Via e-mail to Jolie Harrison at <a href="mailto:ITP.Laws@noaa.gov">ITP.Laws@noaa.gov</a>

Jolie Harrison Chief, Permits and Conservation Division Office of Protected Resources National Marine Fisheries Service 1315 East-West Highway Silver Spring, MD 20910

E-mail: jolie.harrison@noaa.gov

Re: Takes of Marine Mammals Incidental to Specified Activities; Taking Marine Mammals Incidental to Geophysical Surveys in the Atlantic Ocean; RIN 0648-XE283; 82 Fed. Reg. 26,244 (June 6, 2017); 82 Fed. Reg. 31048 (July 5, 2017).

Dear Ms. Harrison:

We ardently oppose offshore oil and gas drilling as well as geological and geophysical ("G&G") survey technologies, <sup>1</sup> including seismic airgun surveys, which have been proposed for use by five G&G companies to conduct oil and gas exploration in the Atlantic. <sup>2</sup> Over 125 municipalities along the East Coast and nearly 1,200 elected officials, as well as an alliance representing 41,000 businesses and 500,000 fishing families have publicly opposed seismic airgun surveys and/or offshore drilling, citing threats to marine life, commercial fisheries and coastal economies. <sup>3</sup> For

-

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> For purposes of this comment letter, "G&G survey technologies" includes all technologies (used in the past, currently or in the future), including multibeam echo sounders and seismic airguns, that use sound to explore for oil and gas.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> While we appreciate the opportunity to comment on the five proposed IHAs (860 pages), the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management ("BOEM") 2014 Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement ("PEIS") (2,158 pages), and the Federal Register notice itself (91 pages) and numerous referenced sources, the 30-day comment period, extended by a mere 15 days, is entirely too short to allow the public sufficient time to review over 3,500 pages of technical materials and comment in a meaningful manner on five proposed IHAs all at the same time. In accordance with regulations, the Fisheries Service should be providing a separate 30-day comment period for each of the proposed IHAs. 50 C.F.R. § 216.104(b)(2). We urge the Fisheries Service to further extend the comment period to allow for five consecutive 30-day comment periods (one for each proposed IHA) or, at minimum, by an additional 45 days to allow the public reasonable time to comment. In addition, we urge the Fisheries Service to provide public hearings in coastal communities where the proposed seismic surveys are to occur from Delaware to Florida to learn the public's views on this matter.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Oceana, *Grassroots Opposition to Atlantic Drilling and Seismic Airgun Blasting*, <a href="http://usa.oceana.org/climate-and-energy/grassroots-opposition-offshore-drilling-and-exploration-atlantic-ocean-and">http://usa.oceana.org/climate-and-energy/grassroots-opposition-offshore-drilling-and-exploration-atlantic-ocean-and</a> (last visited July 20, 2017); <a href="https://see also">see also</a> Letter from the New England Fishery Management Council to Secretary Zinke, cc'ing Assistant Administrator for NOAA Fisheries, Chris Oliver; Director of NOAA Office of Protected Resources, Donna Wieting; Director of NOAA Office of Habitat Conservation, Patricia Montanio (June 29, 2017), <a href="http://usa.oceana.org/sites/default/files/662/nefmc\_letter\_2017-06-29.pdf">http://usa.oceana.org/sites/default/files/662/nefmc\_letter\_2017-06-29.pdf</a>; Letter from the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council to Secretary Zinke, cc'ing NOAA Acting Administrator for Fisheries Sam Rauch (April 25, 2017), <a href="http://usa.oceana.org/sites/default/files/662/safmc\_letter\_2017-04-25.pdf">http://usa.oceana.org/sites/default/files/662/safmc\_letter\_2017-04-25.pdf</a>; Letter from 103 Congressional Representatives to Secretary Ryan Zinke (June 28, 2017), <a href="http://usa.oceana.org/sites/default/files/662/final\_signed\_-\_zinke\_-\_atlantic\_seismic\_testing\_-\_june\_28\_2017.pdf">http://usa.oceana.org/sites/default/files/662/final\_signed\_-\_zinke\_-\_atlantic\_seismic\_testing\_-\_june\_28\_2017.pdf</a>

July 21, 2017 Page 2 of 24

the reasons elaborated below, we urge the National Marine Fisheries Service ("Fisheries Service" or "agency") to deny all five proposed incidental harassment authorizations ("IHAs").

#### Marine Mammal Protection Act ("MMPA") Violations

Under the MMPA, the Fisheries Service must deny the IHA applications if they do not meet either of the required statutory elements of "small numbers" or "negligible impact." And, a failure of the agency to use and require IHA applicants to uniformly use the "best scientific evidence available" presents additional grounds to deny the five IHA applications.<sup>4</sup>

• <u>Small numbers</u>: When determining the meaning of the "small numbers" requirement, federal courts have *never* found an IHA that requested a percentage of take greater than 12 to be a "small number." In fact, an IHA "that permits the potential taking of as much as 12 percent of the population of a species is *plainly* against Congress' intent." Here, the Fisheries Service's own proposed take limit of 30 percent of a marine mammal stock abundance estimate is not a "small number" and is "*plainly* against Congress' intent." As all IHA applicants have individually exceeded the "small number" threshold of 12 percent in some manner in their take estimates, the Fisheries Service must deny all five proposed IHAs. And, if the five proposed IHA applications are reviewed with a view to cumulative impacts as both logic and law dictate considering the acknowledged fact that "the specified activity, specified geographic region, and proposed dates of activity are substantially similar," then the Fisheries Service must categorically deny all five proposed IHAs.

(last visited July 14, 2017); Letter from 103 Congressional Representatives to Secretary Ross (July 20, 2017) (on file with Oceana).

<sup>8</sup> 82 Fed. Reg. 26,244, 26,245 (June 6, 2017).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> 16 U.S.C. 1371(a)(3)(A) (requiring "best scientific evidence available" to determine "when, to what extent, if at all, and by what means . . . to waive the requirements . . . so as to allow taking, or importing of any marine mammal. ..."); 50 C.F.R. § 216.102(a) (requiring "best scientific evidence available" when analyzing the taking of small numbers of marine mammals under section 101(a)(5)(A) through (D)); see also id. § 216.104(c); § 216.105(c). <sup>5</sup> See NRDC, Inc. v. Pritzker, 828 F.3d 1125, 1132 (9th Cir. 2016) (stating "the Navy may also take, through level B Harassment, up to 12% of the entire stock of every affected marine mammal species every year") (emphasis added); NRDC v. Pritzker, 62 F. Supp. 3d 969, 981 (N.D. Cal. 2014) ("The Navy must conduct operations so that no more than 12% of any marine mammal species or stock will be taken annually by Level B harassment, regardless of the number of vessels operating."); NRDC v. Evans, 232 F. Supp. 2d 1003, 1027 (N.D. Cal. 2002) ("A definition of 'small number' that permits the potential taking of as much as 12 percent of the population of a species is plainly against Congress' intent"); see also Takes of Marine Mammals Incidental to Specified Activities; Taking Marine Mammals Incidental to Marine Geophysical Survey in the Atlantic Ocean Off the Eastern Seaboard, August to September 2014 and April to August 2015, 79 Fed. Reg. 52122, 52131 (Sept. 2, 2014) (responding to an environmental organization's claim that 43% of a population would be taken pursuant to an IHA, violating the "small numbers" requirement of the MMPA, by stating that the number taken would actually be only 6.5% of the U.S. EEZ stock).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> NRDC v. Evans, 232 F. Supp. 2d 1003, 1027 (N.D. Cal. 2002).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> 82 Fed. Reg. 26244, 26295 (June 6, 2017) (stating that "we propose a take authorization limit of 30 percent of a stock abundance estimate" to define "small numbers" and limiting IHA applicant takes to that level); *see also id.* at Table 10 (revising the numbers of potential incidental take proposed for authorization in the IHAs at Table 11 to reach the agency proposed "small number" level of 30% or less, which in several instances means that the agency is allowing the IHA applicants to *increase* take levels). For example, Spectrum's take levels for all marine mammal species but one (the blue whale) were *increased* by the Fisheries Service.

- Negligible impact: The Fisheries Service's "subjective and relative" decision matrix in the Federal Register notice leads to a flawed negligible impact determination, <sup>9</sup> and one that would even allow takes in excess of the "potential biological removal level" ("PBR") for the marine mammal species in the proposed survey area. <sup>10</sup> The agency's approach to negligible impact is illogical and unlawful. Potential biological removal levels are listed in Table 4 of the Federal Register notice and the estimated takes for the five proposed IHAs, which the agency arbitrarily revised, are listed in Table 11. <sup>11</sup> The actual estimated takes requested by the applicants are found in the IHA applications. <sup>12</sup>
  - o <u>Humpback whale</u>: By conducting this comparison between Table 4 and Table 11 in the Federal Register, one finds that, with respect to the humpback whale, which has an annual potential biological removal level of only 13 individuals, the serious injury or mortality (Level A) take estimates from Spectrum (16), TGS (22) and CGG (22) clearly exceed 13 individuals when looked at separately. Takes of this magnitude could harm the population growth rate of the species if looked at cumulatively (as they should be).
  - O Pantropical spotted dolphin: In its IHA application, CGG requested 37 serious injury or mortality (Level A) takes of the pantropical spotted dolphin. The PBR for this species is 17. As CGG's take request exceeds the PBR for this species, the Fisheries Service should deny the IHA application for failure to meet the "negligible impact" standard of the MMPA.
  - North Atlantic right whale: The PBR for the endangered and depleted population of 440 individual North Atlantic right whales is one;<sup>15</sup> however, there have been nine mortalities of North Atlantic right whales since April 2017, including two

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> 82 Fed. Reg. 26,244, 26,296 (June 6, 2017); *id.* at 26,296-26,308. In the Fisheries Service's self-described "subjective and relative" decision matrix, a negligible impact rating is allegedly derived by combining "magnitude," which is composed of measurable factors – amount of take, spatial extent and temporal extent of effect, "consequence", which is a qualitative, and context, which includes species-specific information related to the status of the stock and mitigation.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup> 16 U.S.C. § 1362(20). The Fisheries Service must evaluate several factors to determine the "potential biological removal level": (1) the minimum population estimate of the stock; (2) one-half the maximum theoretical or estimated net productivity rate of the stock at a small population size; and (3) a recovery factor of between 0.1 and 1.0. *Id*.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup> Compare 82 Fed. Reg. 26,244, 26,269-70, Table 4 – Marine Mammals Potentially Present in the Vicinity of the Proposed Survey Activities (June 6, 2017) with id. at 26,295-96 at Table 11 – Estimated Incidents of Potential Exposure for Level B Harassment. Table 10, represents the estimated incidents of exposure as devised by the Fisheries Service to allow each individual applicant to take up to 30% of a stock abundance estimate (resulting in the take of an absurdly large number of a marine mammal species when looked at from a cumulative perspective. *Id.* at Table 10 – Numbers of Potential Incidental Take Proposed for Authorization.

Spectrum IHA Application at Table 4; TGS IHA Application at Table 6.5, 85; WesternGeco IHA Application at Table 6.5, 83; ION IHA Application at Table 4; CGG IHA Application at Tables 4, 7.
 CGG IHA Application at Table 4.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>14</sup> 82 Fed. Reg. 26,244 at Table 4 (June 6, 2017).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>15</sup> 82 Fed. Reg. 26,244 at Table 4 (June 6, 2017) (noting a NMFS stock abundance of 440 for the endangered and depleted North Atlantic right whale and a PBR of one).

sexually mature females and one yearling that was a female. <sup>16</sup> While the PBR level for North Atlantic right whales was calculated as one when the population was 440, the calculated PBR would be even further reduced as a result of the additional loss of nine individuals since April 2017. <sup>17</sup> Here, the serious injury or mortality (Level A) take estimates for Spectrum (1) and ION (2) exceed the current PBR for the right whale; therefore, their IHA applications should be denied. In addition, take estimates found in each of the five IHA applications request permission to harass North Atlantic right whales 38 times— if they harass 38 different individuals that would amount to harassment of nearly nine percent of the right whale population. See table below. Roughly nine percent is a significant number of takes for such a small population of only 440 individuals, particularly considering that the population is declining in abundance. <sup>18</sup> On this basis alone, the five proposed IHAs would not meet the "negligible impact" standard and should be denied.

North Atlantic Right Whale Takes

Requested Takes By Exposures		
	Level A Take	Level B Take
Spectrum	1	1
TGS	0	12
WesternGeco	0	6
ION	2	14
CGG	0	2
-Total Per Take Type-	-3-	-35-
Total	38	
Total divided by population 440 <sup>19</sup>	8.63% <sup>20</sup> of the population will be harassed	

Sources: Spectrum IHA Application at Table 4; TGS IHA Application at Table 6.5, 85; WesternGeco IHA Application at Table 6.5, 83; ION IHA Application at Table 4; CGG IHA Application at Tables 4, 7.

• <u>Best scientific evidence available</u>: Under the MMPA and the Fisheries Service's implementing regulations, the agency itself must not only use but also must require IHA

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>16</sup> Ashifa Kassam, Seven right whales found dead in 'devastating' blow to endangered animal, THE GUARDIAN (July 8, 2017), <a href="https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2017/jul/08/right-whales-dead-canada-endangered-species">https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2017/jul/08/right-whales-dead-canada-endangered-species</a>; Elizabeth Fraser, Snow crab fishery closed after 8<sup>th</sup> right whale found dead in Gulf of St. Lawrence, CBC NEWS (July 21, 2017), <a href="https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/new-brunswick/right-whale-dead-gulf-st-lawrence-1.4213660">https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/new-brunswick/right-whale-dead-gulf-st-lawrence-1.4213660</a>; NOAA Fisheries, Updated on Right Whale Found Dead in Cape Cod Bay; Vessels of all sizes need to be cautious (Apr. 14, 2017),

 $<sup>\</sup>frac{https://www.greateratlantic.fisheries.noaa.gov/mediacenter/2017/04/Update\%\,20on\%\,20Right\%\,20Whale\%\,20Found\,\%\,20Dead\%\,20in\%\,20Cape\%\,20Cod\%\,20Bay.html.}$ 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>17</sup> The potential biological removal level for the North Atlantic right whale is likely closer to .86 (440 - 9 x .02 x.1). Scott D. Kraus, et. al, *Recent Scientific Publications Cast Doubt on North Atlantic Right Whale Future*, 3

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>18</sup> Scott D. Kraus, et. al, *Recent Scientific Publications Cast Doubt on North Atlantic Right Whale Future*, 3 FRONTIERS IN MARINE SCIENCE 1, 2 (2016).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>19</sup> 82 Fed. Reg. 26,244 at Table 4 (June 6, 2017) (noting a NMFS stock abundance of 440 for the endangered and depleted North Atlantic right whale and a PBR of one).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>20</sup> 8.63% is derived by dividing total takes of 38 by the population of North Atlantic right whales of 440.

July 21, 2017 Page 5 of 24

applicants to uniformly use the "best scientific evidence available." Here, the IHA applicants do not uniformly rely on best scientific evidence available, such as *CetMap* data, in their IHA applications. <sup>22</sup> *CetMap* is a working group that was organized by NOAA to map cetacean density and distribution in U.S. waters. <sup>23</sup> Rather than relying on outdated and vastly differing take estimates in the five proposed IHAs, overlooking the lack of up-to-date stock assessment data for several marine mammal species and instead choosing the most favorable abundance estimates, the Fisheries Service must deny all five proposed IHAs. <sup>24</sup>

### National Environmental Policy Act ("NEPA") Violations

In the event the Fisheries Service does not deny the proposed IHAs (and it should), to comply with the NEPA, the agency must:

- Review the significant and cumulative impacts of all five IHA applications due to the similar timeframes and locations proposed for G&G surveys; not only is an environmental impact statement ("EIS") for each IHA required but also a new programmatic EIS for the Atlantic;
- Decline to tier any NEPA analysis related to the proposed IHAs to BOEM's 2014 Atlantic Final PEIS until a new Atlantic Final PEIS is issued and the flaws are corrected, including:
  - Considering a full range of alternatives, including a preferred alternative for which the mitigation measures will adequately protect the endangered North Atlantic right whale;
  - o Incorporating the best available science on acoustic thresholds for marine mammals, *following* review and revisions to the 2016 Acoustic Guidance;<sup>25</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>21</sup> 16 U.S.C. 1371(a)(3)(A) (requiring "best scientific evidence available" to determine "when, to what extent, if at all, and by what means . . . to waive the requirements . . . so as to allow taking, or importing of any marine mammal. . . . "); 50 C.F.R. § 216.102(a) (requiring "best scientific evidence available" when analyzing the taking of small numbers of marine mammals under section 101(a)(5)(A) through (D)); see also id. § 216.104(c); § 216.105(c). 
<sup>22</sup> NOAA, What is CetMap?, <a href="http://cetsound.noaa.gov/cda-index">http://cetsound.noaa.gov/cda-index</a> (last visited July 17, 2017); see also Duke University Marine Geospatial Ecology Laboratory, <a href="https://seamap.env.duke.edu/models/Duke-EC-GOM-2015/">https://seamap.env.duke.edu/models/Duke-EC-GOM-2015/</a> (last visited July 17, 2017) (explaining the methodology and use of the CetMap model). For example, of the five proposed IHA applications, only TGS and WesternGeco partially use CetMap data, along with other methods to determine marine mammal density. Both TGS and WesternGeco use Exposures Modeled Using Line-Transect Theory and Exposures Modeled as Mean Group Size. TGS IHA Application at Table 6.5; WesternGeco IHA Application at Table 6.5. While these two IHA applications are a step in the right direction, they still do not represent the "best scientific evidence available."

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>23</sup> NOAA, What is CetMap?, http://cetsound.noaa.gov/cda-index (last visited July 17, 2017).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>24</sup> At a minimum, the Fisheries Service must require uniform data sets from all IHA applicants to avoid the current situation in which it is impossible to compare one IHA applicant's data to another's. Uniform data is also extremely important to fully understand the cumulative impacts of all requested takes of marine mammals.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>25</sup> Fisheries Service, Technical Guidance for Assessing the Effects of Anthropogenic Sound on Marine Mammal Hearing: Underwater Acoustic Thresholds for Onset of Permanent and Temporary Threshold Shifts (July 2016),

- Evaluating information on the possible indirect impacts of Level B takes,
   including the possibility that Level B takes could lead to mass mortality events;
- o Ensuring the baseline against which BOEM measured environmental impacts is accurate, including reliance on updated stock assessments and consideration of the unusual mortality event for bottlenose dolphins in the Atlantic as well as the impacts of Hurricane Sandy and the 2010 British Petroleum oil-spill disaster;
- o Taking a hard look at environmental impacts of G&G surveys, and in particular, seismic airgun activities, on essential fish habitat;<sup>26</sup>
- o Relying on the forthcoming Programmatic BiOp, rather than the outdated 2013 BiOp as was done in the 2014 Atlantic PEIS; and
- o Incorporating at least the same breadth of analysis done in the 2016 Gulf Draft PEIS in the new Atlantic Final PEIS, including:
  - Recognition that there is a "risk of entanglement any time gear, particularly lines and cables, is put in the water."<sup>27</sup> BOEM completely failed to analyze the possibility of entanglements from G&G activities in the 2014 Atlantic Final PEIS;
  - Inclusion of reduced levels of seismic activities,<sup>28</sup> i.e., a reduction in the overall number of seismic airgun surveys;
  - Implementation of much larger area closures to protect marine life;<sup>29</sup>
  - Addition of concrete steps to implement a report similar to the one found in Appendix K of the 2016 Gulf Draft PEIS, which analyzes cumulative effects of G&G surveying on marine mammals;<sup>30</sup> and
  - Analysis of cumulative effects similar to Appendix L of the 2016 Gulf Draft PEIS to avoid duplicative G&G surveys in the same area.<sup>31</sup>

http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/pr/acoustics/Acoustic%20Guidance%20Files/opr-55\_acoustic\_guidance\_tech\_memo.pdf [hereinafter "2016 Acoustic Guidance"].

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>26</sup> Oceana Comment Letter re: PEIS for G&G Activities in the Atlantic OCS at 162-170 of .pdf (May 7, 2014), <a href="http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/pr/permits/incidental/energy/atlg\_g\_2015iha\_pubcomm.pdf">http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/pr/permits/incidental/energy/atlg\_g\_2015iha\_pubcomm.pdf</a>.; Avery Paxton et al., <a href="Seismic survey noise disrupted fish use of a temperate reef">temperate reef</a>, 78 MARINE POLICY 68, 71 (2017) (stating that, during seismic surveying, reef-fish abundance declined by 78%).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>27</sup> BOEM, Gulf of Mexico OCS Proposed Geological and Geophysical Activities, Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement 4-74 (2016), <a href="https://www.boem.gov/BOEM-EIS-2016-049-v1/">https://www.boem.gov/BOEM-EIS-2016-049-v1/</a> [hereinafter "2016 Gulf Draft PEIS"].

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>28</sup> 2016 Gulf Draft PEIS at Chapter 2.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>29</sup> Compare 2016 Gulf Draft PEIS at Table ES-1 with 2014 Atlantic Final PEIS at Table 2-6.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>30</sup> 2016 Gulf Draft PEIS at Appendix K at 485.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>31</sup> 2016 Gulf Draft PEIS at Appendix L at 541.

July 21, 2017 Page 7 of 24

• Ensure all NEPA documents analyze the effects of climate change. 32

#### **Endangered Species Act Violations**

We also recommend that, *prior* to making any decisions regarding the proposed IHAs, the Fisheries Service update the 2013 Programmatic BiOp pursuant to Endangered Species Act Section 7(a)(2) to analyze the effect of G&G activities in the Mid- and South Atlantic planning areas.<sup>33</sup> BOEM and the Fisheries Service reinitiated consultations in 2015 to consider, among other changes, an expansion of critical habitat for the North Atlantic right whale.<sup>34</sup> We propose that the following issues be considered in any updated BiOp:

- Final rule designating critical habitat for the Northwest Atlantic distinct population segment (DPS) of loggerhead sea turtles (79 FR 39855);
- Final rule listing the Northwest Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico DPS of scalloped hammerhead shark as endangered (79 FR 38213);
- Proposed rule to expand designated critical habitat for the North Atlantic Right Whale (80 FR 9314);
- Proposed listing of the following species under the ESA: (i) Caribbean electric ray (79 FR 4877); (ii) dwarf seahorse (77 FR 25687); (iii) bigeye thresher shark (80 FR 48061); (iv) common thresher shark (80 FR 11379); (v) porbeagle shark (80 FR 16356); (vi) smooth hammerhead shark (80 FR 48053); (vii) humpback whale (80 FR 22304); (vii) and green sea turtle (80 FR 51763);
- New information available since the issuance of the 2013 Programmatic Biological Opinion.<sup>35</sup>

In addition, the Fisheries Service must closely review and consider the results of any new scientific studies regarding the effects of seismic airgun surveys on endangered species in the Atlantic and/or the ecosystems on which they rely, including a new study showing that seismic airgun surveys negatively impact zooplankton, which form the base of global marine

<sup>32</sup> Christina Goldfuss, Memorandum for Heads of Federal Departments and Agencies: Final Guidance for Federal Departments and Agencies on Consideration of Greenhouse Gas Emissions and the Effects of Climate Change in National Environmental Policy Act Reviews (Aug. 1, 2016) (on file with Oceana).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>33</sup> Fisheries Service, *Biological Opinion for Programmatic Geological and Geophysical Activities in the Mid- and South Atlantic Planning Areas for 2013 to 2020* (July 19, 2013), <a href="http://www.boem.gov/Final-Biological-Opinion-19-July-2013/">http://www.boem.gov/Final-Biological-Opinion-19-July-2013/</a> [hereinafter "Fisheries Service 2013 Programmatic Biological Opinion"].

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>34</sup> NGO Letter to BOEM and Fisheries Service (May 26, 2016), <a href="https://www.nrdc.org/sites/default/files/atlantic-seismic-letter-narw-20160526.pdf">https://www.nrdc.org/sites/default/files/atlantic-seismic-letter-narw-20160526.pdf</a> (requesting renewed environmental impact review of proposed G&G activities in the Mid- and South Atlantic and Endangered Species Act review to account for significant new information regarding the status of North Atlantic right whales).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>35</sup> BOEM, *Atlantic G&G Permitting*, <a href="http://www.boem.gov/Atlantic-G-and-G-Permitting/#Section-7">http://www.boem.gov/Atlantic-G-and-G-Permitting/#Section-7</a> (last visited July 20, 2017).

July 21, 2017 Page 8 of 24

ecosystems.<sup>36</sup> Before finalizing updates to the BiOp, the Fisheries Service should also consider another recent study about the effect of seismic surveys on marine turtles.<sup>37</sup> Once the new BiOp is released, BOEM should update the 2014 Atlantic PEIS and address all deficiencies noted above. The update of the 2014 Atlantic PEIS must happen *before* the Fisheries Service can consider tiering its NEPA analysis for the IHA applications.

#### **Recommended Mitigation Measures**

Finally, in the event the Fisheries Service does not deny the IHA applications (and the agency absolutely should deny them), we believe the proposed mitigation measures are entirely inadequate. We urge that the agency to improve the proposed mitigation measures<sup>38</sup> as follows:

- Permit only one seismic survey covering the proposed survey area;
- Make the seismic survey data available to industry, government (federal, tribal, state and local), and the public so that all stakeholders can make an informed cost-benefit analysis and decide whether offshore drilling should be allowed off the Atlantic coast;
- Hire visual and passive acoustic observers via an independent third-party observer provider and require scientifically-founded and standardized training and performance;
- Require at least three visual protected species observers per watch on a survey vessel to
  maximize the probability of sighting all marine mammals in the seismic survey area and
  to fully meet scientifically-based data collection requirements;
- Require at least three passive acoustic monitoring protected species observers per watch
  on a survey vessel to maximize the probability of acoustically detecting all marine
  mammals in the survey area via properly deployed and operated acoustic recording
  equipment that fully meets scientifically-based data collection requirements;
- Ensure visual monitoring and passive acoustic monitoring are always occurring simultaneously;
- Stop all seismic survey activities when visual protected species observers cannot detect marine mammals in the survey area, including at night and under any other conditions with poor visibility;
- Formulate federal standards for passive acoustic monitoring and software that ensures quality recording and detection of marine mammals;

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>36</sup> Robert McCauley et al., *Widely used marine seismic survey air gun operations negatively impact zooplankton*, NATURE ECOLOGY & EVOLUTION (June 22, 2017) (stating that "all larval krill were killed after air gun passage").

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>37</sup> Sarah Nelms et al., *Seismic surveys and marine turtles: An underestimated global threat?*, 193 BIOLOGICAL CONSERVATION 49-65 (2016).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>38</sup> 82 Fed. Reg. 26,244, 26,250-67 (June 6, 2017).

July 21, 2017 Page 9 of 24

- Require exclusion and buffer zones that are much larger than the 500 meter exclusion zone and 1000 meter buffer zone currently proposed, ideally based on the updated version of the Fisheries Service's 2016 Acoustic Guidance, which currently recommends a distance of at least 1,585 meters to protect all hearing levels among marine mammal species;
- Implement a 60-minute shutdown following observation of a marine mammal in the survey area;
- Expand time-area closures to adequately account for presence of marine mammals over the course of a year, including calving and migration patterns;
- Reconsider ramp-up procedures considering recent studies that show that these procedures may displace marine mammals, potentially causing harm by interrupting foraging, causing stress, which can adversely affect reproduction and survival, or even push animals into areas where the risk of being caught as bycatch increases;<sup>39</sup>
- Provide transparency by sharing AIS data, all seismic survey activities, and data recorded
  by visual and passive acoustic monitoring protected species observers with the public
  daily and live stream data as often as possible as well as archive the passive acoustic
  monitoring feed; and
- Conduct independent third-party acoustic monitoring, funded by seismic survey applicants, before, during and after the surveys to collect data on the impacts of these activities on marine life.

\*\*\*

In conclusion, the Fisheries Service must deny the proposed IHAs. Otherwise, the Fisheries Service will be in violation of the MMPA's requirement to use "the best available science" as well as the statutory requirements that all takes be a "small number" and have a "negligible impact" on marine mammals. In the event the Fisheries Service does not deny the IHA applications (and it should), we urge the agency to fully comply with NEPA and the ESA as well as to implement our recommended mitigation measures in the manner described above. We appreciate the opportunity to provide our recommendations and thank you for your time. We will continue to be engaged in this process.

Sincerely, Nancy Pyne Acting Campaign Director, Climate and Energy Oceana 1350 Connecticut Ave., NW, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor Washington, DC 20036

Phone: 202-833-3900 Email: <a href="mailto:npyne@oceana.org">npyne@oceana.org</a>

\_

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>39</sup> Karin Forney et al., *Nowhere to go: noise impact assessments for marine mammal populations with high site fidelity*, 32 ENDANG. SPECIES RES. 391-413 (May 8, 2017).

July 21, 2017 Page 10 of 24

Beth Allgood

US Country Director, International Fund for Animal Welfare

1350 Connecticut Ave. NW, Suite 1220

Washington, DC 20036 Phone: 202-536-1919 Email: eallgood@ifaw.org

Dr. Thomas Armbruster

President, SandyHook SeaLife Foundation

Medford, NJ 08055 Phone: 609-953-2677

Email: shslfoundation@aol.com

Neil Armingeon

Riverkeeper, Matanzas Riverkeeper

St. Augustine, FL 32080

Email: neil@matanzasriverkeeper.org

Regina Asmutis-Silvia

Executive Director, Whale and Dolphin Conservation

7 Nelson Street

Plymouth, MA 02360 Phone: 508-746-2522

Email: regina.asmutis-silvia@whales.org

Larry Baldwin

Waterkeeper, Crystal Coast Waterkeeper

700 Arendell Street, Suite #2 Morehead City, NC 28557 Phone: 252-670-1413

Email: larryb@crystalcoastwaterkeeper.org

Larry Baldwin

Executive Director, Coastal Carolina Riverwatch

1406 Neuse Boulevard New Bern, NC 28560 Phone: 252-670-1413

Email: larryb@crystalcoastwaterkeeper.org

July 21, 2017 Page 11 of 24

Larry Baldwin Interim Executive Director, White Oak-New Riverkeeper Alliance 118 Woodbrook Drive Midway Park, NC 28544

Phone: 252-670-1413

Email: larryb@crystalcoastwaterkeeper.org

#### Kemp Burdette

Cape Fear Riverkeeper, Cape Fear River Watch 617 Surrey Street Wilmington, NC 28401 Phone: 910-264-8036

Email: kemp@cfrw.us

## Chris Carnevale

Coastal Climate & Energy Manager, Southern Alliance for Clean Energy P.O. Box 13673

Charleston, SC 29422 Phone: 843-973-2637

Email: chris@cleanenergy.org

#### Carrie Clark

Executive Director, North Carolina League of Conservation Voters
112 S Blount St # 103,
Raleigh, NC 27601

Phone: 919-839-0006 Email: <u>carrie@nclcv.org</u>

## Candace Crespi

Campaign Director, Ocean Preservation Society 336 Bon Air Center #384 Greenbrae, CA 94904

Phone: 303-444-2454

Email: <a href="mailto:candace@opsociety.org">candace@opsociety.org</a>

#### Robert DeLuca

President, Group for the East End

54895 NY-25

Southold, NY 11971 Phone: 631-765-6450

Email: bdeluca@eastendenvironment.org

July 21, 2017 Page 12 of 24

Leah Donahey

Senior Campaign Director, Alaska Wilderness League

122 C St NW, Ste 240 Washington, DC 20001 Phone: 202-266-0421

Email: <a href="mailto:leah@alaskawild.org">leah@alaskawild.org</a>

Laura Early

Executive Director, Satilla Riverkeeper

PO Box 697

Woodbine, GA 31569 Phone: 912-510-9500

Email: riverkeeper@satillariverkeeper.org

Mindy Egan and David Egan

Co-Directors, The Initiative to Protect Jekyll Island

308 Old Plantation Rd. Jekyll Island, GA 31527 Phone: 912-577-4655

Email: degan1@bellsouth.net

Sasha Eisenstein

Government Relations Manager, Audubon New York

2 Third Street, Suite 480 Troy, New York 12180 Phone: 518-869-9731

Email: seisenstein@audubon.org

Adrienne Esposito

Executive Director, Citizens Campaign for the Environment

225-A Main Street Farmingdale, NY 11735 Phone: 516-390-7150

Email: Aesposito@citizenscampaign.org

Daniel Estrin, Esq.

General Counsel & Advocacy Director, Waterkeeper Alliance

180 Maiden Lane, Suite 603

New York, NY 10038 Phone: 845-705-5229

Email: LLiebmann@waterkeeper.org

July 21, 2017 Page 13 of 24

Mark Ferrulo

Executive Director, Progress Florida

1010 Central Ave. #209 St. Petersburg, FL 33705 Phone: 727-289-2612

Email: mark@progressflorida.org

Karen Forget

Executive Director, Lynnhaven River NOW 1608 Pleasure House Road, Suite 108

Virginia Beach, VA 23455 Phone: 757-962-5398 Email: karen@lrnow.org

Jennette Gayer

Director, Environment Georgia

108 E. Ponce De Leon Ave., Suite 210

Decatur, GA 30030 Phone: 404-370-1764

Email: jennette@environmentgeorgia.org

Tim Gestwicki

CEO, North Carolina Wildlife Federation

1346 St. Julien St. Charlotte, NC 28205 Phone: 704-332-5696

Email: tim@ncwf.org

Marcia Geyer

Steering Committee, 350 Central Virginia

1008 Peartree Lane Charlottesville VA 22901

Email: marciageyer2@gmail.com

Sarah Greenberger

Vice President, Conservation Policy, National Audubon Society 1200 18th St NW

Washington, DC 20036 Phone: 202-600-7989

Email: sgreenberger@audubon.org

Bill Hamilton

Chairman, Friends of Matanzas, Inc.

Email: gwhiii@bellsouth.net

July 21, 2017 Page 14 of 24

Matthew Heim

Outreach and Communication Coordinator,

Assateague Coastal Trust

9842 Main St

Berlin, MD 21811 Phone: 410-629-1538

Email: staff@actforbays.org

#### Jen Hilburn

Executive Director, Altamaha Riverkeeper

PO Box 4122 Macon, GA 31208

Phone: 912-441-3908

Email: jen@altamahariverkeeper.org

## John Hocevar

Oceans Campaign Director, Greenpeace

702 H St NW #300 Washington, DC 20001

Phone: 202-319-2408

Email: john.hocevar@greenpeace.org

## Elizabeth Hogan

Campaign Manager for Oceans & Wildlife, World Animal Protection

Nelson Tower Building, 31st floor

450 Seventh Avenue

New York, NY 10123, USA

Phone: 202-374-7068

Email: ElizabethHogan@worldanimalprotection.org

Peach Hubbard

President, The Dolphin Project

PO Box 60753

Savannah, Georgia 31420

Phone: 912-657-3927

Email: thedolphinproject@gmail.com

George Jacunski

President, South Anastasia Communities Association

Phone: 904-471-0312

Email: hork@sprintmail.com

July 21, 2017 Page 15 of 24

David Kaplan

President, Cetacean Society International

162 Selden Hill Drive West Hartford, CT 06107 Phone: 860-313-0711

Email: davidgkaplan@gmail.com

Alex Kearns

Chair, St. Marys EarthKeepers

902 Ann Street St Marys, GA 31558

Phone: 912-673-6120

Email: <u>alexkearns1@msn.com</u>

Marcie Keever

Oceans & Vessels Program Director, Friends of the Earth

1101 15th Street NW Washington, D.C. 20005 Phone: 202-783-7400 Email: MKeever@foe.org

Alice Keyes

Vice President of Coastal Conservation, One Hundred Miles

1312 Newcastle Street Brunswick, GA 31520 Phone: 912-230-6494

Email: alice@onehundredmiles.org

Frank Knapp

President, Business Alliance for Protecting the Atlantic Coast

1717 Gervais Street Columbia, SC 29201 Phone: 803-497-3204

Email: fknapp@protectingtheatlanticcoast.org

David Kyler

Executive Director, Center for a Sustainable Coast

221 Mallory Street, Suite B

Saint Simons Island, Georgia 31522

Phone: 912-506-5088 Email: susdev@gate.net

July 21, 2017 Page 16 of 24

Michele Langa

Staff Attorney, NY/NJ Baykeeper

52 W. Front Street Keyport, NJ 07735 Phone: 732-888-9870

Email: michele@nynjbaykeeper.org

Scott Leonard

Director of Operations, Nantucket Marine Mammal

**Conservation Program** 

P.O. Box 332

Nantucket, MA 02554 Phone: 508-400-7293

Email: nantucketmarinemammals@gmail.com

Nick Lund

Sr. Manager Landscape Conservation, National Parks

Conservation Association 777 6th St NW #700 Washington, DC 20001

Phone: 202-454-3319 Email: nlund@npca.org

Athan Manuel

Director, Lands Protection Program, Sierra Club

50 F St NW

Washington, DC 20016 Phone: 202-548-6595

Email: athan.manuel@sierraclub.org

Harrison Marks

Executive Director, Sound Rivers, Inc.

P.O. Box 15451 New Bern, NC 28561 Phone: 252-946-7211

Email: <a href="mailto:harrison@soundrivers.org">harrison@soundrivers.org</a>

Hunter Miller

**Environmental Youth Council** 

Phone: 863-528-6011

Email: whuntermiller@gmail.com

Kristen Monsell

Staff Attorney, Center for Biological Diversity

Phone: 510-844-7100 ext. 337

Email: kmonsell@biologicaldiversity.org

July 21, 2017 Page 17 of 24

Alice Morrisey

Co-Founder, Don't Drill SC Lowcountry

P.O. Box 683

Sullivans Island SC 29482 Phone: 843-442-5778 Email: seachoice@aol.com

Laurie Murphy

Executive Director, Emerald Coastkeeper, Inc.

P.O. Box 13283 Pensacola, FL 32591 Phone: 850-292-5960

Email: laurie@emeraldcoastkeeper.org

Kathy Phillips

Executive Director, Assateague Coastkeeper

PO Box 731 Berlin, MD 21811 Phone: 410-269-1538

Email: Coastkeeper@ACTforBays.org

Anne Poole

President, New Jersey Environmental Lobby

204 W State St. Trenton, NJ 08608 Phone: 609-458-7058

Email: njel@earthlink.net

Mary Rafferty

Executive Director, Virginia Conservation Network

409 E Main St #104 Richmond, VA 23219 Phone:804-614-7670 Email: mary@vcnva.org

Jennifer Rubiello

State Director, Environment Florida

3110 1st Ave N #2k St. Petersburg, FL 33713 Phone: 727-327-3138

Email: jennifer@environmentflorida.org

July 21, 2017 Page 18 of 24

Cara Schildtknecht

Waccamaw Riverkeeper, Winyah Rivers Foundation

PO Box 261954 Conway, SC 29526 Phone: 843-349-4007

Email: riverkeeper@winyahrivers.org

Peter Shelley

Senior Counsel, Conservation Law Foundation

62 Summer Street Boston, MA 02110 Phone: 617-850-1754 pshelley@clf.org

Pete Stauffer

Environmental Director, Surfrider Foundation

PO Box 6010

San Clemente, CA 92674 Phone: 503-887-0514

Email: pstauffer@surfrider.org

Michael Stocker

Director, Ocean Conservation Research

P.O. Box 559

Lagunitas, CA 94938

Email: mstocker@OCR.org

Mike Tidwell

Executive Director, Chesapeake Climate Action Network

6930 Carroll Ave, Suite 720 Takoma Park, MD 20912 Phone: 240-460-5838

Email: MTidwell@chesapeakeclimate.org

Mike Town

Executive Director, Virginia League of Conservation Voters

100 W Franklin St #102 Richmond, VA 23220 Phone: 804-225-1902

Email: mtown@valcv.org

July 21, 2017 Page 19 of 24

John Tynan

Executive Director, Conservation Voters of South Carolina

701 Whaley St # 207 Columbia, SC 29201 Phone: 803-799-0716

Email: john@cvsc.org

Wendy Vaughn

Conservation and Beautification Committee Chairman,

Garden Club of Virginia 12 E Franklin Street Richmond, VA 23219

Phone: 757-617-8321

Email: wendyvaughn2@cox.net

Wendy Vaughn

Conservation Chairman, The Princess Anne Garden Club

P.O. Box 1319

Virginia Beach, VA 23451 Phone: 757-617-8321

Email: wendyvaughn2@cox.net

Jim Watkins

Chair, Stop Offshore Drilling in the Atlantic

P.O. Box 1380

Pawleys Island, SC 29585 Phone: 843-527-0078

Email: SODA.SC.2017@gmail.com

Sierra Weaver

Senior Attorney, Southern Environmental Law Center

122 C St NW

Washington, DC 20001 Phone: 919-967-1450

Email: sweaver@selcnc.org

Richard Webster

Legal Program Director, Riverkeeper

20 Secor Road Ossining, NY 10562 Phone: 914-478-4501

Email: sdixon@riverkeeper.org

July 21, 2017 Page 20 of 24

Vicki Weeks

Georgia State Coordinator, Dogwood Alliance

129 Biltmore Ave Asheville, NC 28801 Phone: 912-231-2252

Email: Vicki@DogwoodAlliance.org

Leslie Weichsel

President, Ogeechee Audubon Society

PO Box 13424

Savannah, Georgia 31416

Email: leslieweichsel@gmail.com

**Sharon Young** 

Marine Issues Field Director, The Humane Society of the United States

1255 23rd St NW Washington, DC 20037

Phone: 508-833-0181

Email: syoung@humanesociety.org

Cindy Zipf

Executive Director, Clean Ocean Action

18 Hartshorne Drive Highlands, NJ 07732 Phone: 732-872-0111

Email: zipf@CleanOceanAction.org

July 21, 2017

Page 21 of 24





































July 21, 2017 Page 22 of 24





















ACT FOR BAYS, ORG





















July 21, 2017 Page 23 of 24



























New Jersey Environmental Lobby



# DON'T DRILL LOWCOUNTRY















July 21, 2017 Page 24 of 24

CC:

Secretary Wilbur Ross U.S. Department of Commerce Office of the Secretary Herbert C. Hoover Building 1401 Constitution Ave., NW Washington, DC 20230

E-mail: docexecsec@doc.gov

Chris Oliver Assistant Administrator for Fisheries National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration National Marine Fisheries Service 1315 East-West Highway Silver Spring, MD 20910 E-mail: chris.oliver@noaa.gov

**Donna Wieting** Director Office of Protected Resources National Marine Fisheries Service 1315 East-West Highway Silver Spring, MD 20910 Email: donna.wieting@noaa.gov

Benjamin Laws Office of Protected Resources Permits and Conservation Division National Marine Fisheries Service 1315 East-West Highway Silver Spring, MD 20910

Email: benjamin.laws@noaa.gov

Secretary Ryan Zinke

U.S. Department of the Interior 1849 C Street NW. Washington, DC 20240 Email: oiea@ios.doi.gov

Walter Cruickshank Director, Bureau of Ocean Energy Management U.S. Department of the Interior 1849 C Street, NW Washington, D.C. 20240 E-mail: walter.cruickshank@boem.gov

Mike Celata Regional Director, Gulf of Mexico OCS Region & Atlantic OCS Region Bureau of Ocean Energy Management 1201 Elmwood Park Blvd New Orleans, LA 70123-2394 Email: Michael.Celata@boem.gov