Biology, 174: 139-154.
- 186. Sparling, C.E. and M.A. Fedak. (2004). *Metabolic rates of captive grey seals during voluntary diving.* J Exp Biol, 207(Pt 10): 1615-24.
- 187. Bowen, W., D. Boness, and S. Iverson. (1999). *Diving behaviour of lactating harbour seals and their pups during maternal foraging trips.* Canadian Journal of Zoology, 77: 978-988.
- 188. Lesage, V., M.O. Hammill, and K.M. Kovacs. (1999). *Functional classification of harbor seal (Phoca vitulina) dives using depth profiles, swimming velocity, and an index of foraging success.* Canadian Journal of Zoology, 77(1): 74-87.
- 189. Gjertz, I., C. Lydersen, and O. Wiig. (2001). *Distribution and diving of harbor seals (Phoca vitulina) in Svalbard.* Polar Biology, 24(3): 209-214.
- 190. Hastings, K.K., et al. (2004). *Regional differences in diving behavior of harbor seals in the Gulf of Alaska.* Canadian Journal of Zoology, 82(11): 1755-1773.
- 191. Eguchi, T. and J.T. Harvey. (2005). *Diving behavior of the Pacific harbor seal (Phoca vitulina richardii) in Monterey Bay, California.* Marine Mammal Science, 21(2): 283-295.
- 192. Ries, E.H., et al. (1997). *Diving patterns of harbour seals (Phoca vitulina) in the Wadden Sea, the Netherlands and Germany, as indicated by VHF telemetry.* Canadian Journal of Zoology, 75(12): 2063-2068.
- 193. James, M.C., S.A. Eckert, and R.A. Myers. (2005). *Migratory and reproductive movements of male leatherback turtles (Dermochelys coriacea).* Marine Biology, 147(4): 845-853.
- 194. Sale, A., et al. (2006). *Long-term monitoring of leatherback turtle diving behaviour during oceanic movements.* Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology, 328(2): 197-210.
- 195. Byrne, R., et al. (2009). *Tracking leatherback turtles (Dermochelys coriacea) during consecutive inter-nesting intervals: Further support for direct transmitter attachment.* Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology, 377(2): 68-75.
- 196. López-Mendilaharsua, M., et al. (2009). *Prolonged deep dives by the leatherback turtle Dermochelys coriacea: pushing their aerobic dive limits.* Marine Biodiversity Records, 2: e35.



doi:10.1578/am.35.3.2009.313.

**Appendix C: Annual Acoustic Exposure Tables**

### **Table C-1. Year 1 Acoustic Exposure Estimates of Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles for the Atlantic Shores North Project Based on Impact Pile Driving Installation Schedule 1 (15-m Monopiles and OSS Jackets, Which Includes Four Post-Piled Pin Piles) for the Shallow Model Site.**



### **Table C-2. Year 1 Acoustic Exposure Estimates of Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles for the Atlantic Shores North Project Based on Impact Pile Driving Installation Schedule 1 (15-m Monopiles and OSS Jackets, Which Includes Four Post-Piled Pin Piles) for the Deep Model Site.**



### **Table C-3. Year 2 Acoustic Exposure Estimates of Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles for the Atlantic Shores North Project Based on Impact Pile Driving Installation Schedule 1 (15-m Monopiles and OSS Jackets, Which Includes Four Post-Piled Pin Piles) for the Shallow Model Site.**



### **Table C-4. Year 2 Acoustic Exposure Estimates of Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles for the Atlantic Shores North Project Based on Impact Pile Driving Installation Schedule 1 (15-m Monopiles and OSS Jackets, Which Includes Four Post-Piled Pin Piles) for the Deep Model Site.**



### **Table C-5. Year 1 Acoustic Exposure Estimates of Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles for the Atlantic Shores North Project Based on Impact Pile Driving Installation Schedule 2 (Jackets and OSS Jackets, Which Includes Four Pre- and Post-Piled Pin Piles, Respectively) for the Shallow Model Site.**



# **Table C-6. Year 1 Acoustic Exposure Estimates of Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles for the Atlantic Shores North Project Based on Impact Pile Driving Installation Schedule 2 (Jackets and OSS Jackets, Which Includes Four Pre- and Post-Piled Pin Piles, Respectively) for the Deep Model Site.**



# **Table C-7. Year 2 Acoustic Exposure Estimates of Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles for the Atlantic Shores North Project Based on Impact Pile Driving Installation Schedule 2 (Jackets and OSS Jackets, Which Includes Four Pre- and Post-Piled Pin Piles, Respectively) for the Shallow Model Site.**



# **Table C-8. Year 2 Acoustic Exposure Estimates of Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles for the Atlantic Shores North Project Based on Impact Pile Driving Installation Schedule 2 (Jackets and OSS Jackets, Which Includes Four Pre- and Post-Piled Pin Piles, Respectively) for the Deep Model Site.**



### **Table C-9. Year 1 Acoustic Exposure Estimates of Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles for the Atlantic Shores North Project Based on the Maximum Case Impact Pile Driving Installation (15-m Monopiles and Maximum Exposures per Species from Either Model Site).**





