
Elim Subsistence Harbor Feasibility Study

Appendix I: Draft Biological Assessment

Elim, Alaska



November 2020



**US Army Corps
of Engineers**

Alaska District

This page was intentionally left blank.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), Alaska District, proposes to create a protected multi-purpose navigation feature that will accommodate small local watercraft, commercial fishing tenders, and cargo barges. This project includes dredging with possible confined underwater blasting, construction of two rubble mound breakwaters, and pile driving. The project's construction has the potential to impact several species listed under the Endangered Species Act (ESA). The species, listing status, managing agency, and effects determination are included in Table ES-1.

Table ES-1. Executive Summary Effects Determination

Species Common Name	Species Latin Name	Listed Population	ESA Status	Determination of Effect	Critical Habitat Adversely Modified?
Ringed seal	<i>Pusa hispida</i>	Arctic DPS	Threatened	May effect, likely to adversely affect	N/A
Bearded seal	<i>Erignathus barbatus</i>	Beringia DPS	Threatened	May effect, likely to adversely affect	N/A
Gray whale	<i>Eschrichtius robustus</i>	W. North Pacific DPS	Endangered	May effect, likely to adversely affect	N/A
Humpback whale	<i>Megaptera novaeangliae</i>	W. Pacific DPS	Endangered	May effect, likely to adversely affect	N/A
		Mexico DPS	Threatened		
Steller sea lion	<i>Eumetopias jubatus</i>	Western DPS	Endangered	May effect, likely to adversely affect	No
Sperm whale	<i>Physeter macrocephalus</i>	All	Endangered	No effect	N/A
N. Pacific right whale	<i>Eubalaena japonica</i>	All	Endangered	No effect	No
Bowhead whale	<i>Balaena mysticetus</i>	All	Endangered	No effect	N/A
Fin whale	<i>Balaenoptera physalus</i>	All	Endangered	No effect	N/A
Blue whale	<i>Balaenoptera musculus</i>	All	Endangered	No effect	N/A

This page was intentionally left blank.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Introduction	I-1
1.1 Purpose and Need	I-2
1.2 Location	I-2
1.3 Definition of the Action Area.....	I-3
1.4 Proposed Action.....	I-4
1.4.1 Project Details	I-4
1.4.2 Mitigation Measures	I-8
2. Description of Species and their Habitats	I-9
2.1 Ringed Seals.....	I-10
2.2 Bearded Seals.....	I-11
2.3 Gray Whale – Western North Pacific DPS	I-12
2.4 Humpback Whale – Mexico and Western North Pacific DPS.....	I-13
2.5 Steller Sea Lion - Western DPS and Critical Habitat.....	I-14
3. Environmental Baseline	I-14
4. Effects Analysis	I-20
5. Determination of Effects	I-29
5.1 Ringed Seals.....	I-29
5.2 Bearded Seals.....	I-29
5.3 Gray Whale – Western North Pacific DPS	I-29
5.4 Humpback Whale – Western Pacific DPS and Mexico DPS	I-30
5.5 Steller Sea Lion - Western DPS	I-30
6. Preparers	I-31
7. References	I-32

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Project Location and Vicinity	I-2
Figure 2. Action Area Considered for this Project (Yellow Area)	I-3
Figure 3. Project Area	I-4
Figure 4. Recommended Plan.....	I-6
Figure 5. Proposed Dredged Material Placement Site	I-7
Figure 6. 120dB Vibratory Pile Driving Noise Contour and Assumed Zonation.....	I-25

This page was intentionally left blank.

1. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this Draft Biological Assessment (BA) is to review the proposed dredging, confined underwater blasting, pile driving, and related construction activities at Elim, Alaska to determine whether the project might affect species protected under the Federal Endangered Species Act (ESA). A BA is needed because there is a potential for significant impacts on fish and wildlife habitats within the project area that may be caused by the proposed activities. The need for a BA from a regulatory standpoint is because there is Federal funding, and there are Federal permits needed for the project. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) has prepared a 404(b)(1) Clean Water Act 40 CFR Part 230 analysis (Appendix A to the Integrated Feasibility Report/Environmental Assessment (IFR/EA) and the project must fulfill the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requirements. USACE will apply for an Incidental Harassment Authorization (IHA) to take marine mammals by Level B (Behavioral) harassment; primarily due to marine pile-driving impacts. Accordingly, this document was prepared consistent with legal requirements set forth under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act (19 U.S. Code 1536 (c)).

An Incidental Take Authorization in the form of an IHA to take marine mammals by Level B harassment, primarily due to impacts of pile driving in marine waters, will be necessary for this project. An IHA is appropriate because it is not feasible to monitor a roughly 8-kilometer zone for marine mammals and shut down pile driving until the ESA species leave the area. While it often makes sense to accept the shutdowns on smaller projects with even moderate areas that are ensonified, the Elim project's risk of lengthy delays justifies obtaining an IHA. Also, there are non-ESA species in the area that are protected by the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA). The only regulatory mechanism available to harass the marine mammals that are just MMPA listed is an IHA. All of the harassment is incidental Level B due to pile driving. Still, an IHA is necessary to continue pile-driving while marine mammals are in the Level B zone.

The Draft BA lays out the rationale for which ESA species are considered and the rationale for the preliminary "likely effect" determinations. Since USACE, has through its analysis, determined that its action "may affect, and is likely to affect" ESA-listed marine mammals adversely, the formal ESA consultation procedures established by 50 CFR 402 et seq. are triggered. That will lead to the development of a Biological Opinion (BO) by the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). Section 7(b)(4)(C) of the ESA further provides that if an endangered or threatened marine mammal is involved, the taking must first be authorized by Section 101(a)(5) of the MMPA. Other non-ESA species, such as beluga and the non-ESA listed gray whales, will likely be included in the IHA application package. These details will inform the IHA application to help determine

estimated take numbers for marine mammals and serve to advance this Draft BA from a draft to a final version. Authorized take numbers from the IHA are necessary to assess the effects under the ESA and allow for accurate completion of the BA and resulting BO.

1.1 Purpose and Need

The purpose of the project is to improve the safe accessibility of marine navigation to the community of Elim, Alaska. The need for the project is to reduce hazards in order to provide safer navigation for subsistence vessels, fuel barges, cargo vessels, and a limited commercial fleet, all of which are critical to the long term viability of the community and the mixed subsistence-cash economy at Elim. Elim has no moorage, harbor, or boat landing infrastructure, and this adversely affects commercial and subsistence fishermen, tender vessels, and the barges delivering fuel and freight to the community. The location and vicinity of Elim are shown in Figure 1.



Figure 1. Project Location and Vicinity

1.2 Location

Elim is on the northwest shore of Norton Bay on the Seward Peninsula, 96 miles east of Nome and 460 miles northwest of Anchorage. It lies at approximately 64.6 degrees North Latitude, -162.3 degrees West Longitude. Elim is located in the Cape Nome Recording District. The area encompasses 2.4 square miles of land and 0 square miles of water.

1.3 Definition of the Action Area

The action area is defined in the ESA regulations (50 CFR 402.02) as the area within which all direct and indirect effects of the project will occur. The action area is distinct from and larger than the project footprint because some project elements may affect listed species some distance from the project footprint. Therefore, the action area extends out to a point where no measurable effects from the project are expected to occur.

The Action Area for this Draft BA includes:

- the dredged navigation channel and disposal area;
- the footprint of the breakwaters;
- the ensonified area surrounding the noise sources (pile-driving, dredging, rock ripping, confined underwater blasting, vessel operation);
- the transit routes between the dredged channel and placement site during construction; and
- the transit route between Elim and Cape Nome.

While it is uncertain that rock would come from the established quarry at Cape Nome and the use of this quarry would not be specified in the construction contract, it is the most likely source and is used for analysis in this Draft BA. It is possible that this source, and thus the route, may change between this Draft BA and the Final BA prepared in Pre-construction Engineering and Design (PED). The action area is shown in Figure 2.




Figure 2. Action Area Considered for this Project (Yellow Area)

The yellow area is the action area for this project. It is a combination of the calculated 120 decibel (dB) isopleth for vibratory pile driving, confined underwater blasting, plus an estimated zone that would encompass project-related vessel traffic between Elim and the potential rock source at Cape Nome. The length of this action area is approximately 155 kilometers from east to west. The radii for confined underwater blasting and pile driving, the largest zone for construction noise sources, are similar, extending approximately 7 kilometers offshore. A closer view of the project location is shown in Figure 3.



Figure 3. Project Area

1.4 Proposed Action

1.4.1 Project Details

Under the Recommended Plan, two rubble mound breakwaters would provide a 1.4-acre moorage basin and a 2.5-acre turning and maneuvering basin. The west breakwater would be 986 feet long and the east breakwater 820 feet long. The entrance channel, tender dock access, barge landing access, and turning basin would have a required dredged depth of -13.0 feet Mean Lower Low Water (MLLW), while the moorage basin and access channel would be dredged to -9 feet MLLW. Local service facilities required would include an extension to the fuel header located on Elim Beach, a single boat launch, uplands with an area of 1 acre for parking and turnaround at the

boat launch, a tender dock, a barge landing, two mooring points, and a road connecting the uplands to Front St. to the harbor uplands. The road would be approximately 250 feet long. Construction of the tender dock would require 276 linear feet of sheet pile, and two moorage points (pilings) would be installed in the uplands adjacent to the barge landing. A layout of the preferred plan is shown in Figure 4.




Figure 4. Recommended Plan

Dredged Material Placement

Dredged material not used as fill in project construction would be discharged at an open-water disposal site. The proposed disposal site is a square, 2,000 feet on each side (for an area of 92 acres), located 2 nautical miles east-southeast of the project site, in the relatively deep water of 5 fathoms (30 feet; Figure 3). The disposal site is sized to accommodate the entire 185,645-cubic yard volume of construction dredged material deposited at an average thickness of 1.25 feet. The vertices of the proposed disposal site are:

- a. 64.6065 °N, 162.1856 °W (northwest)
- b. 64.6065 °N, 162.1729 °W (northeast)
- c. 64.6011 °N, 162.1729 °W (southeast)
- d. 64.6011 °N, 162.1856 °W (southwest)

The northwest vertex is 2 nautical miles from the project site on a bearing of 105 degrees true north (Figure 5).




Figure 5. Proposed Dredged Material Placement Site

The proposed disposal site is inland of the Norton Bay "closing line" (i.e., within the territorial sea baseline) and therefore, within "inland waters"; the territorial sea baseline runs from "Airport Point" just west of Elim, southeast to Cape Denbigh (Figure 3). The seafloor at the disposal site is presumed to be flat and mostly sandy, based on general knowledge of Norton Bay conditions.

Confined Underwater Blasting

The precise blasting plan for this project would be developed in PED. Still, a reasonable scenario for the Draft BA purposes assumes drilling boreholes for confined underwater blasting in a 12-foot by 12-foot grid pattern over the portion of the dredge prism where solid rock cannot be effectively ripped by mechanical means. It is possible that a more constrained blasting scenario could be implemented if there are only a few scattered rocky outcrops in the dredge prism. The holes in each shot would be separated by at least 15 milliseconds such that each hole would be treated individually for fish and marine mammal impact assessment purposes.

The distances to Level A harassment (lethal or permanent injury) zones, based on similar blasting scenarios for a harbor project in Valdez, Alaska range from less than 200 meters in diameter for Steller sea lions to approximately 1,500 meters for humpback whales. The calculations done in PED with a more specific blasting plan would determine the exact shutdown distances that would be monitored. At this time the information from the Valdez scenario is similar to what is expected for Elim. Level B harassment (behavioral disturbance) zone will also be modeled in PED but is likely to extend about 7,000 meters from the blast site. This distance is similar to the zone that would be monitored for Level B harassment during pile driving. An IHA would be pursued from NMFS to allow for construction to occur while marine mammals are present in the Level B Zone for both pile driving and confined underwater blasting.

Rock Ripping

A rock ripper would be used to remove rock where a conventional excavator bucket is ineffective. Rock rippers resemble a hydraulic claw that breaks rock by both hydraulic force and vibratory motion. These tools fill a niche between a hydraulic hammer and confined underwater blasting. They are often effective for removing moderate quantities of rock as long as there are fracture lines to exploit.

1.4.2 Mitigation Measures

The USACE intends to collect the IHA data during the PED phase of the project, which will provide more detail regarding the specific impacts to protected resources. Well-reasoned and effective mitigations to reduce those impacts will also be developed, in consultation with the managing agency, along with the number of marine mammals that may be taken by harassment. The final mitigation measures for the proposed project cannot be presented prior to the IHA development. The USACE would likely incorporate the following generic mitigation measures in the construction of the project to reduce specific temporary construction impacts on discrete natural resources:

1. Marine Mammal Monitoring – This is a required component of any issued IHA since monitoring is necessary to assess exposures to various harassment by

various sources. The Level B zone will be monitored for species presence and abundance. A shutdown zone will be established and monitored to ensure Level A takes do not occur (if there are not Level A takes allowances) or Level A takes are minimized if allowed.

2. Speed limits for construction vessels to reduce the likelihood of vessel strikes.
3. Shutdown distances are typically limited when constructing with IHAs, but shutdown distances around the dredge and Level A harassment from pile driving would be established. Avoidance measures for vessels would be developed to minimize harassment when construction vessels are underway, particularly for barge traffic between the project site and Cape Nome. These avoidance measures always prioritize safe navigation.
4. Work windows would avoid winter work to minimize impacts on ice seals when they are most abundant.

A shutdown distance appropriate for each species would be adhered to during blasting to minimize impacts to marine mammals. This shutdown distance would encompass what is known as the "Level-A zone" where lethal or permanent effects would occur. These sorts of effects are not permitted, and thus blasting would not be initiated when an animal is in the Level A zone. Rigorous on-site monitoring would be conducted prior to blasting to ensure that marine mammals are not present in this zone. Distances for these Level A zones, based on similar blasting scenarios for a harbor project in Valdez, Alaska range from less than 200 meters in diameter for Steller sea lions to approximately 1,500 meters for humpback whales. The calculations done in PED with a more specific blasting plan would determine the exact shutdown distances that would be monitored. At this time the information from the Valdez scenario is likely very close to what is expected for Elim.

2. DESCRIPTION OF SPECIES AND THEIR HABITATS

This section provides a description of the species and their habitat that may be affected by the Elim Harbor project. Species listed in Executive Summary table ES-1 that have a "no effect" determination next to them are not discussed further in this section or subsequent sections. "No effect" determinations are commonly made by the action agency when species have a very low or no chance of being in the action area due to either geographic constraints, seasonal timing, very low abundance, or a combination of some or all of these factors. The resource agency, NMFS in this case, is not obligated to concur or comment on "no effect" determinations made by an action agency.

2.1 Ringed Seals

Ringed seals exhibit a circumpolar distribution and are found in all seasonally ice-covered seas in the Northern Hemisphere. The ringed seal Arctic subspecies are listed as threatened under the Endangered Species Act. According to NMFS distribution maps, the Pribilof Islands' nearshore waters appear to be the species' southern-most range extent. Ringed seals are closely associated with sea ice; they use it for hauling out, pupping, nursing, and molting. They follow its recession north in the springtime. A reliable population estimate of Alaska's stock is unavailable, and the data utilized in past estimates is over 10 years old.

Ringed seals have a small head, a short cat-like snout, and a plump body. Their coat is dark with light-colored rings on their back and sides and a light-colored belly. Their small foreflippers have thick, strong claws used to maintain breathing holes through 6 feet or more of ice. Ringed seals grow to an average length of 4–4.5 feet with weights ranging from 110–150 pounds. The average weight of a ringed seal pup at birth is about 10 pounds.

Ringed seals eat a wide variety of mostly small prey. They rarely prey on more than 10–15 species in any specific geographic location, and not more than 2–4 of these species are considered important prey. However, regional and seasonal variations in the diet of ringed seals, fishes of the cod family tend to dominate the diet in many areas from late autumn through spring. Crustaceans appear to become more important in many areas during the open-water season and often dominate young seals' diet. While foraging, ringed seals dive to depths of up to 150 feet or more.

Ringed seals can live in areas that are completely covered with ice. They use their sharp claws to make and maintain their breathing holes through the ice, which may be 6 feet or more in thickness. In winter through early spring, they also carve out lairs in snowdrifts over their breathing holes. As the temperatures warm and the snow covering their lairs melts during spring, ringed seals transition from lair use to basking on the surface of the ice near breathing holes, lairs, or cracks in the ice as they undergo their annual molt. Ringed seals do not live in large groups and are usually found alone, but they may occur in large groups during the molting season, gathered around cracks or breathing holes in the ice.

Ringed seals are primarily associated with shore-fast ice, whereas other ice seals prefer moving ice. Near Nome, ringed seals are often seen using open water offshore from Cape Nome and Safety Sound in winter and spring. Most seals follow the ice pack north as it retreats in summer, but some remain in open water all summer (Oceana and Kawerak 2014). It is anticipated that ringed seals have a similar sea ice distribution near Elim. Small numbers of ringed seals could be present in the action area during construction and be exposed to disturbance from project vessels and underwater noise

from pile driving. Hearing abilities of ringed seals are discussed in detail in Section 5, Determination Effects of Analysis.

2.2 Bearded Seals

Bearded seals exhibit circumpolar distribution and are closely associated with the presence of sea ice; they utilize it for hauling out, pupping, nursing, and molting in the spring and early summer. Bearded seal Beringia Distinct Population Segments (DPS) are listed as threatened under the Endangered Species Act. NMFS distribution maps for bearded seal show their southern-most range extent to be the Bering Shelf and nearshore waters of the Pribilof Islands. Reliable population abundance data on bearded seals are unavailable. It is difficult to distinguish seal species in open water unless they are very close to the observer, so bearded seals are included in this Draft BA since they would be part of a Letters of Acknowledgement (LOA) application package in the future. Their inclusion in a LOA application assumes they could be in the area (the multi-kilometer action area for blasting) and remain undetected. Thus, exposed to Level B harassment rather than a need to harass them because they are expected to be present at most times.

Bearded seals are the largest species of Arctic seal. They grow to lengths of about 7–8 feet and range from about 575–800 pounds. In some regions, females appear to be slightly larger than males. Bearded seals generally have unpatterned gray to brown coats, massive bodies, and small square fore flippers. They have a short snout with thick, long white whiskers, which gives this species its "beard."

Bearded seals primarily feed on or near the sea bottom on various invertebrates (e.g., shrimps, crabs, clams, and welks) and some fish (e.g., cod and sculpin). While foraging, they typically dive to depths of less than 325 feet. They do not like deep water and prefer to forage in waters less than 650 feet deep, where they can reach the ocean floor. Still, adult bearded seals have been known to dive to depths greater than 1,600 feet.

Bearded seals tend to prefer sea ice with natural openings, though they can make breathing holes in thin ice using their heads and/or claws. Sea ice provides the bearded seal and its young some protection from predators – such as polar bears – during whelping and nursing. Sea ice also provides bearded seals with a haul-out platform for molting and resting. Bearded seals are solitary creatures and can be seen resting on ice floes with their heads facing downward into the water. Facing downward allows them to escape into the sea if pursued by a predator quickly. Bearded seals also have been seen sleeping vertically in open water with their heads on the water surface.

Bearded seals are extremely vocal, and males use elaborate songs for advertising breeding conditions or establishing aquatic territories. These individually distinct

vocalizations predominantly consist of several variations of trills, moans, and groans. Some trills can be heard for up to 12 miles and can last as long as 3 minutes.

Bearded seals are generally found in moving ice and areas of open water. They can be found in the Bering Strait region all year, although much of the population migrates north into the Arctic Ocean during the summer and early fall. Many juveniles remain in the Bering Sea during summer, feeding in bays and estuaries. Like the ringed seals, bearded seals use the open water found near Cape Nome and Sledge Island in winter (Oceana and Kawerak 2014). These seals are also likely to be present near Elim. Small numbers of bearded seals could be present in the action area during construction and be exposed to disturbance from project vessels and underwater noise from pile driving. Hearing abilities of bearded seals are discussed in detail in Section 5, Determination of Effects.

2.3 Gray Whale – Western North Pacific DPS

Gray whales are found mainly in shallow coastal waters in the North Pacific Ocean. There are two geographic distributions of gray whales in the North Pacific: the eastern North Pacific stock, found along the west coast of North America, and the western North Pacific stock, found along the coast of eastern Asia. Most of the eastern North Pacific stock spend the summer feeding in the northern Bering and Chukchi Seas. Some gray whales have also been reported feeding along the Pacific coast during the summer in waters off Southeast Alaska, British Columbia, Washington, Oregon, and northern California. In the fall, gray whales migrate from their summer feeding grounds, heading south along the coast of North America to spend the winter in their wintering and calving areas off Baja California, Mexico. Calves are born during the migration or in the shallow lagoons and bays of Mexico from early January to mid-February. From mid-February to May, eastern North Pacific gray whales can be seen migrating northward along the U.S. west coast.

Photo-identification studies indicate that gray whales in this stock move widely within and between areas on the Pacific coast. They are not always observed in the same area each year, and there may be gaps of several years between repeat sightings. Western and eastern DPS gray were thought to be relatively isolated from each other. However, recent satellite tagging data have shown that at least some western North Pacific DPS gray whales migrate across the northern Gulf of Alaska and along the west coast of British Columbia, the United States, and Mexico. The eastern North Pacific population was once listed as endangered under the ESA. However, it was successfully recovered and delisted in 1994. The western North Pacific population remains low, and its continued survival is questionable. This population is estimated to include fewer than 200 individuals. Small numbers of gray whales could be present in the action area during construction and be exposed to disturbance from project vessels and underwater

noise from pile driving. Of the gray whales that may be protected, most are likely to be the non-ESA listed whales. However, whales from the listed western North Pacific DPS are not distinguishable from the majority of gray whales that are only protected under the MMPA. The forthcoming IHA application will cover both the listed DPS and the non-ESA listed whales since both can be in the project area during the open-water period. Hearing abilities of gray whales (low-frequency cetaceans) are discussed in detail in Section 5, Determination of Effects.

2.4 Humpback Whale – Mexico and Western North Pacific DPS

Humpback whales are either threatened, endangered, or delisted under the Endangered Species Act depending upon which DPS they derive. According to NMFS guidance, humpback whales observed in the Aleutian Islands, Bering, Chukchi, and Beaufort Seas derive from three recognized North Pacific DPSs: the Western North Pacific DPS, the Hawaii DPS, and the Mexico DPS. Humpback whales deriving from the Western North Pacific DPS – listed as Federally endangered – are the least likely to be encountered in Alaskan waters, at only 4.4%. Humpback whales deriving from the Mexico DPS – listed as Federally threatened – have a similarly low encounter probability of 11.3%. Humpback whales deriving from the Hawaii DPS are not listed under the Endangered Species Act; they are most likely to be encountered in Alaskan waters, at 86.5%. It should be noted that among these DPSs, individual whales do not exhibit physical traits that would allow for visual confirmation of population lineage (NMFS 2016).

Humpback whales are migratory, spending the summer feeding in the northern seas' cold waters and migrating to lower latitudes for breeding and calving. They feed by lunging open-mouthed through swarms of small fish and invertebrates and forcing the water through their baleen plates to filter separate the food from the water. Humpback whales are gregarious and often travel together or congregate at areas where food density is relatively high. They are distinguishable among other whales by their physical characteristics: large pectoral fins, and humped dorsal fins. They also display frequent rounds of breaching, and fin and tail slapping the water's surface. The various DPS (Mexico and Western Pacific DPS) are indistinguishable from the majority of the population that is not listed under the ESA. Small numbers of humpback whales could be present in the action area during construction and be exposed to disturbance from project vessels and underwater noise from pile driving. The forthcoming IHA application will cover all humpback whales. Still, only a small portion of the total allocation authorized for incidental Level B harassment will be from the two listed DPSs. Hearing abilities of humpback whales (low-frequency cetaceans) are discussed in detail in Section 5, Determination of Effects.

2.5 Steller Sea Lion - Western DPS and Critical Habitat

Steller sea lions (*Eumetopias jubatus*) occur in two DPSs in Alaska. An eastern U.S. DPS, including animals east of Cape Suckling, Alaska (144°W), was listed as threatened under the ESA until delisted recently. A western U.S. DPS listed as endangered, including sea lions at and west of Cape Suckling (including Norton Sound and the associated project area) (62 CFR 30772, 05 June 1997, and 78 CFR 66140, 04 November 2013).

Steller sea lions are large, sexually dimorphic otariids, with males attaining 11 feet in length and 2,500 pounds, and females 9.5 feet and 800 pounds. Steller sea lions are dependent upon isolated haul-outs and rookery areas; they do not tolerate disturbance in these areas. Although not technically migratory, Steller sea lions move about the entirety of their range as they pursue prey species' seasonal abundances. Steller sea lions are not known to migrate, but individuals disperse widely outside the breeding season (late May to early July). At sea, Steller sea lions commonly occur near the 656-foot (200-meter) depth contour but have been seen from near shore to well beyond the continental shelf (Kajimura and Loughlin 1988). Steller sea lions are opportunistic predators, feeding primarily on a wide variety of fishes and cephalopods, including walleye pollock (*Theragra chalcogramma*), Atka mackerel (*Pleurogrammus monopterygius*), Pacific herring (*Clupea pallasii*), capelin (*Mallotus villosus*), Pacific sand lance (*Ammodytes hexapterus*), Pacific cod (*Gadus macrocephalus*), and salmon (*Oncorhynchus* spp.) (Pitcher 1981; Merrick et al. 1997). On rare occasions, Steller sea lions prey on seals and possibly sea otter pups. Overall, populations of Steller sea lions declined precipitously between the 1950s and 1980s, and began to stabilize and slightly increase by the 2000s. Still, there are trends in either direction depending upon which portion of the species' overall range is sampled. Steller sea lions will likely remain endangered for the foreseeable future.

Small numbers of ringed Steller sea lions could be present in the action area during construction and be exposed to disturbance from project vessels and underwater noise from pile driving. Elim is near the northern limits of their range, but they could be in the action area with changing seasonal ice extents. The hearing abilities of sea lions are discussed in detail in Chapter 5, Determination of Effects.

3. ENVIRONMENTAL BASELINE

The environmental baseline includes the past and present impacts of:

- All Federal, state, or private actions and other human activities in the action area;
- The anticipated impacts of all proposed Federal projects in the action area that have already undergone formal or early Section 7 consultation; and

- The impact of state or private actions that are contemporaneous with the consultation in the process (50 CFR § 402.02).

Several human activities have contributed to the current status of populations of ESA-listed whales, ringed seals, and bearded seals in the Chukchi Sea. The recent report, "Biological Opinion: Oil and Gas Leasing and Exploration Activities in the U.S. Beaufort and Chukchi Seas, Alaska" (NMFS 2013) identified and described major threats to ESA-listed marine mammals. While this report focuses on the Beaufort and Chukchi Seas, it is also useful for Elim's impacts. Elim is located in Norton Sound in the Bering Sea. It is relatively close, and the species overlap with the Beaufort and Chukchi Sea report. The report did not cover Steller sea lions or humpback whales. However, the discussion of underwater noise, vessel strike, commercial fishing interaction and pollutants, and climate change is relevant to both species. There is no hunting of humpback whales and only minimal hunting of Steller sea lions.

NMFS indicated the principal stressors to large whales and ice seals in the Chukchi Sea that effect the likelihood that these species will survive and recover in the wild are:

- Targeted hunts
- Acoustic Noise
- Ship Strike
- Commercial Fishing Interaction
- Pollutants and Contamination
- Climate Change

The 2013 Biological Opinion, "Oil and Gas Leasing and Exploration Activities in the U.S. Beaufort and Chukchi Seas, Alaska," discusses these six factors NMFS considers to be most pertinent to the ability of bowhead whales, ringed seals, and bearded seals to recover and survive in the wild within the context of the environmental baseline of the greater Chukchi Sea.

Acoustic Impacts

Underwater noise can have many impacts on marine mammals, including temporary and permanent threshold shifts, masking, behavioral impacts, and interference with echolocation.

Baleen Whales

Cetaceans like whales and dolphins may be particularly susceptible to hydroacoustic impacts due to their reliance on acoustic information for communication, navigation, and finding food. Numerous studies in the Arctic support the understanding that whales are sensitive to offshore drilling noise, particularly migrating whales. Feeding whales may be more tolerant of underwater noise than migrating whales. (Blackwell et al. 2015)

found that bowhead whales react differently to different thresholds of seismic noise. At relatively low cumulative exposure levels (as soon as airguns were just detectable), bowhead whales almost doubled their call rates. Once cumulative exposure levels exceeded 127 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}^2\text{-s}$, call rates decreased. Bowhead whales went completely silent at received levels over 160 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}^2\text{-s}$.

Underwater sounds can be broadly classified as ambient and anthropogenic, natural and human-made, respectively. Ambient noise can come from all sorts of sources, including animals, tides, currents, ice, seismic activity, etc. It forms the background from which any escalations are compared. Anthropogenic noise is related directly to people's actions; ship traffic, pile-driving, and blasting are three examples of common sources of anthropogenic noise.

Ice seals

Pinnipeds are less impacted by underwater noise than cetaceans because pinnipeds do not rely on echolocation to feed the way cetaceans do. Pinnipeds are not known to communicate underwater with sound either, so they are not susceptible to acoustic masking in the way that cetaceans are. Underwater noise's prior effects on pinnipeds are a general disturbance and threshold shifts from powerful sounds.

Ship Strike

Vessels transiting the marine environment can collide with or strike marine mammals (Laist et al. 2001, Jensen and Silber 2003). The probability of strike events depends on the frequency, speed, route of the marine vessels, and marine mammals' distribution in the area. Humpback whales are especially susceptible to ship strike injury and mortality in narrow bottleneck passages (Williams and O'Hara 2010). Laist et al. (2001) found that while all sizes and types of vessels can strike a whale, ships greater than 80 meters and those going faster than 14 knots were most likely to cause severe or fatal injuries.

Baleen whales

Vessel collisions with whales remain a significant management concern, given the increasing abundance of whales foraging in Alaska, as well as the growing presence of marine traffic in Alaska's coastal waters and the Norton Sound area. The reduction in Arctic sea ice in recent years has renewed interest in using the Arctic Ocean as a potential waterway for coastal, regional, and trans-Arctic marine operations. Climate models predict that the warming trend in the Arctic will accelerate, causing the ice to begin melting earlier in the spring and resume freezing later in the fall, resulting in expanding potential shipping routes and lengthening the potential navigation season. Based on these factors, injury and mortality of baleen whales resulting from vessel strike may likely continue or possibly increase in the future (Neilson et al. 2012).

Ice Seals

Seals are less susceptible to vessel traffic impacts, largely because vessel traffic tends to avoid areas of high ice concentration due to the hazard the ice poses to navigation, reducing the likelihood of a vessel injuring or killing a seal from direct impact. The discharge of hazardous substances related to shipping represents a residual threat to ice seals in acute and chronic toxicity and trophic effects. Vessel traffic can also present noise and disturbance impacts to ice seals, but pinnipeds are generally less receptive to noise impacts than cetaceans. They also spend a significant portion of their lives above the water, where the hydroacoustic impact pathway is disrupted.

Targeted Hunting

Seal Hunting

Marine mammals play a critical role in the traditions of the Native people of Norton Sound. The subsistence harvest of marine mammals and ESA-listed species is permissible under the MMPA. The listing of bearded seals and ringed seals under the ESA does not affect the subsistence harvest of ice seals by Alaska Natives. The number of seals taken annually varies considerably between years due to ice and wind conditions, impacting hunter access to seals. Currently, there is no comprehensive effort to quantify harvest levels of seals in Alaska. The best estimate of the statewide annual ringed seal subsistence harvest is 9,567 (Allen and Angliss 2014). Kelly et al. (2010) concluded that although the subsistence harvest of Arctic ringed seals is currently substantial in some parts of their range, harvest levels appear to be sustainable.

The following passage concerning the subsistence harvest of bearded seals was extracted directly from the NMFS Biological Opinion, "Oil and Gas Leasing in the Beaufort and Chukchi Seas, Alaska," NMFS consultation number F/AKR/2011/0647:

Alaska Native hunters mostly take bearded seals during their northward migration in the late spring and early summer, using small boats in open leads among ice floes close to shore (Kelly 1988). Allen and Angliss (2010) reported that based on subsistence harvest data maintained by ADF&G primarily for the years 1990 to 1998, the mean estimated annual harvest level in Alaska averaged 6,788 bearded seals as of August 2000 (Coffing et al. 1998, Georgette et al. 1998, Wolfe and Hutchinson-Scarborough 1999, Allen and Angliss 2011). The estimate of 6,788 bearded seals is considered by Allen and Angliss (2010) to be the best estimate of the subsistence harvest level in Alaska. Cameron et al. (2010) noted that ice cover in hunting locations can dramatically affect the availability of bearded seals and the success of hunters in retrieving seals that have been shot, which can range from 50-75% success in the ice (Burns and

Frost 1979, Reeves et al. 1992) to as low as 30% in open water (Burns 1967, Smith and Taylor 1977, Riewe and Amsden 1979, Davis et al. 1980). Using the mean annual harvest reported from 1990-1998, assuming 25 to 50% of seals struck are lost, they estimated the total annual hunt by Alaska Natives would range from 8,485 to 10,182 bearded seals. (2013)

Climate Change

Climate change is a factor potentially affecting the range-wide status of all species (including humans) and is of particular relevance for Arctic species. The general discussion in this section applies to all species addressed in this Draft BA.

Since the 1950s, the atmosphere and oceans have warmed, snow and sea ice have diminished in both areal extent and volume, sea level has risen, and greenhouse gas concentrations have increased. The time period 1983–2012 was likely the warmest 30-year period in the Northern Hemisphere in the last 1400 years. There has been strong scientific consensus over the past two decades that atmospheric temperatures are increasing, affecting many of the earth's climate-related processes. The overwhelming majority of climate scientists agree that human activities, especially the burning of fossil fuels (coal, oil, and gas), are responsible for most of the climate change currently being observed (IPCC 2014).

Effects on marine ecosystems from increased atmospheric carbon dioxide and climate change include ocean acidification, expanded oligotrophic gyres, and shifts in temperature, circulation, stratification, and nutrient input. Altered oceanic circulation and warming cause reduced subsurface oxygen concentrations. These large-scale shifts have the potential to disrupt existing trophic pathways as changing cascades from primary producers to top-level predators. Effects on marine mammals could result from changes in the distribution of temperatures suitable for rearing young, the distribution and abundance of prey, and the distribution and abundance of competitors or predators (Doney et al. 2012).

The potential impacts of climate and oceanographic change on whales and seals will likely affect habitat availability and food availability. Site selection for feeding, breeding, and whale migration may be influenced by factors such as ocean currents and water temperature. For example, there is some evidence from Pacific equatorial waters that sperm whale feeding success and, in turn, calf production rates are negatively affected by increases in sea surface temperature (Smith and Whitehead 1993, Whitehead 1997). Any changes in these factors could render currently used habitat areas unsuitable. Changes to climate and oceanographic processes may also lead to decreased prey productivity and different prey distribution patterns and availability. Such changes could affect whales and seals that are dependent on those affected prey. Variations in sea-surface temperatures and the extent of sea ice cover during the winter months have

been linked to variations in the recruitment of krill (*Euphausia* spp.) and the reproductive success of krill predators. Different species of whales will likely react to these changes differently. For example, range size, location, and whether specific range areas are used for different life history activities (e.g., feeding, breeding) are likely to affect how each species responds to climate change (Learmonth et al. 2006).

Climate change will affect pinnipeds on land where they rest and give birth to young, and at sea where they forage. On land, sea-level rise and larger, more frequent storms may reduce or eliminate resting and birthing areas. (Learmonth et al. 2006). Changes in ocean currents, ocean acidification, and other alterations in climate cycles such as changes in El Niño events' frequency are likely to alter ocean food webs and affect the abundance and diversity of prey items. These changes may also affect susceptibility to diseases. Some changes may be positive. For example, new suitable habitats may become available for some species (Learmonth et al. 2006).

The most pronounced warming is expected in the north, exceeding the estimate for mean global warming by a factor of 3, due in part to the "ice-albedo feedback loop." As the reflective areas of Arctic ice and snow retreat, the northern latitudes absorb more heat, exacerbating the warming (NRC 2012). Climate change is projected to have substantial direct and indirect effects on individuals, populations, species, and the structure and function of marine, coastal, and terrestrial ecosystems in the foreseeable future (NRC 2012).

According to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), the average September sea ice extent declines by 12.8% per decade. In 2018, the Arctic ice cap shrank to 1.77 million square miles, tied for the sixth-lowest September minimum on record. All indications are that the extent of sea ice will continue to decrease in the future, translating to increasing impacts of climate change on ice seals.

Ice Seals

The principal threat to ringed and bearded seals and all ice seals is climate-driven sea ice reduction. Climate change impacts to sea ice were the driving force behind listing bearded seals and ringed seals in the ESA. Sea ice is a primary constituent element of ringed seal critical habitat. While bearded seal critical habitat has not been formally designated, it is a critical requirement for bearded seals' multiple life stages. The Final Rule listing bearded seals under the ESA describes five main functions that sea ice performs during the life cycle of bearded seals: (1) A dry and stable platform for whelping and nursing of pups in April and May (Kovacs et al. 1996; Atkinson 1997); (2) a rearing habitat that allows mothers to feed and replenish energy reserves lost while nursing; (3) a habitat that allows a pup to gain experience diving, swimming, and hunting with its mother, and that provides a platform for resting, relatively isolated from most terrestrial and marine predators; (4) habitat for rutting males to hold territories and

attract post-lactating females; and (5) a platform suitable for extended periods of hauling out during molting.

If suitable ice cover is absent from shallow feeding areas during times of peak whelping and nursing (April/May) or molting (May/June and sometimes through August), bearded seals would be forced to seek sea-ice habitat over deeper waters (perhaps with poor access to food), or onshore haul-out sites (perhaps with increased risks of disturbance, predation, and competition). Both scenarios would require bearded seals to adapt to novel (i.e., potentially suboptimal) conditions and exploit habitats to which they may not be well adapted, likely compromising their reproduction and survival rates (77 FR 76740).

Ringed seals are strongly impacted by the synergistic relationship between diminished ice cover and reduced snow accumulation predicted by climate models throughout their range. Ringed seals need 50–65 centimeters of snow depth to excavate subnivean birthing lairs, but current climate change models predict inadequate snow cover within this century for the Alaska stock's entire range (Kelly et al. 2010). Ringed seals, particularly pups, are vulnerable to freezing without adequate snow cover.

4. EFFECTS ANALYSIS

"Effects of the action" means the direct and indirect effects of an action on the species or critical habitat, together with the effects of other activities that are interrelated or interdependent with that action that will be added to the environmental baseline. Indirect effects are those that are caused by the proposed action and are later, but still are reasonably certain to occur (50 CFR § 402.02).

The principal impacts on the action area resulting from the proposed action are in-water noise within the zone of influence and elevated vessel strike hazard. Pile driving, marine construction, and dredging generate underwater noise that can potentially disturb marine mammals in the project area. In addition to disturbance, underwater noise from pile driving is capable of causing injury to marine mammals if they are exposed at close distances.

The proposed primary concern activities to ESA-listed humpback whales, ringed seals, bearded seals, and sea lions include exposure to sounds from pile driving and dredging, general disturbance from the elevated anthropogenic activities associated with construction and operation of the proposed project, and vessel strikes from construction-related vessels. Upland project features are ill-defined and would have discountable effects on the ESA-listed marine mammals in the action area, so the effects of those upland features will not be discussed in the effects of the action.

Confined Underwater Blasting

More importantly, underwater noise and the rapid rise and fall of pressure levels would likely extend to about 7 kilometers from shore. More precise distance estimates will be developed in PED. Since an IHA would be obtained for this project, marine mammals would be exposed to Level B (Behavioral) harassment, which would impact the most susceptible marine mammals (low-frequency cetaceans such as humpback whales) out to 7 kilometers. Phocid seals and otariid seals would be subject to Level B harassment at smaller distances. Level A harassment (mortality or permanent injury) authorization would not be sought as part of this project, and blasting shutdowns would be implemented for Level A zones. These zones would be calculated in PED but are expected to be range from a few hundred meters for otariids to approximately 1,000 meters for low-frequency cetaceans. These relatively small Level A zones are capable of being effectively monitored and would thus limit marine mammal impacts from confined underwater blasting to behavioral effects ranging from leaving the area, altered foraging patterns in the Level B zone, and possibly to no observable response at all. Overall, the potential impacts from confined underwater blasting are anticipated to be minor since they occur over a short period of time (once per day at most for several days) and would likely only expose a small number of marine mammals.

Rock Ripping

The potential effects of rock ripping to marine mammals would be minor. The Level A zone of typical hydraulic rippers is 2–3 meters, whereas the Level B zone would be less than the zone for vibratory pile driving (~7 kilometers). Given the small amount of operating time compared to vibratory pile driving and the very small Level A zones, the potential impacts to marine mammals from rock ripping are anticipated to be minor.

Marine Pile-Driving Impacts

Geotechnical investigations will need to be performed within the project footprint during preconstruction engineering and design (PED) to properly characterize the proposed dredge material, evaluate and recommend the suitability of breakwater foundation material, and identify any geological conditions that would require special foundation treatment.

The Alaska District does not have source level (SL) sound data for pile-driving in the waters around Elim. According to Caltrans (2015), sheet pile installation for bridge construction over the Tanana River near Salcha, Alaska, in 2012 recorded a peak average amplitude of 140–156 dB at 10 meters from the pile face. Scientific Fishery Systems (SFS), Inc. recorded a variety of pile driving operations in the Port of Anchorage in 2008 (SFS 2009). The SFS study recorded pile-driving sounds from ranges of 31–1207 meters from the source and applied a transmission loss multiplier of

20 to predict the source sound pressure level (SPL). The prediction resulted in an average source SPL of 187 dB and included a range of tides between 18.93 feet MLLW and 30.42 feet MLLW. The tide level significantly affected the propagation of sound energy; higher tides resulted in the more efficient transmission of sound energy due to the increased vertical area of the pile in contact with the water.

The NMFS published a notice in the Federal Register on 23 May 2017. It announced the issuance of an incidental harassment authorization for the take of marine mammal's incidental to dock replacement project in Unalaska, Alaska, citing sound pressure of 163 dB RMS recorded 10 meters from the source (FR Vol. 82, No. 98, Pg. 23535–23550). This sound was recorded during the use of a vibratory hammer to drive sheet pile and lies within the range of recorded SL for other projects. The Alaska District has used it to calculate the harassment radii for vibratory installation of sheet pile in the absence of project-specific SL data.

Caltrans (2015) also describes several projects involving the use of an impact hammer to drive 36" round piles. The typical received SPLs for pile-driving in water less than 5 meters deep are 208 dB Peak, 190 dB RMS, and 180 dB SEL. The Alaska District has assumed the Caltrans data are acceptable surrogates for the proposed impact pile driving at Elim.

The NMFS has promulgated guidance regarding the effects of anthropogenic noise on marine mammals (NMFS 2018). The NMFS guidance provides information regarding the onset of permanent threshold shift (PTS) in various clades of marine mammals, low-frequency cetaceans, mid-frequency cetaceans, high-frequency cetaceans, Phocid pinnipeds, and Otariid pinnipeds. The ESA-listed species included in this Draft BA and their respective generalized hearing ranges are:

- Phocid pinniped (PW) – ringed seals and bearded seals (50 Hz-86 kHz)
- Otariid pinniped (OW) – Steller sea lions (60 Hz-39 kHz)
- Low-frequency (LF) cetacean – bowhead whale, Pacific right whale, gray whale, humpback whale, fin whale, and blue whale (7 Hz-35 kHz)
- Mid-frequency (MF) cetacean – sperm whale and beluga whale (150 Hz-160 kHz)

The impacts of noise on marine mammals are also influenced by the type of noise produced by the activity, broadly classified as impulsive and non-impulsive noise. Impulsive noise is characterized by the rapid increase and decay of sound pressure. Simultaneously, non-impulsive noise does not have the rapid increase and decay of sound pressure associated with impulsive noise. Both classes of noise can be broadband and brief, but non-impulsive noise can be prolonged, continuous, or

intermittent. The use of a vibratory hammer to drive piles is considered non-impulsive, while the use of an impact hammer is considered impulsive.

The MMPA defines "harassment" as "any act of pursuit, torment, or annoyance which (i) has the potential to injure a marine mammal or marine mammal stock in the wild [Level A harassment]; or (ii) 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 [Level B harassment]" (16 U.S.C. § 1362(18)(A)(i)–(ii)).

While the ESA does not define "harass," NMFS recently issued guidance interpreting the term "harass" under the ESA as to: "create the likelihood of injury to wildlife by annoying it to such an extent as to significantly disrupt normal behavioral patterns which include, but are not limited to, breeding, feeding, or sheltering" (NMFS 2018). For this Draft BA, any action that amounts to incidental harassment under the MMPA—whether Level A or Level B—constitutes an incidental "take" under the ESA and must be authorized by the IHA (Section 10).

As described below, it is anticipated that exposures to listed marine mammals from noise associated with the proposed action may result in disturbance (Level B harassment) and/or permanent injury (Level A harassment) under the MMPA, collectively representing "take" under the ESA. Due to the relatively low sound pressure emitted by vibratory pile driving, no Level A harassment, permanent impairment to hearing, or mortalities are anticipated. Impact pile-driving would produce powerful sounds with the potential to cause permanent injury or hearing damage.

The NMFS guidance provides thresholds for the onset of PTS in the various hearing groups of marine mammals for non-impulsive noise. The PTS threshold for humpback whales is 199 dB, while the PTS threshold for ringed and bearded seals is 201 dB, and the PTS threshold for sea lions is 219 dB. The source SPL for vibratory pile driving is assumed to be 178 dB, which is lower than the PTS thresholds for whales, ringed seals, bearded seals, and sea lions. The use of a vibratory hammer to drive sheet pile for the pier and dock does not have the potential to result in a permanent threshold shift at the source, so there is no need to determine PTS radii. As an additional precaution against impacts to protected resources, the USACE will establish a 100-meter exclusion radius around all pile-driving activities. No pile-driving would occur during times when protected species are observed within the exclusion radius.

The harassment threshold for non-impulsive noise, based on behavioral modifications and temporary threshold shift (TTS), is set at 120 dB RMS for all marine mammal species. No injury, serious injury, or mortality of marine mammals would be anticipated as a result of noise above the harassment threshold and below the PTS threshold. Except when vibratory hammers are operated continuously for long periods in the

presence of marine mammals that do not move away from the noise source, vibratory hammers do not have the potential to cause injury to marine mammals due to the relatively low SPL and lack of potentially injurious sound characteristics (rapid rise and decay of sound pressure).

The harassment threshold for impulsive sound (impact pile-driving) is set at 160 dB RMS. Impulsive sounds are typically transient, brief (less than 1 second), broadband, and consist of high peak sound pressure with rapid rise time and rapid decay. Impact pile-driving has the potential to exceed the permanent threshold shift (PTS) criteria and cause permanent injury to exposed marine mammals.

The NMFS recommends the transmission loss (TL) formula $TL=15\log(R2/R1)$ to predict the attenuation of underwater noise with respect to the effects of underwater noise on marine mammals; where TL is the transmission loss, R1 is the distance of a known or measured sound level, and R2 is the estimated distance that is required for sound to attenuate to a prescribed acoustic threshold. The formula can be rewritten to predict the attenuation distance, the bounds of which is known as the isopleth. The amplitude of the underwater noise would deteriorate to a specified threshold. The modified formula is $R2=R1 \times 10^{((dBR1-dBt)/15)}$; where R1 is the distance of a known or measured sound level, and R2 is the estimated distance that is required for sound to attenuate to a prescribed acoustic threshold, dBR1 is the amplitude of the sound measured at the distance R1, and dBt is the specified acoustic threshold.

Vibratory Hammer Pile-Driving

Assuming a transmission loss coefficient of 15, a received SPL of 163 dB at 10 meters, and the 120 dB acoustic threshold for harassment, the practical spreading loss model, would provide a harassment isopleth of 7,356 meters from the source.

$$R2=10 \times 10^{((163-120)/15)}$$

$$R2=7,356.4m$$

A harassment isopleth of 7,356 meters around each of the sheet pile docks produces an area of ensonification exceeding the 120 dB harassment threshold of 111.2 square kilometers for the pile-driven project features after removing the terrestrial portion of the radii (Figure 6). This does not account for the impact of the breakwaters on sound propagation. The breakwaters would likely be constructed prior to the docks, so their presence could have an attenuating impact on the hydroacoustic contours. The extent of the potential attenuation is unknown.




Figure 6. 120dB Vibratory Pile Driving Noise Contour and Assumed Zonation

Observation of an area so large would present tremendous implantation challenges and costs. The additional time associated with observing the ensonified area and shutting down operations in the event a protected species enters the ensonified area would present unacceptable delays in completing the project. The Alaska District intends to prepare an IHA application during the design phase of the project and collect specific observation data regarding the abundance and distribution of ESA-listed species to determine the potential exposures of protected species to anthropogenic marine noise. Without the direct observation data required for the IHA, the quantification of takes under the definition of harassment is not possible.

Impact Hammer Pile-Driving

Harassment

Assuming a transmission loss coefficient of 15, a received SPL of 190 dB at 10 meters, and the 160 dB acoustic threshold for harassment, the practical spreading loss model would provide a harassment isopleth of 1,000 meters from the source.

$$R2=10 \times 10^{((190-160)/15)}$$

$$R2=1000\text{m}$$

A harassment isopleth of 1,000m around each of the dolphins would create an area of 5.6 square kilometers of water that would be ensonified beyond the 160 dB threshold for harassment from the impulsive sound. This area calculation does not account for the effects of the breakwaters on sound propagation.

The Alaska District employed the same methodology to estimate the zonation of hydroacoustic noise described in the previous section. Area 1 is 2.22 km², Area 2 is 0.58 km², and Area 3 is 2.65 km².

Injury

Phocid pinnipeds. Assuming a transmission loss coefficient of 15, a received SPL of 190 dB at 10 meters, and the 185 dB acoustic threshold for PTS, the practical spreading loss model, would provide a PTS isopleth of 22.5 meters from the source.

$$R2=10 \times 10^{((190-185)/15)}$$

$$R2=22.5\text{m}$$

Otariid pinnipeds. Assuming a transmission loss coefficient of 15, a received SPL of 190 dB at 10 meters, and the 203 dB acoustic threshold for PTS, the practical spreading loss model, would provide a PTS isopleth of 1.4 meters from the source.

$$R2=10 \times 10^{((190-203)/15)}$$

$$R2=1.4\text{m}$$

Mid-frequency cetaceans. Assuming a transmission loss coefficient of 15, a received SPL of 190 dB at 10 meters, and the 185 dB acoustic threshold for PTS, the practical spreading loss model, would provide a PTS isopleth of 22.5 meters from the source.

$$R2=10 \times 10^{((190-185)/15)}$$

$$R2=22.5\text{m}$$

Low-frequency cetaceans. Assuming a transmission loss coefficient of 15, a received SPL of 190 dB at 10 meters, and the 183 dB acoustic threshold for PTS, the practical spreading loss model, would provide a PTS isopleth of 29.3 meters from the source.

$$R^2=10 \times 10^{((190-183)/15)}$$

$$R^2=29.3\text{m}$$

The areas ensonified by acoustic energy of a magnitude sufficient to cause injury to marine mammals are small enough that the Alaska District could effectively observe and shut down work in the event of marine mammal incursion. There would be no Level A take of marine mammals.

Dredging

The USACE would employ a mechanical dredge to excavate sediment for the navigation channel and turning and mooring basin. The dredged material from these navigation features would be placed about 2 nautical miles southeast of the project location. Dredging and dredged material placement has the potential to create noise, turbidity, direct physical and vessel strike impacts.

Vessels transiting the marine environment have the potential to collide with or strike, marine mammals (Laist et al. 2001, Jensen and Silber 2003). The probability of strike events depends on the frequency, speed, and route of the marine vessels and the distribution of marine mammals in the area. Humpback whales are especially susceptible to ship strike injury and mortality in narrow bottleneck passages (Williams and O'Hara 2010). Laist et al. (2001) found that while all sizes and types of vessels can strike a whale, ships greater than 80 meters and those going faster than 14 knots were most likely to cause severe or fatal injuries.

Mechanical dredges are relatively stationary, so there is minimal potential for vessel strike impacts during dredging. The dredging plant would excavate sediment and place the material on a barge for transportation to the placement location. The barge would only be capable of traveling about 8 knots, which minimizes the potential for impacting ESA-listed species by a vessel strike.

Bucket dredging noise can be delineated into six distinct events to complete a single cycle. These events are repeated every time the bucket is deployed and retrieved. The first event is winch noise as the boom and bucket are swung into position, and the bucket is lowered. The bucket striking the water surface creates a splashing noise detectable at short distances. The second event is the bucket's noise, striking the sediment surface that is followed by the noise of the bucket closing and capturing the dredged material. The fourth event is the noise of the bucket jaws contacting each other. The bucket is raised by the winch, creating the fifth noise. The sixth and final

noise of the cycle is the sound of the material being dumped into the scow. The amplitude of the second, third, and sixth events is strongly influenced by the sediment's granularity that is being excavated. Coarse material produces more powerful sounds than fine material. Winching noise is produced at a higher frequency than the other event noises, so it attenuates more quickly. Bucket dredging is classified as a repetitive class of sound, rather than continuous.

Clark et al. recorded the clamshell dredge *Viking* dredging sand and gravel from Cook Inlet in 2001. The *Viking* is a 1,475 hp clamshell dredge with an 11.5-cubic meter bucket. Clark recorded sounds digging sounds between 113–107 dB at distances of 158–464 meters from the source, respectively. Assuming a transmission loss coefficient of 15 for the practical spreading calculation, a received 113 dB level at a range of 158 meters indicates an SL of 146 dB. The same calculation using a received level of 107 dB at a range of 464 meters indicates an SL of 147 dB.

The equipment used to dredge at Elim would be similar in scale to the *Viking* and could be assumed to generate similar amplitude noise. The amplitude of the sounds produced by dredging near Elim would be similar to the amplitude of the *Viking* dredging sounds in Cook Inlet.

The dredging noise would be below the PTS threshold at the source, so the dredging noise would not have the potential to seriously injure or kill low-frequency cetaceans or Phocid seals, assuming an SL of between 146–147 dB. The sound would attenuate to the 120 dB harassment threshold between 54–63 meters from the source. The USACE would establish a 75-meter exclusion radius around the dredge to monitor for the presence of ESA-listed species and halt dredging operations as soon as safely possible in the event a protected species enters or appears on a course to enter the exclusion radius.

Considering the observation of a 75-meter exclusion radius around the dredge plant and support vessels, the underwater noise produced by dredging may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect, ESA-listed ringed seals and bearded seals. The underwater noise produced by dredging would have no effect on humpback whales due to the relatively low amplitude of the noise and the low potential for bowhead whales to be in the project area during dredging.

General Habitat Alteration

The proposed dredging would alter the bottom composition of the area within the dredge prism and the placement area. Established communities of benthic and epibenthic organisms would be excavated, transported to the placement area, discharged from the scow, and the sediments in which the organisms are entrained would smother in situ communities of organisms. Many of the organisms that would be

excavated and/or smothered are broadcast spawning invertebrates and can quickly recolonize the disturbed area. This action would have an immediate deleterious impact on the dredged prism's productivity and the placement area, with a corresponding impact on the higher trophic level organisms that forage in these areas. There has not been a survey of the epibenthic community within the proposed placement area.

5. DETERMINATION OF EFFECTS

5.1 Ringed Seals

The project **May Affect** ringed seals because of:

- Acoustic harassment from vibratory pile driving.
- Acoustic harassment from confined underwater blasting.
- Acoustic harassment from dredging.
- Additional vessel traffic during construction.

The project is **Likely to Adversely Affect** ringed seals because of:

- Exposure to underwater noise from dredging and pile driving. This would be limited to Level B (Behavioral) harassment.
- Exposure to confined underwater blasting effects. This would be limited to Level B (Behavioral) harassment.

5.2 Bearded Seals

The project **May Affect** bearded seals because of:

- Acoustic harassment from vibratory pile driving.
- Acoustic harassment from confined underwater blasting.
- Acoustic harassment from dredging.
- Additional vessel traffic during construction.

The project is **Likely to Adversely Affect** bearded seals because of:

- Exposure to underwater noise from vibratory pile driving and dredging. This would be limited to Level B (Behavioral) harassment.
- Exposure to confined underwater blasting effects. This would be limited to Level B (Behavioral) harassment.

5.3 Gray Whale – Western North Pacific DPS

The project **May Affect** gray whales because of:

- Acoustic harassment from vibratory pile driving.

- Acoustic harassment from confined underwater blasting.
- Acoustic harassment from dredging.
- Additional vessel traffic during construction.

The project is ***Likely to Adversely Affect*** gray whales because of:

- Exposure to underwater noise from vibratory pile driving and dredging. This would be limited to Level B (Behavioral) harassment.
- Exposure to confined underwater blasting effects. This would be limited to Level B (Behavioral) harassment.

5.4 Humpback Whale – Western Pacific DPS and Mexico DPS

The project ***May Affect*** humpback whales because of:

- Acoustic harassment from vibratory pile driving.
- Acoustic harassment from confined underwater blasting.
- Acoustic harassment from dredging.
- Additional vessel traffic during construction.

The project is ***Likely to Adversely Affect*** humpback whales because of:

- Exposure to underwater noise from vibratory pile driving and dredging. This would be limited to Level B (Behavioral) harassment.
- Exposure to confined underwater blasting effects. This would be limited to Level B (Behavioral) harassment.

5.5 Steller Sea Lion - Western DPS

The project ***May Affect*** sea lions because of:

- Acoustic harassment from vibratory pile driving.
- Acoustic harassment from confined underwater blasting.
- Acoustic harassment from dredging.
- Additional vessel traffic during construction.

The project is ***Likely to Adversely Affect*** gray sea lions because of:

- Exposure to underwater noise from vibratory pile driving and dredging. This would be limited to Level B (Behavioral) harassment.
- Exposure to confined underwater blasting effects. This would be limited to Level B (Behavioral) harassment.

6. PREPARERS

Chris Hoffman, Biologist, Alaska District

7. REFERENCES

- Allen, B. M., and R. P. Angliss. 2010. Alaska marine mammal stock assessments, 2009. U.S. Dep. Commer., NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFSAFSC- 206, 276 p.
- Allen, B. M., and R. P. Angliss. 2011. Alaska marine mammal stock assessments, 2010. U.S. Dep. Commer., NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-AFSC-223, 292 p.
- Allen, B.M., and R.P. Angliss. 2014. Alaska marine mammal stock assessments. National Marine Mammal Laboratory, Alaska Fisheries Science Center, Seattle, Washington.
- ADFG. 2012. Alaska's Nome Area Wildlife Viewing Guide, Exploring the Nome Roadways.
- Atkinson S (1997) Reproductive biology of seals. *Rev Reprod* 2:175–194
- Blackwell SB, Nations CS, McDonald TL, Thode AM, Mathias D, Kim KH, et al. (2015) Effects of Airgun Sounds on Bowhead Whale Calling Rates: Evidence for Two Behavioral Thresholds. *PLoS ONE* 10(6):e0125720.
<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0125720>
- Burns, J. J. 1967. The Pacific bearded seal. Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Pittman-Robertson Project Report W-6-R and W-14-R. 66 p.
- Burns, J. J., and K. J. Frost. 1979. The natural history and ecology of the bearded seal, *Erignathus barbatus*. In *Environmental Assessment of the Alaskan Continental Shelf*, Final Reports 19:311-392. 565p
- California Department of Transportation (CALTRANS). 2015. Technical Guidance for Assessment and Mitigation of the Hydroacoustic Effects of Pile Driving on Fish.
- Cameron, M.F., J. L. Bengtson, P. L. Boveng, J. K. Jansen, B. P. Kelly, S. P. Dahle, E. A. Logerwell, J. E. Overland, C. L. Sabine, G. T. Waring, and J. M. Wilder. 2010. Status review of the bearded seal (*Erignathus barbatus*). U.S. Dep. Commer., NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-AFSC-211, 246 p.
- Coffing, M., C. L. Scott, and C. J. Utermohle. 1998. The subsistence harvest of seals and sea lions by Alaska Natives in three communities of the Yukon-Kuskokwim

Delta, Alaska, 1997-98. Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Division of Subsistence, Technical Paper No. 255. 56 p.

Davis, R. A., K. J. Finley, and W. J. Richardson. 1980. The present status and future management of arctic marine mammals in Canada. LGL Limited Environmental Research Associates, Prepared by LGL Limited Environmental Research Associates for the Science Advisory Board of the Northwest Territories, Yellowknife, N.W.T. 93 p.

Doney, Scott & Ruckelshaus, Mary & Duffy, J. & Barry, James & Chan, Francis & English, Chad & Galindo, Heather & Grebmeier, Jacqueline & Hollowed, Anne & Knowlton, Nancy & Polovina, Jeffrey & Rabalais, N. & Sydeman, William & Talley, Lynne. (2012). Climate Change Impacts on Marine Ecosystems. Annual review of marine science. 4. 11-37. 10.1146/annurev-marine-041911-111611.

Fisheries, NOAA. *Biological Opinion on Oil and Gas Leasing and Exploration Activities in the U.S. Beaufort and Chukchi Seas, Alaska*. 31 Dec. 2019, www.fisheries.noaa.gov/resource/document/biological-opinion-oil-and-gas-leasing-and-exploration-activities-us-beaufort-0.

Georgette, S., M. Coffing, C. Scott, and C. Utermohle, 1998. The subsistence harvest of seals and sea lions by Alaska Natives in the Norton Sound-Bering Strait region, Alaska, 1996-97. Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Division of Subsistence, Technical Paper No. 242. 88 p.

97. Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Division of Subsistence, Technical Paper No. 242. 88 p

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). (2014). *Climate Change 2014: Synthesis Report*. Cambridge University Press.

Jensen, A.S. and G.K. Silber. 2003. Large Whale Ship Strike Database. U.S. Department of Commerce, NOAA Technical Memorandum. NMFS-OPR- , 37 pp.

Jensen, A.; Silber, G. (2004). Large Whale Ship Strike Database (Report No. NMFS-OPR-25). Report by National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). Report for US Department of Commerce (DOC).

Kajimura, H., and T. R. Loughlin. 1988. Marine mammals in the oceanic food web of the eastern subarctic Pacific. Bull. Ocean Res. Inst. University of Tokyo 26:187-223

Kelly, Brendan & Badajos, Oriana & Kunnasranta, Mervi & Moran, John & Martinez, Micaela & Boveng, Peter. (2010). Seasonal home ranges and fidelity to breeding sites among ringed seals. Polar Biology. 33. 1095-1109.

- Kelly, B. P. 1988. Bearded seal, *Erignathus barbatus*. Pages 77-94 in J. W. Lentifer, editor. Selected Marine Mammal Species of Alaska: Species Accounts with Research and Management Recommendations. Marine Mammal Commission, Washington, D.C.
- Kovacs, K.M., Lydersen, C. & Gjertz, I. (1996). Birth-site characteristics and prenatal moulting in bearded seals (*Erignathus barbatus*). *J. Mamm.* 77, p. 1085-109 1.
- Laist, D.; Knowlton, A.; Mead, J.; Collet, A.; Podesta, M. (2001). Collisions Between Ships and Whales. *Marine Mammal Science*, 17(1), 35-75. DOI: 10.1111/j.1748-7692.2001.tb00980.x
- Lean, Charlie. 2019. Email dated 2 January 2019, subject: Port of Nome Modifications - relative environmental, cultural impacts of 6 alternative designs.
- Learmonth, J. A., MacLeod, C. D., Santos Vazquez, M. B., Pierce, G. J., Crick, H. Q. P., & Robinson, R. A. (2006). Potential effects of climate change on marine mammals. *Oceanography and Marine Biology: An Annual Review*, 44, 431-464.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2009.10.008>
- Merrick, R. L., Chumbley, M. K., & Byrd, G. V. (1997). Diet diversity of Steller sea lions (*Eumetopias jubatus*) and their population decline in Alaska: A potential relationship. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*, 54, 1342-1348.
- NFMS 2013. Biological Opinion: Oil and Gas Leasing and Exploration Activities in the U.S. Beaufort and Chukchi Seas, Alaska. U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service, Alaska Regional Office, Anchorage, AK. 2 April 2013
- National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). (2016). *Occurrence of Endangered Species Act (ESA) Listed Humpback Whales off Alaska*, Revised.
- National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). (2018). *Revisions to: Technical Guidance for Assessing the Effects of Anthropogenic Sound on Marine Mammal Hearing (Version 2.0). Underwater Thresholds for Onset of Permanent and Temporary Threshold Shifts*. U.S. Dept. of Commer., NOAA. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-OPR-59, 167 p.
- National Research Council 2012. Climate Change: Evidence, Impacts, and Choices: PFD Booklet. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.
<https://doi.org/10.17226/14673>
- Neilson, J., Gabriele, C., Jensen, A., Kackson, K., & Straley, J. (2012). Summary of reported whale-vessel collisions in Alaskan Waters. *Journal of Marine Biology*.

- Oceana and Kawerak. (2014). Bering Strait Marine life and subsistence use data synthesis. Juneau, AK: Oceana and Kawerak
- Pitcher, K.W. 1981. Prey of the Steller sea lion, *Eumetopias jubatus*, in the Gulf of Alaska. Fish. Bull. U.S. 79: 467-472
- Reeves, R. R., B. S. Steward, and S. Leatherwood. 1992. Bearded seal, *Erignathus barbatus* Erxleben 1777. Pages 180-187 in The Sierra Club Handbook of Seals and Sirenians. Sierra Club Books, San Francisco, CA.
- Riewe, R. R., and C. W. Amsden. 1979. Harvesting and utilization of pinnipeds by Inuit hunters in Canada's eastern High Arctic. Pages 324-348 in A. P. McCartney, editor. Thule Eskimo Culture: An Anthropological Retrospective. Mercury Series 88. Archaeological Survey of Canada, Ottawa, Canada.
- RJW Consulting (RJW). 2013. Final Report, 2013 Environmental Baseline Studies, Nome Offshore Report, Document #PMM001-3300-101. December 2013.
- Scientific Fishery Systems, Inc. (SFS). 2009. 2008 Underwater Noise Survey during Construction Pile Driving, Port of Anchorage Marine Terminal Development Project. January 2009.
- Smith, M. A., M. S. Goldman, E. J. Knight, and J. J. Warrenchuk. 2017. *Ecological Atlas of the Bering, Chukchi, and Beaufort Seas*. 2nd edition. Audubon Alaska, Anchorage, AK.
- Smith, S. C. & Whitehead, H. (1993) Variation in the feeding success and behaviour of Galápagos sperm whales (*Physeter macrocephalus*) as they relate to oceanographic conditions. Can. J. Zool. 71, 1991–1996
- Smith, T.G., and D. Taylor. 1977. Notes on marine mammal, fox, and polar bear harvests in the Northwest Territories, 1940 to 1972. *Tech. Rept. Environ. Can. Fish. Mar. Serv.*, No. 694, 37p.
- Whitehead, H. 1997. Sea surface temperature and the abundance of sperm whale calves off the Galapagos Islands: implications for the effects of global warming. *Reports of the international Whaling Commission* 47: 941-944.
- Williams, R., and O'Hara, P. (2010). Modelling ship strike risk to fin, humpback and killer whales in British Columbia. Canada. *J. Cetacean Res. Manag.* 11, 1–8.
- Wolfe, R., and L. B. Hutchinson-Scarborough. 1999. The subsistence harvest of harbor seal and sea lion by Alaska Natives in 1998. Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Division of Subsistence, Technical Paper No. 250.