
clerks@guamlegislature.org

From: Speaker's Office <speaker@guamlegislature.org>
Sent: Wednesday, June 10, 2020 3:25 PM
To: Clerks Office
Cc: Rennae Meno
Subject: Messages and Communications
Attachments: Department of the Navy- Notice and Impact Statment.pdf

Buenas and Hafa Adai Clerks,
Attached is the Letterhead for Messages and Communications 35GL-20-1874.
USB with additional files to follow.

06-10-20	8:00 AM	06-05-20	Notice of Availability of the Marianas Islands of the Marianas Islands Training and Testing Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement.*	Department of the Navy	35GL-20-1874



Sinseru yan Minagåhet,

Office of the Speaker • Tina Rose Muña Barnes
Committee on Public Accountability, Human Resources & the Guam Buildup

35th Guam Legislature
I Mina'trentai Singko na Liheslaturan Guåhan

Guam Congress Building | 163 Chalan Santo Papa | Hagatna, GU 96910
T: (671) 477-2520/1
speaker@guamlegislature.org

This e-mail message is intended only for the use of the individual or entity named above and may contain confidential and privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of the information contained in this transmission is strictly PROHIBITED. If you have received this transmission in error, please immediately notify us by replying to speaker@guamlegislature.org and delete the message immediately. Thank you very much.

Gumai pribilehu yan konfedensia este siha na mensåhi. Solo espesiåtmente para hågu ma entensioña pat ma aturisa para unrisibi. Sen prubidu kumu ti un ma aturisa para manribisa, na'setbe, pat mandespåtcha. Yanggen lachi rinisibu-mu nu este na mensåhi , put fabot ago' guatu gi I numa'huyong gi as speaker@guamlegislature.org yan despues destrosa todu siha I kopian mensåhi. Si Yu'os ma'åse'.

35GL-20-1874
Speaker Tina Rose Muña Barnes

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
COMMANDER
UNITED STATES PACIFIC FLEET
250 MAKALAPA DRIVE
PEARL HARBOR, HAWAII 96860-3131

JUN 10 2020
Time 8:00 (X)AM ( )PM
Received By: Alan

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5090
Ser N465/0622
June 05, 2020

The Honorable Tina Rose Muna-Barnes
Senator
35th Guam Legislature
Guam Congress Bldg., 163 Chalan Santo Papa
Hagåtña, GU 96910

Dear Senator Muna-Barnes:

SUBJECT: NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY OF THE MARIANA ISLANDS TRAINING AND TESTING FINAL SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT/OVERSEAS ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

This letter is to inform you that the Department of the Navy (Navy) has completed a Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (EIS/OEIS) to assess the potential environmental impacts associated with ongoing at-sea and Farallon de Medinilla (FDM) training and testing activities conducted within the Mariana Islands Training and Testing (MITT) EIS/OEIS Study Area (hereafter referred to as the "Study Area"). Proposed activities are generally consistent with previously analyzed activities and are similar to those that have occurred in the Study Area for decades.

The Navy understands the challenging times our world and nation face with the COVID-19 pandemic, and the impact it has had on our local governments and communities. It is times like these that the readiness of our military forces becomes even more critical. Our service members need to be prepared for a wide range of potential situations, from combat to humanitarian assistance and disaster relief.

In the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy evaluated new, relevant information, such as more recent marine mammal density data and new scientific information, and updated previous environmental analyses as appropriate. This Supplemental EIS/OEIS supports the Navy's request for federal regulatory permits and authorizations under the Marine Mammal Protection Act and the Endangered Species Act.

The Study Area remains unchanged and includes the existing Mariana Islands Range Complex (MIRC), additional ocean areas outside of the MIRC, a transit corridor between the MIRC and the Hawaii Range Complex, and Navy piers located in Apra Harbor (Enclosure 1). Other activities and land components associated with the MIRC (except FDM) are not considered in the supplement because they have not appreciably changed and remain covered under the 2015 analysis and associated authorizations.

The Proposed Action is to continue training and testing activities within the Study Area at sea and on FDM. These activities include the use of active sonar and explosives while employing mitigation measures. The purpose of the Proposed Action is to continue training and testing activities to ensure the Navy, other U.S. military services, and the U.S. Coast Guard meet their respective missions, which for the Navy is to maintain, train, and equip combat-ready forces capable of winning wars, deterring aggression, and maintaining freedom of the seas.

To achieve and maintain military readiness, the Navy proposes to:

- Continue at-sea training and testing activities at levels required to support military readiness requirements beyond 2020.
- Incorporate evolving mission requirements, including those resulting from the development, testing, and introduction of new vessels, aircraft, and weapons systems into the fleet.

The completion of the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS follows years of research, analysis, stakeholder engagement, and public involvement. The Navy welcomed public involvement and input during the 2017 scoping process and held four public meetings on Guam, Saipan, Tinian, and Rota in March 2019 to provide information and obtain public input on the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Comments received from the public, community organizations, elected officials, and government agencies on the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS were considered and responded to in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS.

In accordance with National Environmental Policy Act regulations, the Navy will wait 30 days after publication of the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS before making a final decision on the action. The Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS will be available to the public on the project website **www.MITT-EIS.com** beginning June 5, 2020. A flash drive of the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS is enclosed for your use (Enclosure 2). Copies of the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS have been sent to the following public libraries and are available depending on COVID-19 conditions regulating access to public facilities. Please check with libraries regarding hours of operation and the availability of the document.

Robert F. Kennedy Memorial Library
University of Guam
UOG Station
Mangilao, GU 96923

Nieves M. Flores Memorial Library
254 Martyr St.
Hagåtña, GU 96910

Tinian Public Library
San Jose Village
Tinian, MP 96952

Antonio C. Atalig Memorial Library
Rota Public Library
Rota, MP 96951

Joeten-Kiyu Public Library
Beach Road and Insatto St.
Saipan, MP 96950

5090
Ser N465/0622
June 05, 2020

If you have questions or would like additional information, please visit **www.MITT-EIS.com** or contact:

Naval Facilities Engineering Command Pacific
Attention: MITT Supplemental EIS/OEIS Project Manager
258 Makalapa Drive, Suite 100
Pearl Harbor, HI 96860-3134

Please help the Navy inform the community about the availability of the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS by sharing this information with your staff and interested individuals.


Sincerely,



D. A. MCNAIR
Director, Environmental Readiness
By direction of the Commander

Enclosures: 1. Mariana Islands Training and Testing Supplemental EIS/OEIS Study Area
2. Mariana Islands Training and Testing Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS (flash drive)

Enclosure: 1. Mariana Islands Training and Testing Supplemental EIS/OEIS Study Area



Enclosure (1)



Farallon de Medinilla

Saipan

Tinian

Rota

Guam

The Mariana Islands Training and Testing

Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement
United States Department of the Navy

Volume 1

June 2020 | Final

NAVSEA
NAVAL SEA SYSTEMS COMMAND

ONR
Science & Technology

Doc. No. 35GL-20-1874.*

Mariana Islands Training and Testing Activities Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement

Volume 1

June 2020

MITT SEIS/OEIS Project Manager
Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Pacific/EV21
258 Makalapa Dr., Suite 100
Pearl Harbor, HI 96860-3134

Doc. No. 35GL-20-1874.*

FOREWORD

The Draft Mariana Islands Training and Testing (MITT) Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS/OEIS) was released on February 1, 2019 for public review and comment through April 17, 2019. Changes in this Final SEIS/OEIS reflect responses to all substantive comments made on the Draft SEIS/OEIS during the public comment period as well as refinements to the Proposed Action made by the Navy. Public comments are summarized, and their corresponding responses are provided, in Appendix K (Public Comments and Responses) of the Final SEIS/OEIS.

While most sections in the Final SEIS/OEIS were changed in some manner between the draft and final versions, many of those changes were not substantive and entailed minor modifications to improve clarity. Substantive changes made to sections between the Draft SEIS/OEIS and Final SEIS/OEIS are summarized below.

- Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives):

  Information on standard operating procedures for amphibious assaults and amphibious raids was added. Standard operating procedures for these activities are designed primarily for safety of personnel and equipment but will also benefit shallow coral reefs, hard bottom, and other substrates.

  Added Table 2.3-1 which provides the differences between major training exercises and smaller integrated/coordinated anti-submarine exercises based on scale, duration, and sonar hours for the purposes of exercise reporting requirements.

- Section 3.0 (Introduction to Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences):

  Additional information regarding the surface area of the seafloor that has the potential to be impacted by the use of military expended materials proposed under the SEIS/OEIS was added to *Table 3.0-18 (Impact Area of Proposed Military Expended Materials)*. The amount of military expended materials that would result from activities proposed in this SEIS/OEIS would decrease from the amount analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Therefore, the area of the seafloor potentially impacted by military expended materials residing on the seafloor is expected to be less. In addition, updated information was added to *Section 3.0.4.1.4.1 (Muzzle Blast from Naval Gunfire)*, including a new figure that depicts 5-inch deck gun variants on two classes of Navy surface ships, to enhance the discussion of weapon firing noise. Additional information was provided in *Section 3.0.4.1.2 (Vessel Noise)* to differentiate between Navy ships and non-Navy ships in terms of their radiated ship noise. Finally, *Section 3.0.4.4.7 (Personnel Disturbance)* presented a new stressor to account for the potential for physical impacts on the nearshore seafloor from personnel involved in training or testing activities.

- Section 3.2 (Sediments and Water Quality):

  Additional information regarding water quality criteria and screening levels in waters surrounding Guam and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (CNMI) was provided, including water quality standards and classifications set by Guam and the CNMI. In addition, a summary of research conducted at other sites with expended munitions and other military expended materials was included.

- Section 3.4 (Marine Mammals):

  Updates including the best available science and discussions of newly published journal articles were included in this section. In addition, an error was identified in the explosive range to effects tables and was corrected. There is no change to the explosives being proposed. Lastly, an expanded discussion of beaked whale strandings was added in *Section 3.4.2.1.1.6 (Stranding)* to include the history of their routine occurrence in the Mariana Islands based on concern expressed in public comments on the Draft SEIS/OEIS.

- Section 3.5 (Sea Turtles):

  Updates including the best available science and discussions of newly published journal articles were included in this section. In addition, an error was identified in the explosive range to effects tables and was corrected. There is no change to the explosives being proposed. This section was also updated to include an analysis on potential impacts on sea turtles resulting from multiple stressors (*Section 3.5.3, Summary of Potential Impacts on Sea Turtles*).

- Section 3.6 (Birds):

  An analysis of potential impacts on birds from multiple stressors (*Section 3.6.3, Summary of Potential Impacts on Marine Birds*) was included in this section.

- Section 3.8 (Marine Invertebrates):

  Background information and analysis on hydrothermal vents, to the extent that data were available, was included in this section. In addition, a coral reef map (*Figure 3.8-1: Percent Coral Cover and Habitat Types Around Farallon de Medinilla*) was added. Updated information from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's coral condition report for CNMI and Guam was incorporated.

- Section 3.9 (Fishes):

  Updates including the best available science and discussions of newly published journal articles were included in this section. In addition, an error was identified in the explosive range to effects tables and was corrected. There is no change to the explosives being proposed.

- Section 3.10 (Terrestrial Species and Habitats):

  Clarifications on when periodic surveys of Farallon de Medinilla occur and on training activity type descriptions on the island were included in this section.

- Section 3.11 (Cultural Resources):

  Cultural practices and beliefs shared by participants at the National Historic Preservation Act Section 106 consultation meetings were added to this section. Minor corrections and edits were made, where applicable.

- Section 3.12 (Socioeconomic Resources):

  A more in-depth analysis of environmental justice issues, particularly issues associated with traditional fishing practices, was added to this section. Changes included information on the importance of coral reefs to fishers, citing National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration publications that report on surveys of fishers. The most recent available economic data on GDP growth for Guam and CNMI, visitation, and fisheries landings were added to the section. Data on the

number of Notices to Mariners issued by the U.S. Coast Guard on behalf of the Navy and announcing restrictions on access to waters around Farallon de Medinilla and beneath warning areas were updated. Lastly, information was provided on bioaccumulation risk to fisheries due to munitions constituents in the secondary impact discussion.

- Chapter 5 (Mitigation):

  The Navy worked with the National Marine Fisheries Service during the Endangered Species Act consultation process to develop new procedural mitigation for manta rays and enhance existing procedural mitigation for marine mammals, sea turtles, and hammerhead sharks during explosive mine neutralization activities involving Navy divers. In addition, updates to mitigation area measures were also included as a result of consultations under the Marine Mammal Protection Act and Endangered Species Act, as detailed in Appendix I (Geographic Mitigation Assessment).

- Appendix I (Geographic Mitigation Assessment):

  The boundaries of the proposed geographic mitigation areas were updated using bathymetry as the physical feature defining the areas. The list of mitigation areas considered but not carried forward was expanded to include other areas suggested by commenters and the rationale for not proposing those areas as geographic mitigation areas.

  The Navy developed new mitigation for the Final SEIS/OEIS in consultation with NMFS to limit surface ship hull-mounted MF1 mid-frequency active sonar to a maximum combined total of 20 hours from December 1 to April 30 in the Marpi Reef Geographic Mitigation Area and Chalan Kanoa Reef Mitigation Area.

- Appendix K (Public Comment Responses):

  This Appendix was added since the release of the Draft SEIS/OEIS and includes an explanation of the public comment process for the Draft SEIS/OEIS, a list of agencies and organizations that provided comments, and a table containing the comments received and the Navy's responses.

This page intentionally left blank.

FINAL SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT/ OVERSEAS ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT FOR MARIANA ISLANDS TRAINING AND TESTING

Lead Agency: United States Department of the Navy
Cooperating Agency: National Marine Fisheries Service
United States Coast Guard
Title of the Proposed Action: Mariana Islands Training and Testing
Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/
Overseas Environmental Impact Statement

Abstract

The United States Department of the Navy (Navy) prepared this Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS/OEIS) in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969 (42 United States Code section 4321 et seq.); the Council on Environmental Quality Regulations for Implementing the Procedural Provisions of NEPA (Title 40 Code of Federal Regulations sections 1500 et seq.); Navy Procedures for Implementing NEPA (32 Code of Federal Regulations section 775); and Executive Order 12114, *Environmental Effects Abroad of Major Federal Actions*. This SEIS/OEIS evaluates the potential environmental impacts of conducting training and testing activities after August 2020 at sea and on Farallon de Medinilla within the Mariana Islands Training and Testing (MITT) Study Area (Study Area). The Study Area is the same as was analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and is composed of three components: (1) the Mariana Islands Range Complex, (2) additional areas on the high seas, and (3) a transit corridor between the Mariana Islands Range Complex and the Hawaii Range Complex. Three alternatives were analyzed in this SEIS/OEIS:

- The No Action Alternative represents no military readiness activities at sea or on Farallon de Medinilla associated with the Proposed Action within the Study Area. Other military activities not associated with this Proposed Action would continue to occur.
- Alternative 1 consists of an adjustment from the level of training and testing activities analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, accounting for changes in the types and tempo (increases or decreases) of activities necessary to meet current and future military readiness requirements beyond 2020.
- Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative) includes the same type of training and testing activities that would occur under Alternative 1 and had been analyzed in the 2015 MITT FEIS/OEIS. Alternative 2 also considers an increase in tempo of some training and testing activities, including additional Fleet exercises and associated unit-level activities, should unanticipated emergent world events require increased readiness levels.

Resources evaluated include sediments and water quality, air quality, marine habitats, marine mammals, sea turtles, marine birds, marine vegetation, marine invertebrates, fishes, terrestrial species and habitats, cultural resources, socioeconomic resources and environmental justice, and public health and safety.

Prepared by: United States Department of the Navy
Point of Contact: MITT SEIS/OEIS Project Manager
Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Pacific/EV21
258 Makalapa Dr., Suite 100
Pearl Harbor, HI 96860-3134(808) 472-1402

Executive Summary

Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/ Overseas Environmental Impact Statement Mariana Islands Training and Testing

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ES EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 1

ES.1 Introduction 1

ES.2 Purpose of and Need for Proposed Training and Testing Activities 1

ES.3 Scope and Content of the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement 1

ES.4 Proposed Action and Alternatives 2

ES.4.1 No Action Alternative 3

ES.4.2 Alternative 1 4

ES.4.3 Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative) 4

ES.5 Summary of Environmental Effects 4

ES.5.1 Cumulative Impacts 33

ES.6 Standard Operating Procedures, Mitigation, and Monitoring 33

ES.6.1 Standard Operating Procedures 34

ES.6.2 Mitigation 34

ES.6.3 Mitigation Measures Considered but Eliminated 34

ES.6.4 Monitoring and Reporting 34

ES.7 Other Considerations 35

ES.7.1 Consistency with Other Federal, Guam, CNMI, and Local Plans, Policies, and Regulations 35

ES.7.2 Relationship Between Short-Term Use of the Human Environment and Maintenance and Enhancement of Long-Term Productivity 35

ES.7.3 Irreversible or Irretrievable Commitment of Resources 36

ES.7.4 Energy Requirements and Conservation Potential of Alternatives 36

ES.8 Public Involvement 36

ES.8.1 Scoping Process 36

ES.8.2 Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement Public Comments 36

List of Figures

Figure ES.4-1: Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area ES-3

List of Tables

Table ES.5-1: Summary of Environmental Impacts for the No Action Alternative, Alternative 1, and Alternative 2 ..... ES-6

ES Executive Summary

ES.1 Introduction

The United States (U.S.) Department of the Navy (Navy) prepared the supplement to the May 2015 Mariana Islands Training and Testing (MITT) Final Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas EIS (EIS/OEIS) (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2015) pursuant to Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) Regulations. The Supplemental EIS (SEIS)/OEIS considered ongoing and future activities conducted at sea and on Farallon de Medinilla (FDM), updated training and testing requirements, incorporated new information from an updated acoustic effects model, updated marine mammal density data, and incorporated evolving and emergent best available science. The SEIS/OEIS also supports the issuance of federal regulatory permits and authorizations under the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA) and the Endangered Species Act (ESA) by using the most current and best available science and analytical methods to reassess potential environmental impacts on the species applicable to those regulations. The Navy consulted with the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) to renew these authorizations. While the Study Area remains unchanged from the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, the SEIS/OEIS focuses only on the at-sea and FDM portion of that area.

The 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS also analyzed training and testing activities conducted at existing Mariana Islands Range Complex (MIRC) land-based training areas located on Guam, Saipan, Tinian, and Rota. In accordance with 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Section 1502.9, the Navy will continue to rely on the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and the 2015 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service consultation for land-based activities because there are no changes that are relevant to environmental concerns or that would have a bearing on the land-based activities or their impacts.

ES.2 Purpose of and Need for Proposed Training and Testing Activities

The Navy and NMFS (as a cooperating agency) have coordinated from the outset and developed this document to meet each agency's distinct National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) obligations and support the decision making of both agencies. The Navy's purpose of the Proposed Action is to conduct training and testing activities to ensure that the Navy, other U.S. military services, and the U.S. Coast Guard meet their respective missions, which, for the Navy under Title 10 United States Code (U.S.C.) Section 8062, is to maintain, train, and equip combat-ready military forces capable of winning wars, deterring aggression, and maintaining freedom of the seas. The respective missions are achieved in part by training and testing within the Study Area in accordance with established military readiness requirements. NMFS's purpose is to evaluate the Navy's Proposed Action pursuant to NMFS's authority under the MMPA, and to make a determination whether to issue incidental take regulations and Letters of Authorization, including any conditions needed to meet the statutory mandates of the MMPA.

ES.3 Scope and Content of the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement

In the SEIS/OEIS, the Navy reanalyzed at-sea and FDM training and testing activities that could potentially impact natural resources, such as marine mammals, sea turtles, and other marine resources. Since the completion of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, new information has become available and is incorporated in the analysis, in addition to proposed changes in training and testing requirements. The range of alternatives in the SEIS/OEIS includes the No Action Alternative and two action alternatives. The Navy analyzed direct, indirect, cumulative, short-term, and long-term impacts, and the irreversible and irretrievable commitment of resources that may result from the Proposed Action. The Navy is the

lead agency for the Proposed Action and is responsible for the scope and content of the SEIS/OEIS. The document is being prepared in coordination with the U.S. Coast Guard as a cooperating agency, as its at-sea and FDM training and testing activities in the Study Area are included in the Proposed Action.

The National Oceanic Atmospheric Administration's NMFS is serving as a cooperating agency because the scope of the Proposed Action and alternatives involves activities that have the potential to impact protected resources under their jurisdiction by law, including marine mammals, threatened and endangered species, and Essential Fish Habitat. The National Oceanic Atmospheric Administration's authorities and special expertise are based on their statutory responsibilities under the MMPA of 1972, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1361 et seq.), the ESA of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.), and the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA) (16 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.). In addition, NMFS, in accordance with 40 CFR 1506.3 and 1505.2, may adopt the SEIS/OEIS and issue a separate Record of Decision associated with its decision to grant or deny the Navy's request for an incidental take authorization pursuant to Section 101(a)(5)(A) of the MMPA.

In accordance with CEQ regulations (40 CFR 1505.2), the Navy will issue a Record of Decision that provides the rationale for choosing one of the alternatives.

ES.4 Proposed Action and Alternatives

The Navy proposes to continue military readiness training and testing activities throughout the Study Area (Figure ES.4-1), primarily in the existing MIRC. The proposed training and testing activities associated with the Proposed Action are to be conducted at sea (including the transit corridor between the MIRC and the Hawaii Range Complex, and select Navy pierside and harbor locations) and on FDM. These proposed activities are generally consistent with those at-sea and FDM activities analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. To achieve and maintain Fleet readiness through this SEIS/OEIS, the Navy

- analyzes at-sea and FDM activities necessary to meet readiness requirements beyond 2020 and into the reasonably foreseeable future, including any changes to those activities previously analyzed, and reflects the most up-to-date compilation of training and testing activities deemed necessary to accomplish military readiness requirements;
- adjusts types and tempo (increases or decreases) of training and testing events from the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS to the level needed to meet readiness requirements beyond 2020 and into the reasonably foreseeable future;
- presents the results of the evaluation of relevant new information, which was incorporated into revised analyses where appropriate (each resource area analyzed within the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS was evaluated to determine the need for reanalysis within the SEIS/OEIS);
- updates the environmental impact analyses in previous documents to account for changes to tempo of activity, renaming or combining related types of activities, acknowledging discontinuation of some activities assessed in 2015, and assessing new activities, such as those involving high-energy lasers, to enable the Navy to adopt new technology and new capabilities;
- updates environmental analyses with the best available science and most current acoustic analysis methods to evaluate the potential effects of training and testing on the marine environment; and
- supports reauthorization of incidental takes of marine mammals under the MMPA and incidental takes of threatened and endangered marine species under the ESA.




Figure ES.4-1: Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area

ES.4.1 No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, the Navy would not conduct the proposed training and testing activities in the MITT Study Area. Other military activities not associated with this Proposed Action would continue to occur. For FDM, the lease agreement between the U.S. government and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands would remain in place, and the island would continue to be maintained as a Navy range, although strike warfare would no longer continue on the island. For NMFS, denial of an application for an incidental take authorization constitutes the NMFS No Action Alternative, which is consistent with NMFS' statutory obligation under the MMPA to grant or deny requests for take incidental to specified activities. The resulting environmental effects from taking no action will be compared with the effects of the action alternatives.

Cessation of proposed Navy at-sea training and testing activities would mean that the Navy would not meet its statutory requirements and would be unable to properly defend itself and the United States from enemy forces, unable to successfully detect enemy submarines, and unable to safely and effectively use its weapons systems or defensive countermeasures due to a lack of training of forces and testing of systems that replicate the conditions to which Naval forces must operate while executing the range of military operations required to further national security objectives. Navy personnel would

essentially not obtain the unique skills or be prepared to safely and effectively use sensors, weapons, and technologies in realistic scenarios required to accomplish the overall mission. Consequently, the No Action Alternative of not conducting the proposed live, at-sea training and testing activities in the Study Area is inherently unreasonable because it does not meet the purpose of and need for the Proposed Action.

ES.4.2 Alternative 1

This alternative consists of an adjustment from the level of training and testing activities analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, accounting for changes in the types and tempo (increases or decreases) of activities necessary to meet current and future military readiness requirements beyond 2020.

- **Adjustments to Tempo of Training and Testing Activities.** This alternative includes changes to training and testing requirements necessary to accommodate current and future training and testing requirements at sea and on FDM, including new at-sea activities as well as activities subject to previous analysis that are currently ongoing and have historically occurred in the Study Area.

Alternative 1 reflects a level of training and testing activities to be conducted at sea and on FDM, with adjustments from the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS that account for changes in the types and tempo of activities necessary to meet current and future military readiness requirements beyond 2020. Alternative 1 reflects a representative year of training and testing to account for the typical fluctuation of training cycles, testing programs, and deployment schedules that generally limit the maximum level of training and testing from occurring for the reasonably foreseeable future.

ES.4.3 Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)

Alternative 2 includes the same type of training and testing activities that would occur under Alternative 1. Alternative 2 also includes an increase in tempo of some training and testing activities, including additional Fleet exercises and associated unit-level activities, should unanticipated emergent world events require increased readiness levels. Alternative 2 includes additional electronic warfare activities for Naval Air Systems Command and additional electronic warfare, anti-submarine warfare, and surface warfare activities for Naval Sea Systems Command. Alternative 2 reflects the maximum number of training activities that could occur within a given year, and assumes the maximum number of Fleet exercises would occur annually. This alternative allows for the greatest flexibility for the Navy to maintain readiness when considering potential changes in the national security environment, fluctuations in training and deployment schedules, and anticipated in-theater demands.

ES.5 Summary of Environmental Effects

Environmental effects which might result from implementing the Navy's Proposed Action have been analyzed in the SEIS/OEIS. Physical resources (e.g., air quality, sediments, and water quality) considered for re-evaluation in the SEIS/OEIS are the same as those that were analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Biological resources considered include marine habitats, marine mammals, sea turtles, marine birds, marine vegetation, marine invertebrates, fishes, and terrestrial species and habitats. Human resources considered in the SEIS/OEIS include cultural resources, socioeconomic resources and environmental justice, and public health and safety.

As stated previously, the SEIS/OEIS is an update to the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. New information specifically addressed in the SEIS/OEIS includes updates to military readiness requirements, an updated acoustic effects model, updated marine mammal density data, and evolving and emergent best available

science.[1] As the science regarding the potential impacts of acoustics (sonar and explosives) on marine species has evolved since the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (new research available, updated criteria and thresholds), the acoustic analysis contained in the supplement is a complete update and does not rely on the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS analysis. Analysis associated with activities that result in non-acoustic impacts is updated as necessary in the SEIS/OEIS to reflect new science and refers to the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS analysis when appropriate.

Table ES.5-1 lists the potential environmental impacts of the Proposed Action. All sections of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS were reviewed to determine whether there was relevant best available science that would require updates to the analysis and incorporation into the SEIS/OEIS. To the extent there was updated or new and relevant best available science, it is reflected in each of the sections in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences). The Navy also reassessed effects determinations for marine species. Predicted acoustic exposures are reduced 25 percent under Alternative 1 and would decrease 17 percent under Alternative 2, when compared to the impacts predicted in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

[1] The 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS used a new modeling system known as the Navy Acoustic Effects Model, developed by the Navy in cooperation with the National Marine Fisheries Service, and marine mammal density information that was the best available information at the time. In the SEIS/OEIS, the Navy Acoustic Effects Model has been refined, marine mammal density estimates have been updated, NMFS has published new criteria, and criteria used in the acoustic model have been revised.

Table ES.5-1: Summary of Environmental Impacts for the No Action Alternative, Alternative 1, and Alternative 2

Resource Category	Summary of Impacts
Section 3.1 Sediments and Water Quality	The Navy considered all stressors that could potentially impact sediments and water quality as a result of the Proposed Action. The following conclusions have been reached for the No Action and Action Alternatives: **No Action Alternative:** • Under the No Action Alternative, proposed training and testing activities would not occur in the MITT Study Area. Discontinuing training and testing would result in fewer explosives and explosives byproducts, metals, chemicals, and other materials within the marine environment where training and testing activities have historically occurred. Discontinuing training and testing activities would reduce the potential for impacts on sediments and water quality from training and testing activities. **Alternative 1:** • Explosives and explosives byproducts: The number of explosive munitions used during at-sea training and testing activities and on FDM would increase compared to the number analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. In addition, all munitions would be dropped on the same existing impact areas on FDM. The analysis shows that the proposed increase in ordnance use on FDM would be less than 1 percent compared to levels analyzed previously. The small increase in at-sea activities and on FDM would have no appreciable change on the impact conclusions presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Furthermore, chemical, physical, or biological changes in sediment or water quality would have no appreciable change on the impact conclusions presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Guam, CNMI, and federal standards or guidelines would not be violated. • Metals: Under Alternative 1, the number of sources of metals that would be expended during training and testing would increase compared to the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. There is no new information that changes the basis of the conclusions presented for the potential impacts of metals on sediments and water quality. Chemical, physical, or biological changes to sediments or water quality in the Study Area would not be detectable beyond the vicinity of the corroding metals and any impacts would be short term and localized. Therefore, increases in training and testing activities proposed under Alternative 1 would have no appreciable change on the impact conclusions presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. • Chemicals other than explosives: Under Alternative 1, fewer items that would expend chemicals other than explosives (e.g., solid-fuel propellants in missiles and rockets, Otto Fuel II torpedo propellant and combustion byproducts, polychlorinated biphenyls [PCBs] in target vessels used during sinking exercises, and other chemicals associated with expended materials) would be used during training and testing activities compared to the number of items proposed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Some testing activities that would introduce chemicals other than explosives into the environment would increase, while others would decrease. The changes in the number of activities that introduce chemicals other than explosives proposed under Alternative 1 would have no appreciable change on the impact conclusions presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

Table ES.5-1: Summary of Environmental Impacts for the No Action Alternative, Alternative 1, and Alternative 2 (continued)

Resource Category	Summary of Impacts
Section 3.1 Sediments and Water Quality (continued)	• Other materials expended: Under Alternative 1, the number of proposed training and testing activities that would introduce other materials, such as marine markers and flares, chaff, towed and stationary targets, and miscellaneous components, would increase over levels analyzed previously in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. These materials and components are made mainly of nonreactive or slowly reactive materials (e.g., glass, carbon fibers, and plastics), or they break down or decompose into benign byproducts (e.g., rubber, steel, iron, and concrete). Increases in training and testing activities under Alternative 1 would have no appreciable change on the impact conclusions presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. **Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative):** • Explosives and explosives byproducts: Activities proposed under Alternative 2 would increase the number of explosive munitions used during at-sea training and testing activities and on FDM as compared to Alternative 1 and the number analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. As noted under Alternative 1, all munitions would be dropped on the same existing impact areas on FDM under Alternative 2. The small increase of at-sea ordnance and ordnance dropped on FDM under Alternative 2 would have no appreciable change on the impact conclusions presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Therefore, under Alternative 2, impacts on sediments and water quality from the use of explosives and generating explosives byproducts would be negligible. • Metals: Under Alternative 2, the number of sources of metals expended would increase as compared to the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and Alternative 1. However, these increases would have no appreciable change on the impact conclusions for metals under Alternative 1 and the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. • Chemicals other than explosives: Under Alternative 2, the number of sources that would generate chemicals other than explosives would increase as compared to Alternative 1. Impacts from chemicals other than explosives under Alternative 2 would be similar to impacts described under Alternative 1 despite a small increase in expended materials. • Other materials expended: The number of proposed training and testing activities that would introduce other expended materials would increase over levels analyzed previously in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and as compared to Alternative 1; however, these increases would have no appreciable change on the impact conclusions presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

Table ES.5-1: Summary of Environmental Impacts for the No Action Alternative, Alternative 1, and Alternative 2 (continued)

Resource Category	Summary of Impacts
Section 3.2 Air Quality	The Navy considered all stressors that could potentially impact air quality as a result of the Proposed Action. The following conclusions have been reached for the No Action and Action Alternatives: **No Action Alternative:** • Under the No Action Alternative, proposed training and testing activities would not occur. Other military activities not associated with this Proposed Action would continue to occur. Implementation of the No Action Alternative would mean that emissions associated with proposed training and testing activities would no longer be produced; however, there would be no measurable change in air quality conditions. **Alternative 1:** • Criteria air pollutants: The amount of air pollutants emitted within territorial waters and subsequently transported ashore would be minor because pollutants would be emitted over large areas (i.e., 501,873 NM^2) mostly beyond 3 NM and would be substantially dispersed during transport. Increased emissions under Alternative 1 would not affect the NAAQS attainment status of the relevant air quality control regions nor impact the general public because criteria air pollutants are below *de minimis* thresholds. **Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative):** • Criteria air pollutants: Under Alternative 2, the numbers of training and testing activities would increase over what is proposed under Alternative 1. Increased emissions however would not affect the NAAQS attainment status of the relevant air quality control regions nor impact the general public because criteria air pollutants are below *de minimis* thresholds.
Section 3.3 Marine Habitats	The Navy considered all stressors that could potentially impact marine habitats as a result of the Proposed Action. The following conclusions have been reached for the No Action and Action Alternatives: **No Action Alternative:** • Under the No Action Alternative, proposed training and testing activities would not occur in the MITT Study Area. Discontinuing training and testing activities would result in fewer explosive and physical disturbance and strike stressors within the marine environment where training and testing activities have historically occurred. Therefore, discontinuing training and testing activities would reduce the potential for explosive or physical disturbance and strike stressor impacts on marine habitat, but would not measurably improve the overall distribution or abundance of marine habitat.

Table ES.5-1: Summary of Environmental Impacts for the No Action Alternative, Alternative 1, and Alternative 2 (continued)

Resource Category	Summary of Impacts
Section 3.3 Marine Habitats (continued)	**Alternative 1:** • Explosives: Most of the explosive military expended materials would detonate at or near the water surface. Training and testing activities that include bottom-laid in-water explosions under Alternative 1 would affect marine habitat structure in the Study Area, but these activities would occur in an area that has been previously disturbed and impacts would be localized. Mitigation measures would help the Navy avoid or reduce impacts on seafloor resources (including shallow-water coral reefs, live hard bottom, artificial reefs, and submerged cultural resources) from explosives during applicable activities. • Physical Disturbance and Strike: Vessel and in-water device strikes, military expended materials, seafloor devices, and personnel disturbance (walking, standing, or swimming in the nearshore waters during amphibious activities such as raids and assaults) could disturb bottom substrates. However, the impact of physical disturbance and strike stressors on marine habitats would remain inconsequential because (1) vessel and in-water activities that could come into contact with marine substrates would be located in previously disturbed areas (i.e., nearshore shallow waters), (2) military expended materials could be colonized by benthic organisms, and (3) seafloor devices would be used predominantly in previously disturbed areas and therefore would not be expected to affect marine substrates. **Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative):** • Explosives: The number of explosives are proposed to be the same as under Alternative 1 and increase compared to the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. However, proposed increases would have no appreciable change on the impact conclusions as described under Alternative 1. • Physical Disturbance and Strike: Proposed increases in some physical disturbance and strike stressors, such as military expended materials, could increase the impact risk on marine habitats but would have no appreciable change on the impact conclusions as described under Alternative 1, or impact conclusions presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.
Section 3.4 Marine Mammals	The Navy considered all stressors that could potentially impact marine mammals as a result of the Proposed Action. The following conclusions have been reached for the No Action and Action Alternatives: **No Action Alternative:** • Under the No Action Alternative, proposed training and testing activities would not occur in the MITT Study Area. Discontinuing training and testing activities would result in fewer stressors that potentially affect marine mammals. Therefore, discontinuing training and testing activities would reduce the potential for stressor impacts on marine mammals, but would not measurably improve the overall habitat, distribution, or abundance of marine mammals.

Table ES.5-1: Summary of Environmental Impacts for the No Action Alternative, Alternative 1, and Alternative 2 (continued)

Resource Category	Summary of Impacts
Section 3.4 Marine Mammals (continued)	**Alternative 1:** • Acoustics: Navy training and testing activities have the potential to expose marine mammals to multiple acoustic stressors. Exposures to sound-producing activities present risks to marine mammals that could include temporary or permanent hearing threshold shift, auditory masking, physiological stress, or behavioral responses. Individual animals would typically experience only a small number of behavioral responses or temporary hearing threshold shifts per year due to exposure to acoustic stressors, and these are very unlikely to lead to any costs or long-term consequences for individuals or populations. • Explosives: Explosions in the water or near the water's surface present a risk to marine mammals located in proximity to the explosion because the resulting shock waves could cause injury or result in the death of an animal. There are, however, no mortalities predicted by the analysis. If a marine mammal is farther from an explosion, the impulsive, broadband sounds introduced into the marine environment may cause a temporary or permanent threshold shift, auditory masking, physiological stress, or behavioral responses. Population-level effects on marine mammals are unlikely because most estimated impacts from explosions are behavioral responses or temporary threshold shifts, and the number of marine mammals potentially impacted by explosives are small compared to each species' respective abundance. • Energy: Navy training and testing activities have the potential to expose marine mammals to electromagnetic fields or high-energy lasers as energy stressors. The likelihood and magnitude of energy impacts depend on the proximity of marine mammals to energy stressors. Based on the relatively weak strength of the electromagnetic field created by some Navy activities, a marine mammal would have to be in close proximity for there to be any effect. Impacts on marine mammal migrating behaviors and navigational patterns are not anticipated. Statistical probability analyses with conservative assumptions (tending to overestimation of exposures) demonstrate with a high level of certainty that a marine mammal would not be struck by a high-energy laser. These activities are temporary and localized in nature, and may result in short-term and minor impacts on individual marine mammals, but would not result in long-term impacts on marine mammal populations. • Physical Disturbance and Strike: Marine mammals would potentially be exposed to multiple physical disturbance and strike stressors associated with Navy training and testing activities. Historical data indicate no occurrence of vessel strikes with marine mammals in the MITT Study Area over the last 10 years during any training and testing activities. Since the Navy does not anticipate a substantive change in the level of vessel use compared to the last decade, the potential for striking a marine mammal is not expected. Physical disturbance of individual marine mammals due to vessel movement and in-water devices may occur, but any stress response or avoidance behavior would not be severe enough to have long-term fitness consequences on individual marine mammals. The use of in-water devices during Navy activities involves multiple types of vehicles or towed devices traveling on the water surface, through the water column, or along the seafloor, all of which have

Table ES.5-1: Summary of Environmental Impacts for the No Action Alternative, Alternative 1, and Alternative 2 (continued)

Resource Category	Summary of Impacts
Section 3.4 Marine Mammals (continued)	the potential to physically disturb or strike marine mammals. No recorded or reported instances of marine mammal strikes have resulted from in-water devices; therefore, impacts on individuals or long-term consequences to marine mammal populations are not anticipated. Potential impacts from military expended materials and seafloor devices are determined through statistical probability analyses. Analyses suggest a very low potential for marine mammals to be struck by these items. Long-term consequences on marine mammal populations from physical disturbance and strike associated with the use of vessels, in-water devices, military expended materials, and seafloor devices during training and testing activities are not anticipated. • Entanglement: Marine mammals could be exposed to multiple entanglement sources associated with Navy training and testing activities. The potential for impacts is dependent on the probability that a marine mammal would encounter an expended material, as well as the physical properties of the expended materials and the likelihood that a marine mammal could become entangled in the item. Physical characteristics of cables, wires, and decelerators/parachutes suggest that it is not likely a marine mammal would become entangled in these items. While it may be possible for a marine mammal to become entangled in cables or wires, the sparse distribution of these items throughout the Study Area indicates a very low potential for encounter. Furthermore, fiber optic cables used during mine warfare activities are easily abraded and have a low breaking strength, which reduces the risk of entanglement should a cable be encountered. Short-term impacts on individual marine mammals and long-term impacts on marine mammal populations from entanglement are not anticipated. • Ingestion: Navy training and testing activities have the potential to expose marine mammals to ingestion impacts from multiple sources. The potential for impacts relies heavily on feeding behaviors of marine mammals that occur in the Study Area, the physical properties of the expended items, the feasibility that a marine mammal could ingest the items, and the likelihood that a marine mammal would encounter an item. Marine mammals that forage along the water surface or within the water column are less likely to encounter ingestion stressors as they sink through the water column to the seafloor. Most expended materials that would remain floating or suspended within the water column are typically too small to pose a risk of intestinal blockage to any marine mammal that encounters it. Bottom-feeding marine mammals would be more likely to encounter expended materials that have already sunk to the floor. In the unlikely event that a marine mammal encounters and ingests expended material, the individual might be negatively affected if the material becomes lodged in the digestive tract. The likelihood that a marine mammal would ingest a military expended item associated with training and testing activities is considered low. Long-term consequences to marine mammal populations from expended materials associated with training and testing activities are not anticipated. • Secondary: Marine mammals would be exposed to secondary stressors associated with training and testing activities in the Study Area. In-water explosions have the potential to injure or kill prey species that marine mammals feed on; however, impacts would not substantially impact prey availability. Explosion byproducts are not considered as indirect stressors to

Table ES.5-1: Summary of Environmental Impacts for the No Action Alternative, Alternative 1, and Alternative 2 (continued)

Resource Category	Summary of Impacts
Section 3.4 Marine Mammals (continued)	marine mammals while mixed in marine sediments or water. Explosion byproducts and unexploded munitions would have no lasting or meaningful effect on water quality and would therefore not constitute a secondary indirect stressor for marine mammals. Metals are introduced into the water and sediments from targets, munitions, and other expended materials. Evidence from a number of studies indicate metal contamination is localized and ephemeral, and bioaccumulation resulting from munitions was not observed in the studies specifically designed to look for bioaccumulation. Therefore, it is unlikely that impacts on marine mammal prey availability would occur. Several training and testing activities introduce explosive byproducts into the marine environment that are potentially harmful in concentration; however, rapid dilution would occur and toxic concentrations would not likely be encountered. Furthermore, there is no evidence of acute toxicity or chronic accumulation of chemicals introduced by Navy activities that would alter water quality to an extent that would result in overall habitat degradation for marine mammals. Transmission of diseases and parasites are not considered likely from the Navy's trained marine mammals because strict protocols are in place to prevent such impacts on wild populations. Secondary stressors from training and testing activities in the Study Area are not expected to have short-term impacts on individual marine mammals or long-term impacts on marine mammal populations. **Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative):** • Acoustics: Potential impacts on marine mammals would be similar to those discussed for training and testing activities under Alternative 1. The only difference in sonar and other transducer use between Alternatives 1 and 2 is that the number of sonar hours used would be greater under Alternative 2. Potential impacts resulting from vessel noise would be similar to those discussed for activities under Alternative 1. The only difference in weapons noise impacts between Alternatives 1 and 2 is that the number of munitions used would be greater under Alternative 2. While the types of expected impacts on any individual marine mammal would remain the same, more animals could be affected. • Explosives: The locations and number of events involving explosives that could impact marine mammals would increase under Alternative 2 compared to Alternative 1 and the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. However, this increase would have no appreciable change on the impact conclusions described under Alternative 1. • Energy: The locations, number of events, and potential effects associated with energy stressors would be the same under Alternatives 1 and 2. Under Alternative 2, the use of high-energy lasers would increase as compared to Alternative 1. There would be no change regarding the impact conclusions for energy stressors under Alternative 1 and the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. • Physical Disturbance and Strike: Under Alternative 2, potential physical disturbance and strike impacts on marine mammals associated with training and testing activities would be similar to those discussed for activities under Alternative 1. There

Table ES.5-1: Summary of Environmental Impacts for the No Action Alternative, Alternative 1, and Alternative 2 (continued)

Resource Category	Summary of Impacts
Section 3.4 Marine Mammals (continued)	would be a small increase in vessel and in-water device use in the Study Area. However, the difference would not result in substantive changes to the potential for or types of impacts on marine mammals. • Entanglement: There would be an increase in the number of military expended materials associated with Alternative 2 activities. However, the increase is negligible, and the potential impacts from wires and cables and decelerators/parachutes under Alternative 2 would be similar to that of Alternative 1. • Ingestion: Under Alternative 2, the locations and types of military expended materials used would be the same as those of Alternative 1. There would be an increase in the number of some items expended. However, the increase in the total number of items expended would not be expected to result in substantive changes to the type or degree of impacts on marine mammals. • Secondary: Impacts from secondary stressors on marine mammals resulting from Alternative 2 activities would be the same as those described under Alternative 1. Secondary stressors from training and testing activities in the Study Area are not expected to have short-term impacts on individual marine mammals or long-term impacts on marine mammal populations.
Section 3.5 Sea Turtles	The 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS analyzed potential impacts of at-sea training and testing activities, as well as amphibious landings on training beaches on Guam and within the CNMI, which may support sea turtle nesting. Activities on Guam, Rota, and Tinian are not proposed to change; therefore, the SEIS/OEIS only addresses potential stressors on sea turtles for training and testing activities at sea. The Navy considered all stressors that could potentially impact sea turtles as a result of the Proposed Action. The following conclusions have been reached for the No Action and Action Alternatives: **No Action Alternative:** • Under the No Action Alternative, proposed training and testing activities would not occur in the MITT Study Area. Discontinuing the training and testing activities would result in fewer stressors that potentially affect sea turtles within the marine environment where training and testing have historically occurred. Therefore, discontinuing training and testing activities would reduce the potential for stressor impacts on sea turtles, but would not measurably improve the status of sea turtle populations. **Alternative 1:** • Acoustics: Navy training and testing activities have the potential to expose sea turtles to multiple acoustic stressors. Exposures to sound-producing activities present risks to sea turtles that could include temporary or permanent hearing threshold shift, auditory masking, physiological stress, or behavioral responses. Individual sea turtles would typically

Table ES.5-1: Summary of Environmental Impacts for the No Action Alternative, Alternative 1, and Alternative 2 (continued)

Resource Category	Summary of Impacts
Section 3.5 Sea Turtles (continued)	experience only a small number of behavioral responses or temporary hearing threshold shifts per year due to exposure to acoustic stressors, and these are very unlikely to lead to any costs or long-term consequences for individuals or populations. • Explosives: Explosions in the water or near the water's surface present a risk to sea turtles located near the explosion because the resulting shock waves can cause injury or result in the death of an animal. If a sea turtle is farther from an explosion, the impulsive, broadband sounds introduced into the marine environment may cause a temporary or permanent threshold shift, auditory masking, physiological stress, or behavioral responses. Due to the low numbers of sea turtles anticipated to be in locations where explosives at sea are expended, impacts are unlikely to occur. Lower-NEW explosives were analyzed for potential impacts on sea turtles within nearshore habitats of Guam. Potential impacts resulting from these activity types are anticipated to be few, if any, due to the fact that other stressor types occur before nearshore explosives occur (such as small vessel movements and other activities on or above the water) that would likely induce sea turtles to leave the area. • Energy: In-water electromagnetic devices are not expected to result in population-level impacts for sea turtles due to the low intensity, localized potential impact area, and short duration of use. The use of high-energy lasers associated with training and testing activities is not expected to impact sea turtles as a result of the very low probability of a strike by a high-energy laser. • Physical Disturbance and Strike: Sea turtles would potentially be exposed to multiple physical disturbance and strike stressors associated with Navy training and testing activities. The potential for impacts relies heavily on the probability that sea turtles would be in close proximity to an activity (e.g., a vessel or an expended non-explosive munition). Green sea turtles and hawksbill sea turtles occur inside or within proximity to port locations where vessel movements would be most frequent. Use of vessels and in-water devices, military expended materials, and seafloor devices may cause short-term disturbance to an individual turtle within the Study Area. However, due to the low numbers of sea turtles anticipated to be in locations where these items are expended, impacts are unlikely to occur. • Entanglement: Sea turtles could be exposed to multiple entanglement sources associated with Navy training and testing activities. The potential for impacts is dependent on the probability that a sea turtle would encounter an expended material, the physical properties of the expended materials, and the likelihood that a sea turtle could become entangled in the item. Physical characteristics of cables, wires, and decelerators/parachutes suggest it is unlikely a sea turtle would become entangled in these items. While it may be possible for a sea turtle to become entangled in cables or wires, the sparse distribution of these items throughout the Study Area indicates a very low potential for encounter. Furthermore, fiber optic cables used during mine warfare activities are easily abraded and have a low breaking strength, which reduces the risk of entanglement should a cable be encountered.

Table ES.5-1: Summary of Environmental Impacts for the No Action Alternative, Alternative 1, and Alternative 2 (continued)

Resource Category	Summary of Impacts
Section 3.5 Sea Turtles (continued)	• Ingestion: Navy training and testing activities have the potential to expose sea turtles to ingestion impacts from multiple sources. The potential for impacts relies heavily on feeding behaviors of different sea turtle species that occur in the Study Area, the physical properties of the expended items, the feasibility that a sea turtle could ingest the items, and the likelihood that a sea turtle would encounter an item. Sea turtles that forage along the water surface or within the water column are less likely to encounter ingestion stressors as they sink through the water column to the seafloor. Most expended materials that would remain floating or suspended within the water column are typically too small to pose a risk of intestinal blockage to any sea turtle that encounters it. Bottom-feeding sea turtles would be more likely to encounter expended materials that have already sunk to the sea floor if the floor is within the dive depth of a particular sea turtle species. In the unlikely event that a sea turtle encounters and ingests expended material, the individual might be negatively affected if the material becomes lodged in the digestive tract. The likelihood that a sea turtle would ingest a military expended item associated with training and testing activities is considered low. • Secondary: Sea turtles would be exposed to secondary stressors associated with training and testing activities in the Study Area. In-water explosions have the potential to injure or kill prey species that some sea turtle species feed on; however, impacts would not substantially impact prey availability. Metals are introduced into the water and sediments from targets, munitions, and other expended materials. Evidence from several studies indicate metal contamination is localized and ephemeral, and bioaccumulation resulting from munitions was not observed in the studies specifically designed to look for bioaccumulation. Therefore, it is unlikely that impacts on sea turtle prey availability would occur. Furthermore, there is no evidence of acute toxicity or chronic accumulation of chemicals introduced by Navy activities that would alter water quality to an extent that would result in overall habitat degradation for sea turtles. **Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative):** • Acoustics: Potential impacts on sea turtles would be similar to those discussed for training and testing activities under Alternative 1. The only difference in sonar and other transducer use between Alternatives 1 and 2 is that the number of sonar hours used would be greater under Alternative 2. Potential impacts resulting from vessel noise would be similar to those discussed for activities under Alternative 1. The only difference in weapons noise impacts between Alternatives 1 and 2 is that the number of munitions used would be greater under Alternative 2. While the types of expected impacts on any individual sea turtle would remain the same, more animals could be affected. • Explosives: The locations and number of events involving explosives would increase under Alternative 2 compared to Alternative 1 and the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. However, this increase would have no appreciable change on the impact conclusions described under Alternative 1.

Table ES.5-1: Summary of Environmental Impacts for the No Action Alternative, Alternative 1, and Alternative 2 (continued)

Resource Category	Summary of Impacts
Section 3.5 Sea Turtles (continued)	• Energy: The locations, number of events, and potential effects associated with energy stressors would be the same under Alternatives 1 and 2. Under Alternative 2, the use of high-energy lasers would increase as compared to Alternative 1. There would be no change regarding the impact conclusions described under Alternative 1 and the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. • Physical Disturbance and Strike: Under Alternative 2, potential physical disturbance and strike impacts on sea turtles associated with training and testing activities would be similar to Alternative 1. There would be a small increase in vessel and in-water device use in the Study Area. However, the difference would not result in substantive changes to the potential for or types of impacts on sea turtles. • Entanglement: There would be an increase in the number of military expended materials associated with Alternative 2 activities. However, the increase is negligible and the potential impacts from wires and cables and decelerators/parachutes under Alternative 2 would be similar to Alternative 1. • Ingestion: Under Alternative 2, the locations and types of military expended materials used would be the same as Alternative 1. There would be an increase in the number of some items expended. However, the increase in the total number of items expended would not be expected to result in substantive changes to the type or degree of impacts on sea turtles. • Secondary: Impacts from secondary stressors on sea turtles resulting from Alternative 2 activities would be nearly identical to Alternative 1.
Section 3.6 Marine Birds	The Navy considered all stressors that could potentially impact marine birds as a result of the Proposed Action. The following conclusions have been reached for the No Action and Action Alternatives: **No Action Alternative:** • Under the No Action Alternative, proposed training and testing activities would not occur in the MITT Study Area. Discontinuing training and testing activities would result in fewer stressors that potentially affect marine birds. Therefore, discontinuing training and testing activities would reduce the potential for stressor impacts on marine birds, but would not measurably improve the status of marine bird populations. **Alternative 1:** • Acoustics: Navy training and testing activities have the potential to expose marine birds to multiple acoustic stressors, such as sonar and other transducers, vessel noise, aircraft noise, and weapons noise. Birds are less susceptible to both temporary or permanent hearing threshold shifts relative to other marine species because birds have adaptions to protect the middle

Table ES.5-1: Summary of Environmental Impacts for the No Action Alternative, Alternative 1, and Alternative 2 (continued)

Resource Category	Summary of Impacts
Section 3.6 Marine Birds (continued)	ear and tympanum from pressure changes during diving that may affect hearing. Therefore, the likelihood of a diving bird experiencing an underwater exposure to sonar or other transducer that could result in an impact on hearing is considered low. In-air noise was analyzed for potential impacts on birds in at-sea areas and on FDM. Training and testing activities on FDM would not significantly impact populations of marine birds on the island. This conclusion is based on statistical analysis of periodic population counts of masked, brown, and red-footed boobies by the Navy from 1998 through 2016, and the relatively small increases in the number of events, munitions, and NEW expended on FDM proposed under Alternative 1 compared to what was analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. • Explosives: Explosions in the water or near the water's surface present a risk to marine birds located near the explosion because the resulting shock waves can cause injury or result in the death of an animal. Potential exposure to stressors associated with ordnance use would increase under Alternative 1 compared to the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Factors that limit the potential for additional adverse impacts, however, include maintaining the same ordnance type and targeting restrictions included in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and 2015 USFWS Biological Opinion. All ordnance expended on FDM would target existing impact zones, with the same ordnance restrictions imposed on all FDM activities and with the same avoidance and minimization measures in place. • Physical Disturbance and Strike: Navy training and testing activities have the potential to expose marine birds to multiple physical disturbance and strike stressors. In at-sea environments, the risk for marine birds is low because of the wide dispersal of training and testing activities throughout the Study Area. On FDM, where intensive military training and testing activities occur on an island that supports important marine bird rookery locations, the Navy analyzed munitions use and wildfires for potential impacts on marine birds. Factors that limit the potential for additional adverse impacts from physical disturbance and strike, however, include maintaining the same ordnance type and targeting restrictions included in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. All ordnance expended on FDM would target existing impact zones, with the same ordnance restrictions imposed on all FDM activities and with the same avoidance and minimization measures in place. Recent relocation of target positions from the cliff to inland portions within impact zones further reduces potential impacts on marine bird rookeries on FDM. • Secondary: Marine birds would be exposed to multiple secondary stressors associated with training and testing activities in the Study Area. In-water explosions have the potential to injure or kill prey species that marine bird species feed on; however, impacts would not substantially impact prey availability. Metals are introduced into the water and sediments from targets, munitions, and other expended materials. Evidence from several studies indicate metal contamination is localized and ephemeral, and bioaccumulation resulting from munitions was not observed in the studies specifically designed to look for bioaccumulation. Therefore, it is unlikely that impacts on marine bird prey availability would occur. Furthermore, there is

Table ES.5-1: Summary of Environmental Impacts for the No Action Alternative, Alternative 1, and Alternative 2 (continued)

Resource Category	Summary of Impacts
Section 3.6 Marine Birds (continued)	no evidence of acute toxicity or chronic accumulation of chemicals introduced by Navy activities that would alter water quality to an extent that would result in overall habitat degradation for marine birds. **Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative):** • Acoustics: Potential impacts on marine birds would be similar to those discussed for training and testing activities under Alternative 1. The only difference in sonar and other transducer use between Alternatives 1 and 2 is that the number of sonar hours used would be greater under Alternative 2. Potential impacts resulting from vessel noise would be similar to those under Alternative 1. The only difference in weapons noise impacts between Alternatives 1 and 2 is that the number of munitions used would be greater under Alternative 2. While the types of expected impacts on any individual marine bird would remain the same, more animals could be affected. • Explosives: The locations and number of events involving explosives that could impact marine birds would increase under Alternative 2 compared to Alternative 1 and the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. However, this increase would not have no appreciable change on the impact conclusions described under Alternative 1. • Physical Disturbance and Strike: Under Alternative 2, potential physical disturbance and strike impacts on marine birds associated with training and testing activities would be similar to those discussed for activities under Alternative 1. There would be a small increase in vessel and in-water device use in the Study Area. However, the difference would not result in substantive changes to the potential for or types of impacts on marine birds. • Secondary: Impacts from secondary stressors on marine birds resulting from Alternative 2 activities would be nearly identical to those described under Alternative 1.
Section 3.7 Marine Vegetation	The Navy considered all stressors that could potentially impact marine vegetation as a result of the Proposed Action. The following conclusions have been reached for the No Action and Action Alternatives: **No Action Alternative:** • Under the No Action Alternative, proposed training and testing activities would not occur in the MITT Study Area. Discontinuing training and testing activities would result in fewer stressors that potentially affect marine vegetation within the marine environment. Therefore, discontinuing training and testing activities would reduce the potential for stressor impacts on marine vegetation, but would not measurably improve the status of populations or subpopulations. **Alternative 1:** • Explosives: Explosives could affect vegetation by destroying or removing marine vegetation; however, the use of explosives

Table ES.5-1: Summary of Environmental Impacts for the No Action Alternative, Alternative 1, and Alternative 2 (continued)

Resource Category	Summary of Impacts
Section 3.7 Marine Vegetation (continued)	is not expected to impact the long-term survival, annual reproductive success, and lifetime reproductive success of marine vegetation. • Physical Disturbance and Strike: Physical disturbance and strike could affect vegetation by destroying individuals or damaging parts of individuals; however, physical disturbance and strike impacts on marine vegetation under Alternative 1 would be negligible. • Secondary: Stressors from Navy training and testing activities could pose secondary or indirect impacts on marine vegetation via habitat, sediment, or water quality. Potential impacts on marine vegetation exposed to secondary stressors could occur indirectly through sediments and water quality. Explosive ordnance could loosen the soil on FDM and runoff from surface drainage areas containing soil, and explosive byproducts could contaminate sediments and the surrounding ocean water. **Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative):** • Explosives: The locations and number of events involving explosives that could impact marine vegetation would increase under Alternative 2 compared to Alternative 1 and the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. However, this increase would have no appreciable change on the impact conclusions described under Alternative 1. • Physical Disturbance and Strike: Although impacts from physical disturbance and strike under Alternative 2 would increase slightly compared to those of Alternative 1 because of a small increase in proposed activities, physical disturbance and strike impacts on marine vegetation under Alternative 2 would also be negligible. • Secondary: Impacts from secondary stressors under Alternative 2 would increase slightly compared to those of Alternative 1 because of a small increase in activities and expended materials, but the difference would not result in substantive changes to the marine environment.
Section 3.8 Marine Invertebrates	The Navy considered all stressors that could potentially impact marine invertebrates as a result of the Proposed Action. The following conclusions have been reached for the No Action and Action Alternatives: **No Action Alternative:** • Under the No Action Alternative, proposed training and testing activities would not occur in the MITT Study Area. Discontinuing training and testing activities would result in fewer stressors that potentially affect marine invertebrates within the marine environment. Therefore, discontinuing training and testing activities would reduce the potential for stressor impacts on marine invertebrates, but would not measurably improve the status of invertebrate populations or subpopulations.

Table ES.5-1: Summary of Environmental Impacts for the No Action Alternative, Alternative 1, and Alternative 2 (continued)

Resource Category	Summary of Impacts
Section 3.8 Marine Invertebrates (continued)	**Alternative 1:** • Acoustics: Marine invertebrates throughout the Study Area may be exposed to non-impulse sounds generated by low-, mid-, and high-frequency sonar and other acoustic sources, vessel noise, and aircraft noise during training and testing activities. Acoustic impacts on marine invertebrates under Alternative 1 would be inconsequential because most marine invertebrates would not be close enough to intense sound sources. Any marine invertebrate capable of sensing sound may alter its behavior and become disoriented due to masking of relevant environmental sounds if exposed to non-impulsive sound, although it is unknown if responses to non-impulsive sounds occur. Continuous noise, such as from vessels, may also contribute to masking of relevant environmental sounds. Because the distance over which most marine invertebrates are expected to detect any sound is limited and vessels would be in transit, any sound exposures with the potential to cause masking or behavioral responses would last only minutes. Furthermore, invertebrate species have their best sensitivity to sound below 1 kilohertz and would not be capable of detecting the majority of sonars and other acoustic sources used in the Study Area. Therefore, non-impulsive sounds associated with Alternative 1 are not expected to impact the majority of marine invertebrates or cause more than a short-term behavioral disturbance (e.g., change in orientation or swim speeds) to those capable of detecting nearby sound. No population-level impacts on the survival, growth, recruitment, or reproduction of populations are expected under Alternative 1. • Explosives: Most explosions at the water surface would not injure benthic marine invertebrates because of the great water depth in areas where most explosives would be used. Explosions would likely kill or injure nearby marine invertebrates. Effects could include physical disturbance, fragmentation, or mortality to sessile organisms and pelagic larvae. If corals are present in areas overlapping with other training and testing activities using explosives, sessile shallow-water corals, hard-bottom, and deep-water corals, as well as eggs, sperm, early embryonic stages, and planula larvae of corals could be impacted. Consequences of exposure to an explosive shock wave could include breakage, injury, or mortality. Many corals and hard bottom invertebrates are sessile, fragile, and particularly vulnerable. No long-term impacts are expected because exposures to explosive shock waves are brief, limited in number, and spread over a large area. Explosives may impact individuals and groups of marine invertebrates, but are unlikely to impact populations or subpopulations. Therefore, impacts on marine invertebrates under Alternative 1 from explosives would be negligible. • Energy: High-energy lasers are designed to disable surface targets, rendering them immobile. The primary concern is the potential for an invertebrate to be struck with the laser beam at or near the water's surface, where extended exposure could result in injury or death. Little information exists about marine invertebrates' susceptibility to electromagnetic fields. Most corals are thought to use water temperature, day length, lunar cycles, and tidal fluctuations as cues for spawning. Magnetic fields are not known to influence coral spawning or larval settlement. Most marine invertebrates are not susceptible to laser exposure because they occur beneath the sea surface. Under Alternative 1, the number of proposed

Table ES.5-1: Summary of Environmental Impacts for the No Action Alternative, Alternative 1, and Alternative 2 (continued)

Resource Category	Summary of Impacts
Section 3.8 Marine Invertebrates (continued)	training and testing activities involving the use of in-water electromagnetic devices would decrease in comparison to the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. The activities would occur in the same locations and in a similar manner as were analyzed previously. Therefore, impacts on marine invertebrates under Alternative 1 from in-water electromagnetic devices would be negligible. • Physical Disturbance and Strike: The impact of physical disturbance and strike stressors on marine invertebrates is likely to cause injury or mortality to individuals, such as corals on nearshore reefs, but impacts on populations would be negligible because (1) the area exposed to the stressor is extremely small (localized) relative to most marine invertebrates' ranges, and (2) the activities are dispersed such that few individuals could conceivably be exposed to more than one event. Activities involving vessels and in-water devices, military expended materials, seafloor devices, and personnel disturbance are not expected to yield behavioral changes or lasting effects on the survival, growth, recruitment, or reproduction of invertebrate species at the population level. However, the combined consequences of all physical disturbance and strike stressors could degrade habitat quality at some locations, to some degree. Combat swimmers and Marines may be required to walk through nearshore areas and reefs, potentially damaging coral species. These activities could cause injury or mortality to individuals, but impacts on marine invertebrate populations, including ESA-listed corals, are unlikely. Therefore, under Alternative 1, impacts on marine invertebrates from the use of vessels and in-water devices, military expended materials, and seafloor devices would be negligible. • Entanglement: Entanglement stressors that may impact marine invertebrates include (1) fiber optic cables and guidance wires, and (2) decelerators/parachutes. The impact of fiber optic cables, guidance wires, and decelerators/parachutes on marine invertebrates is not likely to cause injury or mortality to individuals, and impacts would be negligible because (1) the area exposed to the stressor is extremely small (localized) relative to most marine invertebrates' ranges, (2) the activities are dispersed such that few individuals could conceivably be exposed to more than one activity, and (3) marine invertebrates are not particularly susceptible to entanglement stressors. Activities involving cables, guidance wires, and decelerators/parachutes are not expected to yield behavioral changes or lasting impacts on the survival, growth, recruitment, or reproduction of invertebrate species at individual or population levels. Therefore, impacts on marine invertebrates from entanglement stressors under Alternative 1 would be negligible. • Ingestion: Most military expended materials and fragments of military expended materials are too large to be ingested by marine invertebrates. The potential for marine invertebrates to encounter fragments of ingestible size increases as the materials degrade into smaller fragments. The increase in military expended materials, primarily from small-caliber projectiles, would not represent an ingestion risk for marine invertebrates. Only a small fraction would be of ingestible size, or become ingestible after degradation; while those may impact individual marine invertebrates, such as ESA-listed corals,

Table ES.5-1: Summary of Environmental Impacts for the No Action Alternative, Alternative 1, and Alternative 2 (continued)

Resource Category	Summary of Impacts
Section 3.8 Marine Invertebrates (continued)	they are unlikely to impact populations. Therefore, impacts on marine invertebrates from ingestion of military expended materials under Alternative 1 would be negligible. • Secondary: Potential impacts on marine invertebrates exposed to stressors could occur indirectly through sediments and water quality. Stressors from Navy training and testing activities could pose secondary or indirect impacts on marine invertebrates via habitat, sediment, or water quality. Components of these stressors that could pose indirect impacts include (1) explosives and byproducts; (2) metals; (3) chemicals; and (4) other materials such as targets, chaff, and plastics. Impacts on marine invertebrates, including zooplankton, eggs, and larvae, are likely within a very small radius of the ordnance (1–6 ft. [0.3–1.8 m]). These impacts may continue as the ordnance degrades over months to decades. Because most ordnance is deployed as projectiles, multiple unexploded or low-order detonations would accumulate on spatial scales of 1 to 6 ft. (0.3 to 1.8 m.); therefore, potential impacts are likely to remain local and widely separated. Given these conditions, the possibility of population-level impacts on marine invertebrates is negligible. Concentrations of metals in water are extremely unlikely to be high enough to cause injury or mortality to marine invertebrates; therefore, indirect impacts of metals via water are likely to be negligible and not detectable. Marine invertebrates could be indirectly impacted by chemicals from plastics but, absent bioaccumulation, these impacts would be limited to direct contact with the material because relatively few military expended materials contain plastics. Therefore, population-level impacts on marine invertebrates attributable to Navy-expended materials are likely to be negligible and not detectable. **Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative):** • Acoustics: Under Alternative 2, increases in the number of sonar hours would have no appreciable change on the impact conclusions described for acoustic stressors under Alternative 1 and the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Therefore, acoustic impacts on marine invertebrates under Alternative 2 would be negligible. • Explosives: Under Alternative 2, increases in the number of underwater explosives would have no appreciable change on the impact conclusions described for explosive stressors under Alternative 1 and the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Therefore, impacts on marine invertebrates under Alternative 2 from explosives would be negligible. • Energy: The locations, number of events, and potential effects would be the same under Alternatives 1 and 2. Therefore, impacts on marine invertebrates under Alternative 2 from in-water electromagnetic devices would be negligible. • Physical Disturbance and Strike: Impacts on marine invertebrates would be inconsequential for the same reasons as Alternative 1, and there would have no appreciable change on the impact conclusions described for physical disturbance and strike stressors under Alternative 1 and in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Therefore, under Alternative 2, impacts on marine invertebrates from the use of vessels and in-water devices, military expended materials, and seafloor devices would be negligible.

Table ES.5-1: Summary of Environmental Impacts for the No Action Alternative, Alternative 1, and Alternative 2 (continued)

Resource Category	Summary of Impacts
Section 3.8 Marine Invertebrates (continued)	• Entanglement: Training and testing activities involving fiber optic cables, guidance wires, and decelerators/parachutes are not expected to yield behavioral changes or lasting impacts on the survival, growth, recruitment, or reproduction of invertebrate species at individual or population levels for the same reasons as Alternative 1. Therefore, impacts on marine invertebrates from entanglement stressors under Alternative 2 would be negligible. • Ingestion: Under Alternative 2, the combined number of ingestion stressors would increase compared to Alternative 1. However, these increases would have no appreciable change on the impact analysis or conclusions described under Alternative 1 and in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Therefore, impacts on marine invertebrates from ingestion of military expended materials under Alternative 2 would be negligible. • Secondary: Impacts from secondary stressors on invertebrates resulting from activities under Alternative 2 would be nearly identical to those described under Alternative 1.
Section 3.9 Fishes	The Navy considered all stressors that could potentially impact fishes as a result of the Proposed Action. The following conclusions have been reached for the No Action and Action Alternatives: **No Action Alternative:** • Under the No Action Alternative, proposed training and testing activities would not occur in the MITT Study Area. Discontinuing training and testing activities would result in fewer stressors that potentially affect fishes. Therefore, discontinuing training and testing activities would reduce the potential for stressor impacts on fishes, but would not measurably improve the status of fish populations or subpopulations. **Alternative 1:** • Acoustics: The use of sonar and other transducers, vessel noise, aircraft noise, and weapons noise could impact fishes in the Study Area. Some sonars and other transducers, vessel noise, and weapons noise could result in hearing loss, masking, physiological stress, or behavioral reactions. Aircraft noise would not likely result in impacts other than brief, mild behavioral responses in fishes close to the surface. Most impacts, such as masking or behavioral reactions, are expected to be temporary and infrequent, as most activities involving acoustic stressors would be at low levels of noise, temporary, localized, and infrequent. More severe impacts such as mortality or injury could lead to permanent or long-term consequences for individuals, but overall, long-term consequences for fish populations are not expected. • Explosives: The use of explosives could result in impacts on fishes within the Study Area. Sound and energy from explosions are capable of causing mortality, injury, hearing loss, masking, physiological stress, or behavioral responses. The time scale of individual explosions is very limited, and training and testing activities involving explosions are dispersed in space and

Table ES.5-1: Summary of Environmental Impacts for the No Action Alternative, Alternative 1, and Alternative 2 (continued)

Resource Category	Summary of Impacts
Section 3.9 Fishes (continued)	time. Therefore, repeated exposure of individual fishes is unlikely. Most effects such as hearing loss or behavioral responses are expected to be short term and localized. More severe impacts such as mortality or injury could lead to permanent or long-term consequences for individuals, but overall, long-term consequences for fish populations are not expected. • Energy: The use of in-water electromagnetic devices may elicit brief behavioral or physiological stress responses only in those exposed fishes with sensitivities to the electromagnetic spectrum. This behavioral impact is expected to be temporary and minor. Similar to regular vessel traffic, in-water electromagnetic fields would be continuously moving and cover only a small spatial area during use; thus, population-level impacts are unlikely. • Physical Disturbance and Strike: Impacts on fishes from vessel strikes, in-water device strikes, military expended material strikes, and seafloor device strikes are highly unlikely because most fishes are highly mobile and have sensory capabilities that enable the detection and avoidance of vessels, expended materials, or objects in the water column or on the seafloor. Exceptions include a few large, slow-moving species such as manta rays, ocean sunfish, and whale sharks that occur near the surface. Long-term consequences from vessel strikes for individuals and fish populations are not expected. • Entanglement: Fishes could be exposed to multiple entanglement stressors associated with Navy training and testing activities. The potential for impacts is dependent on the physical properties of the expended materials and the likelihood a fish would encounter a potential entanglement stressor and become entangled in it. Physical characteristics of wires and cables, and decelerators/parachutes, combined with the sparse distribution of these items throughout the Study Area, indicates a very low potential for fishes to encounter and become entangled in them. Population-level impacts are unlikely because of the low numbers of fishes potentially impacted by entanglement stressors. • Ingestion: The likelihood that expended items would cause a potential impact on a given fish species depends on the size and feeding habits of the fish, the rate at which the fish encounters the item, and the composition of the item. Military expended materials from munitions present an ingestion risk to fishes that forage in the water column and on the seafloor. Military expended materials other than munitions present an ingestion risk for fishes foraging at or near the surface while these materials are buoyant, and on the seafloor when the materials sink. Population-level impacts are unlikely because of the low numbers of fishes potentially impacted by ingestion stressors. • Secondary: Effects on sediment or water quality would be minor, temporary, and localized and could have short-term, small-scale secondary effects on fishes; however, there would be no persistent or large-scale effects on the growth, survival, distribution, or populations of fishes.

Table ES.5-1: Summary of Environmental Impacts for the No Action Alternative, Alternative 1, and Alternative 2 (continued)

Resource Category	Summary of Impacts
Section 3.9 Fishes (continued)	**Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative):** • Acoustics: Although the number of training and testing activities under Alternative 2 would increase relative to Alternative 1, acoustic impacts are not expected to be meaningfully different from those described under Alternative 1. Therefore, impacts associated with training and testing activities are the same as Alternative 1. • Explosives: Although activities under Alternative 2 increase relative to Alternative 1, impacts from explosives are not expected to be meaningfully different from those described under Alternative 1. Therefore, impacts associated with training and testing activities are the same as Alternative 1. • Energy: Although activities under Alternative 2 increase relative to Alternative 1, impacts from energy stressors are not expected to be meaningfully different from those described under Alternative 1. Therefore, impacts associated with training and testing activities are the same as Alternative 1. • Physical Disturbance and Strike: Although impacts from physical disturbance and strike under Alternative 2 would increase slightly compared to those of Alternative 1 because of a small increase in proposed activities, physical disturbance and strike impacts on marine fishes under Alternative 2 would also be negligible. • Entanglement: Although activities under Alternative 2 increase relative to Alternative 1, impacts from entanglement stressors are not expected to be meaningfully different from those described under Alternative 1. Therefore, impacts associated with training and testing activities are the same as Alternative 1. • Ingestion: Although activities under Alternative 2 increase relative to Alternative 1, impacts from ingestion stressors are not expected to be meaningfully different from those described under Alternative 1. Therefore, impacts associated with training and testing activities are the same as Alternative 1. • Secondary: Impacts from secondary stressors under Alternative 2 would increase slightly compared to those of Alternative 1 due to a small increase in activities and expended materials; however, the difference would not result in substantive changes. Therefore, impacts from secondary stressors associated with training and testing activities are the same as Alternative 1.

Table ES.5-1: Summary of Environmental Impacts for the No Action Alternative, Alternative 1, and Alternative 2 (continued)

Resource Category	Summary of Impacts
Section 3.10 Terrestrial Species and Habitats	The Navy considered all stressors that could potentially impact terrestrial species and habitats as a result of the Proposed Action. The SEIS/OEIS addresses potential impacts on terrestrial species and habitats on FDM. The following conclusions have been reached for the No Action and Action Alternatives: **No Action Alternative:** • Under the No Action Alternative, the proposed training and testing activities would not occur in the MITT Study Area. For FDM, the lease agreement between the U.S. government and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands would remain in place, and the island would continue to be maintained as a Navy range. **Alternative 1:** • Acoustics: Navy training activities have the potential to expose terrestrial wildlife on FDM to multiple acoustic stressors. Sources of noise from weapons firing that may be heard by wildlife on FDM include close-in weapons firing from vessels, helicopters, close-combat surface firing from fixed-wing aircraft, and surface firing, with the largest increase in munitions use resulting from small arms, medium-caliber explosives, and mortar and grenade use during Direct Action training activities. These training events would occur within the Northern Special Use Area and fire into the impact areas towards the south; therefore, more megapodes and bats (along with other wildlife species) would be exposed to more weapons firing noise under Alternative 1 because of the increased number of small-caliber rounds, medium-caliber explosives, and grenades and mortars fired into impact areas from the Northern Special Use Area. The weapons-firing noise would likely be masked somewhat by natural sounds on FDM, such as waves and winds. The impulsive sound caused by weapon firings would have limited potential to mask important biological sound because the duration of the impulse is brief, even when multiple shots are fired in series. • Explosives: There would be a small increase in the number of explosions on FDM, which would increase the number of exposures to percussive force. The types of explosive munitions used on FDM include explosive bombs, missiles, rockets, explosive grenades and mortars, medium-caliber projectiles, and large-caliber projectiles. The number of explosive bombs would not change compared to the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, while the increases in NEW would be from the increased number of smaller NEW munitions. Although more ordnance would be used on FDM under Alternative 1, all of the ordnance would target impact zones, with the same avoidance and minimization measures in place as analyzed previously in 2015. • Physical Disturbance and Strike: Navy training activities have the potential to impact terrestrial species and habitats through direct strike, habitat disturbance, and potential wildfires ignited by training activities on FDM. Factors that limit the potential for additional adverse impacts from physical disturbance and strike, however, include maintaining the same ordnance type and targeting restrictions included in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. All ordnance expended on FDM would

Table ES.5-1: Summary of Environmental Impacts for the No Action Alternative, Alternative 1, and Alternative 2 (continued)

Resource Category	Summary of Impacts
Section 3.10 Terrestrial Species and Habitats (continued)	target existing impact zones, with the same ordnance restrictions imposed on FDM activities and with the same avoidance and minimization measures in place. • Secondary: The Navy analyzed the potential for invasive species introduction, establishment, and spread on FDM as part of the analysis for secondary stressors. Of the two training activity types that would increase on FDM under Alternative 1, only Direct Action training activities present potential introduction pathways for invasive species. Introduction pathways that originate on Guam and end on FDM present a potential hazard for brown treesnake dispersal. The Direct Action training activities, which are proposed to increase, would still be subject to biosecurity measures. The potential introduction of invasive species to FDM from additional transits during Direct Action training activities is unlikely; therefore, there would be no appreciable increase in risk. **Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative):** • Acoustics: Potential impacts on terrestrial species and habitats would be similar to those discussed under Alternative 1. Under Alternative 2, there would be an increase in the amount of ordnance expended compared to Alternative 1. As with Alternative 1, these training events would occur within the Northern Special Use Area and fire into the impact areas towards the south; therefore, more megapodes and bats (along with other wildlife species) would be exposed to more weapons firing noise under Alternative 2 because of the increased number of small-caliber rounds, medium-caliber explosives, and grenades and mortars fired into impact areas from the Northern Special Use Area. The weapons-firing noise would likely be masked somewhat by natural sounds on FDM, such as waves and winds. Additionally, the impulsive sound caused by weapon firings would have limited potential to mask important biological sound because the duration of the impulse is brief, even when multiple shots are fired in series, and the short duration of an exercise expending munitions on FDM. • Explosives: Under Alternative 2, there would be an increase in the number of events using FDM as a training location or target, with a corresponding increase in the number of munitions items expended on FDM (see Table 3.6-2) compared to what was analyzed previously in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and under Alternative 1. However, factors that limit the potential for additional adverse impacts would include maintaining the same ordnance type and targeting restrictions consistent with Alternative 1. • Physical Disturbance and Strike: Under Alternative 2, potential physical disturbance and strike impacts on terrestrial species and habitats would be similar to those discussed under Alternative 1. All ordnance expended on FDM would target existing impact zones, with the same ordnance restrictions imposed on FDM activities and with the same avoidance and minimization measures in place. Recent relocation of target positions from the cliff to inland portions within impact zones further reduces potential impacts on terrestrial species and wildlife on FDM.

Table ES.5-1: Summary of Environmental Impacts for the No Action Alternative, Alternative 1, and Alternative 2 (continued)

Resource Category	Summary of Impacts
Section 3.10 Terrestrial Species and Habitats (continued)	• Secondary: Impacts from secondary stressors on terrestrial species and habitats on FDM resulting from Alternative 2 activities would be nearly identical to those from Alternative 1.
Section 3.11 Cultural Resources	The Navy considered all stressors that could potentially impact cultural resources as a result of the Proposed Action. The following conclusions have been reached for the No Action and Action Alternatives: **No Action Alternative:** • Under the No Action Alternative, the proposed training and testing activities would not occur in the MITT Study Area. Discontinuing training and testing activities would result in fewer stressors that potentially affect cultural resources. Therefore, discontinuing training and testing activities would reduce the potential for stressor impacts on cultural resources. **Alternative 1:** • Explosives: Explosive stressors resulting from underwater explosions creating shock waves and cratering of the seafloor would not result in adverse effects to known submerged cultural resources because of the great water depth in areas where most explosives would be used. In accordance with Section 402 of the NHPA, no known World Heritage Sites would be affected. Therefore, no submerged cultural resources are expected to be impacted. • Physical Disturbance and Strike: Physical disturbance and strike stressors resulting from in-water devices, military expended materials, and seafloor devices during training and testing activities would not result in adverse effects on known submerged cultural resources because of the deep water and the implementation of standard operating procedures. Devices are also designed so they do not come in contact with the sea floor. In accordance with Section 402 of the NHPA, no known World Heritage Sites would be affected. Therefore, no submerged cultural resources are expected to be affected. • Measures to avoid and protect submerged historic properties would continue to be implemented according to the mitigation measures and procedures identified and described in the 2009 MIRC Programmatic Agreement. While the MIRC Programmatic Agreement expired in December 2019, the Navy initiated an NHPA Section 106 consultation in January 2019 with an eye toward developing new updated Programmatic Agreements. The interim PAs took effect after the expiration of the 2009 MIRC PA and serve as a continuation of the DoD's compliance under Section 106 of the NHPA for MITT activities. The interim PA with the CNMI Historic Preservation Officer (HPO) expires September 10, 2020, while the interim PA with the Guam HPO expires June 30, 2020.

Table ES.5-1: Summary of Environmental Impacts for the No Action Alternative, Alternative 1, and Alternative 2 (continued)

Resource Category	Summary of Impacts
Section 3.11 Cultural Resources (continued)	**Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative):** • Explosives: Explosive ordnance would continue to occur in the same areas and would have no appreciable change on the impact analysis or conclusions described under Alternative 1 and in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Therefore, potential effects would the same as under Alternative 1. • Physical Disturbance and Strike: Under Alternative 2, increases as compared to Alternative 1 would have no appreciable change on the impact conclusions described under Alternative 1 and in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Therefore, potential effects would be the same as under Alternative 1.
Section 3.12 Socioeconomic Resources and Environmental Justice	The Navy considered all stressors that could potentially impact socioeconomic resources and environmental justice as a result of the Proposed Action. The following conclusions have been reached for the No Action and Action Alternatives: **No Action Alternative:** • Under the No Action Alternative, the proposed training and testing activities would not occur in the MITT Study Area. Limits on accessibility to the ocean and airspace associated with the proposed training and testing activities would not be introduced. Therefore, existing environmental conditions would either remain unchanged or would improve slightly after cessation of ongoing training and testing activities. • Discontinuing training and testing activities would result in fewer stressors on socioeconomic resources within the marine environment where training and testing activities have historically occurred. Therefore, discontinuing training and testing activities would reduce the potential for impacts on socioeconomic resources, such as commercial and recreational fishing, commercial transportation and shipping, tourism, and traditional fishing practices in the Study Area. • The Navy and Navy personnel are an important and often stabilizing contributor to the local and regional economies. Therefore, not conducting the proposed at-sea training and testing activities may have negative impacts on the socioeconomic resources of Guam and the CNMI. The number and types of jobs available on Guam and to a lesser extent the CNMI may decline. For example, vessels and associated equipment used specifically for military readiness activities would no longer be needed if training and testing activities ceased. Consequently, the civilian and Navy personnel supporting those activities may be relocated or reassigned, or have to find other employment. The secondary effects from reducing the number of personnel who support at-sea military training and testing activities could include a decline in revenue for local businesses frequented by Navy personnel and their families, such as businesses in the food services, retail, and housing sectors.

Table ES.5-1: Summary of Environmental Impacts for the No Action Alternative, Alternative 1, and Alternative 2 (continued)

Resource Category	Summary of Impacts
Section 3.12 Socioeconomic Resources and Environmental Justice (continued)	**Alternative 1:** • Accessibility: Alternative 1 may result in impacts on commercial and recreational fishing, traditional fishing practices, or tourism when areas of co-use are temporarily inaccessible during training and testing activities to ensure public safety. Some areas in the Study Area are permanently restricted and inaccessible by the public, notably the waters extending 3 NM from shore around FDM. These restrictions remain in place to ensure the safety of the public. No impacts on commercial transportation and shipping are anticipated because training and testing activities are scheduled and located to avoid potential conflicts with commercial vessels and air traffic. The military would continue to collaborate with local communities to enhance existing means of communication with the public to reduce the potential effects of limiting accessibility. • Airborne Acoustics: Under Alternative 1, potential impacts from airborne acoustics from proposed training and testing activities would remain consistent with ongoing activities and would not be significant. • Physical Disturbance and Strike and Airborne Acoustic Disturbances: Alternative 1 is not expected to result in impacts from physical disturbance and strike or airborne acoustic disturbances on commercial and recreational fishing, traditional fishing practices, other recreational activities or tourism because the vast majority of training and testing activities would occur in areas far from locations typically used by the public for fishing and recreation activities. Furthermore, the large size of the Study Area over which the proposed military training and testing activities would be distributed, and adherence to the Navy's standard operating procedures, would further reduce the potential for impacts. • Environmental Justice: Traditional fishers in Guam and the CNMI would not be disproportionately impacted by limits on accessibility, airborne acoustic disturbances, or the possibility of physical disturbance and strike because traditional fishers typically use the same general areas as recreational fishers, specifically areas closer to shore and far from the majority of training and testing activities. **Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative):** • Accessibility: Limits on accessibility to marine areas used by the public could increase under Alternative 2 due to an increase in some training and testing activities. However, this increase would be a slight change and would have no appreciable change on the potential for impacts over what is analyzed for Alternative 1. • Airborne Acoustics: Under Alternative 2, potential impacts from airborne acoustics from proposed training and testing activities would remain consistent with ongoing activities and would not be significant. • Physical Disturbance and Strike: Under Alternative 2, potential physical disturbance and strike impacts associated with training and testing activities would be similar to those as described under Alternative 1.

Table ES.5-1: Summary of Environmental Impacts for the No Action Alternative, Alternative 1, and Alternative 2 (continued)

Resource Category	Summary of Impacts
Section 3.12 Socioeconomic Resources and Environmental Justice (continued)	• Environmental Justice: Under Alternative 2, environmental justice impacts associated with training and testing activities would be similar to those as described under Alternative 1.
Section 3.13 Public Health and Safety	The Navy considered all stressors that could potentially impact public health and safety as a result of the Proposed Action. The following conclusions have been reached for the No Action and Action Alternatives: **No Action Alternative:** • Under the No Action Alternative, the proposed training and testing activities would not occur in the MITT Study Area. Not conducting the proposed at-sea training and testing activities may reduce the potential for interactions between the Navy and civilians but would not measurably improve public health and safety. **Alternative 1:** • Underwater Energy: Sources of underwater energy include active sonar, underwater explosions, air guns, vessel movements, aircraft overflights, mine warfare devices, and unmanned underwater vehicles. Standard operating procedures are in place to ensure no overlap between military and non-military activities. Impacts on public health and safety under Alternative 1 would be unlikely because of the military's implementation of safety procedures. • In-Air Energy: In-air energy stressors include sources of electromagnetic energy and lasers, such as radar, navigational aids, high-energy lasers, and electronic warfare systems. High-energy lasers would be used during testing activities that were not previously analyzed. Standard operating procedures would be in place to prevent personnel and non-participants from being exposed. Impacts on public health and safety under Alternative 1 would be unlikely because of the military's implementation of safety procedures. • Physical Interactions: Military aircraft, vessels, targets, munitions, towed devices, seafloor devices, and other expended materials have the potential to encounter recreational, commercial, institutional, and governmental aircraft; vessels; and users such as swimmers, divers, and anglers. Standard operating procedures are in place to ensure no overlap between military and non-military activities. Impacts on public health and safety under Alternative 1 would be unlikely because of the military's implementation of safety procedures.

Table ES.5-1: Summary of Environmental Impacts for the No Action Alternative, Alternative 1, and Alternative 2 (continued)

Resource Category	Summary of Impacts
Section 3.13 Public Health and Safety (continued)	• Secondary Stressors: Impacts on public health and safety would be unlikely because there would be no violation of any standards or guidelines structured to protect human health. **Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative):** • Underwater Energy: The locations, number of events, and potential effects associated with underwater energy stressors would increase under Alternative 2 compared to Alternative 1. However, standard operating procedures for in-water energy sources would prevent impacts on public health and safety. • In-Air Energy: The locations, number of events, and potential effects associated with in-air energy stressors would increase under Alternative 2 compared to Alternative 1. However, standard operating procedures for in-air energy sources would prevent impacts on public health and safety. • Physical Interactions: Impacts on public health and safety under Alternative 2 would be unlikely, even with increased activity levels, because of the military's implementation of standard operating procedures. • Secondary Stressors: Potential impacts from secondary stressors under Alternative 2 would be the same as Alternative 1.

Notes: SEIS/OEIS = Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement, ESA = Endangered Species Act, FDM = Farallon de Medinilla, MBTA = Migratory Bird Treaty Act, MITT = Mariana Islands Training and Testing, MMPA = Marine Mammal Protection Act, Navy = United States Department of the Navy, U.S. = United States, USFWS = U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, NMFS = National Marine Fisheries Service, MIRC = Mariana Islands Range Complex, CNMI = Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, NEW = Net Explosive Weight, ft. = feet, m = meter(s), NM = nautical miles, NM^2 = square nautical miles, NAAQS = National Ambient Air Quality Standards, NHPA = National Historic Preservation Act

ES.5.1 Cumulative Impacts

All resources are analyzed in Chapter 4 (Cumulative Impacts); however, based on guidance from the CEQ (Council on Environmental Quality, 1997), the cumulative impacts analysis focuses on impacts that are "truly meaningful." The level of analysis for each resource is commensurate with the intensity of the impacts identified in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) and the level to which impacts from the Proposed Action are expected to overlap with impacts from existing activities. Therefore, a full analysis of potential cumulative impacts is provided for marine mammals, marine invertebrates, sea turtles, and socioeconomic resources:

- Past human activities have impacted these resources to the extent that several marine mammals, sea turtles, marine invertebrate species, and some terrestrial species occurring in the Study Area are ESA-listed. Several marine mammal species have stocks that are classified as strategic stocks under the MMPA.
- The use of sonar and other non-impulsive sound sources under Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 has the potential to disturb or injure marine mammals and sea turtles.
- Explosive detonations, and vessel strikes under Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 have the potential to disturb, injure, or kill marine mammals and sea turtles.
- Under Alternative 1 and Alternative 2, danger zones would restrict access to fishing and recreational areas when ranges are in use.

The aggregate impacts of past, present, and other reasonably foreseeable future actions would continue to have significant impacts on some individual marine mammals and all sea turtle species in the Study Area. Alternative 1 or Alternative 2 would contribute to cumulative impacts; however, marine mammal and sea turtle mortality and injury from non-Navy actions associated with commercial fisheries, commercial vessel strikes, and entanglement in marine debris are the leading causes of direct mortality to marine mammals and sea turtles (Carretta et al., 2017; Helker et al., 2017; Lent & Squires, 2017; National Marine Fisheries Service, 2016; National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Marine Debris Program, 2014; Read et al., 2006). In summary, based on the analysis presented in Sections 3.4 (Marine Mammals), 3.5 (Sea Turtles), 3.8 (Marine Invertebrates), and 3.12 (Socioeconomic Resources), the current aggregate impacts of past, present, and other reasonably foreseeable future actions are not significantly different than the assessment in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. For marine mammals, sea turtles, and marine invertebrates, Alternative 1 or Alternative 2 would contribute to and increase cumulative impacts, but the relative contribution would be negligible compared to other non-Navy actions. Cumulative effects on socioeconomic resources may have short-term impacts on accessibility to public services, fishing sites, and tourism, but they are not expected to have long-term negative impacts on these resources or the economy of Guam and the CNMI. No new information or circumstances are significant enough to warrant further cumulative impact review.

The analysis presented in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) and Chapter 4 (Cumulative Impacts) indicates the incremental contribution of Alternative 1 or Alternative 2 to cumulative impacts on sediments and water quality, air quality, marine habitats, marine birds, marine vegetation, fishes, cultural resources, and public health and safety would occur but be negligible.

ES.6 Standard Operating Procedures, Mitigation, and Monitoring

Within the Study Area, the Navy implements standard operating procedures, mitigation measures, and marine species monitoring and reporting. Marine species monitoring and reporting efforts are designed

to track compliance with take authorizations, evaluate the effectiveness of mitigation measures, and improve understanding of the effects of training and testing activities on marine resources.

ES.6.1 Standard Operating Procedures

For training and testing to be effective, units must be able to safely use their sensors and weapons systems optimally as they are intended to be used in military missions and combat operations and to their optimum capabilities. Standard operating procedures applicable to training and testing have been developed through years of experience. The primary purpose of these procedures is to provide for safety (including public health and safety) and mission success and therefore are included as part of the Proposed Action and considered in the Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) environmental analysis for applicable resources. As described in Section 2.3.3 (Standard Operating Procedures), there are benefits to environmental and cultural resources resulting from the Navy's implementation of standard operating procedures.

ES.6.2 Mitigation

Mitigation measures differ from standard operating procedures. Mitigation is designed specifically for the purpose of avoiding or reducing potential impacts from the Proposed Action on environmental and cultural resources, whereas standard operating procedures are designed to provide for safety and mission success. Mitigation measures that the Navy would implement under the Proposed Action are organized into three categories: procedural mitigation measures for at-sea activities, at-sea mitigation areas, and terrestrial mitigation measures for activities on FDM. Procedural mitigation is mitigation that would be implemented whenever and wherever an applicable training or testing activity takes place within the Study Area. Mitigation areas are geographic locations within the Study Area where the military would implement additional mitigation during all or part of the year. Terrestrial mitigation measures are measures that the Navy would implement during applicable training and testing activities on land at FDM.

The Navy coordinated with the appropriate regulators (e.g., NMFS) on the mitigation measures detailed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) and Appendix I (Geographic Mitigation Assessment) through the consultation and permitting processes. The Navy Record of Decision, MMPA Regulations and Letter of Authorization, ESA Biological Opinion, and other applicable consultation documents would document all mitigation measures the Navy would implement under the Proposed Action.

ES.6.3 Mitigation Measures Considered but Eliminated

A number of possible additional mitigation measures were suggested during the public scoping period and Draft SEIS/OEIS public comment period, as well as during comment periods of previous Navy environmental documents. Section 5.6 (Measures Considered but Eliminated) and Appendix I (Geographic Mitigation Assessment) contain information on measures that did not meet the appropriate balance between being effective and practical to implement and therefore would not be implemented under the Proposed Action.

ES.6.4 Monitoring and Reporting

The Navy is committed to demonstrating environmental stewardship while executing its national security mission, complying with the suite of applicable federal environmental laws and regulations, and providing required and relevant reports to appropriate regulatory agencies. Since 2006, across all Navy range complexes (Mariana Islands, Pacific, Atlantic, Gulf of Mexico, and Gulf of Alaska), the Navy has produced Major Exercise Reports, Annual Exercise Reports, and Monitoring Reports and submitted to

NMFS to further research goals aimed at understanding the Navy's impact on the environment as it trains and conducts tests to accomplish its mission. As a complement to the Navy's commitment to avoiding and reducing impacts of the Proposed Action through mitigation, the Navy will undertake monitoring efforts to track compliance with take authorizations, help investigate the effectiveness of implemented mitigation measures, and better understand the impacts of the Proposed Action on marine resources. Taken together, mitigation and monitoring comprise the Navy's integrated approach for reducing environmental impacts from the Proposed Action. The Navy's overall monitoring approach will seek to leverage and build on existing research efforts whenever possible.

Consistent with the cooperating agency agreement with NMFS, mitigation and monitoring measures presented in the SEIS/OEIS focus on the requirements for protection and management of marine resources. Since monitoring will be required for compliance with the Final Rule issued for the Proposed Action under the MMPA, details of the monitoring program are being developed in coordination with NMFS through the regulatory process.

The Navy developed the Integrated Comprehensive Monitoring Program to serve as the overarching framework for coordinating its marine species monitoring efforts and as a planning tool to focus its monitoring priorities pursuant to ESA and MMPA requirements (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2010). The purpose of the Integrated Comprehensive Monitoring Program is to coordinate monitoring efforts across all regions and to allocate the most appropriate level and type of monitoring effort for each range complex based on a set of standardized objectives, regional expertise, and resource availability. Additional information about the U.S. Navy Marine Species Monitoring Program, including an introduction to adaptive management and strategic planning, is provided in Section 5.1.2.2.1 (Marine Species Research and Monitoring Programs).

The Navy is committed to documenting and reporting relevant aspects of training and testing activities to reduce environmental impacts and improve future environmental assessments. Initiatives include training and testing activity reporting and incident reporting. Additional information is available on the U.S. Navy Marine Species Monitoring Program website www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us.

ES.7 Other Considerations

ES.7.1 Consistency with Other Federal, Guam, CNMI, and Local Plans, Policies, and Regulations

Based on an evaluation of consistency with statutory obligations, the proposed training and testing activities would not conflict with the objectives or requirements of federal, territorial, regional, or local plans, policies, or legal requirements. The Navy consulted with regulatory agencies as appropriate during the NEPA process and would continue to coordinate as necessary prior to implementation of the Proposed Action to ensure all legal requirements are met.

ES.7.2 Relationship Between Short-Term Use of the Human Environment and Maintenance and Enhancement of Long-Term Productivity

In accordance with NEPA, the SEIS/OEIS provides an analysis of the relationship between a project's short-term impacts on the environment and the effects these impacts may have on the maintenance and enhancement of the long-term productivity of the affected environment. The Proposed Action may result in both short- and long-term environmental effects; however, it would not be expected to result in impacts that would reduce environmental productivity, permanently narrow the range of beneficial uses of the environment, or pose long-term risks to health, safety, or the general welfare of the public.

ES.7.3 Irreversible or Irretrievable Commitment of Resources

For both Alternative 1 and Alternative 2, most resource commitments are neither irreversible nor irretrievable. Most impacts are short-term and temporary or, if long lasting, are negligible. No habitat associated with threatened or endangered species would be lost as result of implementation of the Proposed Action. There would be no building or facility construction; therefore, the consumption of materials typically associated with such construction (e.g., concrete, metal, sand, or fuel) would not occur. Energy typically associated with construction activities would not be expended and irreversibly lost.

Implementation of the Proposed Action would require fuels used by aircraft, ships, and ground-based vehicles. Relative total fuel use could increase because fixed- and rotary-wing flight and ship activities could increase. Therefore, if total fuel consumption increased, this nonrenewable resource would be considered irretrievably lost.

ES.7.4 Energy Requirements and Conservation Potential of Alternatives

Resources that would be permanently and be continually consumed by implementation of the Proposed Action include water, electricity, natural gas, and fossil fuels; however, the amount and rate of consumption of these resources would not result in significant environmental impacts or the unnecessary, inefficient, or wasteful use of resources.

Sustainable range management practices are in place that protect and conserve natural and cultural resources and preserve access to training and testing areas for current and future requirements while addressing potential encroachments that threaten to impact range and training area capabilities.

ES.8 Public Involvement

The first step in the NEPA process for an EIS is to prepare a Notice of Intent to develop an EIS. The Navy published a Notice of Intent for the SEIS/OEIS in the *Federal Register* and several newspapers on August 1, 2017. In addition, the public notices were distributed to federal, state, and local elected officials and government agencies. The Notice of Intent provided an overview of the Proposed Action and the scope of the SEIS/OEIS, and initiated the scoping process.

ES.8.1 Scoping Process

In accordance with CEQ regulations for implementing the requirements of NEPA, scoping is not required for a supplement to a draft or final EIS (40 CFR 1502.9(c)(4)); however, in an effort to maximize public participation and ensure the public's input was considered, the Navy chose to conduct scoping for the SEIS/OEIS.

Public scoping comments were accepted during the 45-day scoping period from August 1, 2017 to September 15, 2017. In total, the Navy received 36 comment submissions from individuals, groups, agencies, and elected officials. The Navy considered all scoping comments in preparing the SEIS/OEIS.

ES.8.2 Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement Public Comments

The Draft SEIS/OEIS was released for public review and comment February 1, 2019 through April 17, 2019. The Navy made the following efforts to facilitate maximum public participation during the Draft SEIS/OEIS public review and comment period:

- Sent notification letters to federal and local elected officials and agencies.

- Mailed postcards to 350 recipients on the project mailing list, including individuals; non-governmental organizations; community and business groups; fishing, aviation, and recreation groups; and private companies.
- Distributed news releases to announce the availability of the Draft SEIS/OEIS and public meetings.
- Participated in numerous press and media engagements to broadcast availability of the Draft SEIS/OEIS and public meetings.
- Placed newspaper advertisements to announce the availability of the Draft SEIS/OEIS and public meetings in local and regional newspapers.
- Held three public meetings in the CNMI (Tinian, Rota, and Saipan) and one in Guam.

Changes in this Final SEIS/OEIS reflect comments made on the Draft SEIS/OEIS during the public comment period. Appendix K (Public Comment Responses) describes the public's participation and includes a list of the agencies and private entities that commented on the Draft SEIS/OEIS, along with a comment matrix with Navy responses associated with the comments received.

REFERENCES

Carretta, J. V., M. M. Muto, J. Greenman, K. Wilkinson, D. Lawson, J. Viezbicke, and J. Jannot. (2017). *Sources of Human-Related Injury and Mortality for U.S. Pacific West Coast Marine Mammal Stock Assessments, 2011–2015* (NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SWFSC-579). La Jolla, CA: Southwest Fisheries Science Center.

Council on Environmental Quality. (1997). *Considering Cumulative Effects Under the National Environmental Policy Act*. Washington, DC: The Council on Environmental Quality.

Helker, V. T., M. M. Muto, K. Savage, S. Teerlink, L. A. Jemison, K. Wilkinson, and J. Jannot. (2017). *Human-Caused Mortality and Injury of NMFS-Managed Alaska Marine Mammal Stocks, 2011–2015* (NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-AFSC-354). Seattle, WA: Alaska Fisheries Science Center.

Lent, R., and D. Squires. (2017). Reducing marine mammal bycatch in global fisheries: An economics approach. *Deep-Sea Research II: Topical Studies in Oceanography, 140*, 268–277.

National Marine Fisheries Service. (2016). *U.S. National Bycatch Report First Edition Update 2*. Silver Spring, MD: U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service. Retrieved from http://www.st.nmfs.noaa.gov/observer-home/first-edition-update-2.

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Marine Debris Program. (2014). *Report on the Entanglement of Marine Species in Marine Debris with an Emphasis on Species in the United States*. Silver Spring, MD: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

Read, A. J., P. Drinker, and S. Northridge. (2006). Bycatch of marine mammals in U.S. and global fisheries. *Conservation Biology, 20*(1), 163–169.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2010). *Navy Integrated Comprehensive Monitoring Plan*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Navy.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2015). *Final Mariana Islands Training and Testing Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement*. Pearl Harbor, HI: Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Pacific.

Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/

Overseas Environmental Impact Statement

Mariana Islands Training and Testing

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1 PURPOSE AND NEED 1-1

1.1 Introduction 1-1

1.2 The Navy's Environmental Compliance and At-Sea Policy 1-3

1.3 Proposed Action 1-4

1.4 Purpose and Need 1-4

1.4.1 Why the Navy Trains 1-5

1.4.2 Why the Navy Tests 1-6

1.5 Overview and Strategic Importance of Existing Range Complex 1-6

1.6 The Environmental Planning Process 1-7

1.6.1 National Environmental Policy Act Requirements 1-8

1.6.2 Executive Order 12114 1-8

1.6.3 Other Environmental Requirements Considered 1-9

1.6.3.1 Executive Order 13840, Ocean Policy to Advance the Economic, Security, and Environmental Interests of the United States 1-9

1.7 Scope and Content 1-9

1.8 Organization of this Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement 1-9

2 DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES 2-1

2.1 Description of the Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area 2-2

2.1.1 Description of the Mariana Islands Range Complex 2-2

2.1.1.1 Special Use Airspace and Air Traffic Controlled Assigned Airspace 2-2

2.1.1.2 Sea and Undersea Space 2-3

2.1.2 Description of the Ocean Operating Areas Outside the Bounds of the Mariana Islands Range Complex 2-7

2.1.3 Description of Pierside Locations and Apra Harbor 2-7

2.2 Primary Mission Areas 2-7

2.2.1 Air Warfare 2-7

2.2.2 Amphibious Warfare 2-9

2.2.3 Anti-Submarine Warfare 2-9

2.2.4 Electronic Warfare 2-9
2.2.5 Expeditionary Warfare 2-10
2.2.6 Mine Warfare 2-10
2.2.7 Strike Warfare 2-11
2.2.8 Surface Warfare 2-11
2.3 Proposed Activities 2-11
2.3.1 Changes to Proposed Activities 2-12
2.3.1.1 New Technologies and Capabilities 2-12
2.3.1.2 Renamed and Reorganized Testing Activities 2-12
2.3.2 Proposed Training and Testing Activities 2-12
2.3.3 Standard Operating Procedures 2-14
2.3.3.1 High-Energy Laser Safety 2-15
2.3.3.2 Sea Space and Airspace Deconfliction 2-15
2.3.3.3 Target Deployment and Retrieval Safety 2-16
2.3.3.4 Pierside Testing Safety 2-16
2.3.3.5 Underwater Detonation Safety 2-16
2.3.3.6 Sonic Booms 2-17
2.3.3.7 Unmanned Surface Vehicle Safety 2-17
2.3.3.8 Sinking Exercise Safety 2-17
2.3.3.9 Amphibious Assault and Amphibious Raid Procedures 2-17
2.3.4 Mitigation Measures 2-18
2.4 Action Alternatives Development 2-19
2.4.1 Alternatives Eliminated from Further Consideration 2-20
2.4.1.1 "Status Quo" Alternative 2-20
2.4.1.2 Alternative Training and Testing Locations 2-20
2.4.1.3 Reduced Training and Testing 2-20
2.4.1.4 Alternatives Including Geographic Mitigation Measures within the Study Area 2-20
2.4.1.5 Simulated Training and Testing Only 2-21
2.4.1.6 Training and Testing Without the Use of Active Sonar 2-21
2.4.2 Alternatives Carried Forward 2-21
2.4.2.1 No Action Alternative 2-22
2.4.2.2 Alternative 1 2-23
2.4.2.3 Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative) 2-24

2.4.3 Comparison of Proposed Sonar and Explosive Use in the Action Alternatives 2-25
2.4.3.1 Sonar Use 2-25
2.4.3.2 Explosives Use 2-26
2.5 Comparison of Alternatives 2-27

3 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES 3-1
3.0 Introduction 3-1
3.0.1 Overall Approach to Analysis 3-1
3.0.1.1 Navy Compiled and Generated Data 3-2
3.0.1.2 Navy's Quantitative Analysis to Determine Impacts on Sea Turtles and Marine Mammals 3-3
3.0.2 Regulatory Framework 3-7
3.0.3 Resources and Issues Not Carried Forward for More Detailed Discussion 3-8
3.0.4 Identification of Stressors for Analysis 3-8
3.0.4.1 Acoustic Stressors 3-10
3.0.4.2 Explosive Stressors 3-22
3.0.4.3 Energy Stressors 3-25
3.0.4.4 Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors 3-27
3.0.4.5 Entanglement Stressors 3-34
3.0.4.6 Ingestion Stressors 3-37
3.0.4.7 Conceptual Framework for Assessing Effects from Acoustic and Explosive Activities 3-38
3.1 Sediments and Water Quality 3.1-1
3.1.1 Affected Environment 3.1-1
3.1.1.1 Existing Conditions 3.1-1
3.1.2 Environmental Consequences 3.1-9
3.1.2.1 Explosives and Explosives Byproducts 3.1-10
3.1.2.2 Metals 3.1-13
3.1.2.3 Chemicals Other than Explosives 3.1-14
3.1.2.4 Other Materials 3.1-17
3.1.3 Public Comments 3.1-18
3.2 Air Quality 3.2-1
3.2.1 Methods 3.2-1
3.2.1.1 National Ambient Air Quality Standards 3.2-1

3.2.1.2 Conformity Analyses in Nonattainment and Maintenance Areas 3.2-1
3.2.2 Affected Environment 3.2-2
3.2.2.1 Climate of the Study Area 3.2-2
3.2.2.2 Regional Emissions 3.2-2
3.2.2.3 Existing Air Quality 3.2-2
3.2.3 Environmental Consequences 3.2-3
3.2.3.1 Criteria Pollutants 3.2-3
3.2.3.2 Hazardous Air Pollutants 3.2-5
3.2.3.3 Greenhouse Gases 3.2-6
3.2.4 Public Comments 3.2-6
3.3 Marine Habitats 3.3-1
3.3.1 Affected Environment 3.3-1
3.3.1.1 Existing Conditions 3.3-1
3.3.2 Environmental Consequences 3.3-3
3.3.2.1 Explosive Stressors 3.3-3
3.3.2.2 Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors 3.3-5
3.3.3 Public Comments 3.3-7
3.4 Marine Mammals 3.4-1
3.4.1 Affected Environment 3.4-1
3.4.1.1 General Background 3.4-1
3.4.1.2 Species Unlikely to Be Present in the Study Area 3.4-3
3.4.1.3 Group Size 3.4-3
3.4.1.4 Habitat Use 3.4-4
3.4.1.5 Dive Behavior 3.4-4
3.4.1.6 Hearing and Vocalization 3.4-4
3.4.1.7 General Threats 3.4-8
3.4.1.8 Blue Whale (*Balaenoptera musculus*) 3.4-16
3.4.1.9 Bryde's Whale (*Balaenoptera edeni*) 3.4-17
3.4.1.10 Fin Whale (*Balaenoptera physalus*) 3.4-18
3.4.1.11 Humpback Whale (*Megaptera novaeangliae*) 3.4-19
3.4.1.12 Minke Whale (*Balaenoptera acutorostrata*) 3.4-23
3.4.1.13 Omura's Whale (*Balaenoptera omurai*) 3.4-24

3.4.1.14 Sei Whale (*Balaenoptera borealis*) 3.4-25
3.4.1.15 Blainville's Beaked Whale (*Mesoplodon densirostris*) 3.4-25
3.4.1.16 Common Bottlenose Dolphin (*Tursiops truncatus*) 3.4-27
3.4.1.17 Cuvier's Beaked Whale (*Ziphius cavirostris*) 3.4-28
3.4.1.18 Dwarf Sperm Whale (*Kogia sima*) 3.4-30
3.4.1.19 False Killer Whale (*Pseudorca crassidens*) 3.4-30
3.4.1.20 Fraser's Dolphin (*Lagenodelphis hosei*) 3.4-32
3.4.1.21 Ginkgo-Toothed Beaked Whale (*Mesoplodon ginkgodens*) 3.4-32
3.4.1.22 Killer Whale (*Orcinus orca*) 3.4-34
3.4.1.23 Longman's Beaked Whale (*Indopacetus pacificus*) 3.4-35
3.4.1.24 Melon-Headed Whale (*Peponocephala electra*) 3.4-36
3.4.1.25 Pantropical Spotted Dolphin (*Stenella attenuata*) 3.4-37
3.4.1.26 Pygmy Killer Whale (*Feresa attenuata*) 3.4-38
3.4.1.27 Pygmy Sperm Whale (*Kogia breviceps*) 3.4-39
3.4.1.28 Risso's Dolphin (*Grampus griseus*) 3.4-40
3.4.1.29 Rough-Toothed Dolphin (*Steno bredanensis*) 3.4-41
3.4.1.30 Short-Finned Pilot Whale (*Globicephala macrorhynchus*) 3.4-42
3.4.1.31 Sperm Whale (*Physeter macrocephalus*) 3.4-43
3.4.1.32 Spinner Dolphin (*Stenella longirostris*) 3.4-45
3.4.1.33 Striped Dolphin (*Stenella coeruleoalba*) 3.4-47
3.4.2 Environmental Consequences 3.4-48
3.4.2.1 Acoustic Stressors 3.4-51
3.4.2.2 Explosive Stressors 3.4-196
3.4.2.3 Energy Stressors 3.4-263
3.4.2.4 Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors 3.4-265
3.4.2.5 Entanglement Stressors 3.4-267
3.4.2.6 Ingestion Stressors 3.4-268
3.4.2.7 Secondary Stressors 3.4-270
3.4.3 Summary of Potential Impacts on Marine Mammals 3.4-271
3.4.3.1 Combined Impacts of All Stressors Under Alternative 1 ..... 3.4-273
3.4.3.2 Combined Impacts of All Stressors Under Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative) 3.4-273

3.4.3.3 Combined Impacts of All Stressors Under the No Action Alternative 3.4-273
3.4.3.4 Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015 ..... 3.4-274
3.4.4 Marine Mammal Protection Act Determinations 3.4-277
3.4.5 Endangered Species Act Determinations 3.4-277
3.4.6 Public Comments 3.4-278

3.5 Sea Turtles 3.5-1
3.5.1 Affected Environment 3.5-1
3.5.1.1 Group Size 3.5-2
3.5.1.2 Habitat Use 3.5-3
3.5.1.3 Dive Behavior 3.5-3
3.5.1.4 Hearing and Vocalization 3.5-4
3.5.1.5 General Threats 3.5-5
3.5.1.6 Green Sea Turtle (*Chelonia mydas*) 3.5-7
3.5.1.7 Hawksbill Sea Turtle (*Eretmochelys imbricata*) 3.5-8
3.5.1.8 Loggerhead Sea Turtle (*Caretta caretta*) 3.5-9
3.5.1.9 Olive Ridley Sea Turtle (*Lepidochelys olivacea*) 3.5-9
3.5.1.10 Leatherback Sea Turtle (*Dermochelys coriacea*) 3.5-9
3.5.2 Environmental Consequences 3.5-9
3.5.2.1 Acoustic Stressors 3.5-11
3.5.2.2 Explosive Stressors 3.5-24
3.5.2.3 Energy Stressors 3.5-46
3.5.2.4 Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors 3.5-49
3.5.2.5 Entanglement Stressors 3.5-50
3.5.2.6 Ingestion Stressors 3.5-51
3.5.2.7 Secondary Stressors 3.5-52
3.5.3 Summary of Potential Impacts on Sea Turtles 3.5-53
3.5.4 Endangered Species Act Determination 3.5-54
3.5.5 Public Comments 3.5-54

3.6 Marine Birds 3.6-1
3.6.1 Affected Environment 3.6-1
3.6.1.1 Group Size 3.6-2

3.6.1.2 Diving Behavior 3.6-2
3.6.1.3 Flight Altitudes 3.6-2
3.6.1.4 Distance from Shore 3.6-3
3.6.1.5 Hearing and Vocalization 3.6-3
3.6.1.6 General Threats 3.6-5
3.6.1.7 Rookery Locations and Breeding Activities on FDM 3.6-5
3.6.2 Environmental Consequences 3.6-6
3.6.2.1 Acoustic Stressors 3.6-11
3.6.2.2 Explosives Stressors (explosive shock wave and sound, explosive fragments) 3.6-19
3.6.2.3 Energy Stressors 3.6-23
3.6.2.4 Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors 3.6-25
3.6.2.5 Ingestion Stressors 3.6-28
3.6.2.6 Secondary Stressors (impacts on habitat, impacts on prey availability) 3.6-30
3.6.3 Migratory Bird Treaty Act 3.6-30
3.6.4 Public Comments 3.6-31

3.7 Marine Vegetation 3.7-1
3.7.1 Affected Environment 3.7-1
3.7.1.1 General Threats 3.7-1
3.7.1.2 Marine Vegetation Groups 3.7-1
3.7.1.3 Seagrasses 3.7-1
3.7.1.4 Mangroves 3.7-1
3.7.2 Environmental Consequences 3.7-1
3.7.2.1 Explosive Stressors 3.7-2
3.7.2.2 Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors 3.7-3
3.7.2.3 Secondary Stressors 3.7-5
3.7.3 Public Comments 3.7-5

3.8 Marine Invertebrates 3.8-1
3.8.1 Affected Environment 3.8-1
3.8.1.1 Sound Sensing and Production 3.8-4
3.8.1.2 General Threats 3.8-4
3.8.1.3 Endangered Species Act-Listed Species 3.8-4

3.8.1.4 Taxonomic Groups 3.8-5
3.8.2 Environmental Consequences 3.8-5
3.8.2.1 Acoustic Stressors 3.8-6
3.8.2.2 Explosive Stressors 3.8-8
3.8.2.3 Energy Stressors 3.8-10
3.8.2.4 Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors 3.8-12
3.8.2.5 Entanglement Stressors 3.8-15
3.8.2.6 Ingestion Stressors 3.8-16
3.8.2.7 Secondary Stressors 3.8-17
3.8.3 Public Comments 3.8-18

3.9 Fishes 3.9-1
3.9.1 Affected Environment 3.9-1
3.9.1.1 Hearing and Vocalization 3.9-1
3.9.1.2 General Threats 3.9-3
3.9.1.3 Endangered Species Act Species 3.9-3
3.9.1.4 Federally Managed Species 3.9-7
3.9.1.5 Taxonomic Group Descriptions 3.9-11
3.9.2 Environmental Consequences 3.9-11
3.9.2.1 Acoustic Stressors 3.9-12
3.9.2.2 Explosive Stressors 3.9-40
3.9.2.3 Energy Stressors 3.9-53
3.9.2.4 Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors 3.9-55
3.9.2.5 Entanglement Stressors 3.9-57
3.9.2.6 Ingestion Stressors 3.9-59
3.9.2.7 Secondary Stressors 3.9-60
3.9.3 Public Comments 3.9-62

3.10 Terrestrial Species and Habitats 3.10-1
3.10.1 Affected Environment 3.10-1
3.10.1.1 Vegetation Communities on Farallon de Medinilla 3.10-2
3.10.1.2 Wildlife Communities on Farallon de Medinilla 3.10-3
3.10.1.3 Endangered Species Act Listed Species 3.10-3
3.10.1.4 Major Terrestrial Species Taxonomic Group Descriptions 3.10-4

3.10.2 Environmental Consequences 3.10-4
3.10.2.1 Acoustic Stressors 3.10-5
3.10.2.2 Explosives Stressors 3.10-10
3.10.2.3 Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors 3.10-12
3.10.2.4 Secondary Stressors 3.10-15
3.10.3 Public Comments 3.10-16

3.11 Cultural Resources 3.11-1
3.11.1 Affected Environment 3.11-1
3.11.1.1 Guam, Mariana Islands 3.11-1
3.11.1.2 Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands 3.11-1
3.11.1.3 Cultural/Traditional Practices and Beliefs 3.11-3
3.11.1.4 Mariana Islands Training and Testing Transit Corridor 3.11-4
3.11.1.5 Current Requirements, Practices, and Protective Measures 3.11-4
3.11.2 Environmental Consequences 3.11-5
3.11.2.1 Explosive Stressors 3.11-5
3.11.2.2 Physical Disturbance and Strike 3.11-7
3.11.3 Public Comments 3.11-8

3.12 Socioeconomic Resources and Environmental Justice 3.12-1
3.12.1 Affected Environment 3.12-1
3.12.1.1 Commercial Transportation and Shipping 3.12-4
3.12.1.2 Commercial and Recreational Fishing 3.12-7
3.12.1.3 Tourism 3.12-12
3.12.1.4 Environmental Justice 3.12-14
3.12.2 Environmental Consequences 3.12-17
3.12.2.1 Accessibility (to the Ocean and Airspace) 3.12-17
3.12.2.2 Airborne Acoustics 3.12-25
3.12.2.3 Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors 3.12-28
3.12.2.4 Secondary Stressors 3.12-32
3.12.3 Public Comments 3.12-34

3.13 Public Health and Safety 3.13-1
3.13.1 Affected Environment 3.13-1
3.13.1.1 Existing Conditions 3.13-1

3.13.1.2 Airspace 3.13-3
3.13.1.3 Safety and Inspection Procedures 3.13-3
3.13.2 Environmental Consequences 3.13-5
3.13.2.1 Underwater Energy 3.13-6
3.13.2.2 In-Air Energy 3.13-7
3.13.2.3 Physical Interactions 3.13-8
3.13.2.4 Secondary Stressors 3.13-9
3.13.3 Public Comments 3.13-10

4 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS 4-1
4.1 Principles of Cumulative Impacts Analysis 4-1
4.1.1 Determination of Significance 4-1
4.1.2 Identifying Region of Influence for Cumulative Impacts Analysis 4-1
4.2 Projects and Other Activities Analyzed for Cumulative Impacts 4-2
4.3 Cumulative Impacts on Environmental Resources 4-22
4.4 Resource-Specific Cumulative Impacts 4-22
4.4.1 Sediments and Water Quality 4-22
4.4.2 Air Quality 4-23
4.4.3 Marine Habitats 4-24
4.4.4 Marine Mammals 4-25
4.4.4.1 Region of Influence 4-25
4.4.4.2 Resource Trends 4-25
4.4.4.3 Impacts of Other Actions 4-26
4.4.4.4 Impacts of the Proposed Action that May Contribute to Cumulative Impacts 4-29
4.4.4.5 Cumulative Impacts on Marine Mammals 4-30
4.4.5 Sea Turtles 4-31
4.4.5.1 Region of Influence 4-31
4.4.5.2 Resource Trends 4-32
4.4.5.3 Impacts of Other Actions 4-32
4.4.5.4 Impacts of the Proposed Action That May Contribute to Cumulative Impacts 4-35
4.4.5.5 Cumulative Impacts on Sea Turtles 4-36
4.4.6 Marine Birds 4-37
4.4.7 Marine Vegetation 4-38

4.4.8 Marine Invertebrates 4-39
4.4.8.1 Region of Influence 4-39
4.4.8.2 Resource Trends 4-39
4.4.8.3 Impacts of Other Actions 4-39
4.4.8.4 Impacts of the Proposed Action That May Contribute to Cumulative Impacts 4-40
4.4.8.5 Cumulative Impacts on Marine Invertebrates 4-41
4.4.9 Marine Fishes 4-42
4.4.10 Terrestrial Species and Habitats 4-43
4.4.11 Cultural Resources 4-43
4.4.12 Socioeconomic Resources 4-44
4.4.12.1 Resource Trends 4-45
4.4.12.2 Onshore and Offshore Fishing for Economic Self-Sustainability 4-45
4.4.12.3 Impacts of Other Actions 4-46
4.4.12.4 Cumulative Impacts on Socioeconomic Resources 4-46
4.4.13 Public Health and Safety 4-46
4.5 Summary of Cumulative Impacts 4-46
4.6 Public Comments 4-47

5 MITIGATION 5-1
5.1 Introduction 5-1
5.1.1 Benefits of Mitigation 5-2
5.1.2 Compliance Initiatives 5-3
5.1.2.1 Protective Measures Assessment Protocol 5-3
5.1.2.2 Monitoring, Research, and Reporting Initiatives 5-3
5.2 Mitigation Development Process 5-9
5.2.1 At-Sea Procedural Mitigation Development 5-10
5.2.1.1 Lookouts 5-11
5.2.1.2 Mitigation Zones 5-12
5.2.1.3 Procedural Mitigation Implementation 5-12
5.2.2 At-Sea Mitigation Area Development 5-13
5.2.3 Terrestrial Mitigation Measure Development 5-14
5.2.4 Practicality of Implementation 5-14
5.2.4.1 Assessment Criteria 5-14
5.2.4.2 Factors Affecting Practicality 5-17

5.3 At-Sea Procedural Mitigation to be Implemented 5-19
5.3.1 Environmental Awareness and Education 5-19
5.3.2 Acoustic Stressors 5-21
5.3.2.1 Active Sonar 5-21
5.3.2.2 Weapons Firing Noise 5-25
5.3.3 Explosive Stressors 5-26
5.3.3.1 Explosive Sonobuoys 5-26
5.3.3.2 Explosive Torpedoes 5-29
5.3.3.3 Explosive Medium-Caliber and Large-Caliber Projectiles 5-31
5.3.3.4 Explosive Missiles and Rockets 5-35
5.3.3.5 Explosive Bombs 5-38
5.3.3.6 Sinking Exercises 5-40
5.3.3.7 Explosive Mine Countermeasure and Neutralization Activities 5-43
5.3.3.8 Explosive Mine Neutralization Activities Involving Navy Divers 5-45
5.3.3.9 Maritime Security Operations – Anti-Swimmer Grenades 5-49
5.3.4 Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors 5-51
5.3.4.1 Vessel Movement 5-51
5.3.4.2 Towed In-Water Devices 5-54
5.3.4.3 Small-, Medium-, and Large-Caliber Non-Explosive Practice Munitions 5-55
5.3.4.4 Non-Explosive Missiles and Rockets 5-56
5.3.4.5 Non-Explosive Bombs and Mine Shapes 5-57
5.4 At-Sea Mitigation Areas to be Implemented 5-57
5.4.1 Mitigation Areas for Seafloor Resources 5-58
5.4.2 Mitigation Areas for Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles 5-62
5.5 Terrestrial Mitigation Measures to be Implemented 5-65
5.5.1 Farallon De Medinilla 5-65
5.6 Measures Considered but Eliminated 5-66
5.6.1 Active Sonar 5-67
5.6.2 Explosives 5-70
5.6.3 Active and Passive Acoustic Monitoring Devices 5-71
5.6.4 Thermal Detection Systems 5-72
5.6.5 Third-Party Observers 5-75
5.6.6 Foreign Navy Mitigation 5-76
5.6.7 Reporting Requirements 5-76

5.7 Mitigation Summary 5-77

6 ADDITIONAL REGULATORY CONSIDERATIONS 6-1

6.1 Consistency with Other Applicable Federal, State, and Local Plans, Policies, and Regulations 6-1

6.1.1 Coastal Zone Management Act Compliance 6-7

6.1.1.1 Guam Coastal Management Program 6-7

6.1.1.2 Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands Coastal Zone Management Program 6-7

6.1.2 Marine Protected Areas 6-8

6.1.3 Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act 6-8

6.2 Relationship Between Short-Term Use of the Environment and Maintenance and Enhancement of Long-Term Productivity 6-9

6.3 Irreversible or Irretrievable Commitment of Resources 6-9

6.4 Energy Requirements and Conservation Potential of Alternatives 6-9

7 LIST OF PREPARERS 7-1

8 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT AND DISTRIBUTION 8-1

8.1 Project Website 8-1

8.2 Scoping Period 8-1

8.2.1 Public Scoping Notification 8-4

8.2.1.1 Notification Letters 8-4

8.2.1.2 Postcard Mailer 8-11

8.2.1.3 Newspaper Advertisements 8-13

8.2.1.4 Press Release 8-14

8.2.2 Summary of Public Scoping Comments 8-17

8.2.2.1 Description of the Proposed Action and Alternatives 8-17

8.2.2.2 National Environmental Policy Act and Public Involvement 8-17

8.2.2.3 Location of Activities 8-17

8.2.2.4 Indirect and Cumulative Impacts 8-17

8.2.2.5 Sediments and Water Quality Impacts 8-17

8.2.2.6 Socioeconomic Resources 8-18

8.2.2.7 Terrestrial Species and Habitats/Marine Birds 8-18

8.2.2.8 Marine Resources 8-18

8.2.2.9 Marine Mammal Impacts/Sea Turtles 8-18

8.2.2.10 Fish/Marine Habitat 8-18

8.2.2.11 Cultural Resources 8-18
8.2.2.12 Public Health and Safety 8-18
8.2.2.13 Mitigation Measures 8-18
8.2.2.14 Other 8-19
8.3 Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement Public Review and Comment Period 8-19
8.3.1 Notification of Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement Public Review and Comment Period and Public Meetings 8-25
8.3.1.1 Notification Letters 8-25
8.3.1.2 Postcard Mailers 8-33
8.3.1.3 Newspaper Advertisements 8-36
8.3.1.4 Press Releases 8-39
8.3.1.5 Subscriber Email Notifications 8-48
8.3.2 Public Meetings 8-48
8.4 Comments on the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement 8-48
8.5 Distribution of the Draft and Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement 8-49
8.5.1 Federal Agencies 8-49
8.5.2 Information Repositories 8-49

List of Figures

1 Purpose and Need

Figure 1.1-1: Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area 1-3
Figure 1.6-1: National Environmental Policy Act Process Conducted for this SEIS/OEIS 1-8

2 Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives

Figure 2.1-1: Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area 2-3
Figure 2.1-2: Mariana Islands Range Complex Airspace 2-4
Figure 2.1-3: Warning Area 517 2-5
Figure 2.1-4: Farallon de Medinilla Restricted Area 7201, 7201A, and Danger Zone 2-6
Figure 2.2-1: Apra Harbor Naval Complex (Main Base) and Main Base/Polaris Point 2-8
Figure 2.4-1: Proposed Annual Total Hull-Mounted Mid-Frequency Sonar Hour Use Compared to the Number Authorized in the 2015–2020 Marine Mammal Protection Act Permit 2-25
Figure 2.4-2: Proposed Annual Explosives Use (Bins E1–E5) Compared to the 2015–2020 Marine Mammal Protection Act Permit 2-26

Figure 2.4-3: Proposed Annual Explosives Use (Bins E6–E12) Compared to the 2015–2020 Marine Mammal Protection Act Permit 2-27

3 Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences

Figure 3.0-1: Gun Blast and Projectile from a MK 45 MOD 2 5-inch/54 Caliber Navy Gun on a Cruiser (top), a MK 45 MOD 2 5-in/54 Caliber Navy Gun on a Destroyer (bottom left), and a MK 45 MOD 4 5-inch/62 Caliber Navy Gun on a Destroyer (bottom right) 3-21
Figure 3.0-2: Sonobuoy Launch Depicting the Relative Size of a Small Decelerator/Parachute 3-36
Figure 3.0-3: Aerial Target (Drone) with Parachute Deployed 3-37
Figure 3.0-4: Flow Chart of the Evaluation Process of Sound-Producing Activities 3-41
Figure 3.0-5: Two Hypothetical Threshold Shifts 3-44

3.1 Sediments and Water Quality

There are no figures in this section.

3.2 Air Quality

Figure 3.2-1: Annual Wind Speed and Direction at Apra Harbor, Guam 3.2-3

3.3 Marine Habitats

Figure 3.3-1: Nearshore Marine Habitats around Saipan 3.3-2
Figure 3.3-2: Existing Mine Warfare Underwater Detonation (UNDET) Areas 3.3-4

3.4 Marine Mammals

Figure 3.4-1: Composite Audiograms for Hearing Groups Likely Found in the Study Area 3.4-7
Figure 3.4-2: Two Hypothetical Threshold Shifts 3.4-57
Figure 3.4-3: Odontocete Critical Ratios 3.4-65
Figure 3.4-4: Critical Ratios for Different Noise Types 3.4-66
Figure 3.4-5: Navy Auditory Weighting Functions for all Species Groups 3.4-107
Figure 3.4-6: TTS and PTS Exposure Functions for Sonar and Other Transducers 3.4-108
Figure 3.4-7: Behavioral Response Function for Odontocetes 3.4-110
Figure 3.4-8: Behavioral Response Function for Mysticetes 3.4-111
Figure 3.4-9: Behavioral Response Function for Beaked Whales 3.4-111
Figure 3.4-10: Relative Likelihood of a Response Being Significant Based on the Duration and Severity of Behavioral Reactions 3.4-113
Figure 3.4-11: Blue Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 ..... 3.4-130
Figure 3.4-12: Blue Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 ..... 3.4-131

Figure 3.4-13: Bryde's Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 ..... 3.4-132
Figure 3.4-14: Bryde's Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 ..... 3.4-133
Figure 3.4-15: Fin Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 ..... 3.4-135
Figure 3.4-16: Fin Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 ..... 3.4-136
Figure 3.4-17: Humpback Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 ..... 3.4-137
Figure 3.4-18: Humpback Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 ..... 3.4-139
Figure 3.4-19: Minke Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 ..... 3.4-140
Figure 3.4-20: Minke Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 ..... 3.4-141
Figure 3.4-21: Omura's Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 ..... 3.4-142
Figure 3.4-22: Omura's Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 ..... 3.4-143
Figure 3.4-23: Sei Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 ..... 3.4-144
Figure 3.4-24: Sei Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 ..... 3.4-145
Figure 3.4-25: Blainville's Beaked Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 ..... 3.4-150
Figure 3.4-26: Cuvier's Beaked Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 ..... 3.4-151
Figure 3.4-27: Ginkgo-Toothed Beaked Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 ..... 3.4-152
Figure 3.4-28: Longman's Beaked Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 ..... 3.4-153
Figure 3.4-29: Blainville's Beaked Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 ..... 3.4-155
Figure 3.4-30: Cuvier's Beaked Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 ..... 3.4-156
Figure 3.4-31: Ginkgo-Toothed Beaked Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 ..... 3.4-157
Figure 3.4-32: Longman's Beaked Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 ..... 3.4-158

Figure 3.4-33: Bottlenose Dolphin Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 ....3.4-159
Figure 3.4-34: Bottlenose Dolphin Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 ....3.4-160
Figure 3.4-35: Dwarf Sperm Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 ....3.4-161
Figure 3.4-36: Pygmy Sperm Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 ....3.4-162
Figure 3.4-37: Dwarf Sperm Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 ....3.4-163
Figure 3.4-38: Pygmy Sperm Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 ....3.4-164
Figure 3.4-39: False Killer Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 ....3.4-165
Figure 3.4-40: False Killer Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 ....3.4-166
Figure 3.4-41: Fraser's Dolphin Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 ....3.4-168
Figure 3.4-42: Fraser's Dolphin Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 ....3.4-169
Figure 3.4-43: Killer Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 ....3.4-170
Figure 3.4-44: Killer Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 ....3.4-171
Figure 3.4-45: Melon-Headed Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 ....3.4-172
Figure 3.4-46: Melon-Headed Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 ....3.4-173
Figure 3.4-47: Pantropical Spotted Dolphin Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 ....3.4-175
Figure 3.4-48: Pantropical Spotted Dolphin Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 ....3.4-176
Figure 3.4-49: Pygmy Killer Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 ....3.4-177
Figure 3.4-50: Pygmy Killer Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 ....3.4-178
Figure 3.4-51: Risso's Dolphin Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 ....3.4-179
Figure 3.4-52: Risso's Dolphin Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 ....3.4-181

Figure 3.4-53: Rough-Toothed Dolphin Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 ..... 3.4-182
Figure 3.4-54: Rough-Toothed Dolphin Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 ..... 3.4-183
Figure 3.4-55: Short-Finned Pilot Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 ..... 3.4-184
Figure 3.4-56: Short-Finned Pilot Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 ..... 3.4-185
Figure 3.4-57: Sperm Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 ..... 3.4-187
Figure 3.4-58: Sperm Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 ..... 3.4-188
Figure 3.4-59: Spinner Dolphin Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 ..... 3.4-189
Figure 3.4-60: Spinner Dolphin Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 ..... 3.4-190
Figure 3.4-61: Striped Dolphin Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 ..... 3.4-192
Figure 3.4-62: Striped Dolphin Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 ..... 3.4-193
Figure 3.4-63: Navy Phase III Weighting Functions for All Species Groups 3.4-205
Figure 3.4-64: Navy Phase III Behavioral, TTS, and PTS Exposure Functions for Explosives 3.4-206
Figure 3.4-65: Bryde's Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 ..... 3.4-222
Figure 3.4-66: Bryde's Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 ..... 3.4-223
Figure 3.4-67: Humpback Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 ..... 3.4-225
Figure 3.4-68: Humpback Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 ..... 3.4-227
Figure 3.4-69: Minke Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 ..... 3.4-228
Figure 3.4-70: Minke Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 ..... 3.4-229
Figure 3.4-71: Omura's Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 ..... 3.4-230
Figure 3.4-72: Sei Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 ..... 3.4-232

Figure 3.4-73: Sei Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 ..... 3.4-233
Figure 3.4-74: Ginkgo-Toothed Beaked Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 ..... 3.4-236
Figure 3.4-75: Longman's Beaked Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 ..... 3.4-237
Figure 3.4-76: Ginkgo-Toothed Beaked Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 ..... 3.4-238
Figure 3.4-77: Longman's Beaked Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 ..... 3.4-239
Figure 3.4-78: Dwarf Sperm Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 ..... 3.4-241
Figure 3.4-79: Pygmy Sperm Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 ..... 3.4-242
Figure 3.4-80: Dwarf Sperm Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 ..... 3.4-243
Figure 3.4-81: Pygmy Sperm Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 ..... 3.4-244
Figure 3.4-82: Fraser's Dolphin Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 ..... 3.4-246
Figure 3.4-83: Fraser's Dolphin Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 ..... 3.4-247
Figure 3.4-84: Melon-Headed Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 ..... 3.4-248
Figure 3.4-85: Melon-Headed Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 ..... 3.4-249
Figure 3.4-86: Pantropical Spotted Dolphin Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 ..... 3.4-251
Figure 3.4-87: Pantropical Spotted Dolphin Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 ..... 3.4-252
Figure 3.4-88: Risso's Dolphin Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 ..... 3.4-254
Figure 3.4-89: Risso's Dolphin Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 ..... 3.4-255
Figure 3.4-90: Short-Finned Pilot Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 ..... 3.4-257
Figure 3.4-91: Spinner Dolphin Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 ..... 3.4-259
Figure 3.4-92: Spinner Dolphin Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 ..... 3.4-260

Figure 3.4-93: Striped Dolphin Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 .....3.4-261
Figure 3.4-94: Striped Dolphin Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-262

3.5 Sea Turtles

Figure 3.5-1: Dive Depth and Duration Summaries for Sea Turtle Species 3.5-3
Figure 3.5-2: Generalized Dive Profiles and Activities Described for Sea Turtles.....3.5-4
Figure 3.5-3: Composite Underwater Audiogram for Sea Turtles 3.5-5
Figure 3.5-4: Auditory Weighting Function for Sea Turtles 3.5-18
Figure 3.5-5: TTS and PTS Exposure Functions for Sonar and Other Transducers.....3.5-18
Figure 3.5-6: Auditory Weighting Functions for Sea Turtles.....3.5-32
Figure 3.5-7: TTS and PTS Exposure Functions for Impulsive Sounds.....3.5-33
Figure 3.5-8: Green Sea Turtle Estimated Impacts per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 .....3.5-42
Figure 3.5-9: Green Sea Turtle Impacts Estimated per Year from Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2.....3.5-45

3.6 Marine Birds

There are no figures in this section.

3.7 Marine Vegetation

There are no figures in this section.

3.8 Marine Invertebrates

Figure 3.8-1: Percent Coral Cover and Habitat Types Around Farallon de Medinilla.....3.8-3

3.9 Fishes

Figure 3.9-1: Fish Hearing Group and Navy Sonar Bin Frequency Ranges.....3.9-30

3.10 Terrestrial Species and Habitats

Figure 3.10-1: Farallon de Medinilla Impact Zones and Micronesian Megapode Occurrences 3.10-8

3.11 Cultural Resources

Figure 3.11-1: Known Wrecks, Obstructions, or Occurrences Within the United States Territorial Waters 3.11-2

3.12 Socioeconomic Resources and Environmental Justice

Figure 3.12-1: Commercial Fisheries Landings in Guam from the Years 2013 through 2018 .....3.12-9
Figure 3.12-2: Commercial Fisheries Landings in the CNMI from the Years 2013 through 2018.....3.12-11

Figure 3.12-3: Number of NOTMARs Issued for FDM and W-517 for the Years 2010 through 2019.3.12-19
Figure 3.12-4: Number of Days per Year Affected by Military Activities at FDM and W-517 .....3.12-20
Figure 3.12-5: Joint Region Marianas Facebook Post Announcing Military Training Activities at FDM and W-517.....3.12-23

3.13 Public Health and Safety

There are no figures in this section.

4 Cumulative Impacts

There are no figures in this chapter.

5 Mitigation

Figure 5.4-1: Seafloor Resource Mitigation Areas off Guam 5-59
Figure 5.4-2: Seafloor Resource Mitigation Areas off Tinian, Saipan, and Farallon de Medinilla 5-60
Figure 5.4-3: Marine Mammal and Sea Turtle Mitigation Areas 5-64

6 Additional Regulatory Considerations

There are no figures in this chapter.

7 List of Preparers

There are no figures in this chapter.

8 Distribution List

Figure 8.2-1: Notice of Intent for Scoping.....8-2
Figure 8.2-2: Stakeholder Scoping Notification Letter.....8-8
Figure 8.2-3: Postcard Mailer for Scoping (Front and Back).....8-12
Figure 8.2-4: Newspaper Announcement for Scoping.....8-13
Figure 8.2-5: Press Release for Scoping 8-15
Figure 8.3-1: Federal Register Notice of Public Meetings for the Draft SEIS/OEIS.....8-20
Figure 8.3-2: Federal Register Notice of Availability for the Draft SEIS/OEIS.....8-21
Figure 8.3-3: Federal Register Notice of Rescheduled Public Meetings for the Draft SEIS/OEIS 8-22
Figure 8.3-4: Federal Register Notice of Extension of Public Comment Period for the Draft SEIS/OEIS.8-24
Figure 8.3-5: Stakeholder Letter for the Notification of Availability of the Draft SEIS/OEIS 8-29
Figure 8.3-6: Notice of the Draft SEIS/OEIS Public Meetings Postcard Mailer (Front and Back).....8-34
Figure 8.3-7: Notice of the Draft SEIS/OEIS Rescheduled Public Meetings and Comment Period Extension Postcard Mailer (Front and Back) 8-35
Figure 8.3-8: Newspaper Announcement of the Draft SEIS/OEIS Availability and Public Meetings 8-37
Figure 8.3-9: Newspaper Announcement of the Draft SEIS/OEIS Availability and Rescheduled Public Meetings 8-38

Figure 8.3-10: Newspaper Announcement of the Draft SEIS/OEIS Public Comment Extension Period..8-38
Figure 8.3-11: Press Release of the Notification of Availability of the Draft SEIS/OEIS.....8-40
Figure 8.3-12: Press Release of the Public Comment Period Extension and Public Meetings for the Draft SEIS/OEIS.....8-43
Figure 8.3-13: Press Release of the Public Comment Period Extension for the Draft SEIS/OEIS 8-46

List of Tables

1 Purpose and Need

There are no tables in this chapter.

2 Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives

Table 2.3-1: Major Training Exercises and Integrated/Coordinated Anti-Submarine Warfare Training Activities.....2-14
Table 2.3-2: Overview of Mitigation Categories 2-19
Table 2.5-1: Current and Proposed Training Activities 2-28
Table 2.5-2: Current and Proposed Testing Activities.....2-42

3 Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences

Table 3.0-1: Comparison of Stressors Analyzed.....3-8
Table 3.0-2: Sonar and Transducer Sources Quantitatively Analyzed 3-13
Table 3.0-3: Sonar and Transducers Qualitatively Analyzed.....3-15
Table 3.0-4: Representative Aircraft Sound Characteristics 3-17
Table 3.0-5: Sonic Boom Underwater Sound Levels Modeled for F/A-18 Hornet Supersonic Flight 3-19
Table 3.0-6: Example Weapons Noise 3-20
Table 3.0-7: Explosive Sources Quantitatively Analyzed that Could Be Used Underwater or at the Water Surface 3-24
Table 3.0-8: Typical Air Explosive Munitions During Navy Activities 3-25
Table 3.0-9: Annual Number of Events in the Study Area that Include In-Water Electromagnetic Devices 3-26
Table 3.0-10: Annual Number of Events in the Study Area that Include High-Energy Lasers 3-27
Table 3.0-11: Annual Number of Events in the Study Area that Include Aircraft Movement 3-28
Table 3.0-12: Annual Number of Events in the Study Area that Include Vessel Movement 3-28
Table 3.0-13: Annual Number of Events in the Study Area that Include In-Water Devices 3-28
Table 3.0-14: Annual Number of Non-Explosive Practice Munitions Expended At Sea in the Study Area 3-29
Table 3.0-15: Annual Number of Other Military Expended Materials Used At Sea in the Study Area....3-30
Table 3.0-16: Annual Number of Explosive Munitions Expended At Sea in the Study Area 3-30
Table 3.0-17: Annual Number of Targets Expended At Sea in the Study Area.....3-31

Table 3.0-18: Impact Area of Proposed Military Expended Materials....3-31
Table 3.0-19: Annual Number of Events in the Study Area that Include Seafloor Devices....3-33
Table 3.0-20: Annual Number of Munitions Used on Farallon de Medinilla....3-33
Table 3.0-21: Annual Number of Events in the Study Area that Include the Potential for Personnel Disturbance....3-34
Table 3.0-22: Annual Number of Wires and Cables Expended in the Study Area....3-35
Table 3.0-23: Size Categories for Decelerators/Parachutes Expended During Training and Testing Activities....3-36
Table 3.0-24: Annual Number of Decelerators/Parachutes Expended in the Study Area....3-37
Table 3.0-25: Annual Number of Chaff Cartridges Expended in the Study Area....3-38
Table 3.0-26: Annual Number of Flares Expended in the Study Area....3-38

3.1 Sediments and Water Quality

Table 3.1-1: Water Quality Standard, Criteria, and Applicable Water Use Areas....3.1-3
Table 3.1-2: Rates of Failure and Low-Order Detonations....3.1-7

3.2 Air Quality

Table 3.2-1: Baseline Pollutant Emissions for At-Sea and FDM Training and Testing Activities that Occur Within 3 Nautical Miles of the Coast from Aircraft, Vessels, and Ordnance (tpy)....3.2-4
Table 3.2-2: Annual Emissions for At-Sea and FDM Training and Testing Activities that Occur Within 3 Nautical Miles of the Coast Under Alternative 1 from Aircraft, Vessels, and Ordnance (tpy)....3.2-4
Table 3.2-3: Annual Emissions for At-Sea and FDM Training and Testing Activities that Occur Within 3 Nautical Miles of the Coast Under Alternative 2 from Aircraft, Vessels, and Ordnance (tpy)....3.2-5
Table 3.2-4: Annual Greenhouse Gas Emissions Under All Three Alternatives....3.2-6

3.3 Marine Habitats

There are no tables in this section.

3.4 Marine Mammals

Table 3.4-1: Marine Mammal Occurrence within the Study Area....3.4-2
Table 3.4-2: Species within Marine Mammal Hearing Groups Likely Found in the Study Area....3.4-6
Table 3.4-3: Cutoff Distances for Moderate Source Level, Single Platform Training and Testing Events and for All Other Events with Multiple Platforms or Sonar with Source Levels at or Exceeding 215 dB re 1 µPa at 1 m....3.4-112
Table 3.4-4: Range to Permanent Threshold Shift for Five Representative Sonar Systems....3.4-116
Table 3.4-5: Ranges to Temporary Threshold Shift for Sonar Bin HF4 over a Representative Range of Environments within the Study Area....3.4-116

Table 3.4-6: Ranges to Temporary Threshold Shift for Sonar Bin LF4 over a Representative Range of Environments within the Study Area 3.4-117

Table 3.4-7: Ranges to Temporary Threshold Shift for Sonar Bin MF1 over a Representative Range of Environments within the Study Area 3.4-117

Table 3.4-8: Ranges to Temporary Threshold Shift for Sonar Bin MF4 over a Representative Range of Environments within the Study Area 3.4-118

Table 3.4-9: Ranges to Temporary Threshold Shift for Sonar Bin MF5 over a Representative Range of Environments within the Study Area 3.4-118

Table 3.4-10: Ranges to a Potentially Significant Behavioral Response for Sonar Bin HF4 over a Representative Range of Environments within the Study Area.....3.4-119

Table 3.4-11: Ranges to a Potentially Significant Behavioral Response for Sonar Bin LF4 over a Representative Range of Environments within the Study Area.....3.4-120

Table 3.4-12: Ranges to a Potentially Significant Behavioral Response for Sonar Bin MF1 over a Representative Range of Environments within the Study Area.....3.4-121

Table 3.4-13: Ranges to a Potentially Significant Behavioral Response for Sonar Bin MF4 over a Representative Range of Environments within the Study Area.....3.4-122

Table 3.4-14: Ranges to a Potentially Significant Behavioral Response for Sonar Bin MF5 over a Representative Range of Environments within the Study Area.....3.4-123

Table 3.4-15: Estimated Impacts on Individual Blue Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 .....3.4-130

Table 3.4-16: Estimated Impacts on Individual Blue Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-131

Table 3.4-17: Estimated Impacts on Individual Bryde's Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 .....3.4-132

Table 3.4-18: Estimated Impacts on Individual Bryde's Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-134

Table 3.4-19: Estimated Impacts on Individual Fin Whale Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 .....3.4-135

Table 3.4-20: Estimated Impacts on Individual Fin Whale Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-136

Table 3.4-21: Estimated Impacts on Individual Humpback Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1.....3.4-138

Table 3.4-22:Estimated Impacts on Individual Humpback Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-139

Table 3.4-23: Estimated Impacts on Individual Minke Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 .....3.4-140

Table 3.4-24: Estimated Impacts on Individual Minke Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-141

Table 3.4-25: Estimated Impacts on Individual Omura's Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 .....3.4-142

Table 3.4-26: Estimated Impacts on Individual Omura's Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-143

Table 3.4-27: Estimated Impacts on Individual Sei Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 .....3.4-144

Table 3.4-28: Estimated Impacts on Individual Sei Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-146

Table 3.4-29: Estimated Impacts on Individual Blainville's Beaked Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 .....3.4-151

Table 3.4-30: Estimated Impacts on Individual Cuvier's Beaked Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1.....3.4-152

Table 3.4-31: Estimated Impacts on Individual Ginkgo-Toothed Beaked Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 .....3.4-153

Table 3.4-32: Estimated Impacts on Individual Longman's Beaked Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 .....3.4-154

Table 3.4-33: Estimated Impacts on Individual Blainville's Beaked Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-155

Table 3.4-34: Estimated Impacts on Individual Cuvier's Beaked Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2.....3.4-156

Table 3.4-35: Estimated Impacts on Individual Ginkgo-Toothed Beaked Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2. .....3.4-157

Table 3.4-36: Estimated Impacts on Individual Longman's Beaked Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-158

Table 3.4-37: Estimated Impacts on Individual Bottlenose Dolphins Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1.....3.4-159

Table 3.4-38: Estimated Impacts on Individual Bottlenose Dolphins Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2.....3.4-160

Table 3.4-39: Estimated Impacts on Individual Dwarf Sperm Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1.....3.4-162

Table 3.4-40: Estimated Impacts on Individual Pygmy Sperm Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1.....3.4-162

Table 3.4-41: Estimated Impacts on Individual Dwarf Sperm Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2.....3.4-164

Table 3.4-42: Estimated Impacts on Individual Pygmy Sperm Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2.....3.4-164

Table 3.4-43: Estimated Impacts on Individual False Killer Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 .....3.4-166

Table 3.4-44: Estimated Impacts on Individual False Killer Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-167

Table 3.4-45: Estimated Impacts on Individual Fraser's Dolphin Impacts Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 .....3.4-168

Table 3.4-46: Estimated Impacts on Individual Fraser's Dolphin Impacts Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-169

Table 3.4-47: Estimated Impacts on Individual Killer Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 .....3.4-170

Table 3.4-48: Estimated Impacts on Individual Killer Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-171

Table 3.4-49: Estimated Impacts on Individual Melon-Headed Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 .....3.4-172

Table 3.4-50: Estimated Impacts on Individual Melon-Headed Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-174

Table 3.4-51: Estimated Impacts on Individual Pantropical Spotted Dolphins Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 .....3.4-175

Table 3.4-52: Estimated Impacts on Individual Pantropical Spotted Dolphins Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-176

Table 3.4-53: Estimated Impacts on Individual Pygmy Killer Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 .....3.4-177

Table 3.4-54: Estimated Impacts on Individual Pygmy Killer Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-178

Table 3.4-55: Estimated Impacts on Individual Risso's Dolphins Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 .....3.4-180

Table 3.4-56: Estimated Impacts on Individual Risso's Dolphins Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-181

Table 3.4-57: Estimated Impacts on Individual Rough-Toothed Dolphins Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 .....3.4-182

Table 3.4-58: Estimated Impacts on Individual Rough-Toothed Dolphins Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-183

Table 3.4-59: Estimated Impacts on Individual Short-Finned Pilot Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 ..... 3.4-184
Table 3.4-60: Estimated Impacts on Individual Short-Finned Pilot Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 ..... 3.4-186
Table 3.4-61: Estimated Impacts on Individual Sperm Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 ..... 3.4-187
Table 3.4-62: Estimated Impacts on Individual Sperm Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 ..... 3.4-188
Table 3.4-63: Estimated Impacts on Individual Spinner Dolphins Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 ..... 3.4-189
Table 3.4-64: Estimated Impacts on Individual Spinner Dolphins Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 ..... 3.4-191
Table 3.4-65: Estimated Impacts on Individual Striped Dolphins Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 ..... 3.4-192
Table 3.4-66: Estimated Impacts on Individual Striped Dolphins Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 ..... 3.4-193
Table 3.4-67: Criteria to Quantitatively Assess Non-Auditory Injury Due to Underwater Explosions 3.4-204
Table 3.4-68: Navy Phase III Weighted Sound Exposure Thresholds for Underwater Explosive Sounds 3.4-207
Table 3.4-69: Ranges to Non-Auditory Injury (in meters) for All Marine Mammal Hearing Groups .. 3.4-209
Table 3.4-70: Ranges to Mortality (in meters) for All Marine Mammal Hearing Groups as a Function of Animal Mass 3.4-210
Table 3.4-71: SEL-Based Ranges to Onset PTS, Onset TTS, and Behavioral Reaction (in meters) for High-Frequency Cetaceans 3.4-211
Table 3.4-72: Peak Pressure Based Ranges to Onset PTS and Onset TTS (in meters) for High-Frequency Cetaceans 3.4-212
Table 3.4-73: SEL-Based Ranges to Onset PTS, Onset TTS, and Behavioral Reaction (in meters) for Low-Frequency Cetaceans 3.4-214
Table 3.4-74: Peak Pressure Based Ranges to Onset PTS and Onset TTS (in meters) for Low-Frequency Cetaceans 3.4-215
Table 3.4-75: SEL-Based Ranges to Onset PTS, Onset TTS, and Behavioral Reaction (in meters) for Mid-Frequency Cetaceans 3.4-217
Table 3.4-76: Peak Pressure Based Ranges to Onset PTS and Onset TTS (in meters) for Mid-Frequency Cetaceans 3.4-218
Table 3.4-77: Estimated Impacts on Individual Bryde's Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 ..... 3.4-223
Table 3.4-78: Estimated Impacts on Individual Bryde's Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 ..... 3.4-224

Table 3.4-79: Estimated Impacts on Individual Humpback Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 ..... 3.4-226

Table 3.4-80: Estimated Impacts on Individual Humpback Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 ..... 3.4-227

Table 3.4-81: Estimated Impacts on Individual Minke Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 ..... 3.4-228

Table 3.4-82: Estimated Impacts on Individual Minke Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 ..... 3.4-229

Table 3.4-83: Estimated Impacts on Individual Omura's Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 ..... 3.4-231

Table 3.4-84: Estimated Impacts on Individual Sei Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 ..... 3.4-232

Table 3.4-85: Estimated Impacts on Individual Sei Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 ..... 3.4-233

Table 3.4-86: Estimated Impacts on Individual Ginkgo-Toothed Beaked Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 ..... 3.4-236

Table 3.4-87: Estimated Impacts on Individual Longman's Beaked Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 ..... 3.4-237

Table 3.4-88: Estimated Impacts on Individual Ginkgo-Toothed Beaked Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 ..... 3.4-238

Table 3.4-89: Estimated Impacts on Individual Longman's Beaked Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 ..... 3.4-239

Table 3.4-90: Estimated Impacts on Individual Dwarf Sperm Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 ..... 3.4-241

Table 3.4-91: Estimated Impacts on Individual Pygmy Sperm Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 ..... 3.4-242

Table 3.4-92: Estimated Impacts on Individual Dwarf Sperm Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 ..... 3.4-243

Table 3.4-93: Estimated Impacts on Individual Pygmy Sperm Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 ..... 3.4-244

Table 3.4-94: Estimated Impacts on Individual Fraser's Dolphins Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 ..... 3.4-246

Table 3.4-95: Estimated Impacts on Individual Fraser's Dolphins Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 ..... 3.4-247

Table 3.4-96: Estimated Impacts on Individual Melon-Headed Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 ..... 3.4-249

Table 3.4-97: Estimated Impacts on Individual Melon-Headed Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 ..... 3.4-250

Table 3.4-98: Estimated Impacts on Individual Pantropical Spotted Dolphins Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 ..... 3.4-251

Table 3.4-99: Estimated Impacts on Individual Pantropical Spotted Dolphins Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-252

Table 3.4-100: Estimated Impacts on Individual Risso's Dolphin Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 .....3.4-254

Table 3.4-101: Estimated Impacts on Individual Risso's Dolphin Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-255

Table 3.4-102: Estimated Impacts on Individual Short-Finned Pilot Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-257

Table 3.4-103: Estimated Impacts on Individual Spinner Dolphins Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 .....3.4-259

Table 3.4-104: Estimated Impacts on Individual Spinner Dolphins Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-260

Table 3.4-105: Estimated Impacts on Individual Striped Dolphins Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 .....3.4-261

Table 3.4-106: Estimated Impacts on Individual Striped Dolphins Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-262

3.5 Sea Turtles

Table 3.5-1: Endangered Species Act Status and Presence of Endangered Species Act Listed Sea Turtles in the Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area 3.5-2

Table 3.5-2: Criteria to Quantitatively Assess Non-Auditory Injury due to Underwater Explosions....3.5-31

Table 3.5-3: TTS and PTS Peak Pressure Thresholds Derived for Sea Turtles Exposed to Impulsive Sounds 3.5-34

Table 3.5-4: Ranges to Non-Auditory Injury[1] (in meters) for Sea Turtles Exposed to Explosives as a Function of Animal Mass.....3.5-36

Table 3.5-5: Ranges to Mortality for Sea Turtles Exposed to Explosives as a Function of Animal Mass[1] 3.5-37

Table 3.5-6: Peak Pressure Based Ranges to TTS and PTS for Sea Turtles Exposed to Explosives 3.5-38

Table 3.5-7: SEL Based Ranges to TTS and PTS for Sea Turtles Exposed to Explosives.....3.5-39

Table 3.5-8: Estimated Impacts on Individual Green Sea Turtles Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1.....3.5-42

Table 3.5-9: Estimated Impacts on Individual Green Sea Turtles Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2.....3.5-45

3.6 Marine Birds

Table 3.6-1: Number of Events by Activity Type on Farallon de Medinilla.....3.6-8

Table 3.6-2: Number of Munitions by Activity Type on Farallon de Medinilla.....3.6-9

Table 3.6-3: Munitions Use on Farallon de Medinilla, Net Explosive Weight Comparisons.....3.6-9

3.7 Marine Vegetation

There are no tables in this section.

3.8 Marine Invertebrates

Table 3.8-1: Status of Endangered Species Act-Listed Species Within the Study Area 3.8-5

3.9 Fishes

Table 3.9-1: Endangered Species Act Listed and Special Status Fish Species in the Mariana Islands Study Area 3.9-4
Table 3.9-2: Federally Managed Fish Species Within the Mariana Islands Study Area for Each Fishery Management Unit in the FEP 3.9-8
Table 3.9-3: Sound Exposure Criteria for TTS from Sonar 3.9-31
Table 3.9-4: Ranges to Temporary Threshold Shift from Four Representative Sonar Bins 3.9-33
Table 3.9-5: Range to 10 Percent Mortality from In-water Explosions for Fishes with a Swim Bladder 3.9-43
Table 3.9-6: Sound Exposure Criteria for Mortality and Injury from Explosives 3.9-48
Table 3.9-7: Sound Exposure Criteria for Hearing Loss from Explosives 3.9-49
Table 3.9-8: Range to Mortality and Injury for All Fishes from Explosives 3.9-50
Table 3.9-9: Range to TTS for Fishes with a Swim Bladder from Explosives 3.9-51

3.10 Terrestrial Species and Habitats

Table 3.10-1: Endangered Species Act Listed Species on Farallon de Medinilla 3.10-2

3.11 Cultural Resources

There are no tables in this section.

3.12 Socioeconomic Resources and Environmental Justice

There are no tables in this section.

3.13 Public Health and Safety

Table 3.13-1: Marine Protected Areas within the Study Area 3.13-2

4 Cumulative Impacts

Table 4.2-1: Past, Present, and Reasonably Foreseeable Actions 4-3

5 Mitigation

Table 5-1: Environmental Awareness and Education 5-20
Table 5-2: Procedural Mitigation for Active Sonar 5-22
Table 5-3: Procedural Mitigation for Weapons Firing Noise 5-25
Table 5-4: Procedural Mitigation for Explosive Sonobuoys 5-27

Table 5-5: Procedural Mitigation for Explosive Torpedoes 5-29
Table 5-6: Procedural Mitigation for Explosive Medium-Caliber and Large-Caliber Projectiles 5-32
Table 5-7: Procedural Mitigation for Explosive Missiles and Rockets 5-35
Table 5-8: Procedural Mitigation for Explosive Bombs....5-38
Table 5-9: Procedural Mitigation for Sinking Exercises 5-41
Table 5-10: Procedural Mitigation for Explosive Mine Countermeasure and Neutralization Activities 5-44
Table 5-11: Procedural Mitigation for Explosive Mine Neutralization Activities Involving Navy Divers 5-46
Table 5-12: Procedural Mitigation for Maritime Security Operations – Anti-Swimmer Grenades 5-50
Table 5-13: Procedural Mitigation for Vessel Movement....5-52
Table 5-14: Procedural Mitigation for Towed In-Water Devices....5-54
Table 5-15: Procedural Mitigation for Small-, Medium-, and Large-Caliber Non-Explosive Practice Munitions....5-55
Table 5-16: Procedural Mitigation for Non-Explosive Missiles and Rockets 5-56
Table 5-17: Procedural Mitigation for Non-Explosive Bombs and Mine Shapes....5-57
Table 5-18: Mitigation Areas for Seafloor Resources 5-58
Table 5-19: Mitigation Areas for Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles....5-63
Table 5-20: Farallon de Medinilla Mitigation Measures....5-65
Table 5-21: Summary of At-Sea Procedural Mitigation 5-78
Table 5-22: Summary of At-Sea Mitigation Areas....5-79
Table 5-23: Summary of Terrestrial Mitigation....5-80

6 Additional Regulatory Considerations

Table 6.1-1: Summary of Environmental Compliance for the Proposed Action....6-2

7 List of Preparers

There are no tables in this chapter.

8 Distribution List

Table 8.2-1: Federal and Local Entities that Received the Scoping Notification Letter....8-4
Table 8.2-2: Newspaper Publications for Scoping 8-13
Table 8.3-1: Federal and Local Entities that Received the Draft SEIS/OEIS Notification Letter 8-25
Table 8.3-2: Newspaper Publications of Draft SEIS/OEIS and Public Meetings....8-36
Table 8.3-3: Public Meeting Locations....8-48
Table 8.5-1: Information Repositories 8-49

Appendices

Appendix A Training and Testing Activities Descriptions

Appendix B Federal Register Notices

Appendix C Agency Correspondence

Appendix D Air Quality Emissions Calculations

Appendix E Estimated Marine Mammal and Sea Turtle Impacts from Exposure to Acoustic and Explosive Stressors Under Navy Training and Testing Activities

Appendix F Training and Testing Activities Matrices

Appendix G Conceptual Framework for Assessing Effects on Biological Resources

Appendix H Acoustic and Explosive Concepts

Appendix I Geographic Mitigation Assessment

Appendix J Statistical Probability Analysis for Estimating Direct Strike Impact and Number of Potential Exposures from Military Expended Materials

Appendix K Public Comment Responses

Acronyms and Abbreviations

Acronym	Definition
µPa	Micropascal(s)
ac.	Acre(s)
AGL	Above Ground Level
AMRAAM	Advanced Medium-Range Air-to-Air Missile
AnnualEx	Annual Exercise
ANSI	American National Standards Institute
BO	Biological Opinion
BOBO	2nd Lt. John P. Bobo class vessel
BSP	Bureau of Statistics and Plans
CD	Consistency Determination
CEQ	Council on Environmental Quality
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CJMT	Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands Joint Military Training
CNMI	Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands
CO	Carbon Monoxide
CV	Coefficient of Variation
dB	Decibel(s)
dB re 1 µPa	Decibels referenced to 1 micropascal
dB re 1 μPa^2s	Decibels referenced to 1 micropascal squared seconds
dBA	A-weighted decibel
dBA re 1 µPa	A-weighted db referenced to 1 micropascal
dBA re 1 μPa^2s	A-weighted db referenced to 1 micropascal squared seconds
DCRM	Division of Coastal Resources Management
DDT	Dichlorodiphenyltrichloroethane
DNT	Dinitrotoluene
DoD	Department of Defense
DPS	Distinct Population Segment
EEZ	Exclusive Economic Zone
EFH	Essential Fish Habitat
EFHA	Essential Fish Habitat Assessment
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
EO	Executive Order
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
ESA	Endangered Species Act
FAA	Federal Aviation Administration
FDM	Farallon de Medinilla
FEP	Fishery Ecosystem Plan
FR	Federal Register
ft.	Foot/feet
FY	Fiscal Year
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GuamEx	Guam Exercise
GUNEX	Gunnery Exercise
ha	Hectare
HAPC	Habitat Area of Particular Concern
HARM	High-Speed Anti-Radiation Missile
HE-ET	High Explosive-Electronic Time
HF	High Frequency
HMX	High Melting Explosive
HPO	Historic Preservation Officer
hr.	Hour(s)
HRC	Hawaii Range Complex
Hz	Hertz
in.	Inch(es)
JRM	Joint Region Marianas
kHz	Kilohertz
km	Kilometers
lb.	Pound(s)
LF	Low Frequency
LMSR	Large, Medium Speed, Roll On/Roll Off
LOA	Letter of Authorization
m	Meter(s)

Acronym	Definition
MBTA	Migratory Bird Treaty Act
MF	Mid-Frequency
MHz	Megahertz
mi.	Mile(s)
MIRC	Mariana Islands Range Complex
MISSILEX	Missile Exercise
MITT	Mariana Islands Training and Testing
mm	millimeter(s)
MMPA	Marine Mammal Protection Act
MPA	Marine Protected Area
MSA	Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act
MSC	Military Sealift Command
Navy	U.S. Department of the Navy
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NEPM	Non-Explosive Practice Munition
NEW	Net explosive weight
NM	Nautical Mile(s)
NM^2	Square Nautical Miles
NMFS	National Marine Fisheries Service
NOAA	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
NOTAM	Notice to Airmen
NOTMAR	Notice to Mariners
NO_x	Nitrogen oxide
OEIS	Overseas Environmental Impact Statement
Pa	Pascal
Pa-s	Pascal-second(s)
PCB	Polychlorinated Biphenyl
PM_{10}	Particulate matter less than 10 microns
$PM_{2.5}$	Particulate matter less than 2.5 microns
PSD	Prevention of Significant Deterioration
psi	Pounds per square inch
Psi-ms	Pounds per square inch per millisecond
PTS	Permanent Threshold Shift
R	Restricted Area
RDX	Royal Demolition Explosive
RL	Received SPL
rms	Root-Mean-Square
ROD	Record of Decision
SAR	Stock Assessment Report
SEIS	Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement
SEL	Sound Exposure Level
SHPO	State Historic Preservation Officer
SL	Source Level
SO_2	Sulfur Dioxide
SO_X	Sulfur Oxide
SPL	Sound Pressure Level
SWATT	Surface Warfare Advanced Tactical Training
TNT	Trinitrotoluene
tpy	Tons per year
TS	Threshold Shift
TTS	Temporary Threshold Shift
U.S.	United States
U.S.C.	United States Code
UNDET	Underwater Detonation
USFWS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
VOC	Volatile Organic Compound
W	Warning Area

1 Purpose and Need

Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/ Overseas Environmental Impact Statement Mariana Islands Training and Testing

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1 PURPOSE AND NEED 1-1
1.1 Introduction 1-1
1.2 The Navy's Environmental Compliance and At-Sea Policy 1-3
1.3 Proposed Action 1-4
1.4 Purpose and Need 1-4
1.4.1 Why the Navy Trains 1-5
1.4.2 Why the Navy Tests 1-6
1.5 Overview and Strategic Importance of Existing Range Complex 1-6
1.6 The Environmental Planning Process 1-7
1.6.1 National Environmental Policy Act Requirements 1-8
1.6.2 Executive Order 12114 1-8
1.6.3 Other Environmental Requirements Considered 1-9
1.6.3.1 Executive Order 13840, Ocean Policy to Advance the Economic, Security, and Environmental Interests of the United States 1-9
1.7 Scope and Content 1-9
1.8 Organization of this Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement 1-9

List of Figures

Figure 1.1-1: Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area 1-3
Figure 1.6-1: National Environmental Policy Act Process Conducted for this SEIS/OEIS 1-8

List of Tables

There are no tables in this chapter.

This page intentionally left blank.

1 Purpose and Need

1.1 Introduction

The United States (U.S.) Department of the Navy (Navy) has prepared this supplement to the May 2015 Mariana Islands Training and Testing (MITT) Final Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (EIS/OEIS) (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2015) pursuant to Council on Environmental Quality Regulations. The Navy proposes to conduct training activities (referred to as "training"), and research, development, testing and evaluation (referred to as "testing") activities in the MITT Study Area, primarily within the existing Mariana Islands Range Complex (MIRC), as represented in Figure 1.1-1. Training and testing activities, collectively referred to as "military readiness activities," that prepare the Navy to fulfill its mission to protect and defend the United States and its allies, have the potential to impact the environment. The Navy prepared this Supplemental EIS (SEIS)/OEIS to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and Executive Order 12114, *Environmental Effects Abroad of Major Federal Actions*, by reassessing the potential environmental impacts associated with the proposed military readiness activities to be conducted within the Study Area.

This SEIS/OEIS was prepared to update the Navy's assessment of the potential environmental impacts associated with proposed training and testing to be conducted at sea and on Farallon de Medinilla (FDM). These proposed activities are generally consistent with those at-sea and FDM activities analyzed in the May 2015 *Final Mariana Islands Training and Testing Activities Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement* (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2015), referred to as the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, and are representative of activities the military has been conducting in the Study Area for decades.[1] These military readiness activities include the use of active sonar and explosives at sea off the coasts of Guam and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (CNMI), throughout the in-water areas around the MIRC, the transit corridor between the MIRC and the Hawaii Range Complex, and at select Navy pierside and harbor locations.

The 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS also analyzed training and testing activities conducted at existing MIRC land-based training areas located on Guam, Saipan, Tinian, and Rota. The Navy consulted with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service regarding effects of the land-based training activities on terrestrial species listed under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) and received a Biological Opinion (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2015) and concurrence letter (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2016). The Navy is not proposing any changes to those land-based activities on Guam, Saipan, Tinian, and Rota. Therefore, in accordance with 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Section 1502.9, the Navy will continue to rely on the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS for land-based activities because there are no changes that are relevant to environmental concerns or that would have a bearing on the land-based activities or their impacts. In

[1] Activities analyzed in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS are largely a continuation of the ongoing training and testing activities that were analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, 2010 MIRC EIS/OEIS, and 1999 Mariana EIS/OEIS. Section 1.2 (The Navy's Environmental Compliance and At-Sea Policy) of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS presents a summary of the Navy's environmental compliance and "At-Sea Policy."

addition, in accordance with 50 CFR Section 402.16, the 2015 and 2016 consultations remain valid as none of the factors necessary to trigger reinitiating consultation have been met.

New information specifically addressed in this SEIS/OEIS includes updates to training and testing requirements, an updated acoustic effects model, updated marine mammal density data, and evolving and emergent best available science.[2] Using the updated information, the Navy requested the reissuance of federal regulatory permits and authorizations under the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA) and ESA to support training and testing requirements within the Study Area beyond the 2020 expiration of current authorization. The Navy consulted with the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) to obtain new authorizations. While the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS Study Area remains unchanged, this SEIS/OEIS focuses on the at-sea and FDM portion of that area. The Study Area consists of three primary components: (1) the MIRC, (2) additional areas on the high seas, and (3) a transit corridor between the MIRC and the Hawaii Range Complex. Collectively, these areas continue to be referred to as the MITT Study Area (Figure 1.1-1).

The United States is facing a complex and volatile security environment. Major conflicts, terrorism, and natural disasters all have the potential to threaten national security of the United States. The security, prosperity, and vital interests of the United States are increasingly tied to other nations because of the close relationships between the United States and other national economies. The Navy operates on the world's oceans, seas, and coastal areas—the international maritime domain—on which 90 percent of the world's trade and two-thirds of its oil are transported. The majority of the world's population also lives within a few hundred miles of an ocean. The U.S. Navy carries out training and testing activities to be able to protect the United States against its potential adversaries, to protect and defend the rights and interests of the United States and its allies to move freely on the oceans, and to provide humanitarian assistance.

Department of Defense actions in the Western Pacific have previously been, or are currently, the subject of various environmental planning documents. These include realignment of Marine Corps forces to Guam, ongoing EIS efforts to address joint training and land-based training requirements in the CNMI, and EIS efforts to discuss Air Force divert landing and training requirements in the CNMI. The training and testing activities covered by the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, as well as in this supplement, are separate and distinct from the actions proposed by Marine Corps forces and those of the U.S. Air Force within the CNMI. This SEIS/OEIS only addresses ongoing and future at-sea and FDM training and testing activities that are independent and do not rely on any realignment efforts. Further, the training and testing activities covered by the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and this SEIS/OEIS have been occurring in the Study Area for decades and would continue regardless of whether any of the other Department of Defense efforts in the Western Pacific come to fruition.

[2] The 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS used a new modeling system known as the Navy Acoustics Effects Model and marine mammal density information, developed by the Navy in cooperation with the National Marine Fisheries Service, that was the best available information at the time. The Navy Acoustics Effects Model has been refined, marine mammal density estimates have been updated, NMFS has published new criteria, and criteria used in the acoustic model have been revised.




Figure 1.1-1: Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area

1.2 The Navy's Environmental Compliance and At-Sea Policy

In 2000, the Navy completed a review of its environmental compliance requirements for exercises and training at sea. The Navy then instituted the "At-Sea Policy" (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2000) to ensure compliance with applicable environmental regulations and policies, and preserve the flexibility necessary for the Navy to train and test at sea. This policy directed, in part, that Fleet Commanders develop a programmatic approach to environmental compliance at sea for ranges and operational areas within their respective geographic areas of responsibility (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2000). Those ranges affected by the "At-Sea Policy" are designated water areas, sometimes containing instrumentation, which are managed and used to conduct training and testing activities. Some ranges are further broken down into operational areas, to better manage and deconflict military readiness activities.

In 2005, the Navy and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration reached an agreement on a coordinated programmatic strategy for assessing certain environmental effects of military readiness activities at sea.

The first phase of the programmatic strategy was accomplished by the preparation and completion of individual or separate NEPA/Executive Order 12114 environmental documents for training and testing activities at each range complex. The second phase of the Navy's environmental compliance planning covered activities and existing ranges and operating areas previously analyzed in the Phase I NEPA/Executive Order 12114 documents and additional geographic areas including, but not limited to, pierside locations and a transit corridor. The Navy is currently in the third phase of implementing this programmatic approach, which covers similar types of military readiness training and testing activities in the same MITT Study Area analyzed in Phase II. As was done in Phase I and Phase II, the Navy will use the Phase III analysis to support regulatory consultations and a request for a letter of authorization under the MMPA and incidental take statements under the ESA. Given that the training and testing activities have not substantially changed, there is not a significant change in environmental impacts when compared to activities analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, and the same Study Area is used for the proposed activities, the Navy determined an SEIS/OEIS to be appropriate for Phase III of the Navy's environmental compliance planning in the MITT Study Area. For further discussion of the first two phases, please see Section 1.2 (The Navy's Environmental Compliance and At-Sea Policy) of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

1.3 Proposed Action

The Navy's Proposed Action, described in detail in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives), is to conduct military readiness training and testing activities in the Study Area (Figure 1.1-1).

1.4 Purpose and Need

The Navy and NMFS (as a cooperating agency) have coordinated from the outset and developed this document to meet each agency's distinct NEPA obligations and support the decision making of both agencies. The Navy's purpose of the Proposed Action is to conduct training and testing activities to ensure that the Navy and other Services meet their respective missions, which, for the Navy, is to maintain, train, and equip combat-ready military forces capable of winning wars, deterring aggression, and maintaining freedom of the seas. The respective missions are achieved in part by conducting training and testing within the Study Area in accordance with established Navy military readiness requirements. The sections that follow provide a description of the need for military readiness activities. Appendix A (Training and Testing Activities Descriptions) provides detailed Navy and other Services' activities descriptions.

Title 10 section 8062 of the U.S. Code provides: "The Navy shall be organized, trained, and equipped primarily for prompt and sustained combat incident to operations at sea. It is responsible for the preparation of naval forces necessary for the effective prosecution of war except as otherwise assigned and, in accordance with integrated joint mobilization plans, for the expansion of the peacetime components of the Navy to meet the needs of war."

The Navy has requested authorization to take marine mammals incidental to conducting their training and testing activities in the Study Area by Level A and B harassment, serious injury, and/or mortality. Take under the MMPA (50 CFR 216.3) is defined as "to

harass, hunt, capture, collect, or kill, or attempt to harass, hunt, capture, collect, or kill any marine mammal." For military readiness activities, the MMPA defines harassment "(i) any act that injures or has the significant potential to injure a marine mammal or marine mammal stock in the wild [Level A harassment] or (ii) any act that disturbs or is likely to disturb a marine mammal or marine mammal stock in the wild by causing disruption of natural behavioral patterns, including, but not limited to, migration, surfacing, nursing, breeding, feeding, or sheltering, to a point where such behavioral patterns are abandoned or significantly altered [Level B harassment]."

NMFS has issued proposed regulations and is considering issuance of a subsequent Letter of Authorization (LOA) under section 101(a)(5)(A) of the MMPA of 1972, as amended (16 United States Code [U.S.C.] 1361 et seq.) that would govern the taking of marine mammals incidental to the Navy training and testing activities within the Study Area. The issuance of regulations and associated LOA to the Navy is a major federal action requiring NMFS to analyze the effects of their issuance on the human environment pursuant to NEPA requirements and National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration policies.

The purpose of issuing an incidental take authorization is to provide an exception to the take prohibition in the MMPA and to ensure that the action complies with the MMPA and implementing regulations. Incidental take authorizations may be issued as either (1) regulations and associated LOA under section 101(a)(5)(A) of the MMPA or (2) Incidental Harassment Authorization under section 101(a)(5)(D) of the MMPA. An Incidental Harassment Authorization can be issued only when there is no potential for serious injury or mortality or where any such potential can be negated through required mitigation measures. Because some of the activities under the Proposed Action may create a potential for lethal takes or takes that may result in serious injury that could lead to mortality, the Navy is requesting rulemaking and the issuance of an LOA for this action.

NMFS's purpose is to evaluate the Navy's Proposed Action pursuant to NMFS's authority under the MMPA, and to make a determination whether to issue incidental take regulations and a LOA, including any conditions needed to meet the statutory mandates of the MMPA. To authorize the incidental take of marine mammals, NMFS evaluates the best available scientific information to determine whether the take would have a negligible impact on the affected marine mammal species or stocks and an unmitigable impact on their availability for taking for subsistence uses (not relevant here for Navy's proposed action). NMFS must also prescribe permissible methods of taking, other "means of effecting the least practicable adverse impact" on the affected species or stocks and their habitat, and monitoring and reporting requirements. NMFS cannot issue an incidental take authorization unless it can make the required findings as stated above. The need for NMFS's action is to consider the impacts of the Navy's activities on marine mammals and meet NMFS's obligations under the MMPA. This SEIS/OEIS analyzes the environmental impacts associated with issuance of the requested authorization of the take of marine mammals incidental to the training and testing activities within the Study Area, to include a variety of mitigation measures that were considered during the MMPA authorization process. The analysis of mitigation measures considers benefits to species or stocks and their habitat, and analyzes the practicability and efficacy of each measure. This analysis of mitigation measures was used to support requirements pertaining to mitigation, monitoring, and reporting that would be specified in final MMPA regulations and subsequent LOA.

1.4.1 Why the Navy Trains

As described above, the Navy is statutorily mandated to protect U.S. national security by being ready, at all times, to effectively prosecute war and defend the nation by conducting operations at sea. The Navy

is essential to protecting U.S. national interests, considering that 70 percent of the earth is covered in water, 80 percent of the planet's population lives within close proximity to coastal areas, and 90 percent of global commerce is conducted by sea. Naval forces must be ready for a variety of military operations to address the dynamic, social, political, economic, and environmental issues that occur in today's rapidly evolving world. Through its continuous presence on the world's oceans, the Navy can respond to a wide range of situations because, on any given day, over one-third of its ships, submarines, and aircraft are deployed overseas. Units must be able to respond promptly and effectively while forward deployed. This presence helps to dissuade aggression, which prevents conflict escalation, and provides the President with options to promptly address global contingencies. Before deploying, naval forces must train to develop a broad range of capabilities to respond to threats, from full-scale armed conflict in a variety of different geographic areas and environmental conditions to humanitarian assistance and disaster relief efforts. Training prepares Navy personnel to be proficient in safely operating and maintaining the equipment, weapons, and systems they will use to conduct their assigned missions. The training process provides personnel with an in-depth understanding of their individual limits and capabilities; the training process also helps the testing community improve new weapon systems' capabilities and effectiveness. Refer to Chapter 1, Section 1.4.1 (Why the Navy Trains) in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS for additional information on Navy training.

1.4.2 Why the Navy Tests

The Navy's research and acquisition community, including research-funding organizations, laboratory facilities, and systems commands, has a mission to provide weapons, systems, and platforms for the Navy to support its missions and ensure a technological edge over the United States' potential adversaries. This community is at the forefront of researching, developing, testing, evaluating, acquiring, and delivering modern platforms, systems, and related equipment to meet Fleet capability and readiness requirements. The Navy's research funding organizations and laboratories concentrate primarily on the development of new science and technology, and the initial testing of concepts that are relevant to the Navy of the future. As a result, systems commands develop ship, aircraft, and weapons products that support all Navy platforms throughout their lifecycles from systems acquisition through sustainment to end of life. Refer to Chapter 1, Section 1.5.1 (Why the Navy Tests) in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS for additional information on Navy testing. The Navy's research and acquisition community operating in the Study Area includes the following:

- The Naval Sea Systems Command, which develops, acquires, delivers, and maintains surface ships, submarines, unmanned vehicles, and weapon system platforms.
- The Naval Air Systems Command, which develops, tests, acquires, delivers, and sustains naval aviation aircraft, unmanned aerial systems, weapons, and systems.
- The Office of Naval Research, which plans, fosters, and encourages scientific research that promotes future naval sea power and enhances national security.

1.5 Overview and Strategic Importance of Existing Range Complex

The Navy has historically used areas in the Study Area for training and testing. The Navy has designated a portion of the Study Area as a "range complex" (see Figure 1.1-1) A range complex provides a controlled environment where military ship, submarine, and aircraft crews can train in realistic conditions while safely deconflicting with non-military activities, such as civilian shipping and aircraft. Sufficient sea and airspace in proximity to land training ranges, airfields, nearshore amphibious landing sites, and special use airspace is critical to realistic training and testing. Diverse and realistic training is

critical to ensuring U.S. Forces, when needed, are both ready and able to effectively conduct operations in myriad environments.

Systems commands also require access to a realistic environment to conduct testing. The systems commands frequently conduct tests on Fleet range complexes and use Fleet assets to support the testing. The MIRC, which is primarily used by the systems commands, must provide the flexibility to meet diverse testing requirements, given the wide range of various advanced platforms and systems and capabilities that the fleets and systems commands must demonstrate before certification for deployment to the Fleet. This is important because testing in conditions that reflect (or are similar to) those in which the technology could be employed enhances combat readiness.

The MIRC is characterized by a unique combination of attributes that make it a strategically important range complex, including:

- Location within and adjacent to a U.S. territory
- Ranges and operating areas on the islands of Guam, Rota, Saipan, Tinian, and FDM
- Expansive airspace, surface sea space, and underwater sea space
- Authorized use of multiple types of explosive and non-explosive ordnance on FDM
- Support for all Navy warfare areas and numerous other service roles, missions, and tactical tasks
- Support for service units based at military installations on Guam
- Training support for deployed forces
- Ability to conduct joint and combined force exercises, including those in which foreign partners and allies participate
- Rehearsal area for Western Pacific contingencies

1.6 The Environmental Planning Process

NEPA and Executive Order 12114 require federal agencies to examine the environmental impacts of their proposed actions within the United States and its territories. An EIS is a detailed public document that assesses the potential effects that a major federal action might have on the human environment. The Navy undertakes environmental planning for major Navy actions in accordance with applicable laws, regulations, and Executive Orders.

Pursuant to 40 CFR section 1502.9(c), a supplemental EIS is prepared when the agency makes substantial changes in the proposed action that are relevant to environmental concerns (40 CFR section 1502.9(c)(1)(i)); or there are significant new circumstances or information relevant to environmental concerns and bearing on the proposed action or its impacts (40 CFR section 1502.9(c)(1)(ii)). An agency may also supplement a final EIS when the agency determines that the purpose of NEPA will be furthered by doing so (40 CFR section 1502(c)(2)).

Pursuant to Council on Environmental Quality Regulations, the Navy has prepared this supplement to the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS to consider future activities conducted at sea and on FDM, and updated training and testing requirements; incorporate new information from an updated acoustic effects model and updated marine mammal density data; and incorporate evolving and emergent best available science. It will also support any reissuance of federal regulatory permits and authorizations under the MMPA and the ESA using the best available science and analytical methods to assess potential environmental impacts.

1.6.1 National Environmental Policy Act Requirements

When developing a supplement to an existing EIS/OEIS, the first step in the NEPA process (Figure 1.6-1) is to prepare a Notice of Intent. The Notice of Intent is published in the Federal Register and in local newspapers, and provides an overview of the proposed action and the scope of this SEIS/OEIS (see Appendix B, Federal Register Notices). The Notice of Intent is also the first step in engaging the public, initiating the scoping process.

Scoping is an early and open process for developing the "scope" of issues to be addressed in an EIS and for identifying significant issues related to a proposed action. In accordance with the Council on Environmental Quality regulations (40 CFR section 1501.7) for implementing the requirements of NEPA, scoping is not required for a supplement to a draft or final EIS; however, in an effort to maximize public participation and ensure the public's input was considered, the Navy chose to conduct a scoping period for this SEIS/OEIS.

After the scoping process, a Draft SEIS/OEIS is prepared to assess potential impacts of the proposed action and alternatives on the environment. When completed, a Notice of Availability is published in the Federal Register and notices are placed in local or regional newspapers announcing the availability of the Draft SEIS/OEIS. The Draft SEIS/OEIS is circulated for public review and comment. Public meetings may also be scheduled to further inform the public and solicit their comments.

The Final SEIS/OEIS considers and addresses all public comments received on the Draft SEIS/OEIS. Responses to public comments may include factual corrections, supplements or modifications to analysis, and inclusion of new information. Additionally, responses may explain why the comments do not warrant further agency response.

Finally, the decision-maker will issue a Record of Decision no earlier than 30 days after the Final SEIS/OEIS is made available to the public (40 CFR section 1505.2 and 40 CFR section 1506.10 (b)(2)).

For a description of how the Navy complies with each of these requirements during the development of this SEIS/OEIS, please see Chapter 8 (Public Involvement and Distribution).




Figure 1.6-1: National Environmental Policy Act Process Conducted for this SEIS/OEIS

1.6.2 Executive Order 12114

Executive Order 12114 of 1979, *Environmental Impacts Abroad of Major Federal Actions*, furthers the purpose of NEPA by directing federal agencies to provide for informed environmental decision-making for major federal actions outside the United States and its territories. Presidential Proclamation 5928, issued December 27, 1988, extended the exercise of U.S. sovereignty and jurisdiction under international law to 12 nautical miles (NM) from the shoreline; however, the proclamation expressly provides that it does not extend or otherwise alter existing federal law or any associated jurisdiction, rights, legal interests, or obligations. Thus, as a matter of policy, the Navy analyzes environmental effects and actions within 12 NM under NEPA (an EIS) and those effects occurring beyond 12 NM under the provisions of Executive Order 12114 (an OEIS).

1.6.3 Other Environmental Requirements Considered

The Navy must comply with all applicable federal environmental laws, regulations, and executive orders as discussed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Further information can be found in Chapter 6 (Additional Regulatory Considerations). Since the publication of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, Executive Order 13840, *Ocean Policy to Advance the Economic, Security, and Environmental Interests of the United States* revoked and replaced Executive Order 13547, *Stewardship of the Ocean, Our Coasts, and the Great Lakes.*

1.6.3.1 Executive Order 13840, Ocean Policy to Advance the Economic, Security, and Environmental Interests of the United States

On June 19, 2018, President Trump signed Executive Order 13840. The Executive Order is intended to advance the economic, security, and environmental interests of the United States through improved public access to marine data and information; efficient federal agency coordination on ocean-related matters; and engagement with marine industries, the science and technology community, and other ocean stakeholders, including Regional Ocean Partnerships. The Executive Order continues to require federal agencies to coordinate activities regarding ocean-related matters for effective management of the ocean as well as promote lawful use of the ocean by agencies, including the Armed Forces. The Navy continues to engage with regional and state ocean planning entities. This Executive Order revokes and replaces Executive Order 13547, *Stewardship of the Ocean, Our Coasts, and the Great Lakes*.

1.7 Scope and Content

In this SEIS/OEIS, the Navy reanalyzed at-sea and FDM military readiness activities that could potentially impact the natural resources, such as marine mammals, sea turtles, and other marine resources. Since the completion of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, new information has become available and is incorporated in this analysis, in addition to proposed changes in training and testing requirements. The range of alternatives in this SEIS/OEIS includes the No Action Alternative and two action alternatives. In this SEIS/OEIS, the Navy analyzed direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts that may result from the Proposed Action. The Navy is the lead agency for the Proposed Action and is responsible for the scope and content of this SEIS/OEIS. The U.S. Coast Guard is a cooperating agency, and this SEIS/OEIS addresses its at-sea and FDM training activities, which are included in the Proposed Action.

The National Oceanic Atmospheric Administration's NMFS is serving as a cooperating agency because the scope of the Proposed Action and alternatives involves activities that have the potential to impact protected resources under their jurisdiction by law and special expertise, including marine mammals, threatened and endangered species, and Essential Fish Habitat. The National Oceanic Atmospheric Administration's authorities and special expertise is based on their statutory responsibilities under the MMPA of 1972, as amended 16 U.S.C. 1361 et seq.), the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.), and the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act. In addition, NMFS, in accordance with 40 CFR 1506.3 and 1505.2, may adopt this SEIS/OEIS and issue a separate Record of Decision associated with its decision to grant or deny the Navy's request for an incidental take authorization pursuant to Section 101(a)(5)(A) of the MMPA.

1.8 Organization of this Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement

This SEIS/OEIS is organized as follows:

- Chapter 1 (Purpose and Need) describes the purpose of and need for the Proposed Action.

- Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) describes the Proposed Action and proposed changes to the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS implemented actions projected to take place starting in 2020, and alternatives to be carried forward for analysis.
- Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) describes the existing conditions of the affected environment and potential environmental consequences on those resources requiring additional discussion or analysis beyond what was analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.
- Chapter 4 (Cumulative Impacts) describes the analysis of cumulative impacts, which are the impacts of the Proposed Action when added to past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions.
- Chapter 5 (Mitigation) describes the measures the Navy evaluated that could mitigate impacts to the environment.
- Chapter 6 (Additional Regulatory Considerations) describes considerations required by NEPA and describes how the Navy complies with other federal, state, and local plans, policies, and regulations.
- Chapter 7 (List of Preparers) includes a list of preparers of this SEIS/OEIS.
- Chapter 8 (Public Involvement and Distribution) describes the public participation process.
- References are provided at the end of each section.
- Appendices provide technical information that support the SEIS/OEIS analyses and its conclusions.

REFERENCES

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2000). *Compliance with Environmental Requirements in the Conduct of Naval Exercises or Training at Sea*. Washington, DC: The Under Secretary of the Navy.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2015). *Final Mariana Islands Training and Testing Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement*. Pearl Harbor, HI: Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Pacific.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. (2015). *Biological Opinion for the Mariana Islands Training and Testing Program*. Honolulu, HI: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Pacific Islands Fish and Wildlife Office.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. (2016). *Informal Consultation on Mariana Islands Training and Testing Program Affects to Eighteen Newly-Listed Species, Guam and Tinian*. Honolulu, HI: Fish and Wildlife Service, Pacific Islands Fish and Wildlife Office.

This page intentionally left blank.

2 Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives

Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/ Overseas Environmental Impact Statement Mariana Islands Training and Testing

TABLE OF CONTENTS

2 DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES....2-1

2.1 Description of the Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area....2-2

2.1.1 Description of the Mariana Islands Range Complex....2-2

2.1.1.1 Special Use Airspace and Air Traffic Controlled Assigned Airspace....2-2

2.1.1.2 Sea and Undersea Space....2-3

2.1.2 Description of the Ocean Operating Areas Outside the Bounds of the Mariana Islands Range Complex....2-7

2.1.3 Description of Pierside Locations and Apra Harbor....2-7

2.2 Primary Mission Areas....2-7

2.2.1 Air Warfare....2-7

2.2.2 Amphibious Warfare....2-9

2.2.3 Anti-Submarine Warfare....2-9

2.2.4 Electronic Warfare....2-9

2.2.5 Expeditionary Warfare....2-10

2.2.6 Mine Warfare....2-10

2.2.7 Strike Warfare....2-11

2.2.8 Surface Warfare....2-11

2.3 Proposed Activities....2-11

2.3.1 Changes to Proposed Activities....2-12

2.3.1.1 New Technologies and Capabilities....2-12

2.3.1.2 Renamed and Reorganized Testing Activities....2-12

2.3.2 Proposed Training and Testing Activities....2-12

2.3.3 Standard Operating Procedures....2-14

2.3.3.1 High-Energy Laser Safety....2-15

2.3.3.2 Sea Space and Airspace Deconfliction....2-15

2.3.3.3 Target Deployment and Retrieval Safety....2-16

2.3.3.4 Pierside Testing Safety....2-16

2.3.3.5 Underwater Detonation Safety....2-16

2.3.3.6 Sonic Booms....2-17

2.3.3.7 Unmanned Surface Vehicle Safety....2-17

2.3.3.8 Sinking Exercise Safety....2-17
2.3.3.9 Amphibious Assault and Amphibious Raid Procedures....2-17
2.3.4 Mitigation Measures....2-18
2.4 Action Alternatives Development....2-19
2.4.1 Alternatives Eliminated from Further Consideration....2-20
2.4.1.1 "Status Quo" Alternative....2-20
2.4.1.2 Alternative Training and Testing Locations....2-20
2.4.1.3 Reduced Training and Testing....2-20
2.4.1.4 Alternatives Including Geographic Mitigation Measures within the Study Area....2-20
2.4.1.5 Simulated Training and Testing Only....2-21
2.4.1.6 Training and Testing Without the Use of Active Sonar....2-21
2.4.2 Alternatives Carried Forward....2-21
2.4.2.1 No Action Alternative....2-22
2.4.2.2 Alternative 1....2-23
2.4.2.3 Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)....2-24
2.4.3 Comparison of Proposed Sonar and Explosive Use in the Action Alternatives....2-25
2.4.3.1 Sonar Use....2-25
2.4.3.2 Explosives Use....2-26
2.5 Comparison of Alternatives....2-27

List of Figures

Figure 2.1-1: Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area....2-3
Figure 2.1-2: Mariana Islands Range Complex Airspace....2-4
Figure 2.1-3: Warning Area 517....2-5
Figure 2.1-4: Farallon de Medinilla Restricted Area 7201, 7201A, and Danger Zone....2-6
Figure 2.2-1: Apra Harbor Naval Complex (Main Base) and Main Base/Polaris Point....2-8
Figure 2.4-1: Proposed Annual Total Hull-Mounted Mid-Frequency Sonar Hour Use Compared to the Number Authorized in the 2015–2020 Marine Mammal Protection Act Permit....2-25
Figure 2.4-2: Proposed Annual Explosives Use (Bins E1–E5) Compared to the 2015–2020 Marine Mammal Protection Act Permit....2-26
Figure 2.4-3: Proposed Annual Explosives Use (Bins E6–E12) Compared to the 2015–2020 Marine Mammal Protection Act Permit....2-27

List of Tables

Table 2.3-1: Major Training Exercises and Integrated/Coordinated Anti-Submarine Warfare Training Activities....2-14
Table 2.3-2: Overview of Mitigation Categories....2-19
Table 2.5-1: Current and Proposed Training Activities....2-28
Table 2.5-2: Current and Proposed Testing Activities....2-42

This page intentionally left blank.

2 Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives

The United States (U.S.) Department of the Navy (Navy) proposes to conduct military readiness activities which include training activities (referred to as "training"), and research, development, testing, and evaluation (referred to as "testing") activities in the Mariana Islands Training and Testing (MITT) Study Area, primarily within the existing Mariana Islands Range Complex (MIRC). This Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS/OEIS) is being prepared to assess the potential environmental impacts associated with proposed training and testing activities to be conducted at sea and on Farallon de Medinilla (FDM). These proposed activities are generally consistent with those at-sea and FDM activities analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)/OEIS and are representative of activities the military has been conducting in the Study Area since the 1940s. These training and testing activities include the use of active sonar and explosives at sea off the coasts of Guam and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (CNMI), throughout the in-water areas around the MIRC, the transit corridor between the MIRC and the Hawaii Range Complex (HRC), and at select Navy pierside and harbor locations.

In this chapter, the military builds upon the purpose and need to train and test (as described in Chapter 1) by describing the Study Area and identifying the primary mission areas for which these training and testing activities are conducted. Each warfare community (e.g., aviation, surface, submarine, and expeditionary) conducts training and testing activities that contribute to the success of these primary mission areas. Each primary mission area requires unique skills, sensors, weapons, and technologies to accomplish the overall mission. For example, under the anti-submarine warfare primary mission area, surface, submarine, and aviation warfare communities each utilize different skills, sensors, and weapons to locate, track, and eliminate submarine threats. The testing community contributes to the success of anti-submarine warfare by anticipating and identifying technologies and systems that respond to the needs of the warfare communities. See Section 2.2 (Primary Mission Areas) and Section 2.3 (Proposed Activities) for additional information.

This chapter describes the activities that comprise the Proposed Action for this SEIS/OEIS necessary to meet training and testing requirements beyond 2020 and into the reasonably foreseeable future. These at-sea and FDM activities are then analyzed for their potential effects on the environment in the resource-specific chapters of this SEIS/OEIS. For further details regarding specific training and testing activities, please see Appendix A (Training and Testing Activities Descriptions). The Navy has requested from the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) an incidental take authorization under the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA), and an incidental take statement under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) for marine species. Relative to compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), NMFS' Proposed Action will be a direct outcome of responding to the Navy's request for an incidental take authorization pursuant to the MMPA.

The 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS also analyzed training and testing activities conducted at existing MIRC land-based training areas located on Guam, Saipan, Tinian, and Rota. The Navy consulted with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service regarding effects of the land-based training activities on terrestrial species listed under the ESA and received a Biological Opinion (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2015) and concurrence letter (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2016). As the Navy is not proposing any changes to those land-based activities on Guam, Saipan, Tinian, and Rota, the Navy will continue to rely on the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS because there is no new information that would affect the EIS/OEIS analysis. In addition, in accordance with 50 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) section 402.16, the 2015 and 2016

consultations remain valid as none of the factors necessary to trigger reinitiating consultation have been met.

2.1 Description of the Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area

The Study Area (Figure 2.1-1) for this SEIS/OEIS is the same used for the analysis in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (Section 2.1, Description of the Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area), and is composed of three components: (1) the MIRC, (2) additional areas on the high seas outside of the MIRC, and (3) a transit corridor between the MIRC and the HRC. Collectively, for the purposes of this SEIS/OEIS, these areas continue to be referred to as the MITT Study Area (Figure 2.1-1). The transit corridor is outside the geographic boundaries of the MIRC and is a direct route across the high seas for Navy ships transiting between the MIRC and the HRC.

Section 2.1.1 (Description of the Mariana Islands Range Complex) and the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (Section 2.1, Description of the Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area) provide complete descriptions of range components that comprise the MIRC. For more information on the areas outside the boundaries of the MIRC but within the Study Area, see Section 2.1.2 (Description of the Ocean Operating Areas Outside the Bounds of the Mariana Islands Range Complex) and Section 2.1.3 (Description of Pierside Locations and Apra Harbor) below and in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

2.1.1 Description of the Mariana Islands Range Complex

The MIRC includes land training areas, ocean surface and subsurface areas, and special use airspace. These areas extend from the waters south of Guam to north of Pagan (Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands), and from the Pacific Ocean east of the Mariana Islands to the Philippine Sea to the west, encompassing 501,873 square nautical miles (NM^2) of open ocean (Figure 2.1-1). The Department of Defense leases FDM for use as a live and inert gunnery, missile, and bombing range.

2.1.1.1 Special Use Airspace and Air Traffic Controlled Assigned Airspace

The MIRC includes approximately 40,000 NM^2 of special use airspace. Special use airspace is airspace of defined dimensions where activities must be confined because of their nature or where limitations may be imposed upon aircraft operations that are not part of those activities (Federal Aviation Administration, 2013). As described in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, Section 2.1 (Description of the Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area), special use airspace includes restricted areas, military operations areas, and warning areas. As depicted in Figure 2.1-2 and Figure 2.1-3, most of this airspace is almost entirely over the ocean and includes warning areas and restricted areas:

Warning Areas (W): W-517 and W-12 include approximately 11,800 NM^2 of special use airspace (Figure 2.1-2 and Figure 2.1-3); W-11 (A/B) is approximately 10,500 NM^2 of special use airspace, and W-13 (A/B/C) is approximately 18,000 NM^2 of special use airspace.

Restricted Area Airspace (R): Over or near land areas within the MIRC includes approximately 2,463 NM^2 of special use airspace and includes restricted areas R-7201 and R-7201A, which extends in a 12 nautical mile radius around FDM (Figure 2.1-2 and Figure 2.1-4).




Figure 2.1-1: Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area

2.1.1.2 Sea and Undersea Space

The MIRC includes the sea and undersea space from the ocean surface to the ocean floor. The MIRC also consists of designated sea and undersea space training and testing areas, which include designated drop zones, underwater demolition and floating mine exclusion zones, danger zones associated with live-fire ranges, and training areas associated with military controlled beaches, harbors, and littoral areas.

W-517, W-12, W-11 and, W-13 (Figure 2.1-2) are designated as special use airspace where the sea space underneath may be restricted from public access during hazardous training events. Portions of the Marianas Trench Marine National Monument, established in January 2009 by Presidential Proclamation under the authority of the Antiquities Act (16 U.S. Code sections 431–433), lie within the MIRC and under all MIRC Warning Areas. However, the prohibitions required by the Proclamation do not apply to activities and exercises of the Armed Forces (including those carried out by the U.S. Coast Guard).




Figure 2.1-2: Mariana Islands Range Complex Airspace




Figure 2.1-3: Warning Area 517




Figure 2.1-4: Farallon de Medinilla Restricted Area 7201, 7201A, and Danger Zone

2.1.2 Description of the Ocean Operating Areas Outside the Bounds of the Mariana Islands Range Complex

In addition to the MIRC, the Study Area includes the area to the north of the MIRC that is within the U.S. Exclusive Economic Zone of the CNMI and areas to the west of the MIRC, as depicted in Figure 2.1-1.

The transit corridor between MIRC and HRC, although not part of any defined range complex, is important to the Navy in that it provides available air, sea, and undersea space where vessels and aircraft conduct training and testing while in transit. The transit corridor is the shortest distance between the MIRC and the HRC.

2.1.3 Description of Pierside Locations and Apra Harbor

The Study Area includes pierside locations in Apra Harbor. For purposes of this SEIS/OEIS, pierside locations include channels and routes to and from the Navy port in the Apra Harbor Naval Complex, and associated wharves and facilities within the Navy port (Figure 2.2-1).

2.2 Primary Mission Areas

The Navy categorizes its at-sea activities into functional warfare areas called primary mission areas. Training and testing activities generally fall into the following eight primary mission areas:

- air warfare
- amphibious warfare
- anti-submarine warfare
- electronic warfare
- expeditionary warfare
- mine warfare
- strike warfare
- surface warfare

Most activities addressed in this SEIS/OEIS are categorized under one of these primary mission areas; activities that do not fall within one of these areas are listed as “other activities” (e.g., precision anchoring, search and rescue at sea). Each warfare community (e.g., surface, subsurface, aviation, and expeditionary warfare) may train in some or all of these primary mission areas. The research and acquisition community also categorizes most, but not all, of its testing activities under these primary mission areas. A description of the sonar, munitions, targets, systems, and other material used during training and testing activities within these primary mission areas is provided in Appendix A (Training and Testing Activities Descriptions).

2.2.1 Air Warfare

The mission of air warfare (referred to as anti-air warfare in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS) is to destroy or reduce enemy air and missile threats (including unmanned airborne threats) and serves two purposes: to protect U.S. forces from attacks from the air and to gain air superiority. Air warfare provides U.S. forces with adequate attack warnings, while denying hostile forces the ability to gather intelligence about U.S. forces.

Aircraft conduct air warfare through radar search, detection, identification, and engagement of airborne threats. Surface ships conduct air warfare through an array of modern anti-aircraft weapon systems such as aircraft-detecting radar, naval guns linked to radar-directed fire-control systems, surface-to-air missile systems, and radar-controlled guns for close-in point defense.




Figure 2.2-1: Apra Harbor Naval Complex (Main Base) and Main Base/Polaris Point

Testing of air warfare systems is required to ensure the equipment is fully functional under the conditions in which it will be used. Tests may be conducted on radar and other early-warning detection and tracking systems, new guns or gun rounds, and missiles. Testing of these systems may be conducted on new ships and aircraft, and on existing ships and aircraft following maintenance, repair, or modification. For some systems, tests are conducted periodically to assess operability. Additionally, tests may be conducted in support of scientific research to assess new and emerging technologies.

2.2.2 Amphibious Warfare

The mission of amphibious warfare is to project military power from the sea to the shore (i.e., attack a threat on land by a military force embarked on ships) through the use of naval firepower and expeditionary landing forces. Amphibious warfare operations include small unit reconnaissance or raid missions to large-scale amphibious exercises involving multiple ships and aircraft combined into a strike group.

Amphibious warfare training ranges from individual, crew, and small unit events to large task force exercises. Individual and crew training include amphibious vehicles and naval gunfire support training. Such training includes shore assaults, boat raids, airfield or port seizures, and reconnaissance. Large-scale amphibious exercises involve ship-to-shore maneuver, naval fire support, such as shore bombardment, and air strike and attacks on targets that are in close proximity to friendly forces.

2.2.3 Anti-Submarine Warfare

The mission of anti-submarine warfare is to locate, neutralize, and defeat hostile submarine forces that threaten Navy surface forces. Anti-submarine warfare is based on the principle that surveillance and attack aircraft, ships, and submarines all search for hostile submarines. These forces operate together or independently to gain early warning and detection, and to localize, track, target, and attack submarine threats.

Anti-submarine warfare training addresses basic skills such as detection and classification of submarines, as well as evaluating sounds to distinguish between enemy submarines and friendly submarines, ships, and marine life. More advanced training integrates the full spectrum of anti-submarine warfare from detecting and tracking a submarine to attacking a target using either exercise torpedoes (i.e., torpedoes that do not contain a warhead) or simulated weapons. These integrated anti-submarine warfare training exercises are conducted in coordinated, at-sea training events involving submarines, ships, and aircraft.

Testing of anti-submarine warfare systems is conducted to develop new technologies and assess weapon performance and operability with new systems and platforms, such as unmanned systems. Testing uses ships, submarines, and aircraft to demonstrate capabilities of torpedoes, missiles, countermeasure systems, and underwater surveillance and communications systems. Tests may be conducted as part of a large-scale Fleet training event involving submarines, ships, fixed-wing aircraft, and helicopters. These integrated training events offer opportunities to conduct research and acquisition activities and to train aircrew in the use of new or newly enhanced systems during a large-scale, complex exercise.

2.2.4 Electronic Warfare

The mission of electronic warfare is to degrade the enemy's ability to use electronic systems, such as communication systems and radar, and to confuse or deny them the ability to defend their forces and assets. Electronic warfare is also used to detect enemy threats and counter their attempts to degrade the electronic capabilities of the Navy.

Typical electronic warfare activities include threat avoidance training, signals analysis for intelligence purposes, and use of airborne and surface electronic jamming devices (that block or interfere with other devices) to defeat tracking, navigation, and communications systems.

Testing of electronic warfare systems is conducted to improve the capabilities of systems and ensure compatibility with new systems. Testing involves the use of aircraft, surface ships, and submarine crews to evaluate the effectiveness of electronic systems. Similar to training activities, typical electronic warfare testing activities include the use of airborne and surface electronic jamming devices (including testing chaff and flares; see Appendix A (Training and Testing Activities Descriptions) for a description of these devices) to defeat tracking and communications systems. Chaff tests evaluate newly developed or enhanced chaff, chaff dispensing equipment, or modified aircraft systems' use against chaff deployment. Flare tests evaluate deployment performance and crew competency with newly developed or enhanced flares, flare dispensing equipment, or modified aircraft systems' use against flare deployment.

2.2.5 Expeditionary Warfare

The mission of expeditionary warfare is to provide security and surveillance in the littoral (at the shoreline), riparian (along a river), or coastal environments. Expeditionary warfare is wide ranging and includes defense of harbors, operation of remotely operated vehicles, defense against swimmers, and boarding/seizure operations.

2.2.6 Mine Warfare

The mission of mine warfare is to detect, classify, and avoid or neutralize (disable) mines to protect Navy ships and submarines and to maintain free access to ports and shipping lanes. Mine warfare also includes offensive mine laying to gain control of or deny the enemy access to sea space. Naval mines can be laid by ships, submarines, or aircraft.

Mine warfare neutralization training includes exercises in which ships, aircraft, submarines, underwater vehicles, unmanned vehicles, or marine mammal detection systems search for mine shapes. Personnel train to destroy or disable mines by attaching underwater explosives to or near the mine or using remotely operated vehicles to destroy the mine. Training would also include raising mine shapes and towing them ashore for recovery and inspection.

Testing and development of mine warfare systems is conducted to improve sonar, laser, and magnetic detectors intended to hunt, locate, and record the positions of mines for avoidance or subsequent neutralization. Mine warfare testing and development falls into two primary categories: mine detection and classification, and mine countermeasure and neutralization. Mine detection and classification testing involves the use of air, surface, and subsurface vessels and uses sonar, including towed and side-scan sonar, and unmanned vehicles to locate and identify objects underwater. Mine detection and classification systems are sometimes used in conjunction with a mine neutralization system. Mine countermeasure and neutralization testing includes the use of air, surface, and subsurface units to evaluate the effectiveness of tracking devices, countermeasure and neutralization systems, and general purpose bombs to neutralize mine threats. Most neutralization tests use mine shapes, or non-explosive practice mines, to evaluate a new or enhanced capability. For example, during a mine neutralization test, a previously located mine is destroyed or rendered nonfunctional using a helicopter or manned/unmanned surface vehicle-based system that may involve the deployment of a towed neutralization system.

The majority of mine warfare systems are deployed by ships, helicopters, and unmanned vehicles. Tests may also be conducted in support of scientific research to support these new technologies.

2.2.7 Strike Warfare

The mission of strike warfare is to conduct offensive attacks on land-based targets, such as refineries, power plants, bridges, major roadways, and ground forces to reduce the enemy's ability to wage war. Strike warfare employs weapons by manned and unmanned air, surface, submarine, and Navy special warfare assets in support of extending dominance over enemy territory (power projection).

Strike warfare includes training fixed-wing attack aircraft pilots and aircrews in the delivery of precision-guided munitions, non-guided munitions, rockets, and other ordnance against land-based targets. Not all strike mission training activities involve dropping ordnance and instead the activity is simulated with video footage obtained by onboard sensors.

2.2.8 Surface Warfare

The mission of surface warfare (referred to as anti-surface warfare in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS) is to obtain control of sea space from which naval forces may operate, and entails offensive action against other surface, subsurface, and air targets while also defending against enemy forces. In surface warfare, aircraft use guns, air-launched cruise missiles, or other precision-guided munitions; ships employ torpedoes, naval guns, and surface-to-surface missiles; and submarines attack surface ships using torpedoes or submarine-launched, anti-ship cruise missiles.

Surface warfare training includes surface-to-surface gunnery and missile exercises, air-to-surface gunnery and missile exercises, and submarine missile or torpedo launch activities, and other munitions against surface targets.

Testing of weapons used in surface warfare is conducted to develop new technologies and to assess weapon performance and operability with new systems and platforms, such as unmanned systems. Tests include various air-to-surface guns and missiles, surface-to-surface guns and missiles, and bombing tests. Testing activities may be integrated into training activities to test aircraft or aircraft systems in the delivery of munitions on a surface target. In most cases the tested systems are used in the same manner in which they are used for Fleet training activities.

2.3 Proposed Activities

The Navy has been conducting training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades. The tempo and types of training and testing activities have fluctuated because of the introduction of new technologies, the evolving nature of international events, advances in warfighting doctrine and procedures, and changes in force structure (organization of ships, submarines, aircraft, weapons, and Sailors). Such developments influence the frequency, duration, intensity, and location of required training and testing activities. The activities analyzed in this SEIS/OEIS are largely a continuation of activities that have been ongoing and were analyzed previously in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. This SEIS/OEIS includes the analysis of those at sea and FDM activities necessary to meet readiness requirements beyond 2020 and into the reasonably foreseeable future, includes any changes to those activities previously analyzed, and reflects the most up-to-date compilation of training and testing activities deemed necessary to accomplish military readiness requirements.

2.3.1 Changes to Proposed Activities

The majority of proposed modifications to the activities included in the Proposed Action are changes to tempo of activity, and renaming or combining related types of activities for greater clarity in this document and for consistency across all Navy at-sea planning documents. A few activities assessed in 2015 have been discontinued from analysis, and a few new activities have been added to the proposed activities to enable the Navy to adopt new technology and new capabilities. The training and testing activities are listed in Table 2.5-1 and Table 2.5-2 and discussed in greater detail below.

2.3.1.1 New Technologies and Capabilities

As described above, new technologies and capabilities are introduced to be evaluated in testing. Some systems have been used and tested by the Navy in other locations, but not the MITT Study Area. Those systems that are new to the Study Area will be analyzed for environmental impacts in this SEIS/OEIS.

The Navy is proposing the testing of two new systems and technologies for Naval Sea Systems Command. Radar and Other Systems Testing may include the use of military or commercial radar, communication systems or simulators, or high-energy lasers. Testing may occur aboard a ship against drones, small boats, rockets, missiles, or other targets. Simulant Testing involves the testing of simulated chemical-biological agents and simulants that are deployed against surface ships. However, Naval Air Systems Command and the Office of Naval Research are not proposing any new testing capabilities in this SEIS/OEIS. Information on all testing activities is provided at the end of this chapter in Table 2.5-1.

2.3.1.2 Renamed and Reorganized Testing Activities

Some Naval Sea Systems Command testing activities have been renamed. Following is a list of testing activities that have been renamed since the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS:

- Undersea Warfare Testing (previously named Torpedo Testing)
- Mine Countermeasure and Neutralization Testing (previously named Mine Countermeasure Mission Package Testing)
- Anti-Submarine Warfare Mission Package Testing (previously named Anti-Submarine Warfare)

In addition, some Naval Sea Systems Command testing activities have been reorganized under a different primary mission area. Following is a list of testing activities that have been reorganized since the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS:

- Kinetic Energy Weapons Testing (now analyzed under Surface Warfare)
- At-Sea Sonar Testing (now analyzed under Anti-Submarine Warfare)
- Torpedo (Explosive) Testing (now analyzed under Anti-Submarine Warfare)
- Torpedo (Non-explosive) Testing (now analyzed under Anti-Submarine Warfare)
- Undersea Warfare Testing (now analyzed under Vessel Evaluation)
- Anti-Submarine Warfare Mission Package Testing (now analyzed under Anti-Submarine Warfare)
- Mine Countermeasure and Neutralization Testing (now analyzed under Mine Warfare)

2.3.2 Proposed Training and Testing Activities

A major training exercise is comprised of several “unit-level” range exercises conducted by several units operating together while commanded and controlled by a single commander. These exercises typically employ an exercise scenario developed to train and evaluate the strike group in naval tactical tasks. In a major training exercise, most of the operations and activities being directed and coordinated by the strike group commander are identical in nature to the operations conducted during individual, crew, and

smaller unit-level training events. In a major training exercise, however, these disparate training tasks are conducted in concert, rather than in isolation. Some integrated or coordinated anti-submarine warfare exercises are similar in that they are comprised of several unit-level exercises but are generally on a smaller scale than a major training exercise, are shorter in duration, use fewer assets, and use fewer hours of hull-mounted sonar per exercise. These coordinated exercises are conducted under anti-submarine warfare. Three key factors used to identify and group the exercises are the scale of the exercise, duration of the exercise, and amount of hull-mounted sonar hours modeled/used for the exercise.

Table 2.3-1 provides the differences between major training exercises and smaller integrated/coordinated anti-submarine exercises based on scale, duration, and sonar hours for the purposes of exercise reporting requirements. Table 2.5-1 and Table 2.5-2 at the end of this chapter provides additional information on all training and testing activities, respectively, such as location, number of events per year, and ordnance used, if any. More information about each training and testing activity can be found in Appendix A (Training and Testing Activities Descriptions) and Appendix F (Training and Testing Activities Matrices). Except for the new activities described in Table 2.5-2, the activities proposed by the Navy in this SEIS/OEIS were described in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS in Table 2.4-2 and Table 2.4-3.

As described in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, the Navy's research and acquisition community engages in a broad spectrum of testing activities in support of the Fleet. These activities include, but are not limited to, basic and applied scientific research and technology development; testing, evaluation, and maintenance of systems (missiles, radar, and sonar) and platforms (surface ships, submarines, and aircraft); and acquisition of systems and platforms. The individual commands within the research and acquisition community included in this SEIS/OEIS are Naval Air Systems Command, Naval Sea Systems Command, and Office of Naval Research.

Table 2.3-1: Major Training Exercises and Integrated/Coordinated Anti-Submarine Warfare Training Activities

	Exercise Group	*Description*	*Scale*	*Location*	*Duration*	*MITT Exercise Examples*	*Modeled Hull-mounted Sonar per Exercise*
Major Training Exercises	Large Integrated ASW	Large-scale, longer duration integrated ASW exercises	Up to three Carrier Strike Groups in coordination with other Services, 2 or more submarines, multiple ASW aircraft	Study Area; Apra Harbor	Typically a 10-day exercise	Joint Multi-Strike Group Exercise (e.g., Valiant Shield)	>500 hours
	Medium Integrated ASW	Medium-scale short duration integrated ASW exercises	Typically 15 surface ships, amphibious assault craft, helicopters, maritime patrol aircraft, strike fighter aircraft, 2 submarines, and various unmanned vehicles	Study Area to nearshore; Apra Harbor; Tinian; Guam; Rota; Saipan	Typically a 10-day exercise	Joint Expeditionary Exercise	100–500 hours
Integrated/Coordinated ASW Training	Small Integrated ASW	Small-scale short duration integrated ASW exercises	Approximately 3–6 surface ASW units, at least 1 submarine, 2–6 ASW aircraft	Study Area; Apra Harbor	Generally less than 5 days	Multi-Sail; SWATT	50–100 hours
	Medium Coordinated ASW	Medium-scale short duration coordinated ASW exercises	Approximately 2–4 surface ASW units, 2–5 ASW aircraft, possibly a submarine	Study Area; Apra Harbor	Generally 3–10 days	AnnualEx, GuamEx	Less than 100 hours
	Small Coordinated ASW	Small-scale short duration coordinated ASW exercises	Approximately 2–4 surface ASW units, possibly a submarine, 1–2 ASW aircraft	Study Area; Apra Harbor	Generally 2–4 days	Group Sail	Less than 50 hours

Notes: ASW = Anti-Submarine Warfare, SWATT = Surface Warfare Advanced Tactical Training, AnnualEx = Annual Exercise, GuamEx = Guam Exercise

2.3.3 Standard Operating Procedures

For training and testing to be effective, units must be able to safely use their sensors and weapon systems as they are intended to be used in military missions and combat operations and to their optimum capabilities. Standard operating procedures applicable to training and testing have been developed through years of experience, and their primary purpose is to provide for safety (including public health and safety) and mission success. Because they are essential to safety and mission success, standard operating procedures are part of the Proposed Action and are considered in the Chapter 3

(Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) environmental analysis for applicable resources.

In many cases, there are benefits to environmental and cultural resources (some of which have high socioeconomic value in the Study Area) resulting from standard operating procedures. Those standard operating procedures that are recognized as providing a benefit to the resources analyzed in this Final SEIS/OEIS are included in Appendix A (Training and Testing Activities Descriptions), as applicable. The following standard operating procedure categories apply to the Proposed Action and are generally consistent with those included in the specified sections in Chapter 5 (Standard Operating Procedures, Mitigation, and Monitoring) of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS:

- Section 5.1.1 (Vessel Safety)
- Section 5.1.2 (Aircraft Safety)
- Section 5.1.3 (Laser Procedures)
- Section 5.1.4 (Weapons Firing Procedures), except Section 5.1.4.3 (Target Deployment Safety), which has been updated in Section 2.3.3.3 (Target Deployment and Retrieval Safety) of this Final SEIS/OEIS
- Section 5.1.6 (Unmanned Aerial and Underwater Vehicle Procedures)
- Section 5.1.7 (Towed In-Water Device Procedures)
- Section 5.7.3 (Farallon de Medinilla Access Restrictions)

Standard operating procedures that apply to the Proposed Action and were not included in, or require a clarification from, the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, are discussed in the sections below.

2.3.3.1 High-Energy Laser Safety

The Navy operates laser systems approved for fielding by the Laser Safety Review Board or service equivalent. Only properly trained and authorized personnel operate high-energy lasers within designated areas. Designated areas where lasers are used are required to have a Laser Range Safety Certification Report that is updated every three years. Prior to commencing activities involving high-energy lasers, the operator performs a search of the intended impact location to ensure that the area is clear of unauthorized persons. These standard operating procedures benefit public health and safety by reducing the potential for interaction with high-energy lasers.

2.3.3.2 Sea Space and Airspace Deconfliction

The Navy schedules training and testing activities to minimize conflicts with the use of sea space and airspace within ranges and throughout the Study Area to ensure the safety of military personnel, the public, commercial aircraft, commercial and recreational vessels, and military assets. The Navy deconflicts its own use of sea space and airspace to allow for the necessary separation of multiple military units to prevent interference with equipment sensors and to avoid interaction with established commercial air traffic routes and commercial shipping lanes. The Navy also minimizes conflicts within areas used for commercial and recreational fishing, subsistence use, and tourism. For example, during applicable seasons around the islands of Guam and the CNMI, the Navy works collaboratively with local communities to deconflict sea space used for fishing to the maximum extent practicable, such as avoiding known fishery infrastructures (e.g., fish aggregating devices) and high-use fishing areas. To help civilian mariners better plan fishing and boating activities that involve accessing the waters around FDM, the Navy notifies them through various means, such as U.S. Coast Guard-issued Notices to Mariners and social media, of the time periods when FDM will not be in use for several consecutive days. Announcing in advance when FDM will be in use (and when it will not be in use for an extended period of time)

facilitates use of waters around FDM by the public during time periods that will not conflict with training and testing activities. These standard operating procedures benefit public health and safety (including persons participating in activities that have subsistence benefits and socioeconomic value, such as recreational or commercial fishing) by reducing potential interactions with training and testing activities.

2.3.3.3 Target Deployment and Retrieval Safety

The standard operating procedures for target deployment and retrieval safety are consistent with the procedures described in Section 5.1.4.3 (Target Deployment Safety) of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, except for the description of which activities will implement them. Under the Proposed Action, the standard operating procedure for target deployment and retrieval safety applies to weapons firing activities that involve small boats deploying or retrieving targets. These activities are typically conducted in daylight hours in Beaufort sea state number 4 conditions or better to ensure safe operating conditions during target deployment and recovery. These standard operating procedures benefit public health and safety, and marine mammals and sea turtles by increasing the effectiveness of visual observations for mitigation, thereby reducing the potential for interactions with the weapons firing activities associated with the use of applicable deployed targets.

During activities that involve recoverable targets (e.g., aerial drones), the military recovers the target and any associated decelerators/parachutes to the maximum extent practicable consistent with personnel and equipment safety. Recovery of these items helps minimize the amount of materials that remain on the surface or on the seafloor, which could potentially alert enemy forces to the presence of military assets during military missions and combat operations. This standard operating procedure benefits biological resources (e.g., marine mammals, sea turtles, fish, marine birds) by reducing the potential for physical disturbance and strike, entanglement, or ingestion of applicable targets and any associated decelerators/parachutes.

2.3.3.4 Pierside Testing Safety

The *U.S. Navy Dive Manual* (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2011) prescribes safe distances for divers from active sonar sources and in-water explosions. Safety distances for the use of electromagnetic energy are specified in Department of Defense Instruction 6055.11 (U.S. Department of Defense, 2009) and Military Standard 464A (U.S. Department of Defense, 2002). These distances are used as the standard safety buffers for in-water energy to protect military divers. If an unauthorized person is detected within the exercise area, the activity will be temporarily halted until the area is again cleared and secured. These standard operating procedures benefit public health and safety (including persons participating in activities that have socioeconomic value, such as commercial or recreational diving) by reducing the potential for interaction with pierside testing activities.

2.3.3.5 Underwater Detonation Safety

Underwater detonation training takes place in designated exercise areas located away from popular recreational dive sites, primarily for human safety. If an unauthorized person (e.g., a recreational diver) or vessel is detected within the exercise area, the activity will be temporarily halted until the area is cleared and secured. Recreational dive sites often include shallow-water coral reefs, artificial reefs, and wrecks. Notices to Mariners are issued when the events are scheduled to alert the public to stay clear of the area. These standard operating procedures benefit public health and safety, environmental resources (e.g., shallow-water coral reefs, artificial reefs, and the biological resources such as fish that inhabit, shelter in, or feed among them), and cultural resources by reducing the potential for interaction with underwater detonation activities.

2.3.3.6 Sonic Booms

As a general policy, aircraft do not intentionally generate sonic booms below 30,000 feet of altitude unless over water and more than 30 miles from inhabited land areas or islands. The military may authorize deviations from this policy for tactical missions, phases of formal training syllabus flights, or research, test, and operational suitability test flights. The standard operating procedures for sonic booms benefit public health and safety by reducing the potential for exposure to sonic booms.

2.3.3.7 Unmanned Surface Vehicle Safety

For activities involving unmanned surface vehicles, the Navy evaluates the need to publish a Notice to Airmen or Notice to Mariners based on the scale, location, and timing of the activity. When necessary, Notices to Airmen and Notices to Mariners are issued to alert the public to stay clear of the area. These standard operating procedures benefit public health and safety by reducing the potential for interaction with unmanned surface vehicles.

2.3.3.8 Sinking Exercise Safety

The Navy is required to conduct sinking exercises greater than 50 nautical miles from land and in waters at least 6,000 feet deep (40 CFR section 229.2). The Navy selects sinking exercise areas to avoid established commercial air traffic routes, commercial vessel shipping lanes, and areas used for recreational activities, and to allow for the necessary separation of Navy units to ensure safety for Navy personnel, the public, commercial aircraft and vessels, and Navy assets. These standard operating procedures benefit public health and safety (including persons participating in activities that have socioeconomic value, such as recreational or commercial fishing) by reducing the potential for interaction with sinking exercises.

2.3.3.9 Amphibious Assault and Amphibious Raid Procedures

All established harbor navigation rules are observed during amphibious assault and amphibious raid training activities, when applicable. The Navy conducts a hydrographic survey prior to amphibious assault and amphibious raid training activities involving beach landings by large amphibious vehicles (e.g., Landing Craft, Air Cushion vessel). During the surveys, Navy personnel identify and designate vessel traffic lanes that are free of coral, hard bottom substrate, and obstructions that could present personnel and equipment safety concerns. The Navy does not conduct hydrographic surveys for beach landings with small boats, such as rigid-hulled inflatable boats, which have a much smaller draft than large amphibious vehicles and are therefore less likely to damage seafloor resources. Large amphibious vehicle beach landings and departures are scheduled at high tide, and vehicles stay fully on cushion or hover when over shallow reefs to avoid corals, hard bottom, and other substrate that could potentially damage equipment.

Due to the grounding of the French Navy Landing Craft that occurred on May 12, 2017, in Apra Harbor, the Navy has implemented additional standard operating procedures for amphibious assault and raid activities. The Navy requires the following standard operating procedures for amphibious landings at Reserve Craft Beach: (1) Concept of Operations for the event and for notification and coordination with Naval Base Guam Operations Officer, (2) presence of craft master who will coordinate planned routes with Mariana Islands Range Complex Ops and Naval Base Guam, (3) presence of a beach master (observers) to assist in approach to shore and restore beach to original condition, and (4) distribution of the Reserve Craft Beach Training Aid to all vessel captains participating in any training event in the vicinity of Reserve Craft Beach.

2.3.4 Mitigation Measures

The Navy developed mitigation measures to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on environmental and cultural resources. This Final SEIS/OEIS was prepared in coordination with the U.S. Air Force and U.S. Coast Guard, and these Services will implement the Navy's mitigation measures as applicable under the Proposed Action. Mitigation measures that the Navy will implement under the Proposed Action are organized into three categories: at-sea procedural mitigation measures, at-sea mitigation areas, and terrestrial mitigation measures. The Navy will implement procedural mitigation measures whenever and wherever applicable training or testing activities take place within the Study Area. Mitigation areas are geographic locations within the Study Area where the Navy will implement additional mitigation during all or part of the year. Terrestrial mitigation measures will be implemented during activities conducted on FDM.

A list of the activity categories, stressors, and mitigation areas for which the Navy developed mitigation measures is provided in Table 2.3-2. Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of this Final SEIS/OEIS provides a full description of each mitigation measure that will be implemented under Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 of the Proposed Action. It also presents a discussion of how the Navy developed and assessed each measure and includes maps of the mitigation area locations. Mitigation developed for the Proposed Action is generally in line with the type and level of mitigation included in Chapter 5 (Standard Operating Procedures, Mitigation, and Monitoring) of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2015). The Navy has updated Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of this Final SEIS/OEIS in its entirety based on its ongoing analysis of the best available science and practicality of implementing potential mitigation measures. A full analysis of the mitigation areas the Navy developed for marine mammals and sea turtles in the Study Area is provided in Appendix I (Geographic Mitigation Assessment). Relevant mitigation details are also provided throughout Appendix A (Training and Testing Activities Descriptions). The Navy Record of Decision will document all mitigation measures the Navy will implement under the Proposed Action. The Navy's Record of Decision, MMPA Regulations and Letter of Authorization, ESA Biological Opinion, and other applicable consultation documents will include mitigation measures applicable to the resources for which the Navy has consulted.

Table 2.3-2: Overview of Mitigation Categories

Mitigation Category	*Chapter 5 (Mitigation) Section*	*Applicable Activity Category, Stressor, or Mitigation Area*
Procedural Mitigation	Section 5.3.2 (Acoustic Stressors)	Active Sonar Weapons Firing Noise
	Section 5.3.3 (Explosive Stressors)	Explosive Sonobuoys Explosive Torpedoes Explosive Medium-Caliber and Large-Caliber Projectiles Explosive Missiles and Rockets Explosive Bombs Sinking Exercises Explosive Mine Countermeasure and Neutralization Activities Explosive Mine Neutralization Activities Involving Navy Divers Maritime Security Operations – Anti-Swimmer Grenades
	Section 5.3.4 (Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors)	Vessel Movement Towed In-Water Devices Small-, Medium-, and Large-Caliber Non-Explosive Practice Munitions Non-Explosive Missiles and Rockets Non-Explosive Bombs and Mine Shapes
Mitigation Areas	Section 5.4 (At-Sea Mitigation Areas to be Implemented)	Seafloor Resource Mitigation Areas Marpi Reef Mitigation Area Chalan Kanoa Reef Mitigation Area Agat Bay Nearshore Mitigation Area
Terrestrial Mitigation	Section 5.5 (Terrestrial Mitigation Measures to be Implemented)	Farallon de Medinilla

2.4 Action Alternatives Development

The identification, consideration, and analysis of alternatives are critical components of NEPA process and contribute to the goal of objective decision-making. The Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) developed regulations to implement NEPA and these regulations require the decision maker to consider the environmental effects of the proposed action and a range of alternatives (including the No Action Alternative) to the proposed action (40 Code of Federal Regulations section 1502.14). CEQ guidance further provides that an EIS must rigorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives for implementing the proposed action and, for alternatives eliminated from detailed study, briefly discuss the reasons for their having been eliminated. To be reasonable, an alternative, except for the no action alternative, must meet the stated purpose of and need for the proposed action.

The action alternatives, and in particular the mitigation measures that are incorporated in the action alternatives, were developed to meet both the Navy's purpose and need to train and test, and NMFS' independent purpose and need to evaluate the potential impacts of the Navy's activities, determine whether incidental take resulting from the Navy's activities will have a negligible impact on affected marine mammal species and stocks, and to prescribe measures to effect the least practicable adverse impact on species or stocks and their habitat, as well as monitoring and reporting requirements.

The Navy developed the alternatives considered in this SEIS/OEIS after careful assessment by subject matter experts, including military commands that utilize the ranges, military range management professionals, and Navy environmental managers and scientists.

2.4.1 Alternatives Eliminated from Further Consideration

This SEIS/OEIS serves as an update to the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS; therefore, alternatives eliminated from consideration in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS were evaluated to determine if they should be reconsidered for this SEIS/OEIS. In response to the comments received during the public scoping period, the Navy also considered developing an alternative that included geographic mitigation. Alternatives eliminated from further consideration are described in the subsections below. The Navy determined that these alternatives did not meet the purpose of and need for the Proposed Action after a thorough consideration of each.

2.4.1.1 "Status Quo" Alternative

In response to public comments, the Navy considered a Status Quo Alternative based on the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS Preferred Alternative (Section 2.7, Alternative 1 [Preferred Alternative]: Expansion of Study Area Plus Adjustments to the Baseline and Additional Weapons, Platforms, and Systems) and the 2015 MITT EIS/OEIS Record of Decision. Under such an alternative, the Navy would continue training and testing in the MITT Study Area at current levels documented in the 2015 MITT EIS/OEIS Record of Decision, requesting separate authorizations under the MMPA and ESA as required. The Navy would continue to conduct training and testing activities, but not at the level and scope of activities necessary to fulfill its Title 10 responsibilities described in Chapter 1 (Purpose and Need). A Status Quo Alternative would not allow the Navy to meet future training and testing requirements necessary to achieve and maintain fleet readiness. Thus, such an alternative would not be reasonable and has been eliminated from detailed study.

2.4.1.2 Alternative Training and Testing Locations

As described in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Training and Testing Locations) in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, the diverse and multi-dimensional environment provided within the Study Area allows the military to develop and maintain high levels of readiness and interoperability with foreign partners in the Western Pacific. There are no other proximate alternative locations that provide for this capability. As a result, this alternative is neither reasonable or practicable and does not meet the purpose of and need for the Proposed Action and has been eliminated from detailed study.

2.4.1.3 Reduced Training and Testing

As described in Section 2.5.1.2 (Reduced Training and Testing) in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, a reduction or cessation of training and testing would prevent the Navy and other Services from meeting its statutory requirements and adequately preparing forces for operations ranging from disaster relief to armed conflict. Therefore, this alternative does not meet the purpose of and need for the Proposed Action and has been eliminated from detailed study.

2.4.1.4 Alternatives Including Geographic Mitigation Measures within the Study Area

The Navy considered but did not develop an alternative based solely on geographic mitigation that would impose time or area restrictions on specific areas in the Study Area, such as areas associated with the presence of specific species. The Navy designed its alternatives development and mitigation development processes to ensure that the maximum level of mitigation that is practical for the Navy to implement when balanced against impacts to safety, sustainability, and the ability to continue meeting mission requirements would be implemented regardless of the action alternative selected. Developing geographic mitigation for both action alternatives is a more conservative (i.e., more environmentally protective) approach than developing geographic mitigation for one action alternative but not the other.

Further, regulations governing the NEPA allow agencies to "Include appropriate mitigation measures not already included in the proposed action or alternatives" (40 CFR 1502.14[f]). Under both action alternatives, the Navy would implement geographic mitigation that is both biologically effective as well as practical to implement. The Supplemental SEIS/OEIS considers and analyzes a comprehensive range of potential mitigation measures, including those that were not adopted, allowing for a robust analysis by the agencies. The mitigation areas developed for the Proposed Action are detailed in Appendix I (Geographic Mitigation Assessment).

2.4.1.5 Simulated Training and Testing Only

As described in Section 2.5.1.4 (Simulated Training and Testing) in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, the Navy continues to use computer simulation for training and testing activities whenever possible; however, there are limits to the realism that current simulation technology can presently provide, and its use cannot substitute for live training or testing. Training and testing through simulated means cannot replicate the conditions in which Navy personnel and platforms are required to conduct military operations. While beneficial as a complementing medium to train and test personnel and platforms, simulation alone cannot accurately replicate both the conditions and the stresses that must be placed on personnel and platforms during training. These conditions and stresses are absolutely vital to adequately preparing Naval forces to conduct the broad spectrum of military operations required of them by operational Commanders. Therefore, simulation as an alternative that completely replaces training and testing in the field does not meet the purpose of and need for the Proposed Action and has been eliminated from detailed study.

2.4.1.6 Training and Testing Without the Use of Active Sonar

As explained in Section 2.4.1.5 (Simulated Training and Testing Only), in order to detect and counter submerged mines and potentially hostile submarines, the Navy uses both passive and active sonar. Sonar proficiency is a complex and perishable skill that requires regular, hands-on training in realistic and diverse conditions. Training and testing with active sonar is needed to find and counter newer-generation submarines around the world, which are growing in number, as are torpedoes and underwater mines, which are true threats to global commerce, national security, and the safety of military personnel. As a result, defense against enemy submarines is a top priority for the Navy. The detection and countering of submarines is paramount to national security. Naval forces cannot counter this threat without the use of active sonar. Because the Navy is statutorily responsible to provide combat-ready forces to operational Commanders, it must train in a manner in which it will be utilized in military operations. Accordingly, training and testing without active sonar is not a reasonable alternative and will not be carried forward.

2.4.2 Alternatives Carried Forward

The military's anticipated level of training and testing activity evolves over time based on numerous factors. Over the past several years, the Navy's ongoing sonar reporting program has gathered classified data regarding the number of sonar hours used to meet anti-submarine warfare requirements. These data allow for a more accurate projection of the number of active sonar hours required to meet anti-submarine warfare training requirements into the reasonably foreseeable future. Alternatives carried forward for analysis in this SEIS/OEIS are discussed in the following subsections and presented in Table 2.5-1 and Table 2.5-2 at the end of this chapter. As previously discussed, in addition to meeting the Navy's purpose and need to train and test, the action alternatives, and in particular the mitigation measures that are incorporated in the action alternatives, were developed to meet NMFS' independent purpose and need to evaluate the potential impacts of the Navy's activities, determine whether

incidental take resulting from the Navy's activities would have a negligible impact on affected marine mammal species and stocks, and prescribe measures to effect the least practicable adverse impact on species or stocks and their habitat, as well as monitoring and reporting requirements.

2.4.2.1 No Action Alternative

As mentioned above in Section 2.4 (Action Alternatives Development), the Council on Environmental Quality implementing regulations require inclusion of a No Action Alternative and analysis of all reasonable alternatives to provide a clear basis for choice among options by the decision maker and the public (40 CFR section 1502.14). Council on Environmental Quality guidance identifies two approaches in developing the No Action Alternative (46 *Federal Register* 18026, Forty Most Asked Questions Concerning CEQ's NEPA Regulations). One approach for activities that have been ongoing for long periods of time is for the No Action Alternative to be thought of in terms of continuing the present course of action, or current management direction or intensity, such as the continuation of Navy training and testing at sea in the MITT Study Area at current levels, even if separate legal authorizations under the MMPA and ESA are required. Under this approach, which was used in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, the analysis compares the effects of continuing current activity levels (i.e., the "status quo") with the effects of the Proposed Action. The second approach depicts a scenario where no authorizations or permits are issued, the Navy's training and testing activities do not take place, and the resulting environmental effects from taking no action are compared with the effects of the Proposed Action. The Navy applied the second approach in this SEIS/OEIS as it further supports NMFS' regulatory process by presenting the scenario where no authorization will be issued. Additionally, the second approach responds to comments submitted at various stages regarding the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and during the scoping process of this SEIS/OEIS.

Under the No Action Alternative analyzed in this SEIS/OEIS, the Navy would not conduct the proposed training and testing activities in the MITT Study Area. Other military activities not associated with this Proposed Action would continue to occur. For FDM, the lease agreement between the U.S. government and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands would remain in place, and the island would continue to be maintained as a Navy range, although strike warfare would no longer continue on the island. Consequently, the No Action Alternative of not conducting the proposed at-sea training and testing activities in the Study Area is inherently unreasonable in that it does not meet the purpose and need (see Section 1.4, Purpose and Need for Proposed Training and Testing Activities) for the reasons stated below. However, the analysis associated with the No Action Alternative is carried forward in order to compare the degree of the potential environmental effects of the Proposed Action with the conditions that would occur if the Proposed Action did not occur (see Section 3.0.1, Overall Approach to Analysis).

From NMFS's perspective, pursuant to its obligation to grant or deny permit applications under the MMPA, the No Action Alternative involves NMFS denying Navy's application for an incidental take authorization under Section 101(a)(5)(A) of the MMPA. If NMFS were to deny the Navy's application, the Navy would not be authorized to incidentally take marine mammals and the Navy would not conduct the at-sea proposed training and testing activities in the MITT Study Area.

Cessation of proposed Navy at-sea training and testing activities would mean that the Navy would not meet its statutory requirements and would be unable to properly defend itself and the United States from enemy forces, unable to successfully detect enemy submarines, and unable to effectively use its weapons systems or defensive countermeasures due to a lack of training of forces and testing of systems that replicate the conditions to which Naval forces must operate while executing the range of

military operations required to further national security objectives. Navy personnel would not obtain the unique skills or be prepared to safely and effectively use sensors, weapons, and technologies in realistic scenarios required to accomplish the overall mission. For example, sonar proficiency, which is a complex and perishable skill, requires regular, hands-on training in realistic and diverse conditions. In order to detect and counter potentially hostile submarines, the Navy uses both passive and active sonar. Inability to train with active sonar would result in no or greatly diminished anti-submarine warfare capability.

Additionally, without proper training, individual Sailors and Marines serving onboard Navy vessels would not be taught how to properly operate complex equipment in inherently dynamic and dangerous environments. Even with high levels of training, injuries, and death occur. Therefore, without proper training, it is likely that there would be an increase in the number of mishaps, potentially resulting in the death or serious injury of Sailors and Marines. Failing to allow our Sailors and Marines to achieve and maintain the skills necessary to defend the United States and its interests would result in an unacceptable increase in the danger they willingly face.

Finally, the lack of live training and testing would require a higher reliance on simulated training and testing. While the Navy continues to research new ways to provide realistic training through simulation, there are limits to the realism that technology provides. While simulators are used for the basic training of sonar technicians, they are of limited utility beyond basic training. A simulator cannot match the dynamic nature of the environment, such as bathymetry and sound propagation properties, or the training activities involving several units with multiple crews interacting in a variety of acoustic environments. Sole reliance on simulation would deny service members the ability to develop battle-ready required proficiency in the employment of active sonar during military operations (Section 2.4.1.5, Simulated Training and Testing Only).

2.4.2.2 Alternative 1

Alternative 1 reflects a representative year of training and testing to account for the typical fluctuation of training cycles, testing programs, and deployment schedules that generally limit the maximum level of training and testing from occurring for the reasonably foreseeable future.

2.4.2.2.1 Training

Under this alternative, the Navy proposes to conduct training activities into the reasonably foreseeable future, as necessary to meet current and future readiness requirements. These include training activities subject to previous analysis that are currently ongoing and have historically occurred in the Study Area. The requirements for the types of activities to be conducted, as well as the intensity at which they need to occur, have been validated by senior leadership. Specifically, training activities are based on changing world events, advances in technology, and U.S. tactical and strategic priorities. These activities account for force structure changes and include training with new aircraft, vessels, unmanned/autonomous systems, and weapon systems that will be introduced to the Fleets after August 2020. The numbers and locations of all proposed training activities are provided in Table 2.5-1.

2.4.2.2.2 Testing

Alternative 1 reflects a level of testing activities to be conducted into the reasonably foreseeable future, with adjustments from the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS that account for changes in the types and tempo (increases or decreases) of testing activities to meet current and future military readiness requirements. The majority of testing activities that would be conducted under this alternative are the same as or similar as those conducted currently or in the past. This alternative includes the testing of new systems

using new technologies and takes into account inherent uncertainties in this type of testing. The numbers and locations of all proposed testing activities are listed in Table 2.5-2.

2.4.2.2.3 Mitigation Measures

The Navy's entire suite of mitigation measures was applied to Alternative 1 to ensure that (1) the benefit of mitigation measures to environmental and cultural resources was considered during the applicable environmental analyses, and (2) Navy senior leadership approved each mitigation measure included in this Final SEIS/OEIS under Alternative 1. Navy senior leadership reviewed relevant supporting information to make a fully informed decision, including the benefit of mitigation measures to environmental and cultural resources, and the impacts that implementing mitigation will have on training and testing activities under Alternative 1. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) and Appendix I (Geographic Mitigation Assessment), the suite of mitigation measures included in this Final SEIS/OEIS represents the maximum level of mitigation that is practical for the Navy to implement when balanced against impacts to safety, sustainability, and the ability to continue meeting its mission requirements.

2.4.2.3 Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)

2.4.2.3.1 Training

Alternative 2 is the Preferred Alternative and includes the same types of training activities as Alternative 1 but also considers additional Fleet exercises and associated unit-level activities should unanticipated emergent world events require increased readiness levels. For example, Alternative 2 contemplates Joint Multi-Strike Group Exercises (i.e., Valiant Shield) occurring annually as compared to every other year under Alternative 1 (see Table 2.5-1). Additionally, Alternative 2 contemplates three (vice two) Small Joint Coordinated Anti-Submarine Warfare exercises (Multi-Sail/Guam Exercises) per year with a 50 percent increase in associated unit-level events (e.g., Missile Exercise [Surface-to-Air]). The numbers and locations of all proposed training activities are provided in Section 2.3 (Proposed Activities) and listed in Table 2.5-1.

Alternative 2 reflects the maximum number of training activities that could occur within a given year, and assumes that the maximum number of Fleet exercises would occur annually. This allows for the greatest flexibility for the Navy to maintain readiness when considering potential changes in the national security environment, fluctuations in training and deployment schedules, and anticipated in-theater demands.

2.4.2.3.2 Testing

Alternative 2 entails a level of testing activities to be conducted into the reasonably foreseeable future. Under Alternative 2, types and tempo of testing activities would increase compared to Alternative 1 (see Table 2.5-2). This alternative includes the contingency for augmenting some weapon systems tests in response to potential increased world conflicts and changing Navy leadership priorities as the result of a direct challenge from a naval opponent that possesses near peer capabilities. The numbers and locations of all proposed testing activities are listed in Table 2.5-2.

2.4.2.3.3 Mitigation Measures

The Navy's entire suite of mitigation measures was applied to Alternative 2 to ensure that: (1) the benefit of mitigation measures to environmental and cultural resources was considered during the applicable environmental analyses, and (2) Navy senior leadership approved each mitigation measure included in this Final SEIS/OEIS under Alternative 2. Navy senior leadership reviewed relevant supporting information to make a fully informed decision, including the benefit of mitigation measures to

environmental and cultural resources, and the impacts that implementing mitigation will have on training and testing activities under Alternative 2. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), the suite of mitigation measures included in this Final SEIS/OEIS represents the maximum level of mitigation that is practical for the Navy to implement when balanced against impacts to safety, sustainability, and the ability to continue meeting its mission requirements.

2.4.3 Comparison of Proposed Sonar and Explosive Use in the Action Alternatives

2.4.3.1 Sonar Use

As part of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and 2015 MMPA Letter of Authorization, NMFS authorized the Navy to use non-impulsive sound sources including sonars and other transducers. Sonars and other transducers were grouped into classes that share one or more attributes, such as frequency range or purpose of use. The classes were further sorted into sound source bins. These bins are defined and quantified in Section 3.0.5.1 (Acoustic Stressors).

In the 2015 analysis, the Navy identified the type of sonar source that resulted in the highest number of exposures to marine mammals, which was hull-mounted mid-frequency active sonar in bin MF1. The Navy was authorized 1,872 hours of MF1 annually in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and by NMFS under the MMPA permit and ESA Biological Opinion.

In this SEIS/OEIS, the Navy is evaluating the potential impacts associated with 1,729 hours of MF1 annually under Alternative 1, a reduction of approximately 8 percent from the currently authorized total (Figure 2.4-1). Under Alternative 2, the Navy is evaluating the potential impacts associated with 1,818 hours of MF1 annually, which is a decrease of approximately 3 percent over currently permitted levels.




Figure 2.4-1: Proposed Annual Total Hull-Mounted Mid-Frequency Sonar Hour Use Compared to the Number Authorized in the 2015–2020 Marine Mammal Protection Act Permit

2.4.3.2 Explosives Use

As part of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and 2015 MMPA Letter of Authorization, NMFS authorized the Navy to use impulsive sources (i.e., explosives). Similar to non-impulsive sources, the Navy sorted explosive sources into bins based on the net explosive weight of the explosive. After analyzing the level of explosive activities conducted during Phase II, the Navy identified that some explosive sources were incorrectly classed into bins with greater net explosive weights than actually is present in the munition. For example, 20-millimeter rounds were considered in bin E1 (defined as 0.1–0.25 pounds net explosive weight) during Phase II, but have less than 0.1 pound of net explosive weight (defined as bin E0) and are, therefore, analyzed qualitatively instead of quantitatively for Phase III. Additionally, in Phase II, munitions within the same category were all analyzed with the highest net explosive weight for all munitions in that category. For example, most bombs were analyzed as bin E12 (to account for the largest potential for environmental impact), whereas many fall within bins E9 and E10. For Phase III, munitions were divided into more appropriate bins based on current and anticipated weapon inventory. Bins used to sort explosive munitions are further defined and quantified in Section 3.0.4.2 (Explosive Stressors).

See Figure 2.4-2 and Figure 2.4-3 for a comparison between explosives authorized for training and testing in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and proposed in this SEIS/OEIS. The number of impulsive sources in bins E2, E5, E8, E9, and E10 would increase in this SEIS/OEIS compared with the totals analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. The number of impulsive sources that would decrease under this SEIS/OEIS are in bins E1, E3, E4, E6, E11, and E12.




Figure 2.4-2: Proposed Annual Explosives Use (Bins E1–E5) Compared to the 2015–2020 Marine Mammal Protection Act Permit




Figure 2.4-3: Proposed Annual Explosives Use (Bins E6–E12) Compared to the 2015–2020 Marine Mammal Protection Act Permit

2.5 Comparison of Alternatives

The following tables compare the proposed SEIS/OEIS action alternatives (Alternative 1 and Alternative 2) with the ongoing training and testing activities (Table 2.5-1, Table 2.5-2). Each table describes the activities in terms of the activity name and where in the Study Area the Navy proposes to conduct it (first two columns). The next two columns show the annual occurrence and ordnance or other expended items (if any) involved in the activity as is currently ongoing (under the heading "2015 MITT EIS/OEIS Ongoing Activities"). The final two pairs of columns present the same information (annual occurrence and ordnance/items) as the activities are analyzed in this SEIS/OEIS for Alternative 1 and Alternative 2, respectively. Table 2.5-1 is the table of training activities, while Table 2.5-2 is the table of Naval Air Systems Command testing activities, Naval Sea Systems Command testing activities, and Office of Naval Research testing activities.

Table 2.5-1: Current and Proposed Training Activities

Range Activity	Location	2015 MITT FINAL EIS/OEIS Ongoing[1] Activities (MITT ROD Alternative)		Supplemental EIS/OEIS (Alternative 1)		Supplemental EIS/OEIS (Alternative 2 – Preferred Alternative)	
		No. of events (per year)	Ordnance (Number per year)	No. of events (per year)	Ordnance (Number per year)	No. of events (per year)	Ordnance (Number per year)
		Legend:	= Decrease in number of events from 2015 Final MITT EIS/OEIS			= Increase in number of events from 2015 Final MITT EIS/OEIS	
Major Training Exercises							
Joint Expeditionary Exercise	Study Area; MIRC	1	Note 2	1	Note 2	1	Note 2
Joint Multi-Strike Group Exercise	Study Area; MIRC	1	Note 2	1 every other year	Note 2	1	Note 2
Air Warfare (AW) (previously named Anti-Air Warfare in 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS)							
Air Combat Maneuver	Study Area > 12 NM from land: SUA	4,800	None	3,800	None	3,800	None
Air Defense Exercise (ADEX)	Study Area > 12 NM from land: SUA	100	None	100	None	100	None
Air Intercept Control (AIC)	Study Area > 12 NM from land: SUA	4,800	None	5,300	None	5,300	None
Gunnery Exercise (GUNEX) (Air-to-Air [A-A]) – Medium-caliber	Study Area SUA > 12 NM from land	36	9,000 rounds	36	9,000 rounds	36	9,000 rounds

Table 2.5-1: Current and Proposed Training Activities (continued)

Range Activity	Location	2015 MITT FINAL EIS/OEIS Ongoing[1] Activities (MITT ROD Alternative)		Supplemental EIS/OEIS (Alternative 1)		Supplemental EIS/OEIS (Alternative 2 – Preferred Alternative)	
		No. of events (per year)	Ordnance (Number per year)	No. of events (per year)	Ordnance (Number per year)	No. of events (per year)	Ordnance (Number per year)
Missile Exercise (MISSILEX) (A-A)	Study Area SUA > 12 NM from land	18	36 explosive missiles	18	36 explosive missiles	18	36 explosive missiles
GUNEX (Surface-to-Air [S-A]) – Large-caliber	Study Area SUA > 12 NM from land	5	40 rounds	6	60 rounds	9	90 rounds
GUNEX [S-A] – Medium-caliber	Study Area SUA > 12 NM from land	12	24,000 rounds	13	26,000 rounds	19	38,000 rounds
MISSILEX [S-A]	Study Area SUA > 12 NM from land	15	15 explosive missiles	18	18 explosive missiles	27	27 explosive missiles
Amphibious Warfare (AMW)							
Naval Surface Fire Support Exercise (FIREX) – Land-based target (Land)	FDM	10	1,800 NEPM rounds 1,000 explosive rounds	10	2,800 explosive rounds	15	4,200 explosive rounds
Marine Air Ground Task Force Exercise (Amphibious) – Battalion	Study Area to nearshore; MIRC; Tinian; Guam; Rota; Saipan; FDM	4	Note 2	4	Note 2	4	Note 2
Amphibious Rehearsal, No Landing	Study Area and Nearshore	12	None	12	None	12	None
Amphibious Assault	MIRC; Tinian; Guam	6	Blanks; Simunitions	6	Blanks; Simunitions	6	Blanks; Simunitions
Amphibious Raid	MIRC; Tinian; Guam; Rota	6	Blanks; Simunitions	6	Blanks; Simunitions	6	Blanks; Simunitions

Table 2.5-1: Current and Proposed Training Activities (continued)

Range Activity	Location	2015 MITT FINAL EIS/OEIS Ongoing[1] Activities (MITT ROD Alternative)		Supplemental EIS/OEIS (Alternative 1)		Supplemental EIS/OEIS (Alternative 2 – Preferred Alternative)	
		No. of events (per year)	Ordnance (Number per year)	No. of events (per year)	Ordnance (Number per year)	No. of events (per year)	Ordnance (Number per year)
Noncombatant Evacuation Operation	MIRC; Guam; Tinian; Rota	5	Blanks; Simunitions	5	Blanks; Simunitions	5	Blanks; Simunitions
Humanitarian Assistance/Disaster Relief Operations	MIRC; Guam; Tinian; Rota	5	Blanks; Simunitions	5	Blanks; Simunitions	5	Blanks; Simunitions
Unmanned Aerial Vehicle – Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance	MIRC; SUA	100	None	100	None	100	None
Special Purpose Marine Air Ground Task Force Exercise	Study Area to nearshore; MIRC; Tinian; Guam; Rota; Saipan	2	Note 2	2	Note 2	2	Note 2
Anti-Submarine Warfare (ASW)							
Tracking Exercise (TRACKEX) –Helicopter (Helo)	Study Area > 3 NM from land; Transit Corridor	62	None/ REXTORP	10	None	10	None/ REXTORP
Torpedo Exercise (TORPEX)– Helo	Study Area > 3 NM from land	4	4 EXTORP	4	4 EXTORP	6	6 EXTORP
TRACKEX – Maritime Patrol (Extended Echo Ranging Sonobuoys)	Study Area > 3 NM from land	11	None	0	0	0	0

Table 2.5-1: Current and Proposed Training Activities (continued)

Range Activity	Location	2015 MITT FINAL EIS/OEIS Ongoing[1] Activities (MITT ROD Alternative)		Supplemental EIS/OEIS (Alternative 1)		Supplemental EIS/OEIS (Alternative 2 – Preferred Alternative)	
		No. of events (per year)	Ordnance (Number per year)	No. of events (per year)	Ordnance (Number per year)	No. of events (per year)	Ordnance (Number per year)
TRACKEX – Maritime Patrol Aircraft	Study Area > 3 NM from land	34	None/ REXTORP	36	None/REXTORP	36	None/ REXTORP
TORPEX – Maritime Patrol Aircraft	Study Area > 3 NM from land	4	4 EXTORP	4	4 EXTORP	6	6 EXTORP
TRACKEX – Surface	Study Area > 3 NM from land	CG/DDG-92 FFG-30 LCS-10	None/ REXTORP	91	None/ REXTORP	91	None/ REXTORP
TORPEX – Surface	Study Area > 3 NM from land	3	3 EXTORP	4	4 EXTORP	6	6 EXTORP
TRACKEX – Submarine (Sub)	Study Area > 3 NM from land; Transit Corridor	12	None	4	None	4	None
TORPEX – Sub	Study Area > 3 NM from land	10	40 MK-48 EXTORP	6	24 MK-48 EXTORP	9	36 MK-48 EXTORP
Combined Small Coordinated ASW exercise (e.g., Multi-Sail/GUAMEX/SWATT) (see Note 3)	Study Area > 3 NM from land	Not called out in previous document, but components were covered under several unit-level exercises	None	2	None	3	None

Table 2.5-1: Current and Proposed Training Activities (continued)

Range Activity	Location	2015 MITT FINAL EIS/OEIS Ongoing[1] Activities (MITT ROD Alternative)		Supplemental EIS/OEIS (Alternative 1)		Supplemental EIS/OEIS (Alternative 2 – Preferred Alternative)	
		No. of events (per year)	Ordnance (Number per year)	No. of events (per year)	Ordnance (Number per year)	No. of events (per year)	Ordnance (Number per year)
Electronic Warfare (EW)							
Electronic Warfare Operations (EW Ops)	Study Area	480	None	522	None	522	None
Counter Targeting Flare Exercise (FLAREX) – Aircraft	Study Area > 12 NM from land	3,200	25,600 rounds	2,200	17,600 rounds	2,200	17,600 rounds
Counter Targeting Chaff Exercise (CHAFFEX) – Ship	Study Area > 12 NM from land	40	240 rounds	41	244 rounds	60	360 rounds
CHAFFEX –Aircraft	Study Area > 12 NM from land	3,200	25,600 rounds	2,200	17,600 rounds	2,200	17,600 rounds
Expeditionary Warfare							
Personnel Insertion/ Extraction[4]	MIRC; Guam; Tinian; Rota	240	None	365	None	365	None
Parachute Insertion[4]	MIRC parachute drop zones; Guam; Tinian; Rota	20	None	64	None	64	None
Mine Warfare (MIW)							
Civilian Port Defense	Mariana littorals; MIRC; Inner and Outer Apra Harbor	1	None	1	None	1	None
Mine Laying	MIRC Warning Areas	4	480 mine shapes	4	480 mine shapes	4	480 mine shapes

Table 2.5-1: Current and Proposed Training Activities (continued)

Range Activity	Location	2015 MITT FINAL EIS/OEIS Ongoing[1] Activities (MITT ROD Alternative)		Supplemental EIS/OEIS (Alternative 1)		Supplemental EIS/OEIS (Alternative 2 – Preferred Alternative)	
		No. of events (per year)	Ordnance (Number per year)	No. of events (per year)	Ordnance (Number per year)	No. of events (per year)	Ordnance (Number per year)
Mine Neutralization – Explosive Ordnance Disposal (EOD)	Agat Bay underwater detonation site Piti and Outer Apra Harbor underwater detonation sites	20	20 explosive charges	20	20 explosive charges	20	20 explosive charges
Limpet Mine Neutralization System	Mariana littorals; Inner and Outer Apra Harbor	40	40 charges	60	60 charges	60	60 charges
Airborne Mine Countermeasure – Towed Mine Detection	Study Area; nearshore	4	None	4	None	4	None
Mine Countermeasure Exercise – Towed Sonar (AQS-20, LCS)	Study Area	4	None	4	None	4	None
Mine Countermeasure Exercise – Surface Ship Sonar (SQQ-32, MCM)	Study Area	4	None	4	None	4	None
Mine Neutralization – Remotely Operated Vehicle Sonar (ASQ-235 [AQS-20], SLQ-48)	Study Area	4	4 explosive neutralizers	4	4 explosive neutralizers	4	4 explosive neutralizers

Table 2.5-1: Current and Proposed Training Activities (continued)

Range Activity	Location	2015 MITT FINAL EIS/OEIS Ongoing[1] Activities (MITT ROD Alternative)		Supplemental EIS/OEIS (Alternative 1)		Supplemental EIS/OEIS (Alternative 2 – Preferred Alternative)	
		No. of events (per year)	Ordnance (Number per year)	No. of events (per year)	Ordnance (Number per year)	No. of events (per year)	Ordnance (Number per year)
Mine Countermeasure – Towed Mine Neutralization	Study Area	4	None	4	None	4	None
Underwater Demolition Qualification/ Certification	Agat Bay underwater detonation site Piti and Outer Apra Harbor underwater detonation sites	30	30 explosive charges	45	45 explosive charges	45	45 explosive charges
Submarine Mine Exercise	Mariana Littorals, Inner/Outer Apra Harbor	16	None	1	None	1	None
Surface Ship Object Detection	Study Area	Not previously analyzed	Not previously analyzed	6	None	6	None
Strike Warfare (STW)							
Bombing Exercise (BOMBEX) (Air-to-Ground [A-G])	FDM	2,300	2,670 NEPM 6,242 explosive rounds	2,300	2,670 NEPM 6,242 explosive rounds	2,300	2,670 NEPM 6,242 explosive rounds

Table 2.5-1: Current and Proposed Training Activities (continued)

Range Activity	Location	2015 MITT FINAL EIS/OEIS Ongoing[1] Activities (MITT ROD Alternative)		Supplemental EIS/OEIS (Alternative 1)		Supplemental EIS/OEIS (Alternative 2 – Preferred Alternative)	
		No. of events (per year)	Ordnance (Number per year)	No. of events (per year)	Ordnance (Number per year)	No. of events (per year)	Ordnance (Number per year)
GUNEX (A-G)	FDM	96	24,000 small-caliber rounds	96	24,000 small-caliber rounds	96	24,000 small-caliber rounds
			94,150 medium-caliber rounds		94,650 medium-caliber rounds		94,650 medium-caliber rounds
			17,350 explosive med.-caliber rounds		17,500 explosive med-caliber rounds		17,500 explosive med -caliber rounds
			200 explosive large-caliber rounds		200 explosive large-caliber rounds		200 explosive large-caliber rounds
MISSILEX	FDM	85	2,000 explosive rockets	115	2,000 explosive rockets	115	2,000 explosive rockets
			85 explosive missiles		115 explosive missiles		115 explosive missiles
Surface Warfare (SUW)							
GUNEX (Air-to-Surface [A-S]) – Small-caliber	Study Area SUA > 12 NM from land	242	48,040 rounds	321	128,400 rounds	321	128,400 rounds

Table 2.5-1: Current and Proposed Training Activities (continued)

Range Activity	Location	2015 MITT FINAL EIS/OEIS Ongoing[1] Activities (MITT ROD Alternative)		Supplemental EIS/OEIS (Alternative 1)		Supplemental EIS/OEIS (Alternative 2 – Preferred Alternative)	
		No. of events (per year)	Ordnance (Number per year)	No. of events (per year)	Ordnance (Number per year)	No. of events (per year)	Ordnance (Number per year)
GUNEX (A-S) – Medium-caliber	Study Area SUA > 12 NM from land; Transit Corridor	295	29,500 non-explosive rounds 7,150 explosive rounds	120	3,600 explosive rounds	120	3,600 explosive rounds
MISSILEX (A-S) – Rocket)	Study Area SUA > 12 NM from land	3	114 rockets (114 explosive)	111	2,109	111	2,109
MISSILEX (A-S)	Study Area SUA > 12 NM from land	20	20 explosive missiles	10	18 explosive missiles	10	18 explosive missiles
Laser Targeting (at sea)	Study Area SUA > 12 NM from land	600	None	600	None	600	None
BOMBEX (A-S)	Study Area > 50 NM from land	37	368 NEPM 184 explosive rounds	37	368 NEPM 184 explosive rounds	37	368 NEPM 184 explosive rounds
Torpedo Exercise (Submarine to Surface)	Study Area > 3 NM from land	5	10 EXTORP	0	None	0	None
MISSILEX (Surface-to-Surface [S-S])	Study Area > 50 NM from land	12	12 explosive missiles	19	19 explosive missiles	28	28 explosive missiles

Table 2.5-1: Current and Proposed Training Activities (continued)

Range Activity	Location	2015 MITT FINAL EIS/OEIS Ongoing[1] Activities (MITT ROD Alternative)		Supplemental EIS/OEIS (Alternative 1)		Supplemental EIS/OEIS (Alternative 2 – Preferred Alternative)	
		No. of events (per year)	Ordnance (Number per year)	No. of events (per year)	Ordnance (Number per year)	No. of events (per year)	Ordnance (Number per year)
GUNEX (S-S) Ship – Large-caliber	Study Area SUA > 12 NM from land; Transit Corridor	140	5,198 non-explosive rounds	170	16,320 non-explosive rounds	255	24,480 non-explosive rounds
			500 explosive rounds		510 explosive rounds		765 explosive rounds
GUNEX (S-S) Ship – Small- and Medium-caliber	Study Area SUA > 12 NM from land; Transit Corridor	100	21,000 non-explosive rounds	162	172,010 non-explosive rounds	234	250,800 non-explosive rounds
			900 explosive rounds		480 explosive rounds		720 explosive rounds

Table 2.5-1: Current and Proposed Training Activities (continued)

Range Activity		Location	2015 MITT FINAL EIS/OEIS Ongoing[1] Activities (MITT ROD Alternative)		Supplemental EIS/OEIS (Alternative 1)		Supplemental EIS/OEIS (Alternative 2 – Preferred Alternative)	
			No. of events (per year)	Ordnance (Number per year)	No. of events (per year)	Ordnance (Number per year)	No. of events (per year)	Ordnance (Number per year)
Sinking Exercise (SINKEX) Representative ordnance. Actual ordnance used will vary.		Study Area > 50 NM from land and > 1,000 fathoms depth	2	28 explosive Bombs 42 explosive Missiles 800 explosive Large-caliber rounds 2 MK-48 explosive 4 explosive Demolitions	1	28 explosive Bombs 42 explosive Missiles 800 explosive Large-caliber rounds 2 MK-48 explosive 4 explosive Demolitions	1	28 explosive Bombs 42 explosive Missiles 800 explosive Large-caliber rounds 2 MK-48 explosive 4 explosive Demolitions
GUNEX [S-S] Boat – Small and Medium-caliber	Medium-caliber	Study Area SUA > 12 NM from land; Transit Corridor	10	2,000 non-explosive rounds	20	4,000 non-explosive rounds	20	4,000 non-explosive rounds
				100 explosive rounds		200 explosive rounds		200 explosive rounds
	Small-caliber	Study Area > 3 NM from land; Transit Corridor	40	36,000 rounds	43	36,600 rounds	43	36,600 rounds

Table 2.5-1: Current and Proposed Training Activities (continued)

Range Activity	Location	2015 MITT FINAL EIS/OEIS Ongoing[1] Activities (MITT ROD Alternative)		Supplemental EIS/OEIS (Alternative 1)		Supplemental EIS/OEIS (Alternative 2 – Preferred Alternative)	
		No. of events (per year)	Ordnance (Number per year)	No. of events (per year)	Ordnance (Number per year)	No. of events (per year)	Ordnance (Number per year)
Maritime Security Operations (MSO)	Study Area; MIRC	40	200 G911 anti-swimmer grenades	40	200 G911 anti-swimmer grenades	40	200 G911 anti-swimmer grenades
Other							
Direct Action (Tactical Air Control Party)	FDM	18	18,000 small-caliber rounds	18	30,000 small-caliber rounds	18	30,000 small caliber rounds
			600 explosives (grenade/ mortar)		1,000 med-caliber explosive		1,000 med-caliber explosive
					1,000 explosive (grenade mortar)		1,000 explosive (grenade mortar)
Intelligence, Surveillance, Reconnaissance[4]	MIRC; Guam; Tinian; Rota; Saipan	16	None	44	None	44	None
Precision Anchoring	Apra Harbor; Mariana Islands anchorages	18	None	18	None	18	None
Search and Rescue At Sea	Study Area	40	None	45	None	45	None

Table 2.5-1: Current and Proposed Training Activities (continued)

Range Activity	Location	2015 MITT FINAL EIS/OEIS Ongoing[1] Activities (MITT ROD Alternative)		Supplemental EIS/OEIS (Alternative 1)		Supplemental EIS/OEIS (Alternative 2 – Preferred Alternative)	
		No. of events (per year)	Ordnance (Number per year)	No. of events (per year)	Ordnance (Number per year)	No. of events (per year)	Ordnance (Number per year)
Small Boat Attack	Study Area > 3 NM from land	6	2,100 small-caliber rounds	18	2,100 small-caliber rounds	27	3,150 small-caliber rounds
	Study Area	12	4,000 blank rounds		4,000 blank rounds		6,000 blank rounds
Submarine Navigation	Apra Harbor and Mariana littorals	8	None	8	None	8	None
Submarine Sonar Maintenance	Study Area > 3 NM from land; Inner Apra Harbor; Transit Corridor	48	None	86	None	86	None
Surface Ship Sonar Maintenance	Study Area > 3 NM from land; Inner Apra Harbor; Transit Corridor	42	None	44	None	44	None
Underwater Survey	Mariana littorals	16	None	32	None	32	None
Unmanned Aerial Training and Certification	Study Area; Orote Point Airfield, Guam; Northwest Airfield, Guam; North Airfield, Tinian; MIRC SUA	1,000	None	951	None	951	None

Table 2.5-1: Current and Proposed Training Activities (continued)

Range Activity	Location	2015 MITT FINAL EIS/OEIS Ongoing[1] Activities (MITT ROD Alternative)		Supplemental EIS/OEIS (Alternative 1)		Supplemental EIS/OEIS (Alternative 2 – Preferred Alternative)	
		No. of events (per year)	Ordnance (Number per year)	No. of events (per year)	Ordnance (Number per year)	No. of events (per year)	Ordnance (Number per year)
Unmanned Underwater Vehicle Training (Note 2)	MIRC, Mariana Littorals, Warning Areas	N/A	N/A	64	None	64	None

Legend: = Decrease in number of events from 2015 Final MITT EIS/OEIS

= Increase in number of events from 2015 Final MITT EIS/OEIS

Note 1: Ongoing activities are those training and testing activities that were analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. The Supplemental EIS/OEIS (1) includes the analysis of activities at sea and on FDM necessary to meet readiness requirements beyond 2020 and into the reasonably foreseeable future, (2) includes any changes to those activities previously analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, and (3) reflects the most up-to-date compilation of training and testing activities deemed necessary to accomplish military readiness requirements.

Note 2: All ordnance use during the conduct of these exercises is analyzed within the Primary Mission events listed in this table.

Note 3: Small Joint Coordinated ASW exercise was not called out in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, but the components of the exercise were covered under several unit-level activities.

Note 4: Proposed increases in Personnel Insertion/Extractions; Parachute Insertions; and Intelligence, Surveillance, Reconnaissance activities would only occur offshore within the MIRC.

Notes: MITT = Mariana Islands Training and Testing, ROD = Record of Decision, EIS = Environmental Impact Statement, OEIS = Overseas Environmental Impact Statement, MIRC = Mariana Islands Range Complex, FDM = Farallon de Medinilla, N/A = Not Applicable, No. = Number, SUA = Special Use Airspace, NM = Nautical Mile(s), NEPM = Non-Explosive Practice Munitions, EXTORP = Exercise Torpedo (non-explosive), REXTORP = Recoverable Exercise Torpedo (non-explosive/non-running practice torpedo shape), SWATT = Surface Warfare Advanced Tactical Training

Table 2.5-2: Current and Proposed Testing Activities

Range Activity	Location	2015 MITT FINAL EIS/OEIS Ongoing[1] Activities (MITT ROD Alternative)		Supplemental EIS/OEIS (Alternative 1)		Supplemental EIS/OEIS (Alternative 2 – Preferred Alternative)	
		No. of events (per year)	Ordnance (Number per year)	No. of events (per year)	Ordnance (Number per year)	No. of events (per year)	Ordnance (Number per year)
Legend:			**= Decrease in number of events from 2015 Final MITT EIS/OEIS**			**= Increase in number of events from 2015 Final MITT EIS/OEIS**	
NAVAL AIR SYSTEMS COMMAND PROPOSED TESTING ACTIVITIES							
Surface Warfare (SUW)							
Air-to-Surface Missile Test	Study Area > 50 NM from land	8	8 Harpoon Missiles (up to 4 explosive)	4	4 Harpoon Missiles (up to 4 explosive)	4	4 Harpoon Missiles (up to 4 explosive)
Anti-Submarine Warfare (ASW)							
Anti-Submarine Warfare Tracking Test – Maritime Patrol Aircraft (Sonobuoys)	Study Area > 3 NM from land	188	240 IEER 553 SUS	26	392 SUS	26	392 SUS
Anti-Submarine Warfare Torpedo Test	Study Area > 3 NM from land	40	40 EXTORP	20	20 REXTORPs	20	20 REXTORPs
Electronic Warfare (EW)							
Intelligence, Surveillance, Reconnaissance /Electronic Warfare Testing (previously named Broad Area Maritime Surveillance Testing – MQ-4C)	Study Area > 3 NM from land	10	None	20	None	20	None

Table 2.5-2: Current and Proposed Testing Activities (continued)

Range Activity	Location	2015 MITT FINAL EIS/OEIS Ongoing[1] Activities (MITT ROD Alternative)		Supplemental EIS/OEIS (Alternative 1)		Supplemental EIS/OEIS (Alternative 2 – Preferred Alternative)	
		No. of events (per year)	Ordnance (Number per year)	No. of events (per year)	Ordnance (Number per year)	No. of events (per year)	Ordnance (Number per year)
NAVAL SEA SYSTEMS COMMAND TESTING ACTIVITIES							
Anti-Submarine Warfare							
Anti-Submarine Warfare Mission Package Testing	Mariana Island Range Complex	33	None	100	8 torpedoes (non-explosive)	100	8 torpedoes (non-explosive)
At-Sea Sonar Testing	Study Area	20	None	3	None	7	None
Countermeasure Testing	Study Area	2	56 torpedoes	0	None	0	None
Torpedo (Explosive) Testing	Mariana Island Range Complex	2[2]	20 torpedoes (up to 8 non-explosive[2])	2	4 explosive (8 non-explosive)	3	6 explosive (12 non-explosive)
Torpedo (Non-explosive) Testing	Mariana Island Range Complex			6	28 non-explosive	7	37 non-explosive
Mine Warfare							
Mine Countermeasure and Neutralization Testing (Previously covered under Mine Countermeasure Mission Package Testing)	Mariana Island Range Complex	32	48 neutralizers (up to 24 explosive)	3	40 neutralizers	3	40 neutralizers
Electronic Warfare (EW)							
Radar and Other System Testing	Study Area	Not Previously Analyzed	Not Previously Analyzed	54	None	60	None

Table 2.5-2: Current and Proposed Testing Activities (continued)

Range Activity	Location	2015 MITT FINAL EIS/OEIS Ongoing[1] Activities (MITT ROD Alternative)		Supplemental EIS/OEIS (Alternative 1)		Supplemental EIS/OEIS (Alternative 2 – Preferred Alternative)	
		No. of events (per year)	Ordnance (Number per year)	No. of events (per year)	Ordnance (Number per year)	No. of events (per year)	Ordnance (Number per year)
Shipboard Protection Systems and Swimmer Defense Testing							
Pierside Integrated Swimmer Defense	Inner Apra Harbor	11	None	0	None	0	None
Surface Warfare							
Gun Testing – Large Caliber	Mariana Island Range Complex	4	5,600 rounds (Up to 3,290 in-air explosives)	0	None	0	None
Gun Testing – Medium Caliber	Mariana Island Range Complex	4	4,080 rounds (up to 2,040 explosives)	0	None	0	None
Gun Testing – Small Caliber	Study Area	4	2,000 rounds	0	None	0	None
Missile and Rocket Testing	Mariana Island Range Complex	4	32 missiles/rockets (up to 16 explosives)	0	None	0	None
Kinetic Energy Weapon Testing	Study Area	50	2,000 projectiles	4	80 projectiles 160 non-explosive projectiles	9	180 projectiles 360 non-explosive projectiles
		1 time-only event	5,000 projectiles				

Table 2.5-2: Current and Proposed Testing Activities (continued)

Range Activity	Location	2015 MITT FINAL EIS/OEIS Ongoing[1] Activities (MITT ROD Alternative)		Supplemental EIS/OEIS (Alternative 1)		Supplemental EIS/OEIS (Alternative 2 – Preferred Alternative)	
		No. of events (per year)	Ordnance (Number per year)	No. of events (per year)	Ordnance (Number per year)	No. of events (per year)	Ordnance (Number per year)
Vessel Evaluation (previously named Life Cycle Activities)							
Ship Signature Testing	MITT Study Area	17	None	0	None	0	None
Undersea Warfare Testing (previously covered under torpedo testing)	Mariana Island Range Complex	2[2]	20 torpedoes (up to 8 explosive)[2]	1	8 non-explosive torpedoes	1	8 non-explosive torpedoes
Other Testing Activities							
Simulant Testing	Study Area	Not Previously Analyzed	Not Previously Analyzed	100	None	100	None
OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH							
Acoustic and Oceanographic Research (previously named North Pacific Acoustic Lab Philippine Sea 2018–19 Experiment, Deep Water)	Study Area	1	None	1	None	1	None

Legend: = Decrease in number of events from 2015 Final MITT EIS/OEIS

= Increase in number of events from 2015 Final MITT EIS/OEIS

Table 2.5-2: Current and Proposed Testing Activities (continued)

Range Activity	Location	2015 MITT FINAL EIS/OEIS Ongoing[1] Activities (MITT ROD Alternative)		Supplemental EIS/OEIS (Alternative 1)		Supplemental EIS/OEIS (Alternative 2 – Preferred Alternative)	
		No. of events (per year)	Ordnance (Number per year)	No. of events (per year)	Ordnance (Number per year)	No. of events (per year)	Ordnance (Number per year)

[1] Ongoing activities are those training and testing activities that were analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. The Supplemental EIS/OEIS (1) includes the analysis of activities at sea and on FDM necessary to meet readiness requirements beyond 2020 and into the reasonably foreseeable future, (2) includes any changes to those activities previously analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, and (3) reflects the most up-to-date compilation of training and testing activities deemed necessary to accomplish military readiness requirements.

[2] Torpedo (Explosive) Testing, Torpedo (Non-explosive) Testing, and Undersea Warfare Testing were previously covered under torpedo testing in the 2015 MITT EIS/OEIS.

Notes: MITT = Mariana Islands Training and Testing, ROD = Record of Decision, EIS = Environmental Impact Statement, OEIS = Overseas Environmental Impact Statement, MIRC = Mariana Islands Range Complex, NM = Nautical Mile(s), No. = Number, EXTORP = Exercise Torpedo (non-explosive), REXTORP = Recoverable Exercise Torpedo (non-explosive), IEER = Improved Extended Echo Ranging, SUS = Signal Underwater Sound

REFERENCES

U.S. Department of Defense. (2002). *Electromagnetic Environmental Effects: Requirements for Systems*. (MIL-STD-464A). Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, OH: U.S. Air Force/Aeronautical Systems Center.

U.S. Department of Defense. (2009). *Protecting Personnel from Electromagnetic Fields*. (DoD Instruction 6055.11). Washington, DC: Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2011). *U.S. Navy Dive Manual*. Washington, DC: Commander, Naval Sea Systems Command.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2015). *Final Mariana Islands Training and Testing Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement*. Pearl Harbor, HI: Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Pacific.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. (2015). *Biological Opinion for the Mariana Islands Training and Testing Program*. Honolulu, HI: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Pacific Islands Fish and Wildlife Office.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. (2016). *Informal Consultation on Mariana Islands Training and Testing Program Affects to Eighteen Newly-Listed Species, Guam and Tinian*. Honolulu, HI: Fish and Wildlife Service, Pacific Islands Fish and Wildlife Office.

This page intentionally left blank

3 Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences

Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/ Overseas Environmental Impact Statement Mariana Islands Training and Testing

TABLE OF CONTENTS

3 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES 3-1

3.0 Introduction 3-1

3.0.1 Overall Approach to Analysis 3-1

3.0.1.1 Navy Compiled and Generated Data 3-2

3.0.1.2 Navy's Quantitative Analysis to Determine Impacts on Sea Turtles and Marine Mammals 3-3

3.0.2 Regulatory Framework 3-7

3.0.3 Resources and Issues Not Carried Forward for More Detailed Discussion 3-8

3.0.4 Identification of Stressors for Analysis 3-8

3.0.4.1 Acoustic Stressors 3-10

3.0.4.2 Explosive Stressors 3-22

3.0.4.3 Energy Stressors 3-25

3.0.4.4 Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors 3-27

3.0.4.5 Entanglement Stressors 3-34

3.0.4.6 Ingestion Stressors 3-37

3.0.4.7 Conceptual Framework for Assessing Effects from Acoustic and Explosive Activities 3-38

List of Figures

Figure 3.0-1: Gun Blast and Projectile from a MK 45 MOD 2 5-inch/54 Caliber Navy Gun on a Cruiser (top), a MK 45 MOD 2 5-in/54 Caliber Navy Gun on a Destroyer (bottom left), and a MK 45 MOD 4 5-inch/62 Caliber Navy Gun on a Destroyer (bottom right) 3-21

Figure 3.0-2: Sonobuoy Launch Depicting the Relative Size of a Small Decelerator/Parachute 3-36

Figure 3.0-3: Aerial Target (Drone) with Parachute Deployed 3-37

Figure 3.0-4: Flow Chart of the Evaluation Process of Sound-Producing Activities 3-41

Figure 3.0-5: Two Hypothetical Threshold Shifts 3-44

List of Tables

Table 3.0-1: Comparison of Stressors Analyzed 3-8

Table 3.0-2: Sonar and Transducer Sources Quantitatively Analyzed 3-13

Table 3.0-3: Sonar and Transducers Qualitatively Analyzed....3-15
Table 3.0-4: Representative Aircraft Sound Characteristics....3-17
Table 3.0-5: Sonic Boom Underwater Sound Levels Modeled for F/A-18 Hornet Supersonic Flight....3-19
Table 3.0-6: Example Weapons Noise....3-20
Table 3.0-7: Explosive Sources Quantitatively Analyzed that Could Be Used Underwater or at the Water Surface....3-24
Table 3.0-8: Typical Air Explosive Munitions During Navy Activities....3-25
Table 3.0-9: Annual Number of Events in the Study Area that Include In-Water Electromagnetic Devices....3-26
Table 3.0-10: Annual Number of Events in the Study Area that Include High-Energy Lasers....3-27
Table 3.0-11: Annual Number of Events in the Study Area that Include Aircraft Movement....3-28
Table 3.0-12: Annual Number of Events in the Study Area that Include Vessel Movement....3-28
Table 3.0-13: Annual Number of Events in the Study Area that Include In-Water Devices....3-28
Table 3.0-14: Annual Number of Non-Explosive Practice Munitions Expended At Sea in the Study Area....3-29
Table 3.0-15: Annual Number of Other Military Expended Materials Used At Sea in the Study Area....3-30
Table 3.0-16: Annual Number of Explosive Munitions Expended At Sea in the Study Area....3-30
Table 3.0-17: Annual Number of Targets Expended At Sea in the Study Area....3-31
Table 3.0-18: Impact Area of Proposed Military Expended Materials....3-31
Table 3.0-19: Annual Number of Events in the Study Area that Include Seafloor Devices....3-33
Table 3.0-20: Annual Number of Munitions Used on Farallon de Medinilla....3-33
Table 3.0-21: Annual Number of Events in the Study Area that Include the Potential for Personnel Disturbance....3-34
Table 3.0-22: Annual Number of Wires and Cables Expended in the Study Area....3-35
Table 3.0-23: Size Categories for Decelerators/Parachutes Expended During Training and Testing Activities....3-36
Table 3.0-24: Annual Number of Decelerators/Parachutes Expended in the Study Area....3-37
Table 3.0-25: Annual Number of Chaff Cartridges Expended in the Study Area....3-38
Table 3.0-26: Annual Number of Flares Expended in the Study Area....3-38

3 Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences

This chapter describes the United States (U.S.) Department of the Navy's (Navy's) approach to analysis, existing environmental conditions in the Mariana Islands Training and Testing (MITT) Study Area, as well as the analysis of resources potentially impacted by the Proposed Action described in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives). The Study Area is described in Section 2.1 (Description of the Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area) and depicted in Figure 2.1-1.

3.0 Introduction

In May 2015, the Navy released the MITT Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (EIS/OEIS) (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2015a), hereafter referred to as the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, for which a Record of Decision was released (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2015b). The Navy applied the Navy Acoustics Effects Model for the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS to quantitatively analyze potential acoustic effects from Navy training and testing activities. For this Supplemental EIS (SEIS)/OEIS, the Navy refined the Navy Acoustics Effects Model (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2018b) and updated marine mammal density estimates (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2018a), as well as the acoustic criteria and activity data inputs used in the acoustic model (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2017b).

The following subsections are included in Section 3.0:

- Section 3.0.1 (Overall Approach to Analysis) identifies the methodology used in this SEIS/OEIS to assess resource impacts associated with the Proposed Action.
- Section 3.0.2 (Regulatory Framework) presents the regulatory framework on which this SEIS/OEIS is based. It identifies applicable laws, regulations, executive orders (EOs), and directives used to develop the analyses.
- Section 3.0.3 (Resources and Issues Not Carried Forward for More Detailed Discussion) identifies the resources that were eliminated from further consideration in this SEIS/OEIS.
- Section 3.0.4 (Identification of Stressors for Analysis) discusses the stressors used in the analysis of impacts on resources

3.0.1 Overall Approach to Analysis

The methods used in this SEIS/OEIS to assess resource impacts associated with the Proposed Action include the procedural steps outlined below:

- Review the existing 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and Record of Decision.
- Determine if the affected environment has changed.
- Identify new activities and proposed changes to existing activities.
- Identify the stressors associated with the updated list of activities.
- Review existing and identify new federal and state regulations and standards relevant to resource-specific management or protection and determine if there has been any change since the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.
- Review and apply new literature, including science, surveys, and information on how resources could be affected by stressors.
- Determine if there is a new method of analysis for those activities.
- Review and consider comments received from members of the public and other stakeholders during the scoping period.

- Identify past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions to analyze the cumulative impacts.
- Consider mitigation measures to reduce identified potential impacts.

3.0.1.1 Navy Compiled and Generated Data

While preparing this document, the Navy used the best available data, science, and information accepted by the relevant and appropriate regulatory and scientific communities to establish a baseline in the environmental analyses for all resources in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the Administrative Procedure Act (5 United States Code sections 551–596), and EO 12114.

In support of the environmental baseline and environmental consequences sections for this and other environmental documents, the Navy has sponsored and supported both internal and independent research and monitoring efforts. The Navy's research and monitoring programs, as described below, are largely focused on filling data gaps and obtaining the most up-to-date science.

3.0.1.1.1 Marine Species Monitoring and Research Programs

The Navy has been conducting marine species monitoring for compliance with the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA) and Endangered Species Act (ESA) since 2005, both in association with training and testing events and independently. In addition to monitoring activities associated with regulatory compliance, two other U.S. Navy research programs provide extensive investments in basic and applied research: the Office of Naval Research Marine Mammals & Biology program, and the Living Marine Resources program. In fact, the U.S. Navy is one of the largest sources of funding for marine mammal research in the world. A survey of federally funded marine mammal research and conservation conducted by the Marine Mammal Commission found that the Navy was the second-largest source of funding for marine mammal activities (direct project expenditures, as well as associated indirect or support costs) in the United States in 2014, second only to National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Fisheries (Purdy, 2016).

The monitoring program has historically focused on collecting baseline data that supports analysis of marine mammal occurrence, distribution, abundance, and habitat use preferences in and around ocean areas in the Atlantic and Pacific where the Navy conducts training and testing. More recently, the priority has begun to shift towards assessing the potential response of individual species to training and testing activities. Data collected through the monitoring program serves to inform the analysis of impacts on marine mammals with respect to species distribution, habitat use, and potential responses to training and testing activities. Monitoring is performed using various methods, including visual surveys from surface vessels and aircraft, passive acoustics, and tagging. Additional information on the program is available on the U.S. Navy Marine Species Monitoring Program website (https://www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/), which serves as a public online portal for information on the background, history, and progress of the program and also provides access to reports, documentation, data, and updates on current monitoring projects and initiatives.

The two other Navy programs previously mentioned invest in research on the potential effects of sound on marine species and develop scientific information and analytic tools that support preparation of environmental impact statements and associated regulatory processes under the MMPA and ESA, as well as support development of improved monitoring and detection technology and advance overall knowledge about marine species. These programs support coordinated science, technology, research, and development focused on understanding the effects of sound on marine mammals and other marine

species, including physiological, behavioral, ecological, and population-level effects. Additional information on these programs and other ocean resources-oriented initiatives can be found on the Living Marine Resources Program page at https://www.navfac.navy.mil/navfac_worldwide/specialty_centers/exwc/products_and_services/ev/lmr.html.

3.0.1.2 Navy's Quantitative Analysis to Determine Impacts on Sea Turtles and Marine Mammals

If proposed Navy activities introduce sound or explosive energy into the marine environment, an analysis of potential impacts on marine species is conducted. Data on the density of animals (number of animals per unit area) of each species and stock is needed, along with criteria and thresholds defining the levels of sound and energy that may cause certain types of impacts. The Navy's acoustic effects model takes the density and the criteria and thresholds as inputs and analyzes Navy training and testing activities. Finally, mitigation and animal avoidance behaviors are considered to determine the number of impacts that could occur. The inputs and process are described below. A detailed explanation of this analysis is provided in the technical report titled *Quantifying Acoustic Impacts on Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles: Methods and Analytical Approach for Phase III Training and Testing* (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2018b).

3.0.1.2.1 Marine Species Density Database

A quantitative analysis of impacts on a species requires data on their abundance and distribution in the potentially impacted area. The most appropriate metric for this type of analysis is density, which is the number of animals present per unit area. Estimating marine species density requires substantial surveys and effort to collect and analyze data to produce a usable estimate. The National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) is the primary agency responsible for estimating marine mammal and sea turtle density within the U.S. Exclusive Economic Zone. Other agencies and independent researchers often publish density data for species in specific areas of interest, including areas outside the U.S. Exclusive Economic Zone. In areas where surveys have not produced adequate data to allow robust density estimates, methods such as model extrapolation from surveyed areas, Relative Environmental Suitability models, or expert opinion are used to estimate occurrence. These density estimation methods rely on information such as animal sightings from adjacent locations, amount of survey effort, and the associated environmental variables (e.g., depth, sea surface temperature).

There is no single source of density data for every area of the world, species, and season because of the fiscal limitations, resources, effort involved in providing survey coverage to sufficiently estimate density, and practical limitations. Therefore, to characterize marine species density for large areas, such as the MITT Study Area, the Navy compiled data from multiple sources and developed a protocol to select the best available density estimates based on species, area, and time (i.e., season). When multiple data sources were available, the Navy ranked density estimates based on a hierarchal approach to ensure that the most accurate estimates were selected. The highest tier included peer-reviewed published studies of density estimates from spatial models, since these provide spatially explicit density estimates with relatively low uncertainty. Other preferred sources included peer-reviewed published studies of density estimates derived from systematic line-transect survey data, the method typically used for the NMFS marine mammal stock assessment reports. In the absence of survey data, information on species occurrence and known or inferred habitat associations have been used to predict densities using model-based approaches, including Relative Environmental Suitability models. Because these estimates inherently include a high degree of uncertainty, they were considered the least preferred data source. In

cases where a preferred data source was not available, density estimates were selected based on expert opinion from scientists.

The resulting Geographic Information System database includes seasonal density values for every marine mammal and sea turtle species present within the Study Area. This database is described in the technical report titled *U.S. Navy Marine Species Density Database Phase III for the Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area* (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2018a), hereafter referred to as the Density Technical Report. These data were used as an input into the Navy Acoustic Effects Model.

The Density Technical Report describes the models that were utilized in detail and provides detailed explanations of the models applied to each species density estimate. The below list describes models in order of preference.

1. Spatial density models are preferred and used when available because they provide an estimate with the least amount of uncertainty by deriving estimates for divided segments of the sampling area. These models (see Becker et al., 2016; Forney et al., 2015) predict spatial variability of animal presence as a function of habitat variables (e.g., sea surface temperature, seafloor depth). This model is developed for areas, species, and, when available, specific timeframes (months or seasons) with sufficient survey data.
2. Stratified design-based density estimates use line-transect survey data with the sampling area divided (stratified) into sub-regions, and a density is predicted for each sub-region (see Barlow, 2016; Becker et al., 2016; Bradford et al., 2017; Campbell et al., 2015; Jefferson et al., 2014). While geographically stratified density estimates provide a good indication of a species' distribution within the Study Area, the uncertainty is typically high because each sub-region estimate is based on a smaller stratified segment of the overall survey effort.
3. Design-based density estimations use line-transect survey data from land and aerial surveys designed to cover a specific geographic area (see Carretta et al., 2015). These estimates use the same survey data as stratified design-based estimates, but they are not segmented into sub-regions and instead provide one estimate for a large surveyed area.
4. Although relative environmental suitability models provide estimates for areas of the oceans that have not been surveyed, using information on species occurrence and inferred habitat associations, and have been used in past density databases, these models were not used in the current quantitative analysis.

When interpreting the results of the quantitative analysis, as described in the Density Technical Report, it is important to consider that "each model is limited to the variables and assumptions considered by the original data source provider. No mathematical model representation of any biological population is perfect, and with regards to marine mammal biodiversity, any single model will not completely explain the results" (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2017a). These factors and others described in the Density Technical Report should be considered when examining the estimated impact numbers in comparison to current population abundance information for any given species or stock.

3.0.1.2.2 Developing Acoustic and Explosive Criteria and Thresholds

Information about the numerical sound and energy levels that are likely to elicit certain types of physiological and behavioral reactions is needed to analyze potential impacts on marine species. The criteria and thresholds for quantitative modeling of impacts are based on the best available existing data from scientific journals, technical reports, and monitoring reports for estimating impacts to marine species. Working with NMFS, the Navy has developed updated criteria for marine mammals and sea turtles.

Since the release of the *Criteria and Thresholds for U.S. Navy Acoustic and Explosive Effect Analysis* in 2012 (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2012a), recent and emerging science has necessitated an update to these criteria and thresholds for assessing potential impacts on marine mammals and sea turtles. A detailed description of the revised acoustic and explosive criteria and threshold development is included in the supporting technical report *Criteria and Thresholds for U.S. Navy Acoustic and Explosive Impact to Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles* (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2017b), and details are provided in each resource section. A series of behavioral studies, largely funded by the U.S. Navy, has led to a new understanding of how some species of marine mammals react to military sonar. This understanding resulted in developing new behavioral response functions for estimating alterations in behavior. Additional information on auditory weighting functions has also emerged [e.g., (Mulsow et al., 2015)], leading to the development of a new methodology to predict auditory weighting functions for each hearing group along with the accompanying hearing loss thresholds. These criteria for predicting hearing loss in marine mammals were largely adopted by NMFS for species within their purview (National Marine Fisheries Service, 2016).

The Navy also uses criteria for estimating effects to fishes and the ranges to which those effects are likely to occur. A working group of experts generated a technical report that provides numerical criteria and relative likelihood of effects to fish within different hearing groups (i.e., fishes with no swim bladder versus fishes with a swim bladder involved in hearing) (Popper et al., 2014). Where applicable, thresholds and relative risk factors presented in the technical report were used to assist in the analysis of effects to fishes from Navy activities. Details on criteria used to estimate impacts on marine fishes are contained within the appropriate stressor section (e.g., sonar and other transducers, explosives) within Section 3.9 (Fishes). This panel of experts also estimated parametric criteria for the effects of sea turtle exposure to sources located at ”near,” “intermediate,” and “far” distances, assigning ”low,” ”medium,” and “high” probability to specific categories of behavioral impacts (Popper et al., 2014).

3.0.1.2.3 The Navy’s Acoustic Effects Model

The Navy’s Acoustic Effects Model calculates sound energy propagation from sonar and other transducers and explosives during naval activities and the energy or sound received by animat dosimeters. Animat dosimeters are virtual representations of marine mammals or sea turtles distributed in the area around the modeled naval activity; each animat records its individual sound “dose.” The model bases the distribution of animats over the Study Area on the density values in the Navy Marine Species Density Database and distributes animats in the water column proportional to the known time that species spend at varying depths.

The model accounts for environmental variability of sound propagation in both distance and depth when computing the received sound level on the animats. The model conducts a statistical analysis based on multiple model runs to compute the estimated effects on animals. The number of animats that exceed the received threshold for an effect is tallied to provide an estimate of the number of marine mammals or sea turtles that could be affected.

Assumptions in the Navy model intentionally err on the side of overestimation when there are unknowns:

- Naval activities are modeled as though they would occur regardless of proximity to marine mammals or sea turtles (i.e., mitigation and implementation of standard operating procedures that employ protective measures are not modeled) and without any avoidance of the activity by the animal. The final step of the quantitative analysis of acoustic effects is to consider the

implementation of mitigation. For sonar and other transducers, the possibility that marine mammals or sea turtles would avoid continued or repeated sound exposures is also considered.

- Many explosions from munitions such as bombs and missiles actually occur upon impact with above-water targets and at the water's surface. However, for this analysis, sources such as these were modeled as exploding underwater. This modeling overestimates the amount of explosive and acoustic energy entering the water.

The model estimates the impacts caused by individual training and testing activities. During any individual modeled event, impacts on individual animats are considered over 24-hour periods. The animats do not represent actual animals, but rather allow for a statistical analysis of the number of instances that marine mammals or sea turtles may be exposed to sound levels resulting in an effect. Therefore, the model estimates the number of instances in which an effect threshold was exceeded over the course of a year, but it does not estimate the number of individual marine mammals or sea turtles that may be impacted over a year (i.e., some marine mammals or sea turtles could be impacted several times, while others would not experience any impact). A detailed explanation of the Navy's Acoustic Effects Model is provided in the technical report *Quantifying Acoustic Impacts on Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles: Methods and Analytical Approach for Phase III Training and Testing* (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2018b).

3.0.1.2.4 Accounting for Mitigation

3.0.1.2.4.1 Sonar and Other Transducers

The Navy implements mitigation measures (described in Section 5.3.2, Acoustic Stressors), including the power-down or shut-down (i.e., power off) of sonar when a marine mammal or sea turtle is observed in the mitigation zone, during activities that use sonar and other transducers. The mitigation zones encompass the estimated ranges to injury (including permanent threshold shift [PTS]) for a given sonar exposure. Therefore, the impact analysis quantifies the potential for mitigation to reduce the risk of PTS. Two factors are considered when quantifying the effectiveness of mitigation: (1) the extent to which the type of mitigation proposed for a sound-producing activity (e.g., active sonar) allows for observation of the mitigation zone prior to and during the activity; and (2) the sightability of each species that may be present in the mitigation zone, which is determined by species-specific characteristics and the viewing platform. A detailed explanation of the analysis is provided in the technical report *Quantifying Acoustic Impacts on Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles: Methods and Analytical Approach for Phase III Training and Testing* (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2018b).

In the quantitative analysis, consideration of mitigation measures means that, for activities where mitigation is feasible, some model-estimated PTS is considered mitigated to the level of temporary threshold shift (TTS). The quantitative analysis does not analyze the potential for mitigation to reduce TTS or behavioral effects, even though mitigation could also reduce the likelihood of these effects. In practice, mitigation also protects all unobserved (below the surface) animals in the vicinity, including other species, in addition to the observed animal. However, the analysis assumes that only animals sighted at the water surface would be protected by the applied mitigation. The analysis, therefore, does not capture the protection afforded to all marine species in the vicinity of animals sighted at the ocean surface within the mitigation zone.

The ability to observe the range to PTS was estimated for each training or testing event. The ability of Navy Lookouts to detect marine mammals or sea turtles in or approaching the mitigation zone is dependent on the animal's presence at the surface and the characteristics of the animal that influence

its sightability (such as group size or surface active behavior). The behaviors and characteristics of some species may make them easier to detect. For example, based on small boat surveys between 2000 and 2012 in the Hawaiian Islands, pantropical spotted dolphins and striped dolphins were frequently observed leaping out of the water, and Cuvier's beaked whales (Baird, 2013) and Blainville's beaked whales (HDR, 2012) were occasionally observed breaching. These behaviors are visible from a great distance and likely increase sighting distances and detections of these species. Environmental conditions under which the training or testing activity could take place are also considered, such as the sea surface conditions, weather (e.g., fog or rain), and day versus night.

3.0.1.2.4.2 Explosions

The Navy implements mitigation measures (described in Section 5.3.3, Explosive Stressors) during explosive activities, including delaying detonations when a marine mammal or sea turtle is observed in the mitigation zone. The mitigation zones encompass the estimated ranges to mortality for a given explosive. Therefore, the impact analysis quantifies the potential for mitigation to reduce the risk of mortality due to exposure to explosives. Two factors are considered when quantifying the effectiveness of mitigation: (1) the extent to which the type of mitigation proposed for a sound-producing activity (e.g., gunnery exercise) allows for observation of the mitigation zone prior to and during the activity; and (2) the sightability of each species that may be present in the mitigation zone, which is determined by species-specific characteristics and the viewing platform. A detailed explanation of the analysis is provided in the technical report *Quantifying Acoustic Impacts on Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles: Methods and Analytical Approach for Phase III Training and Testing* (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2018b).

In the quantitative analysis, consideration of mitigation measures means that, for activities where mitigation is feasible, model-estimated mortality is considered mitigated to the level of injury. The impact analysis does not analyze the potential for mitigation to reduce non-auditory injury, PTS, TTS, or behavioral effects, even though mitigation would also reduce the likelihood of these effects. In practice, mitigation also protects all unobserved (below the surface) animals in the vicinity, including other species, in addition to the observed animal. However, the analysis assumes that only animals sighted at the water surface would be protected by the applied mitigation. The analysis, therefore, does not capture the protection afforded to all marine species that may be near or within the mitigation zone.

3.0.1.2.5 Marine Mammal Avoidance of Sonar and Other Transducers

Because a marine mammal is assumed to initiate avoidance behavior (tens of meters away for most species groups) after an initial startle reaction when exposed to relatively high received levels of sound, a marine mammal could reduce its cumulative sound energy exposure over a sonar event with multiple pings. This would reduce risk of both PTS and TTS, although the quantitative analysis conservatively only considers the potential to reduce instances of PTS by accounting for marine mammals swimming away to avoid repeated high-level sound exposures. All reductions in PTS impacts from likely avoidance behaviors are instead considered TTS impacts.

3.0.2 Regulatory Framework

In accordance with the Council on Environmental Quality regulations that implement the requirements of the NEPA, other planning and environmental review procedures are integrated in this SEIS/OEIS to the fullest extent possible.

Chapter 6 (Additional Regulatory Considerations) provides a status of compliance with the applicable environmental laws, regulations, and EOs that were considered in preparing this SEIS/OEIS (including those that may be secondary considerations in the resource evaluations).

The federal statutes and EOs considered in this SEIS/OEIS that were described in Section 3.0.1 (Regulatory Framework) of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS have not changed.

3.0.3 Resources and Issues Not Carried Forward for More Detailed Discussion

Considerations under EO 13045, *Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks*, were eliminated from further analysis because all of the proposed activities occur in the ocean where there are no child populations present. Therefore, the Proposed Action would not lead to disproportionate environmental health risks or safety risks to children.

3.0.4 Identification of Stressors for Analysis

Some of the stressors identified for consideration in this SEIS/OEIS in the analysis of resources have been refined from those considered in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. The list of stressors analyzed in this SEIS/OEIS and changes from the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS are shown in Table 3.0-1. Although the names of some stressors have changed, the analysis conducted on that stressor did not change. Where useful, an explanation of the change is provided in italics.

Table 3.0-1: Comparison of Stressors Analyzed

2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS	*Supplemental EIS/OEIS*
Components and Stressors for Physical Resources	
Sediments and Water Quality Stressors	
• Explosives and explosive byproducts • Metals • Chemicals other than explosives • Other materials	• Explosives • Metals • Chemicals other than explosives • Other materials
Air Quality Stressors	
• Criteria pollutants • Hazardous air pollutants	• Criteria pollutants • Hazardous air pollutants
Components and Stressors for Biological Resources	
Acoustic Stressors	
• Sonar and other active acoustic sources • Vessel noise • Aircraft noise • Weapons firing, launch, and impact noise • Underwater explosives • Swimmer defense airguns	• Sonar and other transducers • Vessel noise • Aircraft noise • Weapons noise • (*"Underwater explosives" is moved to next category of "In-water explosions"*) • (*Swimmer defense airguns are not proposed or analyzed in this SEIS/OEIS*)
Explosive Stressors	
(*In the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, Explosives were included under Acoustic Stressors*)	• In-water explosions • In-air explosions

Table 3.0-1: Comparison of Stressors Analyzed (continued)

2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS	*Supplemental EIS/OEIS*
Energy Stressors	
• Electromagnetic devices • Lasers	• In-air electromagnetic devices (*included under Electromagnetic Devices*) • In-water electromagnetic devices (*included under Electromagnetic Devices*) • Lasers (high energy)
Components and Stressors for Physical Resources	
Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors	
• Aircraft and aerial targets • Vessels • In-water devices • Military expended materials • Seafloor devices • Ground disturbance • Wildfires	• Aircraft and aerial targets • Vessels and in-water devices • Military expended materials • Seafloor devices • Ground disturbance (FDM only) • Personnel disturbance • Wildfires (FDM only)
Entanglement Stressors	
• Fiber optic cables and guidance wires • Decelerators/parachutes	• Wires and cables • Decelerators/parachutes
Ingestion Stressors	
• Military expended materials from munitions • Military expended materials other than munitions	• Military expended materials from munitions • Military expended materials other than munitions
Secondary Stressors	
• Habitat • Prey availability	• Impacts on habitat • Invasive species introductions into terrestrial habitats (FDM only) • Impacts on prey availability
Components and Stressors for Human Resources	
Cultural Resources Stressors	
• Acoustic • Physical Disturbance and Strike	• Explosives (*previously referred to as Acoustic*) • Physical Disturbance and Strike
Socioeconomic Resources Stressors	
• Accessibility • Airborne acoustics • Physical disturbance and strike • Secondary impacts from availability of resources	• Accessibility • Airborne acoustics • Physical disturbance and strike • Secondary impacts from availability of resources
Public Health and Safety Stressors	
• In-water energy • In-air energy • Physical interactions • Secondary stressors (sediments and water quality)	• In-water energy • In-air energy • Physical interactions • Secondary stressors (sediments and water quality)

Notes: (1) *Italics* reflect changes in stressors/stressor analysis in this SEIS/OEIS as compared to 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS; (2) FDM = Farallon de Medinilla; OEIS = Overseas Environmental Impact Statement; SEIS = Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement

3.0.4.1 Acoustic Stressors

This section describes the characteristics of sounds produced during naval training and testing and the relative magnitude and location of these sound-producing activities. This section provides the basis for analysis of acoustic impacts on resources in the remainder of Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences). Explanations of the terminology and metrics used when describing sound in this SEIS/OEIS are in Appendix H (Acoustic and Explosive Concepts).

Acoustic stressors include acoustic signals emitted into the water from a specific source such as sonar and other transducers (devices that convert energy from one form to another—in this case, to sound waves), as well as incidental sources of broadband sound produced as a byproduct of vessel movement, aircraft transits, and use of weapons or other deployed objects. Explosives also produce broadband sound but are characterized separately from other acoustic sources due to their unique hazardous characteristics (Section 3.0.4.2, Explosive Stressors). Characteristics of each of these sound sources are described in the following sections.

In order to better organize and facilitate the analysis of approximately 300 sources of underwater sound used for testing and training by the Navy including sonars, other transducers, and explosives, a series of source classifications, or source bins, were developed. The source classification bins do not include the broadband sounds produced incidental to vessel and aircraft transits and weapons firing.

The use of source classification bins provides the following benefits:

- Provides the ability for new sensors or munitions to be covered under existing authorizations, as long as those sources fall within the parameters of a "bin."
- Improves efficiency of source utilization data collection and reporting requirements anticipated under the MMPA authorizations.
- Ensures a conservative approach to all impact estimates, as all sources within a given class are modeled as the most impactful source (highest source level, longest duty cycle [i.e., the proportion of time signals are emitted in a given period of time], or largest net explosive weight) within that bin.
- Allows analyses to be conducted in a more efficient manner, without any compromise of analytical results.
- Provides a framework to support the reallocation of source usage (hours/explosives) between different source bins, as long as the total numbers of takes remain within the overall analyzed and authorized limits. This flexibility is required to support evolving Navy training and testing requirements, which are linked to military missions and combat operations.

3.0.4.1.1 Sonar and Other Transducers

Active sonar and other transducers emit non-impulsive sound waves into the water to detect objects, safely navigate, and communicate. Passive sonars differ from active sound sources in that they do not emit acoustic signals; rather, they only receive acoustic information about the environment, or listen. In this SEIS/OEIS, the terms sonar and other transducers will be used to indicate active sound sources unless otherwise specified.

The Navy employs a variety of sonars and other transducers to obtain and transmit information about the undersea environment. Some examples are mid-frequency hull-mounted sonars used to find and track potential enemy submarines, high-frequency small object detection sonars used to detect mines, high-frequency underwater modems used to transfer data over short ranges, and extremely high-frequency (greater than 200 kilohertz [kHz]) Doppler sonars used for navigation, like those used on

commercial and private vessels. The characteristics of these sonars and other transducers, such as source level, beam width, directivity, and frequency, depend on the purpose of the source. Higher frequencies can carry or provide more information about objects off which they reflect, but attenuate more rapidly. Lower frequencies attenuate less rapidly, so may detect objects over a longer distance, but with less detail.

Propagation of sound produced underwater is highly dependent on environmental characteristics such as bathymetry, bottom type, water depth, temperature, and salinity. The sound received at a particular location will be different than near the source due to the interaction of many factors, including propagation loss; how the sound is reflected, refracted, or scattered; the potential for reverberation; and interference due to multi-path propagation. In addition, absorption greatly affects the distance over which higher frequency sounds propagate. The effects of these factors are explained in Appendix H (Acoustic and Explosive Concepts). Because of the complexity of analyzing sound propagation in the ocean environment, the Navy relies on acoustic models in its environmental analyses that consider sound source characteristics and varying ocean conditions across the Study Area.

The sound sources and platforms typically used in naval activities analyzed in the SEIS/OEIS are described in Appendix A (Training and Testing Activities Descriptions). Sonars and other transducers used to obtain and transmit information underwater during Navy training and testing activities generally fall into several categories of use described below.

3.0.4.1.1.1 Anti-Submarine Warfare

Sonar used during anti-submarine warfare would impart the greatest amount of acoustic energy of any category of sonar and other transducers analyzed in this SEIS/OEIS. Types of sonars used to detect potential enemy vessels include hull-mounted, towed, line array, sonobuoy, helicopter dipping, and torpedo sonars. In addition, acoustic targets and decoys (countermeasures) may be deployed to emulate the sound signatures of vessels or repeat received signals.

Most anti-submarine warfare sonars are mid-frequency (1–10 kHz) because mid-frequency sound balances sufficient resolution to identify targets with distance over which threats can be identified. However, some sources may use higher or lower frequencies. Duty cycles can vary widely, from rarely used to continuously active. Anti-submarine warfare sonars can be wide-angle in a search mode or highly directional in a track mode.

Most anti-submarine warfare activities involving submarines or submarine targets would occur in waters greater than 600 feet (ft.) deep due to safety concerns about running aground at shallower depths. Sonars used for anti-submarine warfare activities would typically be used beyond 12 nautical miles (NM) from shore. Exceptions include use of dipping sonar by helicopters, maintenance of systems while in port, and system checks while transiting to or from port.

3.0.4.1.1.2 Mine Warfare, Small Object Detection, and Imaging

Sonars used to locate mines and other small objects, as well as those used in imaging (e.g., for hull inspections or imaging of the seafloor), are typically high frequency or very high-frequency. Higher frequencies allow for greater resolution and, due to their greater attenuation, are most effective over shorter distances. Mine detection sonar can be deployed (towed or vessel hull-mounted) at variable depths on moving platforms (ships, helicopters, or unmanned vehicles) to sweep a suspected mined area. Hull-mounted anti-submarine sonars can also be used in an object detection mode known as

"Kingfisher" mode. Sonars used for imaging are usually used in close proximity to the area of interest, such as pointing downward near the seafloor.

Mine detection sonar use would be concentrated in areas where practice mines are deployed, typically in water depths less than 200 ft., and at established training minefields, temporary minefields close to strategic ports and harbors, or at targets of opportunity such as navigation buoys. Kingfisher mode on vessels is most likely to be used when transiting to and from port. Sound sources used for imaging could be used throughout the Study Area.

3.0.4.1.1.3 Navigation and Safety

Similar to commercial and private vessels, Navy vessels employ navigational acoustic devices including speed logs, Doppler sonars for ship positioning, and fathometers. These may be in use at any time for safe vessel operation. These sources are typically highly directional to obtain specific navigational data.

3.0.4.1.1.4 Communication

Sound sources used to transmit data (such as underwater modems), provide location (pingers), or send a single brief release signal to bottom-mounted devices (acoustic release) may be used throughout the Study Area. These sources typically have low duty cycles and are usually only used when it is desirable to send a detectable acoustic message.

3.0.4.1.1.5 Classification of Sonar and Other Transducers

Sonars and other transducers are grouped into classes that share an attribute, such as frequency range or purpose of use. As detailed below, classes are further sorted by bins based on the frequency or bandwidth; source level; and, when warranted, the application in which the source would be used. Unless stated otherwise, a reference distance of 1 meter is used for sonar and other transducers.

- Frequency of the non-impulsive acoustic source:
    - Low-frequency sources operate below 1 kHz.
    - Mid-frequency sources operate at and above 1 kHz, up to and including 10 kHz.
    - High-frequency sources operate above 10 kHz, up to and including 100 kHz.
    - Very high-frequency sources operate above 100 kHz but below 200 kHz.
- Sound pressure level (SPL):
    - Greater than 160 decibels (dB) referenced to (re) 1 micropascal (dB re 1 µPa), but less than 180 dB re 1 µPa
    - Equal to 180 dB re 1 µPa at 1 m and up to 200 dB re 1 µPa
    - Greater than 200 dB re 1 µPa
- Application in which the source would be used:
    - Sources with similar functions that have similar characteristics, such as pulse length (duration of each pulse), beam pattern, and duty cycle

The bins used for classifying active sonars and transducers that are quantitatively analyzed in the Study Area are shown in Table 3.0-2. While general parameters or source characteristics are shown in the table, actual source parameters are classified.

Table 3.0-2 also shows the bin use that could occur in any year under each action alternative for training and testing activities; amounts used in on-going activities pursuant to the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and the 2015 NMFS Letter of Authorization are included for comparison.

Table 3.0-2: Sonar and Transducer Sources Quantitatively Analyzed

Source Class Category	*Bin*	*Unit**	*Training & Testing*		
			2015 Final EIS/OEIS	*Alternative 1*	*Alternative 2*
Low-Frequency (LF): Sources that produce signals less than 1 kHz	LF4	H	123	1	1
	LF5	H	11	10	10
	LF6	H	40	0	0
Mid-Frequency (MF): Tactical and non-tactical sources that produce signals between 1 and 10 kHz	MF1	H	1,872	1,729	1,818
	MF1K	H	0	3	3
	MF2	H	625	0	0
	MF3	H	192	189	228
	MF4	H	214	172	185
	MF5	C	2,588	2,024	2,094
	MF6	C	33	62	74
	MF8	H	123	0	0
	MF9	H	47	15	29
	MF10	H	231	0	0
	MF11	H	324	292	304
	MF12	H	656	608	616
High-Frequency (HF): Tactical and non-tactical sources that produce signals between 10 and 100 kHz	HF1	H	113	63	73
	HF3	H	0	4	4
	HF4	H	1,060	1,472	1,472
	HF5	H	336	0	0
	HF6	H	1,173	163	309
Anti-Submarine Warfare (ASW): Tactical sources (e.g., active sonobuoys and acoustic countermeasures systems) used during ASW training and testing activities	ASW1	H	144	192	192
	ASW2	C	660	538	554
	ASW3	H	3,935	3,024	3,124
	ASW4	C	11	268	332
	ASW5	H	0	50	50
Torpedoes (TORP): Source classes associated with the active acoustic signals produced by torpedoes	TORP1	C	115	62	71
	TORP2	C	62	40	62
	TORP3	C	0	6	6
Forward Looking Sonar (FLS): Forward or upward looking object avoidance sonars used for ship navigation and safety	FLS2	H	0	4	4
Acoustic Modems (M): Systems used to transmit data through the water	M3	H	112	17	31

Table 3.0-2: Sonar and Transducer Sources Quantitatively Analyzed (continued)

Source Class Category	*Bin*	*Unit**	*Training & Testing*		
			2015 Final EIS/OEIS	*Alternative 1*	*Alternative 2*
Swimmer Detection Sonar (SD): Used to detect divers and submerged swimmers	SD1	H	2,341	0	0
Air Guns (AG): Used during swimmer defense and diver deterrent training and testing activities	AG	C	308	0	0
Synthetic Aperture Sonars (SAS): Sonars in which active acoustic signals are post-processed to form high-resolution images of the seafloor	SAS2	H	0	449	449
	SAS4	H	0	6	6

* H = hours; C = count (e.g., number of individual pings or individual sonobuoys)

There are in-water active acoustic sources with narrow beam widths, downward directed transmissions, short pulse lengths, frequencies above known hearing ranges, low source levels, or combinations of these factors, which are not anticipated to result in takes of protected species. These sources are categorized as *de minimis* sources and are qualitatively analyzed to determine the appropriate determinations under NEPA in the appropriate resource impact analyses, as well as under the MMPA and the ESA. When used during routine training and testing activities, and in a typical environment, *de minimis* sources fall into one or more of the following categories:

- Transmit primarily above 200 kHz: Sources above 200 kHz are above the hearing range of the most sensitive marine mammals and far above the hearing range of other protected species in the Study Area.
- Source levels of 160 dB re 1 µPa or less: Low-powered sources with source levels less than 160 dB re 1 µPa are typically hand-held sonars, range pingers, transponders, and acoustic communication devices. Assuming spherical spreading for a 160 dB re 1 µPa source, the sound will attenuate to less than 140 dB re 1 µPa within 10 m and less than 120 dB re 1 µPa within 100 m of the source. Ranges would be even shorter for a source less than 160 dB re 1 µPa source level.
- Acoustic source classes listed in Table 3.0-3: Sources with operational characteristics, such as short pulse length, narrow beam width, downward-directed beam, and low energy release, or manner of system operation, which exclude the possibility of any significant impact on a protected species (actual source parameters are classified). Even if there is a possibility that some species may be exposed to and detect some of these sources, any response is expected to be short-term and inconsequential.

Table 3.0-3: Sonar and Transducers Qualitatively Analyzed

Source Class Category	*Bin*	*Characteristics*
Broadband Sound Sources (BB): Sources with wide frequency spectra	BB3	• very high frequency • very short pulse length
	BB8	• small imploding source (light bulb)
Doppler Sonar/Speed Logs (DS): High-frequency/very high-frequency navigation transducers	DS2–DS4	*Required for safe navigation* • downward focused • narrow beam width • very short pulse lengths
Fathometers (FA): High-frequency sources used to determine water depth	FA1–FA4	*Required for safe navigation* • downward focused directly below the vessel • narrow beam width (typically much less than 30°) • short pulse lengths (less than 10 milliseconds)
Hand-Held Sonar (HHS): High-frequency sonar devices used by Navy divers for object location	HHS1	• very high frequency sound at low power levels • narrow beam width • short pulse lengths • under control of the diver (power and direction)
Imaging Sonar (IMS): Sonars with high or very high frequencies used to obtain images of objects underwater	IMS1–IMS3	• High-frequency or very high-frequency • downward directed • narrow beam width • very short pulse lengths (typically 20 milliseconds)
High-Frequency Acoustic Modems (M): Systems that send data underwater **Tracking Pingers (P):** Devices that send a ping to identify an object location	M2 P1–P4	• low duty cycles (single pings in some cases) • short pulse lengths (typically 20 milliseconds) • low source levels
Acoustic Releases (R): Systems that ping to release a bottom-mounted object from its housing in order to retrieve the device at the surface	R1–R3	• typically emit only several pings to send release order
Side-Scan Sonars (SSS): Sonars that use active acoustic signals to produce high-resolution images of the seafloor	SSS1–SSS2	• downward-directed beam • short pulse lengths (less than 20 milliseconds)

Notes: ° = degree(s), kHz = kilohertz, lb. = pound(s)

3.0.4.1.2 Vessel Noise

Vessel noise, in particular commercial shipping, is a major contributor to underwater anthropogenic noise in the ocean within the Study Area. Naval vessels (e.g., ships and small craft) and civilian vessels (e.g., commercial ships, tugs, work boats, pleasure craft) produce low-frequency, broadband underwater sound, though the exact level of noise produced varies by vessel type. Frisk (2012) reported that between 1950 and 2007 ocean noise in the 25–50 Hertz (Hz) frequency range has increased 3.3 dB per decade, resulting in a cumulative increase of approximately 19 dB over a baseline of 52 dB. The increase in noise is associated with an increase in commercial shipping, which correlates with global economic growth (Frisk, 2012).

Anti-submarine warfare surface platforms are much quieter than Navy oil tankers, for example, which have a smaller presence but contribute substantially more broadband noise (Mintz & Filadelfo, 2011).

A variety of smaller craft that vary in size and speed, such as service vessels for routine operations and opposition forces used during training and testing events, would be operating within the Study Area as well.

The quietest Navy warships radiate much less broadband noise than a typical fishing vessel, while the loudest Navy ships during travel are almost on par with large oil tankers (Mintz & Filadelfo, 2011). The average acoustic signature for a Navy vessel is 163 dB re 1 µPa, while the average acoustic signature for a commercial vessel is 175 dB re 1 µPa (Mintz & Filadelfo, 2011). Typical large vessel ship-radiated noise is dominated by tonals related to blade and shaft sources at frequencies below 50 Hz and by broadband components related to cavitation and flow noise at higher frequencies (approximately around the one-third octave band centered at 100 Hz) (MacGillivray et al., 2019; Mintz & Filadelfo, 2011; Richardson et al., 1995; Urick, 1983). Ship types also have unique acoustic signatures characterized by differences in dominant frequencies. Bulk carrier noise is predominantly near 100 Hz while container ship and tanker noise is predominantly below 40 Hz (McKenna et al., 2012). Small craft will emit higher-frequency noise (between 1 kHz and 50 kHz) than larger ships (below 1 kHz). Sound produced by vessels will typically increase with speed (MacGillivray et al., 2019; Wladichuk et al., 2019).

The Center for Naval Analyses conducted studies to determine traffic patterns of Navy and non-Navy vessels (Mintz & Parker, 2006; Mintz & Filadelfo, 2011; Mintz, 2012; Mintz, 2016). The most recent analysis covered the period 2011–2015 (Mintz, 2016) and included U.S. Navy surface ship traffic and non-military vessels such as cargo vessels, bulk carriers, commercial fishing vessels, oil tankers, passenger vessels, tugs, and research vessels. Caveats to this analysis include that only vessels over 65 ft. in length are reported, so smaller Navy vessels and civilian craft are not included, and vessel position records are much more frequent for Navy vessels than for commercial vessels. Therefore, the Navy is likely overrepresented in the data and the reported fraction of total energy is likely the upper limit of its contribution (Mintz & Filadelfo, 2011; Mintz, 2012).

Although the aforementioned studies did not include analysis of vessel traffic and associated vessel noise in the Study Area (the geographic scope was the continental United States and Hawaii), the conclusions of the studies are relevant to vessel noise in the Study Area. Overall, the contribution of Navy vessel traffic to broadband noise levels was relatively small compared with the contribution from commercial vessel traffic.

3.0.4.1.3 Aircraft Noise

Fixed-wing, tiltrotor, and rotary-wing aircraft are used for a variety of training and testing activities throughout the Study Area, contributing both airborne and underwater sound to the ocean environment. Sounds in air are often measured using A-weighting, which adjusts received sound levels based on human hearing abilities (see Appendix H, Acoustic and Explosive Concepts). Aircraft used in training and testing generally have turboprop or jet engines. Motors, propellers, and rotors produce the most noise, with some noise contributed by aerodynamic turbulence. Aircraft sounds have more energy at lower frequencies, and noise levels can vary due to different aircraft and engine types, speeds, heights, and angles (Erbe et al., 2018). Perception of aircraft noise can vary between marine species based on different hearing sensitivities (Erbe et al., 2018). Aircraft may transit to or from vessels at sea throughout the Study Area from established airfields on land. The majority of aircraft noise would be generated at air stations, which are outside the Study Area. Takeoffs and landings occur at established airfields as well as on vessels at sea across the Study Area. Takeoffs and landings from Navy vessels produce in-water noise at a given location for a brief period as the aircraft climbs to cruising altitude. Military activities involving aircraft generally are dispersed over large expanses of open ocean

but can be highly concentrated in time and location. Table 3.0-4 provides source levels for some typical aircraft used during training and testing in the Study Area and depicts comparable airborne source levels for the F-35A, EA-18G, and F/A-18C/D during takeoff.

3.0.4.1.3.1 Underwater Transmission of Aircraft Noise

The 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (Section 3.0.5.2.1.6, Aircraft Overflight Noise) describes underwater transmission of aircraft noise. Since information regarding underwater transmission of aircraft noise has not changed, this SEIS/OEIS will not further analyze underwater transmission of aircraft noise.

3.0.4.1.3.2 Helicopters

The 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (Section 3.0.5.2.1.6, Aircraft Overflight Noise) describes characteristics and production of noise from helicopters. Since information regarding characteristics and production of noise from helicopters has not changed, this SEIS/OEIS will not further analyze characteristics and production of noise from helicopters.

Table 3.0-4: Representative Aircraft Sound Characteristics

Noise Source	*Sound Pressure Level*
In-Water Noise Level	
F/A-18 Subsonic at 1,000 ft. (300 m) Altitude	152 dB re 1 µPa at 2 m below water surface[1]
F/A-18 Subsonic at 10,000 ft. (3,000 m) Altitude	128 dB re 1 µPa at 2 m below water surface[1]
H-60 Helicopter Hovering at 82 ft. (25 m) Altitude	Approximately 125 dB re 1 µPa at 1 m below water surface, estimate based on in-air level[2]
Airborne Noise Level	
F/A-18C/D Under Military Power	143 dBA re 20 µPa at 13 m from source[3]
F/A-18C/D Under Afterburner	146 dBA re 20 µPa at 13 m from source[3]
F-35A Under Military Power	145 dBA re 20 µPa at 13 m from source[3]
F-35A Under Afterburner	148 dBA re 20 µPa at 13 m from source[3]
H-60 Helicopter Hovering at 82 ft. (25 m) Altitude	113 dBA re 20 µPa at 25 m from source[2]
F-35A Takeoff Through 1,000 ft. (300 m) Altitude	119 dBA re 20 μPa^2s^4 (per second of duration), based on average sound exposure level
EA-18G Takeoff Through 1,622 ft. (500 m) Altitude	115 dBA re 20 μPa^2s [5] (per second of duration), based on average sound exposure level

Notes: dB re 1 µPa = decibel(s) referenced to 1 micropascal, dBA re 20 µPa = A-weighted decibel(s) referenced to 20 micropascals, m = meter(s), ft. = feet, dBA re 20 μPa^2s = A-weighted decibel(s) referenced to 20 micropascals squared seconds
Sources: [1]Eller and Cavanagh (2000), [2]Bousman and Kufeld (2005), [3]U.S. Naval Research Advisory Committee (2009), [4]U.S. Department of the Air Force (2016), [5]U.S. Department of the Navy (2012b).

3.0.4.1.3.3 Sonic Booms

An intense but infrequent type of aircraft noise is the sonic boom, produced when an aircraft exceeds the speed of sound. Per Navy Instruction *Naval Air Training and Operating Procedures General Flight and Operating Instructions Manual, Commander Naval Air Forces Manual-3710.7* (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2017c), it is incumbent on every pilot flying aircraft capable of generating sonic booms to reduce such disturbances and damage to the absolute minimum dictated by operational/training requirements. Supersonic flight operations shall be strictly controlled and supervised by operational

commanders. Supersonic flight over land or within 30 NM offshore shall be conducted in specifically designated areas. Such areas must be chosen to ensure minimum possibility of disturbance. As a general policy, sonic booms shall not be intentionally generated below 30,000 ft. of altitude unless over water and more than 30 miles from inhabited land areas or islands. Deviations from the foregoing general policy may be authorized only under one of the following conditions:

- tactical missions that require supersonic speeds;
- phases of formal training syllabus flights requiring supersonic speeds;
- research, test, and operational suitability test flights requiring supersonic speeds; or
- when specifically authorized by the Chief of Naval Operations for flight demonstration purposes.

Several factors that influence sonic booms include weight, size, and shape of aircraft or vehicle; altitude; flight paths; and atmospheric conditions. A larger and heavier aircraft must displace more air and create more lift to sustain flight, compared with small, light aircraft. Therefore, larger aircraft create sonic booms that are stronger than those of smaller, lighter aircraft. Consequently, the larger and heavier the aircraft, the stronger the shock waves (U.S. Department of the Navy & Department of Defense, 2007). Aircraft maneuvers that result in changes to acceleration, flight path angle, or heading can also affect the strength of a boom. In general, an increase in flight path angle (lifting the aircraft's nose) will diffuse a boom while a decrease (lowering the aircraft's nose) will focus it. In addition, acceleration will focus a boom while deceleration will weaken it. Any change in horizontal direction will focus a boom, causing two or more wave fronts that originated from the aircraft at different times to coincide exactly (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2001). Atmospheric conditions such as wind speed and direction, and air temperature and pressure can also influence the sound propagation of a sonic boom.

Of all the factors influencing sonic booms, increasing altitude is the most effective method of reducing sonic boom intensity. The width of the boom "carpet" or area exposed to sonic boom beneath an aircraft is about 1 mile for each 1,000 ft. of altitude. For example, an aircraft flying supersonic, straight and level at 50,000 ft. can produce a sonic boom carpet about 50 miles wide. The sonic boom, however, would not be uniform, and its intensity at the water surface would decrease with greater aircraft altitude. Maximum intensity is directly beneath the aircraft and decreases as the lateral distance from the flight path increases, until shock waves refract away from the ground or water surface and the sonic boom attenuates. The lateral spreading of the sonic boom depends only on altitude, speed, and the atmosphere and is independent of the vehicle's shape, size, and weight. The ratio of the aircraft length to maximum cross-sectional area also influences the intensity of the sonic boom. The longer and more slender the aircraft, the weaker the shock waves. The wider and more blunt the aircraft, the stronger the shock waves can be (U.S. Department of the Navy & Department of Defense, 2007).

In air, the energy from a sonic boom is concentrated in the frequency range from 0.1 to 100 Hz. The underwater sound field due to transmitted sonic boom waveforms is primarily composed of low-frequency components (Sparrow, 2002), and frequencies greater than 20 Hz have been found to be difficult to observe at depths greater than 33 ft. (10 meters) (Sohn et al., 2000). F/A-18 Hornet supersonic flight was modeled to obtain peak sound pressure levels and energy flux density at the water surface and at depth (U.S. Department of the Air Force, 2000). Table 3.0-5 shows these results.

Table 3.0-5: Sonic Boom Underwater Sound Levels Modeled for F/A-18 Hornet Supersonic Flight

*Mach Number**	*Aircraft Altitude (km)*	*Peak SPL (dB re 1 µPa)*			*Energy Flux Density (dB re 1 µPa²-s)[1]*		
		At surface	*50 m Depth*	*100 m Depth*	*At surface*	*50 m Depth*	*100 m Depth*
1.2	1	176	138	126	160	131	122
	5	164	132	121	150	126	117
	10	158	130	119	144	124	115
2	1	178	146	134	161	137	128
	5	166	139	128	150	131	122
	10	159	135	124	144	127	119

[1] Equivalent to SEL for a plane wave.

* Mach number equals aircraft speed divided by the speed of sound.

Notes: SPL = sound pressure level, dB re 1 µPa = decibel(s) referenced to 1 micropascal, dB re 1 µPa²-s = decibel(s) referenced to 1 micropascal squared seconds, m = meter(s)

3.0.4.1.4 Weapon Noise

The Navy trains and tests using a variety of weapons, as described in Appendix A (Training and Testing Activities Descriptions). Depending on the weapon, incidental (unintentional) noise may be produced at launch or firing, while in flight, or upon impact. Other devices intentionally produce noise to serve as a non-lethal deterrent. Not all weapons utilize explosives, either by design or because they are non-explosive practice munitions. Noise produced by explosives, both in air and water, are discussed in Section 3.0.4.2 (Explosive Stressors).

Noise associated with large-caliber weapons firing and the impact of non-explosive practice munitions or kinetic weapons would occur at locations greater than 12 NM from shore in warning areas or special use airspace for safety reasons, with the exception of areas near Farallon de Medinilla (FDM). Small- and medium-caliber weapons firing could occur throughout the Study Area in identified training areas.

Table 3.0-6 shows examples of some types of weapons noise and provides examples of launch noise. Noise produced by other weapons and devices are described further below.

Table 3.0-6: Example Weapons Noise

Noise Source	*Sound Level*
In-Water Noise Level	
Naval Gunfire Muzzle Blast (5-inch)	Approximately 200 dB re 1 µPa peak directly under gun muzzle at 1.5 m below the water surface[1]
Airborne Noise Level	
Naval Gunfire Muzzle Blast (5-inch)	178 dB re 20 µPa peak directly below the gun muzzle above the water surface[1]
Hellfire Missile Launch from Aircraft	149 dB re 20 µPa at 4.5 m[2]
Advanced Gun System Missile (115-millimeter)	133-143 dBA re 20 µPa between 12 and 22 m from the launcher on shore[3]
RIM 116 Surface-to-Air Missile	122-135 dBA re 20 µPa between 2 and 4 m from the launcher on shore[3]
Tactical Tomahawk Cruise Missile	92 dBA re 20 µPa 529 m from the launcher on shore[3]

Notes: dB re 1 µPa = decibel(s) referenced to 1 micropascal, dB re 20 µPa = decibel(s) referenced to 20 micropascals, dBA re 20 µPa = A-weighted decibel(s) referenced to 20 micropascals, m = meter(s)
Sources: [1]Yagla and Stiegler (2003); [2]U.S. Department of the Army (1999); [3]U.S. Department of the Navy (2013)

3.0.4.1.4.1 Muzzle Blast from Naval Gunfire

Firing a gun produces a muzzle blast in air that propagates away from the gun with strongest directivity in the direction of fire (Table 3.0-6). Because the muzzle blast is generated at the gun, the noise decays with distance from the gun. The muzzle blast has been measured for the largest gun analyzed in this SEIS/OEIS, the 5-inch large caliber naval gun. At a distance of 3,700 ft. from the gun, which was fired at 10 degrees elevation angle, and at 10 degrees off the firing line, the in-air received level was 124 dB re 20 µPa SPL peak for the atmospheric conditions of the test (U.S. Department of the Navy, 1981). Measurements were obtained for additional distances and angles off the firing line, but were specific to the atmospheric conditions present during the testing.

As the pressure from the muzzle blast from a ship-mounted large caliber gun propagates in air toward the water surface, the pressure can be both reflected from the water surface and transmitted into the water. As explained in Appendix H (Acoustic and Explosive Concepts), most sound enters the water in a narrow cone beneath the sound source (within about 13–14 degrees of vertical), with most sound outside of this cone being totally reflected from the water surface. In-water sound levels were measured during the muzzle blast of a 5-inch large caliber naval gun. The highest possible sound level in the water (average peak SPL of 200 dB re 1 µPa, measured 5 ft. below the surface) was obtained when the gun was fired at the lowest angle, placing the blast closest to the water surface (Yagla & Stiegler, 2003). The unweighted SEL would be expected to be 15–20 dB lower than the peak pressure, making the highest possible SEL in the water about 180 to 185 dB re 1 µPa squared seconds (dB re 1 µPa ^{2}-s) directly below the muzzle blast. Configuration of the 5-inch gun on US Navy ships also affects how sound from much muzzle blast could enter the water. On cruisers, when swung out to either side the barrel of the gun extends beyond the ship deck and over water. On destroyers, when swung out to either side the barrel of the gun is still over the ship's deck (Figure 3.0-1). Other gunfire arrangements, such as with smaller-caliber weapons or greater angles of fire, would result in less sound entering the water. The sound entering the water would have the strongest directivity directly downward beneath the gun blast,

with lower sound pressures at increasing angles of incidence until the angle of incidence is reached where no sound enters the water.



Figure 3.0-1: Gun Blast and Projectile from a MK 45 MOD 2 5-inch/54 Caliber Navy Gun on a Cruiser (top), a MK 45 MOD 2 5-in/54 Caliber Navy Gun on a Destroyer (bottom left), and a MK 45 MOD 4 5-inch/62 Caliber Navy Gun on a Destroyer (bottom right)

3.0.4.1.4.2 Supersonic Projectile Bow Shock Wave

Supersonic projectiles, such as a fired gun shell or kinetic energy weapon, create a bow shock wave along the line of fire. A bow shock wave is an impulsive sound caused by a projectile exceeding the speed of sound (for more explanation, see Appendix H, Acoustic and Explosive Concepts). The bow shock wave itself travels at the speed of sound in air. The projectile bow shock wave created in air by a shell in flight at supersonic speeds propagates in a cone (generally about 65 degrees) behind the projectile in the direction of fire (U.S. Department of the Navy, 1981). Exposure to the bow shock wave is very brief.

Projectiles from a 5-inch/54 caliber gun would travel at approximately 2,600 ft./second, and the associated bow shock wave is subjectively described as a "crack" noise (U.S. Department of the Navy, 1981). Measurements of a 5-inch projectile shock wave ranged from 140 to 147 dB re 20 µPa SPL peak taken at the ground surface at 0.59 NM distance from the firing location and 10 degrees off the line of fire for safety (approximately 190 meters from the shell's trajectory) (U.S. Department of the Navy, 1981).

Hyperkinetic projectiles may travel up to and exceeding approximately six times the speed of sound in air, or about 6,500 ft./second (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2014). For a hyperkinetic projectile sized similar to the 5 inch shell, peak pressures would be expected to be several dB higher than those described for the 5 inch projectile above, following the model in U.S. Department of the Navy (1981).

Like sound from the gun muzzle blast, sound waves from a projectile in flight could only enter the water in a narrow cone beneath the sound source, with in-air sound being totally reflected from the water surface outside of the cone. The region of underwater sound influence from a single traveling shell would be relatively narrow, and the duration of sound influence would be brief at any location.

3.0.4.1.4.3 Launch Noise

The 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (Section 3.0.5.2.1.4, Weapons Firing, Launch, and Impact Noise) describes launch noise. Since information regarding launch noise has not changed, this SEIS/OEIS will not further analyze launch noise. Table 3.0-6 provides examples of launch noise measurements.

3.0.4.1.4.4 Impact Noise (Non-Explosive)

The 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (Section 3.0.5.2.1.4, Weapons Firing, Launch, and Impact Noise) describes characteristics and production of non-explosive impact noise. Since information regarding non-explosive impact noise has not changed, this SEIS/OEIS will not further analyze non-explosive impact noise.

3.0.4.1.4.5 Long Range Acoustic Device

The Long Range Acoustic Device is a communication device that can be used to warn vessels against continuing towards a high-value asset by emitting loud sounds in air. Although not a weapon, the Long Range Acoustic Device (and other hailing and deterrent devices) is considered along with in-air sounds produced by Navy sources. The system would typically be used in training activities nearshore, and use would be intermittent during these activities. Source levels at 1 meter range between 137 A-weighted decibels re 1 µPa for small portable systems and 153 A-weighted decibels re 1 µPa for large systems. Sound would be directed within a 30–60-degree wide zone and would be directed over open water.

3.0.4.2 Explosive Stressors

This section describes the characteristics of explosions during naval training and testing. The activities analyzed in the SEIS/OEIS that use explosives are described in Appendix A (Training and Testing Activities Descriptions). This section provides the basis for analysis of explosive impacts on resources in the remainder of Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences). Explanations of the terminology and metrics used when describing explosives in this SEIS/OEIS are in Appendix H (Acoustic and Explosive Concepts).

The near-instantaneous rise from ambient to an extremely high peak pressure is what makes an explosive shock wave potentially damaging. Farther from an explosive, the peak pressures decay and the explosive waves propagate as an impulsive, broadband sound. Several parameters influence the effect of an explosive: the weight of the explosive warhead, the type of explosive material, the boundaries and characteristics of the propagation medium, and, in water, the detonation depth. The net explosive weight, the explosive power of a charge expressed as the equivalent weight of trinitrotoluene (TNT), accounts for the first two parameters. The effects of these factors are explained in Appendix H (Acoustic and Explosive Concepts).

3.0.4.2.1.1 Explosions in Water

Explosive detonations during training and testing activities are associated with high-explosive munitions, including, but not limited to, bombs, missiles, rockets, naval gun shells, torpedoes, mines, demolition charges, and explosive sonobuoys. Explosive detonations during training and testing activities involving the use of high-explosive munitions, including bombs, missiles, and naval gun shells, could occur in the air or near the water's surface. Explosive detonations associated with torpedoes and explosive

sonobuoys would occur in the water column; mines and demolition charges could be detonated in the water column or on the ocean bottom. Detonations would typically occur in waters greater than 200 ft. in depth, and greater than 3 NM from shore, with the exception of existing mine warfare areas, including Outer Apra Harbor, Piti, and Agat. Section 5.3.3 (Explosive Stressors) outlines the procedural mitigation measures for explosive stressors to reduce potential impacts on biological resources.

In order to better organize and facilitate the analysis of Navy training and testing activities using explosives that could detonate in water or at the water surface, explosive classification bins were developed. The use of explosive classification bins provides the same benefits as described for acoustic source classification bins in Section 3.0.4.1 (Acoustic Stressors).

Explosives detonated in water are binned by net explosive weight. The bins of explosives that are proposed for use in the Study Area are shown in Table 3.0-7. This table shows the number of explosive items that could be used in any year under each action alternative for training and testing activities. A range of annual bin use indicates that use of that bin is anticipated to vary annually, consistent with the variation in the number of annual activities described in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives).

In addition to the explosives quantitatively analyzed for impacts on marine mammals and sea turtles shown in Table 3.0-7, the Navy uses some very small impulsive sources (less than 0.1 pounds net explosive weight), categorized in bin E0, that are not anticipated to result in takes of marine mammals or sea turtles. Quantitative modeling in multiple locations has validated that these sources have a very small zone of influence. These E0 charges, therefore, are categorized as *de minimis* sources for marine mammals and sea turtles and are qualitatively analyzed to determine the appropriate determinations under NEPA in the appropriate resource impact analyses, as well as under the MMPA and the ESA.

Propagation of explosive pressure waves in water is highly dependent on environmental characteristics such as bathymetry, bottom type, water depth, temperature, and salinity, which affect how the pressure waves are reflected, refracted, or scattered; the potential for reverberation; and interference due to multi-path propagation. In addition, absorption greatly affects the distance over which higher frequency components of explosive broadband noise can propagate. Appendix H (Acoustic and Explosive Concepts) explains the characteristics of explosive detonations and how the above factors affect the propagation of explosive energy in the water. Because of the complexity of analyzing sound propagation in the ocean environment, the Navy relies on acoustic models in its environmental analyses that consider sound source characteristics and varying ocean conditions across the Study Area.

Table 3.0-7: Explosive Sources Quantitatively Analyzed that Could Be Used Underwater or at the Water Surface

Explosives	*Training & Testing Activities (Annual In-Water Detonations)*		
	2015 Final EIS/OEIS	*Alternative 1*	*Alternative 2*
E1 (0.1–0.25 lb. NEW)	10,140	512	768
E2 (>0.25–0.5 lb. NEW)	106	400	400
E3 (>0.5–2.5 lb. NEW)	932	683	683
E4 (> 2.5–5 lb. NEW)	420	44	44
E5 (> 5–10 lb. NEW)	684	965	1,221
E6 (> 10–20 lb. NEW)	76	29	29
E8 (> 60–100 lb. NEW)	16	134	134
E9 (> 100–250 lb. NEW)	4	110	110
E10 (> 250–500 lb. NEW)	12	69	78
E11 (> 500–650 lb. NEW)	6	3	5
E12 (> 650–1,000 lb. NEW)	184	48	48

Notes: lb. = pound(s), NEW = Net Explosive Weight

3.0.4.2.1.2 Explosions in Air

Explosions in air include detonations of missiles during surface-to-air and air-to-air missile exercises conducted during air warfare. These explosions typically occur far above the water surface in special use airspace. Some typical types of explosive munitions that would be detonated in air during Navy activities are shown in Table 3.0-8. Various missiles, rockets, and medium- and large-caliber projectiles may be explosive or non-explosive, depending on the objective of the training or testing activity in which they are used. Quantities of explosive and non-explosive missiles, rockets, and projectiles proposed for use during Navy training and testing are provided in the tables below.

Table 3.0-8: Typical Air Explosive Munitions During Navy Activities

Weapon Type[1]	*Net Explosive Weight (lb.)*	*Typical Altitude of Detonation (ft.)*
Surface-to-Air Missile		
RIM-66 SM-2 Standard Missile	80	> 15,000
RIM-116 Rolling Airframe Missile	39	< 3,000
RIM-7 Sea Sparrow	36	> 15,000 (can be used on low targets)
FIM-92 Stinger	7	< 3,000
Air-to-Air Missile		
AIM-9 Sidewinder	38	> 15,000
AIM-7 Sparrow	36	> 15,000
AIM-120 AMRAAM	17	> 15,000
Air-to-Surface Missile		
AGM-88 HARM	45	< 100
AGM-84 Harpoon	488	< 100
Projectile – Large-Caliber[2]		
5"/54 caliber HE-ET	7	< 100
5"/54 caliber Other	8	< 100

[1] Mission Design Series and popular name shown for missiles.
[2] Most medium and large caliber projectiles used during training and testing activities do not contain high explosives.
Notes: AMRAAM = Advanced Medium-Range Air-to-Air Missile, HARM = High-Speed Anti-Radiation Missile, HE-ET = High Explosive-Electronic Time, lb. = pound(s), ft. = foot/feet

Bombs and projectiles that detonate at or near the water surface, which are considered for underwater impacts (see Table 3.0-8), would also release some explosive energy into the air. Appendix A (Training and Testing Activities Descriptions) describes where activities with these stressors typically occur.

The explosive energy released by detonations in the air has been well-studied (see Appendix H, Acoustic and Explosive Concepts) and basic methods are available to estimate the explosive energy exposure with distance from the detonation (U.S. Department of the Navy, 1975). In air, the propagation of impulsive noise from an explosion is highly influenced by atmospheric conditions, including temperature and wind. While basic estimation methods do not consider the unique environmental conditions that may be present on a given day, they allow for approximation of explosive energy propagation under neutral atmospheric conditions. Explosions that occur during air warfare would typically be at a sufficient altitude that a large portion of the sound refracts upward due to cooling temperatures with increased altitude.

Missiles, rockets, projectiles, and other cased weapons will produce casing fragments upon detonation. These fragments may be of variable size and are ejected at supersonic speed from the detonation. The casing fragments will be ejected at velocities much greater than debris from any target due to the proximity of the casing to the explosive material. Unlike detonations on land targets, in-air detonations during Navy training and testing would not result in other propelled materials such as crater debris.

3.0.4.3 Energy Stressors

Energy stressors are discussed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Changes to energy stressors analyzed in this SEIS/OEIS are described below.

3.0.4.3.1 Electromagnetic Devices

In the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, electromagnetic devices included those used in water. For this SEIS/OEIS, electromagnetic devices are further categorized as either in-water electromagnetic devices or in-air electromagnetic devices.

3.0.4.3.1.1 In-Water Electromagnetic Devices

In-water electromagnetic devices were described in Section 3.0.5.2.2.1 (Electromagnetic Devices) of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Table 3.0-9 shows the number of ongoing events (from the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS) and the number of events proposed in this SEIS/OEIS that include the use of in-water electromagnetic devices.

Table 3.0-9: Annual Number of Events in the Study Area that Include In-Water Electromagnetic Devices

Training & Testing		
2015 Final EIS/OEIS	***Alternative 1***	***Alternative 2***
5	4	4

3.0.4.3.1.2 In-Air Electromagnetic Devices

Sources of electromagnetic energy in the air include communications transmitters, radars, and electronic countermeasures transmitters. Electromagnetic devices on Navy platforms operate across a wide range of frequencies and power. On a single ship the source frequencies may range from 2 megahertz (MHz) to 14,500 MHz, and transmitter maximum average power may range from 0.25 watts to 1,280,00 watts.

The Navy originally coined the term “radar” to refer to Radio Detection And Ranging. A radar system is an electromagnetic device that emits radio waves to detect and locate objects. In most cases, basic radar systems operate by generating pulses of radio frequency energy and transmitting these pulses via directional antennae into space (Courbis & Timmel, 2008). Some of this energy is reflected by the target back to the antenna, and the signal is processed to provide useful information to the operator.

Radars come in a variety of sizes and power, ranging from wide-band milliwatt systems to very high-power systems that are used primarily for long-range search and surveillance (Courbis & Timmel, 2008). In general, radars operate at radio frequencies that range between 300 MHz and 300 gigahertz, and are often classified according to their frequency range. Navy vessels commonly operate radar systems that include S-band and X-band electronically steered radar. S-band radar serves as the primary search and acquisition sensor capable of tracking and collecting data on a large number of objects, while X-band radar can provide high-resolution data on particular objects of interest and discrimination for weapons systems. Both systems employ a variety of waveforms and bandwidths to provide high-quality data collection and operational flexibility (Baird et al., 2016).

It is assumed that most Navy platforms associated with the Proposed Action will be transmitting from a variety of in-air electromagnetic devices at all times when underway, with very limited exceptions. Most of these transmissions (e.g., for routine surveillance, communications, and navigation) will be at low power. High-power settings are used for a small number of activities, including ballistic missile defense training, radar and other system testing, and signature analysis operations. The number of Navy vessels or aircraft in the Study Area at any given time varies and is dependent on local training or testing

requirements. Therefore, in-air electromagnetic energy as part of the Proposed Action would be widely dispersed throughout the Study Area, but more concentrated in portions of the Study Area near ports, naval installations, and range complexes. Because these stressors are operated at power levels, altitudes, and distances from people and animals to ensure that energy received is well below levels that could disrupt behavior or cause injury and because most in-air electromagnetic energy is reflected by water, in-air electromagnetic energy is not analyzed further in Section 3.4 (Marine Mammals) and Section 3.6 (Marine Birds).

3.0.4.3.2 Lasers

Laser devices can be organized into two categories: (1) low-energy lasers and (2) high-energy lasers.

3.0.4.3.2.1 Low-Energy Lasers

Low-energy lasers are proposed to be used as described in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, where they would have an extremely low potential to impact marine biological resources (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2010). Therefore, as in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, low-energy lasers will not be further analyzed in this SEIS/OEIS for possible impacts on biological resources.

3.0.4.3.2.2 High-Energy Lasers

While no high-energy lasers were proposed to be used in the Study Area previously, they are now proposed for use as part of the Proposed Action in this SEIS/OEIS. High-energy laser weapons activities involve the use of directed energy as a weapon against small surface vessels and airborne targets. High-energy lasers would be employed from surface ships and are designed to create small but critical failures in potential targets. The high-energy laser is expected to be used at short ranges. Marine life or birds at or near the ocean surface could be susceptible to injury by high-energy lasers. Table 3.0-10 shows the number of ongoing events (from the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS) and the number of events proposed in this SEIS/OEIS that include the use of high-energy lasers.

Table 3.0-10: Annual Number of Events in the Study Area that Include High-Energy Lasers

Training & Testing		
2015 Final EIS/OEIS	***Alternative 1***	***Alternative 2***
0	54	60

3.0.4.4 Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors

As described in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, physical disturbance and strike stressors can result from the Navy's proposed use of aircraft and aerial targets, vessels, in-water devices, military expended materials, seafloor devices, and, on the island of FDM, ground disturbance and wildfires.

3.0.4.4.1 Aircraft and Aerial Targets

Section 3.0.5.2.3.1 (Aircraft and Aerial Targets) in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS described aircraft and aerial targets. Table 3.0-11 shows the number of ongoing events (from the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS) and the number of events proposed in this SEIS/OEIS that include the use of aircraft.

Table 3.0-11: Annual Number of Events in the Study Area that Include Aircraft Movement

Training & Testing		
2015 Final EIS/OEIS	***Alternative 1***	***Alternative 2***
22,397	20,058	20,094

3.0.4.4.2 Vessels

Section 3.0.5.2.3.2 (Vessels) in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS described vessels. Table 3.0-12 shows the number of ongoing events (from the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS) and the number of events proposed in this SEIS/OEIS that include the use of vessels.

Table 3.0-12: Annual Number of Events in the Study Area that Include Vessel Movement

Training & Testing		
2015 Final EIS/OEIS	***Alternative 1***	***Alternative 2***
3,968	4,249	4,493

3.0.4.4.3 In-Water Devices

Section 3.0.5.2.3.3 (In-Water Devices) in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS described in-water devices. Table 3.0-13 shows the number of ongoing events (from the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS) and the number of events proposed in this SEIS/OEIS that include the use of towed in-water devices.

Table 3.0-13: Annual Number of Events in the Study Area that Include In-Water Devices

Training & Testing		
2015 Final EIS/OEIS	***Alternative 1***	***Alternative 2***
2,205	2,289	2,397

3.0.4.4.4 Military Expended Materials

Section 3.0.5.2.3.4 (Military Expended Materials) in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS described military expended materials. Table 3.0-14 shows the number of non-explosive practice munitions analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and the number proposed in this SEIS/OEIS. Other military expended materials are listed in Table 3.0-15, explosive munitions in Table 3.0-16, and targets in Table 3.0-17. Since the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, the Navy has improved its ability to track expended items, which are now reflected in the following tables. If the newly listed items were used but not counted in the 2015 Final EIS/OEIS, that cell will include a note stating those items were not previously calculated.

Table 3.0-14: Annual Number of Non-Explosive Practice Munitions Expended At Sea in the Study Area

Non-Explosive Ordnance	*Training & Testing*		
	2015 Final EIS/OEIS	*Alternative 1*	*Alternative 2*
Mine Neutralization System Neutralizers	24	0	0
Anti-Torpedo Torpedoes	Note 1	8	11
Torpedoes [Note 2]	169	104	132
Bombs	848	152	152
Rockets	0	1,697	1,697
Rockets (Flechette)	Note 1	89	89
Missiles	20	0	0
Kinetic Energy Rounds	Note 1	80	180
Large-Caliber Projectiles	6,918	14,772	22,268
Large-Caliber Projectile Land-Based Casings	Note 1	2,800	4,200
Medium-Caliber Projectiles	87,540	223,150	280,750
Sabot	Note 1	80	180
Small-Caliber Projectiles	88,140	308,364	354,318
Small-Caliber Casings	Note 1	304,356	348,306

Note 1: These items were not calculated in the 2015 Final EIS/OEIS.
Note 2: Exercise torpedoes are recovered for reuse following completion of the training or testing activity.

Table 3.0-15: Annual Number of Other Military Expended Materials Used At Sea in the Study Area

Other Military Expended Materials	*Training & Testing*		
	2015 Final EIS/OEIS	*Alternative 1*	*Alternative 2*
Acoustic Countermeasures	294	387	466
Anchor (Expended)[Note 2]	Note 1	20	28
Anti-Torpedo Torpedo Accessories	Note 1	8	11
Buoy (Non-Explosive)	314	70	82
Canister – Miscellaneous	Note 1	1	1
Compression Pad or Plastic Pistons	Note 1	17,600	17,600
Endcap – Chaff and Flares	Note 1	35,218	35,218
Expended Bathythermograph	520	341	364
Fiber Optic Can	28	44	44
Flare O-ring	Note 1	17,618	17,618
Heavyweight Torpedo Accessories	54	49	73
Lightweight Torpedo Accessories	72	60	66
Illumination Flare	18	18	18
JATO Bottle	20	20	20
Marine Marker	617	538	538
Sonobuoys	11,912	5,386	5,876

Note 1: These items were not calculated in the 2015 Final EIS/OEIS.

Note 2: These are anchors used to secure objects like moored mines and bottom-placed instruments to the seafloor, not ship anchors.

Table 3.0-16: Annual Number of Explosive Munitions Expended At Sea in the Study Area

Explosive Ordnance	*Training & Testing*		
	2015 Final EIS/OEIS	*Alternative 1*	*Alternative 2*
Mine Neutralization System Neutralizers	28	44	44
Grenades	Note 1	400	400
Torpedoes	10	5	7
Bombs	212	198	198
Rockets	114	323	323
Missiles	145	231	249
Large-Caliber Projectiles	12,220	1,372	1,658
Medium-Caliber Projectiles	10,190	22,224	22,480
Buoys	804	392	392

Note 1: These items were not calculated in the 2015 Final EIS/OEIS.

Table 3.0-17: Annual Number of Targets Expended At Sea in the Study Area

Target	*Training & Testing*		
	2015 Final EIS/OEIS	*Alternative 1*	*Alternative 2*
Air Targets –Decoy	Note 1	153	168
Air Targets –Drone	Note 1	1	1
Mine Shape (Non-Explosive)	Note 1	599	599
Ship Hulk	2	1	1
Subsurface Target (Mobile)	Note 1	254	265
Subsurface Target (Stationary)	Note 1	4	5
Surface Target (Mobile)	Note 1	1,499	1,581
Surface Target (Stationary)	786	879	1,107

Note 1: These items were not calculated in the 2015 Final EIS/OEIS.

Table 3.0-14, Table 3.0-15, Table 3.0-16, and Table 3.0-17 show that some items are proposed to increase, while others would decrease or remain the same. As shown in Table 3.0-18, the surface area of the ocean bottom that could be impacted by the use of military expended materials as proposed in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS would decrease from the amount analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

Table 3.0-18: Impact Area of Proposed Military Expended Materials

Military Expended Materials	*Area of Potential Impact (acre)*		
	2015 Final EIS/OEIS	*Alternative 1*	*Alternative 2*
Bombs (Explosive)	0.5495	0.5132	0.5132
Bombs (Non-Explosive)	2.1980	0.3940	0.3940
Grenades (Explosive)	Note 1	0.0019	0.0019
Kinetic Energy Rounds	Note 1	0.0019	0.0042
Large-Caliber Projectiles (Explosive)	1.1330	0.1272	0.1537
Large-Caliber Projectiles (Non-Explosive)	0.6414	1.3696	2.0645
Large Caliber Land-Based Casings	Note 1	0.0649	0.0974
Medium-Caliber Projectiles (Explosive)	0.0524	0.1142	0.1155
Medium-Caliber Projectiles (Non-Explosive)	0.4500	1.1470	1.4431
Small-Caliber Projectiles	0.2460	0.8608	0.9891
Small Caliber Casing	Note 1	0.2103	0.2407
Missiles (Explosive)	0.2487	0.3963	0.4271
Missiles (Non-Explosive)	0.0285	0.0000	0.0000
Rockets (Explosive)	0.0042	0.0118	0.0118
Rockets (Non-Explosive)	0.0000	0.0622	0.0622
Rockets (Non-Explosive): Flechette	Note 1	0.0033	0.0033
Sabot	Note 1	0.0019	0.0042
Air Target - Expended (decoy)	Note 1	0.0985	0.1082
Air Target - Expended (drone)	Note 1	0.0044	0.0044
Mine Shape (Non-Explosive)	Note 1	0.2233	0.2233

Table 3.0-18: Impact Area of Proposed Military Expended Materials (continued)

Military Expended Materials	*Area of Potential Impact (acre)*		
	2015 Final EIS/OEIS	*Alternative 1*	*Alternative 2*
Subsurface Targets (Mobile)	Note 1	0.0142	0.0149
Subsurface Targets (Stationary)	Note 1	0.0011	0.0013
Surface Targets (Mobile)	Note 1	0.3959	0.4175
Surface Target (Stationary)	3.4960	3.9097	4.9238
Acoustic Countermeasures	0.0084	0.0110	0.0133
Chaff – Air Cartridge	0.0013	0.0009	0.0009
Chaff – Ship Cartridge	0.0404	0.0226	0.0331
Flares	2.9005	1.9710	1.9710
Mine Neutralization System Neutralizers (Explosive)	0.0021	0.0033	0.0033
Mine Neutralization System Neutralizers (Non-Explosive)	0.0002	0.0000	0.0000
Air-Launched Lightweight Torpedoes (Explosive)	0.0018	0.0009	0.0009
Surface-Launched Lightweight Torpedo (Explosive)	0.0009	0.0005	0.0005
Lightweight Torpedo Accessories	0.0033	0.0028	0.0031
Heavyweight Torpedo (Explosive)	0.0109	0.0055	0.0091
Heavyweight Torpedo Accessories	0.0040	0.0036	0.0054
Anchors (Other)	Note 1	0.0057	0.0080
Anti-torpedo Torpedo	Note 1	0.0017	0.0023
Anti-torpedo Torpedo Accessories	Note 1	0.0004	0.0005
Buoys (Explosive)	0.0720	0.0351	0.0351
Buoys (Non-Explosive)	0.0281	0.0063	0.0073
Cannister	Note 1	0.0001	0.0001
Compression Pad/Pistons	Note 1	0.0035	0.0035
Endcaps	Note 1	0.0035	0.0035
Flare O-Rings	Note 1	0.0035	0.0035
Sonobuoys (Non-Explosive)	0.6676	0.3019	0.3293
Expended Bathythermograph	0.0066	0.0043	0.0046
Marine Marker	0.0552	0.0482	0.0482
Illumination Flare	0.0020	0.0020	0.0020
Fiber Optic Can	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
JATO Bottle	0.0033	0.0033	0.0033
Small Decelerator/Parachutes	2.1959	2.2571	2.4634
Medium Parachutes	0.4206	0.2103	0.2103
Large Parachutes	1.8030	0.9015	0.9015
Ship Hulk	29.0299	14.5150	14.5150
TOTAL	**49.31**	**30.25**	**32.80**

Note 1: These items were not calculated in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

3.0.4.4.5 Seafloor Devices

Seafloor devices represent items used during training or testing activities that are deployed onto the seafloor and recovered. These items include moored mine shapes, anchors, and bottom placed instruments. In certain cases, weights that anchor a device would be expended when the device is recovered (e.g., pop-up buoys). Seafloor devices are either stationary or move very slowly along the bottom and do not pose a threat to highly mobile organisms. The effect of devices on the bottom will be discussed as an alteration of the bottom substrate and associated living resources (i.e., invertebrates and vegetation). Table 3.0-19 shows the number of ongoing events (from the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS) and the number of events proposed in this SEIS/OEIS that include the use of seafloor devices.

Table 3.0-19: Annual Number of Events in the Study Area that Include Seafloor Devices

Training & Testing		
2015 Final EIS/OEIS	***Alternative 1***	***Alternative 2***
200	180	182

3.0.4.4.6 Ground Disturbance and Wildfires

Section 3.0.5.2.3.6 (Ground Disturbance and Wildfires) in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS described ground disturbance and wildfires on FDM. Table 3.0-20 shows the number and type of munitions analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and proposed in this SEIS/OEIS.

Table 3.0-20: Annual Number of Munitions Used on Farallon de Medinilla

Ordnance Use	*2015 Final EIS/OEIS*	*Alternative 1*	*Alternative 2*
Small-caliber Rounds	24,000	24,000	24,000
NEPM Bombs ≤ 2,000 lb.	2,670	2,670	2,670
Explosive Bombs ≤ 2,000 lb.	6,242	6,242	6,242
Explosive Missiles and Rockets ≤ 5"	85 missiles; 2,000 rockets	115 missiles; 2,000 rockets	115 missiles; 2,000 rockets
Explosive Grenades and Mortars	600	1,000	1,000
Medium-caliber Projectiles	17,350 explosives; 94,150 NEPM	17,500 explosives; 94,650 NEPM	17,500 explosives; 94,650 NEPM
Large-caliber Projectiles	1,200 explosives; 1,800 NEPM	3,000 explosives	4,400 explosives

Notes: lb. = pound, NEPM = Non-Explosive Practice Munition

3.0.4.4.7 Personnel Disturbance

Personnel disturbance accounts for the potential for physical impacts on the nearshore seafloor from personnel involved in training or testing activities. During some activities, such as amphibious activities, military personnel approaching land from the ocean may walk in the shallow water through nearshore areas. For example, as amphibious boats approach a beach, military personnel may be required to exit the boat, stand up, and walk to the beach landing area. Table 3.0-21 shows the number of ongoing

events (from the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS) and the number of events proposed in this SEIS/OEIS that include the potential for personnel disturbance.

Table 3.0-21: Annual Number of Events in the Study Area that Include the Potential for Personnel Disturbance

Training & Testing		
2015 Final EIS/OEIS	***Alternative 1***	***Alternative 2***
272	272	272

3.0.4.5 Entanglement Stressors

As described in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, entanglement stressors can result from the Navy's proposed use of fiber optic cables, guidance wires, and decelerators/parachutes. In addition, sonobuoy wires, not previously identified as entanglement stressors, can be entanglement stressors and are included in this SEIS/OEIS for analysis.

3.0.4.5.1 Wires and Cables

3.0.4.5.1.1 Fiber Optic Cables

Although a portion may be recovered, some fiber optic cables used during Navy training and testing associated with remotely operated mine neutralization activities would be expended. The length of the expended tactical fiber would vary (up to about 3,000 meters) depending on the activity. Tactical fiber has an 8-micrometer (0.008 millimeter [mm]) silica core and acrylate coating, and looks and feels like thin monofilament fishing line. Other characteristics of tactical fiber are a 242-micrometer (0.24 mm) diameter, 12-pound tensile strength, and 3.4-mm bend radius (Corning Incorporated, 2005; Raytheon Company, 2015). Tactical fiber is relatively brittle; it readily breaks if knotted, kinked, or abraded against a sharp object. Deployed tactical fiber will break if looped beyond its bend radius (3.4 mm), or exceeds its tensile strength (12 pounds). If the fiber becomes looped around an underwater object or marine animal, it will not tighten unless it is under tension. Such an event would be unlikely based on its method of deployment and its resistance to looping after it is expended. The tactical fibers are often designed with controlled buoyancy to minimize the fiber's effect on vehicle movement. The tactical fiber would be suspended within the water column during the activity, and then be expended and sink to the seafloor (effective sink rate of 1.45 centimeters/second (Raytheon Company, 2015)) where it would be susceptible to abrasion and burial by sedimentation.

3.0.4.5.1.2 Guidance Wires

Section 3.0.5.2.4.1 (Guidance Wires) in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS described guidance wires.

3.0.4.5.1.3 Sonobuoy Wires

Sonobuoys consist of a surface antenna and float unit and a subsurface hydrophone assembly unit. The two units are attached through a thin-gauge, dual-conductor, and hard-draw copper strand wire, which is then wrapped by a hollow rubber tubing or bungee in a spiral configuration. The tensile breaking strength of the wire and rubber tubing is no more than 40 pounds. The length of the wire is housed in a plastic canister dispenser, which remains attached upon deployment. The length of wire that extends out is no more than 1,500 ft. and is dependent on the water depth and type of sonobuoy. Attached to the wire is a kite-drogue and damper disk stabilizing system made of non-woven nylon fabric. The nylon fabric is very thin and can be broken by hand. The wire runs through the stabilizing system, and leads to

the hydrophone components. The hydrophone components may be covered by thin plastic netting depending on type of sonobuoy, but pose no entanglement risk. Each sonobuoy has a saltwater activated polyurethane float that inflates when the sonobuoy is submerged and keeps the sonobuoy components floating vertically in the water column below it. Sonobuoys remain suspended in the water column for no more than 30 hours, after which they sink to the seafloor.

Bathythermographs are similar to sonobuoys in that they consist of a subsurface unit (to measure temperature of the water column in the case of the bathythermograph) that is connected by wire to the float unit (for air-deployed bathythermographs) or directly to the ship (for ship-deployed bathythermographs). The bathythermograph wire is similar to the sonobuoy wire as described above.

Table 3.0-22 shows the number of wires and cables analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and the number proposed in this SEIS/OEIS.

Table 3.0-22: Annual Number of Wires and Cables Expended in the Study Area

Training & Testing		
2015 Final EIS/OEIS	***Alternative 1***	***Alternative 2***
Fiber Optic Cables		
144	44	44
Guidance Wires		
60	49	73
Sonobuoy Wires		
Note 1	5,386	5,876
Bathythermograph Wires		
Note 1	341	364

Note 1: These items were not calculated in the 2015 Final EIS/OEIS.

3.0.4.5.2 Decelerators/Parachutes

Decelerators/parachutes used during training and testing activities are classified into four different categories based on size: small, medium, large, and extra-large; extra-large are not proposed for use in the MITT Study Area (Table 3.0-23). Aircraft-launched sonobuoys and lightweight torpedoes (such as the MK 46 and MK 54) use nylon decelerators/parachutes ranging in size from 18 to 48 inches in diameter (small). The majority of the decelerators/parachutes in the small size category are smaller (18 inches) cruciform shape decelerators/parachutes associated with sonobuoys (Figure 3.0-2). Illumination flares use medium decelerators/parachutes, up to approximately 19 ft. in diameter. Both small- and medium-sized decelerators/parachutes are made of cloth and nylon, many with weights attached to their short attachment lines to speed their sinking. At water impact, the decelerator/parachute assembly is expended and sinks away from the unit. The decelerator/parachute assembly may remain at the surface for 5–15 seconds before the decelerator/parachute and its housing sink to the seafloor, where it becomes flattened (Environmental Sciences Group, 2005). Once settled on the bottom the canopy may temporarily billow if bottom currents are present.

Table 3.0-23: Size Categories for Decelerators/Parachutes Expended During Training and Testing Activities

Size Category	*Diameter (ft.)*	*Associated Use*
Small	1.5–6	Air-launched sonobuoys, lightweight torpedoes, and drones (drag decelerator/parachute)
Medium	19	Illumination flares
Large	30–50	Drones (main decelerator/parachute)



Figure 3.0-2: Sonobuoy Launch Depicting the Relative Size of a Small Decelerator/Parachute

Aerial targets (drones) use large (between 30 and 50 ft. in diameter) decelerators/parachutes (Figure 3.0-3). Large decelerators/parachutes are also made of cloth and nylon, with suspension lines of varying lengths (40–70 ft. in length [with up to 28 lines per decelerator/parachute]). Some aerial targets also use a small drag parachute (6 ft. in diameter) to slow their forward momentum prior to deploying the larger primary decelerator/parachute. Unlike the small- and medium-sized decelerators/parachutes, drone decelerators/parachutes do not have weights attached and may remain at the surface or suspended in the water column for some time prior to eventual settlement on the seafloor.



Figure 3.0-3: Aerial Target (Drone) with Parachute Deployed

Table 3.0-24 shows the number of decelerators/parachutes analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and the number proposed in this SEIS/OEIS.

Table 3.0-24: Annual Number of Decelerators/Parachutes Expended in the Study Area

Training & Testing		
2015 Final EIS/OEIS	***Alternative 1***	***Alternative 2***
12,572	10 Large, 18 Medium, 5,437 Small	10 Large, 18 Medium, 5,934 Small

3.0.4.6 Ingestion Stressors

As described in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, ingestion stressors can result from the Navy's proposed use of non-explosive practice munitions (small- and medium-caliber), fragments from explosives, fragments from targets, chaff, flare casings (including plastic end caps and pistons), and decelerator/parachutes. The annual number of non-explosive practice munitions expended is shown in Table 3.0-14, the number of explosive munitions that could fragment is shown in Table 3.0-16, the number of targets that could fragment is shown in Table 3.0-17, the number of decelerator/parachutes is shown in Table 3.0-24, the number of chaff cartridges is shown in Table 3.0-25, and the number of flares is shown in Table 3.0-26.

Table 3.0-25: Annual Number of Chaff Cartridges Expended in the Study Area

Training & Testing		
2015 Final EIS/OEIS	***Alternative 1***	***Alternative 2***
Chaff – Air Cartridge		
26,000	17,600	17,600
Chaff – Ship Cartridge		
440	246	360

Table 3.0-26: Annual Number of Flares Expended in the Study Area

Training & Testing		
2015 Final EIS/OEIS	***Alternative 1***	***Alternative 2***
25,900	17,600	17,600

3.0.4.7 Conceptual Framework for Assessing Effects from Acoustic and Explosive Activities

This conceptual framework describes the potential effects from exposure to acoustic and explosive activities and the accompanying short-term costs to the animal (e.g., expended energy or missed feeding opportunity). It then outlines the conditions that may lead to long-term consequences for the individual if the animal cannot fully recover from the short-term costs and how these in turn may affect the population. The methods to predict effects on each specific taxa are derived from this conceptual framework.

An animal is considered "exposed" to a sound if the received sound level at the animal's location is above the background ambient noise level within a similar frequency band. A variety of effects may result from exposure to acoustic and explosive activities.

The categories of potential effects are:

- ***Injury*** *- Injury to organs or tissues of an animal.*
- ***Hearing loss*** *- A noise-induced decrease in hearing sensitivity that can be either temporary or permanent and may be limited to a narrow frequency range of hearing.*
- ***Masking*** *- When the perception of a biologically important sound (i.e., signal) is interfered with by a second sound (i.e., noise).*
- ***Physiological stress*** *- An adaptive process that helps an animal cope with changing conditions; although, too much stress can result in physiological problems.*
- ***Behavioral response*** *- A reaction ranging from very minor and brief changes in attentional focus, changes in biologically important behaviors, and avoidance of a sound source or area, to aggression or prolonged flight.*

Figure 3.0-4 is a flowchart that diagrams the process used to evaluate the potential effects to marine animals exposed to sound-producing activities. The shape and color of each box on the flowchart represents either a decision point in the analysis (green diamonds); specific processes such as responses, costs, or recovery (blue rectangles); external factors to consider (purple parallelograms); and final outcomes for the individual or population (orange ovals and rectangles). Each box is labeled for reference throughout the following sections. For simplicity, sound is used here to include not only sound

waves but also blast waves generated from explosive sources. Box A1, the Sound-Producing Activity, is the source of this stimuli and therefore the starting point in the analysis.

The first step in predicting whether an activity is capable of affecting a marine animal is to define the stimuli experienced by the animal. The stimuli include the overall level of activity, the surrounding acoustical environment, and characteristics of the sound when it reaches the animal.

Sounds emitted from a sound-producing activity (Box A1) travel through the environment to create a spatially variable sound field. The received sound by the animal (Box A2) determines the range of possible effects. The received sound can be evaluated in several ways, including number of times the sound is experienced (repetitive exposures), total received energy, or highest SPL experienced. Sounds that are higher than the ambient noise level and within an animal's hearing sensitivity range (Box A3) have the potential to cause effects. There can be any number of individual sound sources in a given activity, each with its own unique characteristics. For example, a Navy training exercise may involve several ships and aircraft using several types of sonar. Environmental factors such as temperature and bottom type impact how sound spreads and attenuates through the environment. Additionally, independent of the sounds, the overall level of activity and the number and movement of sound sources are important to help predict the probable reactions.

The magnitude of the responses is based on the characteristics of the acoustic stimuli and the characteristics of the animal (species, susceptibility, life history stage, size, and past experiences). Very high exposure levels close to explosives have the potential to cause injury. High-level, long-duration, or repetitive exposures may potentially cause some hearing loss. All perceived sounds may lead to behavioral responses, physiological stress, and masking. Many sounds, including sounds that are not detectable by the animal, could have no effect (Box A4).

3.0.4.7.1 Injury

Injury (Box B1) refers to the direct injury of tissues and organs by shock or pressure waves impinging upon or traveling through an animal's body. Marine animals are well adapted to large, but relatively slow, hydrostatic pressure changes that occur with changing depth. However, injury may result from exposure to rapid pressure changes, such that the tissues do not have time to adequately adjust.

Therefore, injury is normally limited to relatively close ranges from explosions. Injury can be mild and fully recoverable or, in some cases, lead to mortality.

Injury includes both auditory and non-auditory injury. Auditory injury is the direct mechanical injury to hearing-related structures, including tympanic membrane rupture, disarticulation of the middle ear ossicles, and injury to the inner ear structures such as the organ of Corti and the associated hair cells. Auditory injury differs from auditory fatigue in that the latter involves the overstimulation of the auditory system at levels below those capable of causing direct mechanical damage. Auditory injury is always injurious but can be temporary. One of the most common consequences of auditory injury is hearing loss.

This page intentionally left blank.




Figure 3.0-4: Flow Chart of the Evaluation Process of Sound-Producing Activities

This page intentionally left blank.

Non-auditory injury can include hemorrhaging of small blood vessels and the rupture of gas-containing tissues such as the lung, swim bladder, or gastrointestinal tract. After the ear (or other sound-sensing organs), these are usually the organs and tissues most sensitive to explosive injury. An animal's size and anatomy are important in determining its susceptibility to non-auditory injury (Box B2). Larger size indicates more tissue to protect vital organs. Therefore, larger animals should be less susceptible to injury than smaller animals. In some cases, acoustic resonance of a structure may enhance the vibrations resulting from noise exposure and result in an increased susceptibility to injury. The size, geometry, and material composition of a structure determine the frequency at which the object will resonate. Because most biological tissues are heavily damped, the increase in susceptibility from resonance is limited.

Vascular and tissue bubble formation resulting from sound exposure is a hypothesized mechanism of injury to breath-holding marine animals. Bubble formation and growth due to direct sound exposure have been hypothesized (Crum & Mao, 1996; Crum et al., 2005); however, the experimental laboratory conditions under which these phenomena were observed would not be replicated in the wild. Certain dive behaviors by breath-holding animals are predicted to result in conditions of blood nitrogen super-saturation, potentially putting an animal at risk for decompression sickness (Fahlman et al., 2014), although this phenomena has not been observed (Houser et al., 2009). In addition, animals that spend long periods of time at great depths are predicted to have super-saturated tissues that may slowly release nitrogen if the animal then spends a long time at the surface (i.e., stranding) (Houser et al., 2009).

Injury could increase the animal's physiological stress (Box B8), which feeds into the stress response (Box B7) and also increases the likelihood or severity of a behavioral response. Injury may reduce an animal's ability to secure food by reducing its mobility or the efficiency of its sensory systems, making the injured individual less attractive to potential mates, increasing an individual's chances of contracting diseases, falling prey to a predator (Box D2), or increasing an animal's overall physiological stress level (Box D10). Severe injury can lead to the death of the individual (Box D1).

Damaged tissues from mild to moderate injury may heal over time. The predicted recovery of direct injury is based on the severity of the injury, availability of resources, and characteristics of the animal. The animal may also need to recover from any potential costs due to a decrease in resource gathering efficiency and any secondary effects from predators or disease. Severe injuries can lead to reduced survivorship (longevity), elevated stress levels, and prolonged alterations in behavior that can reduce an animal's lifetime reproductive success. An animal with decreased energy stores or a lingering injury may be less successful at mating for one or more breeding seasons, thereby decreasing the number of offspring produced over its lifetime.

3.0.4.7.2 Hearing Loss

Hearing loss, also called a noise-induced threshold shift, is possibly the most studied type of effect from sound exposures to animals. Hearing loss manifests itself as loss in hearing sensitivity across part of an animal's hearing range, which is dependent upon the specifics of the noise exposure. Hearing loss may be either PTS or TTS. If the threshold shift eventually returns to zero (the animal's hearing returns to pre-exposure value), the threshold shift is a TTS. If the threshold shift does not return to zero but leaves some finite amount of threshold shift, then that remaining threshold shift is a PTS. Figure 3.0-5 shows one hypothetical threshold shift that completely recovers, a TTS, and one that does not completely recover, leaving some PTS.

The characteristics of the received sound stimuli are used and compared to the animal's hearing sensitivity and susceptibility to noise (Box A3) to determine the potential for hearing loss. The amplitude, frequency, duration, and temporal pattern of the sound exposure are important parameters for predicting the potential for hearing loss over a specific portion of an animal's hearing range. Duration is particularly important because hearing loss increases with prolonged exposure time. Longer exposures with lower sound levels can cause more threshold shift than a shorter exposure using the same amount of energy overall. The frequency of the sound also plays an important role. Experiments show that animals are most susceptible to hearing loss (Box B3) within their most sensitive hearing range. Sounds outside of an animal's audible frequency range do not cause hearing loss.

The mechanisms responsible for hearing loss may consist of a variety of mechanical and biochemical processes in the inner ear, including physical damage or distortion of the tympanic membrane (not including tympanic membrane rupture which is considered auditory injury), physical damage or distortion of the cochlear hair cells, hair cell death, changes in cochlear blood flow, and swelling of cochlear nerve terminals (Henderson et al., 2006; Kujawa & Liberman, 2009). Although the outer hair cells are the most prominent target for fatigue effects, severe noise exposures may also result in inner hair cell death and loss of auditory nerve fibers (Henderson et al., 2006).




Figure 3.0-5: Two Hypothetical Threshold Shifts

The relationship between TTS and PTS is complicated and poorly understood, even in humans and terrestrial mammals, where numerous studies failed to delineate a clear relationship between the two. Relatively small amounts of TTS (e.g., less than 40–50 decibels measured two minutes after exposure) will recover with no apparent permanent effects; however, terrestrial mammal studies revealed that larger amounts of threshold shift can result in permanent neural degeneration, despite the hearing thresholds returning to normal (Kujawa & Liberman, 2009). The amounts of threshold shift induced by Kujawa and Liberman (2009) were described as being "at the limits of reversibility." It is unknown whether smaller amounts of threshold shift can result in similar neural degeneration, or if effects would translate to other species such as marine animals.

Hearing loss can increase an animal's physiological stress (Box B8), which feeds into the stress response (Box B7). Hearing loss increases the likelihood or severity of a behavioral response and increase an animal's overall physiological stress level (Box D10). Hearing loss reduces the distance over which animals can communicate and detect other biologically important sounds (Box D3). Hearing loss could

also be inconsequential for an animal if the frequency range affected is not critical for that animal to hear within, or the hearing loss is of such short duration (e.g., a few minutes) that there are no costs to the individual.

Small to moderate amounts of hearing loss may recover over a period of minutes to days, depending on the amount of initial threshold shift. Severe noise-induced hearing loss may not fully recover, resulting in some amount of PTS. An animal whose hearing does not recover quickly and fully could suffer a reduction in lifetime reproductive success. An animal with PTS may be less successful at mating for one or more breeding seasons, thereby decreasing the number of offspring it can produce over its lifetime.

3.0.4.7.3 Masking

Masking occurs if the noise from an activity interferes with an animal's ability to detect, understand, or recognize biologically relevant sounds of interest (Box B4). In this context noise refers to unwanted or unimportant sounds that mask an animal's ability to hear sounds of interest. Sounds of interest include those from conspecifics such as offspring, mates, and competitors; echolocation clicks; sounds from predators; natural, abiotic sounds that may aid in navigation; and reverberation, which can give an animal information about its location and orientation within the ocean. The probability of masking increases as the noise and sound of interest increase in similarity and the masking noise increases in level. The frequency, received level, and duty cycle of the noise determines the potential degree of auditory masking. Masking only occurs during the sound exposure.

A behavior decision (either conscious or instinctive) is made by the animal when the animal detects increased background noise, or possibly, when the animal recognizes that biologically relevant sounds are being masked (Box C1). An animal's past experiences can be important in determining the behavioral response when dealing with masking (Box C4). For example, an animal may modify its vocalizations to reduce the effects of masking noise. Other stimuli present in the environment can influence an animal's behavior decision (Box C5) such as the presence of predators, prey, or potential mates.

An animal may exhibit a passive behavioral response when coping with masking (Box C2). It may simply not respond and keep conducting its current natural behavior. An animal may also stop calling until the background noise decreases. These passive responses do not present a direct energetic cost to the animal; however, masking will continue, depending on the acoustic stimuli.

An animal may actively compensate for masking (Box C3). An animal can vocalize more loudly to make its signal heard over the masking noise. An animal may also shift the frequency of its vocalizations away from the frequency of the masking noise. This shift can actually reduce the masking effect for the animal and other animals that are listening in the area.

If masking impairs an animal's ability to hear biologically important sounds (Box D3) it could reduce an animal's ability to communicate with conspecifics or reduce opportunities to detect or attract more distant mates, gain information about their physical environment, or navigate. An animal that modifies its vocalization in response to masking could also incur a cost (Box D4). Modifying vocalizations may cost the animal energy, interfere with the behavioral function of a call, or reduce a signaler's apparent quality as a mating partner. For example, songbirds that shift their calls up an octave to compensate for increased background noise attract fewer or less-desirable mates, and many terrestrial species advertise body size and quality with low-frequency vocalizations (Slabbekoorn & Ripmeester, 2007). Masking may also lead to no measurable costs for an animal. Masking could be of short duration or intermittent such that biologically important sounds that are continuous or repeated are received by the animal between masking noise.

Masking only occurs when the sound source is operating; therefore, direct masking effects stop immediately upon cessation of the sound-producing activity. Masking could have long-term consequences for individuals if the activity was continuous or occurred frequently enough.

3.0.4.7.4 Physiological Stress

Marine animals naturally experience physiological stress as part of their normal life histories. The physiological response to a stressor, often termed the stress response, is an adaptive process that helps an animal cope with changing external and internal environmental conditions. Sound-producing activities have the potential to cause additional stress. However, too much of a stress response can be harmful to an animal, resulting in physiological dysfunction.

If a sound is detected (i.e., heard or sensed) by an animal, a stress response can occur (Box B7). The severity of the stress response depends on the received sound level by the animal (Box A2), the details of the sound-producing activity (Box A1), and the animal's life history stage (e.g., juvenile or adult, breeding or feeding season), and past experience with the stimuli (Box B5). An animal's life history stage is an important factor to consider when predicting whether a stress response is likely (Box B5). An animal's life history stage includes its level of physical maturity (i.e., larva, infant, juvenile, sexually mature adult) and the primary activity in which it is engaged such as mating, feeding, or rearing/caring for young. Prior experience with a stressor may be of particular importance because repeated experience with a stressor may dull the stress response via acclimation (St. Aubin & Dierauf, 2001) or increase the response via sensitization. Additionally, if an animal suffers injury or hearing loss, a physiological stress response will occur (Box B8).

The generalized stress response is characterized by a release of hormones (Reeder & Kramer, 2005) and other chemicals (e.g., stress markers) such as reactive oxidative compounds associated with noise-induced hearing loss (Henderson et al., 2006). Stress hormones include norepinephrine and epinephrine (i.e., the catecholamines), which produce elevations in the heart and respiration rate, increase awareness, and increase the availability of glucose and lipid for energy. Other stress hormones are the glucocorticoid steroid hormones cortisol and aldosterone, which are classically used as an indicator of a stress response and to characterize the magnitude of the stress response (Hennessy et al., 1979).

An acute stress response is traditionally considered part of the startle response and is hormonally characterized by the release of the catecholamines. Annoyance type reactions may be characterized by the release of either or both catecholamines and glucocorticoid hormones. Regardless of the physiological changes that make up the stress response, the stress response may contribute to an animal's decision to alter its behavior.

Elevated stress levels may occur whether or not an animal exhibits a behavioral response (Box D10). Even while undergoing a stress response, competing stimuli (e.g., food or mating opportunities) may overcome any behavioral response. Regardless of whether the animal displays a behavioral response, this tolerated stress could incur a cost to the animal. Reactive oxygen compounds produced during normal physiological processes are generally counterbalanced by enzymes and antioxidants; however, excess stress can lead to damage of lipids, proteins, and nucleic acids at the cellular level (Berlett & Stadtman, 1997; Sies, 1997; Touyz, 2004).

Frequent physiological stress responses may accumulate over time increasing an animal's chronic stress level. Each component of the stress response is variable in time, and stress hormones return to baseline levels at different rates. Elevated chronic stress levels are usually a result of a prolonged or repeated

disturbance. Chronic elevations in the stress levels (e.g., cortisol levels) may produce long-term health consequences that can reduce lifetime reproductive success.

3.0.4.7.5 Behavioral Reactions

Behavioral responses fall into two major categories: alterations in natural behavior patterns and avoidance. These types of reactions are not mutually exclusive, and many overall reactions may be combinations of behaviors or a sequence of behaviors. Severity of behavioral reactions can vary drastically between minor and brief reorientations of the animal to investigate the sound, to severe reactions such as aggression or prolonged flight. The type and severity of the behavioral response will determine the cost to the animal. The total number of vessels and platforms involved, the size of the activity area, the distance between the animal and activity, and the duration of the activity are important considerations when predicting the initial behavioral responses.

A physiological stress response (Box B7) such as an annoyance or startle reaction, or cueing or alerting (Box B6) may cause an animal to make a behavior decision (Box C6). Any exposure that produces an injury or hearing loss is also assumed to produce a stress response (Box B7) and increase the severity or likelihood of a behavioral reaction. Both an animal's experience (Box C4) and competing and reinforcing stimuli (Box C5) can affect an animal's behavior decision. The decision can result in three general types of behavioral reactions: no response (Box C9), area avoidance (Box C8), or alteration of a natural behavior (Box C7).

An animal's past experiences can be important in determining what behavior decision it may make when dealing with a stress response (Box C4). Habituation is the process by which an animal learns to ignore or tolerate stimuli over some period and return to a normal behavior pattern, perhaps after being exposed to the stimuli with no negative consequences. Sensitization is when an animal becomes more sensitive to a set of stimuli over time, perhaps as a result of a past, negative experience that could result in a stronger behavioral response.

Other stimuli (Box C5) present in the environment can influence an animal's behavioral response. These stimuli may be conspecifics or predators in the area or the drive to engage in a natural behavior. Other stimuli can also reinforce the behavioral response caused by acoustic stimuli. For example, the awareness of a predator in the area coupled with the sound-producing activity may elicit a stronger reaction than the activity alone would have.

An animal may reorient, become more vigilant, or investigate if it detects a sound-producing activity (Box C7). These behaviors all require the animal to divert attention and resources, therefore slowing or stopping their presumably beneficial natural behavior. This can be a very brief diversion, or an animal may not resume its natural behaviors until after the activity has concluded. An animal may choose to leave or avoid an area where a sound-producing activity is taking place (Box C8). A more severe form of this comes in the form of flight or evasion. Avoidance of an area can help the animal avoid further effects by avoiding or reducing further exposure. An animal may also choose not to respond to a sound-producing activity (Box C9).

An animal that alters its natural behavior in response to stress or an auditory cue may slow or cease its natural behavior and instead expend energy reacting to the sound-producing activity (Box D5). Natural behaviors include feeding, breeding, sheltering, and migrating. The cost of feeding disruptions depends on the energetic requirements of individuals and the potential amount of food missed during the disruption. Alteration in breeding behavior can result in delaying reproduction. The costs of a brief interruption to migrating or sheltering are less clear.

An animal that avoids a sound-producing activity may expend additional energy moving around the area, be displaced to poorer resources, miss potential mates, or have social interactions affected (Box D6). The amount of energy expended depends on the severity of the behavioral response. Missing potential mates can result in delaying reproduction. Groups could be separated during a severe behavioral response such as flight and offspring that depend on their parents may die if they are permanently separated. Splitting up an animal group can result in a reduced group size, which can have secondary effects on individual foraging success and susceptibility to predators.

Some severe behavioral reactions can lead to stranding (Box D7) or secondary injury (Box D8). Animals that take prolonged flight, a severe avoidance reaction, may injure themselves or strand in an environment for which they are not adapted. Some injury is likely to occur to an animal that strands (Box D8). Injury can reduce the animal's ability to secure food and mates, and increase the animal's susceptibility to predation and disease (Box D2). An animal that strands and does not return to a hospitable environment may die (Box D9).

3.0.4.7.6 Long-Term Consequences

The potential long-term consequences from behavioral responses are difficult to discern. Animals displaced from their normal habitat due to an avoidance reaction may return over time and resume their natural behaviors. This is likely to depend upon the severity of the reaction and how often the activity is repeated in the area. In areas of repeated and frequent acoustic disturbance, some animals may habituate to the new baseline; conversely, species that are more sensitive may not return, or return but not resume use of the habitat in the same manner. For example, an animal may return to an area to feed but no longer rest in that area. Long-term abandonment or a change in the utilization of an area by enough individuals can change the distribution of the population. Frequent disruptions to natural behavior patterns may not allow an animal to recover between exposures, which increase the probability of causing long-term consequences to individuals.

The magnitude and type of effect and the speed and completeness of recovery (i.e., return to baseline conditions) must be considered in predicting long-term consequences to the individual animal (Box E4). The predicted recovery of the animal (Box E1) is based on the cost to the animal from any reactions, behavioral or physiological. Available resources fluctuate by season, location, and year and can play a major role in an animal's rate of recovery (Box E2). Recovery can occur more quickly if plentiful food resources, many potential mates, or refuge or shelter is available. An animal's health, energy reserves, size, life history stage, and resource gathering strategy affect its speed and completeness of recovery (Box E3). Animals that are in good health and have abundant energy reserves before an effect takes place will likely recover more quickly.

Animals that recover quickly and completely are unlikely to suffer reductions in their health or reproductive success, or experience changes in habitat utilization (Box F2). No population-level effects would be expected if individual animals do not suffer reductions in their lifetime reproductive success or change their habitat utilization (Box G2). Animals that do not recover quickly and fully could suffer reductions in their health and lifetime reproductive success; they could be permanently displaced or change how they use the environment; or they could die (Box F1). These long-term consequences to the individual can lead to consequences for the population (Box G1); although, population dynamics and abundance play a role in determining how many individuals would need to suffer long-term consequences before there was an effect on the population.

Long-term consequences to individuals can translate into consequences for populations dependent upon population abundance, structure, growth rate, and carry capacity. Carrying capacity describes the theoretical maximum number of animals of a particular species that the environment can support. When a population nears its carrying capacity, its growth is naturally limited by available resources and predator pressure. If one, or a few animals, in a population are removed or gather fewer resources, then other animals in the population can take advantage of the freed resources and potentially increase their health and lifetime reproductive success. Abundant populations that are near their carrying capacity (theoretical maximum abundance) that suffer consequences on a few individuals may not be affected overall. Populations that exist well below their carrying capacity may suffer greater consequences from any lasting consequences to even a few individuals. Population-level consequences can include a change in the population dynamics, a decrease in the growth rate, or a change in geographic distribution.

REFERENCES

Baird, R. W. (2013). False Killer Whales Around Kauai and Niihau. *Offshore Neighbors, Hawaii Fishing News,* pp. 24–25.

Baird, R. W., D. L. Webster, S. Watwood, R. Morrissey, B. K. Rone, S. D. Mahaffy, A. M. Gorgone, D. B. Anderson, and D. J. Moretti. (2016). *Odontocete Studies on the Pacific Missile Range Facility in February 2015: Satellite-Tagging, Photo-Identification, and Passive Acoustic Monitoring. Final Report*. Olympia, WA: HDR Environmental Inc.

Barlow, J. (2016). *Cetacean Abundance in the California Current Estimated from Ship-based Line-transect Surveys in 1991–2014.* (NOAA Administrative Report NMFS-SWFSC-LJ-1601). La Jolla, CA: Southwest Fisheries Science Center.

Becker, E. A., K. A. Forney, P. C. Fiedler, J. Barlow, S. J. Chivers, C. A. Edwards, A. M. Moore, and J. V. Redfern. (2016). Moving Towards Dynamic Ocean Management: How Well Do Modeled Ocean Products Predict Species Distributions? *Remote Sensing, 8*(2), 149.

Berlett, B. S., and E. R. Stadtman. (1997). Protein oxidation in aging, disease, and oxidative stress. *The Journal of Biological Chemistry, 272*(33), 20313–20316.

Bousman, W. G., and R. M. Kufeld. (2005). *UH-60A Airloads Catalog*. Moffett Field, CA: National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Bradford, A. L., K. A. Forney, E. M. Oleson, and J. Barlow. (2017). Abundance estimates of cetaceans from a line-transect survey within the U.S. Hawaiian Islands Exclusive Economic Zone. *Fishery Bulletin, 115*(2), 129–142.

Campbell, G. S., L. Thomas, K. Whitaker, A. B. Douglas, J. Calambokidis, and J. A. Hildebrand. (2015). Inter-annual and seasonal trends in cetacean distribution, density and abundance off southern California. *Deep Sea Research Part II: Topical Studies in Oceanography, 112*, 143–157.

Carretta, J. V., E. Oleson, D. W. Weller, A. R. Lang, K. A. Forney, J. Baker, M. M. Muto, B. Hanson, A. J. Orr, H. Huber, M. S. Lowry, J. Barlow, J. Moore, D. Lynch, L. Carswell, and R. L. Brownell. (2015). *U.S. Pacific Marine Mammal Stock Assessments: 2014* (NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SWFSC-549). La Jolla, CA: Southwest Fisheries Science Center.

Corning Incorporated. (2005). *Corning SMF-28e Optical Fiber Product Information*. Corning, NY: Corning Incorporated.

Courbis, S., and G. Timmel. (2008). Effects of vessels and swimmers on behavior of Hawaiian spinner dolphins (*Stenella longirostris*) in Kealake'akua, Honaunau, and Kauhako bays, Hawai'i. *Marine Mammal Science, 25*(2), 430–440.

Crum, L., and Y. Mao. (1996). Acoustically enhanced bubble growth at low frequencies and its implications for human diver and marine mammal safety. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 99*(5), 2898–2907.

Crum, L., M. Bailey, J. Guan, P. Hilmo, S. Kargl, and T. Matula. (2005). Monitoring bubble growth in supersaturated blood and tissue *ex vivo* and the relevance to marine mammal bioeffects. *Acoustics Research Letters Online, 6*(3), 214–220.

Eller, A. I., and R. C. Cavanagh. (2000). *Subsonic Aircraft Noise at and Beneath the Ocean Surface: Estimation of Risk for Effects on Marine Mammals*. McLean, VA: United States Air Force Research Laboratory.

Environmental Sciences Group. (2005). *Canadian Forces Maritime Experimental and Test Ranges: Environmental Assessment Update 2005*. Kingston, Canada: Environmental Sciences Group, Royal Military College.

Erbe, C., R. Williams, M. Parsons, S. K. Parsons, I. G. Hendrawan, and I. M. I. Dewantama. (2018). Underwater noise from airplanes: An overlooked source of ocean noise. *Marine Pollution Bulletin, 137*, 656–661.

Fahlman, A., P. L. Tyack, P. J. O. Miller, and P. H. Kvadsheim. (2014). How man-made interference might cause gas bubble emboli in deep diving whales. *Frontiers in Physiology, 5*(13), 1–6.

Forney, K. A., E. A. Becker, D. G. Foley, J. Barlow, and E. M. Oleson. (2015). Habitat-based models of cetacean density and distribution in the central North Pacific. *Endangered Species Research, 27*, 1–20.

Frisk, G. V. (2012). Noiseonomics: The relationship between ambient noise levels in the sea and global economic trends. *Scientific Reports, 2*(437), 1–4.

HDR. (2012). *Summary Report: Compilation of Visual Survey Effort and Sightings for Marine Species Monitoring in the Hawaii Range Complex, 2005–2012*. Pearl Harbor, HI: U.S. Pacific Fleet.

Henderson, D., E. C. Bielefeld, K. C. Harris, and B. H. Hu. (2006). The role of oxidative stress in noise-induced hearing loss. *Ear & Hearing, 27*, 1–19.

Hennessy, M. B., J. P. Heybach, J. Vernikos, and S. Levine. (1979). Plasma corticosterone concentrations sensitively reflect levels of stimulus intensity in the rat. *Physiology and Behavior, 22*, 821–825.

Houser, D. S., L. A. Dankiewicz-Talmadge, T. K. Stockard, and P. J. Ponganis. (2009). Investigation of the potential for vascular bubble formation in a repetitively diving dolphin. *The Journal of Experimental Biology, 213*, 52–62.

Jefferson, T. A., M. A. Smultea, and C. E. Bacon. (2014). Southern California Bight marine mammal density and abundance from aerial survey, 2008–2013. *Journal of Marine Animals and Their Ecology, 7*(2), 14–30.

Kujawa, S. G., and M. C. Liberman. (2009). Adding insult to injury: Cochlear nerve degeneration after "temporary" noise-induced hearing loss. *The Journal of Neuroscience, 29*(45), 14077–14085.

MacGillivray, A., Z. Li, D. Hannay, K. Trounce, and O. Robinson. (2019). Slowing deep-sea commercial vessels reduces underwater radiated noise. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 146*(1), 340–351.

McKenna, M. F., D. Ross, S. M. Wiggins, and J. A. Hildebrand. (2012). Underwater radiated noise from modern commercial ships. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 131*(1), 92–103.

Mintz, J. D., and C. L. Parker. (2006). *Vessel Traffic and Speed Around the U.S. Coasts and Around Hawaii*. Alexandria, VA: Center for Naval Analyses.

Mintz, J. D., and R. J. Filadelfo. (2011). *Exposure of Marine Mammals to Broadband Radiated Noise* (Specific Authority N0001-4-05-D-0500). Washington, DC: Center for Naval Analyses.

Mintz, J. D. (2012). *Vessel Traffic in the Hawaii-Southern California and Atlantic Fleet Testing and Training Study Areas*. Alexandria, VA: Center for Naval Analyses.

Mintz, J. D. (2016). *Characterization of Vessel Traffic in the Vicinities of HRC, SOCAL, and the Navy Operating Areas off the U.S. East Coast*. Alexandria, VA: Center for Naval Analyses.

Mulsow, J., C. E. Schlundt, L. Brandt, and J. J. Finneran. (2015). Equal latency contours for bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*) and California sea lions (*Zalophus californianus*). *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 138*(5), 2678.

National Marine Fisheries Service. (2016). *Technical Guidance for Assessing the Effects of Anthropogenic Sound on Marine Mammal Hearing Underwater Acoustic Thresholds for Onset of Permanent and Temporary Threshold Shifts*. (NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-OPR-55). Silver Spring, MD: U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service.

Popper, A. N., A. D. Hawkins, R. R. Fay, D. A. Mann, S. M. Bartol, T. J. Carlson, S. Coombs, W. T. Ellison, R. L. Gentry, M. B. Halvorsen, S. Løkkeborg, P. H. Rogers, B. L. Southall, D. G. Zeddies, and W. N. Tavolga. (2014). *ASA S3/SC1.4 TR-2014 Sound Exposure Guidelines for Fishes and Sea Turtles: A Technical Report prepared by ANSI-Accredited Standards Committee S3/SC1 and registered with ANSI*. New York, NY and London, United Kingdom: Acoustical Society of America Press and Springer Briefs in Oceanography.

Purdy, R. (2016). Kauai's first documented green sea turtle nest of 2016 hatches: Sixty-three hatchlings emerge from Pacific Missile Range Facility. *Currents*(Fall), 24–25.

Raytheon Company. (2015). *Airborne Mine Neutralization System (AMNS): Alternative Optical Fiber Engineering Study Final Report*. Portsmouth, RI: Integrated Defense Systems.

Reeder, D. M., and K. M. Kramer. (2005). Stress in free-ranging mammals: Integrating physiology, ecology, and natural history. *Journal of Mammalogy, 86*(2), 225–235.

Richardson, W. J., C. R. Greene, Jr., C. I. Malme, and D. H. Thomson. (1995). *Marine Mammals and Noise*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Sies, H. (1997). Physiological Society Symposium: Impaired endothelial and smooth muscle cell function in oxidative stress-oxidative stress: Oxidants and antioxidants. *Experimental Physiology, 82*, 291–295.

Slabbekoorn, H., and E. A. Ripmeester. (2007). Birdsong and anthropogenic noise: Implications and applications for conservation. *Molecular Ecology, 17*(1), 72–83.

Sohn, R. A., F. Vernon, J. A. Hildebrand, and S. C. Webb. (2000). Field measurements of sonic boom penetration into the ocean. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 107*(6), 3073–3083.

Sparrow, V. W. (2002). Review and status of sonic boom penetration into the ocean. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 111*(1), 537–543.

St. Aubin, D., and L. A. Dierauf. (2001). Stress and Marine Mammals. In L. A. Dierauf & F. M. D. Gulland (Eds.), *Marine Mammal Medicine* (2nd ed., pp. 253–269). Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.

Touyz, R. M. (2004). Reactive oxygen species, vascular oxidative stress, and redox signaling in hypertension: What is the clinical significance? *Hypertension, 44*, 248–252.

U.S. Department of the Air Force. (2000). *Supersonic Aircraft Noise At and Beneath the Ocean Surface: Estimation of Risk for Effects on Marine Mammals* (AFRL-HE-WP-TR-2000-0167). McLean, VA: United States Air Force Research Laboratory.

U.S. Department of the Air Force. (2016). *United States Air Force F-35A Operational Beddown–Pacific Final Environmental Impact Statement*. Eielson Air Force Base, AK: United States Air Force.

U.S. Department of the Army. (1999). *Finding of No Significant Impact for the Life Cycle Environmental Assessment for the HELLFIRE Modular Missile System*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Defense.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (1975). *Explosion Effects and Properties Part I – Explosion Effects in Air*. Silver Spring, MD: White Oak Laboratory, Naval Surface Weapons Center.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (1981). *Gun Blast Far Field Peak Overpressure Contours*. (NSWC TR 79-442). Silver Spring, MD: Naval Surface Weapons Center.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2001). *Sonic Boom Parametric Study*. Naval Air Station Patuxent River, MD: Applied Ordnance Technology, Inc. and Operational Environmental Planning Office

U.S. Department of the Navy, and Department of Defense. (2007). *Finding of No Significant Harm and Final Environmental Assessment of the Naval Air Routine Training Exercises in East and Gulf Coast Operation Areas and Seaward*. Norfolk, VA: Atlantic Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2010). *Laser System Usage in the Marine Environment: Applications and Environmental Considerations*. San Diego, CA: Space and Naval Warfare Systems Command Center Pacific.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2012a). *Criteria and Thresholds for U.S. Navy Acoustic and Explosive Effects Analysis*. San Diego, CA: Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Pacific.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2012b). *Biological Assessment for the Expeditionary Electronic Attack Squadron Realignment and Transition at Naval Air Station Whidbey Island, Oak Harbor, Washington*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Navy.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2013). *Petition for Regulations Pursuant to Section 101(a)(5) of the Marine Mammal Protection Act Covering Taking of Marine Mammals Incidental to Target and Missile Launch Activities for the Period 2014–2019 at San Nicolas Island, California (50 CFR Part 216, Subpart I)*. Point Mugu, CA: Office of Protected Resources, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2014). *U.S. Navy Testing of Hypervelocity Projectiles and an Electromagnetic Railgun*. Wallops Island, VA: U.S. Department of the Navy.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2015a). *Final Mariana Islands Training and Testing Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement*. Pearl Harbor, HI: Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Pacific.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2015b). *Record of Decision for the Mariana Islands Training and Testing Final Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (EIS/OEIS)*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Defense.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2017a). *U.S. Navy Marine Species Density Database Phase III for the Hawaii-Southern California Training and Testing Study Area* (Naval Facilities Engineering Command Pacific Technical Report). Pearl Harbor, HI: Naval Facilities Engineering Command Pacific.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2017b). *Criteria and Thresholds for U.S. Navy Acoustic and Explosive Effects Analysis (Phase III)*. San Diego, CA: Space and Naval Warfare Systems Command, Pacific.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2017c). *NATOPS General Flight and Operating Instructions Manual; OPNAV Instruction M-3710.7*. Washington, DC: Department of the Navy, Office of the Chief of Naval Operations.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2018a). *U.S. Navy Marine Species Density Database Phase III for the Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area* (Naval Facilities Engineering Command Pacific Technical Report). Pearl Harbor, HI: Naval Facilities Engineering Command Pacific.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2018b). *Quantifying Acoustic Impacts on Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles: Methods and Analytical Approach for Phase III Training and Testing* (Technical Report prepared by NUWC Division Newport, Space and Naval Warfare Systems Center Pacific, G2 Software Systems, and the National Marine Mammal Foundation). Newport, RI: Naval Undersea Warfare Center.

U.S. Naval Research Advisory Committee. (2009). *Report on Jet Engine Noise Reduction*. Patuxent River, MD: Department of Defense.

Urick, R. J. (1983). *Principles of Underwater Sound* (3rd ed.). Los Altos, CA: Peninsula Publishing.

Wladichuk, J. L., D. E. Hannay, A. O. MacGillivray, Z. Li, and S. J. Thornton. (2019). Systematic Source Level Measurements of Whale Watching Vessels and Other Small Boats. *The Journal of Ocean Technology, 14*(3), 110–126.

Yagla, J., and R. Stiegler. (2003). *Gun blast noise transmission across the air-sea interface*. Paper presented at the 5th European Conference on Noise Control. Naples, Italy.

3.1 Sediments and Water Quality

Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/ Overseas Environmental Impact Statement Mariana Islands Training and Testing

TABLE OF CONTENTS

3.1 Sediments and Water Quality 3.1-1
3.1.1 Affected Environment 3.1-1
3.1.1.1 Existing Conditions 3.1-1
3.1.2 Environmental Consequences 3.1-9
3.1.2.1 Explosives and Explosives Byproducts 3.1-10
3.1.2.2 Metals 3.1-13
3.1.2.3 Chemicals Other than Explosives 3.1-14
3.1.2.4 Other Materials 3.1-17
3.1.3 Public Comments 3.1-18

List of Figures

There are no figures in this section.

List of Tables

Table 3.1-1: Water Quality Standard, Criteria, and Applicable Water Use Areas 3.1-3
Table 3.1-2: Rates of Failure and Low-Order Detonations 3.1-7

This page intentionally left blank.

3.1 Sediments and Water Quality

3.1.1 Affected Environment

The purpose of this section is to supplement the analysis of impacts on sediments and water quality as presented in the 2015 Mariana Islands Training and Testing (MITT) Final Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (EIS/OEIS) with new information relevant to proposed changes in training and testing activities conducted at sea and on Farallon de Medinilla (FDM). Information presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS that remains valid is noted as such and referenced in the appropriate sections. Any new or updated information describing the affected environment and analysis of impacts on sediments and water quality associated with the Proposed Action is provided in this section. Comments received from the public during scoping related to Sediments and Water Quality are addressed in Section 3.1.3 (Public Comments). Comments received from the public during the Draft Supplemental EIS (SEIS)/OEIS commenting period related to Sediments and Water Quality are addressed in Appendix K (Public Comment Responses).

3.1.1.1 Existing Conditions

Ocean water resources, climate, and the existing water quality in the MITT Study Area were discussed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. The 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS analyzed potential impacts on sediment quality in nearshore and deep water sediments, as well as water quality on the surface and within the water column, and determined that potential impacts on sediment and water quality would not be significant. As stated in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, some studies suggest that deep water is, in general, of higher quality than surface waters. Additionally, water quality in marine environments is determined by complex interactions between physical, chemical, and biological processes (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2015).

There is no new information since the publication of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS for marine sediments that would alter the analysis of potential impacts on water and sediment quality. New information, however, has been released that would improve the understanding of existing conditions for water quality, mainly with regards to marine debris and climate change. In addition, published results that inform the evaluation for water quality impacts in the immediate vicinity of FDM are now available and summarized below. The new information, however, does not indicate an appreciable change to the existing environmental conditions as described in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

3.1.1.1.1 Water Quality Criteria and Screening Levels in Waters Surrounding Guam and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands

Guam Water Quality Standards and Classifications

Title 22 Division II Chapter 5 Section 102 of the Guam Administrative Code (22 GAR Section 5102) defines marine waters as all coastal waters offshore, including estuarine waters, lagoons, bays, brackish areas, wetlands, and other inland waters that are subject to the ebb and flow of tides. General water quality classifications for marine waters include

- **Category M-1 (Excellent)**. Water in this category must be of high enough quality to protect for whole body contact recreation; to ensure the preservation and protection of marine life, including corals and reef-dwelling organisms, fish, and related fisheries resources; and to enable the pursuit of marine scientific research as well as aesthetic enjoyment. This category of water shall remain substantially free from pollution attributed to domestic, commercial, and industrial

discharges; shipping and boating; or mariculture, construction, and other activities that can reduce the waters' quality.

- **Category M-2 (Good)**. Water in this category must be of sufficient quality to allow for the propagation and survival of marine organisms, particularly shellfish and other similarly harvested aquatic organisms, corals and other reef-related resources, and whole body contact recreation. Other important and intended uses include mariculture activities, aesthetic enjoyment, and related activities.
- **Category M-3 (Fair)**. Water in this category is intended for general, commercial, and industrial use, while allowing for protection of aquatic life, aesthetic enjoyment, and compatible recreation with limited body contact. Specific intended uses include shipping, boating and berthing, industrial cooling water, and marinas.

Title 22 GAR Section 5102 also classifies different surface waters. These classifications include

- **Category S-1 (High)**. Surface water in this category is used for drinking water, wilderness areas, propagation and preservation of aquatic life, whole body contact recreation, and aesthetic enjoyment. It is the objective of these standards that these waters shall be kept free of substances or pollutants from domestic, commercial, and industrial discharges, or agricultural activities, construction, or other land-use practices that may impact water quality.
- **Category S-2 (Medium)**. Surface water in this category is used for recreational purposes, including whole body contact recreation; for use as potable water supply after adequate treatment is provided; and for propagation and preservation of aquatic wildlife and aesthetic enjoyment.
- **Category S-3 (Low)**. Surface water in this category is primarily used for commercial, agricultural, and industrial activities. Aesthetic enjoyment and limited body contact recreation are acceptable in this zone, as is maintenance of aquatic life. Discharges within this zone may be required to have construction or discharge permits under existing Guam Sediment and Soil Erosion regulations or under National Pollution Discharge Elimination System.

Table 3.1-1 lists each standard with specific criteria in Guam's regulations and applicability to each water classification. The water quality standards include criteria for microbiological concentrations (Enterococci and *E. coli*), pH, nutrients (nitrate-nitrogen, total nitrogen, orthophosphate, ammonia), dissolved oxygen, total filterable suspended solids, salinity, temperature, turbidity, radioactive materials, oil and petroleum products, toxic pollutants, and other general considerations.

Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands Water Quality Standards and Classification

Chapter 65-130 Part 200 of the Northern Mariana Islands Administrative Code establishes definitions of water use areas within the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (CNMI) coastal zone. Class "AA" waters are coastal waters surrounding Saipan, Tinian, Rota, and the northern islands (FDM, Anatahan, Sariguan, Guguan, Alamagan, Pagan, Agrihan, Asuncion, Maug, and Farallon de Pajaros) that are not designated as class "A" waters. Class "A" waters off of Saipan include waters out to 3,000 feet from the shoreline, from the entrance to Smiling Cove Marina to Saddok As Agatan, inclusive of the waters within Smiling Cove Marina and its entrance channel; and waters surrounding the Agingan Wastewater Treatment Plant, within a 1,000-foot radius of the outfall. Class "A" waters off of Tinian include coastal waters known as San Jose Harbor. Class "A" waters off of Rota include coastal waters known as East Harbor and West Harbor. Class "A" waters off of the northern islands includes waters

surrounding FDM; however, these waters are not included in the CNMI coastal zone. Class "1" and Class "2" waters are associated with freshwater features. No land-based training activities are included in the Proposed Action, and the military does not conduct any training activities on land within waters that would be considered Class "1" or Class "2."

Chapter 65-130 Part 400 provides water quality standards for water use areas in nearshore waters of the CNMI. Table 3.1-1 lists each standard with specific criteria in CNMI's regulations and applicability to each water use area. The water quality standards include criteria for microbiological concentrations (Enterococci and *E. coli*), pH, nutrients (nitrate-nitrogen, total nitrogen, orthophosphate, ammonia), dissolved oxygen, total filterable suspended solids, salinity, temperature, turbidity, radioactive materials, oil and petroleum products, toxic pollutants, and other general considerations. The military readiness activities that generate stressors to water quality do not occur in the water use areas; rather, they occur outside of the CNMI coastal zone and are analyzed in the context of their potential to induce reasonably foreseeable effects into Class "AA" or Class "A" water use areas.

Table 3.1-1: Water Quality Standard, Criteria, and Applicable Water Use Areas

Water Quality Standard[1]		Criteria/Threshold[2]	Guam Water Classification[3]	CNMI Water Classification[4]
Microbiological Requirements	Enterococci	The Enterococci concentration shall not exceed a geometric mean of 35 per 100 mL based on samples taken in any 30-day interval. No single sample result shall exceed 130 Enterococci per 100 mL.	M-1, M-2, M-3	All Waters
	E. coli	The *E. coli* concentration shall not exceed a geometric mean of 126 per 100 mL based on samples taken in any 30-day interval. The Statistical Threshold Value is 410 *E. coli* per 100 ml.	M-1, M-2, M-3	All Waters
pH		pH shall remain within the range of 6.5–8.5	M-1, M-2, M-3	A, AA
		pH shall not deviate more than 0.5 units from a value of 8.1; no lower than 7.6 or higher than 8.6.	N/A	1, 2
		pH shall not deviate more than 0.5 from ambient conditions and shall not be lower than 6.5 nor higher than 8.5.	M-1, M-2, M-3	A, AA
Nutrients	Nitrate-Nitrogen	Not to exceed 0.10 mg/L	M-1, S-1	AA
		Not to exceed 0.20 mg/L	M-2, S-2	N/A
		Not to exceed 0.50 mg/L	M-3, S-3	A
	Total Nitrogen	Not to exceed 0.4 mg/L	N/A	AA
		Not to exceed 0.75 mg/L	N/A	A, 1
		Not to exceed 1.50 mg/L	N/A	2
	Ortho-phosphate	Not to exceed 0.025 mg/L	M-1, S-1	AA
		Not to exceed 0.05 mg/L	M-2, S-2	A
		Not to exceed 0.10 mg/L	M-3, S-3	1, 2
	Total Phosphorus	Not to exceed 0.025 mg/L	M-1, S-1	AA
		Not to exceed 0.05 mg/L	M-2, S-2	A
		Not to exceed 0.10 mg/L	M-3, S-3	1, 2
	Ammonia (un-ionized)	Not to exceed 0.02 mg/L	All Waters	All Waters

Table 3.1-1: Water Quality Standard, Criteria, and Applicable Water Use Areas (continued)

Water Quality Standard[1]		Criteria/Threshold[2]	Guam Water Classification[3]	CNMI Water Classification[4]
Dissolved Oxygen		Not less than 75% saturation/or further reduce DO when low DO is attributed to natural causes	All Waters	All Waters
Total filterable suspended solids		Concentrations of suspended matter at any point shall not be increased from ambient conditions at any time, and should not exceed 5 mg/L except when due to natural conditions.	M-1, S-1	AA, 1
		Concentrations of suspended matter at any point shall not be increased from ambient conditions at any time, and should not exceed 20 mg/L except when due to natural conditions.	M-2, M-3	N/A
		Concentrations of suspended matter at any point shall not be increased from ambient conditions at any time, and should not exceed 40 mg/L except when due to natural conditions.	M-3, S-3	A, 2
Salinity	Marine waters	M-1, M-2, M-3		AA, A
	Fresh waters	S-1, S-2, S-3		1,2
Temperature		Water temperature shall not vary by more than 1.0°C from the ambient conditions.	All Waters	All Waters
Turbidity		Turbidity at any point, as measured by NTU, shall not exceed 0.5 NTU over ambient conditions except when due to natural conditions.	M-1, M-2	AA, 1
		Turbidity values (NTU) at any point shall not exceed 1.0 NTU over ambient conditions.	M-2, M-3, S-2, S-3	A, 2
Radioactive Materials		Discharge of radioactive materials at any level into any waters of the Commonwealth or state waters is strictly prohibited.	All Waters	All Waters
Oil and Petroleum Products		The concentration of oil or petroleum products shall not (a) be detectable as a visible film, sheen, or discoloration of the surface or cause an objectionable odor; (b) cause tainting of fish or other aquatic life, be injurious to the indigenous biota, or cause objectionable taste in drinking water; or (c) form an oil deposit on beaches or shoreline, or on the bottom of a body of water.	All Waters	All Waters

Table 3.1-1: Water Quality Standard, Criteria, and Applicable Water Use Areas (continued)

Water Quality Standard[1]	Criteria/Threshold[2]	Guam Water Classification[3]	CNMI Water Classification[4]
Toxic Pollutants	All waters shall be free from toxic pollutants in concentrations that are lethal to, or that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, or animal life. Detrimental responses include, but are not limited to decreased growth rate and decreased reproductive success of resident or indicator species; or significant alterations in population, community ecology, or receiving water biota.	All Waters	All Waters

[1]Water Quality Standards are provided in section 65-130 Part 400 of the CNMI Administrative Code.
[2]The Proposed Action will not exceed criteria/thresholds within the CNMI coastal zone.
[3]Water use areas are specified in Title 22 Section 5103 of the Guam Administrative Code.
[4]Water use areas are specified in section 65-130 Part 200 of the CNMI Administrative Code.
Notes: °C = degrees Celsius, CFU = coliform forming units, DO = dissolved oxygen, L = Liters, mg = milligrams, NTU = nephelometric turbidity unit

3.1.1.1.2 Marine Debris and Water Quality

Richardson et al. (2016) describe the results of seine net (vertical nets that are held in place with weights and buoys) surveys in open ocean waters of the western and central Pacific Ocean within exclusive economic zones (EEZs) of 25 Pacific countries and territories, as well as in international waters. A majority of the reported purse seine (a seine net that fully encompasses an area of fish) pollution incidents are related to plastics waste. Other common pollution incidents are related to oil spillages and to abandoned, lost, or dumped fishing gear. Data analysis highlighted the need for increased monitoring, reporting, enforcement of pollution violations for all types of fishing vessels operating in the Pacific region, a regional outreach and compliance assistance program on marine pollution prevention, and improvements in Pacific port waste reception facilities. Most of the pollution incidents associated with marine debris occurred in Papua New Guinea's EEZ (approximately 45 percent), while less than 1 percent of the debris accumulations collected on the surface by Richardson et al. (2016) were within the portion of the United States (U.S.) EEZ surrounding Guam, the CNMI, and other U.S. Pacific islands.

3.1.1.1.3 Climate Change and Water Quality

New information on the potential for climate change to impact water quality was obtained for the western Pacific region. The 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS identified decreasing ocean pH (i.e., increasing acidity), increasing water temperatures, and increasing storm activity as aspects of climate change that potentially impact water quality.

Rainfall and tropical cyclones are significant aspects of the climate on islands within the Study Area; however, potential impacts on rainfall and tropical cyclone patterns are difficult to estimate (Keener et al., 2015). One study for Guam predicts fewer, but more intense, storms, that would likely follow new storm tracks, and a moderate increase in daily and annual average rainfall (U.S. Marine Corps, 2014). On Saipan, an assessment of vulnerability to climate change assumed a future small increase in average rainfall, an increase in extreme rainfall, as well as more extreme wet and dry seasons. Although difficult to predict, changes in rainfall and storm intensity are generally anticipated to be harmful to ecosystems that provide ecological services beneficial to water quality within the Study Area.

Keener et al. (2015) documented a coral bleaching event off of Guam in 2013 through 2014. That event, combined with the strong associations between sea surface temperature increases and coral bleaching events throughout the Pacific (Griesser & Spillman, 2016), suggests that it is highly likely sea surface temperature increases in the Mariana Islands are at least partially to blame for coral bleaching events. Coral cover on Guam is generally similar to other southern Mariana Islands, but lower than the northern islands (Raymundo et al., 2016). Because coral distribution and coral cover on reefs is naturally patchy and heterogeneous, a single island-wide number is not a particularly useful summary of the coral community. Long-term monitoring surveys conducted by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric and Administration's Coral Reef Ecosystem Division Pacific Assessment and Monitoring Program found approximately 10−15 percent coral cover overall, but the recent multi-year coral bleaching events have had dramatic, if patchy, consequences for the reef communities on Guam. For example, Raymundo et al. (2017) estimated a 53 percent decline in staghorn *Acropora* spp. on Guam. Of the 21 sites in the study, 6 are on Joint Region Marianas-administered submerged lands, including 4 in Apra Harbor. The estimated mean mortality of staghorn *Acropora* spp. was 80 percent at Big Blue Shoals, 80 percent at Western Shoals, 30 percent at Dogleg, and 90 percent at Gab (Raymundo et al., 2016). In the past several years, corals in Guam have been bleaching regularly each summer and recovery has been limited, leading to significant levels of coral mortality (Harvey, 2016; Raymundo et al., 2017).

Even though the new studies show variability in coral cover at FDM and decreases in some coral species off Guam, this information does not appreciably change the analysis presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS because the species composition on the reefs has not changed.

Changes in pH outside the normal range can make it difficult for marine organisms that make hard structures through calcification (e.g., shells or skeletons) to maintain their structures. Many of those creatures are at the base of the marine food chain, such as phytoplankton, so changes may cascade through the ecosystem. Rising water temperatures can be detrimental to coastal ecosystems and, by extension, coastal water quality because these ecosystems provide ecological services (e.g., sediment trapping, nutrient cycling).

3.1.1.1.4 Farallon de Medinilla

Range condition assessments are conducted at all operational ranges within the Mariana Islands Range Complex in accordance with Department of Defense (DoD) Instruction 4715.14, Operational Range Assessments, and the Chief of Naval Operations Range Sustainability Environmental Program Analysis Policy. The Navy is committed to surveying in accordance with the Biological Opinion provided to the Navy in 2017, which includes terms and conditions for conducting in-water surveys at FDM. These surveys would ascertain the status and health of the coral reef environment and occur every five years (one of the terms and conditions of the Biological Opinion). The Navy will also conduct routine clearance of unexploded ordnance and other range debris from the FDM impact areas. The coral reef surveys could provide an indication if the waters surrounding FDM (designated Class A) are degrading in quality, as evidenced by coral health. Routine clearance of unexploded ordnance from the FDM impact areas removes potential sources of munition constituents, helping to protect CNMI's water quality. The Navy engaged with the National Marine Fisheries Service in coral consultations under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) and through the Essential Fish Habitat Assessment, relevant to all species of corals and essential fish habitats that are present in the Study Area. These consultations and regulatory conclusions were summarized in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2015). After the release of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, the Navy and NMFS entered into a subsequent consultation with a focus on potential effects of military use of FDM on coral species listed since the previous consultation

between the Navy and NMFS (National Marine Fisheries Service, 2017). The Navy and NMFS have reinitiated consultation for activities described under Alternative 2 of this SEIS/OEIS. Any new provisions included in NMFS's Biological Opinion will be included in the Record of Decision.

No detailed data was available for munitions expenditure during the last three decades of the 20th century on FDM, but early environmental planning documents in 1974 and 1999 provide some insight to the source loading. Delivered munitions that resulted in either a low-order detonation or a "dud" are the predominant energetic munition constituent source material on FDM. Munition constituents commonly associated with munitions such as high melting explosive (HMX) (also referred to as octogen), royal demolition explosive (RDX) (also referred to as cyclonite), Dinitrotoluene (DNT), and heavy metals are likely present in small dispersed residual quantities associated with high-order detonations and in localized higher concentrations associated with duds or low-order detonations. Areas with high explosive concentrations are often found around "carcasses" of munitions that were only partly detonated. Heavily cratered areas on military ranges often have below detection or low high-explosive concentrations, suggesting that high-order detonations leave only trace amounts of explosive residues (Walsh, 2007). The frequency of low-order detonations or dud rates of munitions fired into the impact zones at FDM is not known; however (MacDonald & Mendez, 2005) provided failure rates and low-order detonation rates for various munitions types, shown in Table 3.1-2. As part of the Operational Range Clearance activities that occur on FDM, qualititative observations of partially detonated munitions suggest that the dud and low-order explosion rates of munitions expended on FDM are generally low and consistent with the rates shown in Table 3.1-1.

Table 3.1-2: Rates of Failure and Low-Order Detonations

Ordnance	Failure Rate (Percent)	Low-Order Detonation Rate (Percent)
Guns/artillery	4.68	0.16
Hand grenades	1.78	–
Explosive ordnance	3.37	0.09
Rockets	3.84	–
Submunitions[1]	8.23	–

[1] Submunitions are munitions contained within and distributed by another device such as a rocket.

Sources: MacDonald and Mendez (2005); Walsh (2007)

Since the publication of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, the draft analysis of multi-year dive surveys conducted in nearshore waters of FDM between 1997 and 2012 has been published (Smith & Marx, 2016). During these dive surveys, Smith and Marx (2016) provide qualitative observations of water quality and sediment quality surrounding the live-fire range. A summary of the observations is included below, and a more detailed description of the surveys and observations may be found in Section 3.1.3.1.5.3 (Farallon de Medinilla Specific Impacts) of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

- **Natural causes of erosion**. Based on these direct observations of damage off the coast of FDM, the majority of disturbances to the seafloor sediments, substrates, and mass movement of FDM can be attributed to typhoons and storm surges. Further, damage attributed to military training activities recovered within two to three years at the same rate of damage associated with natural phenomenon (Smith & Marx, 2016). As discussed in Section 3.10 (Terrestrial Species and Habitats), prior to the mid-1990s, the ordnance drops on FDM were not confined to designated

impact zones, and there were no ordnance constraints in terms of net explosive weight. The vegetation loss on the island and subsequent erosion has likely decreased under current training constraints for FDM relative to the intensive range use over the decades prior to the mid-1990s.

- **Assessment of long-term impacts: military impacts**. Based on the dive surveys, there is no evidence that long-term adverse impacts on the nearshore environment have taken place as a result of military training activities. These findings are based on the number of detectable impacts (e.g., from visual observation during dive surveys), the size of those impacts, and the apparent recovery time (e.g., how long an ordnance fragment or physical damage is no longer visually apparent). Impacts on the physical environment clearly attributable to military training activities were noted in 2007, 2008, 2010, and 2012 (Smith & Marx, 2016). Indirect impacts, such as ordnance skipping or eroding off of FDM and rock and ordnance fragments blasted off of the island, were detected in every survey year. Dive surveys completed in 2005 noted that disturbed sites in 2004 showed no color differences with surrounding undamaged areas, and revealed new, small (less than 3 centimeters), scattered colonies of coral and crustose coralline algae. By 2006 and observed again through 2012, no visual evidence of abnormalities, or of damaged or diseased coral, could be detected (Smith et al., 2013). Further, no new submerged cliff blocks were observed between 2005 and 2012. Small-to-medium-sized fresh rock fragments (generally less than 1 foot [30 centimeters]) have been observed yearly, and are attributed to detonation impacts. In 2007, the first clear indication of a detonation of a bomb on the seafloor was observed. The impact area was measured to be approximately 100 square feet (9 square meters). During the subsequent survey in 2008, the impact area supported new growth of stony corals and crustose algae; by 2009, no trace of the disturbance could be detected by the surveyors (Smith & Marx, 2009). The vast majority of unexploded ordnance observed in the water lacked fins and tail assemblies, which indicates that the ordnance either skipped or ricocheted off of the island, or eroded or washed off of FDM at a later date (Smith & Marx, 2016).
- **Indicators of diminished water quality**. The dive surveys have looked for indicators of diminished water quality in waters surrounding FDM. For instance, high densities of macrobioeroders (e.g., boring sponges), bleaching of corals, surface lesions, or dead patches on stony corals or stony coral mucus production have been associated with sedimentation, pollutants, or other stressors that diminish water quality. Although a moderate bleaching event was noted in 2007, and a barnacle infestation was noted in 2012 (Smith et al., 2013), the bleaching event was regional and extended from southern Japan through the Mariana Islands and south through waters surrounding Palau, which suggests that it was not due to training events at FDM. In addition, subsequent surveys observed soft and fire corals had recovered completely, and 75 percent of the stony corals had recovered by 2008 (Smith & Marx, 2009, 2016). The dive surveys were not conducted in more recent years with bleaching events; however, the health of the marine ecosystem surrounding FDM was comparable to similar habitats within the Mariana Archipelago, demonstrating that training activities occurring at FDM do not have an appreciable impact on the water quality (Smith & Marx, 2016). A subsequent survey around the island was conducted to identify coral species, specifically species listed under the ESA (Carilli et al., 2018). In addition to conducting the in-water coral survey, the Navy reported observations of ordnance and any impacts on nearshore habitat from the use of ordnance (e.g., craters). All but three ordnance encountered were deemed old based on the

amount of encrusted corals and other colonizing species using the ordnance as hard substrate. The report concluded that there were no impacts due to the use of ordnance on the island, including the use of explosive ordnance (Carilli et al., 2018).

3.1.2 Environmental Consequences

Section 3.1 (Sediments and Water Quality) of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS analyzed potential impacts of training and testing activities resulting from the following stressors: (1) explosives (in-air explosives and in-water explosives) and explosives byproducts, (2) metals, (3) chemicals other than explosives, and (4) a miscellaneous category of other materials. The 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS assessed the likelihood for these stressors to result in the following potential impacts on sediments and water quality:

- The potential release of materials into the water that subsequently disperse, react with seawater, or dissolve over time
- The potential for depositing materials on the ocean bottom and any subsequent interactions with sediments or the accumulation of such materials over time
- The potential for depositing materials on the ocean bottom and any subsequent interaction with the water column
- The potential for depositing materials on the ocean bottom and any subsequent disturbance of those sediments or their resuspension in the water column

This section evaluates how, and to what degree, potential impacts on sediments and water quality from stressors described in Section 3.0 (Introduction) may have changed since the analysis presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS was completed. Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2 in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) list the proposed training and testing activities, the number of times each event would be conducted annually, and the locations within the Study Area where the activity would typically occur under each alternative. The tables also present the same information for activities described in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS so that the proposed levels of training and testing under this supplement can be easily compared.

The Navy conducted a review of federal and state regulations and standards relevant to sediments and water quality, as well as a review of new literature pertaining to sediments and water quality that could inform the analysis presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Although additional information was found and described in Section 3.1.1 (Affected Environment), the new information does not indicate an appreciable change to the existing environmental conditions as described in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Thus, the analysis in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS remains valid. The analysis presented in this section also considers standard operating procedures, which are discussed in Section 2.3.3 (Standard Operating Procedures) of this SEIS/OEIS, and mitigation measures that are described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation). These measures are not specifically designed to offset potential impacts on water resources; however, implementation of some of these measures designed for other resource areas discussed in this SEIS/OEIS would avoid or reduce potential impacts on sediments and water quality. For example, Table 5-18 (Seafloor Resource Mitigation Areas) lists several protective measures that avoid or reduce disturbance to corals and benthic habitats, as well as targeting and ordnance restrictions that would reduce runoff into FDM's nearshore habitats.

The most relevant new information used in this section is published by the Hawaii Undersea Military Munitions Assessment, a program administered by the DoD and the University of Hawaii at Manoa (Briggs et al., 2016; Edwards et al., 2016b; Kelley et al., 2016; Silva & Chock, 2016; Tomlinson & De Carlo,

2016). The investigations completed as part of the program provide quantitative information on the fate and transport of sea-disposed conventional munitions at a munitions dump site south of Oahu, including (1) the spatial extent and distribution of munitions; (2) the integrity of munitions casings; (3) whether munitions constituents could be detected in sediment, seawater, or animals near munitions; (4) whether constituent levels at munitions sites differed significantly from levels at reference control sites; (5) whether statistically significant differences in ecological population metrics could be detected between the two types of sites; and (6) whether munitions constituents or their derivatives potentially pose an unacceptable risk to human health.

3.1.2.1 Explosives and Explosives Byproducts

Sources of explosives and explosives byproducts include the various munitions used during training and testing activities. Potential impacts of explosives and explosive byproducts were analyzed in Section 3.1.3.1 (Explosives and Explosives Byproducts) in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, and that analysis remains valid.

Over 98 percent of residual explosive materials would result from ordnance failures (i.e., the munition fails to detonate and explosives remain in the casing). Ordnance failure rates for various munition types are shown in Table 3.1-4 in Section 3.1.3.1.3 (Ordnance Failure and Low-Order Detonations) of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. The percentages for ordnance failure range from just below two percent to just over eight percent.

There have been no comprehensive studies of the fate and transport of residual explosives residing on the seafloor in the Study Area. However, analysis of potential impacts on sediments and water quality in similar marine environments has been applied. Research conducted at other sites can inform the analysis of potential impacts on sediments and water quality in the Study Area. These studies are summarized below:

- Results reported by Walker et al. (2006) and Beck et al. (2018) demonstrate that trinitrotoluene, RDX, and octogen (HMX) experience rapid biological and photochemical degradation in marine systems. Walker et al. (2006) noted that productivity in marine and estuarine systems is largely controlled by the limited availability of nitrogen. Because nitrogen is a key component of explosives, they are attractive as substrates for marine bacteria that metabolize other naturally occurring organic matter such as polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons. The mineralization of explosives (RDX and HMX are readily mineralized) requires multiple steps, some of which may be biologically driven (Beck et al., 2018). Tobias (2019) used stable isotope tracers to show that over 50 percent of RDX compounds were mineralized into inert inorganic constituents, particularly in sediments with high organic content. The breakdown of trinitrotoluene (TNT) compounds resulted in aqueous (i.e., in a water solution) organic constituents, suggesting that TNT constituents remain suspended in the water column. The results are consistent with observations by Montgomery et al. (2011) that showed TNT may degrade at higher rates where turbidity levels in the water column are higher (e.g., at a turbidity front where fresh water from a river encounters brackish water in an estuary). Juhasz and Naidu (2007) also noted that microbes use explosives as sources of carbon and energy.
- Lotufo et al. (2017) found concentrations that exceeded the ecological screening level for at least one explosive in nearshore waters of Ostrich Bay near Bremerton, Washington, and along Elliott Bay near Seattle at piers formerly used by the Navy as a supply depot during World War II. The piers, referred to as Terminal 91, are now managed by the Port of Seattle under the DoD

Military Munitions Response Program. It is likely that the small quantities of munitions found at Terminal 91 were dropped overboard during vessel loading; there are no records of detonations occurring at the piers. The Terminal 91 site had a sufficient number of samples to allow for a site-wide characterization of contamination. The Ostrich Bay site had fewer than five samples, which was insufficient to characterize the entire site. Off Terminal 91, 1 out of 12 samples exceeded the screening level for the explosives constituent 2,4,6-trinitrophenylmethylnitramine (or "tetryl"). The data from the Terminal 91 site, and others assessed in the study, appear to be consistent with previous reports that the spatial distribution of munitions constituents in sediments at a given geographic site is highly variable but generally decreases with distance from the munition, such that munitions constituents are not detectable beyond 1–2 m from the munition (Edwards et al., 2016b; Lotufo, 2018; Rosen & Lotufo, 2010; University of Hawaii, 2014).

- As part of the Hawaii Undersea Military Munitions Assessment program, Briggs et al. (2016) sampled for explosive materials in sediments and marine invertebrates and fish, showing no detections of explosive residue chemical markers in the biological samples. In 2009, no explosive residues were located within sediments; however, in 2012, 2 of the 121 samples showed low concentrations (0.09 and 0.12 milligrams per kilogram) of an explosive residue compound, 4-nitrotoluene. These samples were collected within 50 centimeters of a munitions casing, with no detections further away from the casing (Briggs et al., 2016).
- Scientific research focused on World War II underwater munitions disposal sites in Hawaii (Briggs et al., 2016; Kelley et al., 2016; Koide et al., 2016) and an intensively used live-fire range in the Mariana Islands (Smith & Marx, 2016) were published after the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. These publications provide information on the impacts of undetonated materials and unexploded munitions on habitat and marine life. On a localized scale, the studies at munitions ocean disposal sites in Hawaii investigated the sediments, seawater, or marine life, depending on the study, in close proximity to corroding munitions to determine if released constituents from the munitions (including explosive materials and metals) could be detected. Comparisons were made between disposal site samples and "clean" nearby reference sites. Analysis of the samples showed no confirmed detection for explosive materials despite decades since the disposal and a relatively high concentration of munitions at the site. Munitions residing on the seafloor as a result of training and testing activities would be more widely dispersed with much lower concentrations than munitions in a disposal site. Investigations by Kelley et al. (2016) and Koide et al. (2016) found that intact munitions (i.e., ones that failed to detonate or non-explosive practice munitions) residing in or on soft sediments habitats provided hard substrate similar to other disposed objects or "artificial reefs" that attracted "hard substrate species," which would not have otherwise colonized the area. Sampling these species revealed that there was no bioaccumulation of munitions-related chemicals in the species (Koide et al., 2016).
- These findings are consistent with other assessments such as that done for the Potomac River Test Range at Dahlgren, Virginia which was established in 1918 and is the Nation's largest fully instrumented, over-the-water gun-firing range. Munitions tested at Dahlgren have included rounds from small-caliber guns up to the Navy's largest (16-inch guns), bombs, rockets, mortars, grenades, mines, depth charges, and torpedoes (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2013b). Results from the assessment indicate that munitions expended at Dahlgren have not contributed significant concentrations of explosive materials or explosives byproducts to the Potomac River

water and sediments given those contributions are orders of magnitude less than concentrations already present in the Potomac River from natural and other manmade sources (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2013b).

In summary, multiple investigations since 2007 involving survey and sampling of World War II munitions disposal sites in Hawaii and other locations where munitions are known to reside have found the following (Briggs et al., 2016; Edwards & Bełdowski, 2016; Edwards et al., 2016a; Edwards et al., 2016b; Koide et al., 2016; Silva & Chock, 2016): (1) chemicals and degradation products, including explosive materials, from underwater munitions "do not pose a risk to human health or to fauna living in direct contact with munitions"; (2) the concentrations of metals measured in sediment samples in very close proximity to degrading World War II-era munitions are higher than naturally occurring marine levels, but they decrease rapidly to baseline levels within a few inches of munitions and "do not cause a significant impact on the environment"; and (3) sediment is not a significant sink of chemicals released by degradation of the explosive components in munitions.

The concentration of explosive munitions and any associated explosives byproducts at any single location in the MITT Study Area would be a small fraction of the totals that have accumulated over decades at World War II-era disposal sites and military ranges. Based on findings from much more intensively used locations, effects on sediments from the use of explosive munitions during training and testing activities in the MITT Study Area would be negligible by comparison. As a result, explosives and explosives byproducts would have no meaningful effect on sediments or water quality in the MITT Study Area.

3.1.2.1.1 Impacts from Explosives and Explosives Byproduct Stressors Under Alternative 1

Under Alternative 1, the number of explosive munitions used during at-sea training and testing activities would increase, compared to the number analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (see Table 3.0-16); however, there would be an increase in the number of activities on FDM that use explosive ordnance (Table 3.0-20). In addition, all munitions would be dropped on the same existing impact areas on FDM. The Navy conducted an analysis as part of this SEIS/OEIS to quantify the amount of ordnance used on FDM, in terms of net explosive weight, that would change compared to what was analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. This analysis shows that the proposed increases in ordnance use on FDM would be less than 1 percent compared to levels analyzed previously.

This small increase on FDM under Alternative 1 would have no appreciable change on the impact conclusions presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS because (1) most of the explosives would be consumed during detonation; (2) the frequency of low-order detonations would be low, and therefore the frequency of releases of explosives would be low; and (3) the constituents of explosives would be subject to physical, chemical, and biological processes that would render the materials harmless or otherwise disperse them to undetectable levels. Neither state nor federal standards or guidelines would be violated. The impacts of unconsumed explosives on water and sediment quality would be long term, local, and negative. Chemical, physical, or biological changes in sediment or water quality would have no appreciable change on the impact conclusions presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, and Guam, CNMI, or federal standards or guidelines would not be violated.

3.1.2.1.2 Impacts from Explosives and Explosives Byproduct Stressors Under Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)

As with Alternative 1, activities proposed under Alternative 2 would decrease the number of explosive munitions used during at-sea training and testing activities, compared to the number analyzed in the

2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (see Table 3.0-16) and increase the number on FDM. At-sea ordnance use under Alternative 2 would be greater than Alternative 1; however, the amount of ordnance use on FDM would slightly increase under Alternative 2 as with Alternative 1 (Table 3.0-20). In addition, all munitions would be dropped on the same existing impact areas on FDM. The small increase of at-sea ordnance and on FDM under Alternative 2 would have no appreciable change on the impact conclusions for explosives and explosives byproducts stressor presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.. Therefore, under Alternative 2, impacts on sediments and water quality from the use of explosives and generating explosives byproducts would be negligible.

3.1.2.1.3 Impacts from Explosives and Explosives Byproduct Stressors Under the No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, proposed training and testing activities would not occur. Other military activities not associated with this Proposed Action would continue to occur. Explosives and explosives byproduct stressors as listed above would not be introduced into the marine environment. Therefore, existing environmental conditions would either remain unchanged or would improve slightly after cessation of ongoing training and testing activities.

Discontinuing at-sea training and testing activities would result in fewer explosives and explosive byproducts introduced into the marine environment where training and testing activities have historically been conducted. Therefore, discontinuing at-sea training and testing activities under the No Action Alternative would lessen the potential for impacts on sediments and water quality resulting from explosives and explosive byproducts.

3.1.2.2 Metals

Sources of metals introduced into the marine environment as part of training and testing activities include munitions and expended materials containing metals (i.e., lead, brass, manganese, copper, nickel, tungsten, chromium, molybdenum, vanadium, boron, selenium, columbium, or titanium). Since the publication of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, the Navy has conducted a review of new literature pertaining to the potential impacts of metals on sediments and water quality. Although additional information was found, as described in the following paragraph, the new information does not indicate an appreciable change to the existing environmental conditions as described in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

As described in Section 3.1.3.1 (Explosives and Explosives Byproducts) of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, sediment samples collected from World War II-era munitions disposal sites and heavily used Navy ranges show that metals are not impacting sediment quality despite longtime use and high concentrations of military munitions composed primarily of metal components (Briggs et al., 2016; Edwards et al., 2016b; Kelley et al., 2016; Smith & Marx, 2016; U.S. Department of the Navy, 2013a). The concentration of munitions and other expended materials containing metals in any one location in the Study Area would be a small fraction of that from a munitions disposal site, a target island used for 45 years, or a water range in a river used for almost 100 years. Chemical, physical, or biological changes to sediments or water quality in the Study Area would not be detectable and would be similar to nearby areas without munitions or other expended materials containing metals. This conclusion is based on the following: (1) most of the metals are benign, and those of potential concern make up a small percentage of expended munitions and other metal objects; (2) metals released through corrosion would be diluted by currents or bound up and sequestered in adjacent sediments; (3) elevated concentrations of metals in sediments would be limited to the immediate area around the expended material; and (4) the areas over which munitions and other metal components would be distributed are large.

3.1.2.2.1 Impacts from Metal Stressors Under Alternative 1

Under Alternative 1, the number of sources of metals that would be expended during training and testing would increase as compared to the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (see Table 3.0-14 through Table 3.0-17 and Table 3.0-20). Although the overall amount of metals introduced to the Study Area would increase, the analysis is not dependent on the amount of metals. Instead, the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS analyzed whether or not the metals deposited from training and testing activities would impact sediments and water quality.

Since the publication of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, the Navy has conducted a review of existing federal and local regulations and standards relevant to sediments and water quality, as well as a review of new literature pertaining to sediments and water quality. There is no new information that changes the basis of the conclusions presented for the potential impacts of metals on sediments and water quality. Therefore, the increases shown in Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2 for training and testing activities proposed under Alternative 1 would have no appreciable change on the impact conclusions presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

3.1.2.2.2 Impacts from Metal Stressors Under Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)

Under Alternative 2, the number of sources of metals being expended would increase as compared to the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and Alternative 1 (see Tables 3.0-14 through Table 3.0-17 and Table 3.0-20). These increases would have no appreciable change on the impact conclusions for metals as summarized above under Alternative 1 and as presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Therefore, under Alternative 2, impacts on sediments and water quality from activities that expend metals would be negligible.

3.1.2.2.3 Impacts from Metal Stressors Under the No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, proposed training and testing activities would not occur. Other military activities not associated with this Proposed Action would continue to occur. Metal stressors as listed above would not be introduced into the marine environment. Therefore, existing environmental conditions would either remain unchanged or would improve slightly after cessation of ongoing training and testing activities.

Discontinuing training and testing activities would result in fewer metals introduced into the marine environment where training and testing activities have historically been conducted. Therefore, discontinuing training and testing activities under the No Action Alternative would lessen the potential for impacts on sediments and water quality resulting from metals released during training and testing activities.

3.1.2.3 Chemicals Other than Explosives

Chemicals other than explosives are associated with the following military expended materials: (1) solid-fuel propellants in missiles and rockets; (2) Otto Fuel II torpedo propellant and combustion byproducts; (3) polychlorinated biphenyls in target vessels used during sinking exercises; (4) other chemicals associated with explosive munitions; and (5) chemicals that simulate chemical warfare agents, referred to as "simulants."

Simulants: Simulants were not analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. The DoD uses compounds, referred to as simulants, as substitutes for chemical and biological warfare agents to test equipment intended to detect their presence. Simulants must have one or more characteristics of a real chemical or

biological agent—size, density, or aerosol behavior—to effectively mimic the agent. Simulants must also pose a minimal risk to human health and the environment to be used safely in outdoor tests.

Simulants are selected using the following criteria: (1) safety to humans and the environment, and (2) the ability to trigger a response by sensors used in the detection equipment. Simulants would be relatively benign (e.g., low toxicity or effects potential) from a human health, safety, and environmental perspective. Exposure levels during testing activities would be well below concentrations associated with any adverse human health or environmental effects. The degradation products of simulants used during testing would also be harmless. Given these characteristics of simulants used during testing activities, it is reasonable to conclude that simulants would have no impact on sediments and water quality in the Study Area. Simulants are not analyzed further in this section.

3.1.2.3.1 Impacts from Chemicals Other Than Explosives Under Alternative 1

Under Alternative 1, the number of sources of chemicals other than explosives would increase as compared to the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (see Table 3.0-14 through Table 3.0-17 and Table 3.0-20).

The fate and transport of solid fuel propellants are described in Section 3.1.3.3.2 (Missile and Rocket Propellant – Solid Fuel) of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. The analysis in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS concluded that, based on the small amount of residual propellant that would remain from training and testing activities using missiles or rockets, perchlorates would not occur in concentrations that would impact sediments and water quality in the Study Area. The changes in the number of missiles and rockets shown in Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2 for activities proposed under Alternative 1 would have no appreciable change on the impact conclusions presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

The fate and transport of Otto Fuel II torpedo propellant and combustion byproducts are described in Section 3.1.3.3.3 (Torpedo Propellant – Otto Fuel II and Combustion Byproducts) of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Otto Fuel II and its combustion byproducts would be released into the water column only in small amounts during combustion. Furthermore, all non-explosive torpedoes are typically recovered for reuse following training and testing activities, which removes any unconsumed fuel from the environment immediately after completion of the activity. Combustion byproducts of Otto Fuel II would be released into the water column, where they would dissolve, dissociate, or be dispersed and diluted. One combustion byproduct, hydrogen cyanide, does not normally occur in seawater; however, it is soluble in seawater and would be diluted to less than 1 micrograms per liter (1.0 part per billion)—below U.S. Environmental Protection Agency-recommended concentrations (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2010)—at a distance of approximately 18 feet from the center of the torpedo's path when first discharged. Additional dilution would occur thereafter, with the rate of dilution depending, in part, upon circulation in the water column in the vicinity of the discharge. The changes in the number of torpedoes shown in Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2 for activities proposed under Alternative 1 would have no appreciable change on the impact conclusions presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

The fate and transport of Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) are described in Section 3.1.3.3.4 (Polychlorinated Biphenyls in Target Vessels) of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Sinking exercises would decrease under Alternative 1 in this SEIS/OEIS and are therefore not analyzed further. Public comments, however, were received that concerned the potential resuspension of PCBs in the water column after activities that use underwater explosives in Outer Apra Harbor. Figure 2.1-5 in Chapter 2 (Description of the Proposed Activities and Alternatives) shows the location of the Outer Apra Harbor Underwater Detonation (UNDET) site. The Navy's literature review found PCB measurements obtained by a University of Guam study in 1997 for PCB contamination within Apra Harbor (Denton et al., 1997). The

location of the UNDET site in Outer Apra Harbor corresponds to a sediment sampling site that was considered by Denton et al. (1997) as within the "light" contamination range (1–10 nanograms/gram dry weight). PCB profiles, determined in sediments from Hotel Wharf and the Commercial Port area, closely resembled those of Aroclor 1254, a commercial PCB mixture that was once widely used as a dielectric fluid in electrical transformers (Denton et al., 1997). Another set of samples were collected in 2014 within Outer Apra Harbor. As part of this sampling regime, preliminary remediation goals were established for different types of PCBs. The location within Outer Apra Harbor that is used for underwater explosions did not exceed these preliminary remediation goal thresholds for PCBs (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2017). Because the same location is used for UNDET sites, the Navy avoids resuspension of PCBs from undisturbed benthic habitats where PCBs may have migrated. There is no information in the University of Guam study that changes the basis of the above findings. Therefore, based on the findings above, the changes in the numbers of UNDETs used within Outer Apra Harbor as shown in Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2 would have not appreciably changed the impacts that chemicals would have on sediments and water quality.

The fate and transport of other chemicals associated with explosive munitions are described in Section 3.1.3.3.5 (Other Chemicals Associated with Ordnance) of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Residual chemical constituents associated with explosive munitions can remain in the environment after low-order (i.e., incomplete) detonations and in unconsumed explosives. These constituents, listed in Table 3.1-10 of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, are in addition to the explosives contained in the munition. Lead azide, titanium compounds, perchlorates, barium chromate, and fulminate of mercury are not naturally constituents of seawater. Another residual constituent, lead oxide, is a rare, naturally occurring mineral (Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, 2007). As noted in Section 3.1.2.1 (Explosives and Explosives Byproducts), fewer explosive munitions would be used during training activities under Alternative 1 compared to the number of explosives proposed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Some testing activities would use more explosive munitions, while others would use fewer. Based on the detailed analysis in Section 3.1.3.1 (Explosives and Explosion Byproducts) in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and the summary of recent studies in Section 3.1.2.1 (Explosives and Explosives Byproducts) in this SEIS/OEIS, concentrations of chemical constituents associated with explosive munitions is expected to be localized to areas adjacent to the munition and similar to concentrations from nearby sites. The changes in the number of explosions shown in Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2 for activities proposed under Alternative 1 would have no appreciable change on the impact conclusions presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

3.1.2.3.2 Impacts from Chemicals Other Than Explosives Under Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)

Under Alternative 2, the number of sources used that would generate chemicals other than explosives would increase as compared to Alternative 1 and to the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (see 3.0-14 through Table 3.0-17 and Table 3.0-20). As discussed in Alternative 1, increases as associated with Alternative 2 would have no appreciable change on the impact conclusions for chemicals as summarized above under Alternative 1 and as presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Therefore, under Alternative 2, impacts on sediments and water quality from activities that expend chemicals would be negligible.

3.1.2.3.3 Impacts from Chemicals Other Than Explosives Under the No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, proposed training and testing activities would not occur. Other military activities not associated with this Proposed Action would continue to occur. Chemical other than explosives as listed above would not be introduced into the marine environment. Therefore, existing

environmental conditions would either remain unchanged or would improve slightly after cessation of ongoing training and testing activities.

Discontinuing the training and testing activities would result in fewer releases of chemical other than explosives into the marine environment where training and testing activities have historically been conducted. Therefore, discontinuing training and testing activities under the No Action Alternative would lessen the potential for impacts on sediments and water quality resulting from chemical stressors.

3.1.2.4 Other Materials

Other materials include marine markers and flares, chaff, towed and stationary targets, and miscellaneous components of other devices. These materials and components are made mainly of nonreactive or slowly reactive materials (e.g., glass, carbon fibers, and plastics), or they break down or decompose into benign byproducts (e.g., rubber, steel, iron, and concrete). Most of these objects would settle to the sea floor where they would (1) be exposed to seawater, (2) become lodged in or covered by seafloor sediments, (3) become encrusted (e.g., by rust) through oxidation, (4) dissolve slowly, or (5) be covered by marine organisms such as coral. Plastics may float or descend to the bottom, depending upon their buoyancy.

The various types of expended materials that would be used during training and testing activities are described in detail in Section 3.1.3.4 (Other Materials) in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. The section describes the constituent components of marine markers, flares, and chaff as well as other items, and the fate and transport of those constituents in the marine environment. Pyrotechnic materials in marine markers and flares are largely consumed during use, and byproducts are released into the air. Chemical constituents of marine markers and flares are listed in Table 3.1-11 and the constituents of chaff are listed in Table 3.1-12 of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

3.1.2.4.1 Impacts from Other Materials Under Alternative 1

Under Alternative 1, the number of proposed training and testing activities that would introduce other materials, such as marine markers and flares, chaff, towed and stationary targets, and miscellaneous components would increase over levels analyzed previously in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (see Table 3.0-17, Tables 3.0-22 through 3.0-26). Increases in training and testing activities under Alternative 1 would have no appreciable change on the impact conclusions presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

3.1.2.4.2 Impacts from Other Materials Under Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)

Under Alternative 2, the number of proposed training and testing activities that would introduce other materials, such as marine markers and flares, chaff, towed and stationary targets, and miscellaneous components would increase over levels analyzed previously in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (see Table 3.0-17, Tables 3.0-22 through 3.0-26). There would also be increases under Alternative 2 in the number of training and testing activities that would likely introduce other materials into the environment, as compared to Alternative 1. As with Alternative 1, increases in training and testing activities proposed under Alternative 2 would have no appreciable change on the impact conclusions presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

3.1.2.4.3 Impacts from Other Materials Under the No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, proposed training and testing activities would not occur. Other military activities not associated with this Proposed Action would continue to occur. Other materials as listed

above would not be introduced into the marine environment. Therefore, existing environmental conditions would either remain unchanged or would improve slightly after cessation of ongoing training and testing activities.

Discontinuing the training and testing activities would result in fewer releases of other materials within the marine environment where training and testing activities have historically been conducted. Therefore, discontinuing training and testing activities under the No Action Alternative would lessen the potential for impacts on sediments and water quality resulting from plastics, marine markers, flares, and chaff released during training and testing activities.

3.1.3 Public Comments

The public raised a number of issues during the scoping period in regard to sediments and water quality. The issues are summarized in the list below. Comments received from the public during the Draft SEIS/OEIS commenting period related to sediments and water quality are addressed in Appendix K (Public Comment Responses).

- **FDM** – Commenters noted a lack of studies documenting the amount of ordnance debris and unexploded ordnance in waters surrounding FDM, while other comments requested that the Navy analyze potential loss of land mass associated with military training activities on FDM. The Navy has included a detailed summary of recent published studies that describe multi-year dive studies conducted by Smith and Marx (2016) and Carilli et al. (2018).The results of these surveys are included in Section 3.1.1.1.4 (Farallon de Medinilla) of this SEIS/OEIS. Throughout all dive surveys, the coral fauna at FDM were observed to be healthy and robust. The nearshore physical environment and basic habitat types at FDM have remained unchanged over the 13 years of survey activity. These conclusions are based on (1) a limited amount of physical damage, (2) very low levels of partial mortality and disease (less than 1 percent of all species observed), (3) absence of excessive mucus production, (4) good coral recruitment, (5) complete recovery by 2012 of the 2007 bleaching event, and (6) a limited number of macrobioeroders and an absence of invasive crown of thorns starfish (*Acanthaster planci*). These factors suggest that sedimentation that may result from military use of FDM is not sufficient as to adversely impact water quality, a conclusion substantiated by repeated dive surveys discussed above (Carilli et al., 2018; Smith & Marx, 2016).
- **Potential loss of landmass through erosion of FDM from military use** – Commenters have expressed concerns regarding erosion of FDM, and the potential loss of landmass. The U.S. military has used FDM as a bombing range since at least 1971. FDM's vegetation appears to have undergone significant changes since the island was leased by the DoD and the subsequent use for military training. The 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS compared historic aerial photographs to recent aerial imagery, which shows that the island has lost substantial forests over the decades, with the northern portion of the island with the most intact forest structure remaining on FDM (see Section 3.10, Terrestrial Species and Habitats, of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS). It is likely that the loss of vegetation over the past decades has accelerated erosion of soils and limestone weathering on the island. The current training activities that use ordnance are constrained in terms of ordnance type and target location (e.g., designated impact zones). These restrictions were put in place as part of past section 7 ESA consultations with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and would continue under the SEIS/OEIS. While these measures were specifically designed to protect ESA-listed species and habitats on FDM, the restrictions would likely reduce

the rates of erosion experienced in previous decades on the island. In addition, since the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, the Navy has relocated vertical cliff targets (established on the western side of the island) to interior locations within impact zones. The target relocations were done to minimize impacts on seabird rookeries along the western side of the island. The Navy's analysis of mass movement and erosion on FDM includes historical photograph analyses and direct observations during dive surveys conducted off FDM since 1999. Additionally, the Navy will investigate methods to baseline current physical conditions on FDM and to monitor those conditions over time. Smith and Marx (2016) also provided anecdotal observations of coral reefs surrounding the island over the course of multi-year dive surveys. These observations suggest healthy reef environments surrounding the island, without signs of sedimentation that would result from erosion of soils from the impact areas. In summary, the intensive bombing regimes of FDM in past decades likely resulted in the loss of forested areas on the island; such reductions in forests likely resulted in erosion of the upper plateau of the island. Current restrictions, however, confine the bombing activities to discrete impact zones located in the interior of the island, with additional restrictions on the types of ordnance allowed for use on the island, thereby reducing the potential for erosion and loss of land mass of FDM. In summary, multiple investigations since 2007 involving survey and sampling of World War II munitions disposal sites off Oahu Hawaii and other locations, have found the following (Briggs et al., 2016; Edwards & Bełdowski, 2016; Edwards et al., 2016a; Edwards et al., 2016b; Koide et al., 2016; Silva & Chock, 2016): (1) chemicals and degradation products, including explosive materials, from underwater munitions "do not pose a risk to human health or to fauna living in direct contact with munitions"; (2) metals measured in sediment samples next to World War II munitions are lower than naturally occurring marine levels and "do not cause a significant impact on the environment"; and (3) sediment is not a significant sink of chemicals released by degradation of the explosive components in munitions. The concentration of explosive munitions and any associated explosives byproducts at any single location in the Study Area would be a small fraction of the totals that have accumulated over decades at World War II era disposal sites and military ranges. Based on findings from much more intensively used locations, effects on sediments from the use of explosive munitions during training and testing activities in the Study Area would be negligible by comparison. As a result, explosives and explosives byproducts would have no meaningful effect on sediments or water quality in the Study Area. The conclusions presented in Section 3.1.3.1.6.2 (Alternative 1) of the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS remain valid. Specifically, short-term impacts on sediments and water quality would arise from explosives byproducts prior to their degradation, and long-term impacts would arise from the presence of unconsumed explosives encased in intact munitions residing on the seafloor. Impacted sediments and water quality would only be immediately adjacent to the munition. Chemical, physical, or biological changes in sediment or water quality would have no appreciable change on the impact conclusions presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and Guam, CNMI, or federal standards or guidelines would be violated. This conclusion on the level of impact is based on the following: (1) most of the explosives would be consumed during detonation; (2) the frequency of low-order detonations would be low, and therefore the frequency of releases of explosives directly into the water column would be low; (3) the amounts of explosives used would be small relative to the area over which they would be distributed; and (4) the constituents of explosives would be subject to physical, chemical, and

biological processes that would render the materials harmless or otherwise disperse them to undetectable levels.

- **Resuspension of PCBs in Outer Apra Harbor** – Commenters were concerned about resuspension of PCBs in the water column resulting from underwater explosions within Outer Apra Harbor. Section 3.1.2.3 (Chemicals) of this SEIS/OEIS includes additional information on the potential for resuspension of PCBs in the water column, which includes sediment data collected from a site in close proximity to the Outer Apra Underwater Detonation Site. The potential for resuspension of PCBs in the water column is reduced because (1) the sediment samples collected by Denton et al. (1997) showed that this location is within the "light" concentration range (1–10 nanograms/gram dry weight), (2) additional sediment sampling from 2014 shows that the area where underwater detonations would occur contains sediments that do not exceed remediation goals for different types of PCBs, and (3) the Navy uses the same seafloor location for underwater explosions. Therefore, the Navy does not conduct this training activity in other areas of Apra Harbor identified as "moderate" or "high" concentrations. In addition, no new undisturbed benthic locations that are contaminated by PCBs would be used for underwater explosions.
- **General impacts on water quality in offshore marine environments** – Commenters were concerned about the fate and transport of metal fragments as they are deposited in open ocean training locations. Section 3.1.3.2 (Metals) in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS describes the potential impacts of metals introduced into marine environments from training locations. Although Guam does not maintain screening standards for metals in sediments or water, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency maintains "threshold" values for metals in marine environments (see Table 3.1-8 of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS). In 2014, the CNMI Bureau of Environmental and Coastal Quality established water quality standards, designating the coastal waters surrounding FDM as "Class A" waters, which are maintained for recreational and aesthetic use, with some allowable uses as long as it is compatible with the protection and propagation of fish, shellfish, and wildlife (Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands Bureau of Coastal and Environmental Quality, 2014). Based on the multi-year dive surveys discussed above, there are no indications of adverse impacts on fish, shellfish, or wildlife within the coastal waters surrounding FDM, with the dive surveys showing healthy ecosystem functions and wildlife abundance within these waters. While no quantitative sampling for metals in training areas have been completed, there are a number of studies conducted in marine training and testing locations that have attempted to measure metal content where military activities occur. In one study, the water was sampled for lead, manganese, nickel, vanadium, and zinc at a shallow bombing range in Pamlico Sound (state waters of North Carolina) immediately following a training event with non-explosive practice bombs. All water quality parameters tested, except nickel, were within the state limits. The nickel concentration was significantly higher than the state criterion, although the concentration did not differ significantly from the control site located outside the bombing range. The results suggest that bombing activities were not responsible for the elevated nickel concentrations (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2010). A recent study conducted by the U.S. Marine Corps sampled sediments and water quality for 26 different constituents related to munitions at several U.S. Marine Corps water-based training ranges. Metals included lead and magnesium. These areas were also used for bombing practice. No munitions constituents were detected above screening values used at

the U.S. Marine Corps water ranges (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2010). A study by Pait et al. (2010) of previous Navy training areas at Vieques, Puerto Rico, found generally low concentrations of metals in marine sediments. Areas in which live ammunition and loaded weapons were used ("live-fire areas") were also included in the analysis. Additional studies are summarized in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. In no instance did metals exceed federal or state thresholds. It is unlikely that metals in sediments or the water column from military training activities would exceed federal thresholds in the Study Area, a conclusion that is consistent with other range locations and qualitative observations of ecosystem health surrounding FDM, as observed by Smith and Marx (2016) and Carilli et al. (2018).

This page intentionally left blank.

REFERENCES

Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry. (2007). *Toxicological Profile for Lead*. Atlanta, GA: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

Beck, A. J., M. Gledhill, C. Schlosser, B. Stamer, C. Böttcher, J. Sternheim, J. Greinert, and E. P. Achterberg. (2018). Spread, behavior, and ecosystem consequences of conventional munitions compounds in coastal marine waters. *Frontiers in Marine Science, 5*.

Briggs, C., S. M. Shjegstad, J. A. K. Silva, and M. H. Edwards. (2016). Distribution of chemical warfare agent, energetics, and metals in sediments at a deep-water discarded military munitions site. *Deep Sea Research Part II: Topical Studies in Oceanography, 128*, 63–69.

Carilli, J., S. H. Smith, D. E. Marx, Jr., L. Bolick, and D. Fenner. (2018). *Farallon de Medinilla 2017 Species Level Coral Reef Survey Report*. Pearl Harbor, HI: U.S. Navy Pacific Fleet.

Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands Bureau of Coastal and Environmental Quality. (2014). *Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands Water Quality Standards*. Retrieved from https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2014-12/documents/northern-mariana-wqs.pdf.

Denton, G. R., H. R. Wood, L. P. Concepcion, H. G. Siegrist, V. S. Eflin, D. K. Narcis, and G. T. Pangelinan. (1997). *Analysis of In-place Contaminants in Marine Sediments from Four Harbor Locations on Guam*. Mangilao, Guam: Water and Environmental Research Institute of the Western Pacific, University of Guam.

Edwards, M., and J. Bełdowski. (2016). Chemical munitions dumped at sea. *Deep Sea Research Part II: Topical Studies in Oceanography, 128*, 1–3.

Edwards, M. H., D. J. Fornari, M. R. Rognstad, C. D. Kelley, C. L. Mah, L. K. Davis, K. R. M. Flores, E. L. Main, and N. L. Bruso. (2016a). Time-lapse camera studies of sea-disposed chemical munitions in Hawaii. *Deep-Sea Research II: Topical Studies in Oceanography, 128*, 25–33.

Edwards, M. H., S. M. Shjegstad, R. Wilkens, J. C. King, G. Carton, D. Bala, B. Bingham, M. C. Bissonnette, C. Briggs, N. S. Bruso, R. Camilli, M. Cremer, R. B. Davis, E. H. DeCarlo, C. DuVal, D. J. Fornari, I. Kaneakua-Pia, C. D. Kelley, S. Koide, C. L. Mah, T. Kerby, G. J. Kurras, M. R. Rognstad, L. Sheild, J. Silva, B. Wellington, and M. V. Woerkom. (2016b). The Hawaii undersea military munitions assessment. *Deep Sea Research Part II: Topical Studies in Oceanography, 128*, 4–13.

Griesser, A., and C. Spillman. (2016). Assessing the skill and value of seasonal thermal stress forecasts for coral bleaching risk in the western Pacific. *Journal of Applied Meteorology and Climatology, 55*(7), 1565–1578.

Harvey, C. (2016). 'I cried... right into my mask': Scientists say Guam's reefs have bleached four years straight. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/energy-environment/wp/2016/08/03/i-cried-right-into-my-mask-these-coral-reefs-have-seen-a-devastating-four-years-of-bleaching/?noredirect=on&utm_term=.17d2d85b6b40.

Juhasz, A. L., and R. Naidu. (2007). Explosives: Fate, dynamics, and ecological impact in terrestrial and marine environments. *Reviews of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology, 191*, 163–215.

Keener, V. W., S. B. Gingerich, and M. L. Finucane. (2015). *Climate Change in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands*. Retrieved from ftp://ftp.soest.hawaii.edu/coastal/USAPI_ClimateChangeBooklets/CNMI%20Climate%202016.pdf.

Kelley, C., G. Carton, M. Tomlinson, and A. Gleason. (2016). Analysis of towed camera images to determine the effects of disposed mustard-filled bombs on the deep water benthic community off south Oahu. *Deep Sea Research Part II: Topical Studies in Oceanography, 128*, 34–42.

Koide, S., J. A. K. Silva, V. Dupra, and M. Edwards. (2016). Bioaccumulation of chemical warfare agents, energetic materials, and metals in deep-sea shrimp from discarded military munitions sites off Pearl Harbor. *Deep Sea Research Part II: Topical Studies in Oceanography, 128*, 53–62.

Lotufo, G. (2018). Overview of munitions constituents in Water, Sediment and Biota, Toxicity to Aquatic Biota and Derivation of Protection Levels. Presentation to SERDP/ESTCP on May 21.

Lotufo, G. R., M. A. Chappell, C. L. Price, M. L. Ballentine, A. A. Fuentes, T. S. Bridges, R. D. George, E. J. Glisch, and G. Carton. (2017). *Review and Synthesis of Evidence Regarding Environmental Risks Posed by Munitions Constituents (MC) in Aquatic Systems*. Washington, DC: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Engineer Research and Development Center.

MacDonald, J., and C. Mendez. (2005). *Unexploded ordnance cleanup costs: Implications of alternative protocols*. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.

Montgomery, M. T., T. J. Boyd, J. P. Smith, S. E. Walker, and C. L. Osburn. (2011). 2,4,6-Trinitrotoluene Mineralization and Incorporation by Natural Bacterial Assemblages in Coastal Ecosystems *Environmental Chemistry of Explosives and Propellant Compounds in Soils and Marine Systems: Distributed Source Characterization and Remedial Technologies* (Vol. 1069, pp. 171–184).

National Marine Fisheries Service. (2017). *Biological Opinion on (1) U.S. Military Mariana Islands Training and Testing Activities; and (2) the National Marine Fisheries Service's Promulgation of regulations and issuance of a letter of authorization pursuant to the Marine Mammal Protection Act for the U.S. Navy to "take" marine mammals incidental to Mariana Islands Training and Testing activities from August 2015 through August 2020*. Silver Spring, MD: National Marine Fisheries Service, Office of Protected Resources.

Pait, A. S., A. L. Mason, D. R. Whitall, J. D. Christensen, and S. I. Hartwell. (2010). Chapter 5: Assessment of Chemical Contaminants in Sediments and Corals in Vieques. In L. J. Bauer & M. S. Kendall (Eds.), *An Ecological Characterization of the Marine Resources of Vieques, Puerto Rico* (pp. 101–150). Silver Spring, MD: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

Raymundo, L. J., M. C. D. Malay, and A. N. Williams. (2016). *Final Report: Research on Stony Coral Health and Community Structure.* Mangilao, GU: University of Guam Marine Laboratory.

Raymundo, L. J., D. Burdick, V. A. Lapacek, R. J. Miller, and V. Brown. (2017). Anomalous temperatures and extreme tides: Guam staghorn *Acropora* succumb to a double threat. *Marine Ecology Progess Series, 564*, 47–55.

Richardson, K., D. Haynes, A. Talouli, and M. Donoghue. (2016). Marine pollution originating from purse seine and longline fishing vessel operations in the Western and Central Pacific Ocean, 2003–2015. *Ambio, 46*(2), 190–200.

Rosen, G., and G. R. Lotufo. (2010). Fate and effects of composition B in multispecies marine exposures. *Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry, 29*(6), 1330–1337.

Silva, J. A. K., and T. Chock. (2016). Munitions integrity and corrosion features observed during the HUMMA deep-sea munitions disposal site investigation. *Deep-Sea Research I*, 14–24.

Smith, S. H., and D. E. Marx, Jr. (2009). *Assessment of Near Shore Marine Resources at Farallon De Medinilla: 2006, 2007 and 2008*. Capitol Hill, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands: Pacific Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command.

Smith, S. H., J. Marx, D. E., and L. H. Shannon. (2013). *Calendar Year 2012 Assessment of Near Shore Marine Resources at Farallon de Medinilla, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands*. Port Hueneme, CA: U.S. Department of the Navy.

Smith, S. H., and D. E. Marx, Jr. (2016). De-facto marine protection from a Navy bombing range: Farallon de Medinilla, Mariana Archipelago, 1997 to 2012. *Marine Pollution Bulletin, 102*(1), 187–198.

Tobias, C. (2019). *Tracking the Uptake, Translocation, Cycling, and Metabolism of Munitions Compounds in Coastal Marine Ecosystems Using Stable Isotopic Tracer: Final Report* (SERDP Project ER-2122). Storrs, CT: University of Connecticut.

Tomlinson, M. S., and E. H. De Carlo. (2016). Occurrence and possible sources of arsenic in seafloor sediments surrounding sea-disposed munitions and chemical agents near Oahu, Hawaii. *Deep Sea Research Part II: Topical Studies in Oceanography, 128*, 70–84.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2010). *Water Range Assessment for the Jacksonville Range Complex*. Norfolk, VA: Parsons.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2013a). *Military Expended Material Shrimp Fisheries Study in the U.S. South Atlantic and Eastern Gulf of Mexico*. Newport, RI: Naval Undersea Warfare Center Division.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2013b). *Comprehensive Exercise and Marine Species Monitoring Report for the U.S. Navy's Atlantic Fleet Active Sonar Training (AFAST) and Virginia Capes, Cherry Point, Jacksonville, and Gulf of Mexico Range Complexes 2009–2012*. Norfolk, VA: United States Fleet Forces Command.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2015). *Final Mariana Islands Training and Testing Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement*. Pearl Harbor, HI: Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Pacific.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2017). *Preliminary Apra Harbor Sediment Data Package*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Navy.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. (2010). *Water Quality Criteria: Suspended and Bedded Sediments*. Washington, DC: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. (2015). *Biological Opinion for the Mariana Islands Training and Testing Program*. Honolulu, HI: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Pacific Islands Fish and Wildlife Office.

U.S. Marine Corps. (2014). *Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact: Reconfiguration and Construction of Small Arms Ranges at the Ulupau Range Training Facility, Marine Corps Base Hawaii Kaneohe Bay*. Fort Collins, CO: Center for Environmental Management of Military Lands.

University of Hawaii. (2014). *Final Environmental Study: Ordnance Reef (HI-06), Wai'anae, O'ahu, Hawai'i* (Contract No. N00024-08-D-6323). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii.

Walker, S. W., C. L. Osburn, T. J. Boyd, L. J. Hamdan, R. B. Coffin, M. T. Montgomery, J. P. Smith, Q. X. Li, C. Hennessee, F. Monteil, and J. Hawari. (2006). *Mineralization of 2, 4, 6-Trinitrotoluene (TNT) in Coastal Waters and Sediments*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Navy, Naval Research Laboratory.

Walsh, M. R. (2007). *Explosives residues resulting from the detonation of common military munitions: 2002–2006*. Hanover, NH: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Engineer Research and Development Center.

3.2 Air Quality

Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/ Overseas Environmental Impact Statement Mariana Islands Training and Testing

TABLE OF CONTENTS

3.2 Air Quality 3.2-1
3.2.1 Methods 3.2-1
3.2.1.1 National Ambient Air Quality Standards 3.2-1
3.2.1.2 Conformity Analyses in Nonattainment and Maintenance Areas 3.2-1
3.2.2 Affected Environment 3.2-2
3.2.2.1 Climate of the Study Area 3.2-2
3.2.2.2 Regional Emissions 3.2-2
3.2.2.3 Existing Air Quality 3.2-2
3.2.3 Environmental Consequences 3.2-3
3.2.3.1 Criteria Pollutants 3.2-3
3.2.3.2 Hazardous Air Pollutants 3.2-5
3.2.3.3 Greenhouse Gases 3.2-6
3.2.4 Public Comments 3.2-6

List of Figures

Figure 3.2-1: Annual Wind Speed and Direction at Apra Harbor, Guam 3.2-3

List of Tables

Table 3.2-1: Baseline Pollutant Emissions for At-Sea and FDM Training and Testing Activities that Occur Within 3 Nautical Miles of the Coast from Aircraft, Vessels, and Ordnance (tpy) 3.2-4
Table 3.2-2: Annual Emissions for At-Sea and FDM Training and Testing Activities that Occur Within 3 Nautical Miles of the Coast Under Alternative 1 from Aircraft, Vessels, and Ordnance (tpy) 3.2-4
Table 3.2-3: Annual Emissions for At-Sea and FDM Training and Testing Activities that Occur Within 3 Nautical Miles of the Coast Under Alternative 2 from Aircraft, Vessels, and Ordnance (tpy) 3.2-5
Table 3.2-4: Annual Greenhouse Gas Emissions Under All Three Alternatives 3.2-6

This page intentionally left blank.

3.2 Air Quality

The purpose of this section is to supplement the analysis of impacts on air quality presented in the 2015 Mariana Islands Training and Testing (MITT) Final Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (EIS/OEIS) with new information relevant to proposed changes in training and testing activities conducted at sea and on Farallon de Medinilla (FDM). Information presented in the 2015 Final MITT EIS/OEIS that remains valid is noted as such and referenced in the appropriate sections. Any new or updated information describing the affected environment and analysis of impacts on air quality associated with the Proposed Action is provided in this section.

3.2.1 Methods

3.2.1.1 National Ambient Air Quality Standards

National ambient air quality and criteria pollutant attainment limits are defined by National Ambient Air Quality Standards, promulgated by the United States (U.S.) Environmental Protection Agency, and are requisite to protect the public health and welfare. Areas that exceed a standard are designated as "nonattainment" for that pollutant, while areas in compliance with a standard are in "attainment" for that pollutant. An area may be nonattainment for some pollutants and attainment for others simultaneously.

States and U.S. territories, through their air quality management agencies, are required to prepare and implement State Implementation Plans for nonattainment areas, which demonstrate how the area will meet the National Ambient Air Quality Standards. Areas that have achieved attainment may be designated as "maintenance areas," subject to maintenance plans showing how the area will continue to meet federal air quality standards. Nonattainment areas for some criteria pollutants are further classified, depending on the severity of their air quality problem, to facilitate their management:

- Ozone – marginal, moderate, serious, severe, and extreme
- Carbon Monoxide – moderate and serious
- Particulate Matter – moderate and serious

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency delegates the regulation of air quality to the state once the state has an approved State Implementation Plan. The Clean Air Act (CAA) also allows states to establish air quality standards more stringent than the National Ambient Air Quality Standards.

The MITT Study Area is mostly offshore of the Territory of Guam and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands and some onshore and nearshore areas. Some elements of the Proposed Action would occur onshore and within or over state waters. Most of the Study Area is offshore, beyond territory and commonwealth boundaries where attainment status is unclassified and CAA National Ambient Air Quality Standards do not apply. However, given fluctuations in wind direction, air quality in adjacent onshore areas may be affected by releases of air pollutants from offshore Study Area sources. Therefore, National Ambient Air Quality Standards attainment status of adjacent onshore areas is considered in determining whether appropriate controls on air pollution sources in the adjacent offshore state waters is warranted.

3.2.1.2 Conformity Analyses in Nonattainment and Maintenance Areas

Federal actions are required to conform with the approved State Implementation Plan for those areas of the United States designated as nonattainment or maintenance air quality areas for any criteria pollutant under the CAA (40 Code of Federal Regulations sections 51 and 93). The purpose of the

General Conformity Rule is to demonstrate that the Proposed Action would not cause or contribute to new violations of an air quality standard and that the Proposed Action would not adversely affect the attainment and maintenance of federal ambient air quality standards. A federal action would not conform if it increased the severity of any existing violations of an air quality standard or delayed the attainment of a standard, required interim emissions reductions, or delayed any other air quality milestone. To ensure that federal activities do not impede local efforts to control air pollution, Section 176(c) of the CAA (42 United States Code section 7506(c)) prohibits federal agencies from engaging in or approving actions that do not conform to an approved State Implementation Plan. The emissions thresholds that trigger the conformity requirements are called *de minimis* thresholds.

Federal agency compliance with the General Conformity Rule can be demonstrated in several ways. The requirement can be satisfied by a determination that the Proposed Action is not subject to the General Conformity Rule, by a Record of Non-Applicability, or by a Conformity Determination. Compliance is presumed if the net increase in emissions from a federal action would be less than the relevant *de minimis* threshold. If net emissions increases exceed the *de minimis* thresholds, then a formal conformity determination must be prepared.

3.2.2 Affected Environment

3.2.2.1 Climate of the Study Area

Climate in the MITT Study Area was discussed in detail in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. The climate within the Study Area has not changed since the publication of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (Climatemps.com, 2017). However, greenhouse gas emissions were analyzed in this Supplemental EIS (SEIS)/OEIS by illustrating their cumulative contribution to climate change.

3.2.2.2 Regional Emissions

Regional emissions have changed since the publication of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Guam and Saipan still contain the majority of the stationary sources of air pollutants within the Study Area. The largest point source emitters for air pollutants were the power-generating facilities at Piti and Tanguisson. However, the power-generating facility at Tanguisson has been retired since then and an explosion and fire at the power-generating facility in Piti has left two turbines inoperable. This has reduced the amount of pollutants being released into the atmosphere from manmade sources. In addition to anthropogenic sources, volcanic activity within the Study Area naturally contributes to sulfur dioxide concentrations in the region.

3.2.2.3 Existing Air Quality

Guam and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, including FDM, meet all national and local ambient air quality standards except for sulfur dioxide. The area of Piti-Cabras is nonattainment for the 2010 sulfur dioxide primary National Ambient Air Quality Standards. The nonattainment area extends in a circle with a radius of 6.074 kilometers from the power-generating facilities. This circle encompasses the majority of Apra Harbor, Agat Bay, and nearshore areas, which includes the Piti Floating Mine Neutralization Site.

Piti and Tanguisson are in nonattainment of the 1971 sulfur dioxide primary National Ambient Air Quality Standards (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2017). These nonattainment areas extend in a circle with a radius of 2.2 miles from the power-generating facilities. However, the retirement of the Tanguisson facility and reduction in functionality of the Piti facility have decreased pollutant emissions and could potentially affect the attainment status for these areas. In general, the islands are considered

to have good ambient air quality due to geographic isolation and favorable climate. Consistent winds (shown in Figure 3.2-1) and rain help to remove and carry away pollutants from the islands.




Figure 3.2-1: Annual Wind Speed and Direction at Apra Harbor, Guam

3.2.3 Environmental Consequences

The 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS analyzed potential impacts on air quality resulting from proposed training and testing activities. This supplemental analysis will update and consider changes to air quality resulting from proposed changes to training and testing activities conducted at sea and on FDM (see Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2). The Study Area includes pierside locations in Apra Harbor. For purposes of this SEIS/OEIS, pierside locations include channels and routes to and from the Navy port in the Apra Harbor Naval Complex, and associated wharves and facilities within the Navy port.

3.2.3.1 Criteria Pollutants

Estimated emissions are compared against baseline emissions (Table 3.2-1). While most of the emissions would be off shore, only emissions that would be released below 3,000 feet of elevation and within 3 nautical miles (NM) of the coastline are analyzed for their impacts on ambient air quality. Pollutants that would be emitted more than 3 NM offshore would be intermittent and distributed across a very large area of ocean (501,873 square nautical miles), and would not be concentrated in any one area. Therefore, pollutants emitted beyond 3 NM are not expected to impact the general public in Guam or the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. Emissions calculations for the Baseline, Alternative 1, and Alternative 2 can be seen in Appendix D (Air Quality Emissions Calculations). Baseline emissions are derived from those presented in Alternative 1 of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (Table 3.2-7). However, this SEIS/OEIS only addresses at-sea activities and activities occurring at FDM, whereas the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS addressed those activities in addition to land-based activities. Therefore, only those activities that are covered under this SEIS/OEIS are considered in the baseline emissions.

Table 3.2-1: Baseline Pollutant Emissions for At-Sea and FDM Training and Testing Activities that Occur Within 3 Nautical Miles of the Coast from Aircraft, Vessels, and Ordnance (tpy)

Criteria Pollutant	NO_x	CO	VOC	SO_x	PM_{10}	$PM_{2.5}$
Aircraft	111	163	23	8	48	43
Vessels	345	38	95	229	41	37
Ordnance	5	203	0	0	8	8
Total of At-Sea and FDM Emissions	461	404	118	237	97	88

Notes: NO_x = nitrogen oxides, CO = carbon monoxide, VOC = volatile organic compounds, SO_x = sulfur oxides, PM_{10} = particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter, $PM_{2.5}$ = particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in diameter, FDM = Farallon de Medinilla, tpy = tons per year. Baseline emissions are derived from those presented in Alternative 1 of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

3.2.3.1.1 Alternative 1

Under Alternative 1, estimated pollutant emissions from aircraft, vessels, and ordnance would increase, as shown in Table 3.2-2. Criteria pollutants emitted in the Study Area within territorial waters could be transported ashore but would not affect the attainment status of the relevant air quality control regions nor impact the general public. Under Alternative 1, the emissions increase for sulfur dioxide (SO_2) from all training and testing activities in the nonattainment areas of Guam in comparison to the baseline is estimated to be 17 tons per year. The *de minimis* threshold for a full conformity determination is an SO_2 emissions increase of 100 tons per year. Therefore, the General Conformity Rule does not apply under Alternative 1.

Table 3.2-2: Annual Emissions for At-Sea and FDM Training and Testing Activities that Occur Within 3 Nautical Miles of the Coast Under Alternative 1 from Aircraft, Vessels, and Ordnance (tpy)

Criteria Pollutant	NO_x	CO	VOC	SO_x	PM_{10}	$PM_{2.5}$
Aircraft Emissions	146	219	31	10	66	60
Vessel Emissions	377	43	134	244	43	39
Ordnance Emissions	5	205	0	0	9	9
Alternative 1 Emissions	**528**	**467**	**166**	**254**	**119**	**107**
Baseline Emissions	461	404	118	237	97	88
Changes in Emissions	**67**	**63**	**47**	**17**	**22**	**19**

Notes: NO_x = nitrogen oxide, CO = carbon monoxide, VOC = volatile organic compounds, SO_x = sulfur oxide, PM_{10} = particulate matter less than 10 microns, $PM_{2.5}$ = particulate matter less than 2.5 microns, tpy = tons per year. Individual values may not add exactly to total values due to rounding.

3.2.3.1.2 Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)

Under Alternative 2, there would be an increase in annual air emissions from the baseline (Table 3.2-3) as well as an increase in relation to Alternative 1 (Table 3.2-2). However, the change in emissions would not affect the attainment status of the relevant air quality control regions nor significantly impact the general public.

Under Alternative 2, the emissions increase for SO_2 from all training and testing activities in the nonattainment areas of Guam in comparison to the baseline is estimated to be 17 tons per year. The *de minimis* threshold for a full conformity determination is an SO_2 emissions increase of 100 tons per year. Therefore, the General Conformity Rule does not apply under Alternative 2. A Record of Non-Applicability has been prepared (Appendix D, Section D.5).

Table 3.2-3: Annual Emissions for At-Sea and FDM Training and Testing Activities that Occur Within 3 Nautical Miles of the Coast Under Alternative 2 from Aircraft, Vessels, and Ordnance (tpy)

Criteria Pollutant	NO_x	CO	VOC	SO_x	PM_{10}	$PM_{2.5}$
Aircraft Emissions	146	219	31	10	66	60
Vessel Emissions	398	48	137	303	55	50
Ordnance Emissions	6	205	0	0	10	9
Alternative 2 Emissions	**549**	**473**	**168**	**313**	**131**	**119**
Baseline Emissions	461	404	118	237	97	88
Difference	**89**	**68**	**50**	**76**	**34**	**31**

Notes: NO_x = nitrogen oxides, CO = carbon monoxide, VOC = volatile organic compounds, SO_x = sulfur oxides, PM_{10} = particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter, $PM_{2.5}$ = particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in diameter, tpy = tons per year. Individual values may not add exactly to total values due to rounding.

3.2.3.1.3 No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, proposed training and testing activities would not occur. Other military activities not associated with this Proposed Action would continue to occur. Therefore, implementation of the No Action Alternative would mean that the emissions shown in Table 3.2-1 would no longer be produced; however, there would be no measurable change in air quality conditions.

3.2.3.2 Hazardous Air Pollutants

These emissions are typically one or more orders of magnitude smaller than concurrent emissions of criteria air pollutants, and could become a concern when large amounts of fuel, explosives, or other materials are consumed during a single activity or in one location. Hazardous air pollutants are analyzed qualitatively in relation to the prevalence of the sources emitting these pollutants during training and testing activities. The 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS concluded that emissions of hazardous air pollutants are not significant and would mostly occur far from land. While there are increases in hazardous air pollutants from the Proposed Action, the results of the analysis as described in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS does not appreciably change and remains valid. Therefore, human health is not anticipated to be significantly impacted by emissions of hazardous air pollutants in the Study Area.

3.2.3.3 Greenhouse Gases

Table 3.2-4 summarizes the greenhouse gas emissions that would be generated under baseline conditions, Alternative 1, and Alternative 2. Greenhouse gas emissions would decrease from the baseline by approximately 4 percent under Alternative 1 and Alternative 2. Since greenhouse gases are relevant in a global scope, they are analyzed based on the extent to which they would contribute to climate change. Implementation of Alternative 1 or 2 would generate a decrease from baseline contributions.

Table 3.2-4: Annual Greenhouse Gas Emissions Under All Three Alternatives

	Annual Greenhouse Gas Emissions (metric tons per year)			
	CO_2	N_2O	CH_4	CO_2e
Baseline Emissions	696,436	23	20	703,853
Alternative 1	668,301	22	19	675,418
Alternative 2	666,794	22	19	673,895
Nationwide Emissions	-	-	-	6,511,000,000

Notes: CO_2 = carbon dioxide, N_2O = nitrous oxide, CH_4 = methane, CO_2e= carbon dioxide equivalent

3.2.4 Public Comments

The public did not raise any issues during the scoping period in regard to air quality. No comments were received from the public during the Draft SEIS/OEIS commenting period related to air quality.

REFERENCES

Climatemps.com. (2017). *Guam Climate & Temperature*. Retrieved from http://www.mariana-islands.climatemps.com/.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. (2017). *Nonattainment Areas for Criteria Pollutants (Green Book)*. Retrieved from https://www.epa.gov/green-book.

This page intentionally left blank.

3.3 Marine Habitats

Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/ Overseas Environmental Impact Statement Mariana Islands Training and Testing

TABLE OF CONTENTS

3.3 Marine Habitats 3.3-1
3.3.1 Affected Environment 3.3-1
3.3.1.1 Existing Conditions 3.3-1
3.3.2 Environmental Consequences 3.3-3
3.3.2.1 Explosive Stressors 3.3-3
3.3.2.2 Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors 3.3-5
3.3.3 Public Comments 3.3-7

List of Figures

Figure 3.3-1: Nearshore Marine Habitats around Saipan 3.3-2
Figure 3.3-2: Existing Mine Warfare Underwater Detonation (UNDET) Areas 3.3-4

List of Tables

There are no tables in this section.

This page intentionally left blank.

3.3 Marine Habitats

3.3.1 Affected Environment

The purpose of this section is to supplement the analysis of impacts on marine habitats presented in the *2015 Mariana Islands Training and Testing (MITT) Final Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement* (EIS/OEIS) with new information relevant to proposed changes in training and testing activities conducted at sea. New information made available since the publication of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS is included below to better understand potential stressors and impacts on the nonliving (abiotic) marine habitats resulting from training and testing activities. Information presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS that remains valid is noted as such and referenced in the appropriate sections (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2015). Other necessary habitats for living resources, including those that form biotic habitats such as aquatic plant beds and coral reefs, are discussed in other sections (e.g., Section 3.7, Marine Vegetation; and Section 3.8, Marine Invertebrates). Comments received from the public during scoping related to marine habitats are addressed in Section 3.3.3 (Public Comments). Comments received from the public during the Draft Supplemental EIS (SEIS)/OEIS commenting period related to marine habitats are addressed in Appendix K (Public Comment Responses). Additional or updated information on the Mariana Trench Marine National Monument was added to this section.

3.3.1.1 Existing Conditions

The information on marine habitat types (i.e., soft shores, rocky shores, vegetated shores, aquatic beds, soft bottoms, hard bottoms, and artificial structures) presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS has not substantially changed and remains valid. In 2017, Kendall et al. (2017) mapped the benthic habitat of Saipan Lagoon. This new data was taken into consideration during the development of this SEIS/OEIS and is shown in Figure 3.3-1. After reviewing this data, the information and analysis on marine habitat types (i.e., soft shores, rocky shores, vegetated shores, aquatic beds, soft bottoms, hard bottoms, and artificial structures) presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS has not substantially changed and remains valid. The majority of the MITT Study Area lies within open-ocean areas. Located in the Mariana Archipelago, the Marianas Trench Marine National Monument protects approximately 95,216 square miles of submerged lands and waters (U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, 2012). This area is comprised of three units: the Islands Unit (waters and submerged lands of the three northernmost Mariana Islands), the Volcanic Unit (submerged lands within 1 nautical mile of 21 designated volcanic sites), and the Trench Unit (submerged lands extending from the northern limit of the Exclusive Economic Zone of the United States in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands to the southern limit of the Exclusive Economic Zone of the United States in the Territory of Guam (U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, 2012). Information on the biological resources that inhabit the hydrothermal vents are presented in Section 3.8 (Marine Invertebrates).

Relatively little of the Study Area includes intertidal and shallow subtidal areas in U.S. territory waters where numerous habitats are exclusively present (e.g., salt/brackish marsh, mangrove, coral reefs, and seagrass beds). Intertidal abiotic habitats (e.g., beaches, tidal deltas, mudflats, rocky shores) are addressed only where intersections with military training and testing activities are reasonably likely to occur. Impacts on the water column are analyzed in Section 3.1 (Sediments and Water Quality). In addition, since the publication of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, no critical habitat has been designated that needs to be considered here. Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) is discussed in Section 6.1.3 (Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act) and is not discussed further in this section.




Figure 3.3-1: Nearshore Marine Habitats around Saipan

3.3.2 Environmental Consequences

The 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS considered training and testing activities that currently occur in the Study Area and considered potential stressors related to marine habitats. The stressors applicable to marine habitats in the Study Area for this SEIS/OEIS are the same stressors considered in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

- Explosive (in-air explosions and in-water explosions)
- Physical disturbance and strike (vessels, in-water devices, military expended materials, seafloor devices, and personnel disturbance)

This section evaluates how and to what degree potential impacts on marine habitats from stressors described in Section 3.0.1 (Overall Approach to Analysis) may have changed since the analysis presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS was completed. Proposed training and testing activities, the number of times each event would be conducted annually, and the locations within the Study Area where the activity would typically occur under each alternative are presented in Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2 in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives). Information for training and testing activities proposed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS is also included for comparison purposes.

The analysis presented in this section also considers standard operating procedures, which are discussed in Section 2.3.3 (Standard Operating Procedures) of this SEIS/OEIS, and mitigation measures that are described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation). The Navy would implement these measures to avoid or reduce potential impacts on marine habitats from stressors associated with the proposed training and testing activities. Marine habitats in the remainder of this section will be referred to as marine substrates to reflect the subset of marine habitats being evaluated, similar to the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS analysis.

3.3.2.1 Explosive Stressors

As stated in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, underwater detonations that occur on or near the bottom are the only explosive stressors that would impact marine substrates. All other explosive stressors (e.g., gunnery exercises, missile exercises, and air-to-surface rockets) used during training and testing activities occur on the water surface or in the water column and would not impact marine substrates. Underwater detonations that occur on or near the bottom are primarily used during various mine warfare training activities. The impacts of in-water explosions vary with the bottom substrate type. As stated in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, mine warfare training and testing activities utilizing bottom placed detonations would only occur in the existing mine warfare underwater detonation area at Outer Apra Harbor, as shown in Figure 3.3-2. Mid-water detonations at Piti and Agat would occur in the water column and would not impact bottom habitat. Therefore, impacts on marine habitats from explosive stressors at Piti and Agat are not discussed further. The majority of Outer Apra Harbor is sandy bottom habitat; however, cobble, rocky reef, and other hard-bottom habitat may be scattered throughout the area. Those hard-bottom areas, which may contain coral or wrecks, would be avoided during training and testing to the maximum extent practicable.




Figure 3.3-2: Existing Mine Warfare Underwater Detonation (UNDET) Areas

3.3.2.1.1 Impacts from Explosive Stressors Under Alternative 1

Under Alternative 1, underwater detonations associated with training activities would increase for underwater demolition qualification/certification (Table 2.5-1). However, these activities would continue to occur in the same areas at the Agat Bay site, Piti, and Outer Apra Harbor sites, and would have no appreciable change in the impact analysis or conclusions for explosive stressors as presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. There would be no increases in underwater detonations associated with testing activities. Therefore, the analysis in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS remains valid.

Mitigation measures will help the Navy avoid or reduce impacts on seafloor resources (including shallow-water coral reefs, live hard bottom, artificial reefs, and shipwrecks) from explosives during applicable activities, as described in Section 5.4.1 (Mitigation Areas for Seafloor Resources).

3.3.2.1.2 Impacts from Explosive Stressors Under Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)

Under Alternative 2, the number of explosives used during training and testing events are proposed to be the same as under Alternative 1 described in this SEIS/OEIS (Table 3.0-7) and increase compared to the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Under Alternative 2, proposed increases would have no appreciable change on the impact conclusions for explosive stressors as summarized above under Alternative 1 because these activities would continue to occur in the same designated areas as presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

Mitigation measures will help the Navy avoid or reduce impacts on seafloor resources (including shallow-water coral reefs, live hard bottom, artificial reefs, and submerged cultural resources) from explosives during applicable activities, as described in Section 5.4.1 (Mitigation Areas for Seafloor Resources).

3.3.2.1.3 Impacts from Explosive Stressors Under the No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, proposed training and testing activities would not occur. Other military activities not associated with this Proposed Action would continue to occur. Explosive stressors as listed above would not be introduced into the marine environment. Therefore, existing environmental conditions would either remain unchanged or would improve after cessation of ongoing training and testing activities.

Discontinuing the training and testing activities would result in fewer explosive stressors within the marine environment where training and testing activities have historically been conducted. Therefore, discontinuing training and testing activities under the No Action Alternative would lessen the potential for explosive impacts on marine habitat, but would not measurably improve the overall distribution or abundance of marine habitat.

3.3.2.2 Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors

Bottom substrates could be disturbed by vessels (i.e., during amphibious landings and only in amphibious landing areas) and in-water devices, military expended materials, seafloor devices used for training and testing activities, and from personnel disturbance such as walking, standing, or swimming in the nearshore waters during activities such as raids and assaults. The Navy takes precautions to avoid or reduce impacts on bottom substrates from vessel strikes. These precautions include only performing amphibious landings in amphibious landing areas, at high tide, and where there are clear routes. By implementing these precautions, disturbance from vessel strikes would be avoided or reduced to the maximum extent practicable. Raids and assaults are planned to occur in areas that are primarily soft-bottom sandy habitat. Due to the nature of high-energy surf and shifting sands in these areas, ocean approaches would not be expected to affect marine habitats.

Seafloor devices would be located in areas that would be primarily soft-bottom and previously disturbed habitat to the greatest extent practical. The impact of seafloor devices on marine habitats is unlikely because these activities would occur over soft-bottom sediment, the items used in nearshore areas have a small footprint, and the items are retrieved. These potential impacts to bottom substrates would be minimal in size and temporary (recovery in days to weeks) to short term (recovery in weeks up to three years) in duration. Further, the majority of military expended materials are widely distributed throughout the Study Area offshore, where the majority of the marine habitat is expected to consist of soft-bottom habitat. Once on the seafloor, military expended material would be buried by sediment, corroded from exposure to the marine environment, or colonized by benthic organisms. As stated in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, impacts of physical disturbance or strike resulting from training and testing activities on biogenic soft bottom (e.g., seagrasses, macroalgae, etc.) and hard bottom (e.g., corals, sponges, tunicates, oysters, mussels, macroalgae, etc.) substrates are discussed in Sections 3.7 (Marine Vegetation) and 3.8 (Marine Invertebrates), respectively.

3.3.2.2.1 Impacts from Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors Under Alternative 1

Under Alternative 1, there would be a slight increase in the use of towed in-water devices (Table 3.0-13). The increase in the number of in-water devices is unlikely to change the impact conclusion presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. As stated in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, the impact of vessels and in-water devices on marine habitats would remain inconsequential because vessel and in-water activities that could come into contact with marine substrates would be located in previously disturbed areas (i.e., nearshore shallow waters), and seafloor devices would be used in predominantly soft bottom previously disturbed areas and therefore would not be expected to affect marine substrates.

Various activities (such as amphibious assault and raid activities) that could involve personnel disturbance from walking, standing, and swimming in nearshore waters to shore would not increase under Alternative 1 on Tinian or Guam within the Mariana Islands Range Complex. These activities would cause minor and temporary increases in suspended sediments in soft-bottom habitats, similar to impacts that occur on beaches that are open to the public (i.e., where people walk around and swim). Hard-bottom substrates would be impacted by personnel disturbance from walking and standing in cobble-laid or reef areas. Contact with hard-bottom substrate in nearshore waters, such as coral reefs, would be avoided or reduced to the greatest extent possible.

Under Alternative 1, the number of military expended materials used for training and testing events that have the potential to impact marine habitats would generally increase (see Tables 3.0-14 through 3.0-17). As shown in Table 3.0-18, the surface area of the ocean bottom that could be impacted by the use of military expended materials as proposed in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS would decrease from the amount analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS under Alternative 1. Military expended materials are very small relative to the amount of available marine habitat and would not significantly change the quality or type of habitat present throughout the Study Area. Therefore, these increases are not expected to pose a risk to marine habitats.

Under Alternative 1, the number of seafloor devices used in shallow-water habitats during training and testing events would decrease from the number presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (Table 3.0-18). Seafloor devices would pose a negligible risk to marine habitat for the same reason described above for military expended materials.

Any impacts on marine habitats incurred by vessel movements and in-water devices or military expended materials to soft-bottom substrates would be minimal and temporary. Physical disturbance and strike of live hard-bottom substrates would be permanent but minimal if it were to occur, and would be avoided or reduced through implementation of standard operating procedures as described in Section 2.3.3 (Standard Operating Procedures) and mitigation measures as described in Section 5.4.1 (Mitigation Areas for Seafloor Resources).

In addition, potential impacts on bottom substrates would be localized and temporary (recovery in days to weeks) to short-term (recovery in weeks up to three years) in duration. Artificial structures should not be adversely affected by the use of seafloor devices.

Mitigation measures will help the Navy avoid or reduce impacts on shallow-water coral reefs, live hard bottom, artificial reefs, and submerged cultural resources from precision anchoring and military expended materials during applicable activities, as described in Section 5.4.1 (Mitigation Areas for Seafloor Resources).

3.3.2.2.2 Impacts from Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors Under Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)

Under Alternative 2, the combined number of proposed training and testing events involving vessels and in-water devices (Table 3.0-12 and Table 3.0-13) are proposed to increase compared to Alternative 1 and the numbers presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Military expended materials (Table 3.0-14, Table 3.0-15, and Table 3.0-16) are proposed to increase, and seafloor devices (Table 3.0-19) are proposed to decrease compared to Alternative 1 and the number in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. However, the total footprint of military expended materials in the Study Area would decrease under Alternative 2. Proposed increases in some physical disturbance and strike stressors, such as military expended materials, could increase the impact risk on marine habitats but does not appreciably change

the analysis as described under Alternative 1, or impact conclusions presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

Mitigation measures will help the Navy avoid or reduce impacts on shallow-water coral reefs, live hard bottom, artificial reefs, and submerged cultural resources from precision anchoring and military expended materials during applicable activities, as described in Section 5.4.1 (Mitigation Areas for Seafloor Resources).

3.3.2.2.3 Impacts from Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors Under the No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, proposed training and testing activities would not occur. Other military activities not associated with this Proposed Action would continue to occur. Physical disturbance and strike stressors as listed above would not be introduced into the marine environment. Therefore, existing environmental conditions would either remain unchanged or would improve slightly after cessation of ongoing training and testing activities.

Discontinuing the training and testing activities would result in fewer physical disturbance and strike stressors within the marine environment where training and testing activities have historically been conducted. Therefore, discontinuing training and testing activities under the No Action Alternative would lessen the potential for physical disturbance and strike impacts on marine habitat, but would not measurably improve the overall distribution or abundance of marine habitat.

3.3.3 Public Comments

The public raised a number of issues during the scoping period in regard to marine habitats. The issues are summarized in the list below. Comments received from the public during the Draft SEIS/OEIS commenting period related to marine habitats are addressed in Appendix K (Public Comment Responses).

- **Impact of unexploded ordnance on the ocean floor** – Unexploded ordnance is not part of the military expended materials proposed to be expended under the Proposed Action.
- **Destruction of habitat** – Proposed training and testing activities are not expected to cause the destruction of marine habitat in the Study Area. Any impacts on marine habitats incurred by vessel movements and in-water devices or military expended materials to soft- and hard-bottom substrates would be minimal. Explosive impacts on hard-bottom habitat are not expected to occur, because bottom explosions only occur in sandy-bottom habitat (i.e., Outer Agat Harbor). Furthermore, the implementation of mitigation measures helps to avoid or reduce impacts on live hard bottom, as defined in Chapter 5 (Mitigation). Impacts on the soft-bottom substrate are determined to be short term and minimal due to the mobile nature of soft-bottom substrates (i.e., sandy bottoms can be stirred up and settle relatively quickly when compared to impacts on hard-bottom substrates).
- **Recommend consideration of temporal mitigation and habitat avoidance mitigation** – Temporal mitigation and habitat avoidance mitigation were considered, and mitigation areas are discussed in Section 5.4 (Mitigation Areas to be Implemented) of Chapter 5 (Mitigation) as well as Appendix I (Geographic Mitigation Assessment).
- **Impacts on EFH from training activities (deposition and resuspension of sediments, erosion and sedimentation, and impacts from unexploded ordnance)** – Because training activities would have adverse effects on EFH, the Navy completed supplemental consultation with NMFS

addressing activities that have changed (i.e., increased) as a result of the Proposed Action; see Section 6.1.3 (Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act), and Appendix C (Agency Correspondence) for further discussion. To avoid or reduce adverse impacts on hard-bottom habitat, the Navy created mitigation measures to protect the resource. As shown in Table 5.4-1 of Chapter 5 (Mitigation), shallow-water coral reefs, live hard bottom, artificial reefs, and submerged cultural resources are areas of focus for protection from explosives and physical disturbance and strike stressors. Mitigation area requirements to reduce impacts on live hard-bottom substrate are listed in Table 5.4-1.

REFERENCES

Kendall, M. S., B. Costa, S. McKagan, L. Johnston, and D. Okano. (2017). *Benthic habitat maps of Saipan Lagoon* (NOAA Technical Memorandum NOS-NCCOS-229). Silver Spring, MD: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2015). *Final Mariana Islands Training and Testing Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement*. Pearl Harbor, HI: Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Pacific.

U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service. (2012). *Marianas Trench Marine National Monument*. Washington, DC: U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service.

This page intentionally left blank.

3.4 Marine Mammals

Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/ Overseas Environmental Impact Statement Mariana Islands Training and Testing

TABLE OF CONTENTS

3.4 Marine Mammals 3.4-1
3.4.1 Affected Environment 3.4-1
3.4.1.1 General Background 3.4-1
3.4.1.2 Species Unlikely to Be Present in the Study Area 3.4-3
3.4.1.3 Group Size 3.4-3
3.4.1.4 Habitat Use 3.4-4
3.4.1.5 Dive Behavior 3.4-4
3.4.1.6 Hearing and Vocalization 3.4-4
3.4.1.7 General Threats 3.4-8
3.4.1.8 Blue Whale (*Balaenoptera musculus*) 3.4-16
3.4.1.9 Bryde's Whale (*Balaenoptera edeni*) 3.4-17
3.4.1.10 Fin Whale (*Balaenoptera physalus*) 3.4-18
3.4.1.11 Humpback Whale (*Megaptera novaeangliae*) 3.4-19
3.4.1.12 Minke Whale (*Balaenoptera acutorostrata*) 3.4-23
3.4.1.13 Omura's Whale (*Balaenoptera omurai*) 3.4-24
3.4.1.14 Sei Whale (*Balaenoptera borealis*) 3.4-25
3.4.1.15 Blainville's Beaked Whale (*Mesoplodon densirostris*) 3.4-25
3.4.1.16 Common Bottlenose Dolphin (*Tursiops truncatus*) 3.4-27
3.4.1.17 Cuvier's Beaked Whale (*Ziphius cavirostris*) 3.4-28
3.4.1.18 Dwarf Sperm Whale (*Kogia sima*) 3.4-30
3.4.1.19 False Killer Whale (*Pseudorca crassidens*) 3.4-30
3.4.1.20 Fraser's Dolphin (*Lagenodelphis hosei*) 3.4-32
3.4.1.21 Ginkgo-Toothed Beaked Whale (*Mesoplodon ginkgodens*) 3.4-32
3.4.1.22 Killer Whale (*Orcinus orca*) 3.4-34
3.4.1.23 Longman's Beaked Whale (*Indopacetus pacificus*) 3.4-35
3.4.1.24 Melon-Headed Whale (*Peponocephala electra*) 3.4-36

3.4.1.25 Pantropical Spotted Dolphin (*Stenella attenuata*) 3.4-37
3.4.1.26 Pygmy Killer Whale (*Feresa attenuata*) 3.4-38
3.4.1.27 Pygmy Sperm Whale (*Kogia breviceps*) 3.4-39
3.4.1.28 Risso's Dolphin (*Grampus griseus*) 3.4-40
3.4.1.29 Rough-Toothed Dolphin (*Steno bredanensis*) 3.4-41
3.4.1.30 Short-Finned Pilot Whale (*Globicephala macrorhynchus*) 3.4-42
3.4.1.31 Sperm Whale (*Physeter macrocephalus*) 3.4-43
3.4.1.32 Spinner Dolphin (*Stenella longirostris*) 3.4-45
3.4.1.33 Striped Dolphin (*Stenella coeruleoalba*) 3.4-47
3.4.2 Environmental Consequences 3.4-48
3.4.2.1 Acoustic Stressors 3.4-51
3.4.2.2 Explosive Stressors 3.4-196
3.4.2.3 Energy Stressors 3.4-263
3.4.2.4 Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors 3.4-265
3.4.2.5 Entanglement Stressors 3.4-267
3.4.2.6 Ingestion Stressors 3.4-268
3.4.2.7 Secondary Stressors 3.4-270
3.4.3 Summary of Potential Impacts on Marine Mammals 3.4-271
3.4.3.1 Combined Impacts of All Stressors Under Alternative 1 ..... 3.4-273
3.4.3.2 Combined Impacts of All Stressors Under Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative) 3.4-273
3.4.3.3 Combined Impacts of All Stressors Under the No Action Alternative 3.4-273
3.4.3.4 Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015 ..... 3.4-274
3.4.4 Marine Mammal Protection Act Determinations 3.4-277
3.4.5 Endangered Species Act Determinations 3.4-277
3.4.6 Public Comments 3.4-278

List of Figures

Figure 3.4-1: Composite Audiograms for Hearing Groups Likely Found in the Study Area 3.4-7
Figure 3.4-2: Two Hypothetical Threshold Shifts 3.4-57
Figure 3.4-3: Odontocete Critical Ratios 3.4-65
Figure 3.4-4: Critical Ratios for Different Noise Types 3.4-66
Figure 3.4-5: Navy Auditory Weighting Functions for all Species Groups 3.4-107

Figure 3.4-6: TTS and PTS Exposure Functions for Sonar and Other Transducers.....3.4-108
Figure 3.4-7: Behavioral Response Function for Odontocetes.....3.4-110
Figure 3.4-8: Behavioral Response Function for Mysticetes.....3.4-111
Figure 3.4-9: Behavioral Response Function for Beaked Whales.....3.4-111
Figure 3.4-10: Relative Likelihood of a Response Being Significant Based on the Duration and Severity of Behavioral Reactions.....3.4-113
Figure 3.4-11: Blue Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1.....3.4-130
Figure 3.4-12: Blue Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2.....3.4-131
Figure 3.4-13: Bryde's Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1.....3.4-132
Figure 3.4-14: Bryde's Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2.....3.4-133
Figure 3.4-15: Fin Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1.....3.4-135
Figure 3.4-16: Fin Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2.....3.4-136
Figure 3.4-17: Humpback Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1.....3.4-137
Figure 3.4-18: Humpback Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2.....3.4-139
Figure 3.4-19: Minke Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1.....3.4-140
Figure 3.4-20: Minke Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2.....3.4-141
Figure 3.4-21: Omura's Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1.....3.4-142
Figure 3.4-22: Omura's Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2.....3.4-143
Figure 3.4-23: Sei Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1.....3.4-144
Figure 3.4-24: Sei Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2.....3.4-145
Figure 3.4-25: Blainville's Beaked Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1.....3.4-150
Figure 3.4-26: Cuvier's Beaked Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1.....3.4-151

Figure 3.4-27: Ginkgo-Toothed Beaked Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1.....3.4-152
Figure 3.4-28: Longman's Beaked Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 .....3.4-153
Figure 3.4-29: Blainville's Beaked Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-155
Figure 3.4-30: Cuvier's Beaked Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-156
Figure 3.4-31: Ginkgo-Toothed Beaked Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2.....3.4-157
Figure 3.4-32: Longman's Beaked Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-158
Figure 3.4-33: Bottlenose Dolphin Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 .....3.4-159
Figure 3.4-34: Bottlenose Dolphin Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-160
Figure 3.4-35: Dwarf Sperm Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 .....3.4-161
Figure 3.4-36: Pygmy Sperm Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 .....3.4-162
Figure 3.4-37: Dwarf Sperm Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-163
Figure 3.4-38: Pygmy Sperm Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-164
Figure 3.4-39: False Killer Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 .....3.4-165
Figure 3.4-40: False Killer Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-166
Figure 3.4-41: Fraser's Dolphin Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 .....3.4-168
Figure 3.4-42: Fraser's Dolphin Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-169
Figure 3.4-43: Killer Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 .....3.4-170
Figure 3.4-44: Killer Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-171
Figure 3.4-45: Melon-Headed Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 .....3.4-172
Figure 3.4-46: Melon-Headed Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-173

Figure 3.4-47: Pantropical Spotted Dolphin Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1.....3.4-175
Figure 3.4-48: Pantropical Spotted Dolphin Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2.....3.4-176
Figure 3.4-49: Pygmy Killer Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 .....3.4-177
Figure 3.4-50: Pygmy Killer Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-178
Figure 3.4-51: Risso's Dolphin Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 .....3.4-179
Figure 3.4-52: Risso's Dolphin Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-181
Figure 3.4-53: Rough-Toothed Dolphin Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 .....3.4-182
Figure 3.4-54: Rough-Toothed Dolphin Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-183
Figure 3.4-55: Short-Finned Pilot Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 .....3.4-184
Figure 3.4-56: Short-Finned Pilot Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-185
Figure 3.4-57: Sperm Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 .....3.4-187
Figure 3.4-58: Sperm Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-188
Figure 3.4-59: Spinner Dolphin Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 .....3.4-189
Figure 3.4-60: Spinner Dolphin Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-190
Figure 3.4-61: Striped Dolphin Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 .....3.4-192
Figure 3.4-62: Striped Dolphin Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-193
Figure 3.4-63: Navy Phase III Weighting Functions for All Species Groups 3.4-205
Figure 3.4-64: Navy Phase III Behavioral, TTS, and PTS Exposure Functions for Explosives.....3.4-206
Figure 3.4-65: Bryde's Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 .....3.4-222
Figure 3.4-66: Bryde's Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-223

Figure 3.4-67: Humpback Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 .....3.4-225
Figure 3.4-68: Humpback Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-227
Figure 3.4-69: Minke Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 .....3.4-228
Figure 3.4-70: Minke Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-229
Figure 3.4-71: Omura's Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-230
Figure 3.4-72: Sei Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 .....3.4-232
Figure 3.4-73: Sei Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-233
Figure 3.4-74: Ginkgo-Toothed Beaked Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 .....3.4-236
Figure 3.4-75: Longman's Beaked Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 .....3.4-237
Figure 3.4-76: Ginkgo-Toothed Beaked Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-238
Figure 3.4-77: Longman's Beaked Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-239
Figure 3.4-78: Dwarf Sperm Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 .....3.4-241
Figure 3.4-79: Pygmy Sperm Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 .....3.4-242
Figure 3.4-80: Dwarf Sperm Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-243
Figure 3.4-81: Pygmy Sperm Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-244
Figure 3.4-82: Fraser's Dolphin Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 .....3.4-246
Figure 3.4-83: Fraser's Dolphin Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-247
Figure 3.4-84: Melon-Headed Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 .....3.4-248
Figure 3.4-85: Melon-Headed Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-249
Figure 3.4-86: Pantropical Spotted Dolphin Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 .....3.4-251

Figure 3.4-87: Pantropical Spotted Dolphin Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-252
Figure 3.4-88: Risso's Dolphin Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 .....3.4-254
Figure 3.4-89: Risso's Dolphin Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-255
Figure 3.4-90: Short-Finned Pilot Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-257
Figure 3.4-91: Spinner Dolphin Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 .....3.4-259
Figure 3.4-92: Spinner Dolphin Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-260
Figure 3.4-93: Striped Dolphin Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 .....3.4-261
Figure 3.4-94: Striped Dolphin Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-262

List of Tables

Table 3.4-1: Marine Mammal Occurrence within the Study Area 3.4-2
Table 3.4-2: Species within Marine Mammal Hearing Groups Likely Found in the Study Area 3.4-6
Table 3.4-3: Cutoff Distances for Moderate Source Level, Single Platform Training and Testing Events and for All Other Events with Multiple Platforms or Sonar with Source Levels at or Exceeding 215 dB re 1 µPa at 1 m 3.4-112
Table 3.4-4: Range to Permanent Threshold Shift for Five Representative Sonar Systems 3.4-116
Table 3.4-5: Ranges to Temporary Threshold Shift for Sonar Bin HF4 over a Representative Range of Environments within the Study Area 3.4-116
Table 3.4-6: Ranges to Temporary Threshold Shift for Sonar Bin LF4 over a Representative Range of Environments within the Study Area 3.4-117
Table 3.4-7: Ranges to Temporary Threshold Shift for Sonar Bin MF1 over a Representative Range of Environments within the Study Area 3.4-117
Table 3.4-8: Ranges to Temporary Threshold Shift for Sonar Bin MF4 over a Representative Range of Environments within the Study Area 3.4-118
Table 3.4-9: Ranges to Temporary Threshold Shift for Sonar Bin MF5 over a Representative Range of Environments within the Study Area 3.4-118
Table 3.4-10: Ranges to a Potentially Significant Behavioral Response for Sonar Bin HF4 over a Representative Range of Environments within the Study Area.....3.4-119
Table 3.4-11: Ranges to a Potentially Significant Behavioral Response for Sonar Bin LF4 over a Representative Range of Environments within the Study Area.....3.4-120

Table 3.4-12: Ranges to a Potentially Significant Behavioral Response for Sonar Bin MF1 over a Representative Range of Environments within the Study Area.....3.4-121

Table 3.4-13: Ranges to a Potentially Significant Behavioral Response for Sonar Bin MF4 over a Representative Range of Environments within the Study Area.....3.4-122

Table 3.4-14: Ranges to a Potentially Significant Behavioral Response for Sonar Bin MF5 over a Representative Range of Environments within the Study Area.....3.4-123

Table 3.4-15: Estimated Impacts on Individual Blue Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 .....3.4-130

Table 3.4-16: Estimated Impacts on Individual Blue Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-131

Table 3.4-17: Estimated Impacts on Individual Bryde's Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 .....3.4-132

Table 3.4-18: Estimated Impacts on Individual Bryde's Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-134

Table 3.4-19: Estimated Impacts on Individual Fin Whale Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 .....3.4-135

Table 3.4-20: Estimated Impacts on Individual Fin Whale Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-136

Table 3.4-21: Estimated Impacts on Individual Humpback Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1.....3.4-138

Table 3.4-22:Estimated Impacts on Individual Humpback Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-139

Table 3.4-23: Estimated Impacts on Individual Minke Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 .....3.4-140

Table 3.4-24: Estimated Impacts on Individual Minke Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-141

Table 3.4-25: Estimated Impacts on Individual Omura's Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 .....3.4-142

Table 3.4-26: Estimated Impacts on Individual Omura's Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-143

Table 3.4-27: Estimated Impacts on Individual Sei Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 .....3.4-144

Table 3.4-28: Estimated Impacts on Individual Sei Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-146

Table 3.4-29: Estimated Impacts on Individual Blainville's Beaked Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 .....3.4-151

Table 3.4-30: Estimated Impacts on Individual Cuvier's Beaked Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1.....3.4-152

Table 3.4-31: Estimated Impacts on Individual Ginkgo-Toothed Beaked Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 .....3.4-153

Table 3.4-32: Estimated Impacts on Individual Longman's Beaked Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 .....3.4-154

Table 3.4-33: Estimated Impacts on Individual Blainville's Beaked Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-155

Table 3.4-34: Estimated Impacts on Individual Cuvier's Beaked Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2.....3.4-156

Table 3.4-35: Estimated Impacts on Individual Ginkgo-Toothed Beaked Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2. .....3.4-157

Table 3.4-36: Estimated Impacts on Individual Longman's Beaked Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-158

Table 3.4-37: Estimated Impacts on Individual Bottlenose Dolphins Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1.....3.4-159

Table 3.4-38: Estimated Impacts on Individual Bottlenose Dolphins Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2.....3.4-160

Table 3.4-39: Estimated Impacts on Individual Dwarf Sperm Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1.....3.4-162

Table 3.4-40: Estimated Impacts on Individual Pygmy Sperm Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1.....3.4-162

Table 3.4-41: Estimated Impacts on Individual Dwarf Sperm Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2.....3.4-164

Table 3.4-42: Estimated Impacts on Individual Pygmy Sperm Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2.....3.4-164

Table 3.4-43: Estimated Impacts on Individual False Killer Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1.....3.4-166

Table 3.4-44: Estimated Impacts on Individual False Killer Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2.....3.4-167

Table 3.4-45: Estimated Impacts on Individual Fraser's Dolphin Impacts Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 .....3.4-168

Table 3.4-46: Estimated Impacts on Individual Fraser's Dolphin Impacts Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-169

Table 3.4-47: Estimated Impacts on Individual Killer Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 .....3.4-170

Table 3.4-48: Estimated Impacts on Individual Killer Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-171

Table 3.4-49: Estimated Impacts on Individual Melon-Headed Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 .....3.4-172

Table 3.4-50: Estimated Impacts on Individual Melon-Headed Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-174

Table 3.4-51: Estimated Impacts on Individual Pantropical Spotted Dolphins Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 .....3.4-175

Table 3.4-52: Estimated Impacts on Individual Pantropical Spotted Dolphins Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-176

Table 3.4-53: Estimated Impacts on Individual Pygmy Killer Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 .....3.4-177

Table 3.4-54: Estimated Impacts on Individual Pygmy Killer Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-178

Table 3.4-55: Estimated Impacts on Individual Risso's Dolphins Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 .....3.4-180

Table 3.4-56: Estimated Impacts on Individual Risso's Dolphins Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-181

Table 3.4-57: Estimated Impacts on Individual Rough-Toothed Dolphins Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 .....3.4-182

Table 3.4-58: Estimated Impacts on Individual Rough-Toothed Dolphins Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-183

Table 3.4-59: Estimated Impacts on Individual Short-Finned Pilot Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 .....3.4-184

Table 3.4-60: Estimated Impacts on Individual Short-Finned Pilot Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-186

Table 3.4-61: Estimated Impacts on Individual Sperm Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 .....3.4-187

Table 3.4-62: Estimated Impacts on Individual Sperm Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-188

Table 3.4-63: Estimated Impacts on Individual Spinner Dolphins Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 .....3.4-189

Table 3.4-64: Estimated Impacts on Individual Spinner Dolphins Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-191

Table 3.4-65: Estimated Impacts on Individual Striped Dolphins Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 .....3.4-192

Table 3.4-66: Estimated Impacts on Individual Striped Dolphins Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-193

Table 3.4-67: Criteria to Quantitatively Assess Non-Auditory Injury Due to Underwater Explosions3.4-204

Table 3.4-68: Navy Phase III Weighted Sound Exposure Thresholds for Underwater Explosive Sounds 3.4-207

Table 3.4-69: Ranges to Non-Auditory Injury (in meters) for All Marine Mammal Hearing Groups..3.4-209

Table 3.4-70: Ranges to Mortality (in meters) for All Marine Mammal Hearing Groups as a Function of Animal Mass 3.4-210

Table 3.4-71: SEL-Based Ranges to Onset PTS, Onset TTS, and Behavioral Reaction (in meters) for High-Frequency Cetaceans 3.4-211

Table 3.4-72: Peak Pressure Based Ranges to Onset PTS and Onset TTS (in meters) for High-Frequency Cetaceans 3.4-212

Table 3.4-73: SEL-Based Ranges to Onset PTS, Onset TTS, and Behavioral Reaction (in meters) for Low-Frequency Cetaceans 3.4-214

Table 3.4-74: Peak Pressure Based Ranges to Onset PTS and Onset TTS (in meters) for Low-Frequency Cetaceans 3.4-215

Table 3.4-75: SEL-Based Ranges to Onset PTS, Onset TTS, and Behavioral Reaction (in meters) for Mid-Frequency Cetaceans 3.4-217

Table 3.4-76: Peak Pressure Based Ranges to Onset PTS and Onset TTS (in meters) for Mid-Frequency Cetaceans 3.4-218

Table 3.4-77: Estimated Impacts on Individual Bryde's Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 .....3.4-223

Table 3.4-78: Estimated Impacts on Individual Bryde's Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-224

Table 3.4-79: Estimated Impacts on Individual Humpback Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 .....3.4-226

Table 3.4-80: Estimated Impacts on Individual Humpback Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-227

Table 3.4-81: Estimated Impacts on Individual Minke Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 .....3.4-228

Table 3.4-82: Estimated Impacts on Individual Minke Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-229

Table 3.4-83: Estimated Impacts on Individual Omura's Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-231

Table 3.4-84: Estimated Impacts on Individual Sei Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 .....3.4-232

Table 3.4-85: Estimated Impacts on Individual Sei Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-233

Table 3.4-86: Estimated Impacts on Individual Ginkgo-Toothed Beaked Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1.....3.4-236

Table 3.4-87: Estimated Impacts on Individual Longman's Beaked Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 .....3.4-237

Table 3.4-88: Estimated Impacts on Individual Ginkgo-Toothed Beaked Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2.....3.4-238

Table 3.4-89: Estimated Impacts on Individual Longman's Beaked Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-239

Table 3.4-90: Estimated Impacts on Individual Dwarf Sperm Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 .....3.4-241

Table 3.4-91: Estimated Impacts on Individual Pygmy Sperm Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 .....3.4-242

Table 3.4-92: Estimated Impacts on Individual Dwarf Sperm Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-243

Table 3.4-93: Estimated Impacts on Individual Pygmy Sperm Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-244

Table 3.4-94: Estimated Impacts on Individual Fraser's Dolphins Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 .....3.4-246

Table 3.4-95: Estimated Impacts on Individual Fraser's Dolphins Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2.....3.4-247

Table 3.4-96: Estimated Impacts on Individual Melon-Headed Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 .....3.4-249

Table 3.4-97: Estimated Impacts on Individual Melon-Headed Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-250

Table 3.4-98: Estimated Impacts on Individual Pantropical Spotted Dolphins Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 .....3.4-251

Table 3.4-99: Estimated Impacts on Individual Pantropical Spotted Dolphins Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-252

Table 3.4-100: Estimated Impacts on Individual Risso's Dolphin Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 .....3.4-254

Table 3.4-101: Estimated Impacts on Individual Risso's Dolphin Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-255

Table 3.4-102: Estimated Impacts on Individual Short-Finned Pilot Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-257

Table 3.4-103: Estimated Impacts on Individual Spinner Dolphins Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 .....3.4-259

Table 3.4-104: Estimated Impacts on Individual Spinner Dolphins Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-260

Table 3.4-105: Estimated Impacts on Individual Striped Dolphins Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 .....3.4-261

Table 3.4-106: Estimated Impacts on Individual Striped Dolphins Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2 .....3.4-262

This page intentionally left blank.

3.4 Marine Mammals

3.4.1 Affected Environment

The purpose of this section is to supplement the analysis of impacts on marine mammals presented in the 2015 Mariana Islands Training and Testing (MITT) Final Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (EIS/OEIS) with new information relevant to proposed changes in training and testing activities conducted at sea and on Farallon de Medinilla (FDM). Information presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS that remains valid is noted as such and referenced in the appropriate sections. Any new or updated information describing the affected environment and analysis of impacts on marine mammals associated with the Proposed Action is provided in this section. Comments received from the public during scoping related to marine mammals are addressed in Section 3.4.6 (Public Comments). Comments received from the public during the Draft Supplemental EIS (SEIS)/OEIS commenting period related to marine mammals are addressed in Appendix K (Public Comment Responses). Additional or updated information regarding beaked whale strandings and newly published journal articles were added to this section.

The complete analysis and summary of potential impacts of the Proposed Action on marine mammals are found in Section 3.4.2 (Environmental Consequences) and Section 3.4.3 (Summary of Potential Impacts on Marine Mammals). For additional information, also see the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, Section 3.4 (Marine Mammals) (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2015a).

3.4.1.1 General Background

Marine mammals are a diverse group of approximately 130 species. Most live predominantly in the marine habitat, although some species, such as seals, spend time in terrestrial habitats, and other species such as manatees and certain dolphins spend time in freshwater habitats (Rice, 1998; U.S. Department of the Navy, 2007). The exact number of formally recognized marine mammal species changes periodically with new scientific understanding or findings (Rice, 1998). For a list of current species classifications, see the formal list of *Marine Mammal Species and Subspecies* maintained online by the Society for Marine Mammalogy. In this document, the Navy follows the naming conventions presented by National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) in the applicable annual Stock Assessment Reports (SAR) for the Pacific and Alaska[1] regions covering the marine mammals present in the MITT Study Area (Carretta et al., 2019c; Muto et al., 2019).

All marine mammals in the United States are protected under the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA), and some species receive additional protection under the Endangered Species Act (ESA). The MMPA defines a marine mammal "stock" as "a group of marine mammals of the same species or smaller taxon in a common spatial arrangement that interbreed when mature" (16 United States Code [U.S.C.] section 1362; for further details, see Oleson et al. (2013). As provided by NMFS guidance, "for purposes of management under the MMPA a stock is recognized as being a management unit that identifies a demographically independent biological population." (Carretta et al., 2017c; National Marine Fisheries Service, 2016f). However, in practice, recognized management stocks may fall short of this ideal for various reasons, including a lack of information, and, in some cases, may even include multiple distinct

[1] Some stocks in the Pacific and the Mariana Islands, such as the Northeast Pacific stocks of sperm whales and fin whales, and the Western North Pacific Stock of humpback whales, include individuals that may spend the summer season foraging in Alaska waters and are therefore included in the Alaska Stock Assessment Report.

population segments in a management unit, such as with the Western North Pacific humpback whale stock (Bettridge et al., 2015).

The ESA provides for listing species, subspecies, or distinct population segments of species, all of which are referred to as "species" under the ESA. The *Interagency Policy Regarding the Recognition of Distinct Vertebrate Population Segments Under the ESA* defines a distinct population segment as, "any subspecies of fish or wildlife or plants, and any distinct population segment of any species of vertebrate fish or wildlife which interbreeds when mature" (61 Federal Register [FR] 4722, February 7, 1996). If a population meets the criteria to be identified as a distinct population segment, it is eligible for listing under the ESA as a separate species (National Marine Fisheries Service, 2016f).

Twenty-six cetacean marine mammal species are known to exist in the Study Area, including 7 mysticetes (baleen whales) and 19 odontocetes (dolphins and toothed whales) (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2005, 2018a). The species expected to be present in the Study Area are provided in Table 3.4-1 and listed alphabetically within the two suborder groupings. The information presented in this SEIS/OEIS incorporates data from the U.S. Pacific and the Alaska Marine Mammal Stock Assessments (Carretta et al., 2019c; Muto et al., 2019), which cover some of those species present in the Study Area and incorporate the best available science, including monitoring data from Navy marine mammal research efforts. For those few species for which stock information exists in the region, relevant data are included in the species-specific Status and Management summaries provided subsequently in this section.

Table 3.4-1: Marine Mammal Occurrence within the Study Area

Common Name[1]	*Scientific Name*	*ESA Status*	*Occurrence in Study Area*		
			Mariana Islands	*Transit Corridor*	*Apra Harbor*
Mysticetes					
Blue whale	*Balaenoptera musculus*	Endangered	Seasonal	Seasonal	-
Bryde's whale	*Balaenoptera edeni*	n/a	Regular	Regular	-
Fin whale	*Balaenoptera physalus*	Endangered	Rare	Rare	-
Humpback whale	*Megaptera novaeangliae*	Endangered	Seasonal	Seasonal	-
Minke whale	*Balaenoptera acutorostrata*	n/a	Seasonal	Seasonal	-
Omura's whale	*Balaenoptera omurai*	n/a	Rare	Rare	-
Sei whale	*Balaenoptera borealis*	Endangered	Seasonal	Seasonal	-
Odontocetes					
Blainville's beaked whale	*Mesoplodon densirostris*	n/a	Regular	Regular	-
Common bottlenose dolphin	*Tursiops truncatus*	n/a	Regular	Regular	-
Cuvier's beaked whale	*Ziphius cavirostris*	n/a	Regular	Regular	-
Dwarf sperm whale	*Kogia sima*	n/a	Regular	Regular	-

Table 3.4-1: Marine Mammal Occurrence within the Study Area (continued)

Common Name[1]	*Scientific Name*	*ESA Status*	*Occurrence in Study Area*		
			Mariana Islands	*Transit Corridor*	*Apra Harbor*
Odontocetes					
False killer whale	*Pseudorca crassidens*	n/a	Regular	Regular	-
Fraser's dolphin	*Lagenodelphis hosei*	n/a	Regular	Regular	-
Ginkgo-toothed beaked whale	*Mesoplodon ginkgodens*	n/a	Regular	Regular	-
Killer whale	*Orcinus orca*	n/a	Regular	Regular	-
Longman's beaked whale	*Indopacetus pacificus*	n/a	Regular	Regular	-
Melon-headed whale	*Peponocephala electra*	n/a	Regular	Regular	-
Pantropical spotted dolphin	*Stenella attenuata*	n/a	Regular	Regular	-
Pygmy killer whale	*Feresa attenuata*	n/a	Regular	Regular	-
Pygmy sperm whale	*Kogia breviceps*	n/a	Regular	Regular	-
Risso's dolphin	*Grampus griseus*	n/a	Regular	Regular	-
Rough-toothed dolphin	*Steno bredanensis*	n/a	Regular	Regular	-
Short-finned pilot whale	*Globicephala macrorhynchus*	n/a	Regular	Regular	-
Sperm whale	*Physeter macrocephalus*	Endangered	Regular	Regular	-
Spinner dolphin	*Stenella longirostris*	n/a	Regular	Regular	-
Striped dolphin	*Stenella coeruleoalba*	n/a	Regular	Regular	-

[1] If available for the species, information on stocks is included in the species-specific Status and Management summaries.

Notes: n/a = status is not applicable for those species that are not listed under ESA; Regular = a species that occurs as a regular or usual part of the fauna of the area, regardless of how abundant or common it is; Rare = a species that occurs in the area only sporadically; Seasonal = species is only seasonally present in the Study Area. Additional details regarding presence in the Study Area are provided in the species-specific subsections.

3.4.1.2 Species Unlikely to Be Present in the Study Area

Consistent with the analysis provided in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, the species carried forward for analysis in this SEIS/OEIS are those likely to be found in the Study Area based on the most recent sighting, survey, and habitat modeling data available. The analysis does not include species that may have once inhabited or transited the area, but have not been sighted in recent years (e.g., species which no longer occur in an area due to factors such as 19th-century commercial exploitation). These species include the North Pacific right whale (*Eubalaena japonica*), the western subpopulation of gray whale (*Eschrichtius robustus*), short-beaked common dolphin (*Delphinus delphis*), Indo-Pacific bottlenose dolphin (*Tursiops aduncus*), northern elephant seal (*Mirounga angustirostris*), and dugong (*Dugong dugon*). Details regarding the reasons for these exclusions are explained in detail in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2015a).

3.4.1.3 Group Size

Many species of marine mammals, particularly odontocetes, are highly social animals that spend much of their lives living in groups called "pods." The size and structures of these groups are dynamic and depending on the species, can range from several to several thousand individuals. Similarly,

aggregations of mysticete whales may form during particular breeding or foraging seasons, although they do not persist through time as a social unit. Marine mammals that live or travel in groups are more likely to be detected by observers, and group size characteristics are incorporated into the many density and abundance calculations. Group size characteristics are also incorporated into acoustic effects modeling to represent a more realistic patchy distribution for a given density. The behavior of aggregating into groups is also important for the purposes of mitigation and monitoring since animals that occur in larger groups have an increased probability of being detected. A comprehensive and systematic review of relevant literature and data was conducted for available published and unpublished literature, including journals, books, technical reports, cruise reports, and raw data from cruises, theses, and dissertations. The results of this review were compiled into a Technical Report, which includes tables of group size information by species along with relevant citations (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2017c).

3.4.1.4 Habitat Use

Many factors influence the distribution of marine mammals in the Study Area, primarily patterns of major ocean currents, bottom relief, and water temperature, which, in turn, affect prey distribution and productivity. The continuous movement of water from the ocean bottom to the surface creates a nutrient-rich, highly productive environment for marine mammal prey in upwelling zones (Jefferson et al., 2015); the equatorial upwelling in the western Pacific is one such area (Di Lorenzo et al., 2010; Helber & Weisberg, 2001). While most baleen whales (such as humpback whales) are migratory, some species such as Bryde's whales and Omura's whales are thought to be present within the Study Area year round. Many of the toothed whales do not migrate in the strictest sense, but some do undergo seasonal shifts in distribution both within and outside of the Study Area.

3.4.1.5 Dive Behavior

All marine mammals, with the exception of polar bears, spend part of their lives underwater while traveling or feeding. Some species of marine mammals have developed specialized adaptations to allow them to make deep dives lasting over an hour, primarily for the purpose of foraging on deep-water prey such as squid. Other species spend the majority of their lives close to the surface, and make relatively shallow dives. The diving behavior of a particular species or individual has implications for the ability to visually detect them for mitigation and monitoring. In addition, their relative distribution through the water column based on diving behavior is an important consideration when conducting acoustic effects modeling. Information and data on diving behavior for each species of marine mammal were compiled and summarized in a technical report (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2017c) that provides the detailed summary of time at depth.

3.4.1.6 Hearing and Vocalization

The typical terrestrial mammalian ear (which is ancestral to that of marine mammals) consists of an outer ear that collects and transfers sound to the tympanic membrane and then to the middle ear (Fay & Popper, 1994; Rosowski, 1994). The middle ear contains ossicles that amplify and transfer acoustic energy to the sensory cells (called hair cells) in the cochlea, which transforms acoustic energy into electrical neural impulses that are transferred by the auditory nerve to high levels in the brain (Møller, 2013). All marine mammals display some degree of modification to the terrestrial ear; however, there are differences in the hearing mechanisms of marine mammals with an amphibious ear versus those with a fully aquatic ear (Wartzok & Ketten, 1999). Marine mammals with an amphibious ear include the marine carnivores: pinnipeds, sea otters, and polar bears (Ghoul & Reichmuth, 2014; Owen & Bowles,

2011; Reichmuth et al., 2013). Outer ear adaptations in this group include external pinnae (ears) that are reduced or absent, and in the pinnipeds, cavernous tissue, muscle, and cartilaginous valves seal off water from entering the auditory canal when submerged (Wartzok & Ketten, 1999). Marine mammals with the fully aquatic ear (cetaceans and sirenians) use bone and fat channels in the head to conduct sound to the ear; while the auditory canal still exists it is narrow and sealed with wax and debris (Ketten, 1998).

The most accurate means of determining the hearing capabilities of marine mammal species are direct measurements of auditory system sensitivity (Nachtigall et al., 2000; Supin et al., 2001). Studies using these methods produce audiograms — plots describing hearing threshold (the quietest sound a listener can hear) as a function of frequency. Marine mammal audiograms, like those of terrestrial mammals, typically have a "U-shape," with a frequency region of best hearing sensitivity at the bottom of the "U" and a progressive decrease in sensitivity outside of the range of best hearing (Fay, 1988; Mooney et al., 2012; Nedwell et al., 2004; Reichmuth et al., 2013). The "gold standard" for producing audiograms is the use of behavioral (psychophysical) methods, where marine mammals are trained to respond to acoustic stimuli (Nachtigall et al., 2000). For species that are untrained for behavioral psychophysical procedures, those that are difficult to house under human care, or in stranding rehabilitation and temporary capture contexts, auditory evoked potential methods are used to measure hearing sensitivity (e.g., Castellote et al., 2014; Finneran et al., 2009; Montie et al., 2011; Mulsow et al., 2011; Nachtigall et al., 2007; Nachtigall et al., 2008; Supin et al., 2001). For odontocetes, the procedure for creating audiograms from auditory evoked potential measurements has recently been standardized (American National Standards Institute & Acoustical Society of America, 2018).

These auditory evoked potential methods, which measure electrical potentials generated by the auditory system in response to sound and do not require the extensive training needed for psychophysical methods, can provide an efficient estimate of hearing sensitivity (Finneran & Houser, 2006; Schlundt et al., 2007; Yuen et al., 2005). The thresholds provided by auditory evoked potential methods are, however, typically elevated above behaviorally measured thresholds, and auditory evoked potential methods are not appropriate for estimating hearing sensitivity at frequencies much lower than the region of best hearing sensitivity (Finneran, 2015; Finneran et al., 2016). For marine mammal species for which access is limited and therefore psychophysical or auditory evoked potential testing is impractical (e.g., mysticete whales and rare species), some aspects of hearing can be estimated from anatomical structures, frequency content of vocalizations, and extrapolations from related species.


Direct measurements of hearing sensitivity exist for approximately 25 of the nearly 130 species of marine mammals. Table 3.4-2 summarizes hearing capabilities for marine mammal species in the Study Area. For this analysis, marine mammals are arranged into the following functional hearing groups based on their generalized hearing sensitivities: high-frequency (HF) cetaceans (HF group: porpoises, Kogia whales), mid-frequency (MF) cetaceans (MF group: delphinids, beaked whales, sperm whales), and low-frequency (LF) cetaceans (LF group: mysticetes). Note that the designations of high-, mid-, and low-frequency cetaceans are based on relative differences of sensitivity between groups, as opposed to conventions used to describe active sonar systems. For Phase III analyses, a single representative composite audiogram (Figure 3.4-1) was created for each functional hearing group using audiograms from published literature. For discussion of all marine mammal functional hearing groups and their derivation see technical report *Criteria and Thresholds for U.S. Navy Acoustic and Explosive Effects Analysis (Phase III)* (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2017b). The mid-frequency cetacean composite audiogram is consistent with behavioral audiograms of killer whales (Branstetter et al., 2017a) published

following development of the technical report. The high-frequency cetacean composite audiogram is consistent with behavioral audiograms of harbor porpoises (Kastelein et al., 2017a) published after the technical report.

Research has shown that hearing in bottlenose dolphins is directional (i.e., the relative angle between the sound source location and the dolphin affects the hearing threshold) (Accomando et al., 2020; Au & Moore, 1984). Hearing sensitivity becomes more directional as the sound frequency increases, with the greatest sensitivity to sounds presented in front and below the dolphin. Other odontocete species with less elongated skull anatomy than the bottlenose dolphin also exhibit direction-dependent hearing, but to a lesser degree (Kastelein et al., 2005a; Popov & Supin, 2009).

Table 3.4-2: Species within Marine Mammal Hearing Groups Likely Found in the Study Area

Hearing Group	*Species within the Study Area*
High-frequency cetaceans	Dwarf sperm whale
	Pygmy sperm whale
Mid-frequency cetaceans	Blainville's beaked whale
	Common bottlenose dolphin
	Cuvier's beaked whale
	False killer whale
	Fraser's dolphin
	Ginkgo-toothed beaked whale
	Killer whale
	Longman's beaked whale
	Melon-headed whale
	Northern right whale dolphin
	Pantropical spotted dolphin
	Pygmy killer whale
	Risso's dolphin
	Rough-toothed dolphin
	Short-finned pilot whale
	Sperm whale
	Spinner dolphin
	Striped dolphin
Low-frequency cetaceans	Blue whale
	Bryde's whale
	Fin whale
	Humpback whale
	Minke whale
	Omura's whale
	Sei whale



Source: (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2017b)
Notes: For hearing in the water; LF = low-frequency, MF = mid-frequency, HF = high-frequency

Figure 3.4-1: Composite Audiograms for Hearing Groups Likely Found in the Study Area

Similar to the diversity of hearing capabilities among species, the wide variety of acoustic signals used in marine mammal communication (including biosonar or echolocation) is reflective of the diverse ecological characteristics of cetacean species (see Avens, 2003; Richardson et al., 1995b). This makes a succinct summary difficult (see Richardson et al., 1995b; Wartzok & Ketten, 1999 for thorough reviews); however, a division can be drawn between lower frequency communication signals that are used by marine mammals in general, and the specific, high-frequency biosonar signals that are used by odontocetes to sense their environment.

Non-biosonar communication signals span a wide frequency range, primarily having energy up into the tens of kilohertz (kHz) range. Of particular note are the very low-frequency calls of mysticete whales that range from tens of hertz (Hz) to several kilohertz, and have source levels of 150–200 decibels referenced to 1 micropascal (dB re 1 µPa) (Cummings & Thompson, 1971; Edds-Walton, 1997; Širović et al., 2007; Stimpert et al., 2007; Wartzok & Ketten, 1999). These calls most likely serve social functions such as mate attraction, but may serve an orientation function as well (Green, 1994; Green et al., 1994; Richardson et al., 1995b). Humpback whales are a notable exception within the mysticetes, with some calls exceeding 10 kHz (Zoidis et al., 2008).

Odontocete cetaceans use underwater communicative signals that, while not as low in frequency as those of many mysticetes, likely serve similar functions. The acoustic characteristics of these signals are quite diverse among species, but can be generally classified as having dominant energy at frequencies below 20 kHz (Richardson et al., 1995b; Wartzok & Ketten, 1999).

Odontocete cetaceans generate short-duration (500–200 µs), specialized clicks used in biosonar with peak frequencies between 10 and 200 kHz to detect, localize, and characterize underwater objects such as prey (Au, 1993; Wartzok & Ketten, 1999). These clicks are often more intense than other communicative signals, with reported source levels as high as 229 dB re 1 µPa peak-to-peak (Au et al., 1974). The echolocation clicks of high-frequency cetaceans are narrower in bandwidth (i.e., the difference between the upper and lower frequencies in a sound) and higher in frequency than those of mid-frequency cetaceans (Madsen et al., 2005; Villadsgaard et al., 2007).

In general, frequency ranges of vocalization lie within the audible frequency range for an animal (i.e., animals vocalize within their audible frequency range); however, auditory frequency range and vocalization frequencies do not perfectly align. The frequency range of vocalization in a species can therefore be used to infer some characteristics of their auditory system; however, caution must be taken when considering vocalization frequencies alone in predicting the hearing capabilities of species for which no data exist (i.e., mysticetes). It is important to note that aspects of vocalization and hearing sensitivity are subject to evolutionary pressures that are not solely related to detecting communication signals. For example, hearing plays an important role in detecting threats (e.g., Deecke et al., 2002), and high-frequency hearing is advantageous to animals with small heads in that it facilitates sound localization based on differences in sound levels at each ear (Heffner & Heffner, 1982). This may be partially responsible for the difference in best hearing thresholds and dominant vocalization frequencies in some species of marine mammals (e.g., Steller sea lions) (Mulsow & Reichmuth, 2010).

3.4.1.7 General Threats

Marine mammal populations can be influenced by various natural factors as well as human activities. There can be direct effects from disease, hunting, and whale watching, or indirect effects such as through reduced prey availability or lowered reproductive success of individuals. Research presented in Twiss and Reeves (1999) and National Marine Fisheries Service (2011a, 2011b, 2011c, 2011e) provides a general discussion of marine mammal conservation and the threats they face. As detailed in National Marine Fisheries Service (2011d), investigations of stranded marine mammals are undertaken to monitor threats to marine mammals (Simeone et al., 2015). Investigations into the cause of death for stranded animals can also provide indications of the general threats to marine mammals in a given location (Bradford & Forney, 2017; Carretta et al., 2019a; Carretta et al., 2017b; Helker et al., 2019; Helker et al., 2017). The causes for strandings include infectious disease, parasite infestation, climate change reducing prey availability and leading to starvation, pollution exposure, trauma (e.g., injuries from ship strikes or fishery entanglements), sound (human-generated or natural), harmful algal blooms and associated biotoxins, tectonic events such as underwater earthquakes, and ingestion of or interaction with marine debris (for more information see NMFS Marine Mammal Stranding Response Fact Sheet (National Marine Fisheries Service, 2016a). Since 1963, Guam Department of Agriculture Division of Aquatic and Wildlife Resources has conducted aerial surveys twice every month (weather permitting) of the coastal margin around Guam at a distance of approximately 200–300 meters (m) offshore of the outer reef margin (Martin et al., 2016). Therefore, the Navy assumes any animals stranded on Guam are likely to have been identified; see also Mobley (2007). For a general discussion of strandings and their causes as well as strandings in association with U.S. Navy activity, see the technical report titled *Strandings Associated with U.S. Navy Activity* (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2017a).

3.4.1.7.1 Water Quality

Chemical pollution and impacts on ocean water quality are of great concern, although the effects on marine mammals are just starting to be understood (Bachman et al., 2014; Bachman et al., 2015;

Desforges et al., 2016; Foltz et al., 2014; Godard-Codding et al., 2011; Hansen et al., 2015; Jepson & Law, 2016; Law, 2014; Peterson et al., 2014; Peterson et al., 2015; Ylitalo et al., 2005; Ylitalo et al., 2009). Oil and other chemical spills are a specific type of ocean contamination that can have damaging effects on some marine mammal species directly through exposure to oil or chemicals and indirectly due to pollutants' impacts on prey and habitat quality (Engelhardt, 1983; Marine Mammal Commission, 2010; Matkin et al., 2008).

On a broader scale ocean contamination resulting from chemical pollutants inadvertently introduced into the environment by industrial, urban, and agricultural use is also a concern for marine mammal conservation and has been the subject of numerous studies (Desforges et al., 2016; Fair et al., 2010; Krahn et al., 2007; Krahn et al., 2009; Moon et al., 2010; Ocean Alliance, 2010). For example, the chemical components of pesticides used on land flow as runoff into the marine environment, which can accumulate in the bodies of marine mammals, and be transferred to nursing young through the mother's milk (Fair et al., 2010). The presence of these chemicals in marine mammals has been assumed to put those animals at greater risk for adverse health effects and potential impact on their reproductive success given toxicology studies and results from laboratory animals (Fair et al., 2010; Godard-Codding et al., 2011; Krahn et al., 2007; Krahn et al., 2009; Peterson et al., 2014; Peterson et al., 2015). Desforges et al. (2016) have suggested that exposure to chemical pollutants may act in an additive or synergistic manner with other stressors resulting in significant population level consequences. Although the general trend has been a decrease in chemical pollutants in the environment following their regulation, chemical pollutants remain important given their potential to impact marine mammals and marine life in general (Bonito et al., 2016; Jepson & Law, 2016; Law, 2014).

3.4.1.7.2 Commercial Industries

Human impacts on marine mammals through fisheries interactions have received much attention in recent decades, and include bycatch (accidental or incidental catch), gear entanglement, and indirect effects from takes of prey species; noise pollution; marine debris (ingestion and entanglement); hunting (both commercial and native practices); vessel strikes; entrainment into power plant water intakes; increased ocean acidification; and general habitat deterioration or destruction.

3.4.1.7.3 Bycatch

Fishery bycatch is likely the most impactful threat to marine mammal individuals and populations and may account for the deaths of more marine mammals than any other cause (Bradford & Forney, 2017; Carretta et al., 2016b; Carretta et al., 2017b; Geijer & Read, 2013; Hamer et al., 2010; Helker et al., 2019; Helker et al., 2017; Lent & Squires, 2017; National Marine Fisheries Service, 2016c; National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2019; Northridge, 2009; Read, 2008; Song, 2017). In 1994, the MMPA was amended to formally address bycatch in the United States. The amendment required the development of a take reduction plan when bycatch exceeds a level considered sustainable and lead to marine mammal population decline. In addition, NMFS develops and implements take reduction plans that help recover and prevent the depletion of strategic stocks of marine mammals that interact with certain fisheries.

At least in part as a result of the amendment, estimates of bycatch in the Pacific by U.S. fisheries declined by a total of 96 percent from 1994 to 2006 (Geijer & Read, 2013). Information on bycatch associated with non-U.S. fishery activities is generally not available in the Study Area. It has been argued that the bycatch of marine mammals by Japan and South Korea is more like an unregulated commercial hunt than an incidental or illegal fishery given the products from bycatch whales can be sold openly on

commercial markets in both countries (Baker et al., 2006b; Lukoschek et al., 2009). For example, in 2008 the reported bycatch in Japan and South Korea totaled 214 minke whales (Lukoschek et al., 2009) and in nine market samples from South Korea between 2003 and 2005, molecular (DNA) evidence indicated that 230 products contained minke whale meat in addition to that of other species (Baker et al., 2006b). A total of 717 cetacean bycatches involving South Korean fish vessels in the East Sea that involved 10 species were reported in a two-year period between 2013 and 2014 (Song, 2017).

3.4.1.7.4 Other Fishery Interactions

Fishery interactions other than bycatch include entanglement in abandoned or partial nets, fishing line, hooks, and the ropes and lines connected to fishing gear (Bradford & Lyman, 2015; Bradford & Forney, 2016, 2017; Carretta, 2013; Carretta et al., 2014; Carretta et al., 2016b; Carretta et al., 2017b; Helker et al., 2019; Helker et al., 2015; Helker et al., 2017; National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2017, 2019; Richardson et al., 2016; Saez et al., 2013). The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Marine Debris Program (2014a) reports that abandoned, lost, or otherwise discarded fishing gear constitutes the vast majority of mysticete entanglements. For the identified sources of entanglement, none included Navy-expended materials. Identified species entangled in the Pacific in 2015 and 2016 included humpback, gray, blue, fin and killer whales with a total of 133 entanglements in the two-year period (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2017).

In waters off Alaska where humpback whales from the Study Area may forage in the summer season, passive acoustic monitoring efforts since 2009 have documented the routine use of non-military explosives at sea (Baumann-Pickering et al., 2013; Rice et al., 2015; Wiggins et al., 2019). Based on the acoustic spectral properties of the recorded sounds and their correspondence with known fishing seasons or activity, the source of these explosions has been linked to the use of explosive marine mammal deterrents, which as a group are commonly known as “seal bombs” (Baumann-Pickering et al., 2013). Seal bombs are intended to be used by commercial fishers to deter marine mammals, particularly pinnipeds, from preying upon their catch and to prevent marine mammals from interacting and potentially becoming entangled with fishing gear (National Marine Fisheries Service, 2015b; Wiggins et al., 2019). The prevalent and continued use of seal bombs in Alaska seems to indicate that, while a potential threat, their use has had no significant effect on populations of marine mammals given that it is likely at least some individuals, if not larger groups of marine mammals, have been repeatedly exposed to this explosive stressor.

3.4.1.7.5 Noise

In some locations, especially where urban or industrial activities or commercial shipping is intense, anthropogenic noise can be a potential habitat-level stressor (Dunlop, 2016; Dyndo et al., 2015; Erbe et al., 2014; Frisk, 2012; Gedamke et al., 2016; Hermannsen et al., 2014; Li et al., 2015; McKenna et al., 2012; Melcón et al., 2012; Miksis-Olds & Nichols, 2016; Nowacek et al., 2015; Pine et al., 2016; Williams et al., 2014c). Noise is of particular concern to marine mammals because many species use sound as a primary sense for navigating, finding prey, avoiding predators, and communicating with other individuals. Noise may cause marine mammals to leave a habitat, impair their ability to communicate, or cause physiological stress (Courbis & Timmel, 2008; Erbe, 2002; Erbe et al., 2016; Hermannsen et al., 2014; Hildebrand, 2009; Rolland et al., 2012; Tyack et al., 2011; Tyne et al., 2017; Williams et al., 2014b). Noise can cause behavioral disturbances, mask other sounds including their own vocalizations, may result in injury, and in some cases may result in behaviors that ultimately lead to death (Erbe et al., 2014; Erbe et al., 2016; National Research Council, 2003, 2005; Nowacek et al., 2007; Southall et al., 2009; Tyack, 2009; Würsig & Richardson, 2009). Anthropogenic noise is generated from a variety of

sources including commercial shipping, oil and gas exploration and production activities, commercial and recreational fishing (including fish-finding sonar, fathometers, and acoustic deterrent and harassment devices), foreign navies, recreational boating and whale watching activities, offshore power generation, and research (including sound from air guns, sonar, and telemetry).

Vessel noise in particular is a major contributor to noise in the ocean (Southall et al., 2018). Commercial shipping's contribution to ambient noise in the ocean increased by as much as 12 decibels (dB) between approximately the 1960s and 2005 (Hildebrand, 2009; McDonald et al., 2008). Frisk (2012) confirmed the trend and reported that between 1950 and 2007 ocean noise in the 25–50 Hz frequency range has increased 3.3 dB per decade, resulting in a cumulative increase of approximately 19 dB over a baseline of 52 dB. The increase in noise is associated with an increase in commercial shipping, which correlates with global economic growth (Frisk, 2012). Subsequently, Miksis-Olds and Nichols (2016) have demonstrated that the trends for low-frequency ocean sound levels no longer show a uniform increase across the globe. Most research has focused on only the low-frequency components of ship noise, given that low-frequency noise propagates farther and is easier to sample, although mid- and high-frequency components are also present in ship noise. When in proximity to transiting vessels, odontocete hearing is more likely to be impacted by substantially elevated mid- to high-frequency noise components, relative to mysticetes, given those frequencies are where toothed whale hearing is most sensitive (Hermannsen et al., 2014).

Although Guam and the Mariana Islands lack a major port, many thousands of trans-Pacific shipments to and from Asia occur as part of the global shipping transportation network and pass in proximity to the Mariana Islands and throughout the Study Area (Kaluza et al., 2010). Redfern et al. (2017) found that shipping channels leading to and from the ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach may have degraded the habitat for blue, fin, and humpback whales due to the loss of communication space where important habitat for these species overlaps with elevated noise from commercial vessel traffic, and similar impacts are also likely in the Study Area on great circle routes and other shortest point-to-point shipping routes.

In many areas of the world, including the Study Area, oil and gas seismic exploration in the ocean is undertaken using a group of air guns towed behind large research vessels. The airguns convert high pressure air into very strong shock wave impulses that are designed to return information off the various buried layers of sediment under the seafloor. Seismic exploration surveys last many days and cover vast overlapping swaths of the ocean area being explored. Most of the impulse energy produced by these airguns is heard as low-frequency sound, which can travel long distances and has the potential to impact marine mammals. NMFS routinely issues permits for the taking of marine mammals associated with these commercial activities.

3.4.1.7.6 Hunting

Commercial hunting, as in whaling and sealing operations, provided the original impetus for marine mammal management efforts and has driven much of the early research on cetaceans and pinnipeds (Twiss & Reeves, 1999). With the enactment of the MMPA and the 1946 International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling, hunting-related mortality has decreased over the last 40 years. Unregulated harvests are still considered as direct threats. However, since passage of the MMPA, there have been relatively few serious calls for culls of marine mammals in the United States compared to other countries, including Canada (Roman et al., 2013). Review of uncovered Union of Soviet Socialist Republics catch records in the North Pacific Ocean indicate extensive illegal whaling activity between 1948 and 1979, with a harvest totaling 195,783 whales. Of these, only 169,638 were reported by the

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to the International Whaling Commission (Ilyashenko et al., 2013; Ilyashenko et al., 2014; Ilyashenko & Chapham, 2014; Ilyashenko et al., 2015). In July 2019, Japan withdrew from the International Whaling Commission and resumed commercial whaling within its waters (BBC News, 2019; Nishimura, 2019; Victor, 2018). Japan had set an annual quota of more than 600 whales per year while a member of the International Whaling Commission, when whales were taken for "research" purposes, but the current cap for commercial whaling set through 2019 now stands at 227 whales. This includes 52 minke whales, 150 Bryde's whales, and 25 sei whales (Nishimura, 2019). It is possible that some of the whales in Japan waters may be part of the same North Pacific populations that are also present seasonally in the MITT Study Area.

3.4.1.7.7 Vessel Strike

Ship strikes are also a growing issue for most marine mammals, especially for large whales as populations recover from widespread commercial whaling. Some of the largest ports in the world are located to the west of the Study Area, and a substantial portion of the world's commercial vessel traffic from Asia and Japan transits through the Study Area heading south to ports of call along the coast of eastern Australia and to New Zealand, in addition to goods shipped into the Mariana Islands.

Since 1995, the U.S. Navy and U.S. Coast Guard have reported all known or suspected vessel collisions with whales to NMFS. There are no known collisions between Navy vessels and whales in the MITT Study Area associated with any of the proposed training or testing activities. The assumed under-reporting of whale collisions by vessels other than U.S. Navy or U.S. Coast Guard makes any comparison of data involving vessel strikes between Navy vessels and other vessels heavily biased. This under-reporting is recognized by NMFS; for example, in the Technical Memorandum providing the analysis of the impacts from vessel collisions with whales in Hawaii (Bradford & Lyman, 2015), NMFS takes into account unreported vessel strikes by civilian vessels.

3.4.1.7.8 Disease and Parasites

As with humans, marine mammals, especially the young, old, and weak, are susceptible to disease. For example, the first case of morbillivirus (a virus related to measles in humans) in the central Pacific was documented for a stranded juvenile male Longman's beaked whale discovered in 2010 in Hawaii (West et al., 2012; West et al., 2015) and subsequently in 2011 *brucella* (a bacterial pathogen) and *morbillivirus* were discovered in a sperm whale that stranded on Oahu (West et al., 2015); both these species are present in the Study Area. Occasionally disease epidemics can also injure or kill a large percentage of a marine mammal population (Keck et al., 2010; Paniz-Mondolfi & Sander-Hoffmann, 2009; Simeone et al., 2015). Recent review of odontocetes stranded along the California coast from 2000 to 2015 found evidence for morbilliviral infection in 9 of the 212 animals examined, therefore indicating this disease may be a contributor to mortality in cetaceans stranding along the California coast (Serrano et al., 2017).

Mass die-offs of some marine mammal species have been linked to toxic algal blooms, which occur as larger organisms consume multiple prey containing those toxins and thereby accumulating fatal doses. A comprehensive study that sampled over 900 marine mammals across 13 species, including several mysticetes, odontocetes, pinnipeds, and mustelids in Alaska, found detectable concentrations of domoic acid in all 13 species and saxitoxin, a toxin absorbed from ingesting dinoflagellates, in 10 of the 13 species (Lefebvre et al., 2016). Algal toxins may have contributed to the stranding and mortality of 30 whales found around the islands in the western Gulf of Alaska and the southern shoreline of the Alaska Peninsula starting in May 2015 (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2016; Rosen, 2015; Savage et al., 2017; Summers, 2017). These findings from studies in Alaska are relevant to the

Study Area given that the fin and humpback whales from the Mariana Islands migrate to Alaska waters in the summer to feed.

Additionally, all marine mammals have parasites that, under normal circumstances, probably do little overall harm, but under certain conditions, can cause serious health problems or even death (Bull et al., 2006; Fauquier et al., 2009; Jepson et al., 2005). Parasitic toxoplasmosis from feral cats (introduced into the ocean from urban runoff) has been found in two stranded spinner dolphins and eight monk seals in Hawaii (Rogers, 2016; West, 2018). In 2011, a Cuvier's beaked whale stranded at Saipan, when necropsied, it was found to have abnormalities and a level of parasitism that resulted in "the worst example of kidneys" the stranding coordinator said he had ever seen (Saipan Tribune, 2011).

3.4.1.7.9 Climate Change

The global climate is warming and is having impacts on some populations of marine mammals (National Marine Fisheries Service, 2015e; National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2018b; Salvadeo et al., 2010; Shirasago-Germán et al., 2015; Simmonds & Eliott, 2009). Climate change can affect marine mammal species directly by causing them to shift their distribution to match physiological tolerance under changing environmental conditions (Doney et al., 2012; Silber et al., 2017), which may or may not result in net habitat loss (some can experience habitat gains). Climate change can also affect marine mammals indirectly via impacts on prey, changes in prey distributions and locations, and changes in water temperature (Giorli & Au, 2017). Sanford et al. (2019) have noted that severe marine heatwaves in California in 2014–2016 triggered marine mammal mortality events, harmful algal blooms, and declines in subtidal kelp beds. Changes in prey can impact marine mammal foraging success, which in turn affects reproductive success and survival. Researchers in July 2016 shifted the location of blue, fin, and humpback whale satellite tagging efforts from Southern California to Central California, following sightings of thin and apparently unwell whales. The whales' conditions were thought to be the result of a change in the distribution of their prey away from traditional foraging areas. (Oregon State University, 2017) In Central California waters, the researchers identified good numbers of blue, fin, and humpback whales in better condition and indicative of a good feeding area that was likely to be sustained that season (Oregon State University, 2017).

Harmful algal blooms may become more prevalent in warmer ocean waters with increased salinity levels such that blooms will begin earlier, last longer, and cover a larger geographical range (Edwards, 2013; Moore, 2008). Warming ocean waters have been linked to the spread of harmful algal blooms into the North Pacific where waters had previously been too cold for most of these algae to thrive. Most of the mysticetes found in the Study Area spend part of the year in the North Pacific. The spread of the algae and associated blooms has led to disease in marine mammals in locations where algae-caused diseases had not been previously known (Lefebvre et al., 2016).

Climate change may indirectly influence marine mammals through changes in human behavior, such as increased shipping and oil and gas extraction, which benefit from sea ice loss (Alter et al., 2010). Ultimately impacts from global climate change may result in an intensification of current and on-going threats to marine mammals (Edwards, 2013).

Marine mammals are influenced by climate-related phenomena, such as typhoons and shifts in extreme weather patterns such as the 2015–2016 El Niño in the ocean off the U.S. West Coast. Generally, not much is known about how large storms and other weather patterns affect marine mammals, other than that mass strandings (when two or more marine mammals become beached or stuck in shallow water) sometimes coincide with hurricanes, typhoons, and other tropical storms (Bradshaw et al., 2006; Marsh,

1989; Rosel & Watts, 2008; Zellar et al., 2017), or other oceanographic conditions. Indirect impacts of climate change may include altered water chemistry in estuaries (low dissolved oxygen or increased nutrient loading) causing massive fish kills (Burkholder et al., 2004), which changes prey distribution and availability for cetaceans (Stevens et al., 2006). Human responses to extreme weather events may indirectly affect behavior and reproductive rates of marine mammals. For example, Miller et al. (2010) reported an increase in reproductive rates in bottlenose dolphins after Hurricane Katrina in the Mississippi Sound, presumably resulting from an increase in fish abundance due to a reduction in fisheries landings, a decrease in recreational and commercial boat activities (National Marine Fisheries Service, 2007b), and an increase in the number of reproductively active females available during the breeding seasons following the storm. Smith et al. (2013a) supplemented the findings from this study and documented a marked increase in foraging activity in newly identified foraging areas that were observed during the two-year study period after the storm.

Habitat deterioration and loss is a major factor for almost all coastal and inshore species of marine mammals and may include such factors as depleting a habitat's prey base and the complete loss of habitat (Ayres et al., 2012; Kemp, 1996; Pine et al., 2016; Rolland et al., 2012; Smith et al., 2009; Veirs et al., 2015; Williams et al., 2014a). Many researchers predict that if oceanic temperatures continue to rise with an associated effect on marine habitat and prey availability, then either changes in foraging or life history strategies, including poleward shifts in many marine mammal species distributions, should be anticipated (Alter et al., 2010; Fleming et al., 2016; Ramp et al., 2015; Salvadeo et al., 2015; Sydeman & Allen, 1999). Poloczanska et al. (2016) analyzed climate change impact data that integrates multiple climate-influenced changes in ocean conditions (e.g., temperature, acidification, dissolved oxygen, and rainfall) to assess anticipated changes to a number of key ocean fauna across representative areas. Their results predict a northward expansion in the distribution of zooplankton, fish, and squid, all of which are prey for many marine mammal species. There remains scientific uncertainty about how or if such climate changes will affect marine mammals and their prey. However, acidification of the ocean could also potentially impact the mobility, growth, and reproduction of calcium carbonate-forming organisms such as crustaceans and plankton, which are the direct prey of some marine mammals, are an important part of the overall food chain in the ocean, and slightly alter the propagation of sound underwater (Lynch et al., 2018; Meyers et al., 2019; Rossi et al., 2016).

3.4.1.7.10 Marine Debris

The majority of marine debris in the ocean comes from land-based sources (Jambeck et al., 2015; Thiel et al., 2018). Without improved waste management and infrastructure in undeveloped coastal countries worldwide, the cumulative quantity of plastic waste available to enter the ocean from land is predicted to increase by an order of magnitude by 2025 (Jambeck et al., 2015). Marine debris is a global threat to marine mammals (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Marine Debris Program, 2014b; Puig-Lozano et al., 2018). A literature review by Baulch and Perry (2014) found that 56 percent of cetacean species are documented as having ingested marine debris and that it can be a significant source of injury and mortality. A Cuvier's beaked whale that stranded at Saipan in 2011 was found to have an approximate 1-inch-diameter circular piece of plastic in its stomach (Saipan Tribune, 2011), and a Cuvier's stranding discovered at Mindanao in the Philippines in spring of 2019 found that individual had 88 pounds of plastic marine debris in its stomach (Paul, 2019). In other cases, attributing cause of death to marine debris ingestion is often difficult (Laist, 1997), but ingestion of plastic bags and Styrofoam has been identified as the cause of injury or death of minke whales (De Pierrepont et al., 2005) and deep-diving odontocetes, including beaked whales (Baulch & Perry, 2014; Paul, 2019), pygmy

sperm whales (Sadove & Morreale, 1989; Stamper et al., 2006; Tarpley & Marwitz, 1993), and sperm whales (Jacobsen et al., 2010; Sadove & Morreale, 1989; Unger et al., 2016).

Without improved waste management and infrastructure in undeveloped coastal countries worldwide, the cumulative quantity of plastic waste available to enter the ocean from land is predicted to increase by an order of magnitude by 2025 (Jambeck et al., 2015). There have been no marine debris surveys in the Mariana Islands, so information from the Hawaiian Islands may be relevant. Since 1996, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration has removed 848 metric tons of derelict fishing nets and debris from the Northwest Hawaiian Islands and has estimated that an additional 52 tons of debris collects on the shallow coral reefs and shores there every year (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2018d). From April 2013 to April 2016 in the waters around Lanai and channels between Lanai, Maui, and Kahoolawe, surveys were conducted to quantify the presence of marine mammals and floating marine debris (Currie et al., 2017). The surveys encountered, collected, and categorized 1,027 pieces of marine debris. Items categorized as "plastic" were the predominant type of debris encountered, accounting for 86 percent of total debris and consisting mainly of plastic bottles, tubs, baskets, foamed polystyrene disposable plates, cups, fragments, plastic bags, and other soft plastic films. A smaller portion of the plastic debris (13 percent; 11 percent of the total debris) was fishing-related and included items such as buoys, netting, rope, and fishing lines; milled lumber and rubber accounted for 10 percent of debris, with the remaining 4 percent attributed to metal, glass, and clothing/fabric. Similar findings have been documented for other locations in the Pacific region (Choy & Drazen, 2013; Horton et al., 2017; Smith, 2012).

Although there are no similar records for the Study Area, for some of the same cetacean species in Hawaii between 2007 and 2012, there were 48 humpback whales, a sperm whale, a bottlenose dolphin, 3 spinner dolphins, and a pantropical spotted dolphin found entangled in marine debris (Bradford & Lyman, 2015). One humpback whale was known to be injured, and it is believed that interaction with debris led to the mortality of a second humpback whale and a spinner dolphin (Bradford & Lyman, 2015). Marine mammals migrating from the Mariana Islands to Alaska also encounter threats outside the Study Area. In Alaska from 2011 through 2015, records of approximately 3,700 human-marine mammal interactions were reviewed by NMFS and determined to have resulted in 440 entanglement/ entrapment-related marine mammal serious injury or mortality to various species (Helker et al., 2017).

An estimated 75 percent or more of marine debris consists of plastic (Derraik, 2002; Hardesty & Wilcox, 2017). High concentrations of floating plastic have been reported in the central and western Pacific Ocean (Cozar et al., 2014; Gibbs et al., 2019; Mu et al., 2019). Plastic pollution found in the oceans is primarily dominated by particles smaller than 1 centimeter, commonly referred to as microplastics (Hidalgo-Ruz et al., 2012). Other researchers have defined microplastics as particles with a diameter ranging from a few micrometers up to 5 millimeters (mm) that are not readily visible to the naked eye (Andrady, 2015). Microplastic fragments and fibers found throughout the oceans result from the breakdown of larger items, such as clothing, packaging, and rope and have accumulated in the pelagic zone and sedimentary habitats (Gibbs et al., 2019; Thompson et al., 2004). Results from the investigation by Browne et al. (2011) have also suggested that microplastic fibers are discharged in sewage effluent resulting from the washing of synthetic fiber clothes. DeForges et al. (2014) sampled the Northeast Pacific Ocean in areas in and near the coastal waters of British Columbia, Canada, and found microplastics (those 62–5,000 micrometers in size) were abundant in all samples with elevated concentrations near urban centers. This finding and those from other similar studies (Mu et al., 2019) should be applicable to all urban centers in the Pacific, including those in the Study Area. Besseling et al.

(2015) documented the first occurrence of microplastics in the intestines of a humpback whale; while the primary cause of the stranding was not determined, the researchers found multiple types of microplastics ranging in sizes from 1 mm to 17 centimeters. There is still a large knowledge gap about possible negative effects of microplastics, but it remains a concern (Besseling et al., 2015). Specifically, the propensity of plastics to absorb and concentrate dissolved pollutant chemicals, such as persistent organic pollutants, is a concern because microfauna may be able to digest plastic nanoparticles, facilitating the delivery of dissolved pollutant chemicals across trophic levels and making them bioavailable to larger marine organisms, such as marine mammals (Andrady, 2015; Burkhardt-Holm & N'Guyen, 2019; Carlos de Sá et al., 2018; Gallo et al., 2018; Nelms et al., 2018).

Marine mammals as a whole are subject to the various influences and factors delineated in this section above. If specific threats to individual species in the Study Area are known, those threats are described below in individual species accounts.

Mysticetes

3.4.1.8 Blue Whale (*Balaenoptera musculus*)

3.4.1.8.1 Status and Management

The blue whale is listed as endangered under the ESA and as depleted under the MMPA throughout its range, but there is no designated critical habitat for this species. NMFS has determined that more research is still needed to rigorously and specifically define the features that make habitat important to blue whales (National Marine Fisheries Service, 2018b). Although the designated Central North Pacific Stock of blue whales are present in winter in "lower latitudes in the western and central Pacific, including Hawaii," blue whales in the Study Area have not been assigned to a stock in either the Alaska or Pacific SARs (Carretta et al., 2019c; Muto et al., 2019).

3.4.1.8.2 Geographic Range and Distribution

Blue whales inhabit all oceans and typically occur in both nearshore and deep oceanic waters. Blue whales belonging to the Central Pacific Stock feed in summer in the Pacific south of the Aleutian Islands and in the Gulf of Alaska, and then migrate to lower latitudes in the winter. There are no recent sighting records for blue whales in the Study Area (Fulling et al., 2011; Hill et al., 2017a; Hill et al., 2018c; Hill et al., 2019; Uyeyama, 2014). Although rare, acoustic detections from passive monitoring devices deployed at Saipan and Tinian have recorded the presence of blue whales over short periods of time (a few days) (Oleson et al., 2015). However, since blue whale calls can travel up to 621 miles (mi.) (1,000 kilometers [km]), it is unknown whether the animals were actually within the Study Area. Blue whales would be most likely to occur in the Study Area during the winter and are expected to be few in number.

3.4.1.8.3 Population and Abundance

Widespread whaling over the last century was believed to have decreased the global blue whale population to approximately 1 percent of its pre-whaling population size (Branch, 2007; Monnahan, 2013; Monnahan et al., 2014; Rocha et al., 2014; Širović et al., 2004). The most current information suggests that following the cessation of commercial whaling in 1971, the population in the North Pacific may have recovered and since the 1990s has been at a stable level despite the impacts of ship strikes, interactions with fishing gear, and increased levels of ambient sound in the Pacific Ocean (Campbell et al., 2015; Carretta et al., 2017c; Carretta et al., 2018a; International Whaling Commission, 2016; Monnahan, 2013; Monnahan et al., 2014; Monnahan et al., 2015; National Marine Fisheries Service, 2018b; Rockwood et al., 2017; Širović et al., 2015; Valdivia et al., 2019). For the portion of the

population present in the eastern Pacific, findings have suggested that the population is now near the environment's carrying capacity and that the rate of change of the population size has declined as a result (Carretta et al., 2018a; International Whaling Commission, 2016; Monnahan et al., 2014; Monnahan et al., 2015).

3.4.1.8.4 Predator-Prey Interactions

Blue whales feed almost exclusively on various types of zooplankton, especially krill (Jefferson et al., 2015); however, it has recently been shown that blue whales can locate and feed on dense swarms of other larger prey when present (De Vos et al., 2018). Blue whales with data recording tags have been recorded feeding from the surface to depths approaching 300 m (Goldbogen et al., 2013a; Goldbogen et al., 2013b).

Blue whales have been documented to be preyed on by killer whales, and 25 percent of photo-identified whales in the Gulf of California carry rake scars from killer whale attacks (Jefferson et al., 2015; Pitman et al., 2007; Sears & Perrin, 2009).

3.4.1.8.5 Species-Specific Threats

Blue whales are susceptible to entanglement in fishing gear and ship strikes (Berman-Kowalewski et al., 2010; Calambokidis et al., 2009a; Calambokidis, 2012; Carretta et al., 2013; Carretta et al., 2016b; Carretta et al., 2019c; Laggner, 2009; Monnahan et al., 2015; National Marine Fisheries Service, 2011d; Rockwood et al., 2017).

3.4.1.9 Bryde's Whale (*Balaenoptera edeni*)

3.4.1.9.1 Status and Management

Bryde's whales are not listed as endangered under the ESA. There is currently no biological basis for defining separate stocks of Bryde's whales in the western or central North Pacific. (Carretta et al., 2017c; Carretta et al., 2017d; Carretta et al., 2019c; Constantine et al., 2018). NMFS recognizes two stocks of Bryde's whales in the Pacific with one for Hawaiian waters and the other for the Gulf of California and waters off California (Carretta et al., 2017c; Carretta et al., 2017d; Carretta et al., 2019c); none of the ranges described for these stocks include the Study Area.

3.4.1.9.2 Geographic Range and Distribution

Data suggest that winter and summer grounds partially overlap in the central North Pacific (Murase et al., 2015). Bryde's whales are distributed in the central North Pacific in summer; the southernmost summer distribution of Bryde's whales inhabiting the central North Pacific is about 20° N (Kishiro, 1996). Some whales remain in higher latitudes (around 25° N) in both winter and summer, but are not likely to move poleward of 40° N (Jefferson et al., 2015; Kishiro, 1996). Bryde's whales are expected to be present in the Study Area based on sighting records (Fulling et al., 2011; Hill et al., 2017a; Mobley, 2007; Oleson & Hill, 2010b; Uyeyama, 2014). Bryde's whales were detected in the Transit Corridor between the Study Area and Hawaii during a NMFS survey in January 2010 (Oleson & Hill, 2010b) and regularly encountered during the 2007 survey of the MITT Study Area[2] (Fulling et al., 2011). Bryde's whales were

[2] The Mariana Islands Sea Turtle and Cetacean Survey (MISTCS) undertaken in 2007 covered an area of approximately 301,300 square kilometers within the larger MITT Study Area, which encompasses approximately

encountered during a NMFS cetacean survey in May–June 2015 off Pagan, Alamagan, and south of Guam (Hill et al., 2018d; Oleson, 2017), and later that same year off Rota during a small boat survey in August–September 2015 (Hill et al., 2017a). In May 2017 a single individual was encountered in deep water off the west side of Saipan (Hill et al., 2018b); none were detected in the 2018 small boat surveys (Hill et al., 2018c; Hill et al., 2019).

3.4.1.9.3 Population and Abundance

Based on the best available science, there are an estimated 233 (Coefficient of Variation [CV] = 0.45) Bryde's whales present in the Study Area (Fulling et al., 2011).

3.4.1.9.4 Predator-Prey Interactions

Bryde's whales primarily feed on schooling fish and are lunge feeders. Prey includes anchovy, sardine, mackerel, herring, krill, and other invertebrates, such as pelagic red crab (Baker & Madon, 2007; Nemoto & Kawamura, 1977). Bryde's whales have been observed using "bubble nets" to herd prey (Kato & Perrin, 2009). Bubble nets are used in a feeding strategy where the whales dive and release bubbles of air that float up in a column and trap prey inside where whales lunge through the column to feed.

Bryde's whale is known to be prey for killer whales, as evidenced by an aerial observation of 15 killer whales attacking a Bryde's whale in the Gulf of California (Weller, 2009).

3.4.1.9.5 Species-Specific Threats

As discussed in Section 3.4.1.7.3 (Bycatch), entanglement risk includes fishing activities out of Japan and South Korea, with the threat of mortality from any such interaction being high given the incentive created by the commercial sale of whale meat/products allowed under Japanese and South Korean law (Baker et al., 2006a; Bettridge et al., 2015; Lukoschek et al., 2009). In nine market samples from South Korea between 2003 and 2005, molecular (DNA) evidence indicated that four products contained Bryde's whale meat (Baker et al., 2006a). There has been one recorded stranding of a Bryde's whale (at Tinian in 2005) within the Study Area (Trianni & Tenorio, 2012).

3.4.1.10 Fin Whale (*Balaenoptera physalus*)

3.4.1.10.1 Status and Management

Fin whales are listed as endangered under the ESA, but there is no designated critical habitat for this species. The stock structure of fin whales remains uncertain (Mizroch et al., 2009), and fin whales in the Study Area have not been assigned to a stock in the current SARs (Carretta et al., 2019c; Muto et al., 2019). NMFS recognizes three stocks of fin whales in the North Pacific (Carretta et al., 2019c; Muto et al., 2019), and none of the ranges described for these stocks include the Study Area.

3.4.1.10.2 Geographic Range and Distribution

Fin whales prefer temperate and polar waters; they are rarely seen in warm, tropical waters and are not expected south of 20°N latitude (Miyashita et al., 1996; Reeves et al., 2002). There are no sighting records for fin whales in the Study Area (Fulling et al., 2011; Hill et al., 2017a; Hill et al., 2018c; Hill et al.,

1,300,000 square kilometers; see Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) for more details with regard to the extent of the MITT Study Area. The MISTCS abundance estimates from the 2007 survey as reported in Fulling et al. (2011) and cited throughout this section, thus represent the number of marine mammals estimated to be present in the approximately 24 percent of the MITT Study Area covered by the MISTCS survey.

2019; Oleson et al., 2015; Uyeyama, 2014). Based on acoustic detections, fin whales are expected to be seasonally present in the Study Area although few in number. Acoustic detections from passive monitoring devices deployed at Saipan and Tinian have recorded the presence of fin whales over short (a few days) periods of time (Oleson et al., 2015), and fin whale vocalizations were detected in January 2010 in the Transit Corridor between Hawaii and Guam (Oleson & Hill, 2010b). Fin whales were not, however, detected in the Transit Corridor using the same equipment and methods in May of that year (Oleson & Hill, 2010b).

3.4.1.10.3 Population and Abundance

There is no current abundance estimate available for fin whales in the Study Area (Carretta et al., 2019c; Muto et al., 2019).There were approximately 50,000 reported fin whales killed during commercial whaling in the North Pacific from 1911 to 1985 (C. Allison, pers. comm. as provided in Mizroch et al. (2009), and it is assumed the population is still recovering.

3.4.1.10.4 Predator-Prey Interactions

Fin whale prey vary by region and may include krill, small invertebrates such as copepods, squid, and schooling fish such as capelin, herring, pollock, and mackerel (Goldbogen et al., 2006; Jefferson et al., 2015; Mizroch et al., 2009).

The fin whale is not known to have a significant number of predators. However, in regions where killer whales are abundant, some fin whales exhibit attack scars on their flippers, flukes, and flanks, suggesting possible predation by killer whales (Aguilar de Soto et al., 2008).

3.4.1.10.5 Species-Specific Threats

Fin whales are susceptible to entanglement in fishing gear (Carretta et al., 2013; Carretta et al., 2016b; Carretta et al., 2017a; Helker et al., 2015; National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2019). Given this and as discussed in Section 3.4.1.7.3 (Bycatch) for other species, entanglement risk includes fishing activities out of Japan and South Korea.

3.4.1.11 Humpback Whale (*Megaptera novaeangliae*)

3.4.1.11.1 Status and Management

Humpback whales in the Study Area are indirectly addressed in the Alaska SAR given that the historic range of humpbacks in the "Asia wintering area" includes the Mariana Islands. The detected presence of humpbacks in the Mariana Islands (Fulling et al., 2011; Hill et al., 2016a; Hill et al., 2017a; Hill et al., 2018b; Hill et al., 2018c; Hill et al., 2019; Klinck et al., 2016b; Munger et al., 2014; Oleson et al., 2015; Uyeyama, 2014) are consistent with the Study Area as a plausible migratory destination for humpback whales from Alaska (Muto et al., 2017; Muto et al., 2018; Muto et al., 2019).

Effective as of October 11, 2016, NMFS changed the status of all humpback whales from an endangered species to a specific status for each of 14 newly identified distinct population segments (DPS) (81 FR 62259). For the Study Area, the Navy believes it is likely that humpback whales in the Mariana Islands are part of the endangered Western North Pacific DPS based on the available science (Bettridge et al., 2015; Calambokidis et al., 2008; Calambokidis et al., 2010; Carretta et al., 2017c; Carretta et al., 2017d; Hill et al., 2017b; Hill et al., 2018c; Hill et al., 2019; Hill et al., 2020; Muto et al., 2017; Muto et al., 2018; Muto et al., 2019; National Marine Fisheries Service, 2016b; National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2015a, 2018c; Wade et al., 2016). Humpback whales from the winter range of the Western North Pacific DPS (including the Study Area) that feed in the summer off Russia and Alaska have

been designated by NMFS as the Western North Pacific Stock (Muto et al., 2019). As part of the Western North Pacific Stock, the population is considered depleted under the MMPA (Muto et al., 2017; Muto et al., 2018; Muto et al., 2019).

There has been no critical habitat designated for the Western North Pacific Distinct Population Segment.

3.4.1.11.2 Geographic Range and Distribution

Between 1948 and 1979, Soviet Union commercial whaling alone took 7,344 humpback whales from the North Pacific (Ilyashenko & Chapham, 2014). It is therefore likely that humpback whales in the western North Pacific are still recovering and will remain rare in parts of their former range. Researchers have concluded that humpback whales use the Mariana Islands as a winter breeding and calving area (Hill et al., 2016a; Hill et al., 2018c; Hill et al., 2019; Hill et al., 2020; National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2018c).

For purposes of the analysis presented in this SEIS/OEIS, the Navy assumes humpback whales in the Study Area are part of the endangered Western North Pacific DPS.[3] This population segment is based on a known breeding group of individuals found off Okinawa and Ogasawara Islands (approximately 1,230 nautical miles [NM] north of Guam) in Japan waters and in Philippine waters (approximately 1,350 NM west of Guam), as identified by photographic identification of individuals (Calambokidis et al., 2008; Calambokidis et al., 2010), in addition to an "unknown breeding group" from a location in the western North Pacific that remained unidentified until recently (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2018c). Humpback whales found off Okinawa, Ogasawara, the Philippines, and the unknown area were combined to form the Western North Pacific population (Bettridge et al., 2015). This "unknown area" corresponds to the historical range for the western North Pacific that included waters extending from the South China Sea east through the Philippines, the Ryukyu Islands, Mariana Islands, and Marshall Islands and from there, north to the Arctic (Muto et al., 2017; Muto et al., 2018; Muto et al., 2019; Rice, 1998). Photographic data collected during Navy-funded small boat surveys has provided matches to individuals identified many years previously off the Ogasawara Islands and the Western North Pacific DPS (Hill et al., 2017a; Hill et al., 2017b; Hill et al., 2018b; Hill et al., 2018c; Hill et al., 2019). Completed analyses of genetic samples to date have found humpback whale in the Mariana Islands share four haplotypes[4] common in humpback whales throughout the North Pacific and two haplotypes that are more common in Western North Pacific DPS whales, but which are also present in humpback whales throughout the North Pacific (Hill et al., 2018c; Hill et al., 2020). Findings from analysis of additional biopsy samples from humpback whales in the Mariana Islands have not yet been published, although DNA analyses are underway, and additional data will be necessary before there can be any

[3] There is reference to a "Second West Pacific DPS" in the latest NMFS humpback whale status report (Bettridge et al., 2015), although that terminology did not carry over into the rule-making establishing the 14 distinct population segments. As a result, although the humpback whales in the Study Area may exactly fit the parameters of the intended "Second West Pacific DPS," in this SEIS/OEIS the Navy has assumed that humpback whales in the Study Area are part of the Western North Pacific Distinct Population Segment consistent with the determinations presented in 81 FR 62259, the range for the Western North Pacific Stock as presented in the Alaska Stock Assessment Report (Muto et al., 2019), and the findings based on a series of small boat surveys in the Mariana Islands (National Marine Fisheries Service, 2018c).

[4] A haplotype is a combination of alleles or polymorphisms found at multiple locations on the same chromosome, that tend to be inherited together. The degree of relatedness can be predicted based on the number of haplotypes shared between individuals.

definitive connection made between humpback whales in the Mariana Islands based on genetic data (Hill et al., 2018c).

Navy aerial monitoring surveys occurring at FDM conducted monthly from 1997 to 2009 and irregularly thereafter documented the occasional presence of humpback whales, including mother-calf pairs and other adult individuals (Uyeyama, 2014). Shipboard survey in the MITT Study Area in February 2007 acoustically detected and subsequently sighted an estimated group of eight humpbacks at Marpi Reef north of Saipan (Fulling et al., 2011; Norris et al., 2012a, 2014). Small boat surveys in 2010 and 2014 off Guam, Saipan, Tinian, Aguijan, and Rota did not encounter humpback whales (Hill et al., 2014). The next documented observations of humpback whales in the Mariana Islands occurred from February 26 to March 8, 2015, when four mother/calf pairs and four other individual humpback whales were observed at Chalan Kanoa Reef off Saipan (Hill et al., 2015a; Hill et al., 2016b). During the subsequent NMFS Mariana Archipelago Cetacean Survey (two months later; May 8 to June 6, 2015), survey transects sampling all the Mariana Islands out to 50 NM from shore detected no humpback whales visually or acoustically in the Mariana Islands (Hill et al., 2018d; Hill et al., 2019; Oleson, 2017). Humpback whales were seen again off Saipan during Navy-funded surveys in 2016, 2017, and 2018 (Hill et al., 2017a; Hill et al., 2017b; Hill et al., 2018b; Hill et al., 2019; Hill et al., 2020; National Marine Fisheries Service, 2019; National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2018c); see Appendix I (Geographic Mitigation Assessment) for additional details regarding all humpback whale sightings in the MITT Study Area. These Navy-funded small boat survey investigations have included photo-identification and genetic sampling and have resulted in the documentation of mother-calf pairs, competitive groups, and 43 additional photo-identified non-calf whales that include seven individuals that were photographed in a previous year (Fulling et al., 2011; Hill et al., 2017a; Hill et al., 2017b; Hill et al., 2018b; Hill et al., 2019; Hill et al., 2020; National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2018c; Norris et al., 2012a, 2014). The presence of newborn calves and competitive groups documented during the aforementioned small boat surveys confirm the Mariana Islands are serving as a breeding location for Western North Pacific DPS humpback whales (Hill et al., 2019; Hill et al., 2020; National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2018c). Investigations in Hawaii over consecutive breeding seasons between 1997 through 2008 in the Maui Basin found a preference by individual mother-calf pairs for both water depth and sea-bed terrain type, with the pair moving into deeper water and rougher terrain as a calf matured (Pack et al., 2017); this habitat preference by mother-calf pairs may also be present in the Mariana Islands.

Based on a compendium of all detections, humpback whales have been sighted in the Study Area in the months of January through March (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2005; Uyeyama, 2014), male humpback songs have been recorded from December through April, and humpback whale sounds were infrequently detected at Tinian during June to October (Hill et al., 2017a; Hill et al., 2019; Klinck et al., 2016b; Munger et al., 2014; Norris et al., 2014; Oleson et al., 2015). Humpback whales were not observed or acoustically detected in the Transit Corridor during a May 2010 survey (Oleson & Hill, 2010b), which is consistent with the presumption that, except when migrating to or from summer feeding areas, humpback whales will most likely be present in relative shallow water locations in the vicinity of the Mariana Islands.

Humpback whales from the Western North Pacific, Hawaii, and Mexico DPSs overlap to some extent on feeding grounds off Alaska (Bettridge et al., 2015; Muto et al., 2017; Muto et al., 2018; Muto et al., 2019; National Marine Fisheries Service, 2016d; Titova et al., 2017; Wade et al., 2016). Photographic identification data have also documented the presence of at least one whale seen multiple years off Ogasawara (Japan) later seen feeding off British Columbia (Darling et al., 1996), and studies of

similarities in humpback whale song across the Pacific (Darling et al., 2019) indicate there may be greater overlap of DPSs in the summer feeding areas than has been characterized in the SARs for Alaska and the Pacific (Carretta et al., 2017c; Carretta et al., 2017d; Carretta et al., 2018b; Carretta et al., 2019c; Muto et al., 2017; Muto et al., 2018; Muto et al., 2019). Comparison of photographic identification data from Russian waters (where the Western North Pacific DPS humpback whales may also feed) has found 35 individual whales that were also documented in Hawaii and 11 that were from the Mexican breeding grounds (Titova et al., 2017).

3.4.1.11.3 Population and Abundance

Based on photographic identifications off Okinawa and Ogasawara gathered previously and conclusions reached in 2008 (Calambokidis et al., 2008), the abundance of humpback whales in the Western North Pacific population was estimated to be approximately 1,000 individuals (Bettridge et al., 2015; Muto et al., 2017). From that same data set, the growth rate of the Western North Pacific Distinct Population Segment was estimated to be 6.9 percent (Bettridge et al., 2015; Calambokidis et al., 2008). This can be viewed in context of the North Pacific population, which has been increasing at a rate of between 5.5 percent and 6.0 percent per year, approximately doubling every 10 years (Bettridge et al., 2015; Muto et al., 2017; Wade et al., 2016).The inclusion of more recent data from photographic identifications off Okinawa has documented the presence of at least 1,402 unique individuals in the Western North Pacific Distinct Population Segment (Kobayashi et al., 2016). Additional information from Navy-funded surveys and passive acoustic hydrophone recordings in the Mariana Islands has confirmed the presence of mother-calf pairs, non-calf whales, and singing males in the Study Area (Fulling et al., 2011; Hill et al., 2016a; Hill et al., 2019; Munger et al., 2014; Munger et al., 2015; National Marine Fisheries Service, 2019; National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2018c; Norris et al., 2014; Oleson & Hill, 2010b; Oleson et al., 2015; Uyeyama et al., 2012). The NMFS Alaska SAR provides a population estimate for humpbacks in Ogasawara Islands, Okinawa, and the Philippines of 1,107 animals, with a minimum population of 865, noting that these are likely to be an underestimate of the Western North Pacific Stock's true abundance (Muto et al., 2017; Muto et al., 2018; Muto et al., 2019). Although not specific to the Study Area, the overall abundance of humpback whales in the North Pacific was recently estimated at 21,808 individuals (Carretta et al., 2017c; Carretta et al., 2017d), confirming that this population of humpback whales has continued to increase and is now greater than some pre-whaling abundance estimates (Barlow et al., 2011; Bettridge et al., 2015; Muto et al., 2017; Muto et al., 2018; Wade et al., 2016).

3.4.1.11.4 Predator-Prey Interactions

When on the summer feeding grounds in Alaska, humpback whales from the Study Area feed on a wide variety of invertebrates and small schooling fishes. The most common invertebrate prey are krill (tiny crustaceans); the most common fish prey are herring, mackerel, sand lance, sardines, anchovies, and capelin (Clapham & Mead, 1999). Feeding occurs both at the surface and in deeper waters, wherever prey is abundant. Humpback whales are the only species of baleen whale that show strong evidence of cooperation when they feed in large groups (D'Vincent et al., 1985).

This species is known to be attacked by both killer whales and false killer whales as evidenced by tooth rake scars on their bodies and fins (Jefferson et al., 2015; Steiger et al., 2008).

3.4.1.11.5 Species-Specific Threats

Based on data from Alaska (including the Western North Pacific Stock), Hawaii, and the U.S. Pacific coast (Bradford & Lyman, 2015; Carretta et al., 2019a; Carretta et al., 2016c; Carretta et al., 2017b; Helker et

al., 2019; Helker et al., 2017; National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2019), humpback whales are subject to risk from entanglement in marine debris and active fishing gear; most often recorded is pot/trap fishery gear. As discussed in Section 3.4.1.7.3 (Bycatch), entanglement risk includes fishing activities out of Japan and South Korea, with the threat of mortality from any such interaction being high given the incentive created by the commercial sale of whale meat/products allowed under Japanese and South Korean law (Baker et al., 2006a; Lukoschek et al., 2009). In nine market samples from South Korea between 2003 and 2005, molecular (DNA) evidence indicated that three products contained humpback whale meat (Baker et al., 2006a).

The mean vessel collision mortality and serious injury rate in Alaska is 4.2 humpback whales annually (Muto et al., 2019), but that rate reflects Southeast Alaska waters where the presence of the Western North Pacific Stock is less likely.

3.4.1.12 Minke Whale (*Balaenoptera acutorostrata*)

3.4.1.12.1 Status and Management

Minke whales are not listed as endangered under the ESA. The stock structure for minke whales remains uncertain in the Pacific, and minke whales in the Study Area have not been assigned to a stock in the current SARs (Carretta et al., 2019c; Muto et al., 2019). NMFS recognizes three stocks of minke whales in the North Pacific: (1) the Hawaii Stock, (2) the California/Oregon/Washington Stock, and (3) the Alaska Stock (Carretta et al., 2019c; Muto et al., 2019).

3.4.1.12.2 Geographic Range and Distribution

Surveys employing towed hydrophone arrays and sonobuoys, and long-term monitoring efforts using fixed passive acoustic recording devices, have routinely detected the presence of minke whales in the Study Area (Klinck et al., 2016a; Norris et al., 2017; Oleson & Hill, 2010b; Oleson et al., 2015). Minke whales have not been visually detected in the Study Area during any survey efforts within approximately the last decade although they are the most common acoustically detected mysticete in the area (Fulling et al., 2011; Hill et al., 2011; Hill et al., 2013a; Hill et al., 2014; Hill et al., 2015b; Hill et al., 2017a; Mobley, 2007; Norris et al., 2014; Oleson & Hill, 2010b; Tetra Tech Inc., 2014; Uyeyama, 2014).

3.4.1.12.3 Population and Abundance

No estimates have been made for the number of minke whales in the North Pacific (Carretta et al., 2019c; Muto et al., 2019). Acoustic data collected during a Navy-funded 2007 line-transect survey employing a towed hydrophone array in the Mariana Islands were used to estimate a minimum abundance of calling minke whales (Norris et al., 2017). Abundance was estimated using two different methodologies, resulting in minimum estimates of 80 or 91 animals in the surveyed area (a density of 0.13 and 0.15 animals per 1,000 square kilometers, respectively; CV = 0.34) (Norris et al., 2017). This study provided the first abundance and density estimates for calling minke whales and the first minimum estimates by which the number of minke whales in the Mariana Islands region could be derived.

3.4.1.12.4 Predator-Prey Interactions

Similar to other rorquals, minke whales are lunge feeders, often plunging through patches of shoaling fish or krill (Hoelzel et al., 1989; Jefferson et al., 2008). In the north Pacific, their major prey include small invertebrates, krill, capelin, herring, pollock, haddock, and other small shoaling fish (Jefferson et al., 2008; Kuker et al., 2005; Lindstrom & Haug, 2001). Minke whales are prey for killer whales (Ford & Ellis, 1999; Ford et al., 2005; Weller, 2009).

3.4.1.12.5 Species-Specific Threats

As discussed in Section 3.4.1.7.3 (Bycatch), entanglement risk for the population of minke whales includes fishing activities out of Japan and South Korea, with the threat of mortality from any such interaction being high given the incentive created by the commercial sale of whale meat/products allowed under Japanese and South Korean law (Baker et al., 2006a; Dalebout et al., 2002a; Lukoschek et al., 2009). For example in 2008, the reported bycatch in Japan and South Korea totaled 214 minke whales (Lukoschek et al., 2009). In nine market samples from South Korea between 2003 and 2005, molecular (DNA) evidence indicated that 230 products contained minke whale meat (Baker et al., 2006a). In the two-year period between 2013 and 2014, the total bycatch by South Korean fisheries in the East Sea totaled a reported 48 minke whales (Song, 2017).

3.4.1.13 Omura's Whale (*Balaenoptera omurai*)

3.4.1.13.1 Status and Management

Omura's whale is not listed under the ESA and is not mentioned in the Pacific or Alaska SARs (Carretta et al., 2019c; Muto et al., 2019). There is no managed stock or population within U.S. waters pursuant to the MMPA, but the species is protected under that statute nonetheless, as are all marine mammals.

3.4.1.13.2 Geographic Range and Distribution

The species was first described in 2003 based on eight specimens taken by Japanese research whaling vessels in the Sea of Japan, the Solomon Sea, and the eastern Indian Ocean (Cerchio et al., 2019; Wada et al., 2003). Records of the species from Philippines shore-based whaling provide additional indication of a broad distribution that includes the western Pacific (Cerchio et al., 2015; Cerchio et al., 2019). Given the documented occurrence of the species, it is assumed the species may be present in the Study Area. Recent well-documented sightings have occurred in nearshore waters off Korea, Madagascar, and Sri Lanka, indicating in those cases a preference for relatively shallow water less than approximately 200 m in depth (Cerchio et al., 2015; Cerchio et al., 2019; de Vos, 2017).

3.4.1.13.3 Population and Abundance

There are no data available to estimate abundance for Omura's whale in the Study Area.

3.4.1.13.4 Predator-Prey Interactions

Observations of feeding Omura's whales in waters off Madagascar suggested the animals were skim feeding on zooplankton given there was an absence of fish or other observable prey (Cerchio et al., 2015), which also corresponds to an account of four individuals feeding on krill in waters off Borneo (Cerchio et al., 2019).

3.4.1.13.5 Species-Specific Threats

An individual Omura's whale observed in Sri Lanka waters showed evidence of an entanglement scar on the left side of its upper jaw, indicating that entanglement is a potential threat for this species (Cerchio et al., 2015; Cerchio et al., 2019; de Vos, 2017). One Omura's whale was reported struck by a fishing boat in the Philippines (Obusan et al., 2016), and there is record of one known strike off Japan (Cerchio et al., 2019).

3.4.1.14 Sei Whale (*Balaenoptera borealis*)

3.4.1.14.1 Status and Management

Sei whales are listed as endangered under the ESA, but there is no designated critical habitat for this species. The stock structure for sei whales is uncertain in the Pacific (Carretta et al., 2017c; Carretta et al., 2017d; Carretta et al., 2019c). NMFS recognizes three stocks of sei whales in the North Pacific: (1) the Hawaii Stock, (2) the California/Oregon/Washington Stock, and (3) the Alaska Stock. The western Pacific and waters within the Study Area have not been addressed by NMFS, and sei whales in the Study Area have not been assigned to a stock (Carretta et al., 2019c; Muto et al., 2019).

3.4.1.14.2 Geographic Range and Distribution

In a January–February survey in 1972, a single group of approximately 13 sei whales were sighted during a survey of the Mariana Islands and Ogasawara (Masaki, 1972). In the 2007 survey of the Mariana Islands (Fulling et al., 2011), a total of 16 sei whales were sighted. Sei whale calls documented during the 2007 survey indicated a greater variability in the vocal repertoire of sei whales than documented elsewhere (Norris et al., 2014), which may have contributed to the lack of acoustic detections in the three-year record from 2010 to 2013 (Oleson et al., 2015). Sei whales were also visually detected in the Transit Corridor between the Study Area and Hawaii during a NMFS survey in January 2010 (Oleson & Hill, 2010b).

3.4.1.14.3 Population and Abundance

During a 2007 systematic survey of the Study Area, sei whales were sighted on 16 occasions with a resulting abundance estimate of 166 individuals (CV = 0.49) (Fulling et al., 2011).

3.4.1.14.4 Predator-Prey Interactions

In the North Pacific, sei whales feed on a diversity of prey, including copepods, krill, fish [specifically sardines and anchovies], and cephalopods [squids, cuttlefish, octopuses] (Horwood, 1987; Horwood, 2009; Nemoto & Kawamura, 1977). Feeding occurs primarily around dawn, which appears to be correlated with vertical migrations of prey species (Horwood, 2009). As with other mysticetes, sei whales have been observed lunging and gulping dense concentrations of prey, but more often tend to obtain prey by skimming (Horwood, 2009). Sei whales, like other large baleen whales, are likely subject to occasional attacks by killer whales.

3.4.1.14.5 Species-Specific Threats

Based on the discovery of a sei whale entangled in rope and fishing gear in Hawaii that presumably came from Alaska (Bradford & Lyman, 2015), sei whales may be subject to entanglement from fishery activity taking place in the western Pacific, including the Study Area. Based on the statistics of other large whales along the U.S. Pacific coast and Alaska (Carretta et al., 2019a; Helker et al., 2019), it is likely that ship strikes also pose a threat to sei whales in the Study Area from commercial vessels transiting that area.

Odontocetes

3.4.1.15 Blainville's Beaked Whale (*Mesoplodon densirostris*)

3.4.1.15.1 Status and Management

Blainville's beaked whale is not listed under the ESA. The stock structure for Blainville's beaked whales remains uncertain in the western Pacific, and Blainville's beaked whales in the Study Area have not been

assigned to a stock in the current SAR (Carretta et al., 2019c). NMFS recognizes a single stock of Blainville's beaked whales in the Pacific in Hawaiian waters (Carretta et al., 2019c).

3.4.1.15.2 Geographic Range and Distribution

Blainville's beaked whales are one of the most widely distributed of the toothed whales within the *Mesoplodon* genus, occurring in temperate and tropical deep waters areas in all oceans (Jefferson et al., 2015; MacLeod, 2000; MacLeod & Mitchell, 2006). In Hawaii, some populations have been documented to be long-term residents to particular areas (Baird et al., 2009b; Baird, 2011; Baird et al., 2015; McSweeney et al., 2007). There were two *Mesoplodon* whale sightings during the 2007 survey of the Study Area, over the West Mariana Ridge, but they were not identified to the species level (Fulling et al., 2011). During the 2015 NMFS survey of the Mariana Islands, two groups of Blainville's beaked whales were identified and photographed in addition to seven other beaked whale sightings identified only as *Mesoplodon* beaked whales (Hill et al., 2018d; Oleson, 2017). During Navy-funded 2010–2018 small boat surveys in the Mariana Islands, five *Mesoplodon* beaked whales were encountered on two occasions in a median depth of approximately 1,140 m and median approximate distance from shore of 15 km (Hill et al., 2013a; Hill et al., 2017a; Hill et al., 2018c; Hill et al., 2018d; Hill et al., 2019). It could not be determined if these were Blainville's beaked whales or ginkgo-toothed beaked whales, both of which belong to the genus *Mesoplodon* and are believed to be present in the Study Area. Acoustic monitoring has indicated that Blainville's beaked whales occur regularly and year-round in the Study Area (Klinck et al., 2016a; Oleson et al., 2015; Tetra Tech Inc., 2014). Although there is no record of similar occurrences in the Mariana Islands, it has been suggested that the Philippines are a stranding "hot spot" for Blainville's beaked whales in Asia (Bachara & Blatchley, 2018).

3.4.1.15.3 Population and Abundance

There are no abundance estimates for Blainville's beaked whales in the Study Area.

3.4.1.15.4 Predator-Prey Interactions

All beaked whales probably feed at or close to the bottom in deep oceanic waters, taking suitable prey opportunistically or as locally abundant, typically by suction feeding (Heyning & Mead, 1996; Jefferson et al., 2015; Werth, 2006a, 2006b). Feeding may also occur at mid-water as shown by tagging data from Blainville's beaked whales (Baird et al., 2005; Baird et al., 2006c). Blainville's beaked whales are known to echolocate in groups when they are on foraging dives, which makes them more easily detectable by passive acoustic means (Moretti & Baird, 2015). *Mesoplodon* beaked whales have been observed being actively preyed upon by killer whales (Wellard et al., 2016).

3.4.1.15.5 Species-Specific Threats

There were five observed interactions between an unidentified beaked whale, unidentified Mesoplodont beaked whale, or Blainville's beaked whale and longline fishing activities in Hawaiian waters between 2010 and 2014 (Bradford & Forney, 2016, 2017). As similar information for U.S. fishing vessels or foreign fishing vessels in the Study Area is unavailable, this data from Hawaii provides information regarding the species interactions with fishing activities in general. As discussed in Section 3.4.1.7.3 (Bycatch), entanglement risk includes fishing activities out of Japan and South Korea, with the threat of mortality from any such interaction being high given the incentive created by the commercial sale of whale meat/products allowed under Japanese and South Korean law (Baker et al., 2006a; Lukoschek et al., 2009). In nine market samples from South Korea between 2003 and 2005, molecular (DNA) evidence indicated at least one product contained Blainville's beaked whale meat (Baker et al., 2006a).

3.4.1.16 Common Bottlenose Dolphin (*Tursiops truncatus*)

3.4.1.16.1 Status and Management

Bottlenose dolphin is not listed under the ESA. The stock structure for bottlenose dolphin remains uncertain in the western Pacific and the Mariana Islands (Martien et al., 2014b), and bottlenose dolphins in the Study Area have not been assigned to a stock in the current Pacific SAR (Carretta et al., 2019c). Other than small and resident Main Hawaiian island-associated populations of bottlenose dolphins, NMFS recognizes a single pelagic stock of bottlenose dolphin in the Pacific in Hawaiian waters (Carretta et al., 2019c).

3.4.1.16.2 Geographic Range and Distribution

Multiple fishery interactions with bottlenose dolphins in the western North Pacific (Miyashita, 1993b) indicated their presence beginning approximately 400 NM north of the Study Area. It is possible that bottlenose dolphins do not occur in great numbers in the Mariana Island chain, but they have been frequently sighted, although in small numbers. In the main Hawaiian Islands, data suggest that bottlenose dolphins exhibit site fidelity (Baird et al., 2009a; Baird et al., 2013c; Martien et al., 2012). Gannier (2002) noted that large densities of bottlenose dolphins do not occur at the Marquesas Islands and attributed this to the area's lack of a significant shelf component, which would be similar to the MITT Study Area.

Common bottlenose dolphins are generally found in coastal and continental shelf waters of tropical and temperate regions of the world and are known to occur in small enclosed bays or harbors (Martien et al., 2012; Rossman et al., 2015; Wells & Scott, 2009), but they have not been detected in any such enclosed water in the Study Area (such as Apra Harbor). During the 2007 survey of the Mariana Islands, there were three sightings of bottlenose dolphins to the east of Saipan in deep waters near the Mariana Trench (Fulling et al., 2011). Bottlenose dolphins were not detected during the 2010 survey of the Mariana Islands and the Transit Corridor (Oleson & Hill, 2010b), but were detected on three occasions during the 2015 NMFS cetacean survey of the Mariana Islands (Hill et al., 2018d; Oleson, 2017). In total during Navy-funded 2010–2018 small boat surveys in the Mariana Islands, bottlenose dolphins were encountered on 38 occasions in a median depth of approximately 122 m and median approximate distance from shore of 5 km (Hill et al., 2017a; Hill et al., 2018b; Hill et al., 2018c; Hill et al., 2018d; Hill et al., 2019). On multiple occasions, encounters with bottlenose dolphins in the Mariana Islands have involved a mixed-species aggregation with one other species that have included short-finned pilot whales, pantropical spotted dolphins, false killer whales, spinner dolphins, or rough-toothed dolphins (Hill et al., 2011; Hill et al., 2018c; Hill et al., 2018d; Hill et al., 2019).

3.4.1.16.3 Population and Abundance

In some regions of the Pacific, "inshore" and "offshore" or pelagic species differ genetically and morphologically (Baird et al., 2009a; Baird et al., 2013c; Tezanos-Pinto et al., 2009), but this has not been demonstrated for the Mariana Islands (Martien et al., 2014b). A total of 4,610 photos taken during small boat surveys between 2011 and 2014 were analyzed to identify individual bottlenose dolphins. A total of 47 individuals were identified with 30 individuals (64 percent) re-encountered and the remaining 17 of those individuals (36 percent) encountered three or more times (Hill et al., 2017a). These re-encounters occurred between all islands and may be similar to the site fidelity present for some of the island-associated populations present in the Hawaiian Islands (Baird et al., 2009a). Genetic samples from 21 bottlenose dolphins encountered off Guam and Saipan in 2007 suggest a history of hybridization with Fraser's dolphin (Martien et al., 2014b). The Mariana Islands samples shared DNA haplotypes with

individuals from the Philippines, South Korea, Taiwan, and the main Hawaiian Islands but precluded determination of any small populations associated with specific locations in the Mariana Islands similar to what has been found in Hawaii (Martien et al., 2014b).

A bottlenose dolphin abundance estimate of 31,700 animals was made for the area approximately 400 NM north of the Mariana Islands (Miyashita, 1993b). There were three sightings of bottlenose dolphin during a 2007 systematic survey of the Study Area, resulting in an abundance estimate of 122 animals (CV = 0.992) (Fulling et al., 2011).

3.4.1.16.4 Predator-Prey Interactions

Bottlenose dolphins are opportunistic feeders, taking a wide variety of fishes, cephalopods, and shrimps (Wells & Scott, 1999, 2009), and using a variety of feeding strategies (Shane, 1990). In addition to using echolocation, bottlenose dolphins detect and orient fish prey by listening for the sounds their prey produce (i.e., passive listening) (Gannon et al., 2005). Nearshore bottlenose dolphins prey predominantly on coastal fish and cephalopods, while offshore individuals prey on open ocean cephalopods and a large variety of near-surface and mid-water fish species (Mead & Potter, 1995). Throughout their range bottlenose dolphins are known to be preyed on by killer whales and sharks (Ferguson et al., 2012; Heithaus, 2001a; Heithaus, 2001b; Sprogis et al., 2018; Wells & Scott, 1999).

3.4.1.16.5 Species-Specific Threats

As discussed in Section 3.4.1.7.3 (Bycatch), entanglement risk includes fishing activities out of Japan and South Korea (Miyashita, 1993b). The threat of mortality from any such interaction is high given the incentive created by the commercial sale of whale meat/products allowed under Japanese and South Korean law (Baker et al., 2006a; Lukoschek et al., 2009). In nine market samples from South Korea between 2003 and 2005, molecular (DNA) evidence indicated that at least two products contained bottlenose dolphin meat, reflecting an estimated 23 bottlenose dolphins (Baker et al., 2006a). The stranding of a single bottlenose dolphin in 2013 near Tumon, Guam, is the only known stranding for this species in the Mariana Islands area (Uyeyama, 2014).

3.4.1.17 Cuvier's Beaked Whale (*Ziphius cavirostris*)

3.4.1.17.1 Status and Management

Cuvier's beaked whale is not listed under the ESA. The stock structure for Cuvier's beaked whales remains uncertain in the western Pacific, and Cuvier's beaked whales in the Study Area have not been assigned to a stock in the current SARs (Carretta et al., 2019c; Muto et al., 2019). With the exception of the U.S. West Coast, NMFS only recognizes a stock of Cuvier's beaked whale in the Pacific in Hawaiian waters (Carretta et al., 2017c; Carretta et al., 2017d; Carretta et al., 2019c) and in the "eastern North Pacific" and Alaskan waters (Muto et al., 2019), whose distribution does not extend to the Study Area.

3.4.1.17.2 Geographic Range and Distribution

Cuvier's beaked whales have an extensive range that includes all oceans, from the tropics to the polar waters of both hemispheres (Ferguson et al., 2006a; Ferguson et al., 2006b; Jefferson et al., 2008; Pitman et al., 1988). Worldwide, beaked whales normally inhabit continental slope and deep oceanic waters. They are commonly sighted around seamounts, escarpments, and canyons (MacLeod et al., 2004). Cuvier's beaked whales are generally sighted in waters with a bottom depth greater than 655 feet (ft.) (200 m) and are frequently recorded in waters with bottom depths greater than 3,280 ft. (1,000 m) (Falcone et al., 2009; Jefferson et al., 2008). While there are indications of potential seasonal re-distribution of Cuvier's beaked whales and documented satellite tag movements in Southern

California waters (Falcone & Schorr, 2014; Moretti, 2017; Schorr et al., 2014; Schorr et al., 2018), no such research findings are available from the Mariana Islands. A study spanning 21 years off the west coast of the Island of Hawaii suggests that this species may show long-term site fidelity in certain areas (McSweeney et al., 2007).

During aerial surveys conducted in August 2007 covering 2,352 km of linear effort, a single Cuvier's beaked whale was observed about 65 NM south of Guam at the edge of the Mariana Trench (Mobley, 2007). One ziphiid whale (the taxon that Cuvier's beaked whales belong to) was observed in deep water during the 2007 shipboard survey of the Study Area but was not identified to the species level (Fulling et al., 2011). A single Cuvier's beaked whale was sighted and others acoustically detected during an August 2013 survey at Pagan Island (Tetra Tech Inc., 2014). A year's duration of acoustic monitoring at Saipan and at Tinian recorded vocalizing Cuvier's beaked whales (Oleson et al., 2015). These vocalizations were detected in all months having sufficient samples to detect their presence in the Study Area, suggesting there is no seasonal aspect to the Cuvier's beaked whale's distribution.

3.4.1.17.3 Population and Abundance

There are no abundance estimates for Cuvier's beaked whales in the Study Area.

3.4.1.17.4 Predator-Prey Interactions

Cuvier's beaked whales, similar to other beaked whale species, are deepwater feeders. Stomach content analyses show that they feed mostly on deep-sea squid, fish, and crustaceans (Hickmott, 2005; Santos et al., 2007). They apparently use suction to swallow prey (Jefferson et al., 2008; Werth, 2006b).

Cuvier's beaked whales may be preyed upon by killer whales (Heyning & Mead, 2009; Jefferson et al., 2008).

3.4.1.17.5 Species-Specific Threats

As discussed in Section 3.4.1.7.3 (Bycatch), entanglement risk includes fishing activities out of Japan and South Korea, with the threat of mortality from any such interaction being high given the incentive created by the commercial sale of whale meat/products allowed under Japanese and South Korean law (Baker et al., 2006a; Lukoschek et al., 2009). In nine market samples from South Korea between 2003 and 2005, molecular (DNA) evidence indicated that at least one product contained Cuvier's beaked whale meat (Baker et al., 2006a).

Single Cuvier's beaked whales were found stranded on Saipan in 2007, and on Rizal Beach, Guam, in 2008 (*Ziphius* sp.). One out of area beaked whale was sighted at-sea in water less than 200 m, but with close proximity of deep water, it is unclear if this sighting was an in-distress animal, or some as yet unknown normal behavior. Two beaked whales were found (one alive and one dead) on Micro Beach, Saipan, in 2011 (Uyeyama, 2014). A necropsy conducted on one of the 2011 stranded animals revealed abnormalities in the animal's kidneys and intestines (Hawaii Pacific University, 2012; Saipan Tribune, 2011). Two strandings of Cuvier's beaked whales occurred in 2015; one in March and one in July. The individual that stranded in March 2015 had a severe Crassicauda (nematode) infestation in its kidneys (West, 2018). The individual stranded in July 2015 was not accessible for transport until days after the stranding and, because of the resulting decomposition, necropsy and histopathology was not conducted for this whale (West, 2018). One stranding occurred on Guam in 2016 (alive and pushed back to sea). A stranding of a single whale occurred on Guam in 2019, with necropsy finding the animal to be young and in good body condition. A stranding of a single whale occurred on Rota in 2019, in which the milling animal went back to sea.

3.4.1.18 Dwarf Sperm Whale (*Kogia sima*)

3.4.1.18.1 Status and Management

Dwarf sperm whale is not listed under the ESA. The stock structure for dwarf sperm whales remains uncertain in the western Pacific, and dwarf sperm whales in the Study Area have not been assigned to a stock in the current SAR (Carretta et al., 2019c). Other than for waters along the U.S. West Coast, NMFS recognizes a single stock of dwarf sperm whale in the Pacific in Hawaiian waters (Carretta et al., 2019c).

3.4.1.18.2 Geographic Range and Distribution

Records of this species have been documented from the western Pacific (Taiwan and Japan) (Sylvestre, 1988; Wang et al., 2001; Wang & Yang, 2006), and there have been four known dwarf sperm whale strandings in the Mariana Islands (Trianni & Tenorio, 2012; Uyeyama, 2014).

There were no species of *Kogia* sighted during the 2007 shipboard survey of the Study Area, although this cryptic species is difficult to detect, particularly in the high sea states that are normally present in the Mariana Islands (Fulling et al., 2011). Aerial surveys in August 2007 covering 2,352 km of linear effort encountered three dwarf sperm whales (Mobley, 2007). In total during Navy-funded 2010–2018 small boat surveys in the Mariana Islands, five dwarf sperm whales have been encountered on four occasions in a median depth of approximately 750 m and at a median distance of approximately 3 km from shore (Hill et al., 2017a; Hill et al., 2018c; Hill et al., 2019).

3.4.1.18.3 Population and Abundance

There are no abundance estimates for dwarf sperm whales in the Study Area.

3.4.1.18.4 Predator-Prey Interactions

Dwarf sperm whales feed on cephalopods and, less often, on deep sea fishes and shrimps (Caldwell & Caldwell, 1989; Sekiguchi et al., 1992). Dwarf sperm whales are believed to generally forage near the seafloor (McAlpine, 2009).

Killer whales are predators of dwarf sperm whales (Dunphy-Daly et al., 2008).

3.4.1.18.5 Species-Specific Threats

Based on data collected in Hawaiian waters, dwarf sperm whales are susceptible to injury or mortality from fisheries interactions (Bradford & Forney, 2014, 2017). It is assumed that fishery activities in the Study Area pose a similar threat to the species.

3.4.1.19 False Killer Whale (*Pseudorca crassidens*)

3.4.1.19.1 Status and Management

The population of false killer whales in the Mariana Islands is not listed under the ESA. The stock structure for false killer whales remains uncertain in the western Pacific (Chivers et al., 2007; Martien et al., 2014a), and false killer whales in the Study Area have not been assigned to a stock in the current SAR for the Pacific (Carretta et al., 2019c). NMFS recognizes multiple stocks of false killer whale in the Pacific within the U.S. Exclusive Economic Zone in Hawaiian waters, at Palmyra Atoll, and waters around America Samoa (Carretta et al., 2019c).

3.4.1.19.2 Geographic Range and Distribution

The false killer whale is an oceanic species, occurring in deep waters of the North Pacific (Miyashita et al., 1996; Wang et al., 2001) but also known to occur close to shore near oceanic islands (Baird, 2012). In

Hawaii, false killer whales have been seen in groups of up to 100 over a wide range of depths and distance from shore (Baird et al., 2003; Baird et al., 2013a; Bradford et al., 2014; Bradford et al., 2015; Oleson et al., 2013). False killer whales are not considered a migratory species, although seasonal shifts in density likely occur. Seasonal movements in the western North Pacific may be related to prey distribution (Odell & McClune, 1999). Satellite-tracked individuals around the Hawaiian islands indicate that false killer whales can move extensively among different islands and also sometimes move from an island coast to as far as 60 mi. (96.6 km) offshore (Baird, 2009b).

During the 2007 survey of the Study Area, there were 10 false killer whale sightings in deep water offshore locations with group sizes ranging from 2 to 26 individuals (Fulling et al., 2011). During the 2010 NMFS survey, one sighting of a pod containing five false killer whales was made approximately midway between Guam and Hawaii in the Transit Corridor (Oleson & Hill, 2010b). During the NMFS 2015 survey of the Mariana Islands, false killer whales were encountered on only two occasions, once off Asuncion Island and once off Alamagan Island, with estimated group sizes of 6–31 individuals (Hill et al., 2018d; Oleson, 2017). In small boat surveys in the Study Area conducted between 2010 and 2018, false killer whales were encountered only on six occasions (Hill et al., 2014; Hill et al., 2017a; Hill et al., 2018c; Hill et al., 2018d; Hill et al., 2019). Three reported false killer whale strandings have been reported between 1963 and 2013; these occurred in 2000, 2003, and 2007 (Trianni & Tenorio, 2012; Uyeyama, 2014).

3.4.1.19.3 Population and Abundance

There are estimated to be about 6,000 false killer whales in the North Pacific (starting approximately 50 NM off the Study Area from 25° N to 39° N latitude) based on fishery interaction data (Miyashita, 1993b). Based on sighting data from the 2007 survey, there were an estimated 637 (CV = 0.74) false killer whales in the Study Area (Fulling et al., 2011).

3.4.1.19.4 Predator-Prey Interactions

False killer whales feed primarily on deep-sea cephalopods and fish (Baird et al., 2008; Koen-Alonso et al., 1999; Odell & McClune, 1999). Four false killer whales found stranded in Hawaii from 2010 through 2016 had stomach contents that included prey items from various squid, yellowfin tuna, mahi mahi, jack, marlin, and bonefish (West, 2016).

False killer whales have been observed to attack other cetaceans, including dolphins and large whales, such as humpback and sperm whales (Baird, 2009a, 2009b). They are known to behave aggressively toward small cetaceans in tuna purse seine nets. Unlike other whales or dolphins, false killer whales frequently pass prey back and forth among individuals before they start to eat the fish, in what appears to be a way of affirming social bonds (Baird et al., 2010b). This species is believed to be preyed on by large sharks and killer whales (Baird, 2009a).

3.4.1.19.5 Species-Specific Threats

Based on a historic decline in the number of false killer whales in Hawaii, which is believed to have been the result of various factors that include incidental take by commercial fisheries (Bradford et al., 2014; Bradford & Forney, 2017; Oleson et al., 2010; Reeves et al., 2009), it should be assumed that foreign and the limited domestic commercial longline fishing in the Study Area may also pose a similar threat to false killer whales in the Mariana Islands. (Allen & Amesbury, 2012; National Marine Fisheries Service, 2015f, 2018d; National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2018a). Necropsy results from four stranded false killer whales in Hawaii documented stomach contents that included fishing gear (hooks, leaders, and line) in two of the four animals (West, 2016). As discussed in Section 3.4.1.7.3 (Bycatch), entanglement risk includes fishing activities out of Japan and South Korea, with the threat of mortality

from any such interaction being high given the incentive created by the commercial sale of whale meat/products allowed under Japanese and South Korean law (Baker et al., 2006a; Lukoschek et al., 2009). In nine market samples from South Korea between 2003 and 2005, molecular (DNA) evidence indicated that at least 19 products contained false killer whale meat (Baker et al., 2006a). In the two-year period between 2013 and 2014, the total bycatch by South Korean fisheries in the East Sea totaled one false killer whale (Song, 2017).

3.4.1.20 Fraser's Dolphin (*Lagenodelphis hosei*)

3.4.1.20.1 Status and Management

Fraser's dolphin is not listed under the ESA. The stock structure for Fraser's dolphin remains uncertain in the western Pacific, and Fraser's dolphin in the Study Area have not been assigned to a stock in the current SAR (Carretta et al., 2019c). NMFS recognizes a single stock of Fraser's dolphin in the Pacific in Hawaiian waters (Carretta et al., 2019c).

3.4.1.20.2 Geographic Range and Distribution

Fraser's dolphin is a tropical oceanic species, except where deep water approaches the coast (Dolar, 2009). This species has been found off the Pacific coast of Japan (Amano et al., 1996). Fraser's dolphin does not appear to be a migratory species (Jefferson & Leatherwood, 1994). In Hawaiian waters, Fraser's dolphin was one of the most abundant species offshore, having large pod group sizes with an observed mean of 283 animals (Bradford et al., 2017).

3.4.1.20.3 Population and Abundance

There are no abundance estimates for Fraser's dolphin in the Study Area. Genetic samples from 21 bottlenose dolphins encountered off Guam and Saipan in 2007 suggests a history of hybridization with Fraser's dolphin (Martien et al., 2014b).

3.4.1.20.4 Predator-Prey Interactions

Fraser's dolphin feeds on mid-water fish, squid, and shrimp (Jefferson & Leatherwood, 1994; Mignucci-Giannoni et al., 1999; Perrin et al., 1994a; Watkins et al., 1994).

3.4.1.20.5 Species-Specific Threats

There is no information available regarding marine mammal interactions with fishing activities in the Study Area, but the threat is presumed to be similar to what has been documented in other locations. There is a report of a Fraser's dolphin being taken as a result of a fishery interaction in the Philippines (Obusan et al., 2016). Fraser's dolphin has been subjected to predation by killer whales in the Bahamas (Dunn et al., 2007).

3.4.1.21 Ginkgo-Toothed Beaked Whale (*Mesoplodon ginkgodens*)

3.4.1.21.1 Status and Management

Ginkgo-toothed beaked whale is not listed under the ESA. Due to the difficulty in distinguishing the different *Mesoplodon* beaked whale species during visual surveys, ginkgo-toothed beaked whales are combined with all other *Mesoplodon* species that occur off the U.S. West Coast and are managed by NMFS as a species guild (Carretta et al., 2019c). The stock structure for ginkgo-toothed beaked whale remains uncertain in the western Pacific, and ginkgo-toothed beaked whales present in the Study Area or the remainder of the Pacific have not been assigned to a stock in the current SAR (Carretta et al., 2019c).

3.4.1.21.2 Geographic Range and Distribution

Worldwide, beaked whales normally inhabit continental slope and deep ocean waters (greater than 200 m) and are only occasionally reported in waters over the continental shelf (Cañadas et al., 2002; Ferguson et al., 2006a; MacLeod & D'Amico, 2006; Pitman, 2009). Acoustic monitoring at sites around the North Pacific have encountered the "BWC type" beaked whale vocalizations, which are assumed to be produced by ginkgo-toothed beaked whales (Baumann-Pickering et al., 2012; Oleson et al., 2015). Strandings of ginkgo-toothed beaked whales are not common anywhere, but the largest number of records are from Japan (Baumann-Pickering et al., 2012); there have been no known strandings of the species in the Mariana Islands.

In total, during Navy-funded 2010–2018 small boat surveys in the Mariana Islands, five *Mesoplodon* beaked whales have been encountered on two occasions in a median depth of approximately 1,140 m and median approximate distance from shore of 15 km (Hill et al., 2017a; Hill et al., 2018c; Hill et al., 2018d; Hill et al., 2019); it could not be determined if these were ginkgo-toothed beaked whales, which are believed to be present in the Study Area; or Blainville's beaked whales, which have been observed elsewhere in the Mariana Islands (Hill et al., 2018d; Oleson, 2017).

A year of acoustic monitoring at Saipan and at Tinian recorded the BWC type beaked whale vocalizations assumed to be produced by ginkgo-toothed beaked whales (Oleson et al., 2015). These vocalizations were detected in all months having sufficient samples to detect their presence in the Study Area, suggesting there is no seasonal aspect to their distribution. This correlates with the findings reported from a previous acoustic monitoring site off Saipan where this same signal type was encountered during 24 percent of days sampled (Baumann-Pickering et al., 2012).

3.4.1.21.3 Population and Abundance

There are no abundance estimates for ginkgo-toothed beaked whale in the Study Area.

3.4.1.21.4 Predator-Prey Interactions

All beaked whales probably feed at or close to the bottom in deep oceanic waters, taking suitable prey opportunistically or as locally abundant, typically by suction feeding (Heyning & Mead, 1996; Jefferson et al., 2015; Werth, 2006a, 2006b). Feeding may also occur at mid-water as shown from tagging data from Blainville's beaked whale habits documented in Hawaii (Baird et al., 2005; Baird et al., 2006c). *Mesoplodon* beaked whales have been observed being actively preyed upon by killer whales (Wellard et al., 2016).

3.4.1.21.5 Species-Specific Threats

As discussed in Section 3.4.1.7.3 (Bycatch), entanglement risk includes fishing activities out of the Philippines, Japan, and South Korea, with the threat of mortality from any such interaction being high given the incentive created by the commercial sale of whale meat/products allowed under Japanese and South Korean law (Baker et al., 2006a; Lukoschek et al., 2009; Obusan et al., 2016). In nine market samples from South Korea between 2003 and 2005, molecular (DNA) evidence indicated at least one product contained Blainville's beaked whale meat (Baker et al., 2006a), suggesting the same risk may be present for ginkgo-toothed beaked whales. There were five observed interactions between an unidentified beaked whale, unidentified Mesoplodont beaked whale, or Blainville's beaked whale and longline fishing activities in Hawaiian waters between 2010 and 2014 (Bradford & Forney, 2016, 2017). There is no information available regarding marine mammal interactions with fishing activities in the Study Area, but the threat is presumed to be similar to what has been documented in Hawaii.

3.4.1.22 Killer Whale (*Orcinus orca*)

3.4.1.22.1 Status and Management

The stock structure for killer whales remains uncertain in the western Pacific, and killer whales present in the Study Area have not been assigned to a stock in the current SARs (Carretta et al., 2019c; Muto et al., 2019). NMFS recognizes eight stocks of killer whales for the Pacific, but none of the identified ranges are within the Study Area (Carretta et al., 2019c; Muto et al., 2019).

Under the ESA, the Southern Resident Distinct Population Segment of killer whales is the only species listed as endangered, but those animals do not venture beyond the North American nearshore waters. Killer whales in the Study Area are not listed pursuant to the ESA.

3.4.1.22.2 Geographic Range and Distribution

Killer whales are found in all marine habitats from inland and nearshore coastal areas, to the deep mid-ocean, and from equatorial regions to the polar pack ice zones of both hemispheres. Forney and Wade (2006) found that killer whale densities increased by one to two orders of magnitude from the tropics to the poles.

There are accounts of killer whales off the coast of Japan (Kasuya, 1971). Japanese whaling and whaling sighting vessels indicate that concentrations of killer whales occurred north of the Northern Mariana Islands (Miyashita et al., 1995), and the species has been reported in the tropical waters around Guam, Yap, and Palau (Rock, 1993). Between 1987 and 2017 in the Mariana Islands, killer whales in pods of three to five individuals were observed on only six occasions (Eldredge, 1991; Uyeyama, 2014). There was also a badly decomposed killer whale found stranded on Guam in August 1981 (Kami, 1982). There were no sightings of the species during a 2007 systematic line-transect survey (Fulling et al., 2011) or a 2010 survey of the area (Oleson & Hill, 2010b). In May 2010, a group of approximately five killer whales, including one calf, were observed about 20 NM south of Farallon de Medinilla (Uyeyama, 2014; Wenninger, 2010). The Navy-funded small boat surveys between 2010 and 2018 in the Mariana Islands did not encounter any killer whales (Hill et al., 2014; Hill et al., 2017a; Hill et al., 2018c; Hill et al., 2019). Vocalizations from killer whales were detected on three occasions south of Guam by passive acoustic recorders aboard an underwater glider survey in 2014 (Klinck et al., 2016a).

3.4.1.22.3 Population and Abundance

There are no abundance estimates for killer whales in the Study Area.

3.4.1.22.4 Predator-Prey Interactions

Killer whales feed on a variety of prey, including bony fishes, elasmobranchs (a class of fish composed of sharks, skates, and rays), cephalopods, seabirds, sea turtles, and other marine mammals (Fertl et al., 1996; Ford et al., 2013; Ford et al., 2014; Jefferson et al., 2015). In May 2010 during the routine Navy aerial survey of Farallon de Medinilla about 20 mi. (32 km) south of the island, a group of approximately five killer whales, including one calf, were observed feeding on a large whale carcass (Uyeyama, 2014; Wenninger, 2010). The killer whale has no known natural predators; it is considered to be the top predator of the oceans (Ford, 2008).

3.4.1.22.5 Species-Specific Threats

As discussed in Section 3.4.1.7.3 (Bycatch), entanglement risk includes fishing activities out of Japan and South Korea, with the threat of mortality from any such interaction being high given the incentive created by the commercial sale of whale meat/products allowed under Japanese and South Korean law

(Baker et al., 2006a; Lukoschek et al., 2009). In nine market samples from South Korea between 2003 and 2005, molecular (DNA) evidence indicated that at least two products contained killer whale meat (Baker et al., 2006a).

3.4.1.23 Longman's Beaked Whale (*Indopacetus pacificus*)

3.4.1.23.1 Status and Management

Longman's beaked whale is not listed under the ESA. Only one stock has been identified for the Pacific for the population present in Hawaiian waters (Carretta et al., 2019c).The stock structure for Longman's beaked whale remains uncertain in the western Pacific, and the species in the Study Area has not been assigned to a stock in the current SAR (Carretta et al., 2019c).

3.4.1.23.2 Geographic Range and Distribution

Longman's beaked whales are found in warm tropical waters, and most sightings occur in waters with sea surface temperatures warmer than 78°F (26°C) (Anderson et al., 2006; MacLeod et al., 2006; MacLeod & D'Amico, 2006). Based on systematic survey data collected from 1986 to 2005 in the eastern Pacific, all Longman's beaked whale sightings were south of 25° N (Hamilton et al., 2009). Sighting records of this species in the Indian Ocean showed that Longman's beaked whales are typically found in waters over deep bathymetric slopes reaching 200–2,000 m or greater (Anderson et al., 2006).

Although the full extent of this species' distribution is not fully understood, there have been many recorded sightings at various locations in tropical waters of the Pacific and Indian Oceans (Afsal et al., 2009; Dalebout et al., 2002b; Dalebout et al., 2003; Moore, 1972). In the Pacific, records of this species indicate presence in the eastern, central, and western Pacific, including waters off the coast of Mexico and Hawaii. Longman's beaked whales have not been observed or detected acoustically in the Study Area, although it is assumed they are present in the area. In Hawaii, there was a single sighting of approximately 18 Longman's beaked whales during a NMFS 2002 survey (Barlow, 2006). During the follow-on 2010 survey, there were three sightings of Longman's beaked whales, with group sizes ranging from approximately 32 to 99 individuals (Bradford et al., 2017). It is assumed that Longman's beaked whales would have similar grouping behavior in the Study Area.

3.4.1.23.3 Population and Abundance

There are no abundance estimates for Longman's beaked whales in the Study Area.

3.4.1.23.4 Predator-Prey Interactions

All beaked whales probably feed at or close to the bottom in deep oceanic waters, taking suitable prey opportunistically or as locally abundant, typically by suction feeding (Heyning & Mead, 1996; Jefferson et al., 2015; Werth, 2006a, 2006b). Feeding may also occur at mid-water as shown by tagging data from Cuvier's and from Blainville's beaked whales in Hawaii (Baird et al., 2005; Baird et al., 2006c). *Mesoplodon* beaked whales have been observed being actively preyed upon by killer whales (Wellard et al., 2016); it is assumed this may also be the case with Longman's beaked whales.

3.4.1.23.5 Species-Specific Threats

Disease may be relatively common in Longman's beaked whales since morbillivirus was documented in a juvenile male Longman's beaked whale that stranded in Hawaii in 2010 (West et al., 2012) and in five individuals stranded in New Caledonia (Garrigue et al., 2016), and also given the small sample sizes involved in those findings.

There is no information available regarding marine mammal interactions with fishing activities in the Study Area, but the threat is presumed to be similar to what has been documented in Hawaii. There were two observed interactions between unidentified beaked whales and longline fishing activities in Hawaiian waters between 2009 and 2013 (Bradford & Forney, 2016), so it is assumed that interactions with fishing activities in the Mariana Islands may also occur. As discussed in Section 3.4.1.7.3 (Bycatch), entanglement risk includes fishing activities out of Japan and South Korea, with the threat of mortality from any such interaction being high given the incentive created by the commercial sale of whale meat/products allowed under Japanese and South Korean law (Baker et al., 2006a; Lukoschek et al., 2009). In nine market samples from South Korea between 2003 and 2005, molecular (DNA) evidence from three different species of beaked whale were identified (Baker et al., 2006a).

3.4.1.24 Melon-Headed Whale (*Peponocephala electra*)

3.4.1.24.1 Status and Management

Melon-headed whale is not listed under the ESA. The stock structure for melon-headed whales remains uncertain in the western Pacific, and melon-headed whales in the Study Area have not been assigned to a stock in the current Pacific SAR (Carretta et al., 2019c). NMFS recognizes two stocks of melon-headed whales in the Pacific associated with Hawaiian waters (Carretta et al., 2019c).

3.4.1.24.2 Geographic Range and Distribution

Melon-headed whales are found worldwide in tropical and subtropical waters, but movement patterns for this species are poorly understood. It has been suggested that melon-headed whales near oceanic islands rest near shore during the day and feed in deeper waters at night (Brownell et al., 2009a; Gannier, 2002; Woodworth et al., 2012). In surveys around the main Hawaiian Islands, melon-headed whales showed no clear pattern in depth use (Baird, 2013). Melon-headed whales are also known to enter shallow water areas on occasion, although these are generally characterized as animals being "out of habitat" or "mass strandings." Such out-of-habitat events, each involving a few hundred melon-headed whales, have occurred at Sasanhaya Bay, Rota (Jefferson et al., 2006); and in Hawaii (Fromm et al., 2006; Mobley et al., 2007; Southall et al., 2006) on the same day in 2004. Similar numbers did so twice in the Philippines entering Manila Bay in February 2009 and the bay at Odiongan, Romblon in March of 2009 (Aragones et al., 2010; Obusan et al., 2016).

There were two sightings of melon-headed whales during the 2007 survey of the Study Area, with group sizes of 80–109 individuals (Fulling et al., 2011). There was one sighting of approximately 53 individuals southeast of Guam and two mid-ocean sightings (pods sizes of 43 and 72) in the Transit Corridor portion of the Study Area during the large vessel Pacific Islands Fisheries Science Center survey (Oleson & Hill, 2010b). During small boat surveys occurring from 2010 to 2018, melon-headed whales have been encountered on only three occasions, but in large pods numbering between 85 and 380 individuals off Guam and Tinian/Saipan (HDR, 2012; Hill et al., 2014; Hill et al., 2018c; Hill et al., 2019). The NMFS 2015 month-long survey of the Mariana Islands encountered melon-headed whales on four occasions, in offshore waters and in large pods estimated to number between 90 and 268 individuals (Hill et al., 2018d; Oleson, 2017).

There was a live stranding of a melon-headed whale on the beach at Inarajan Bay, Guam in April 1980 (Donaldson, 1983; Kami, 1982), and four individuals at Orote in 2009 (Uyeyama, 2014).

3.4.1.24.3 Population and Abundance

Based on sighting data from a systematic survey in 2007, there were an estimated 2,455 (CV = 0.70) melon-headed whales in the Study Area (Fulling et al., 2011).

3.4.1.24.4 Predator-Prey Interactions

Melon-headed whales prey on squid, pelagic fishes, and occasionally crustaceans. Most of the fish and squid families eaten by this species consist of mid-water forms found in waters up to 1,500 m deep, suggesting that feeding takes place deep in the water column (Baird et al., 2010a; Jefferson & Barros, 1997).

3.4.1.24.5 Species-Specific Threats

Melon-headed whales are believed to be preyed on by killer whales and have been observed fleeing from killer whales in Hawaiian waters (Baird et al., 2006a). The 2016 Pacific SAR (Carretta et al., 2017c; Carretta et al., 2017d) suggested that melon-headed whales may be particularly sensitive to impacts from anthropogenic sounds; see the U.S. Navy's Technical Report (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2017a) for a general discussion of strandings potentially related to the use of sonar and other anthropogenic sound.

3.4.1.25 Pantropical Spotted Dolphin (*Stenella attenuata*)

3.4.1.25.1 Status and Management

The pantropical spotted dolphin is not listed under the ESA. The stock structure for pantropical spotted dolphin remains uncertain in the western Pacific, and pantropical spotted dolphins in the Study Area have not been assigned to a stock in the current SAR (Carretta et al., 2019c). NMFS recognizes a single pelagic stock and three Hawaiian Island-associated stocks of pantropical spotted dolphin in Hawaiian waters (Carretta et al., 2019c). Results from genetic analyses of pantropical spotted dolphin populations, including the Indo-Pacific and eastern tropical Pacific Ocean (including eight samples from Guam and the Northern Mariana Islands), support the current taxonomy and indicate very close genetic relationships among the Indo-Pacific populations (Leslie & Morin, 2018).

3.4.1.25.2 Geographic Range and Distribution

A survey of the Mariana Islands in 2007 encountered 17 groups of pantropical spotted dolphins, ranging in size from 1 to 115 individuals (Fulling et al., 2011). Aerial surveys in August 2007 covering 2,352 km of linear effort encountered a single pod of 30 pantropical spotted dolphins (Mobley, 2007). In total during the Navy-funded 2010 to 2018 small boat surveys in the Mariana Islands, pantropical spotted dolphins were encountered on 53 occasions in group sizes of 1–145 individuals at a median approximate distance from shore of 6 km (Hill et al., 2014; Hill et al., 2017a; Hill et al., 2018c; Hill et al., 2019). Approximate satellite tag locations from a pantropical spotted dolphin in 2016 demonstrated wide-ranging use of the waters at a median of 6.1 km offshore of Guam (Hill et al., 2017a), although they have also been encountered off Rota, Antiguan, Tinian, and Saipan (Hill et al., 2018c).

3.4.1.25.3 Population and Abundance

Based on sighting data from the 2007 systematic survey of the Mariana Islands, the estimated abundance for pantropical spotted dolphins in the Study Area is 12,981 (CV = 0.704) (Fulling et al., 2011).

3.4.1.25.4 Predator-Prey Interactions

Pantropical spotted dolphins prey on near-surface fish, squid, and crustaceans and on some mid-water species (Perrin & Hohn, 1994). Results from various tracking and feeding studies suggest that pantropical spotted dolphins in the eastern tropical Pacific and off Hawaii feed primarily at night on surface and mid-water species that rise with the deep scattering layer toward the water's surface after dark (Baird et al., 2001; Silva et al., 2016).

3.4.1.25.5 Species-Specific Threats

There is no information available regarding marine mammal interactions with fishing activities in the Study Area, but the threat is presumed to be similar to what has been documented in other locations. Pantropical spotted dolphins in Hawaii and Samoa have been observed interacting with the longline fishery, resulting in injury (Bradford & Forney, 2014), and there was one case of serious injury to a spotted dolphin observed entangled in fishing line (Bradford & Lyman, 2015). Given the information provided in Section 3.4.1.7.3 (Bycatch), entanglement risk may include fishing activities out of Japan and South Korea (Miyashita, 1993b). The threat of mortality from any such interaction is high given the incentive created by the commercial sale of whale meat/products allowed under Japanese and South Korean law (Baker et al., 2006a; Lukoschek et al., 2009).

Pantropical spotted dolphins may be preyed on by killer whales and sharks and have been observed fleeing killer whales in Hawaiian waters (Baird et al., 2006b). Other predators may include the pygmy killer whale, false killer whale, and occasionally the short-finned pilot whale (Perrin, 2009b).

3.4.1.26 Pygmy Killer Whale (*Feresa attenuata*)

3.4.1.26.1 Status and Management

The pygmy killer whale is not listed under the ESA. The stock structure for pygmy killer whale remains uncertain in the western Pacific, and pygmy killer whales in the Study Area have not been assigned to a stock in the current SAR (Carretta et al., 2019c).

3.4.1.26.2 Geographic Range and Distribution

This species has been documented in the western Pacific (Taiwan and Japan) (Sylvestre, 1988; Wang et al., 2001; Wang & Yang, 2006). Like similar deep-water and deep-diving cetaceans, pygmy killer whales are likely highly mobile in the marine environment with no known concentration areas in the Mariana Islands. There was only one pygmy killer whale sighting of a group of six animals during the 2007 systematic survey of the Study Area (Fulling et al., 2011). The sighting occurred near the Mariana Trench, south of Guam, where the bottom depth was 14,564 ft. (4,413 m). This is consistent with the known habitat preference of this species for deep, oceanic waters. In the Study Area, where there are deep waters relatively close to the islands, pygmy killer whale sightings close to shore are not unexpected. During small boat surveys between 2010 and 2018, there was a single pygmy killer whale sighting northeast of Saipan in 2011 and then single sightings in 2013 and 2014 off Guam; group sizes were from six to nine individuals (Hill et al., 2014; Hill et al., 2017a; Hill et al., 2018c; Hill et al., 2019). Median distance from shore for these sightings was 6.9 km (range 1.1–10 km). There is no information on the wider distribution of pygmy killer whales in the Study Area given the limitations of the survey coverage (Hill et al., 2019). Boat surveys for the most recent pygmy killer whale sightings between 2010 and 2018 are typically of short duration (day-trips over a period of 6–20 days) and may not reflect year-round occurrence or distribution (Hill et al., 2019).

3.4.1.26.3 Population and Abundance

Based on a single sighting during the 2007 survey of the Study Area, pygmy killer whale abundance was estimated at 78 individuals (CV = 0.881) (Fulling et al., 2011).

3.4.1.26.4 Predator-Prey Interactions

Pygmy killer whales feed predominantly on fish and squid. They have been known to attack other dolphin species, apparently as prey, although this is not common (Jefferson et al., 2015; Perryman & Foster, 1980; Ross & Leatherwood, 1994).

3.4.1.26.5 Species-Specific Threats

Fisheries interactions in the Study Area are likely given documented evidence from fishery activities in Hawaii (Bradford & Forney, 2017; Carretta et al., 2017c). Based on the information provided in Section 3.4.1.7.3 (Bycatch), entanglement risk may include fishing activities out of Japan and South Korea (Miyashita, 1993b). The threat of mortality from any such interaction is high given the incentive created by the commercial sale of whale meat/products allowed under Japanese and South Korean law (Baker et al., 2006a; Lukoschek et al., 2009).

The 2016 Pacific SAR (Carretta et al., 2017c; Carretta et al., 2017d) suggested that two mass strandings of pygmy killer whales (that occurred in 2004 and 2005) on Taiwan were, "…possibly associated with offshore naval training exercises" based on the citation to Wang and Yang (2006). Wang and Yang (2006) only speculatively suggested that, "…naval sonar and live ammunition exercises are two of many plausible causes that need to be investigated" given there was a lack of necessary information (such as if sonar was even in use) regarding relatively contemporaneous and distant events involving the U.S. Navy, People's Republic of China Navy, Taiwan's Republic of China Navy, Japanese Navy, and oil and gas seismic exploration occurring in the eastern Pacific. Further, between 1995 and 2005 there were a total of six pygmy killer whale Mass Stranding Events and three milling events involving the same species in Taiwan (Brownell et al., 2009b; Yang et al., 2008), confounding the identification of a specific cause for these particular stranding events. The suggestion that sonar, underwater detonations, or seismic oil and gas exploration may have caused the 2004 and 2005 strandings has remained speculative with researchers pointing to the need for further investigation (Brownell et al., 2009b; Wang & Yang, 2006; Yang et al., 2008). The technical report from the U.S. Department of the Navy (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2017a) provides a general discussion of strandings potentially related to the use of sonar and other anthropogenic sound.

The pygmy killer whale has no documented predators (Weller, 2009), although it may be subject to predation by killer whales.

3.4.1.27 Pygmy Sperm Whale (*Kogia breviceps*)

3.4.1.27.1 Status and Management

Pygmy sperm whale is not listed under the ESA. The stock structure for pygmy sperm whales remains uncertain in the western Pacific, and pygmy sperm whales in the Study Area have not been assigned to a stock in the current SAR (Carretta et al., 2019c). Other than for waters along the U.S. West Coast, NMFS recognizes a single stock of pygmy sperm whale in the Pacific in Hawaiian waters (Carretta et al., 2019c).

3.4.1.27.2 Geographic Range and Distribution

During marine mammal monitoring for Valiant Shield 07, a group of three Kogia (dwarf or pygmy sperm whales) was observed about 8 NM east of Guam (Mobley, 2007). The stranding of a pygmy sperm whale

in 1997 (Trianni & Tenorio, 2012), is the only other confirmed occurrence of this species in the Study Area.

3.4.1.27.3 Population and Abundance

There are no abundance estimates for pygmy sperm whale in the Study Area.

3.4.1.27.4 Predator-Prey Interactions

Pygmy sperm whales feed on cephalopods and, less often, on deep sea fishes and shrimps (Caldwell & Caldwell, 1989; Sekiguchi et al., 1992; West et al., 2009). Pygmy sperm whales are believed to generally forage near the seafloor (McAlpine, 2009).

Killer whales and white sharks are documented predators of pygmy sperm whales (Dunphy-Daly et al., 2008; Long, 1991; Tirard et al., 2010).

3.4.1.27.5 Species-Specific Threats

Based on data collected in Hawaiian waters, pygmy sperm whales are susceptible to injury or mortality from fisheries interactions (Bradford & Forney, 2014, 2017). It is assumed the fishery activities in the Study Area pose a similar threat. Given the information provided in Section 3.4.1.7.3 (Bycatch), entanglement risk may include fishing activities out of Japan and South Korea (Miyashita, 1993b). The threat of mortality from any such interaction is high given the incentive created by the commercial sale of whale meat/products allowed under Japanese and South Korean law (Baker et al., 2006a; Lukoschek et al., 2009).

3.4.1.28 Risso's Dolphin (*Grampus griseus*)

3.4.1.28.1 Status and Management

Risso's dolphin is not listed under the ESA. The stock structure for Risso's dolphin remains uncertain in the western Pacific, and Risso's dolphins in the Study Area have not been assigned to a stock in the current SAR (Carretta et al., 2019c). Other than for waters along the U.S. West Coast, NMFS recognizes a single stock of Risso's dolphins in the Pacific in Hawaiian waters (Carretta et al., 2019c).

3.4.1.28.2 Geographic Range and Distribution

Occurrence of this species is deep open ocean waters off Hawaii and in other locations in the Pacific (Au & Perryman, 1985; Bradford et al., 2017; Leatherwood et al., 1980; Miyashita et al., 1996; Wang et al., 2001). Fishery interaction data determined the species occurrence west of the International Date Line extended as far north as 40° N, but the southern extent of the range could not be determined (Miyashita, 1993a). Aerial surveys in August 2007 covering 2,352 km of linear effort encountered a single pod of eight Risso's dolphins (Mobley, 2007). During the NMFS survey of 2010, there was a single Risso's dolphin sighting of three individuals approximately 60 NM north of FDM (Oleson & Hill, 2010b). The 2015 NMFS month-long survey of the Mariana Islands encountered Risso's dolphins only twice and in small pods with a median group size of three (Hill et al., 2018d; Oleson, 2017). The species has not been detected in any other surveys efforts in the Study Area (Fulling et al., 2011; Hill et al., 2014; Hill et al., 2017a; Hill et al., 2018b; Hill et al., 2018c; Hill et al., 2018d; Hill et al., 2019). Vocalizations from Risso's dolphins were also detected south of Guam by passive acoustic recorders aboard an underwater glider survey in 2014 (Klinck et al., 2016a).

3.4.1.28.3 Population and Abundance

There are no abundance estimates for Risso's dolphin in the Study Area.

3.4.1.28.4 Predator-Prey Interactions

Cephalopods and crustaceans are the primary prey for Risso's dolphins (Clarke, 1996), which feed mainly at night (Fernandez et al., 2017; Jefferson et al., 2015; Perrin et al., 2009). This dolphin may be preyed on by both killer whales and sharks, although there are no documented reports of predation by either (Weller, 2009).

3.4.1.28.5 Species-Specific Threats

As discussed in Section 3.4.1.7.3 (Bycatch), entanglement risk includes fishing activities out of Japan and South Korea, with the threat of mortality from any such interaction being high given the incentive created by the commercial sale of whale meat/products allowed under Japanese and South Korean law (Baker et al., 2006a; Lukoschek et al., 2009). In nine market samples from South Korea between 2003 and 2005, molecular (DNA) evidence indicated that at least one product contained Risso's dolphin meat (Baker et al., 2006a).

3.4.1.29 Rough-Toothed Dolphin (*Steno bredanensis*)

3.4.1.29.1 Status and Management

The rough-toothed dolphin is not listed under the ESA. The stock structure for rough-toothed dolphins remains uncertain in the western Pacific, and rough-toothed dolphins in the Study Area have not been assigned to a stock in the current SAR (Carretta et al., 2019c). NMFS recognizes a single stock of rough-toothed dolphins in the Pacific in Hawaiian waters (Carretta et al., 2019c).

3.4.1.29.2 Geographic Range and Distribution

Rough-toothed dolphins were sighted twice during a 2007 survey; once as nine individuals in a mixed group of short-finned pilot whales and bottlenose dolphins, and once in a pod of nine individuals with calves present (Fulling et al., 2011). A pod of eight rough-toothed dolphins was also sighted approximately 175 km south of Guam during a 2007 aerial survey (Mobley, 2007). There were no rough-toothed dolphins identified in the broad offshore survey in 2010 (Oleson & Hill, 2010b). The species was encountered only three times during the month-long 2015 NMFS survey of the islands, twice in a group with another cetacean species (Oleson, 2017). Annual small boat surveys conducted from 2010 to 2018 have encountered rough-toothed dolphins on seven occasions, and again all but one of those encounters were in a group with other cetaceans (Hill et al., 2014; Hill et al., 2018c; Hill et al., 2018d; Hill et al., 2019). Four of the same photo-identified rough-toothed dolphins encountered in 2013 have been seen multiple times since in the same general location to the west of Saipan off CK Reef (Hill et al., 2014; Hill et al., 2017a). One group of rough-toothed dolphins was sighted in 2014, but none were encountered in surveys occurring in 2015 through 2018 (Hill et al., 2017a; Hill et al., 2018b; Hill et al., 2018c; Hill et al., 2019).

3.4.1.29.3 Population and Abundance

During the 2007 systematic line-transect survey of the Study Area, there was only one on-effort sighting of rough-toothed dolphin that was used to derive an abundance estimate of 166 animals (CV = 0.892) (Fulling et al., 2011). Given the very limited sample size (a single sighting), this estimate is considered highly uncertain. In July 2004, there was a sighting of an undetermined smaller number of rough-toothed dolphins mixed in with a school of an estimated 500–700 melon-headed whales off Rota in Sasanhayan Bay (Jefferson et al., 2006).

3.4.1.29.4 Predator-Prey Interactions

Rough-toothed dolphin prey includes fish and cephalopods. They are known to feed on large fish species, such as mahi mahi (Miyazaki & Perrin, 1994; Pitman & Stinchcomb, 2002), and have been observed feeding during the day on near-surface fishes, including flying fishes (Gannier & West, 2005). They may also prey on reef fish, as Perkins and Miller (1983) noted that parts of reef fish had been found in the stomachs of stranded rough-toothed dolphins in Hawaii, although the stomach contents of a stranded animal may not be representative of the species.

3.4.1.29.5 Species-Specific Threats

There is no information available regarding marine mammal interactions with fishing activities in the Study Area, but the threat is presumed to be similar to what has been documented in Hawaii. In Hawaii from 2010 to 2014, two rough-toothed dolphins were observed injured during deep-set and shallow-set fisheries in the Exclusive Economic Zone (Bradford & Forney, 2017). Given the information provided in Section 3.4.1.7.3 (Bycatch), entanglement risk may include fishing activities out of Japan and South Korea (Miyashita, 1993b). The threat of mortality from any such interaction is high given the incentive created by the commercial sale of whale meat/products allowed under Japanese and South Korean law (Baker et al., 2006a; Lukoschek et al., 2009).

Although this species has not been documented as prey by other species, it may be subject to predation from killer whales.

3.4.1.30 Short-Finned Pilot Whale (*Globicephala macrorhynchus*)

3.4.1.30.1 Status and Management

The short-finned pilot whale is not listed under the ESA. The stock structure for short-finned pilot whales remains uncertain in the western Pacific, and short-finned pilot whales in the Study Area have not been assigned to a stock in the current SAR (Carretta et al., 2019c). With the exception of the U.S. West Coast, NMFS recognizes a single stock of short-finned pilot whales in the Pacific in Hawaiian waters (Carretta et al., 2019c).

3.4.1.30.2 Geographic Range and Distribution

In the 2007 survey of the Mariana Islands, short-finned pilot whales were encountered five times in groups ranging in size from 5 to 43 animals (Fulling et al., 2011). During the 2010 NMFS survey there was a single sighting of 23 short-finned pilot whales in the northern portion of the Study Area (Oleson & Hill, 2010b). Closer to the islands, there have been numerous incidental sightings of short-finned pilot whales occurring between 1977 and 2013 (Uyeyama, 2014). During the Navy-funded 2010–2018 small boat surveys in the Mariana Islands, short-finned pilot whale groups were encountered on 23 occasions in a median depth of approximately 720 m and median approximate distance from shore of 5 km, including one pod of 35 individuals off Marpi Reef north of Saipan (Hill et al., 2014; Hill et al., 2017a; Hill et al., 2018b; Hill et al., 2018c; Hill et al., 2019). Satellite tag locations from one short-finned pilot whale in 2016 appeared to indicate a position inside the mouth of Apra Harbor (there were no prior or subsequent positions on that day) (Hill et al., 2017a). However, it should be considered uncertain if the animal was in Apra Harbor, due to the limited precision (error range) of even high-quality Argos satellite fixes, and in particular with regard to reduced longitudinal precision, given the Argos satellites are in polar orbits (Boyd & Brightsmith, 2013; Vincent et al., 2002). Based on the locations from the 2013 to 2016 satellite tagged individuals in the May–August timeframe, Hill et al. (2018a) argued that the combined data suggested the northwest side of Guam is a frequently used area for pilot whales during

that time of the year. During the August 2018 small boat surveys off Guam, satellite tags were deployed on an additional five adult short-finned pilot whales, three at Marpi Reef and two offshore of Tinian (Hill et al., 2019). Tag durations lasted from approximately 9–128 days, with the individuals ranging from the south at Tumon Bay off Guam to as far north as the waters west of Anatahan (Hill et al., 2019). These tag locations suggest multiple areas of frequent use by pilot whales in the Mariana Islands.

3.4.1.30.3 Population and Abundance

The estimated abundance for short-finned pilot whales in the Study Area is 909 (CV = 0.677), based on sighting data from the 2007 systematic survey of the Mariana Islands (Fulling et al., 2011). Genetic samples taken during small boat surveys between 2010 and 2014 found evidence of genetic differentiation for short-finned pilot whales between the Mariana Islands, although they possess haplotypes also common in the South Pacific, North Atlantic, Indian Ocean, and off of southern Japan (Martien et al., 2014b).

3.4.1.30.4 Predator-Prey Interactions

Pilot whales feed primarily on squid but also take fish (Bernard & Reilly, 1999). They are generally well adapted to feeding on squid (Jefferson et al., 2015; Werth, 2006a, 2006b). Analysis of satellite tagging data from pilot whales in Hawaii correlated with certain environmental parameters, suggesting that the deep mesopelagic boundary community serves as prey for these whales (Abecassis et al., 2015).

Pilot whales are not generally known to prey on other marine mammals, but records from the eastern tropical Pacific suggest that the short-finned pilot whale does occasionally chase and attack, and may eat, dolphins during fishery operations (Olson, 2009; Perryman & Foster, 1980).

3.4.1.30.5 Species-Specific Threats

As discussed in Section 3.4.1.7.3 (Bycatch), entanglement risk includes fishing activities out of Japan and South Korea, with the threat of mortality from any such interaction being high given the incentive created by the commercial sale of whale meat/products allowed under Japanese and South Korean law (Baker et al., 2006a; Lukoschek et al., 2009). In nine market samples from South Korea between 2003 and 2005, molecular (DNA) evidence indicated that at least two products contained short-finned pilot whale meat (Baker et al., 2006a).

This species is not known to have any predators (Weller, 2009), although it may be subject to predation by killer whales.

3.4.1.31 Sperm Whale (*Physeter macrocephalus*)

3.4.1.31.1 Status and Management

The sperm whale is listed as endangered under the ESA, but there is no designated critical habitat for this species. The stock structure for sperm whales remains uncertain in the Pacific (Mesnick et al., 2011; Mizroch & Rice, 2013; National Marine Fisheries Service, 2015a), and sperm whales in the Study Area have not been assigned to a stock in the current Pacific SAR (Carretta et al., 2019c). Except for waters off the U.S. West Coast, NMFS recognizes two stocks of sperm whales, one in the central Pacific (in Hawaiian waters) and one in the North Pacific (in Alaskan waters) (Carretta et al., 2019c; Muto et al., 2019).

3.4.1.31.2 Geographic Range and Distribution

Based on whaling data and discovery tag movement data for the North Pacific, it has been argued that the distribution of sperm whales encompasses the entire Pacific Ocean basin, with concentrations in the

arctic and subtropical areas (Ilyashenko et al., 2014; Mizroch & Rice, 2013). The Study Area is south of the locations where the majority of sperm whales were encountered during whaling (Mizroch & Rice, 2013; Townsend, 1935), although during a 1972 survey of the Ogasawara and Mariana Island regions two large groups totaling 90 sperm whales were reported (Masaki, 1972). Sperm whales have been routinely sighted in the Study Area and detected in acoustic monitoring records. Acoustic recordings in August 2013 at Pagan Island indicated the presence of sperm whales within 20 NM of the island (Tetra Tech Inc., 2014). Passive acoustic recorders detected vocalizations from sperm whales on 20 occasions to the east and south of Guam during an underwater glider survey in 2014 (Klinck et al., 2016a).

Sperm whales are highly nomadic, mobile predators with no known concentration areas in the Mariana Islands. Sightings likely represent transiting individuals and pods. Although it has been reported that sperm whales are generally found far offshore in deep water (Mizroch & Rice, 2013), sightings in the Study Area have included animals close to shore in relatively shallow water as well as in areas near steep bathymetric relief (Bangs, 2001; Fulling et al., 2011; Hill et al., 2017a; Hill et al., 2018c; Hill et al., 2019; Uyeyama, 2014). There are two Associated Press File photographs, taken opportunistically by a local photographer during an encounter from a commercial dive boat, showing a group of three adult sperm whales and a calf on June 15, 2001, "… about four miles off the coast of the Agat Marina in Guam" (Bangs, 2001). There have been no other sperm whale calf sightings reported in the Study Area. A total of 23 sperm whale sightings and 93 acoustic encounters were made during the 2007 survey in water depths between approximately 400 and 1,000 m depth (Fulling et al., 2011; Yack et al., 2016). There were three encounters with sperm whales during the NMFS 2015 cetacean survey of the Mariana Islands (Hill et al., 2018d; Oleson, 2017). During the Navy-funded 2010–2018 small boat surveys in the Mariana Islands, a total of seven sperm whales were detected over four encounters (in 2010, 2013, 2016, and 2018) in a median depth of approximately 1,200 m and median approximate distance from shore of 12 km (Hill et al., 2017a; Hill et al., 2018c; Hill et al., 2018d; Hill et al., 2019).

3.4.1.31.3 Population and Abundance

It is assumed the Pacific population is still recovering, given whaling by the Soviet Union from 1948 to 1979 in the North Pacific took 157,680 sperm whales (Ilyashenko et al., 2014). NMFS has reported that for the Pacific Ocean,[5] the population is estimated between 26,300 and 32,100 for the North Pacific and between 14,800 and 34,600 for the eastern tropical Pacific, while the population of the Hawaii Stock is estimated between 2,539 and 3,354 (National Marine Fisheries Service, 2015a). NMFS has not explicitly stated if the western North Pacific and the Mariana Islands are included in the range for the population of sperm whales considered the North Pacific Stock (Carretta et al., 2019c; Muto et al., 2017; Muto et al., 2018; Muto et al., 2019; National Marine Fisheries Service, 2015a), although that may be the most logical assignment for those animals in the Study Area. The most recent Alaska SAR provides that there is no current abundance data available for sperm whale of the North Pacific Stock (Muto et al., 2019).

During the 2007 systematic line-transect survey of the Mariana Islands, 11 on-effort sperm whale sightings were used to derive an abundance estimate of 705 animals (CV = 0.604) for the Study Area (Fulling et al., 2011). Passive acoustic monitoring was also conducted during the 2007 survey, and 93 acoustic encounters from vocalizing sperm whales were used to develop a habitat-based density

[5]The "Pacific Ocean" estimates provided did not address or otherwise specifically include the western Pacific Ocean that would include the Study Area.

model for this species (Yack et al., 2016). The model provided spatially explicit density estimates for the Study Area, and daily model predictions indicated that sperm whale abundance varied temporally over the period of the 2007 survey (January 15 to April 10). Average Study Area abundance derived from the habitat model was similar to the line-transect estimate based on visual sightings; 700 animals (CV = 0.436) based on a model using sounds typically produced by mature males, females, and juveniles (i.e., "regular clicks"), and 637 animals (CV = 0.447) based on a model using both the regular clicks and "slow clicks" that are only produced by mature males (Yack et al., 2016).

3.4.1.31.4 Predator-Prey Interactions

Sperm whales are known to occur in groups for both predator defense and foraging purposes. Sperm whales feed on squid, other cephalopods, and bottom-dwelling fish and invertebrates (Davis et al., 2007; Marcoux et al., 2007; Rice, 1989). False killer whales, pilot whales, and killer whales have been documented harassing and on occasion attacking sperm whales (Arnbom et al., 1987; Baird, 2009b; Palacios & Mate, 1996; Pitman et al., 2001).

3.4.1.31.5 Species-Specific Threats

Sperm whales are susceptible to injury or mortality from vessel strike (Bradford & Lyman, 2015; Carretta et al., 2016b; Carretta et al., 2017c; Fulling et al., 2017). Sperm whales in the Pacific have been documented as susceptible to entanglement and other interactions with fishing gear (Bradford & Lyman, 2015; Carretta et al., 2016b; Carretta et al., 2017c; Helker et al., 2017). Sperm whales have also been documented as having ingested marine debris, resulting in mortality (Garibaldi & Podesta, 2014; Jacobsen et al., 2010), and as with almost all marine mammals, are susceptible to disease (West et al., 2015).

3.4.1.32 Spinner Dolphin (*Stenella longirostris*)

3.4.1.32.1 Status and Management

The spinner dolphin is not listed under the ESA. The stock structure for spinner dolphins remains uncertain in the western Pacific, and spinner dolphins in the Study Area have not been assigned to a stock in the current SAR (Carretta et al., 2019c). NMFS recognizes seven stocks of island- or atoll-associated spinner dolphin populations in the Pacific in Hawaii and American Samoa waters (Carretta et al., 2017c; Carretta et al., 2017d) (Carretta et al., 2019c), which are all at locations well to the east of the Study Area.

3.4.1.32.2 Geographic Range and Distribution

Spinner dolphins traveling among the Mariana Islands chain are expected to occur throughout the Mariana Islands, having been observed from Uracas in the north to Guam in the south (Fulling et al., 2011; Hill et al., 2017a; Hill et al., 2018c; Hill et al., 2019; Jefferson et al., 2006; Oleson, 2017; Oleson & Hill, 2010a; Tetra Tech Inc., 2014; Trianni & Kessler, 2002; Uyeyama, 2014; Vogt, 2008). Spinner dolphins have been the most frequently encountered species during small boat reconnaissance surveys conducted in the nearshore waters of the Mariana Islands since 2010 but were uncommon offshore (Fulling et al., 2011; HDR, 2011b; HDR EOC, 2012; Hill et al., 2013a; Hill et al., 2014; Hill et al., 2015b; Hill et al., 2016b; Hill et al., 2017a; Hill et al., 2018b; Hill et al., 2018c; Hill et al., 2019; Ligon et al., 2011; National Marine Fisheries Service, 2019; Oleson, 2017; Oleson & Hill, 2010a). Previously reported spinner dolphin high-use areas nearshore at Guam include Bile Bay, Tumon Bay, Double Reef, north Agat Bay, and off Merizo (Cocos Lagoon area), where these animals congregate during the day to rest (Amesbury et al., 2001; Eldredge, 1991). More recently, high-use areas have included Agat Bay; the

Merizo channel, tucked into the several small remote bays between Merizo and Facpi Point; Piti Bay; Hagatna; Tumon Bay; and Pugua Point (Ligon et al., 2011). There have been no documented sightings within Apra Harbor. The locations where spinner dolphins have been documented resting in Agat Bay have been considered for geographic mitigation, as detailed in Appendix I (Geographic Mitigation Assessment).

During the Navy-funded 2010–2018 small boat surveys in the Mariana Islands, there were 157 encounters with pods of spinner dolphins (Hill et al., 2019). The approximate distance from shore for these encounters was 1 km (Hill et al., 2017a; Hill et al., 2018b; Hill et al., 2019). During a survey in August 2013 at Pagan Island, spinner dolphins calves and juveniles were encountered; although sighting rates were low relative to other island areas, re-sightings of four individual spinner dolphins on subsequent days were suggested to be consistent with residency patterns seen elsewhere (Tetra Tech Inc., 2014), which would be similar to behaviors seen in Hawaii (Heenehan et al., 2017b; Lammers, 2004; Marten & Psarakos, 1999; Norris et al., 1994; Tyne et al., 2015; Tyne et al., 2017).

3.4.1.32.3 Population and Abundance

Spinner dolphins were sighted only once during the 2007 broad area line-transect survey of the Mariana Islands (Fulling et al., 2011). As noted previously, spinner dolphins have been the most commonly encountered species in nearshore waters within 1 km from shore and have been encountered in group sizes of up to 124 individuals in a pod (HDR, 2011b; HDR EOC, 2012; Hill et al., 2011; Hill et al., 2013a; Hill et al., 2013b; Hill et al., 2014; Hill et al., 2015b; Hill et al., 2016b; Hill et al., 2017a; Hill et al., 2018b; Hill et al., 2019; Ligon et al., 2011; Oleson & Hill, 2010a). Genetic samples (n = 93) from spinner dolphins encountered during small boat surveys off Guam and Saipan between 2010 and 2014 suggest the population has high haplotypic diversity similar to that observed in the Society Islands of French Polynesia and that spinner dolphins around the Mariana Islands are much less isolated than those around the Hawaiian Islands (Martien et al., 2014b).

3.4.1.32.4 Predator-Prey Interactions

Spinner dolphins feed primarily on small mid-water fishes, squids, and shrimp, and dive to at least 200–300 m (Benoit-Bird & Au, 2003; Perrin & Gilpatrick, 1994). They forage primarily at night, when the mid-water community migrates toward the surface and the shore (Benoit-Bird et al., 2001; Benoit-Bird, 2004; Benoit-Bird & Au, 2009; Tyne et al., 2017). Spinner dolphins track the horizontal and vertical migrations of their prey (Benoit-Bird & Au, 2003), allowing for foraging efficiencies (Benoit-Bird et al., 2001; Benoit-Bird & Au, 2003, 2004; Benoit-Bird & Au, 2009). Foraging behavior has also been linked to lunar phases in scattering layers off of Hawaii (Benoit-Bird & Au, 2004).

3.4.1.32.5 Species-Specific Threats

There is no information available regarding marine mammal interactions with fishing activities in the Study Area, but the threat is presumed to be similar to what has been documented in Hawaii. In Hawaiian waters from 2008 to 2012 there were three observed serious injuries (leading to death) to spinner dolphins (Bradford & Lyman, 2015). Two of these injuries were fishing related, and one involved marine debris preventing the individual's mouth from opening. Given the information provided in Section 3.4.1.7.3 (Bycatch), entanglement risk may include fishing activities out of Japan and South Korea (Miyashita, 1993b). The threat of mortality from any such interaction is high given the incentive created by the commercial sale of whale meat/products allowed under Japanese and South Korean law (Baker et al., 2006a; Lukoschek et al., 2009).

Spinner dolphins are also at risk if ecotourism and whale-watching activities result in chronic disturbance in their resting habitats (Courbis & Timmel, 2008; Heenehan et al., 2016; Heenehan et al., 2017a; Tyne et al., 2014; Tyne, 2015; Tyne et al., 2015; Tyne et al., 2017; Tyne et al., 2018). Courbis (2008) found changes in spinner dolphin aerial behaviors and suggested it was likely that vessel and swimmer activity was at least synergistically involved in causing these changes, but whether the behavioral changes affected the survival and fitness of spinner dolphins remains unknown.

Spinner dolphins have stranded at Saipan (Trianni & Kessler, 2002). Spinner dolphins may be preyed on by sharks, killer whales, pygmy killer whales, and short-finned pilot whales (Perrin, 2009a).

3.4.1.33 Striped Dolphin (*Stenella coeruleoalba*)

3.4.1.33.1 Status and Management

The striped dolphin is not listed under the ESA. The stock structure for striped dolphins remains uncertain in the western Pacific, and striped dolphins in the Study Area have not been assigned to a stock in the current SAR (Carretta et al., 2019c). Other than along the U.S. West Coast, NMFS recognizes only a single stock of striped dolphins that is present within the 200-mi. Exclusive Economic Zone defining Hawaiian waters (Carretta et al., 2019c).(Carretta et al., 2017c; Carretta et al., 2017d)

3.4.1.33.2 Geographic Range and Distribution

Striped dolphins are generally restricted to oceanic regions and are seen close to shore only where deep water approaches the coast. In the eastern tropical Pacific, striped dolphins inhabit areas with large seasonal changes in surface temperature and thermocline depth, as well as seasonal upwelling (Au & Perryman, 1985; Reilly, 1990). The observed northern limits for the species are the Sea of Japan off Hokkaido, off Washington State in the eastern Pacific, or roughly along 40° N latitude across the western and central Pacific (Reeves et al., 2002).

Prior to the 2007 survey of the Study Area (Fulling et al., 2011), striped dolphins were only known to occur in the area from two strandings, one recorded in July 1985 (Eldredge, 1991, 2003) and a second in 1993 off Saipan (Trianni & Tenorio, 2012). However, striped dolphins were sighted throughout the Study Area during the 2007 survey (Fulling et al., 2011). There was at least one sighting over the Mariana Trench, southeast of Saipan. Group sizes ranged from 7 to 44 individuals, and several sightings included calves. In early April 2010, during an oceanographic survey of waters in Micronesia and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, there were two striped dolphin sightings (pod sizes of 6 and 12) in waters to the south of Guam (Oleson & Hill, 2010b). Striped dolphins have not been reported during more recent non-systematic surveys in the Study Area involving small boats operating close to shore (Hill et al., 2011; Hill et al., 2013a; Hill et al., 2014; Hill et al., 2015b; Hill et al., 2017a; Hill et al., 2018b; Hill et al., 2018c; Hill et al., 2019).

3.4.1.33.3 Population and Abundance

The population of striped dolphins south of 30˚ N in the western Pacific (which would include the Study Area) was estimated to be around 52,600 dolphins (Miyashita, 1993b). Based on the 2007 survey data from the Mariana Islands sightings, there were an estimated 3,531 (CV = 0.54) striped dolphins in the survey area (Fulling et al., 2011).

3.4.1.33.4 Predator-Prey Interactions

Striped dolphins often feed in open sea or sea bottom zones along the continental slope or just beyond it in oceanic waters. Most of their prey possess light-emitting organs (lanternfishes), suggesting that

striped dolphins may be feeding at great depths, possibly diving to 200–700 m, and may feed at night in order to take advantage of the deep scattering layer's diurnal vertical movements, including small mid-water fishes and squids (Archer & Perrin, 1999; Perrin et al., 1994b). This species has been documented to be preyed upon by sharks (Ross & Bass, 1971). It may also be subject to predation by killer whales.

3.4.1.33.5 Species-Specific Threats

Striped dolphins have been taken as bycatch by the tuna purse seine fishery in the eastern tropical Pacific and are susceptible to entanglement in fishing gear in other areas (Carretta et al., 2017c; Carretta et al., 2017d). There is no information on fisheries interactions or species-specific threats available for this species in the Study Area. Given the information provided in Section 3.4.1.7.3 (Bycatch), entanglement risk may include fishing activities out of Japan and South Korea (Miyashita, 1993b). The threat of mortality from any such interaction is high given the incentive created by the commercial sale of whale meat/products allowed under Japanese and South Korean law (Baker et al., 2006a; Lukoschek et al., 2009).

3.4.2 Environmental Consequences

Under the Proposed Action for this SEIS/OEIS, there have been some modifications to the quantity and type of acoustic stressors under the two action alternatives. Additionally, there is one new sub-stressor (high-energy lasers) being analyzed because of the potential to affect marine species, as detailed in Section 3.0.4.3.2.2 (High-Energy Lasers).

In the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2015a), the Navy considered all potential stressors associated with ongoing military readiness in the Mariana Islands and then analyzed their potential impacts on marine mammals in the Study Area. In addition, NMFS also reviewed the Navy's analysis and detailed their findings with regard to requirements under the MMPA (80 FR 46112) and pursuant to the ESA for the Navy's Proposed Action in the Biological Opinion for the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2015b).

In general, there have been no substantial changes to the activities analyzed as the Proposed Action the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS that would change the conclusions reached regarding populations of marine mammals in the Study Area. Use of acoustic stressors (sonar and other transducers) and use of explosives have occurred in the Mariana Islands for decades and were last authorized by the 2015 completion of the MITT Record of Decision, MMPA Authorization, and ESA Biological Opinion. There have been no known impacts on populations of marine mammals or adverse effects to ESA-listed marine mammal species that were not otherwise previously analyzed or accounted for in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2015b), the NMFS MMPA Authorization (80 FR 46112), or the NMFS Biological Opinion pursuant to ESA (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2015a) with regard to acoustic or explosive stressors.

In this SEIS/OEIS, the Navy has reviewed the analysis of impacts from these ongoing activities and additionally analyzed the new or changing training and testing activities as projected into the reasonably foreseeable future. The projected future actions are based on evolving operational requirements, including those associated with any anticipated new platforms or systems not previously analyzed. The Navy has compiled, thoroughly reviewed, and incorporated the best available emergent marine mammal science since 2015 that is relevant to the analysis of environmental impacts from the proposed activities as presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Where there has been no substantive or otherwise meaningful change in the action, science, or regulations, the Navy will rely on the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS analysis. Where there has been substantive change in the action, science, or regulations,

the information and analysis provided in this SEIS/OEIS will supplement the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS to support environmental compliance with applicable environmental statutes for marine mammals (the MMPA and ESA).

The 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS considered all training and testing activities proposed to occur in the Study Area that may have the potential to result in the MMPA-defined take of marine mammals or to affect ESA-listed marine mammal species. The stressors applicable to marine mammals in the Study Area for this SEIS/OEIS include a new stressor (high-energy laser) and the same stressors considered in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS:

- **Acoustic** (sonar and other transducers, vessel noise, aircraft noise, weapon noise)
- **Explosives** (in-air explosions and in-water explosions)
- **Energy** (in-water electromagnetic devices, high-energy lasers)
- **Physical disturbance and strike** (vessels and in-water devices, military expended materials, seafloor devices)
- **Entanglement** (wires and cables, decelerators/parachutes)
- **Ingestion** (military expended materials – munitions, military expended materials other than munitions)
- **Secondary** (impacts on habitat, impacts on prey availability)

This section of this SEIS/OEIS evaluates how and to what degree potential impacts on marine mammals from stressors described in Section 3.0 (Introduction) may have changed since the analysis presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS was completed. Table 2.5-1 and Table 2.5-2 in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) list the proposed training and testing activities and include the number of times each activity would be conducted annually and the locations within the Study Area where the activity would typically occur under each alternative. The tables also present the same information for activities described in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS so that the proposed levels of training and testing under this SEIS/OEIS can be easily compared. The analysis in this SEIS/OEIS includes consideration of the Navy's standard operating procedures and mitigation that the Navy will implement to avoid or reduce potential impacts on marine mammals from acoustic, explosive, and physical disturbance and strike stressors. Mitigation for marine mammals has been coordinated with NMFS through the MMPA and ESA consultation processes, and is detailed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) and Appendix I (Geographic Mitigation Assessment) of this SEIS/OEIS.

In 2015, the Navy and NMFS determined that within the Study Area only acoustic stressors and explosive stressors could potentially result in harassment and/or the incidental taking of marine mammals from Navy training and testing activities (80 FR 46112) and that none of the other stressors would result in significant adverse impacts or jeopardize the continued existence of any ESA-listed marine mammals (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2015b).

There has been no emergent science that would necessitate changes to conclusions reached by the Navy or NMFS (as a cooperating agency) in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS regarding those other dismissed stressors as having a negligible or discountable impact on marine mammal populations or species. The 2015 conclusions have also been reaffirmed in the most recent MMPA authorizations (83 FR 66846 and 83 FR 57076) and ESA Biological Opinions (National Marine Fisheries Service, 2017, 2018a) from NMFS for many of the same Navy training and testing activities and the same species as occur in the MITT Study Area. As detailed in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) of this SEIS/OEIS, there are no changes to proposed training and testing activities that would necessitate re-analysis of any of the activities associated with those stressors for which NMFS has previously

determined did not rise to the level of a take under MMPA. The analysis presented in this section of the SEIS/OEIS also considers standard operating procedures, which are discussed in Section 2.3.3 (Standard Operating Procedures) of this Draft SEIS/OEIS, and mitigation measures that are described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation). The Navy would implement these measures to avoid or reduce potential impacts on marine mammals from stressors associated with the proposed training and testing activities. Mitigation for marine mammals has been coordinated with NMFS through the ESA consultation process. In addition, in the Navy developed Appendix I (Geographic Mitigation Assessment), which detailed consideration of specific mitigation areas identified by the public during the scoping process. In short, Appendix I (Geographic Mitigation Assessment) contains the background information for each area being considered and lays out the methodology used by the Navy in its scientific and operational analysis for assessing and developing proposed geographic mitigation areas within the MITT Study Area to further avoid or reduce potential impacts on marine mammals in areas that may be of particular biological importance.

As presented in Section 3.0 (Introduction), since completion of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS there have been refinements made in the modeling of potential impacts from sonar and other transducers and in-water explosives. These changes have been incorporated into the re-analysis of acoustic and explosive stressors presented in this SEIS/OEIS. In addition to the new effects criteria, weighting functions, and thresholds for multiple species, new information for marine mammals includes the integration of new marine mammal density data based on new survey data (Bradford et al., 2017) and the integration of data from acoustic monitoring (Norris et al., 2017; Yack et al., 2016).

There have been no changes to the MITT Study Area, existing conditions, species life histories, or any new information available since 2015 that would otherwise substantively change the conclusions[6] presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. What is new since 2015 are refinements to the Navy Acoustic Effects Model. This SEIS/OEIS, therefore, focuses on a re-analysis of potential impacts on marine mammals from acoustic stressors involving use of sonar and other transducers, and the use of in-water explosives. The following paragraphs provide details on refinements to the Navy's acoustic modeling since 2015. Most important is the information found in Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015) regarding scientific data gathered on marine mammals in locations where the Navy has been training and testing, which serves as an empirical basis for the marine mammal impact assessment presented in this SEIS/OEIS.

The majority of the changes in the results of the impact analyses presented in this SEIS/OEIS pursuant to requirements of the MMPA arise from changes in the model input; specifically, more accurate marine mammal density data, revised acoustic impact criteria, and more comprehensive computer modeling of predicted effects on marine mammals. These improvements are described in Section 3.0.1.2 (Navy's

[6] Conclusions in this regard refer to the findings reached by Navy and NMFS on the two previous sets of analyses for the continuation of training and testing in Study Area. NMFS has recently re-considered analysis of Navy training and testing for many of the same for actions elsewhere (83 FR 10954 and 83 FR 29872) and for a third time reaffirmed their earlier conclusions regarding Navy military readiness activities (83 FR 66846 and 83 FR 57076). The Navy and NMFS have found that there would not be significant impacts on populations of marine mammals resulting from the continuation of training and testing. Under ESA, the Proposed Action may affect certain ESA-listed marine mammal species, but were not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of the continued existence of those species (National Marine Fisheries Service, 2018a).

Quantitative Analysis). Assessment of likely long-term consequences to populations of marine mammals are provided by empirical data gathered from areas where the Navy routinely trains and tests. Substantial Navy-funded marine mammal survey data, monitoring data, and scientific research have been completed since 2007. These empirical data are beginning to provide insight on the qualitative analysis of the actual (as opposed to model predicted numerical) impact on marine mammals resulting from Navy training and testing activities based on observations of marine mammals generally in and around Navy Range Complexes.

The following subsections of this SEIS/OEIS present the potential environmental consequences based on an updated modeling methodology and the scientific observations and investigations made over 12 years of monitoring training and testing activities in the Pacific and elsewhere that are representative of the type of activities proposed in this SEIS/OEIS.

3.4.2.1 Acoustic Stressors

Assessing whether a sound may disturb or injure a marine mammal involves understanding the characteristics of the acoustic sources, the marine mammals that may be present in the vicinity of the sources, and the effects that sound may have on the physiology and behavior of those marine mammals. Although it is known that sound is important for marine mammal communication, navigation, and foraging (National Research Council, 2003, 2005), there are many unknowns in assessing impacts, such as the potential interaction of different effects and the significance of responses by marine mammals to sound exposures (Nowacek et al., 2007; Southall et al., 2007). Many other factors besides just the received level of sound may affect an animal's reaction, such as the duration of the sound-producing activity, the animal's physical condition, prior experience with the sound, activity at the time of exposure (e.g., feeding, traveling, resting), the context of the exposure (e.g., in a semi-enclosed bay versus open ocean), and proximity to the source of the sound.

The ways in which an acoustic exposure could result in immediate effects or long-term consequences for an animal are explained in Section 3.0.4.7 (Conceptual Framework for Assessing Effects from Acoustic and Explosive Activities). The following background section discusses what is currently known about acoustic effects to marine mammals. These effects could hypothetically extend from physical injury or trauma to a behavioral or stress response that may or may not be detectable. Injury (physical trauma) can occur to organs or tissues of an animal (Section 3.4.2.1.1.1, Injury). Hearing loss (Section 3.4.2.1.1.2, Hearing Loss) is a noise-induced decrease in hearing sensitivity, which can be either temporary or permanent. Masking (Section 3.4.2.1.1.4, Masking) can occur when the perception of a biologically important sound (i.e., signal) is interfered with by a second sound (i.e., noise). Physiological stress (Section 3.4.2.1.1.3, Physiological Stress) is an adaptive process that helps an animal cope with changing conditions; however, too much stress can potentially result in additional physiological effects. Behavioral response (Section 3.4.2.1.1.5, Behavioral Reactions) ranges from brief distractions to avoidance of a sound source to prolonged flight. Extreme behavioral or physiological responses can lead to stranding (Section 3.4.2.1.1.6, Stranding). Long-term consequences (Section 3.4.2.1.1.7, Long-Term Consequences) are those impacts, or accumulation of impacts, that can result in decreases in individual fitness or population changes. To avoid or reduce potential impacts to the maximum extent practicable, the Navy will implement marine mammal mitigation measures during applicable training and testing activities that generate acoustic stressors (see Chapter 5, Mitigation; and Appendix I, Geographic Mitigation Assessment).

The Navy will rely on the previous 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS for the analysis of vessel noise, aircraft noise, and weapon noise; new applicable and emergent science in regard to these sub-stressors is

presented in the sections that follow. Due to new acoustic impact criteria, marine mammal densities, and revisions to the acoustic effects model, the analysis provided in Section 3.4.2.1.2 (Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducer Stressors) of this SEIS/OEIS supplants the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS for marine mammals and changes estimated impacts for some species since the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

3.4.2.1.1 Background

3.4.2.1.1.1 Injury

Injury (i.e., physical trauma) refers to the effects on the tissues or organs of an animal due to exposure to pressure waves. Injury due to exposure to non-explosive acoustic stressors such as sonar is discussed below. Moderate- to low-level sound sources, including vessel and aircraft noise, would not cause any injury. Section 3.0.4.7 (Conceptual Framework for Assessing Effects from Acoustic and Explosive Activities) provides additional information on injury (i.e., physical trauma) and the framework used to analyze this potential impact.

Several mechanisms of acoustically induced tissue damage (non-auditory) have been proposed and are discussed below.

Injury Due to Sonar-Induced Acoustic Resonance

An object exposed to its resonant frequency will tend to amplify its vibration at that frequency, a phenomenon called acoustic resonance. Acoustic resonance has been proposed as a mechanism by which a sonar or sources with similar operating characteristics could damage tissues of marine mammals. In 2002, NMFS convened a panel of government and private scientists to investigate the potential for acoustic resonance to occur in marine mammals (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2002). They modeled and evaluated the likelihood that Navy mid-frequency sonar caused resonance effects in beaked whales that eventually led to their stranding. The conclusions of the group were that resonance in air-filled structures was not likely to have caused the Bahamas stranding in 2000. The frequency at which resonance was predicted to occur in the animals' lungs was 50 Hz, well below the frequencies used by the mid-frequency sonar systems associated with the Bahamas event. Furthermore, air cavity vibrations, even at resonant frequencies, were not considered to be of sufficient amplitude to cause tissue damage, even under the unrealistic scenario in which air volumes would be undamped (unrestrained) by surrounding tissues and the amplitude of the resonant response would be greatest. These same conclusions would apply to other training and testing activities involving acoustic sources. Therefore, the Navy concludes that acoustic resonance would not occur under realistic conditions during training and testing activities, and this type of impact is not considered further in this analysis.

Nitrogen Decompression

Marine mammals mitigate nitrogen gas accumulation in their blood and other tissues, which is caused by gas exchange from the lungs under conditions of increased hydrostatic pressure during diving, through anatomical, behavioral, and physiological adaptations (Hooker et al., 2012).

Although not an injury caused by the interaction of sound with tissues, variations in marine mammal diving behavior or avoidance responses in response to sound exposure have been hypothesized to result in the off-gassing of nitrogen super-saturated tissues, possibly to the point of deleterious vascular and tissue bubble formation (Hooker et al., 2012; Jepson et al., 2003; Saunders et al., 2008) with resulting symptoms similar to decompression sickness (also known as "the bends"). Bernaldo de Quirós et al. (2019) provide a recent review of theories of decompression sickness in beaked whales.

Whether marine mammals can produce deleterious gas emboli has been under debate in the scientific community (Hooker et al., 2012; Saunders et al., 2008), although various lines of evidence have been presented in support of the phenomenon. Some of these postulations are described below.

1. Analyses of bycaught animals demonstrated that nitrogen bubble formation occurs in drowned animals when they are brought to the surface (Bernaldo de Quiros et al., 2013b; Moore et al., 2009). Since gas exchange with the lungs no longer occurs once drowned, tissues become supersaturated with nitrogen due to the reduction in hydrostatic pressure near the surface. This demonstrates that the phenomenon of bubble formation is at least physically possible.
2. The presence of osteonecrosis (bone death due to reduced blood flow) in deep-diving sperm whales has been offered as evidence of impacts due to chronic nitrogen supersaturation and a lifetime of decompression insults (Moore & Early, 2004).
3. Dennison et al. (2012) investigated dolphins stranded in 2009–2010. Using ultrasound, they identified gas bubbles in kidneys of 21 of the 22 live-stranded dolphins and in the liver of two of the 22. The authors postulated that stranded animals were unable to recompress by diving and thus retained bubbles that would have otherwise re-absorbed in animals that continued to dive. However, the researchers concluded that the minor bubble formation observed could be tolerated since the majority of stranded dolphins released did not re-strand.
4. A fat embolic syndrome (out-of-place fat particles, typically in the bloodstream) was identified by Fernández et al. (2005) coincident with the identification of bubble emboli in stranded beaked whales. The fat embolic syndrome was the first pathology of this type identified in marine mammals and was thought to possibly arise from the formation of bubbles in fat bodies, which subsequently resulted in the release of fat emboli into the blood stream.
5. Findings of gas and fat emboli in a few stranded Risso's dolphin, and in which sonar exposure was ruled out as a cause of stranding, suggested that other factors, in this case struggling with a prey item, might cause significant variations in dive behavior such that emboli formation could occur (Fernandez et al., 2017).

Only one study has attempted to find vascular bubbles in a freely diving marine mammal (Houser et al., 2009). In that study, no vascular bubbles were imaged by ultrasound in a bottlenose dolphin that repeatedly dove to a 100 m depth and maintained a dive profile meant to maximize nitrogen gas uptake. Thus, although lines of evidence suggest that marine mammals manage excessive nitrogen gas loads, the majority of the evidence for the formation of bubble and fat emboli come from stranded animals in which physiological compromise due to the stranding event is a potential confounding factor.

Researchers have examined how dive behavior affects tissue supersaturation conditions that could put an animal at risk of gas bubble embolism. An early hypothesis was that if exposure to a startling sound elicits a rapid ascent to the surface, tissue gas saturation sufficient for the evolution of nitrogen bubbles might result (Fernandez et al., 2005; Jepson et al., 2003). However, modeling suggested that even unrealistically rapid rates of ascent from normal dive behaviors are unlikely to result in supersaturation to the extent that bubble formation would be expected in beaked whales (Zimmer & Tyack, 2007). Instead, emboli observed in animals exposed to mid-frequency active sonar (Fernandez et al., 2005; Jepson et al., 2003) could stem from a behavioral response that involves repeated dives, shallower than the depth of lung collapse (Aguilar de Soto et al., 2006; Hooker et al., 2012; Tyack et al., 2006; Zimmer & Tyack, 2007). Longer times spent diving at mid-depths above lung collapse would allow gas exchange from the lungs to continue under high hydrostatic pressure conditions, increasing potential for supersaturation; below the depth of lung collapse, gas exchange from the lungs to the blood would likely not occur (Fahlman et al., 2014b). To estimate risk of decompression sickness, Kvadsheim et al.

(2012) modeled gas exchange in the tissues of sperm, pilot, killer, and beaked whales based on actual dive behavior during exposure to sonar in the wild. Results predicted that venous supersaturation would be within the normal range for these species, which would presumably have naturally higher levels of nitrogen gas loading. Nevertheless, deep-diving whales, such as beaked whales, have also been predicted to have higher nitrogen gas loads in body tissues for certain modeled changes in dive behavior, which might make them more susceptible to decompression sickness (Fahlman et al., 2014b; Fernandez et al., 2005; Hooker et al., 2012; Jepson et al., 2003). Bernaldo de Quiros et al. (2019) summarized discussions from a 2017 workshop on potential sonar impacts on beaked whales, suggesting that the effect of mid-frequency active sonar on beaked whales varies among individuals or populations and that predisposing conditions such as previous exposure to sonar and individual health risk factors may contribute to individual outcomes (such as decompression sickness) as well.

Modeling has suggested that the long, deep dives performed regularly by beaked whales over a lifetime could result in the saturation of long-halftime tissues (i.e., tissues that take longer to give off nitrogen, such as fat and bone lipid) to the point that they are supersaturated when the animals are at the surface (Fahlman et al., 2014b; Hooker et al., 2009; Saunders et al., 2008). The presence of osteonecrosis (bone death due to reduced blood flow) in deep-diving sperm whales has been offered as evidence of chronic supersaturation (Moore & Early, 2004). Proposed adaptations for prevention of bubble formation under conditions of persistent tissue saturation have been suggested (Fahlman et al., 2006; Hooker et al., 2009), while the condition of supersaturation required for bubble formation in these tissues has been demonstrated in marine mammals drowned at depth as fisheries bycatch and brought to the surface (Moore et al., 2009). For beaked whale strandings associated with sonar use, one theory is that observed bubble formation might be caused by long periods of compromised blood flow caused by the stranding itself (which reduces ability to remove nitrogen from tissues) following rapid ascent dive behavior that does not allow for typical management of nitrogen in supersaturated, long-halftime tissues (Houser et al., 2009).

Predictive modeling conducted to date has been performed with many unknowns about the respiratory physiology of deep-diving breath-hold animals. For example, as hypothesized by Garcia Parraga et al. (2018), mechanisms may exist that allow marine mammals to create a pulmonary shunt without the need for hydrostatic pressure-induced lung collapse, (i.e., by varying perfusion to the lung independent of lung collapse and degree of ventilation). If such a mechanism exists, then assumptions in prior gas models require reconsideration, the degree of nitrogen gas accumulation associated with dive profiles needs to be re-evaluated, and behavioral responses potentially leading to a destabilization of the relationship between pulmonary ventilation and perfusion should be considered. Costidis and Rommel (2016) suggested that gas exchange may continue to occur across the tissues of air-filled sinuses in deep-diving odontocetes below the depth of lung collapse, if hydrostatic pressures are high enough to drive gas exchange across into non-capillary veins.

If feasible, kinetic gas models would need to consider an additional gas exchange route that might be functional at great depths within the odontocetes. Other adaptations potentially mitigating and defending against deleterious nitrogen gas emboli have been proposed (Blix et al., 2013). Researchers have also considered the accumulation of carbon dioxide produced during periods of high activity by an animal, theorizing that accumulating carbon dioxide, which cannot be removed by gas exchange below the depth of lung collapse, might also facilitate the formation of bubbles in nitrogen-saturated tissues (Bernaldo de Quiros et al., 2012; Fahlman et al., 2014b). In all of these cases, the hypotheses have

received little in the way of experimentation to evaluate whether or not they are supported, thus leaving many unknowns as to the predictive accuracy of modeling efforts.

The appearance of extensive bubble and fat emboli in beaked whales was unique to a small number of strandings associated with certain high-intensity sonar events; the phenomenon has not been observed to the same degree in other stranded marine mammals, including other beaked whale strandings not associated with sonar use. It is uncertain as to whether there is some more easily triggered mechanism for this phenomenon specific to beaked whales or whether the phenomenon occurs only following rapidly occurring stranding events (i.e., when whales are not capable of sufficiently decompressing). Nevertheless, based on the rarity of observations of bubble pathology, the potential for nitrogen decompression sickness, or "the bends," as a result of exposure to Navy sound sources is considered discountable.

Acoustically Induced Bubble Formation Due to Sonars

A suggested cause of injury to marine mammals is rectified diffusion (Crum & Mao, 1996), the process of increasing the size of a microscopic gas bubble by exposing it to a sound field. The process is dependent upon a number of factors, including the sound pressure level (SPL) and duration. Under this hypothesis, microscopic bubbles assumed to exist in the tissues of marine mammals may experience one of three things: (1) bubbles grow to the extent they become emboli or cause localized tissue trauma, (2) bubbles develop to the extent that a complement immune response is triggered or the nervous tissue is subjected to enough localized pressure that pain or dysfunction occurs (a stress response without injury), or (3) the bubbles are cleared by the lung without negative consequence to the animal.

Rectified diffusion is facilitated if the environment in which the ensonified bubbles exist is supersaturated with gas. As discussed above, repetitive diving by marine mammals can cause the blood and some tissues to become supersaturated (Ridgway & Howard, 1979). The dive patterns of some marine mammals (e.g., beaked whales) are predicted to induce greater supersaturation (Houser et al., 2001). If rectified diffusion were possible in marine mammals exposed to high-level sound, conditions of tissue supersaturation could theoretically speed the rate and increase the size of bubble growth. Subsequent effects due to tissue trauma and emboli would presumably mirror those observed in humans suffering from decompression sickness.

It is unlikely that the short duration of sonar pulses would be long enough to drive bubble growth to any substantial size, if such a phenomenon occurs. However, an alternative but related hypothesis has also been suggested: stable microbubbles could be destabilized by high-level sound exposures such that bubble growth then occurs through static diffusion of gas out of supersaturated tissues. In such a scenario, the marine mammal would need to be in a gas-supersaturated state for a long enough time for bubbles to become a problematic size. The phenomena of bubble growth due to a destabilizing exposure was shown by Crum et al. (2005) by exposing highly supersaturated ex vivo bovine tissues to a 37 kHz source at 214 dB re 1 µPa. Although bubble growth occurred under the extreme conditions created for the study, these conditions would not exist in the wild because the levels of tissue supersaturation in the study (as high as 400–700 percent) are substantially higher than model predictions for marine mammals (Fahlman et al., 2009; Fahlman et al., 2014b; Houser et al., 2001; Saunders et al., 2008), and such high exposure level would only occur in very close proximity to the most powerful sonars. It is improbable that this mechanism is responsible for stranding events or traumas associated with beaked whale strandings.

There has been considerable disagreement among scientists as to the likelihood of this phenomenon (Evans & Miller, 2003; Piantadosi & Thalmann, 2004). Although it has been argued that traumas from beaked whale strandings are consistent with gas emboli and bubble-induced tissue separations (Fernandez et al., 2005; Jepson et al., 2003), nitrogen bubble formation as the cause of the traumas has not been verified. The presence of bubbles postmortem, particularly after decompression, is not necessarily indicative of bubble pathology (Bernaldo de Quiros et al., 2012; Bernaldo de Quiros et al., 2013a; Bernaldo de Quiros et al., 2013b; Dennison et al., 2012; Moore et al., 2009).


3.4.2.1.1.2 Hearing Loss

Exposure to intense sound may result in noise-induced hearing loss that persists after cessation of the noise exposure. Hearing loss may be temporary or permanent, depending on factors such as the exposure frequency, received sound pressure level, temporal pattern, and duration. The frequencies affected by hearing loss will vary depending on the frequency of the fatiguing noise, with frequencies at and above the noise frequency most strongly affected. The amount of hearing loss is highly variable and depends on the species, individual, and contextual factors.

Section 3.0.4.7 (Conceptual Framework for Assessing Effects from Acoustic and Explosive Activities) provides additional information on hearing loss and the framework used to analyze this potential impact. Hearing loss has only been studied in a few species of marine mammals, although hearing studies with terrestrial mammals are also informative.

Hearing loss is typically quantified in terms of threshold shift (TS)—the amount (in dB) that hearing thresholds at one or more specified frequencies are elevated, compared to their pre-exposure values, at some specific time after the noise exposure. The amount of TS measured usually decreases with increasing recovery time—the amount of time that has elapsed since a noise exposure. If the TS eventually returns to zero (i.e., the hearing threshold returns to the pre-exposure value), the threshold shift is called a temporary threshold shift (TTS). If the TS does not completely recover (the threshold remains elevated compared to the pre-exposure value), the remaining TS is called a permanent threshold shift (PTS). Figure 3.4-2 shows two hypothetical TSs: one that completely recovers, a TTS, and one that does not completely recover, leaving some PTS. By definition, TTS is a function of the recovery time, therefore comparing the severity of noise exposures based on the amount of induced TTS can only be done if the recovery times are also taken into account. For example, a 20 dB TTS measured 24 hours post-exposure indicates a more hazardous exposure than one producing 20 dB of TTS measured only two minutes after exposure; if the TTS is 20 dB after 24 hours, the TTS measured after two minutes would have likely been much higher. Conversely, if 20 dB of TTS was measured after two minutes, the TTS measured after 24 hours would likely have been much smaller.

Studies have revealed that intense noise exposures may also cause auditory system injury that does not result in PTS (i.e., hearing thresholds return to normal after the exposure, but there is injury nonetheless). Kujawa and Liberman (2009) found that noise exposures sufficient to produce a TTS of 40 dB, measured 24 hours post-exposure using electro-physiological methods, resulted in acute loss of nerve terminals and delayed degeneration of the cochlear nerve in mice. Lin et al. (2011) found a similar result in guinea pigs, that a TTS in auditory evoked potential of up to approximately 50 dB, measured 24 hours post-exposure, resulted in neural degeneration. These studies demonstrate that PTS should not be used as the sole indicator of auditory injury, since exposures producing high levels of TTS (40 to 50 dB measured 24 hours after exposure)—but no PTS—may result in auditory injury.



Notes: TTS = Temporary Threshold Shift, TS = Threshold Shift, PTS = Permanent Threshold Shift

Figure 3.4-2: Two Hypothetical Threshold Shifts

There are no simple functional relationships between TTS and the occurrence of PTS or other auditory injury (e.g., neural degeneration). However, TTS and PTS are, by definition, mutually exclusive. An exposure that produces TTS cannot also produce PTS within the same frequency band in the same individual (Reichmuth et al., 2019); conversely, if an initial threshold shift only partially recovers, resulting in some amount of PTS, the difference between the initial TS and the PTS is not called TTS. As TTS increases, the likelihood that additional exposure SPL or duration will result in PTS or other injury also increases (with the exception that researchers might not be able to observe gradual growth of TTS with increased SELs before onset of PTS (Reichmuth et al., 2019)). Exposure thresholds for the occurrence of PTS or other auditory injury can therefore be defined based on a specific amount of TTS; that is, we assume that any additional exposure may result in some PTS or other injury. The specific upper limit of TTS is based on experimental data showing amounts of TTS that have not resulted in PTS or injury. In other words, we do not need to know the exact functional relationship between TTS and PTS or other injury, we only need to know the upper limit for TTS before some PTS or injury is possible.

A variety of human and terrestrial mammal data indicate that threshold shifts up to 40 dB may be induced without PTS, and that 40 dB is a reasonable upper limit for allowable threshold shift to prevent PTS (e.g., Kryter et al., 1965; Miller et al., 1963; Ward et al., 1958; Ward et al., 1959; Ward, 1960). It is reasonable to assume the same relationship would hold for marine mammals, since there are many similarities between the inner ears of marine and terrestrial mammals, and experiments with marine mammals have revealed similarities to terrestrial mammals for features such as TTS, age-related hearing loss, drug-induced hearing loss, masking, and frequency selectivity (Finneran et al., 2005a; Finneran, 2015; Ketten, 2000). Therefore, we assume that sound exposures sufficient to produce 40 dB of TTS measured approximately four minutes after exposure represent the limit of a non-injurious exposure (i.e., higher-level exposures have the potential to cause auditory injury). Exposures sufficient to produce a TTS of 40 dB, measured approximately four minutes after exposure, therefore represent the threshold for auditory injury. The predicted injury could consist of either hair cell damage/loss resulting in PTS or other auditory injury, such as the delayed neural degeneration identified by Kujawa and Liberman (2009) and Lin et al. (2011) that may not result in PTS.

Numerous studies have directly examined noise-induced hearing loss in marine mammals (see Finneran, 2015). In these studies, hearing thresholds were measured in marine mammals before and after exposure to intense sounds. The difference between the pre-exposure and post-exposure thresholds

was then used to determine the amount of TTS at various post-exposure times. The major findings from these studies include the following:

- The method used to test hearing may affect the resulting amount of measured TTS, with neurophysiological measures producing larger amounts of TTS compared to psychophysical measures (Finneran et al., 2007; Finneran, 2015).
- The amount of TTS varies with the hearing test frequency. As the exposure SPL increases, the frequency at which the maximum TTS occurs also increases (Kastelein et al., 2014b; Kastelein et al., 2020). For high-level exposures, the maximum TTS typically occurs one-half to one octave above the exposure frequency (Finneran et al., 2007; Mooney et al., 2009a; Nachtigall et al., 2004; Popov et al., 2011; Popov et al., 2013; Reichmuth et al., 2019; Schlundt et al., 2000). The overall spread of TTS from tonal exposures can therefore extend over a large frequency range (i.e., narrowband exposures can produce broadband [greater than one octave] TTS).
- The amount of TTS usually increases with exposure SPL and duration and is correlated with sound exposure level (SEL), especially if the range of exposure durations is relatively small (Kastak et al., 2007; Kastelein et al., 2014b; Popov et al., 2014). As the exposure duration increases, however, the relationship between TTS and SEL begins to break down. Specifically, duration has a more significant effect on TTS than would be predicted on the basis of SEL alone (Finneran et al., 2010b; Kastak et al., 2005; Mooney et al., 2009a). This means if two exposures have the same SEL but different durations, the exposure with the longer duration (thus lower SPL) will tend to produce more TTS than the exposure with the higher SPL and shorter duration. In most acoustic impact assessments, the scenarios of interest involve shorter duration exposures than the marine mammal experimental data from which impact thresholds are derived; therefore, use of SEL tends to over-estimate the amount of TTS. Despite this, SEL continues to be used in many situations because it is relatively simple, more accurate than SPL alone, and lends itself easily to scenarios involving multiple exposures with different SPL.
- Gradual increases of TTS may not be directly observable with increasing exposure levels, before the onset of PTS (Reichmuth et al., 2019). Similarly, PTS can occur without measurable behavioral modifications (Reichmuth et al., 2019).
- The amount of TTS depends on the exposure frequency. Sounds at low frequencies, well below the region of best sensitivity, are less hazardous than those at higher frequencies, near the region of best sensitivity (Finneran & Schlundt, 2013). The onset of TTS—defined as the exposure level at which a threshold shift of 6 dB is measured approximately 4 minutes after exposure (i.e., clearly above the typical variation in threshold measurements)—also varies with exposure frequency. At low frequencies TTS onset exposure levels are higher compared to those in the region of best sensitivity.
- TTS can accumulate across multiple exposures, but the resulting TTS will be less than the TTS from a single, continuous exposure with the same SEL (Finneran et al., 2010b; Kastelein et al., 2014b; Kastelein et al., 2015b; Mooney et al., 2009b). This means that TTS predictions based on the total, cumulative SEL will overestimate the amount of TTS from intermittent exposures such as sonar and impulsive sources.
- The amount of observed TTS tends to decrease with increasing time following the exposure; however, the relationship is not monotonic (i.e., increasing exposure does not always increase TTS). The time required for complete recovery of hearing depends on the magnitude of the initial shift; for relatively small shifts recovery may be complete in a few minutes, while large

shifts (e.g., approximately 40 dB) may require several days for recovery. Recovery times are consistent for similar-magnitude shifts, regardless of the type of fatiguing sound exposure (impulsive, continuous noise band, or sinusoidal) (Kastelein et al., 2019b). Under many circumstances TTS recovers linearly with the logarithm of time (Finneran et al., 2010a, 2010b; Finneran & Schlundt, 2013; Kastelein et al., 2012a; Kastelein et al., 2012b; Kastelein et al., 2013a; Kastelein et al., 2014b; Kastelein et al., 2014c; Popov et al., 2011; Popov et al., 2013; Popov et al., 2014). This means that for each doubling of recovery time, the amount of TTS will decrease by the same amount (e.g., 6 dB recovery per doubling of time).

Several recent studies have shown that certain odontocete cetaceans (toothed whales) may learn to reduce their hearing sensitivity (presumably to protect their hearing) when warned of an impending intense sound exposure (Finneran, 2018; Nachtigall & Supin, 2013, 2014, 2015; Nachtigall et al., 2016a; Nachtigall et al., 2016b; Nachtigall et al., 2016c; Nachtigall et al., 2018). The effect was first demonstrated in a false killer whale (*Pseudorca crassidens*) by Nachtigall and Supin (2013). Subsequent experiments, using similar methods, demonstrated similar conditioned hearing changes in a bottlenose dolphin (*Tursiops truncates*) (Nachtigall & Supin, 2014, 2015; Nachtigall et al., 2016c), beluga whale (*Delphinapterus leucas*) (Nachtigall et al., 2016a), and harbor porpoise (*Phocoena phocoena*) (Nachtigall et al., 2016b) Using slightly different methods, Finneran (2018) measured the time course and frequency patterns of conditioned hearing changes in two dolphins. Based on these experimental measurements with captive odontocetes, it is likely that wild odontocetes would also suppress their hearing if they could anticipate an impending, intense sound, or during a prolonged exposure (even if not anticipated). Based on the time course and duration of the conditioned hearing reduction, odontocetes participating in some previous TTS experiments could have been protecting their hearing during exposures (Finneran, 2018). A better understanding of the mechanisms responsible for the observed hearing changes is needed for proper interpretation of some existing temporary threshold shift data, particularly for considering TTS due to short duration, unpredictable exposures. No modification of analysis of auditory impacts is currently suggested, as the Phase III auditory impact thresholds are based on best available data for both impulsive and non-impulsive exposures to marine mammals.

Due to the higher exposure levels or longer exposure durations required to induce hearing loss, only a few types of human-made sound sources have the potential to cause a threshold shift to a marine mammal in the wild. These include some sonars and other transducers and impulsive sound sources such as air guns and impact pile driving, neither of which will be used in the Study Area.

Southall et al. (2019c) evaluated Southall et al. (2007) and used updated scientific information to propose revised noise exposure criteria to predict onset of auditory effects in marine mammals (i.e., PTS and TTS onset). Southall et al. (2019c) note that the quantitative processes described and the resulting exposure criteria (i.e., thresholds and auditory weighting functions) are largely identical to those in Finneran (2016) and NMFS (2016e, 2018e). However, they differ in that the Southall et al. (2019c) exposure criteria are more broadly applicable as they include all marine mammal species (rather than those only under NMFS jurisdiction) for all noise exposures (both in air and underwater for amphibious species), and that while the hearing group compositions are identical they renamed the hearing groups. The thresholds discussed in the paper (TTS/PTS only) are the same as Navy's criteria and NMFS criteria.

Threshold Shift due to Sonar and Other Transducers

TTS in mid-frequency cetaceans exposed to non-impulsive sound has been investigated in multiple studies (Finneran et al., 2005b; Finneran et al., 2010a; Finneran & Schlundt, 2013; Mooney et al., 2009a;

Mooney et al., 2009b; Nachtigall et al., 2003; Nachtigall et al., 2004; Popov et al., 2013; Popov et al., 2014; Schlundt et al., 2000) from two species, bottlenose dolphins and beluga whales. Two high-frequency cetacean species have been studied for TTS due to non-impulsive sources: the harbor porpoise (Kastelein et al., 2012b) and the finless porpoise (*Neophocaena phocaenoides*) (Popov et al., 2011). These data are reviewed in detail in Finneran (2015) as well as the *Criteria and Thresholds for U.S. Navy Acoustic and Explosive Effects Analysis (Phase III)* technical report (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2017b), and the major findings are summarized above.

Several studies of threshold shift in marine mammals exposed to non-impulsive sounds have been published since development of the technical report. Kastelein et al. (2017b) examined threshold shift in harbor porpoises (high-frequency cetaceans) exposed to 3.5 – 4.1 kHz sonar playbacks. Small amounts of TTS (5–6 dB) were observed after exposures with cumulative, weighted SELs of ~156–162 dB SEL, (~3–9 dB above the TTS onset threshold). The data are therefore consistent with the Phase III thresholds.

Popov et al. (2017) measured auditory evoked potentials (AEPs) at 45 kHz in a beluga (a mid-frequency cetacean) before and after 10-minute exposure to half-octave noise centered at 32 kHz with SPL 170 dB re 1 µPa (weighted SEL = 198 dB re 1 μPa^2s). After exposure, AEP amplitude vs. stimulus SPL functions were shifted to the right, but returned to baseline values over time. Maximum threshold shift was 23–25 dB, 5 minutes post-exposure. For these exposures, Phase III criteria over-estimate the observed effects (i.e., Phase III criteria predict 40 dB of TTS for SEL of 198 dB re 1 μPa^2s).

Threshold Shift due to Impulsive Sound Sources

Cetacean TTS data from impulsive sources are limited to two studies with measured TTS of 6 dB or more. Finneran et al. (2002) reported behaviorally measured TTSs of 6 and 7 dB in a beluga exposed to single impulses from a seismic water gun, and Lucke et al. (2009) reported auditory evoked potential-measured TTS of 7– 20 dB in a harbor porpoise exposed to single impulses from a seismic air gun.

In addition to these studies, a number of impulsive noise exposure studies have been conducted without behaviorally measurable TTS of 6 dB or more. The results of these studies are either consistent with the Navy Phase III criteria and thresholds (e.g., exposure levels were below those predicted to cause TTS, and TTS did not occur) or suggest that the Phase III thresholds over-estimate the potential for impact (e.g., exposure levels were above Navy Phase III TTS threshold, but TTS did not occur). The individual studies are summarized below:

Finneran et al. (2000) exposed dolphins and belugas to single impulses from an "explosion simulator," and Finneran et al. (2015) exposed three dolphins to sequences of 10 impulses from a seismic air gun (maximum cumulative SEL = 193 to 195 dB re 1 μPa^2s, peak SPL = 196 to 210 dB re 1 µPa) without measurable TTS. Finneran et al. (2003b) exposed two sea lions to single impulses from an arc-gap transducer with no measurable TTS (maximum unweighted SEL = 163 dB re 1 μPa^2s, peak SPL = 183 dB re 1 µPa).

Kastelein et al. (2015a) behaviorally measured mean TTS of 4 dB at 8 kHz and 2 dB at 4 kHz after a harbor porpoise was exposed to simulated impact pile driving sound. The cumulative SEL was approximately 180 dB re 1 μPa^2s (weighted SEL ~144 dB re 1 μPa^2s, 4 dB above the TTS onset threshold). Using similar, simulated pile driving noise, but varying total exposure duration from 15 to 360 minutes, Kastelein et al. (2016) found only small amounts of TTS (< 6 dB) in two harbor porpoises. The maximum weighted, cumulative SEL was 156 dB SEL (16 dB above Phase III threshold) but resulted in only ~5 dB of TTS.

Kastelein et al. (2017c) measured TTS in a harbor porpoise after exposure to multiple air gun impulses. Either a single or double air gun arrangement was used. Maximum exposure peak pressure was 194/199 dB re 1 µPa for single/double air guns. Maximum cumulative, weighted SEL was 140/143 dB re 1 μPa^2s for ten-shot exposures of single/double air guns. Maximum TTS occurred at 4 kHz and was 3 dB/4 dB for single/double air guns.

3.4.2.1.1.3 Physiological Stress

The growing field of conservation physiology relies in part on the ability to monitor stress hormones in populations of animals, particularly those that are threatened or endangered. The ability to make predictions from stress hormones about impacts on individuals and populations exposed to various forms of stressors, natural and human-caused, relies on understanding the linkages between changes in stress hormones and resulting physiological impacts. At this time, the sound characteristics that correlate with specific stress responses in marine mammals are poorly understood, as are the ultimate consequences due to these changes. Navy-funded efforts are underway to try to improve the understanding of and the ability to predict how stressors ultimately affect marine mammal populations (e.g., King et al., 2015; New et al., 2013a; New et al., 2013b; Pirotta et al., 2015a). With respect to acoustically induced stress, this includes not only determining how and to what degree various types of anthropogenic sound cause stress in marine mammals, but what factors can mitigate those responses. Factors potentially affecting an animal's response to a stressor include the mammal's life history stage, sex, age, reproductive status, overall physiological and behavioral plasticity, and whether they are naïve or experienced with the sound [e.g., prior experience with a stressor may result in a reduced response due to habituation (Finneran & Branstetter, 2013; St. Aubin & Dierauf, 2001)]. Because there are many unknowns regarding the occurrence of acoustically induced stress responses in marine mammals, the Navy assumes in its effects analysis that any physiological response (e.g., hearing loss or injury) or significant behavioral response is also associated with a stress response.

Marine mammals naturally experience stressors within their environment and as part of their life histories. Changing weather and ocean conditions, exposure to disease and naturally occurring toxins, lack of prey availability, and interactions with predators all contribute to the stress a marine mammal experiences (Atkinson et al., 2015). Breeding cycles, periods of fasting, and social interactions with members of the same species are also stressors, although they are natural components of an animal's life history. Anthropogenic activities have the potential to provide additional stressors beyond those that occur naturally (Fair et al., 2014; Meissner et al., 2015; Rolland et al., 2012). Anthropogenic stressors potentially include such things as fishery interactions, pollution, tourism, and ocean noise.

The stress response is a suite of physiological changes that are meant to help an organism mitigate the impact of a stressor (Moberg & Mench, 2000). Over short periods (i.e., hours/days), stress responses can provide access to energetic resources that can be beneficial in life-threatening situations. However, if the magnitude and duration of the stress response is too great or too long, then it can have negative consequences to the organism (e.g., decreased immune function, decreased reproduction). The generalized stress response is classically characterized by the release of cortisol, a hormone that has many functions including elevation of blood sugar, suppression of the immune system, and alteration of the biochemical pathways that affect fat, protein, and carbohydrate metabolism. However, it is now known that the endocrine response (glandular secretions of hormones into the blood) to a stressor can extend to other hormones. For instance, thyroid hormones can also vary under the influence of certain stressors, particularly food deprivation. These types of responses typically occur on the order of minutes to days. The "fight or flight" response, an acute stress response, is characterized by the very rapid

release of hormones that stimulate glucose release, increase heart rate, and increase oxygen consumption. Chronic stressors can occur over the course of weeks or months. Rolland et al. (2017) compared acute (death by ship strike) to chronic (entanglement or live-stranding) stressors in North Atlantic right whales, and found that whales subject to chronic stressors had higher levels of glucocorticoid stress hormones (cortisol and corticosterone) than either healthy whales or those killed by ships. Authors presume that whales subject to acute stress here may have died too quickly for increases in fecal glucocorticoids to be detected.

What is known about the function of the various stress hormones is based largely upon observations of the stress response in terrestrial mammals. The endocrine response of marine mammals to stress may not be the same as that of terrestrial mammals because of the selective pressures marine mammals faced during their evolution in an ocean environment (Atkinson et al., 2015). For example, due to the necessity of breath-holding while diving and foraging at depth, the physiological role of epinephrine and norepinephrine (the catecholamines) might be different in marine versus other mammals. Catecholamines increase during breath-hold diving in seals, co-occurring with a reduction in heart rate, peripheral vasoconstriction (constriction of blood vessels), and an increased reliance on anaerobic metabolism during extended dives (Hance et al., 1982; Hochachka et al., 1995; Hurford et al., 1996); the catecholamine increase is not associated with an increased heart rate, glycemic release, and increased oxygen consumption typical of terrestrial mammals. Other hormone functions might also be different, such as aldosterone, which has been speculated to not only contribute to electrolyte balance, but possibly also the maintenance of blood pressure during periods of vasoconstriction (Houser et al., 2011). In marine mammals, aldosterone is thought to play a particular role in stress mediation because of its pronounced increase in response to handling stress (St. Aubin & Dierauf, 2001; St. Aubin & Geraci, 1989).

Relatively little information exists on the linkage between anthropogenic sound exposure and stress in marine mammals, and even less information exists on the ultimate consequences of sound-induced stress responses (either acute or chronic). Most studies to date have focused on acute responses to sound either by measuring catecholamines or by measuring heart rate as an assumed proxy for an acute stress response. Belugas demonstrated no catecholamine response to the playback of oil drilling sounds (Thomas et al., 1990b) but showed a small but statistically significant increase in catecholamines following exposure to impulsive sounds produced from a seismic water gun (Romano et al., 2004). A bottlenose dolphin exposed to the same seismic water gun signals did not demonstrate a catecholamine response, but did demonstrate a statistically significant elevation in aldosterone (Romano et al., 2004), albeit the increase was within the normal daily variation observed in this species (St. Aubin et al., 1996). Increases in heart rate were observed in bottlenose dolphins to which known calls of other dolphins were played, although no increase in heart rate was observed when background tank noise was played back (Miksis et al., 2001). Unfortunately, in this study, it cannot be determined whether the increase in heart rate was due to stress or an anticipation of being reunited with the dolphin to which the vocalization belonged. Similarly, a young beluga's heart rate was observed to increase during exposure to noise, with increases dependent upon the frequency band of noise and duration of exposure, and with a sharp decrease to normal or below normal levels upon cessation of the exposure (Lyamin et al., 2011). Spectral analysis of heart rate variability corroborated direct measures of heart rate (Bakhchina et al., 2017). This response might have been in part due to the conditions during testing, the young age of the animal, and the novelty of the exposure; a year later the exposure was repeated at a slightly higher received level and there was no heart rate response, indicating the beluga whale had potentially acclimated to the noise exposure. Kvadsheim et al. (2010) measured the heart rate of captive hooded

seals during exposure to sonar signals and found an increase in the heart rate of the seals during exposure periods versus control periods when the animals were at the surface. When the animals dove, the normal dive-related bradycardia (decrease in heart rate) was not impacted by the sonar exposure. Similarly, Thompson et al. (1998) observed a rapid but short-lived decrease in heart rates in harbor and grey seals exposed to seismic air guns (cited in Gordon et al., 2003). Williams et al. (2017a) recently monitored the heart rates of narwhals released from capture and found that a profound dive bradycardia persisted, even though exercise effort increased dramatically as part of their escape response following release. Thus, although some limited evidence suggests that tachycardia might occur as part of the acute stress response of animals that are at the surface, the dive bradycardia persists during diving and might be enhanced in response to an acute stressor. Houser et al. (2020) measured cortisol and epinephrine obtained from 30 bottlenose dolphins exposed to simulated U.S. Navy mid-frequency sonar, and found no correlation between sound pressure level and stress hormone levels. In the same experiment (Houser et al., 2013b), behavioral responses were shown to increase in severity with increasing received sound pressure levels. These results suggest that behavioral reactions to sonar signals are not necessarily indicative of a hormonal stress response.


Whereas a limited amount of work has addressed the potential for acute sound exposures to produce a stress response, almost nothing is known about how chronic exposure to acoustic stressors affects stress hormones in marine mammals, particularly as it relates to survival or reproduction. In what is probably the only study of chronic noise exposure in marine mammals associating changes in a stress hormone with changes in anthropogenic noise, Rolland et al. (2012) compared the levels of cortisol metabolites in North Atlantic right whale feces collected before and after September 11, 2001. Following the events of September 11, shipping was significantly reduced in the region where fecal collections were made, and regional ocean background noise declined. Fecal cortisol metabolites significantly decreased during the period of reduced ship traffic and ocean noise (Rolland et al., 2012). Considerably more work has been conducted in an attempt to determine the potential effect of boating on smaller cetaceans, particularly killer whales (Bain, 2002; Erbe, 2002; Lusseau, 2006; Noren et al., 2009; Pirotta et al., 2015b; Rolland et al., 2012; Skarke et al., 2014; Williams et al., 2006; Williams et al., 2009; Williams et al., 2014b; Williams et al., 2014c). Most of these efforts focused primarily on estimates of metabolic costs associated with altered behavior or inferred consequences of boat presence and noise, but did not directly measure stress hormones. However, Ayres et al. (2012) investigated southern resident killer whale fecal thyroid hormone and cortisol metabolites to assess two potential threats to the species recovery: lack of prey (salmon) and impacts from exposure to the physical presence of vessel traffic (but without measuring vessel traffic noise). Ayres et al. (2012) concluded from these stress hormone measures that the lack of prey overshadowed any population-level physiological impacts on southern resident killer whales due to vessel traffic. Collectively, these studies indicate the difficulty in teasing out factors that are dominant in exerting influence on the secretion of stress hormones, including the separate and additive effects of vessel presence and vessel noise. Nevertheless, although the reduced presence of the ships themselves cannot be ruled out as potentially contributing to the reduction in fecal cortisol metabolites in North Atlantic right whales, the work of Rolland et al. (2012) represents the most provocative link between ocean noise and cortisol in cetaceans to date.

Navy-funded efforts are underway to try and improve our understanding and ability to predict how stressors ultimately affect marine mammal populations (King et al., 2015; New et al., 2013a; Pirotta et al., 2015a), and to determine whether a marine mammal being naïve or experienced with the sound (e.g., prior experience with a stressor) may result in a reduced response due to habituation (St. Aubin & Dierauf, 2001).

3.4.2.1.1.4 Masking

Masking occurs when one sound, the "noise," interferes with the detection, discrimination, or recognition of another sound (the "signal"). The quantitative definition of masking is the amount in decibels an auditory detection, discrimination, or recognition threshold is raised in the presence of a masker (Erbe et al., 2016). As discussed in Section 3.0.4.7 (Conceptual Framework for Assessing Effects from Acoustic and Explosive Activities), masking can effectively limit the distance over which a marine mammal can communicate, detect biologically relevant sounds, and echolocate (odontocetes). Masking only occurs in the presence of the masking noise and does not persist after the cessation of the noise. Masking can lead to vocal changes such as the Lombard effect (increasing amplitude), other noise-induced vocal modifications such as changing frequency(Hotchkin & Parks, 2013), and behavioral changes (e.g., cessation of foraging, leaving an area) to both signalers and receivers, in an attempt to compensate for noise levels (Erbe et al., 2016).


Critical ratios are the lowest signal-to-noise ratio in which detection under masking conditions occurs (Finneran & Branstetter, 2013; Johnson et al., 1989; Southall et al., 2000). When expressed in dB, critical ratios can easily be calculated by subtracting the noise level (in dB re 1 $\mu Pa^2/Hz$) from the signal level (in dB re 1 µPa) at threshold. Critical ratios have been measured for pinnipeds (Southall et al., 2000, 2003; Thomas et al., 1990a), odontocetes (see) (Au & Moore, 1990; Branstetter et al., 2017b; Johnson et al., 1989; Kastelein & Wensveen, 2008; Lemonds et al., 2011), manatees (Gaspard et al., 2012), and sea otters (Ghoul & Reichmuth, 2014). Critical ratios increase as a function of signal frequency (Au & Moore, 1990; Lemonds et al., 2011). Higher frequency noise is more effective at masking higher frequency signals. Composite critical ratio functions have been estimated for odontocetes, which allows predictions of masking if the spectral density of noise is known (Branstetter et al., 2017b). Although critical ratios are typically estimated in controlled laboratory conditions using Gaussian (white) noise, critical ratios can vary considerably (see Figure 3.4-3) depending on the noise type (Branstetter et al., 2013; Branstetter et al., 2017b; Trickey et al., 2010). Signal type (e.g., whistles, burst-pulses, sonar clicks) and spectral characteristics (e.g., frequency modulation and/or harmonics) may further influence masked detection thresholds (Branstetter et al., 2016; Cunningham et al., 2014).



Source: Branstetter et al. (2017b)

Notes: (A) Odontocete critical ratios and composite model: CR = a[log10(f)]^b +c, where *a*, *b*, and *c* are model coefficients and *f* is the signal frequency in Hz. Equation 1 was fit to aggregate data for all odontocetes. (B) *T. truncatus* critical ratios and composite model. (C) *P. phocoena* critical ratios and composite model. Parameter values for composite models are displayed in the lower right of each panel

Figure 3.4-3: Odontocete Critical Ratios



Source: Branstetter et al. (2013)
Notes: CM = comodulated, SS = snapping shrimp, RN = rain noise, G = Gaussian, PS = pile saw, BT = boat engine noise, and IS = ice squeaks

Figure 3.4-4: Critical Ratios for Different Noise Types

Clark et al. (2009) developed a model for estimating masking effects on communication signals for low-frequency cetaceans, including calculating the cumulative impact of multiple noise sources. For example, the model estimates that a right whale's optimal communication space (around 20 km) is decreased by 84 percent when two commercial ships pass through it. Similarly, Aguilar de Soto et al. (2006) found that a 15 dB increase in background noise due to vessels led to a communication range of only 18 percent of its normal value for foraging beaked whales. This method relies on empirical data on source levels of calls (which is unknown for many species) and requires many assumptions such as pre-industrial ambient noise conditions and simplifications of animal hearing and behavior, but it is an important step in determining the impact of anthropogenic noise on animal communication. Erbe (2016) developed a model with a noise source-centered view of masking to examine how a call may be masked from a receiver by a noise as a function of caller, receiver, and noise-source location; distance relative to each other; and received level of the call.

Vocal changes in response to anthropogenic noise can occur across the repertoire of sound production modes used by marine mammals, such as whistling, echolocation click production, calling, and singing. Vocalization changes include increasing the source level, modifying the frequency, increasing the call repetition rate of vocalizations, or ceasing to vocalize in the presence of increased noise (Hotchkin & Parks, 2013). In cetaceans, vocalization changes were reported from exposure to anthropogenic noise sources such as sonar, vessel noise, and seismic surveying (Gordon et al., 2003; Holt et al., 2008; Holt et al., 2011; Lesage et al., 1999; McDonald et al., 2009; Rolland et al., 2012) as well as changes in the natural acoustic environment (Dunlop et al., 2014; Helble et al., 2020). Vocal changes can be temporary, or can be persistent, as seen in the increase in starting frequency for the North Atlantic right whale upcall over the last 50 years (Tennessen & Parks, 2016). Model simulation suggests that the frequency shift resulted in increased detection ranges between right whales; the frequency shift, coupled with an increase in call intensity by 20 dB, led to a call detectability range of less than 3 km to over 9 km

(Tennessen & Parks, 2016). In some cases, these vocal changes may have fitness consequences, such as an increase in metabolic rates and oxygen consumption, as was found for bottlenose dolphins when increasing their call amplitude (Holt et al., 2015). A switch from vocal communication to physical, surface-generated sounds such as pectoral fin slapping or breaching was observed for humpback whales in the presence of increasing natural background noise levels, indicating that adaptations to masking may not be limited to vocal modifications (Dunlop et al., 2010). These changes all represent possible tactics by the sound-producing animal to reduce the impact of masking. The receiving animal can also reduce masking by using active listening strategies such as orienting to the sound source, moving to a quieter location, or reducing self-noise from hydrodynamic flow by remaining still.

Informational Masking

Much emphasis has been placed on signal detection in noise, and as a result, most masking studies and communication space models have focused on masked detection thresholds. However, from a fitness perspective, signal detection is almost meaningless without the ability to determine the sound source location and recognize what is producing the sound. Marine mammals use sound to recognize conspecifics, prey, predators, or other biologically significant sources (Branstetter et al., 2016). Masked recognition thresholds (often called informational masking) for whistle-like sounds have been measured for bottlenose dolphins (Branstetter et al., 2016), and are approximately 4 dB above detection thresholds (energetic masking) for the same signals. It should be noted that the term "threshold" typically refers to the listener's ability to detect or recognize a signal 50 percent of the time. For example, human speech communication where only 50 percent of the words are recognized would result in poor communication (Branstetter et al., 2016). Likewise, recognition of a conspecific call or the acoustic signature of a predator at only the 50 percent level could have severe negative impacts. If "quality communication" is arbitrarily set at 90 percent recognition (which may be more appropriately related to animal fitness), the output of communication space models (which are based on 50 percent detection) would likely result in a significant decrease in communication range (Branstetter et al., 2016).

Marine mammals use sound to recognize predators (Allen et al., 2014; Cummings & Thompson, 1971; Curé et al., 2015; Fish & Vania, 1971). Auditory recognition may be reduced in the presence of a masking noise, particularly if it occurs in the same frequency band. Therefore, the occurrence of masking may prevent marine mammals from responding to the acoustic cues produced by their predators. Whether this is a possibility depends on the duration of the masking and the likelihood of encountering a predator during the time that detection and recognition of predator cues are impeded. For example, harbor seals that reside in the coastal waters off British Columbia are frequently targeted by mammal-eating killer whales. The seals acoustically discriminate between the calls of mammal-eating and fish-eating killer whales (Deecke et al., 2002), a capability that should increase survivorship while reducing the energy required to attend to all killer whale calls. Similarly, sperm whales (Curé et al., 2016; Isojunno et al., 2016), long-finned pilot whales (Visser et al., 2016), and humpback whales (Curé et al., 2015) changed their behavior in response to killer whale vocalization playbacks; these findings indicate that some recognition of predator cues could be missed if the killer whale vocalizations were masked.

Masking by Sonar and Other Transducers

Masking only occurs in the presence of the masking noise and does not persist after the cessation of the noise. Because traditional military sonars typically have low duty cycles, relatively short duration, and narrow bandwidth that does not overlap with vocalizations for most marine mammal species, the effects of such masking would be limited when compared with continuous sources (e.g., vessel noise).

Dolphin whistles and mid-frequency active sonar are similar in frequency, so masking is possible but less likely due to the low-duty cycle of most sonars. Low-frequency active sonar could also overlap with mysticete vocalizations (e.g., minke and humpback whales). For example, in the presence of low-frequency active sonar, humpback whales were observed to increase the length of their songs (Fristrup et al., 2003; Miller et al., 2000), possibly due to the overlap in frequencies between the whale song and the low-frequency active sonar.

Newer high-duty cycle or continuous active sonars have more potential to mask vocalizations, particularly for delphinids and other mid-frequency cetaceans. These sonars transmit more frequently (greater than 80 percent duty cycle) than traditional sonars, but at a substantially lower source level. Similarly, high-frequency acoustic sources such as pingers that operate at higher repetition rates (e.g., 2–10 kHz with harmonics up to 19 kHz, 76 to 77 pings per minute (Culik et al., 2001), also operate at lower source levels. While the lower source levels limit the range of impact compared to traditional systems, animals close to the sonar source are likely to experience masking on a much longer time scale than those exposed to traditional sonars. The frequency range at which high-duty cycle systems operate overlaps the vocalization frequency of many mid-frequency cetaceans. Continuous noise at the same frequency of communicative vocalizations may cause disruptions to communication, social interactions, and acoustically mediated cooperative behaviors such as foraging or reproductive activities. Similarly, because the systems are mid-frequency, there is the potential for the sonar signals to mask important environmental cues like predator vocalizations (e.g., killer whales), possibly affecting survivorship for targeted animals. While there are currently no available studies of the impacts of high-duty cycle sonars on marine mammals, masking due to these systems is likely analogous to masking produced by other continuous sources (e.g., vessel noise and low-frequency cetaceans), and would likely have similar short-term consequences, though longer in duration due to the duration of the masking noise. These may include changes to vocalization amplitude and frequency (Brumm & Slabbekoorn, 2005; Hotchkin & Parks, 2013) and behavioral impacts such as avoidance of the area and interruptions to foraging or other essential behaviors (Gordon et al., 2003). Long-term consequences could include changes to vocal behavior and vocalization structure (Foote et al., 2004; Parks et al., 2007), abandonment of habitat if masking occurs frequently enough to significantly impair communication (Brumm & Slabbekoorn, 2005), a potential decrease in survivorship if predator vocalizations are masked (Brumm & Slabbekoorn, 2005), and a potential decrease in recruitment if masking interferes with reproductive activities or mother-calf communication (Gordon et al., 2003).

Masking by Vessel Noise

Masking is more likely to occur in the presence of broadband, relatively continuous noise sources such as vessels. For example, right whales were observed to shift the frequency content of their calls upward while reducing the rate of calling in areas of increased anthropogenic noise (Parks et al., 2007) as well as increasing the amplitude (intensity) of their calls (Parks, 2009; Parks et al., 2011). Right whales also had their communication space reduced by up to 84 percent in the presence of vessels (Clark et al., 2009). Cholewiak et al. (2018) found that right whale gunshot calls had the lowest loss of communication space in Stellwagen National Sanctuary (5 percent), while fin and humpback whales lost up to 99 percent of their communication space with increased ambient noise and shipping noise combined. Although humpback whales off Australia did not change the frequency or duration of their vocalizations in the presence of ship noise, their source levels were lower than expected based on source level changes to wind noise, potentially indicating some signal masking (Dunlop, 2016). Vessel noise decreased the 4 km of humpback whale modeled communication space (with wind noise up to 100 dB re 1 µPa) to 3 km at

the same received level, and at 105 dB re 1 µPa of noise communication space decreased again to 2 km for low-frequency signals and 1 km for high-frequency signals (Dunlop, 2019). Communication space loss due to vessels in Glacier Bay National Park was estimated to be lower for singing humpback whales than for calling whales and was highest for roaring harbor seals, but synchronizing the arrival and departure times of ships into the park restored some of that communication space for the calling whales and seals (Gabriele et al., 2018). Fournet et al. (2018) found humpback whales increase their call source levels by 0.8 dB and decrease the probability of calling by 9 percent for every 1 dB increase in ambient sound, which included vessel noise.

Multiple delphinid species have also been shown to increase the minimum or maximum frequencies of their whistles in the presence of anthropogenic noise (Papale et al., 2015). More specifically, Williams et al. (2014b) found that in median noise conditions in Haro Strait, killer whales lose 62 percent of their acoustic communication space due to vessel traffic noise, and in peak traffic hours lose up to 97 percent of that space. Holt et al. (2008; 2011) showed that southern resident killer whales in the waters surrounding the San Juan Islands increased their call source level as vessel noise increased. In the presence of boats off the Southern end of Vancouver, Southern Resident killer whales changed the duration of 16 out of 21 discrete call types (Wieland et al., 2010). Most of those call types (n=14) increased mean duration, while 2 call types decreased in duration. Hermannsen et al. (2014) estimated that broadband vessel noise could extend up to 160 kHz at ranges from 60 to 1,200 m, and that the higher frequency portion of that noise might mask harbor porpoise clicks. However, this may not be an issue as harbor porpoises may avoid vessels and may not be close enough to have their clicks masked (Dyndo et al., 2015; Polacheck & Thorpe, 1990; Sairanen, 2014). Furthermore, Hermannsen et al. (2014) estimated that a 6 dB elevation in noise would decrease the hearing range of a harbor porpoise by 50 percent, and a 20 dB increase in noise would decrease the hearing range by 90 percent. Dugong vocalizations were recorded in the presence of passing boats, and although the call rate, intensity, and frequency of the calls did not change, the duration of the vocalizations was increased, as was the presence of harmonics. This may indicate more energy was being used to vocalize in order to maintain the same received level (Ando-Mizobata et al., 2014). Gervaise et al. (2012) estimated that beluga whales in the St. Lawrence Marine Park had their communication space reduced to 30 percent during average vessel traffic. During peak traffic, communication space was further reduced to 15 percent. Lesage et al. (1999) found belugas in the St. Lawrence River estuary reduced overall call rates but increased the production of certain call types when ferry and small outboard motor boats were approaching. Furthermore, these belugas increased the vocalization frequency band when vessels were in close proximity. Liu et al. (2017) found that broadband shipping noise could cause masking of humpback dolphin whistles within 1.5–3 km, and masking of echolocation clicks within 0.5–1.5 km.

Masking by Impulsive Sound

Potential masking from weapon noise is likely to be similar to masking studied for other impulsive sounds such as air guns. Masking could occur in mysticetes due to the overlap between their low-frequency vocalizations and the dominant frequencies of impulsive sources; however, masking in odontocetes is less likely unless the activity is in close range when the pulses are more broadband. For example, differential vocal responses in marine mammals were documented in the presence of seismic survey noise. An overall decrease in vocalizations during active surveying was noted in large marine mammal groups (Potter et al., 2007), while blue whale feeding/social calls increased when seismic exploration was underway (Di Lorio & Clark, 2010), indicative of a possible compensatory response to the increased noise level. Bowhead whales were found to increase call rates in the presence of seismic air gun noise at lower received levels (below 100 dB re: 1 µPa2s cumulative SEL), but once the received

level rose above 127 dB re 1 μPa^2s cumulative SEL the call rate began decreasing, and stopped altogether once received levels reached 170 dB re 1 μPa^2s cumulative SEL (Blackwell et al., 2015). Nieukirk et al. (2012) recorded both seismic surveys and fin whale 20 Hz calls at various locations around the mid-Atlantic Ocean and hypothesized that distant seismic noise could mask those calls, thereby decreasing the communication range of fin whales, whose vocalizations may propagate over 400 km to reach conspecifics ((Spiesberger & Fristrup, 1990)). Two captive seals (one spotted and one ringed) were exposed to seismic air gun sounds recorded within 1 km and 30 km of an air gun survey conducted in shallow (<40 m) water. They were then tested on their ability to detect a 500 ms upsweep centered at 100 Hz at different points in the air gun pulse (start, middle, and end). Based on these results, a 100 Hz vocalization with a source level of 130 dB re 1 μPa would not be detected above a seismic survey 1 km away unless the animal was within 1–5 m, and would not be detected above a survey 30 km away beyond 46 m ((Sills et al., 2017)).

3.4.2.1.1.5 Behavioral Reactions

As discussed in Section 3.0.4.7 (Conceptual Framework for Assessing Effects from Acoustic and Explosive Activities), any stimulus in the environment can cause a behavioral response in marine mammals. These stimuli include noise from anthropogenic sources such as vessels, sonar, or aircraft, but could also include the physical presence of a vessel or aircraft. However, these stimuli could also influence how or if a marine mammal responds to a sound such as the presence of predators, prey, or conspecifics. Furthermore, the response of a marine mammal to an anthropogenic sound may depend on the frequency, duration, temporal pattern and amplitude of the sound as well as the animal's prior experience with the sound and their behavioral state (i.e., what the animal is doing and their energetic needs at the time of the exposure) (Ellison et al., 2011). The distance from the sound source and whether it is approaching or moving away can also affect the way an animal responds to a sound (Wartzok et al., 2003).

For marine mammals, a review of responses to anthropogenic sound was first conducted by Richardson et al. (1995b). Other reviews (Nowacek et al., 2007; Southall et al., 2007) addressed studies conducted since 1995 and focused on observations where the received sound level of the exposed marine mammal(s) was known or could be estimated, and also examined the role of context. Southall et al. (2007) synthesized data from many past behavioral studies and observations to determine the likelihood of behavioral reactions at specific sound levels, and Southall et al. (2016) reviewed the range of experimental field studies that have been conducted to measure behavioral responses of cetaceans to sonar. While in general, the louder the sound source the more intense the behavioral response, it was clear that the proximity of a sound source and the animal's experience, motivation, and conditioning were also critical factors influencing the response (Southall et al., 2007; Southall et al., 2016). Ellison et al. (2011) outlined an approach to assessing the effects of sound on marine mammals that incorporates these contextual-based factors. They recommend considering not just the received level of sound, but also in what activity the animal is engaged, the nature and novelty of the sound (i.e., is this a new sound from the animal's perspective), and the distance between the sound source and the animal. They submit that this "exposure context," as described, greatly influences the type of behavioral response exhibited by the animal (see technical report *Criteria and Thresholds for U.S. Navy Acoustic and Explosive Effects Analysis (Phase III)* (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2017b)). Forney et al. (2017) also point out that an apparent lack of response (e.g., no displacement or avoidance of a sound source) may not necessarily mean there is no cost to the individual or population, as some resources or habitats may be of such high value that animals may choose to stay, even when experiencing stress or hearing loss. Forney et al.

(2017) recommend considering both the costs of remaining in an area of noise exposure such as TTS, PTS, or masking, which could lead to an increased risk of predation or other threats or a decreased capability to forage, and the costs of displacement, including potential increased risk of vessel strike or bycatch, increased risks of predation or competition for resources, or decreased habitat suitable for foraging, resting, or socializing.

Behavioral reactions could result from a variety of sound sources such as sonar and other active acoustic sources (e.g., pingers), vessel noise, and aircraft noise. There is data on the reactions of some species in different behavioral states, providing evidence on the importance of context in gauging a behavioral response. However, for most species, little or no data exist on behavioral responses to any sound source, and so all species have been grouped into broad taxonomic groups from which general response information can be inferred (see technical report *Criteria and Thresholds for U.S. Navy Acoustic and Explosive Effects Analysis (Phase III)* (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2017b)).

Behavioral Reactions to Sonar and Other Transducers

Sonar and other transducers can range in frequency from less than 1 kHz (e.g., low-frequency active sonar) to over 200 kHz (e.g., fish finders), with duty cycles that range from one ping per minute to an almost continuous sound. Although very high-frequency sonars are out of the hearing range of most marine mammals, some of these sources may contain artifacts at lower frequencies that could be detected (Deng et al., 2014; Hastie et al., 2014). High-duty cycle sonar systems operate at lower source levels, but with a more continuous sound output. These sources can be stationary, or on a moving platform, and there can be more than one source present at a time. Guan et al. (2017) also found that sound levels in the mid-frequency sonar bandwidth remained elevated at least 5 dB above background levels for the first 7–15 seconds (within 2 km) after the emission of a sonar ping; depending on the length of the sonar ping and the inter-ping interval, this reverberation could increase cumulative SEL estimates during periods of active sonar. This variability in parameters associated with sonar and other transducers makes the estimation of behavioral responses to these sources difficult, with observed responses ranging from no apparent change in behavior to more severe responses that could lead to some costs to the animal. As discussed in Section 3.0.4.7 (Conceptual Framework for Assessing Effects from Acoustic and Explosive Activities) and Section 3.4.2.1.1.5 (Behavioral Reactions), responses may also occur in the presence of different contextual factors regardless of received level, including the proximity and number of vessels, the behavioral state and prior experience of an individual, and even characteristics of the signal itself or the propagation of the signal through the environment.

In order to explore this complex question, behavioral response studies have been conducted through the collaboration of various research and government organizations in Bahamian, United States (off Southern California), Mediterranean, Australian, and Norwegian waters. These studies have attempted to define and measure responses of beaked whales and other cetaceans to controlled exposures of sonar and other sounds to understand better their potential impacts. While controlling for as many variables as possible (e.g., the distance and movement of the source), these studies also introduce additional variables that do not normally occur in a real Navy training or testing activity, including the tagging of whales, following the tagged animals with multiple vessels, and continually approaching the animal to create a dose escalation. In addition, distances of the sound source from the whales during behavioral response studies were always within 1–8 km. Some of these studies have suggested that ramping up a source from a lower source level would act as a mitigation measure to protect against higher order (e.g., TTS or PTS) impacts of some active sonar sources; however, this practice may only be effective for more responsive animals, and for short durations (e.g., five minutes) of ramp-up (von

Benda-Beckmann et al., 2014; von Benda-Beckmann et al., 2016; Wensveen et al., 2017). Therefore, while these studies have provided the most information to date on behavioral responses of marine mammals to sonar, there are still many contextual factors to be teased apart, and determining what might produce a significant behavioral response is not a trivial task. Additional information about active sonar ramp-up procedures, including why the Navy will not implement them as mitigation under the Proposed Action, is provided in Section 5.6.1 (Active Sonar).

Passive acoustic monitoring and visual observational behavioral response studies have also been conducted on Navy ranges, taking advantage of the existing seafloor hydrophones and real training and testing activity and associated sources to assess behavioral responses (Deakos & Richlen, 2015; Henderson et al., 2016; Manzano-Roth et al., 2016; Martin et al., 2015; McCarthy et al., 2011; Mobley & Deakos, 2015; Moretti et al., 2014; Tyack et al., 2011). In addition, extensive aerial, visual, and passive acoustic monitoring have been conducted before, during, and after training events to watch for behavioral responses during training and look for injured or stranded animals after training (Falcone et al., 2017; Farak et al., 2011; HDR, 2011a; Henderson et al., 2016; Manzano-Roth et al., 2016; Norris et al., 2012b; Smultea & Mobley, 2009; Smultea et al., 2009; Trickey et al., 2015; U.S. Department of the Navy, 2011b, 2013b, 2014a, 2015b). During all of these monitoring efforts, very few behavioral responses were observed, and no injured or dead animal was observed that was directly related to a training event (some dead animals were observed but typically before the event or appeared to have been deceased prior to the event; e.g., Smultea et al., 2011). While passive acoustic studies are limited to observations of vocally active marine mammals, and visual studies are limited to what can be observed at the surface, these study types have the benefit of occurring in the absence of some of the added contextual variables in the controlled exposure studies. Furthermore, when visual and passive acoustic data collected during a training event are combined with ship movements and sonar use, and with tagged animal data when possible, they provide a unique and realistic scenario for analysis, as in Falcone et al. (2017), Manzano-Roth et al. (2016) or Baird et al. (2017). In addition to these types of observational behavioral response studies, Harris & Thomas (2015) highlighted additional research approaches that may provide further information on behavioral responses to sonars and other transducers beyond behavior response type studies or passive acoustic monitoring, including conducting controlled exposures on captive animals with scaled (smaller sized and deployed at closer proximity) sources, on wild animals with both scaled and real but directed sources, and predator playback studies, all of which will be discussed below.

The above behavioral response studies and observations have been conducted on a number of mysticete and odontocete species, which can be extrapolated to other similar species in these taxonomic groups. There are several captive studies on some odontocete species that can provide insight into how these animals may respond in the wild. The captive studies typically represent a more controlled approach, which allow researchers to better estimate the direct impact of the received level of sound leading to behavioral responses, and to potentially link behavioral to physiological responses. However, there are still contextual factors that must be acknowledged, including previous training to complete tasks and the presence of food rewards upon completion. There are no corresponding captive studies on mysticete whales, therefore some of the responses to higher-level exposures must be extrapolated from odontocetes.

Mysticetes

The responses of mysticetes to sonar and other duty-cycled tonal sounds are highly dependent upon the characteristics of the signal, the behavioral state of the animal, the particular sensitivity and previous

experience of an individual, and other contextual factors including distance of the source, movement of the source, and the physical presence of vessels in addition to the sonar (Goldbogen et al., 2013b; Harris et al., 2015; Martin et al., 2015; Sivle et al., 2015). Behavioral response studies have been conducted over a variety of contextual and behavioral states, helping to identify which contextual factors may lead to a response beyond just the received level of the sound. Observed reactions during behavioral response studies have not been consistent across individuals based on received sound levels alone, and likely were the result of complex interactions between these contextual factors.

Surface feeding blue whales did not show a change in behavior in response to mid-frequency simulated and real sonar sources with received levels between 90 and 179 dB re 1 µPa, but deep feeding and non-feeding whales showed temporary reactions including cessation of feeding, reduced initiation of deep foraging dives, generalized avoidance responses, and changes to dive behavior. The behavioral responses they observed were generally brief, of low to moderate severity, and highly dependent on exposure context (behavioral state, source-to-whale horizontal range, and prey availability) (DeRuiter et al., 2017; Goldbogen et al., 2013b; Sivle et al., 2015; Southall et al., 2019b). Similarly, while the rates of foraging lunges decreased in humpback whales due to sonar exposure, there was variability in the response across individuals, with one animal ceasing to forage completely and another animal starting to forage during the exposure (Sivle et al., 2016). In addition, lunges decreased (although not significantly) during a no-sonar control vessel approach prior to the sonar exposure, and lunges decreased less during a second sonar approach than during the initial approach, possibly indicating some response to the vessel and some habituation to the sonar and vessel after repeated approaches. In the same experiment, most of the non-foraging humpback whales did not respond to any of the approaches (Sivle et al., 2016). These humpback whales also showed variable avoidance responses, with some animals avoiding the sonar vessel during the first exposure but not the second, while others avoided the sonar during the second exposure, and only one avoided both. In addition, almost half of the animals that avoided were foraging before the exposure but the others were not; the animals that avoided while not feeding responded at a slightly lower received level and greater distance than those that were feeding (Wensveen et al., 2017). These findings indicate that the behavioral state of the animal plays a role in the type and severity of a behavioral response. In fact, when the prey field was mapped and used as a covariate in similar models looking for a response in the same blue whales, the response in deep-feeding behavior by blue whales was even more apparent, reinforcing the need for contextual variables to be included when assessing behavioral responses (Friedlaender et al., 2016). Further, it was found that the probability of a moderate behavioral response increased when the range to source was closer for these foraging blue whales, although there was a high degree of uncertainty in that relationship (Southall et al., 2019b). However, even when responses did occur the animals quickly returned to their previous behavior after the sound exposure ended (Goldbogen et al., 2013b; Sivle et al., 2015). In another study, humpback whales exposed to a 3 kHz pinger meant to act as a net alarm to prevent entanglement did not respond or change course, even when within 500 m (Harcourt et al., 2014). However, five out of six North Atlantic right whales exposed to an acoustic alarm interrupted their foraging dives; in this case, the alarm was comprised of a mixture of signals with frequencies from 500 to 4500 Hz, was long in duration (lasting several minutes), and was purposely designed to elicit a reaction from the animals as a prospective means to protect them from ship strikes (Nowacek et al., 2004). Although the animals' received SPL was similar in the latter two studies (133–150 dB re 1 μPa^2s), the frequency, duration, and temporal pattern of signal presentation were different. Harris et al. (2019a) suggest that differences in responses between species may be due to contextual factors such as location, time of year, sound source characteristics, or exposure context through the comparison of

differences in changes in lunge feeding between blue, fin, and humpback whales observed during sonar-controlled exposure experiments.

Humpback whales in another behavioral response experiment in Australia also responded to a 2 kHz tone stimulus by changing their course during migration to move more offshore and surfaced more frequently, but otherwise did not respond (Dunlop et al., 2013). Humpback whales in the Norwegian behavioral response study may have habituated slightly between the first and second sonar exposure (Sivle et al., 2015), and actually responded more severely to killer whale vocalization playbacks than they did to the sonar playbacks. Several humpback whales have been observed during aerial or visual surveys during Navy training events involving sonar; no avoidance or other behavioral responses were ever noted, even when the whales were observed within 5 km of a vessel with active (or possibly active) sonar and maximum received levels were estimated to be between 135 and 161 dB re 1 µPa (Mobley & Milette, 2010; Mobley, 2011; Mobley & Pacini, 2012; Mobley et al., 2012; Smultea et al., 2009). In fact, one group of humpback whales approached a vessel with active sonar so closely that the sonar was shut down and the vessel slowed; the animals continued approaching and swam under the bow of the vessel (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2011a). Another group of humpback whales continued heading towards a vessel with active sonar as the vessel was moving away for almost 30 minutes, with an estimated median received level of 143 dB re 1 µPa. This group was observed producing surface active behaviors such as pec slaps, tail slaps, and breaches; however, these are very common behaviors in competitive pods during the breeding season and were not considered to have occurred in response to the sonar (Mobley et al., 2012). In addition, Henderson et al. (2019) examined the dive and movement behavior of humpback whales tagged at the U.S. Navy's Pacific Missile Range Facility, including whales incidentally exposed to sonar during Navy training activities. Tracking data showed that individual humpbacks spent limited time, no more than a few days, in the vicinity of Kaua'i. Potential behavioral responses to sonar exposure were limited and may have been influenced by engagement in breeding and social behaviors.

The strongest baleen whale response in any behavioral response study was observed in a minke whale in the 3S2 study, which responded at 146 dB re 1 µPa by strongly avoiding the sound source (Kvadsheim et al., 2017; Sivle et al., 2015). Although the minke whale increased its swim speed, directional movement, and respiration rate, none of these were greater than rates observed in baseline behavior, and its dive behavior remained similar to baseline dives. A minke whale tagged in the Southern California behavioral response study also responded by increasing its directional movement, but maintained its speed and dive patterns, and so did not demonstrate as strong of a response (Kvadsheim et al., 2017). In addition, the 3S2 minke whale demonstrated some of the same avoidance behavior during the controlled ship approach with no sonar, indicating at least some of the response was to the vessel (Kvadsheim et al., 2017). Martin et al. (2015) found that the density of calling minke whales was reduced during periods of Navy training involving sonar relative to the periods before training, and increased again in the days after training was completed. The responses of individual whales could not be assessed, so in this case it is unknown whether the decrease in calling animals indicated that the animals left the range, or simply ceased calling. Similarly, minke whale detections made using Marine Acoustic Recording Instruments off Jacksonville, FL, were reduced or ceased altogether during periods of sonar use (Simeone et al., 2015; U.S. Department of the Navy, 2013b), especially with an increased ping rate (Charif et al., 2015). Harris et al. (2019b) utilized acoustically generated minke whale tracks at the U.S. Navy's Pacific Missile Range Facility to statistically demonstrate changes in the spatial distribution of minke whale acoustic presence Before, During, and After surface ship mid-frequency active sonar training. The spatial distribution of probability of acoustic presence was different in the During phase compared to the Before phase, and the probability of presence at the center of ship activity for the

During phase was close to zero for both years. The After phases for both years retained lower probabilities of presence suggesting the return to baseline conditions may take more than five days. The results show a clear spatial redistribution of calling minke whales during surface ship mid-frequency active sonar training, however a limitation of passive acoustic monitoring is that one cannot conclude if the whales moved away, went silent, or a combination of the two. Two minke whales also stranded in shallow water after the U.S. Navy training event in the Bahamas in 2000, although these animals were successfully returned to deep water with no physical examinations; therefore, no final conclusions were drawn on whether the sonar led to their stranding (Filadelfo et al., 2009a; Filadelfo et al., 2009b; U.S. Department of Commerce & U.S. Department of the Navy, 2001).

Baleen whales have also been exposed to lower frequency sonars, with the hypothesis that these whales may react more strongly to lower frequency sounds that overlap with their vocalization range. One series of studies was undertaken in 1997–1998 pursuant to the Navy's Low-Frequency Sound Scientific Research Program. The frequency bands of the low-frequency sonars used were between 100 and 500 Hz, with received levels between 115 and 150 dB re 1 µPa, and the source was always stationary. Fin and blue whales were targeted on foraging grounds, singing humpback whales were exposed on breeding grounds, and gray whales were exposed during migratory behavior. These studies found only short-term responses to low-frequency sound by some fin and humpback whales, including changes in vocal activity and avoidance of the source vessel, while other fin, humpback, and blue whales did not respond at all. When the source was in the path of migrating gray whales they changed course up to 2 km to avoid the sound, but when the source was outside their path, little response was observed, although received levels were similar (Clark & Fristrup, 2001; Croll et al., 2001; Fristrup et al., 2003; Miller et al., 2000; Nowacek et al., 2007). Low-frequency signals of the Acoustic Thermometry of Ocean Climate sound source were also not found to affect dive times of humpback whales in Hawaiian waters (Frankel & Clark, 2000).

Opportunistic passive acoustic based studies have also detected behavioral responses to sonar, although definitive conclusions are harder to draw. Blue whales exposed to mid-frequency sonar in the Southern California Bight were less likely to produce low-frequency calls usually associated with feeding behavior, beginning at received levels of 110–120 dB re 1 µPa (Melcón et al., 2012); however, without visual observations it is unknown whether there was another factor that contributed to the reduction in foraging calls, such as the presence of conspecifics. In another example, Risch et al. (2012, 2014) determined that humpback whale song produced in the Stellwagen Bank National Marine Sanctuary was reduced, and since the timing was concurrent with an Ocean Acoustic Waveguide Remote Sensing experiment occurring 200 km away, they concluded that the reduced song was a result of the Ocean Acoustic Waveguide Remote Sensing. However, Gong et al. (2014) analyzed the same data set while also looking at the presence of herring in the region, and found that the singing humpbacks were actually located on nearby Georges Bank and not on Stellwagen, and that the song rate in their data did not change in response to Ocean Acoustic Waveguide Remote Sensing, but could be explained by natural causes.

Although some strong responses have been observed in mysticetes to sonar and other transducers (e.g., the single minke whale), for the most part mysticete responses appear to be fairly moderate across all received levels. While some responses such as cessation of foraging or changes in dive behavior could carry short-term impacts, in all cases behavior returned to normal after the signal stopped. Mysticete responses also seem to be highly mediated by behavioral state, with no responses occurring in some behavioral states, and contextual factors and signal characteristics having more impact than received

level alone. Many of the contextual factors resulting from the behavioral response studies (e.g., close approaches by multiple vessels or tagging) would never be introduced in real Navy training and testing scenarios. While data are lacking on behavioral responses of mysticetes to continuously active sonars, these species are known to be able to habituate to novel and continuous sounds (Nowacek et al., 2004), suggesting that they are likely to have similar responses to high-duty cycle sonars. Therefore, mysticete behavioral responses to Navy sonar would likely be a result of the animal's behavioral state and prior experience rather than external variables such as ship proximity; thus, if significant behavioral responses occur they would likely be short term. In fact, no significant behavioral responses such as panic, stranding, or other severe reactions have been observed during monitoring of actual training exercises (Smultea et al., 2009; U.S. Department of the Navy, 2011b, 2014b; Watwood et al., 2012).

Odontocetes

Behavioral response studies have been conducted on odontocete species since 2007, with a focus on beaked whale responses to active sonar transmissions or controlled exposure playback of simulated sonar on various military ranges (Claridge et al., 2009; Defence Science and Technology Laboratory, 2007; Falcone et al., 2017; Henderson et al., 2015; Henderson et al., 2016; Isojunno et al., 2020; Joyce et al., 2018; Manzano-Roth et al., 2016; McCarthy et al., 2011; Moretti et al., 2009; Southall et al., 2011; Southall et al., 2012; Southall et al., 2013; Southall et al., 2014; Southall et al., 2015; Tyack et al., 2011; Wensveen et al., 2019). Through analyses of these behavioral response studies, a preliminary overarching effect of greater sensitivity to most anthropogenic exposures was seen in beaked whales compared to the other odontocetes studied (Southall et al., 2009).

Observed reactions by Blainville's, Cuvier's, and Baird's beaked whales to mid-frequency sonar sounds have included cessation of clicking, decline in group vocal periods, termination of foraging dives, changes in direction to avoid the sound source, slower ascent rates to the surface, longer deep and shallow dive durations, and other unusual dive behavior (Boyd et al., 2008; Defence Science and Technology Laboratory, 2007; DeRuiter et al., 2013b; Miller et al., 2015; Southall et al., 2011; Stimpert et al., 2014; Tyack et al., 2011). Similar responses have been observed in northern bottlenose whales, one of which conducted the longest and deepest dive on record for that species after the sonar exposure and continued swimming away from the source for over seven hours (Miller et al., 2015; Wensveen et al., 2019). Responses have occurred at received levels between 95 and 150 dB re 1 µPa. Many of these exposures occurred within 1–8 km of the focal animal, within a few hours of tagging the animal, and with one or more boats within a few kilometers to observe responses and record acoustic data. One Cuvier's beaked whale was also incidentally exposed to real Navy sonar located over 100 km away, and the authors did not detect similar responses at comparable received levels. Received levels from the mid-frequency active sonar signals from the controlled and incidental exposures were calculated as 84–144 and 78–106 dB re 1 µPa, respectively, indicating that context of the exposures (e.g., source proximity, controlled source ramp-up) may have been a significant factor in the responses to the simulated sonars (DeRuiter et al., 2013b). However, in a remote environment where sonar exposure is rare, similar responses in northern bottlenose whales were detected in whales up to 28 km away from the source at modeled received levels estimated at 117–126 dB re 1 µPa with no vessel nearby (von Benda-Beckmann et al., 2019; Wensveen et al., 2019). One northern bottlenose whale did approach the ship and circle the source, then resumed foraging after the exposure, but the source level was only 122 dB re 1 µPa.

Falcone et al. (2017) modeled deep and shallow dive durations, surface interval durations, and inter-deep dive intervals of Cuvier's beaked whales against predictor values that included helicopter-dipping,

mid-power mid-frequency active sonar and hull-mounted, high-power mid-frequency active sonar along with other, non-mid-frequency active sonar predictors. They found both shallow and deep dive durations to increase as the proximity to both mid- and high-powered sources decreased, and found surface intervals and inter-deep dive intervals to also increase in the presence of both types of sonars, although surface intervals shortened during periods of no mid-frequency active sonar. The responses to the mid-power mid-frequency active sonar at closer ranges were comparable to the responses to the higher SL ship sonar, again highlighting the importance of proximity. This study also supports context as a response factor, as helicopter-dipping sonars are shorter duration and randomly located, so more difficult for beaked whales to predict or track and therefore potentially more likely to cause a response, especially when they occur at closer distances (6–25 km in this study). Watwood et al. (2017) found that helicopter-dipping events occurred more frequently but with shorter durations than periods of hull-mounted sonar, and also found that the longer the duration of a sonar event, the greater reduction in detected Cuvier's beaked whale group dives. Therefore, when looking at the number of detected group dives, there was a greater reduction during periods of hull-mounted sonar than during helicopter-dipping sonar. Similar results were found by DiMarzio et al. (2019).

Long-term tagging work has demonstrated that the longer duration dives considered a behavioral response by DeRuiter et al. (2013b) fell within the normal range of dive durations found for eight tagged Cuvier's beaked whales on the Southern California Offshore Range (Schorr et al., 2014). However, the longer inter-deep dive intervals found by DeRuiter et al. (2013b), which were among the longest found by Schorr et al. (2014) and Falcone et al. (2017), could indicate a response to sonar. In addition, Williams et al. (2017b) note that in normal deep dives or during fast swim speeds, beaked whales and other marine mammals use strategies to reduce their stroke rates, including leaping or wave surfing when swimming, and interspersing glides between bouts of stroking when diving. They determined that in the post-exposure dives by the tagged Cuvier's beaked whales described in DeRuiter et al. (2013b), the whales ceased gliding and swam with almost continuous strokes. This change in swim behavior was calculated to increase metabolic costs about 30.5 percent and increase the amount of energy expending on fast swim speeds from 27 to 59 percent of their overall energy budget. This repartitioning of energy was detected in the model up to 1.7 hours after the single sonar exposure. Therefore, while the overall post-exposure dive durations were similar, the metabolic energy calculated by Williams et al. (2017b) was higher. However, Southall et al. (2019a) found that prey availability was higher in the western area of the Southern California Offshore Range where Cuvier's beaked whales preferentially occurred, while prey resources were lower in the eastern area and moderate in the area just north of the Range. This high prey availability may indicate that fewer foraging dives are needed to meet metabolic energy requirements than would be needed in another area with fewer resources.

Wensveen et al. (2019) examined the roles of sound source distance and received level in northern bottlenose whales in an environment without frequent sonar activity using controlled exposure experiments. They observed behavioral avoidance of the sound source over a wide range of distances (0.8–28 km) and estimated avoidance thresholds ranging from received SPLs of 117–126 dB re: 1 mPa. The behavioral response characteristics and avoidance thresholds were comparable to those previously observed in beaked whale studies; however, they did not observe an effect of distance on behavioral response and found that onset and intensity of behavioral response were better predicted by received SPL. Joyce et al. (2019) examined modeled received sound levels, dive data, and horizontal movement of seven satellite-tagged Blainville's beaked whales before, during, and after mid-frequency active sonar training at the Atlantic Undersea Test and Evaluation Center instrumented range. They found a decline in deep dives at the onset of the training and an increase in time spent on foraging dives as individuals

moved away from the range. Predicted received levels at which presumed responses were observed were comparable to those previously observed in beaked whale studies. Acoustic data indicated that vocal periods were detected on the range within 72 hours after training ended.

On Navy ranges, Blainville's beaked whales located on the range appear to move off-range during sonar use and return only after the sonar transmissions have stopped, sometimes taking several days to do so (Claridge et al., 2009; Henderson et al., 2015; Manzano-Roth et al., 2016; McCarthy et al., 2011; Moretti et al., 2009; Tyack et al., 2011). For example, five Blainville's beaked whales that were estimated to be within 2–29 km of the AUTEC range at the onset of sonar were displaced a maximum of 28–68 km from the range after moving away from the range, although one whale approached the range during the period of active sonar (Joyce et al., 2019). However, Blainville's beaked whales remain on the range to forage throughout the rest of the year (Henderson et al., 2016), possibly indicating that this a preferred foraging habitat regardless of the effects of the noise, or it could be that there are no long-term consequences of the sonar activity. Similarly, photo-identification studies in the Southern California Range Complex have identified approximately 100 individual Cuvier's beaked whale individuals, with 40 percent having been seen in one or more prior years, with re-sightings up to seven years apart, indicating a possibly resident population on the range (Falcone et al., 2009; Falcone & Schorr, 2014).

Beaked whales may respond similarly to shipboard echosounders, commonly used for navigation, fisheries, and scientific purposes, with frequencies ranging from 12 to 400 kHz and source levels up to 230 dB re 1 µPa but typically a very narrow beam (Cholewiak et al., 2017). During a scientific cetacean survey, an array of echosounders was used in a one-day-on, one-day-off paradigm. Beaked whale acoustic detections occurred predominantly (96 percent) when the echosounder was off, with only four detections occurring when it was on. Beaked whales were sighted fairly equally when the echosounder was on or off, but sightings were further from the ship when the echosounder was on (Cholewiak et al., 2017). These findings indicate that the beaked whales may be avoiding the area and may cease foraging near the echosounder.

Tyack et al. (2011) hypothesized that beaked whale responses to sonar may represent an anti-predator response. To test this idea, vocalizations of a potential predator—a killer whale—were also played back to a Blainville's beaked whale. This exposure resulted in a similar but more pronounced reaction than that elicited by sonar playback, which included longer inter-dive intervals and a sustained straight-line departure of more than 20 km from the area (Allen et al., 2014; Tyack et al., 2011). De Soto et al. (2020) hypothesized that the high degree of vocal synchrony in beaked whales during their deep foraging dives, coupled with their silent, low-angled ascents, have evolved as an anti-predator response to killer whales. Since killer whales do not dive deep when foraging and so may be waiting at the surface for animals to finish a dive, these authors speculated that by diving in spatial and vocal cohesion with all members of their group, and by surfacing silently and up to a kilometer away from where they were vocally active during the dive, they minimize the ability of killer whales to locate them when at the surface. This may lead to a trade-off for the larger, more fit animals that could conduct longer foraging dives, such that all members of the group remain together and are better protected by this behavior. The authors further speculate that this may explain the long, slow, silent, and shallow ascents that beaked whales make when sonar occurs during a deep foraging dive. However, these hypotheses are based only on the dive behavior of tagged beaked whales, with no observations of predation attempts by killer whales, and need to be tested further to be validated. This anti-predator hypothesis was also tested by playing back killer whale vocalizations to pilot whales, sperm whales, and even other killer whales, to determine responses by both potential prey and conspecifics (Miller et al., 2011; Miller, 2012). Results varied, from

no response by killer whales to an increase in group size and attraction to the source in pilot whales (Curé et al., 2012). Gotz et al. (2020) tested startle responses in bottlenose dolphins and found that these responses can occur at moderate received levels and mid-frequencies, and that the relationship between rise time and startle response was more gradual than expected in an odontocete. They therefore hypothesize that the extreme responses of beaked whales to sonar could be a form of startle response, rather than an anti-predator response.

While there has been a focus on beaked whale responses to sonar, other species have been studied during behavioral response studies as well, including pilot whales, killer whales, and sperm whales. Responses by these species have also included horizontal avoidance, reduced breathing rates, changes in behavioral state, and changes in dive behavior (Antunes et al., 2014; Isojunno et al., 2017; Isojunno et al., 2018; Isojunno et al., 2020; Miller et al., 2011; Miller, 2012; Miller et al., 2014). Additionally, separation of a killer whale calf from its group during exposure to mid-frequency sonar playback was observed (Miller et al., 2011). Received level thresholds at the onset of avoidance behavior were generally higher for pilot whales (mean 150 dB re 1 µPa) and sperm whales (mean 140 dB re 1 µPa) than killer whales (mean 129 dB re 1 µPa) (Antunes et al., 2014; Miller, 2012; Miller et al., 2014). A close examination of the tag data from the Norwegian groups showed that responses seemed to be behaviorally, signal frequency, or received sound energy mediated. For example, killer whales only changed their dive behavior when doing deep dives at the onset of 1–2 kHz sonar (sweeping across frequencies), but did not change their dive behavior if they were deep diving during 6–7 kHz sonar (sweeping across frequencies). Nor did they change their dive behavior if they were conducting shallow dives at the onset of either type of sonar. Similarly, pilot whales and sperm whales performed normal deep dives during 6–7 kHz sonar (and more deep foraging dives than during baseline for the pilot whales), while during 1–2 kHz sonar the pilot whales conducted fewer deep dives and the sperm whales performed shorter and shallower dives (Sivle et al., 2012). In addition, pilot whales were also more likely to respond to lower received levels when non-feeding than feeding during 6–7 kHz sonar exposures, but were more likely to respond at higher received levels when non-feeding during 1–2 kHz sonar exposures. Foraging time in pilot whales was reduced during the initial sonar exposure (both mid-frequency active sonar and low-frequency active sonar), with a concurrent increase in travel behavior; however, foraging increased again during subsequent exposures, potentially indicating some habituation (Isojunno et al., 2017). No reduction in foraging was observed during killer whale playbacks. Cessation of foraging appeared to occur at a lower received level of 145–150 dB re 1 µPa than had been observed previously for avoidance behavior (around 170 dB re 1 µPa; Antunes et al., 2014). Pilot whales also exhibited reduced breathing rates relative to their diving behavior when the low-frequency active sonar levels were high (reaching 180 dB re 1 µPa), but only on the first sonar exposure; on subsequent exposures their breathing rates increased (Isojunno et al., 2018), indicating a change in response tactic with additional exposures. Furthermore, pilot whales exposed to a 38 kHz downward-facing echosounder did not change their dive and foraging behavior during exposure periods, although the animals' heading variance increased and fewer deep dives were conducted (Quick et al., 2017). In contrast, killer whales were more likely to respond to either sonar type when non-feeding than when feeding (Harris et al., 2015). Sperm whales were exposed to pulsed active sonar (1-2 kHz) at moderate source levels and high source levels, as well as continuously active sonar at moderate levels for which the summed energy (SEL) equaled the summed energy of the high source level pulsed sonar (Isojunno et al., 2020). Foraging behavior did not change during exposures to moderate source level sonar, but non-foraging behavior increased during exposures to high source level sonar and to the continuous sonar, indicating that the energy of the sound (the SEL) was a better predictor of response than SPL. However,

the time of day of the exposure was also an important covariate in determining the amount of non-foraging behavior, as were order effects (e.g. the SEL of the previous exposure). These results again demonstrate that the behavioral state and environment of the animal mediates the likelihood of a behavioral response, as do the characteristics (e.g., frequency, energy level) of the sound source itself. Further, the highly flexible activity time budgets observed for pilot whales, with a large amount of time spent resting at the surface, may indicate context-dependency on some behaviors, such as the presence of prey driving periods of foraging. Therefore, that time may be more easily re-allocated to missed foraging opportunities, leading to less severe population consequences of periods of reduced foraging (Isojunno et al., 2017).

Other responses during behavioral response studies included the synchronization of pilot whale surfacings with sonar pulses during one exposure, possibly as a means of mitigating the sound (Wensveen et al., 2015), and mimicry of the sonar with whistles by pilot whales (Alves et al., 2014), false killer whales (DeRuiter et al., 2013b) and Risso's dolphins (Smultea et al., 2012). In contrast, in another study melon-headed whales had "minor transient silencing" (a brief, non-lasting period of silence) after each 6–7 kHz signal, and (in a different oceanographic region) pilot whales had no apparent response (DeRuiter et al., 2013a). The probability of detecting delphinid vocalizations (whistles, clicks, and buzzes) increased during periods of sonar relative to the period prior to sonar in a passive acoustic study using Marine Autonomous Recording Units in the Jacksonville Range Complex, while there was no impact of sonar to the probability of detecting sperm whale clicks (Charif et al., 2015; U.S. Department of the Navy, 2013c).

In addition, killer whale sighting data from the same region in Norway as the behavioral response study was used to compare the presence or absence of whales from other years against the period with sonar. The authors found a strong relationship between the presence of whales and the abundance of herring, and only a weak relationship between the whales and sonar activity (Kuningas et al., 2013). Baird et al. (2013b; 2014; 2017) also tagged four shallow-diving odontocete species (rough-toothed dolphins, pilot whales, bottlenose dolphins, and false killer whales) in Hawaii off the Pacific Missile Range Facility before Navy training events. None of the tagged animals demonstrated a large-scale avoidance response to the sonar as they moved on or near the range, in some cases even traveling towards areas of higher noise levels, while estimated received SPLs varied from 130 to 168 dB re 1 µPa and distances from sonar sources ranged between 3.2 and 94.4 km. However, one pilot whale did have reduced dive rates (from 2.6 dives per hour before to 1.6 dives per hour during) and deeper dives (from a mean of 124 m to 268 m) during a period of sonar exposure. Baird et al. (2016) also tagged four short-finned pilot whales from both the resident island-associated population and from the pelagic population. The core range for the pelagic population was over 20 times larger than for the pelagic population, leading Baird et al. (2016) to hypothesize that that likelihood of exposure to mid-frequency active sonar, and therefore the potential for response, would be very different between the two populations. These diverse examples demonstrate that responses can be varied, are often context- and behavior-driven, and can be species and even exposure specific.

Other opportunistic observations of behavioral responses to sonar have occurred as well, although in those cases it is difficult to attribute observed responses directly to the sonar exposure, or to know exactly what form the response took. For example, both sperm and pilot whales potentially ceased sound production during the Heard Island feasibility test, with transmissions centered at 57 Hz and up to 220 dB re 1 µPa (Bowles et al., 1994), although it could not be determined whether the animals ceased sound production or left the area. In May 2003, killer whales in Haro Strait, Washington, exhibited what

were believed by some observers to be aberrant behaviors, during which time the USS Shoup was in the vicinity and engaged in mid-frequency active sonar operations. Sound fields modeled for the USS Shoup transmissions (Fromm, 2009; National Marine Fisheries Service, 2005; U.S. Department of the Navy, 2004) estimated a mean received SPL of approximately 169 dB re 1 µPa at the location of the killer whales at the closest point of approach between the animals and the vessel (estimated SPLs ranged from 150 to 180 dB re 1 µPa). However, attributing the observed behaviors to any one cause is problematic given there were six nearby whale watch vessels surrounding the pod, and subsequent research has demonstrated that "Southern Residents modify their behavior by increasing surface activity (breaches, tail slaps, and pectoral fin slaps) and swimming in more erratic paths when vessels are close" (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2014). Several odontocete species, including bottlenose dolphins, Risso's dolphins, Pacific white-sided dolphins, and common dolphins have been observed near the Southern California Offshore Range during periods of mid-frequency active sonar; responses included changes in or cessation of vocalizations, changes in behavior, and departures from the area, and at the highest received levels animals were not present in the area at all (Henderson et al., 2014). However, these observations were conducted from a vessel off-range, and so any observed responses could not be attributed to the sonar with any certainty. Research on sperm whales in the Caribbean in 1983 coincided with the U.S. intervention in Grenada, where animals were observed scattering and leaving the area in the presence of military sonar, presumably from nearby submarines (Watkins & Schevill, 1975; Watkins et al., 1985). The authors did not report received levels from these exposures and reported similar reactions from noise generated by banging on their boat hull; therefore, it was unclear if the sperm whales were reacting to the sonar signal itself or to a potentially new unknown sound in general.

During aerial and visual monitoring of Navy training events involving sonar, rough-toothed dolphins and unidentified dolphins were observed approaching the vessel with active sonar as if to bow ride, while spotted dolphins were observed nearby but did not avoid or approach the vessel (Mobley, 2011; U.S. Department of the Navy, 2011a; Watwood et al., 2012). During small boat surveys near the Southern California Offshore Range in southern California, more dolphins were encountered in June compared to a similar survey conducted the previous November after seven days of mid-frequency sonar activity; it was not investigated if this change was due to the sonar activity or was a seasonal difference that was also observed in other years (Campbell et al., 2010). There were also fewer passive acoustic dolphin detections during and after longer sonar activities in the Mariana Islands Range Complex, with the post-activity absence lasting longer than the mean dolphin absence of two days when sonar was not present (Munger et al., 2014; Munger et al., 2015).

Acoustic harassment devices and acoustic deterrent devices, that transmit sound into the acoustic environment similar to Navy sonar, have been used to deter marine mammals from fishing gear both to prevent entanglement and to reduce depredation (taking fish). These devices have been used successfully to deter harbor porpoises and beaked whales from getting entangled in fishing nets. For example, Kyhn et al. (2015) tested two types of pingers, one with a 10 kHz tone and one with a broadband 30–160 kHz sweep. Porpoise detection rates were reduced by 65 percent for the sweep and 40 percent for the tone, and while there was some gradual habituation after the first two to four exposures, longer-term exposures (over 28 days) showed no evidence of additional habituation. Similarly, (Kindt-Larsen et al., 2019) tested two pinger types in four configurations and found that while both pingers effectively deterred harbor porpoises, their effect decreased with increasing distance (although their effective distance was limited to a few hundred m). While habituation might occur to a pinger with a single tone, it is less likely to habituate to a pinger with a mixture of signals. Additionally,

sperm whales in the Caribbean stopped vocalizing when presented with sounds from nearby acoustic pingers (Watkins & Schevill, 1975). However, acoustic harassment devices used to deter marine mammals from depredating long lines or aquaculture enclosures have proven less successful. For example, Tixier et al. (2014) used a 6.5 kHz pinger with a source level of 195 dB re 1 µPa on a longline to prevent depredation by killer whales, and although two groups of killer whales fled over 700 m away during the first exposure, they began depredating again after the third and seventh exposures, indicating rapid habituation. In a review of marine mammal deterrents, Schakner & Blumstein (2013) point out that both the characteristics of deterrents and the motivation of the animal play a role in the effectiveness of acoustic harassment devices. Deterrents that are strongly aversive or simulate a predator or are otherwise predictive of a threat are more likely to be effective, unless the animal habituates to the signal or learns that there is no true threat associated with the signal. In some cases net pingers may create a "dinner bell effect," where marine mammals have learned to associate the signal with the availability of prey (Jefferson & Curry, 1996; Schakner & Blumstein, 2013). This may be why net pingers have been more successful at reducing entanglements for harbor porpoise and beaked whales since these species are not depredating from the nets but are getting entangled when foraging in the area and are unable to detect the net (Carretta et al., 2008; Schakner & Blumstein, 2013). Bowles and Anderson (2012) exposed a variety of species in captivity to novel objects, including a fishing net and anchor with line, with and without a gillnet pinger. Responses varied broadly by species, with three species of pinniped showing mild avoidance of the net with the pinger. In contrast, the Pacific white-sided dolphin approached the gillnet without a pinger but avoided it completely when the pinger was added, and Commerson's dolphins demonstrated strong behavioral responses to the pinger including high speed swimming and other high energy behavior, increased use of a refuge pool, and increased rates of vocalizations. In further trials meant to test habituation, the Commerson's dolphins appeared to sensitize to the pinger instead, with even stronger aversive behavior.

Similarly, a 12 kHz acoustic harassment device intended to scare seals was ineffective at deterring seals but effectively caused avoidance in harbor porpoises out to over 500 m from the source, highlighting different species- and device-specific responses (Mikkelsen et al., 2017). Likewise, in a long-term study of killer whale occurrence in inland waters off British Columbia, a region that had been used regularly from 1985 to 1993 showed a significant decrease in killer whale occurrence from 1993 to 1999 when four acoustic deterrent devices were deployed on seal farms; during the same time frame there was no evidence in a reduction in seals in the same area, although they were the intended targets of the devices(Morton & Symonds, 2002). During the same time period, no reduction in killer whale occurrence was detected at an adjacent location, leading to the conclusion that the killer whales were avoiding the area ensonified by the deterrent devices. Once the devices were removed, the killer whales returned to the affected area in similar numbers as had previously occurred. Additional behavioral studies have been conducted with captive harbor porpoises using acoustic alarms, such as those used on fishing nets to help deter marine mammals from becoming caught or entangled (Kastelein et al., 2006; Kastelein et al., 2001). These studies have found that high-frequency sources with varied duration, interval, and sweep characteristics can prove to be effective deterrents for harbor porpoises (Kastelein et al., 2017d). Van Beest et al. (2017) modeled the long-term, population-level impacts of fisheries bycatch, pinger deterrents, and time-area closures on a population of harbor porpoises. They found that when pingers were used alone (in the absence of gillnets or time-area closures), the animals were deterred from the area often enough to cause a population level reduction of 21 percent, greater even than the modeled level of current bycatch impacts. However, when the pingers were coupled with gillnets in the model, and time-area closures were also used (allowing a net- and pinger-free area for the porpoises to move

into while foraging), the population only experienced a 0.8 percent decline even with current gillnet use levels. This demonstrates that, when used correctly, pingers can successfully deter porpoises from gillnets without leading to any negative impacts.

Controlled experiments have also been conducted on captive animals to estimate received levels at which behavioral responses occur. In one study, bottlenose dolphin behavioral responses were recorded when exposed to 3 kHz sonar-like tones between 115 and 185 dB re 1 μPa (Houser et al., 2013a), and in another study bottlenose dolphins and beluga whales were presented with one-second tones up to 203 dB re 1 μPa to measure TTS (Finneran et al., 2001; Finneran et al., 2003a; Finneran & Schlundt, 2004; Finneran et al., 2005b; Schlundt et al., 2000). During these studies, responses included changes in respiration rate, fluke slaps, and a refusal to participate or return to the location of the sound stimulus. This refusal included what appeared to be deliberate attempts to avoid a sound exposure or to avoid the location of the exposure site during subsequent tests (Finneran et al., 2002; Schlundt et al., 2000). In the behavioral response study, bottlenose dolphins demonstrated a 50 percent probability of response at 172 dB re 1 μPa over 10 trials. In the TTS experiment, bottlenose dolphins exposed to one-second intense tones exhibited short-term changes in behavior above received sound levels of 178–193 dB re 1 μPa; beluga whales did so at received levels of 180–196 dB re 1 μPa and above. In some instances, animals exhibited aggressive behavior toward the test apparatus (Ridgway et al., 1997; Schlundt et al., 2000). While animals were commonly reinforced with food during these studies, the controlled environment and ability to measure received levels provide insight on received levels at which animals would behaviorally respond to noise sources.

Behavioral responses to a variety of sound sources have been studied in captive harbor porpoises, including acoustic alarms (Kastelein et al., 2006; Kastelein et al., 2001); emissions for underwater data transmission (Kastelein et al., 2005b); and tones, including 1–2 kHz and 6–7 kHz sweeps with and without harmonics (Kastelein et al., 2014d), 25 kHz with and without sidebands (Kastelein et al., 2015c; Kastelein et al., 2015d), and mid-frequency sonar tones at 3.5–4.1 kHz at 2.7 percent and 96 percent duty cycles (e.g., one tone per minute versus a continuous tone for almost a minute) (Kastelein et al., 2018). Responses include increased respiration rates, more jumping, or swimming further from the source, but responses were different depending on the source. For example, harbor porpoises responded to the 1–2 kHz upsweep at 123 dB re 1 μPa, but not to the downsweep or the 6–7 kHz tonal at the same level (Kastelein et al., 2014d). When measuring the same sweeps for a startle response, the 50 percent response threshold was 133 and 101 dB re 1 μPa for 1–2 kHz and 6–7 kHz sweeps, respectively, when no harmonics were present, and decreased to 90 dB re 1 μPa for 1–2 kHz sweeps with harmonics present (Kastelein et al., 2014d). Harbor porpoises did not respond to the low-duty cycle mid-frequency tones at any received level, but one did respond to the high-duty cycle signal with more jumping and increased respiration rates (Kastelein et al., 2018). Harbor porpoises responded to seal scarers with broadband signals up to 44 kHz with a slight respiration response at 117 dB re 1 μPa and an avoidance response at 139 dB re 1 μPa, but another scarer with a fundamental (strongest) frequency of 18 kHz did not have an avoidance response until 151 dB re 1 μPa (Kastelein et al., 2014a). Exposure of the same acoustic pinger to a striped dolphin under the same conditions did not elicit a response (Kastelein et al., 2006), again highlighting the importance in understanding species differences in the tolerance of underwater noise, although sample sizes in these studies was small so these could reflect individual differences as well. Lastly, Kastelein et al. (2019a) examined the potential masking effect of high sea state ambient noise on captive harbor porpoise perception of and response to high duty cycle playbacks of AN/SQS-53C sonar signals by observing their respiration rates. Results indicated that sonar

signals were not masked by the high sea state noise, and received levels at which responses were observed were similar to those observed in prior studies of harbor porpoise behavior.

Behavioral responses by odontocetes to sonar and other transducers appear to range from no response at all to responses that could potentially lead to long-term consequences for individual animals (e.g., mother-calf separation). This is likely in part due to the fact that this taxonomic group is so broad and includes some of the most sensitive species (e.g., beaked whales and harbor porpoise) as well as some of the least sensitive species (e.g., bottlenose dolphins). This is also the only group for which both field behavioral response studies and captive controlled exposure experiments have been conducted, leading to the assessment of both contextually driven responses as well as dose-based responses. This wide range in both exposure situations and individual- and species-sensitivities makes reaching general conclusions difficult. However, it does appear as though exposures in close proximity, with multiple vessels that approach the animal, lead to higher-level responses in most odontocete species regardless of received level or behavioral state. In contrast, in more "real-world" exposure situations, with distant sources moving in variable directions, behavioral responses appear to be driven by behavioral state, individual experience, or species-level sensitivities. These responses may also occur more in line with received level such that the likelihood of a response would increase with increased received levels. However, these "real-world" responses are more likely to be short-term, lasting the duration of the exposure or even shorter as the animal assesses the sound and (based on prior experience or contextual cues) determines a threat is unlikely. Therefore, while odontocete behavioral responses to Navy sonar would vary across species, populations, and individuals, they are not likely to lead to long-term consequences or population-level effects.

Behavioral Reactions to Vessels Noise

Many thousands of trans-Pacific shipments to and from Asia occur as part of the global shipping transportation network and pass in proximity to the Mariana Islands and throughout the Action Area (Kaluza et al., 2010). Sound emitted from large vessels, such as cargo ships, is the principal source of low-frequency noise in the ocean today, and marine mammals are known to react to or be affected by that noise (Hatch & Wright, 2007; Hildebrand, 2005; Richardson et al., 1995b). For example, Erbe et al. (2012) estimated the maximum annual underwater SEL from vessel traffic near Seattle was 215 dB re 1 μPa^2-s, and Bassett et al. (2010) measured mean SPLs at Admiralty Inlet from commercial shipping at 117 dB re 1 µPa with a maximum exceeding 135 dB re 1 µPa on some occasions. Similarly, Veirs et al. (2015) found average broadband noise levels in Haro Strait to be 110 dB re 1 µPa that extended up to 40 kHz, well into the hearing range of odontocetes.

Many studies of behavioral responses by marine mammals to vessels have been focused on the short- and long-term impacts of whale watching vessels. In short-term studies, researchers noted changes in resting and surface behavior states of cetaceans to whale-watching vessels (Acevedo, 1991; Aguilar de Soto et al., 2006; Arcangeli & Crosti, 2009; Au & Green, 2000; Christiansen et al., 2010; Erbe, 2002; Noren et al., 2009; Stockin et al., 2008; Williams et al., 2009). Received levels were often not reported, so it is difficult to distinguish responses to the presence of the vessel from responses to the vessel noise. Most studies examined the short-term response to vessel sound and vessel traffic (Magalhães et al., 2002; Richardson et al., 1995b; Watkins, 1981), with behavioral and vocal responses occurring when received levels were over 20 dB greater than ambient noise levels. Other research has attempted to quantify the effects of whale watching using focused experiments (Meissner et al., 2015; Pirotta et al., 2015b).

The impact of vessel noise has received increased consideration, particularly as whale watching and shipping traffic has risen (McKenna et al., 2012; Pirotta et al., 2015b; Veirs et al., 2015). Odontocetes and mysticetes in particular have received increased attention relative to vessel noise and vessel traffic. Still, not all species in all taxonomic groups have been studied, and so results do have to be extrapolated across these broad categories in order to assess potential impacts.

Mysticetes

Baleen whales demonstrate a variety of responses to vessel traffic and noise, from not responding at all to both horizontal (swimming away) and vertical (increased diving) avoidance (Baker et al., 1983; Gende et al., 2011; Watkins, 1981). Other common responses include changes in vocalizations, call rate, surface time, swimming speed, swimming angle or direction, respiration rates, dive times, feeding behavior, and social interactions (Au & Green, 2000; Dunlop, 2019; Fournet et al., 2018; Machernis et al., 2018; Richter et al., 2003; Williams et al., 2002a).

The likelihood of response may be driven by the distance, speed, or noise level of the vessel, the animal's behavioral state, or by the prior experience of the individual or population. For example, in one study fin and humpback whales largely ignored vessels that remained 100 m or more away (Watkins, 1981). In another study, minke whales in the Antarctic did not show any apparent response to a survey vessel moving at normal cruising speeds (about 12 knots) at a distance of 5.5 NM. However, when the vessel drifted or moved at very slow speeds (about 1 knot), many whales approached it (Leatherwood et al., 1982). Similarly, Bernasconi et al. (2012) observed the reactions of six individual baleen whales of unknown species at distances of 50–400 m from a fishing vessel conducting an acoustic survey of pelagic fisheries, with only a slight change in swim direction when the vessel began moving around the whales. Gray whales were likely to continue feeding when approached by a vessel in areas with high motorized vessel traffic, but in areas with less motorized vessel traffic they were more likely to change behaviors, either indicating habituation to vessels in high traffic area, or indicating possible startle reactions to close-approaching non-motorized vessels (e.g., kayaks) in quieter areas (Sullivan & Torres, 2018). Changes in behavior of humpback whales when vessels came within 500 m were also dependent on behavioral state such that they would keep feeding but were more likely to start traveling if they were surface active when approached; and changes in behavior were also affected by time of day or season (Di Clemente et al., 2018). Humpback whales changed their acoustic and social behavior when vessels were present; their communication area was reduced by half in average vessel-dominated noise (105 dB 1 µPa), but the physical presence of vessels was the major contributing factor to decreased social interactions (Dunlop, 2019). Sei whales have been observed ignoring the presence of vessels entirely and even passing close to the vessel (Reeves et al., 1998), and North Atlantic right whales tend not to respond to the sounds of oncoming vessels and continue to use habitats in high vessel traffic areas (Nowacek et al., 2004). Studies show that North Atlantic right whales demonstrate little if any reaction to sounds of vessels approaching or the presence of the vessels themselves. This lack of response may be due to habituation to the presence and associated noise of vessels in right whale habitat, or may be due to propagation effects that may attenuate vessel noise near the surface (Nowacek et al., 2004; Terhune & Verboom, 1999).

When baleen whales do respond to vessels, responses can be as minor as a change in breathing patterns (e.g., Baker et al., 1983; Jahoda et al., 2003), or can be evidenced by a decrease in overall presence, as was observed during a construction project in the United Kingdom, when fewer minke whales were observed as vessel traffic increased (Anderwald et al., 2013). Avoidance responses can be as simple as an alteration in swim patterns or direction by increasing speed and heading away from the vessel

(Jahoda et al., 2003), or by increasing swim speed, changing direction to avoid, and staying submerged for longer periods of time (Au & Green, 2000). For example, in the presence of approaching vessels, blue whales perform shallower dives accompanied by more frequent surfacing but otherwise do not exhibit strong reactions (Calambokidis et al., 2009b). In another study in Hawaii, humpback whales exhibited two forms of behavioral avoidance: horizontal avoidance (changing direction or speed) when vessels were between 2,000 m and 4,000 m away, and vertical avoidance (increased dive times and change in diving pattern) when vessels were less than 2,000 m away (Baker et al., 1983). Similarly, humpback whales in Australia demonstrated variable responses to whale watching vessels, including both horizontal avoidance, approaching, and changes in dive and surface behavior (Stamation et al., 2009). Humpback whales demonstrated similar responses to tourist vessels in Alaska, with increased respiration rates when the time spent near vessels increased, increased swim speeds, and more non-linear movement(Schuler et al., 2019). In addition, while foraging and travel behavior states were likely to be maintained in the presence of tourist vessels, surface active behavior was more likely to transition to travel. Humpback whales avoided a Navy vessel by increasing their dive times and decreasing respiration rates at the surface (Smultea et al., 2009). Williamson et al. (2016) specifically looked at close approaches to humpback whales by small research boats for the purposes of tagging. They found that while dive behavior did not change for any groups, some groups did increase their speed and change their course during or right after the approach, but resumed pre-approach speed and heading shortly thereafter. Only mother-calf groups were found to increase their speed during the approach and maintain the increased speed for longer after the approach, but these groups too resumed normal swim speeds after about 40 minutes. It should be noted that there were no responses by any groups that were approached closely but with no attempts at tagging, indicating that the responses were not due to the vessel presence but to the tagging attempt. In addition, none of the observed changes in behavior were outside the normal range of swim speeds or headings for these migrating whales.

Mysticetes have been shown to both increase and decrease calling behavior in the presence of vessel noise. Based on passive acoustic recordings and in the presence of sounds from passing vessels, Melcón et al. (2012) reported that blue whales had an increased likelihood of producing certain types of calls. While humpback whale call repetition and rate has increased in association with high vessel noise (Doyle et al., 2008), a recent study with stringent inclusion criteria found that the probability of humpback whale calls decreased as vessel noise increased (Fournet et al., 2018). The amplitude of humpback whale calls did not change in the absence or presence of vessel noise. However, feeding calls increased amplitude with higher levels of any (i.e., weather or vessel) ambient noise (Fournet et al., 2018). Boat traffic has been a cause of decreased humpback song activity near Brazil (Sousa-Lima & Clark, 2008), and decreased frequency parameters of fin whale calls (Castellote et al., 2012). Bowhead whales avoided the area around icebreaker ship noise and increased their time at the surface and number of blows (Richardson et al., 1995a). Right whales increase the amplitude or frequency of their vocalizations or call at a lower rate in the presence of increased vessel noise (Parks et al., 2007; Parks et al., 2011), and these vocalization changes may persist over long periods if background noise levels remained elevated. Humpback whales increase the source levels of their calls with increased ambient noise levels that include vessel noise, but the probability of calling is also decreased when vessel noise was part of the soundscape (Fournet et al., 2018).

The long-term consequences of vessel noise are not well understood (see Section 3.4.2.1.1.7, Long-Term Consequences). In a short-term study, minke whales on feeding grounds in Iceland responded to increased whale-watching vessel traffic with a decrease in foraging, both during deep dives and at the

surface (Christiansen et al., 2013). They also increased their avoidance of the boats while decreasing their respiration rates, likely leading to an increase in their metabolic rates. Christiansen and Lusseau (2015) and Christiansen et al. (2014) followed up this study by modeling the cumulative impacts of whale-watching boats on minke whales, but found that although the boats cause temporary feeding disruptions, there were not likely to be long-term consequences as a result. This suggests that short-term responses may not lead to long-term consequences and that over time animals may habituate to the presence of vessel traffic. However, in an area of high whale-watch activity, vessels were within 2,000 m of blue whales 70 percent of the time, with a maximum of eight vessels observed within 400 m of one whale at the same time. This study found reduced surface time, fewer breaths at the surface, and shorter dive times when vessels were within 400 m (Lesage et al., 2017). Since blue whales in this area forage 68 percent of the time, and their foraging dive depths are constrained by the location of prey patches, these reduced dive durations may indicate reduced time spent foraging by over 36 percent. In the short term this reduction may be compensated for, but prolonged exposure to vessel traffic could lead to long-term consequences. Using historical records, Watkins (1986) showed that the reactions of four species of mysticetes to vessel traffic and whale-watching activities in Cape Cod had changed over the 25-year period examined (1957–1982). Reactions of minke whales changed from initially more positive reactions, such as coming towards the boat or research equipment to investigate, to more uninterested reactions towards the end of the study. Fin whales, the most numerous species in the area, showed a trend from initially more negative reactions, such as swimming away from the boat with limited surfacing, to more uninterested reactions (ignoring) allowing boats to approach within 30 m. Right whales showed little change over the study period, with a roughly equal number of reactions judged to be negative and uninterested; no right whales were noted as having positive reactions to vessels. Humpback whales showed a trend from negative to positive reactions with vessels during the study period. The author concluded that the whales had habituated to the human activities over time (Watkins, 1986).

Overall baleen whale responses to vessel noise and traffic are varied but are generally minor, and habituation or disinterest seems to be the predominant long-term response. When baleen whales do avoid ships, they do so by altering their swim and dive patterns to move away from the vessel, but no strong reactions have been observed. In fact, in many cases the whales do not appear to change their behavior at all. This may result from habituation by the whales, but may also result from reduced received levels near the surface due to propagation, or due to acoustic shadowing of the propeller cavitation noise by the ship's hull. Although a lack of response in the presence of a vessel may minimize potential disturbance from passing ships, it does increase the whales' vulnerability to vessel strike, which may be of greater concern for baleen whales than vessel noise (see Section 3.4.4.4, Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS).

Odontocetes

Most odontocetes react neutrally to vessels, although both avoidance and attraction behavior have been observed (Hewitt, 1985; Würsig et al., 1998). Würsig et al. (1998) found that Kogia whales and beaked whales were the most sensitive species to vessels, and reacted by avoiding marine mammal survey vessels in 73 percent of sightings, more than any other odontocetes. Avoidance reactions include a decrease in resting behavior or change in travel direction (Bejder et al., 2006a). Incidents of attraction include common, rough-toothed, and bottlenose dolphins bow riding and jumping in the wake of a vessel (Norris & Prescott, 1961; Ritter, 2002; Shane et al., 1986; Würsig et al., 1998). A study of vessel reactions by dolphin communities in the eastern tropical Pacific found that populations that were often

the target of tuna purse-seine fisheries (spotted, spinner, and common dolphins) show evasive behavior when approached; however, populations that live closer to shore (within 100 NM; coastal spotted and bottlenose dolphins) that are not set on by purse-seine fisheries tend to be attracted to vessels (Archer et al., 2010). The presence of vessels has also been shown to interrupt feeding behavior in delphinids (Meissner et al., 2015; Pirotta et al., 2015b).

Short-term displacement of dolphins due to tourist boat presence has been documented (Carrera et al., 2008), while longer-term or repetitive/chronic displacement for some dolphin groups due to chronic vessel noise has been noted (Haviland-Howell et al., 2007). Delphinid behavioral states also change in the presence of tourist boats that often approach animals, with travel or resting increasing and foraging and social behavior decreasing (Cecchetti et al., 2017; Clarkson et al., 2020; Meissner et al., 2015). Most studies of the behavioral reactions to vessel traffic of bottlenose dolphins have documented at least short-term changes in behavior, activities, or vocalization patterns when vessels are near, although the distinction between vessel noise and vessel movement has not been made clear (Acevedo, 1991; Arcangeli & Crosti, 2009; Berrow & Holmes, 1999; Fumagalli et al., 2018; Gregory & Rowden, 2001; Janik & Thompson, 1996; Lusseau, 2004; Marega et al., 2018; Mattson et al., 2005; Scarpaci et al., 2000). Steckenreuter (2011) found bottlenose dolphin groups to feed less, become more tightly clustered, and have more directed movement when approached to 50 m than groups approached to 150 m or approached in a controlled manner. Guerra et al. (2014) demonstrated that bottlenose dolphins subjected to chronic noise from tour boats responded to boat noise by alterations in group structure and in vocal behavior but also found the dolphins' reactions varied depending on whether the observing research vessel was approaching or moving away from the animals being observed. This demonstrates that the influence of the sound exposure cannot be decoupled from the physical presence of a surface vessel, thus complicating interpretations of the relative contribution of each stimulus to the response. Indeed, the presence of surface vessels, their approach, and speed of approach, seemed to be significant factors in the response of the Indo-Pacific humpback dolphins (Ng & Leung, 2003).

The effects of tourism and whale watching have highly impacted killer whales, such as the Northern and Southern Resident populations. These animals are targeted by numerous small whale-watching vessels in the Pacific Northwest and, from 1998 to 2012 during the viewing season, have had an annual monthly average of nearly 20 vessels of various types within 0.5 mile of their location during daytime hours (Clark, 2015; Eisenhardt, 2014; Erbe et al., 2014). These vessels have source levels that ranged from 145 to 169 dB re 1 µPa and produce broadband noise up to 96 kHz and 116 dB re 1 µPa. While new regulations on the distance boats had to maintain were implemented, there did not seem to be a concurrent reduction in the received levels of vessel noise, and noise levels were found to increase with more vessels and faster-moving vessels (Holt et al., 2017). These noise levels have the potential to result in behavioral disturbance, interfere with communication, and affect the killer whales' hearing capabilities via masking (Erbe, 2002; Veirs et al., 2015). Killer whales foraged significantly less and traveled significantly more when boats were within 100 m of the whales (Kruse, 1991; Lusseau et al., 2009; Trites & Bain, 2000; Williams et al., 2002a; Williams et al., 2002b; Williams et al., 2009). These short-term feeding activity disruptions may have important long-term population-level effects (Lusseau et al., 2009; Noren et al., 2009). As with other delphinids, the reaction of the killer whales to whale-watching vessels may be in response to the vessel pursuing them rather than to the noise of the vessel itself, or to the number of vessels in their proximity. Williams et al. (2014b) modeled behavioral responses of killer whales to vessel traffic by looking at their surface behavior relative to the received level of three large classes of ships. The authors found that the severity of the response was largely dependent on seasonal data (e.g., year and month) as well as the animal's prior experience with vessels

(e.g., age and sex), and the number of other vessels present, rather than the received level of the larger ships (Williams et al., 2014b). Sperm whales generally react only to vessels approaching within several hundred meters; however, some individuals may display avoidance behavior, such as quick diving (Magalhães et al., 2002; Würsig et al., 1998) or a decrease in time spent at the surface (Isojunno & Miller, 2015). One study showed that after diving, sperm whales showed a reduced timeframe before they emitted the first click than prior to a vessel interaction (Richter et al., 2006). Smaller whale-watching and research vessels generate more noise in higher frequency bands and are more likely to approach odontocetes directly, and to spend more time near an individual whale. Azzara et al. (2013) also found a reduction in sperm whale clicks while a vessel was passing, as well as up to a half hour after the vessel had passed. It is unknown whether the whales left the area, ceased to click, or surfaced during this period. However, some of the reduction in click detections may be due to masking of the clicks by the vessel noise, particularly during the closest point of approach.

Little information is available on the behavioral impacts of vessels or vessel noise on beaked whales (Cox et al., 2006), although it seems most beaked whales react negatively to vessels by quick diving and other avoidance maneuvers (Würsig et al., 1998). Limited evidence suggests that beaked whales respond to vessel noise, anthropogenic noise in general, and mid-frequency sonar at similar sound levels (Aguilar de Soto et al., 2006; Tyack et al., 2011; Tyack, 2009). An observation of vocal disruption of a foraging dive by a Cuvier's beaked whale when a large, noisy vessel passed suggests that some types of vessel traffic may disturb foraging beaked whales (Aguilar de Soto et al., 2006). Tyack et al. (2011) noted the result of a controlled exposure to pseudorandom noise suggests that beaked whales would respond to vessel noise at similar received levels to those noted previously for mid-frequency sonar. Pirotta et al. (2012) found that while the distance to a vessel did not change the duration of a foraging dive, the proximity of the vessel may have restricted the movement of the group. The maximum distance at which this change was significant was 5.2 km, with an estimated received level of 135 dB re 1 µPa.

Small dolphins and porpoises may also be more sensitive to vessel noise. Both finless porpoises (Li et al., 2008) and harbor porpoises (Polacheck & Thorpe, 1990) routinely avoid and swim away from large motorized vessels, and harbor porpoises may click less when near large ships (Sairanen, 2014). A resident population of harbor porpoise in Swansea Bay are regularly near vessel traffic, but only 2 percent of observed vessels had interactions with porpoises in one study (Oakley et al., 2017). Of these, 74 percent of the interactions were neutral (no response by the porpoises) while vessels were 10 m–1 km away. Of the 26 percent of interactions in which there was an avoidance response, most were observed in groups of 1–2 animals to fast-moving or steady plane-hulling motorized vessels. Larger groups reacted less often, and few responses were observed to non-motorized or stationary vessels. Another study found that when vessels were within 50 m, harbor porpoises had an 80 percent probability of changing their swimming direction when vessels were fast moving; this dropped to 40 percent probability when vessels were beyond 400 m (Akkaya Bas et al., 2017). These porpoises also demonstrated a reduced proportion of feeding and shorter behavioral bout durations in general, if vessels were in close proximity, 62 percent of the time. Although most vessel noise is constrained to lower frequencies below 1 kHz, at close range vessel noise can extend into mid- and high-frequencies (into the tens of kHz) (Hermannsen et al., 2014; Li et al., 2015); these frequencies are what harbor porpoises are likely responding to, at M-weighted received SPLs with a mean of 123 dB re 1 µPa (Dyndo et al., 2015). Foraging harbor porpoises also have fewer prey capture attempts and have disrupted foraging when vessels pass closely and noise levels are higher (Wisniewska et al., 2018).

Odontocetes have been shown to make short-term changes to vocal parameters such as intensity as an immediate response to vessel noise, as well as to increase the pitch, frequency modulation, and length of whistling (May-Collado & Wartzok, 2008), with whistle frequency increasing in the presence of low-frequency noise and whistle frequency decreasing in the presence of high-frequency noise (Gospić & Picciulin, 2016). For example, bottlenose dolphins in Portuguese waters decrease their call rates and change the frequency parameters of whistles in the presence of boats (Luís et al., 2014), while dolphin groups with calves increase their whistle rates when tourist boats are within 200 m and when the boats increase their speed (Guerra et al., 2014). Likewise, modification of multiple vocalization parameters was shown in belugas residing in an area known for high levels of commercial traffic. These animals decreased their call rate, increased certain types of calls, and shifted upward in frequency content in the presence of small vessel noise (Lesage et al., 1999). Another study detected a measurable increase in the amplitude of their vocalizations when ships were present (Scheifele et al., 2005). Killer whales are also known to modify their calls during increased noise. For example, the source level of killer whale vocalizations was shown to increase with higher background noise levels associated with vessel traffic (the Lombard effect) (Holt et al., 2008). In addition, calls with a high-frequency component have higher source levels than other calls, which may be related to behavioral state, or may reflect a sustained increase in background noise levels (Holt et al., 2011). On the other hand, long-term modifications to vocalizations may be indicative of a learned response to chronic noise, or of a genetic or physiological shift in the populations. This type of change has been observed in killer whales off the northwestern coast of the United States between 1973 and 2003. This population increased the duration of primary calls once a threshold in observed vessel density (e.g., whale watching) was reached, which is suggested as being a long-term response to increased masking noise produced by the vessels (Foote et al., 2004).

The long-term and cumulative implications of ship sound on odontocetes is largely unknown (National Academies of Sciences Engineering and Medicine, 2017; National Marine Fisheries Service, 2007a), although some long-term consequences have been reported (Lusseau & Bejder, 2007). Repeated exposure to acoustic and other anthropogenic stimuli has been studied in several cases, especially as related to vessel traffic and whale watching. Common dolphins in New Zealand responded to dolphin-watching vessels by interrupting foraging and resting bouts, and took longer to resume behaviors in the presence of the vessel (Stockin et al., 2008). The authors speculated that repeated interruptions of the dolphins' foraging behaviors could lead to long-term implications for the population. Bejder et al. (2006a) studied responses of bottlenose dolphins to vessel approaches and found stronger and longer lasting reactions in populations of animals that were exposed to lower levels of vessel traffic overall. The authors indicated that lesser reactions in populations of dolphins regularly subjected to high levels of vessel traffic could be a sign of habituation, or it could be that the more sensitive animals in this population previously abandoned the area of higher human activity.

Similar to mysticetes, odontocete responses to vessel noise are varied, although many odontocete species seem to be more sensitive to vessel presence and vessel noise, and these two factors are difficult to tease apart. Some species, in particular killer whales and porpoises, may be sensitized to vessels and respond at further distances and lower received levels than other delphinids. In contrast, many odontocete species also approach vessels to bow ride, indicating either that these species are less sensitive to vessels, or that the behavioral drive to bow ride supersedes any impact of the associated noise. With these broad and disparate responses, it is difficult to assess the impacts of vessel noise on odontocetes.

Behavioral Reactions to Aircraft Noise

The following paragraphs summarize what is known about the reaction of various marine mammal species to overhead flights of many types of fixed-wing aircraft and rotary-wing aircraft (i.e., helicopters), as well as unmanned aerial systems. Thorough reviews of the subject and available information is presented in Richardson et al. (1995b) and elsewhere (e.g., Efroymson et al., 2001; Holst et al., 2011; Luksenburg & Parsons, 2009; Smith et al., 2016). The most common responses of cetaceans to overflights were short surfacing durations, abrupt dives, and percussive behavior (breaching and tail slapping) (Nowacek et al., 2007). Other behavioral responses such as flushing and fleeing the area of the source of the noise have also been observed (Holst et al., 2011; Manci et al., 1988). Richardson et al. (1995b) noted that marine mammal reactions to aircraft overflight largely consisted of opportunistic and anecdotal observations lacking clear distinction between reactions potentially caused by the noise of the aircraft and the visual cue an aircraft presents. In addition, it was suggested that variations in the responses noted were due to generally other undocumented factors associated with overflights (Richardson et al., 1995b). These factors could include aircraft type (e.g., single engine, multi engine, jet turbine), flight path (altitude, centered on the animal, off to one side, circling, level and slow), environmental factors (e.g., wind speed, sea state, cloud cover), and locations where native subsistence hunting continues and animals are more sensitive to anthropogenic impacts, including the noise from aircraft. Erbe et al. (2018) measured airplane noise levels underwater at sites about 1 and 10 km from an airport runway and found median noise levels up to 117 dB re 1 µPa and 10 kHz at the close site, and up to 91 dB re 1 µPa and 2 kHz at the more distant site; both would be audible to a number of marine mammals at those levels and frequencies. Christiansen et al. (2016b) measured the in-air and underwater noise levels of two unmanned aerial vehicles, and found that in-air the broadband source levels were around 80 dB re 20 µPa, while at a meter underwater received levels were 95–100 dB re 1 µPa when the vehicle was only 5–10 m above the surface, and were not quantifiable above ambient noise levels when the vehicle was higher. Therefore, if an animal is near the surface and the unmanned aerial vehicle is low, it may be detected, but in most cases these vehicles are operated at much higher altitudes (e.g., over 30 m) and so are not likely to be heard.

The impact of aircraft overflights is one of the least well-known sources of potential behavioral response by any species or taxonomic group, and so many generalities must be made based on the little data available. There is some data for each taxonomic group; taken together it appears that in general, marine mammals have varying levels of sensitivity to overflights depending on the species and context.

Mysticetes

Mysticetes either ignore or occasionally dive in response to aircraft overflights (Koski et al., 1998). Richardson (1985; 1995b) found no evidence that single or occasional aircraft flying above mysticetes causes long-term displacement of these mammals.

Bowhead whales in the Beaufort Sea exhibited a transient behavioral response to fixed-wing aircraft and vessels. Reactions were frequently observed at less than 1,000 ft. (304.8 m) above sea level, infrequently observed at 1,500 ft. (457.2 m), and not observed at all at 2,000 ft. (609.6 m) (Richardson et al., 1985). Bowhead whales reacted to helicopter overflights by diving, breaching, changing direction or behavior, and altering breathing patterns. Behavioral reactions decreased in frequency as the altitude of the helicopter increased to 150 m or higher. The bowheads exhibited fewer behavioral changes than did the odontocetes in the same area (Patenaude et al., 2002). It should be noted that bowhead whales in this study may have more acute responses to anthropogenic activity than many other marine mammals since these animals were presented with restricted egress due to limited open water between ice floes.

Additionally, these animals are hunted by Alaska Natives, which could lead to animals developing additional sensitivity to human noise and presence.

A pilot study was conducted on the use of unmanned aerial systems to observe bowhead whales; flying at altitudes between 120 and 210 m above the surface, no behavioral responses were observed in any animals (Koski et al., 1998; Koski et al., 2015). Similarly, Christiansen et al. (2016a) did not observe any responses to an unmanned aerial vehicle flown 30–120 m above the water when taking photos of humpback whales to conduct photogrammetry and assess fitness. Acevedo-Whitehouse et al. (2010) successfully maneuvered a remote-controlled helicopter over large baleen whales to collect samples of their blows, with no more avoidance behavior than noted for typical photo-identification vessel approaches. These vehicles are much smaller and quieter than typical aircraft and so are less likely to cause a behavioral response, although they may fly at much lower altitudes (Smith et al., 2016).

Odontocetes

Variable responses to aircraft have been observed in toothed whales, though overall little change in behavior has been observed during flyovers. Some toothed whales dove, slapped the water with their flukes or flippers, or swam away from the direction of the aircraft during overflights; others did not visibly react (Richardson et al., 1995b). Würsig et al. (1998) found that beaked whales were the most sensitive cetacean and reacted by avoiding marine mammal survey aircraft in 89 percent of sightings and at more than twice the rate as Kogia whales, which was the next-most reactive of the odontocetes in 39 percent of sightings; these are the same species that were sensitive to vessel traffic.

During standard marine mammal surveys at an altitude of 750 ft., some sperm whales remained on or near the surface the entire time the aircraft was in the vicinity, while others dove immediately or a few minutes after being sighted. Other authors have corroborated the variability in sperm whales' reactions to fixed-wing aircraft or helicopters (Green et al., 1992; Richter et al., 2003; Richter et al., 2006; Smultea et al., 2008; Würsig et al., 1998). In one study, sperm whales showed no reaction to a helicopter until they encountered the downdrafts from the rotors (Richardson et al., 1995b). A group of sperm whales responded to a circling aircraft (altitude of 800 to 1,100 ft.) by moving closer together and forming a defensive fan-shaped semicircle, with their heads facing outward. Several individuals in the group turned on their sides, apparently to look up toward the aircraft (Smultea et al., 2008). Whale-watching aircraft (fixed-wing airplanes and helicopters) apparently caused sperm whales to turn more sharply but did not affect blow interval, surface time, time to first click, or the frequency of aerial behavior (Richter et al., 2003).

Smaller delphinids generally react to overflights either neutrally or with a startle response (Würsig et al., 1998). The same species that show strong avoidance behavior to vessel traffic (Kogia whales and beaked whales) show similar reactions to aircraft (Würsig et al., 1998). Beluga whales reacted to helicopter overflights by diving, breaching, changing direction or behavior, and altering breathing patterns to a greater extent than mysticetes in the same area (Patenaude et al., 2002). These reactions increased in frequency as the altitude of the helicopter dropped below 150 m. A change in travel direction was noted in a group of pilot whales as the aircraft circled while conducting monitoring (State of Hawaii, 2015). No changes in group cohesion or orientation behavior were observed for groups of Risso's dolphins, common dolphins, or killer whales when a survey airplane flew at altitudes of 213–610 m, but this may be due to the plane maintaining lateral distances greater than 500 m in all (Smultea & Lomac-MacNair, 2016).

Much like mysticetes, odontocetes have demonstrated no responses to unmanned aerial systems. For example, Durban et al. (2015) conducted photogrammetry studies of killer whales using a small helicopter flown 35–40 m above the animals with no disturbance noted. However, it is possible that odontocete responses could increase with use at reduced altitude, due either to noise or the shadows created by the vehicle (Smith et al., 2016). Bottlenose dolphins responded to a small portion of unmanned aerial vehicles by briefly orienting when the vehicle was relatively close (10–30 m high), but in most cases didn't respond at all (Ramos et al., 2018).

Behavioral Reactions to Impulsive Noise

Impulsive signals (i.e., weapon noise and explosions), particularly at close range, have a rapid rise time and higher instantaneous peak pressure than other signal types, making them more likely to cause startle responses or avoidance responses. However, at long distances the rise time increases as the signal duration lengthens (similar to a "ringing" sound), making the impulsive signal more similar to a non-impulsive signal. Behavioral reactions from explosive sounds are likely to be similar to reactions studied for other impulsive sounds, such as those produced by air guns and impact pile driving. Data on behavioral responses to impulsive sound sources are limited across all marine mammal groups, with only a few studies available for mysticetes and odontocetes. Most data have come from seismic surveys that occur over long durations (e.g., on the order of days to weeks) and typically utilize large multi-air gun arrays that fire repeatedly. While seismic data provide the best available science for assessing behavioral responses to impulsive sounds by marine mammals, it is likely that these responses represent a worst-case scenario as compared to responses to explosives used in Navy activities, which would typically consist of single impulses or a cluster of impulses, rather than long-duration, repeated impulses.

Mysticetes

Baleen whales have shown a variety of responses to impulsive sound sources, including avoidance, attraction to the source, reduced surface intervals, altered swimming behavior, and changes in vocalization rates (Gordon et al., 2003; McCauley et al., 2000; Richardson et al., 1985; Southall et al., 2007). Studies have been conducted on many baleen whale species, including gray, humpback, blue, fin and bowhead whales; it is assumed that these responses are representative of all baleen whale species. The behavioral state of the whale seems to be an integral part of whether or not the animal responds and how they respond, as does the location and movement of the sound source, more than the received level of the sound.

Migratory behavior seems to lead to a higher likelihood of response, with some species demonstrating more sensitivity than others do. For example, migrating gray whales showed avoidance responses to seismic vessels at received levels between 164 and 190 dB re 1 µPa (Malme et al., 1986, 1988). Similarly, migrating humpback whales showed avoidance behavior at ranges of 5–8 km from a seismic array during observational studies and controlled exposure experiments in one Australian study (McCauley et al., 1998), and in another Australian study decreased their dive times and reduced their swimming speeds (Dunlop et al., 2015). However, when comparing received levels and behavioral responses using ramp-up versus a constant noise level of air guns, humpback whales did not change their dive behavior but did deviate from their predicted heading and decreased their swim speeds (Dunlop et al., 2016). In addition, the whales demonstrated more course deviation during the constant source trials but reduced travel speeds more in the ramp-up trials; in either case there was no dose-response relationship with the received level of the air gun noise, and similar responses were observed in control trials with vessel movement but no air guns, so some of the response was likely due to the presence of the vessel and not

the received level of the air guns. When looking at the relationships between proximity, received level, and behavioral response, Dunlop et al. (2017) used responses to two different air guns and found responses occurred more towards the smaller, closer source than to the larger source at the same received level, demonstrating the importance of proximity. Responses were found to be more likely when the source was within 3 km or above 140 dB re 1 µPa, although responses were variable and some animals did not respond at those values while others responded below them. In addition, responses were generally small, with course deviations of only around 500 m, and short term (Dunlop et al., 2017). McDonald et al. (1995) tracked a blue whale with seafloor seismometers and reported that it stopped vocalizing and changed its travel direction at a range of 10 km from the seismic vessel (estimated received level 143 dB re 1 µPa peak-to-peak). Bowhead whales seem to be the most sensitive species, perhaps due to a higher overlap between bowhead whale distribution and seismic surveys in Arctic and sub-Arctic waters, as well as a recent history of being hunted. While most bowhead whales did not show active avoidance until within 8 km of seismic vessels (Richardson et al., 1995b), some whales avoided vessels by more than 20 km at received levels as low as 120 dB re 1 µPa. Additionally, Malme et al. (1988) observed clear changes in diving and breathing patterns in bowheads at ranges up to 73 km from seismic vessels, with received levels as low as 125 dB re 1 µPa. Bowhead whales may also avoid the area around seismic surveys, from 6 to 8 km (Koski and Johnson 1987, as cited in Gordon et al., 2003)out to 20 or 30 km (Richardson et al., 1999). However, work by Robertson (2014) supports the idea that behavioral responses are contextually dependent, and that during seismic operations bowhead whales may be less "available" for counting due to alterations in dive behavior but that they may not have left the area after all.

In contrast, noise from seismic surveys was not found to impact feeding behavior or exhalation rates in western gray whales while resting or diving off the coast of Russia (Gailey et al., 2007; Yazvenko et al., 2007); however, the increase in vessel traffic associated with the surveys and the proximity of the vessels to the whales did affect the orientation of the whales relative to the vessels and shortened their dive-surface intervals (Gailey et al., 2016). Todd et al. (1996) found no clear short-term behavioral responses by foraging humpbacks to explosions associated with construction operations in Newfoundland but did see a trend of increased rates of net entanglement closer to the noise source, possibly indicating a reduction in net detection associated with the noise through masking or TTS. Distributions of fin and minke whales were modeled with a suite of environmental variables along with the occurrence or absence of seismic surveys, and no evidence of a decrease in sighting rates relative to seismic activity was found for either species (Vilela et al., 2016). Their distributions were driven entirely by environmental variables, particularly those linked to prey including warmer sea surface temperatures, higher chlorophyll-a values, and higher photosynthetically available radiation (a measure of primary productivity).

Vocal responses to seismic surveys have been observed in a number of baleen whale species, including a cessation of calling, a shift in frequency, increases in amplitude or call rate, or a combination of these strategies. Blue whale feeding/social calls were found to increase when seismic exploration was underway, with seismic pulses at average received SELs of 131 dB re 1 μPa^2s (Di Lorio & Clark, 2010), a potentially compensatory response to increased noise level. Responses by fin whales to a 10-day seismic survey in the Mediterranean Sea included possible decreased 20 Hz call production and movement of animals from the area based on lower received levels and changes in bearings (Castellote et al., 2012). However, similarly distant seismic surveys elicited no apparent vocal response from fin whales in the mid-Atlantic Ocean; instead, Nieukirk et al. (2012) hypothesized that 20 Hz calls may have been masked from the receiver by distant seismic noise. Models of humpback whale song off Angola showed

significant seasonal and diel variation, but also showed a decrease in the number of singers with increasing received levels of air gun pulses (Cerchio et al., 2014). Bowhead whale calling rates decreased significantly at sites near seismic surveys (41–45 km) where median received levels were between 116 and 129 dB re 1 µPa, and did not decrease at sites further from the seismic surveys (greater than 104 km) where median received levels were 99–108 dB re 1 µPa (Blackwell et al., 2013). In fact, bowhead whale calling rates increased at the lower received levels, began decreasing at around 127 dB re 1 μPa^2s cumulative SEL, and ceased altogether at received levels over 170 dB re 1 μPa^2s cumulative SEL (Blackwell et al., 2015). Similar patterns were observed for bowhead vocalizations in the presence of tonal sounds associated with drilling activities and were amplified in the presence of both the tonal sounds and air gun pulses (Blackwell et al., 2017).

Mysticetes seem to be the most sensitive taxonomic group of marine mammals to impulsive sound sources, with possible avoidance responses occurring out to 30 km and vocal changes occurring in response to sounds over 100 km away. However, responses appear to be behaviorally mediated, with most avoidance responses occurring during migration behavior and little observed response during feeding behavior. These response patterns are likely to hold true for Navy impulsive sources; however, Navy impulsive sources would largely be stationary (e.g., explosives fired at a fixed target) and short term (on the order of hours rather than days or weeks) than were found in these studies, and so responses would likely occur in closer proximity or not at all.

Odontocetes

Few data are available on odontocete responses to impulsive sound sources, with only a few studies on responses to seismic surveys, pile driving, and construction activity available. However, odontocetes appear to be less sensitive to impulsive sound than mysticetes, with responses occurring at much closer distances. This may be due to the predominance of low-frequency sound associated with these sources that propagates long distances and overlaps with the range of best hearing for mysticetes but is below that range for odontocetes. The exception to this is the harbor porpoise, which has been shown to be highly sensitive to most sound sources, avoiding both stationary (e.g., pile driving) and moving (e.g., seismic survey vessels) impulsive sound sources out to approximately 20 km (e.g., Haelters et al., 2014; Pirotta et al., 2014). However, even this response is short-term, with porpoises returning to the area within hours after the cessation of the noise.

Madsen et al. (2006a) and Miller et al. (2009) tagged and monitored eight sperm whales in the Gulf of Mexico exposed to seismic air gun surveys. Sound sources were from approximately 2 to 7 NM away from the whales, and received levels were as high as 162 dB SPL re 1 µPa (Madsen et al., 2006). The whales showed no horizontal avoidance; however, one whale rested at the water's surface for an extended period of time until air guns ceased (Miller et al., 2009). While the remaining whales continued to execute foraging dives throughout exposure, tag data suggested there may have been subtle effects of noise on foraging behavior (Miller et al., 2009). Similarly, Weir (2008) observed that seismic air gun surveys along the Angolan coast did not significantly reduce the encounter rate of sperm whales during the 10-month survey period, nor were avoidance behaviors to air gun impulsive sounds observed. In contrast, Atlantic spotted dolphins did show a significant, short-term avoidance response to air gun impulses within approximately 1 km of the source (Weir, 2008). The dolphins were observed at greater distances from the vessel when the air gun was in use, and when the air gun was not in use they readily approached the vessel to bow ride.

Captive bottlenose dolphins sometimes vocalized or were reluctant to return to the test station after exposure to single impulses from a seismic water gun (Finneran et al., 2002). When exposed to multiple

impulses from a seismic air gun, some dolphins turned their heads away from the sound source just before the impulse, showing that they could anticipate the timing of the impulses and perhaps reduce the received level (Finneran et al., 2015). During construction (including the blasting of old bastions) of a bridge over a waterway commonly used by the Tampa Bay, FL, stock of bottlenose dolphins, the use of the area by females decreased while males displayed high site fidelity and continued using the area, perhaps indicating differential habitat uses between the sexes (Weaver, 2015).

A study was conducted on the response of harbor porpoises to a seismic survey using aerial surveys and C-PODs (an autonomous recording device that counts odontocete clicks); the animals appeared to have left the area of the survey and decreased their foraging activity within 5–10 km, as evidenced by both a decrease in vocalizations near the survey and an increase in vocalizations at a distance (Pirotta et al., 2014; Thompson et al., 2013). However, the animals returned within a day after the air gun operation ceased, and the decrease in occurrence over the survey period was small relative to the observed natural seasonal decrease compared to the previous year. A number of studies (Brandt et al., 2011; Dähne et al., 2014; Haelters et al., 2014; Thompson et al., 2010; Tougaard et al., 2005; Tougaard et al., 2009) also found strong avoidance responses by harbor porpoises out to 20 km during pile driving; however, all studies found that the animals returned to the area after the cessation of pile driving. When bubble curtains were deployed around pile driving, the avoidance distance appeared to be reduced to half that distance (12 km), and the response only lasted about five hours rather than a day before the animals returned to the area (Dähne et al., 2017). Kastelein et al. (2013b) exposed a captive harbor porpoise to impact pile driving sounds and found that above 136 dB re 1 µPa (zero-to-peak) the animal's respiration rates increased, and at higher levels it jumped more frequently. Bergstrom et al. (2014) found that although there was a high likelihood of acoustic disturbance during wind farm construction (including pile driving), the impact was short-term. Graham et al. (2017) assessed the occurrence of bottlenose dolphins and harbor porpoises over different area and time scales with and without impact and vibratory pile driving. While there were fewer hours with bottlenose dolphin detections and reduced detection durations within the pile driving area and increased detection durations outside the area, the effects sizes were small, and the reduced harbor porpoise encounter duration was attributed to seasonal changes outside the influence of the pile driving. However, received levels in this area were lower due to propagation effects than in the other areas described above, which may have led to the lack of or reduced response.

Odontocete behavioral responses to impulsive sound sources are likely species- and context-dependent, with most species demonstrating little to no apparent response. Responses might be expected within close proximity to a noise source, under specific behavioral conditions such as females with offspring, or for sensitive species such as harbor porpoises.

3.4.2.1.1.6 Stranding

When a marine mammal (alive or dead) swims or floats onto shore and becomes beached or incapable of returning to sea, the event is termed a "stranding" (Geraci et al., 1999; Geraci & Lounsbury, 2005; Perrin & Geraci, 2002). A stranding can also occur away from the shore if the animal is unable to cope in its present situation (e.g., disabled by a vessel strike, out of habitat) (Geraci & Lounsbury, 2005). Specifically, under U.S. law, a stranding is an event in the wild in which: "(A) a marine mammal is dead and is (i) on a beach or shore of the United States; or (ii) in waters under the jurisdiction of the United States (including any navigable waters); or (B) a marine mammal is alive and is (i) on a beach or shore of the United States and is unable to return to the water; (ii) on a beach or shore of the United States and, although able to return to the water, is in need of medical attention; or (iii) in the waters under the

jurisdiction of the United States (including any navigable waters), but is unable to return to its natural habitat under its own power or without assistance" (16 U.S.C. section 1421h).

Marine mammals are subjected to a variety of natural and anthropogenic factors, acting alone or in combination, which may cause a marine mammal to strand (Geraci et al., 1999; Geraci & Lounsbury, 2005). Natural factors related to strandings include limited food availability or following prey inshore, predation, disease, parasitism, natural toxins, echolocation disturbance, climatic influences, and aging (Bradshaw et al., 2006; Culik, 2004; Geraci et al., 1999; Geraci & Lounsbury, 2005; Huggins et al., 2015; National Research Council, 2006; Perrin & Geraci, 2002; Walker et al., 2005). Anthropogenic factors include pollution (Hall et al., 2006; Jepson et al., 2005), vessel strike (Geraci & Lounsbury, 2005; Laist et al., 2001), fisheries interactions (Read et al., 2006), entanglement (Baird & Gorgone, 2005; Saez et al., 2012; Saez et al., 2013), human activities (e.g., feeding, gunshot) (Geraci & Lounsbury, 2005; Dierauf & Gulland, 2001), and noise (Cox et al., 2006; National Research Council, 2003; Richardson et al., 1995b). Although many marine mammals likely strand due to natural or anthropogenic causes, the majority of reported type of occurrences in marine mammal strandings in the Pacific include fisheries interactions, entanglement, vessel strike, and predation (Carretta et al., 2019a; Carretta et al., 2019b; Carretta et al., 2017b; Helker et al., 2019; Helker et al., 2017; National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2018d, 2019) For some stranding events, environmental factors (e.g., ocean temperature and wind speed and geographic conditions) can be utilized in predictive models to aid in understanding why marine mammals strand in certain areas more than others (Berini et al., 2015). In most instances, even for the more thoroughly investigated strandings involving post-stranding data collection and necropsies, the cause (or causes) for strandings remains undetermined.

Historically, stranding reporting and response efforts have been inconsistent, although they have improved considerably over the last 25 years. Although reporting forms have been standardized nationally, data collection methods, assessment methods, detail of reporting and procedures vary by region and are not yet standardized across the United States. Conditions such as weather, time, location, and decomposition state may also affect the ability to thoroughly examine a specimen (Carretta et al., 2016b; Moore et al., 2013). Because of this, the current ability to interpret long-term trends in marine mammal stranding is limited. While the investigation of stranded animals provides insight into the types of threats marine mammal populations face, investigations are only conducted on a small fraction of the total number of strandings that occur, limiting the understanding of the causes of strandings (Carretta et al., 2016a).

Strandings and Anthropogenic Sound

Along the coasts of the continental United States and Alaska between 2001 and 2009, there were on average approximately 12,545 cetacean strandings and 39,104 pinniped strandings (51,649 total) per year (National Marine Fisheries Service, 2016a). Several mass strandings (strandings that involve two or more individuals of the same species, excluding a single mother-calf pair) that have occurred over the past two decades have been associated with anthropogenic activities that introduced sound into the marine environment, such as naval operations and seismic surveys. U.S. Navy sonar has been identified as a contributing factor in a small number of strandings; none of these have occurred in the Study Area.

Sonar use during exercises involving the U.S. Navy has been identified as a contributing cause or factor in five specific mass stranding events: Greece in 1996; the Bahamas in March 2000; Madeira Island, Portugal in 2000; the Canary Islands in 2002, and Spain in 2006 (Arbelo et al., 2008; Cox et al., 2006; Fernandez, 2006; U.S. Department of the Navy, 2017a), as described in the Navy's technical report titled

Marine Mammal Strandings Associated with U.S. Navy Sonar Activities (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2017a). These five mass strandings resulted in about 40 known cetacean deaths consisting mostly of beaked whales with close linkages to mid-frequency active sonar activity. In these circumstances, exposure to non-impulsive acoustic energy was considered a possible indirect cause of death of the marine mammals (Cox et al., 2006). Factors that were associated with these beaked whale strandings included steep bathymetry, multiple hull-mounted platforms using sonar simultaneously, constricted channels, and strong surface ducts. An in-depth discussion of these strandings and these factors is in the technical report titled *Marine Mammal Strandings Associated with U.S. Navy Sonar Activities* (available at www.mitteis.com). Strandings of other marine mammal species have not been as closely linked to sonar exposure, but rather, have typically been attributed to natural or other anthropogenic factors. The Navy has reviewed training requirements, standard operating procedures, and potential mitigation measures, and has implemented changes to reduce the potential for acoustic related strandings to occur in the future. Discussions of procedures associated with these and other training and testing events are presented in Chapter 5 (Mitigation).

Multiple hypotheses regarding the relationship between non-impulsive sound exposure and stranding have been proposed (see Bernaldo de Quirós et al., 2019). These range from direct impact of the sound on the physiology of the marine mammal, to behavioral reactions contributing to altered physiology (e.g., "gas and fat embolic syndrome") (Fernandez et al., 2005; Jepson et al., 2003; Jepson et al., 2005), to behaviors directly contributing to the stranding (e.g., beaching of fleeing animals). Unfortunately, without direct observation of not only the event but also the underlying process, and given the potential for artefactual evidence (e.g., chronic condition, previous injury) to complicate conclusions from the post-mortem analyses of stranded animals (Cox et al., 2006), it has not been possible to determine with certainty the exact mechanism underlying these strandings. Based on examination of the above sonar-associated strandings, Bernaldo de Quirós et al. (2019) list diagnostic features, the presence of all of which suggest gas and fat embolic syndrome for beaked whales stranded in association with sonar exposure. Bernaldo de Quirós et al. (2019) established that, to date, strandings which have a confirmed association with naval exercise have exhibited all seven of the following diagnostic features:

1. Individual or multiple animals stranded within hours or a few days of an exercise in good body condition;
2. Food remnants in the first gastric compartment ranging from undigested food to squid beaks;
3. Abundant gas bubbles widely distributed in veins (subcutaneous, mesenteric, portal, coronary, subarachnoid veins, etc.) composed primarily of nitrogen in fresh carcasses;
4. Gross subarachnoid and/or acoustic fat hemorrhages;
5. Microscopic multi-organ gas and fat emboli associated with bronchopulmonary shock;
6. Diffuse, mild to moderate, acute, monophasic myonecrosis (hyaline degeneration) with 'disintegration' of the interstitial connective tissue and related structures, including fat deposits, and their replacement by amorphous hyaline material (degraded material) in fresh and well-preserved carcasses; and
7. Multi-organ microscopic hemorrhages of varying severity in lipid-rich tissues such as the central nervous system, spinal cord, and the coronary and kidney fat when present.

Beaked Whale Strandings at the Mariana Islands

Although records of marine mammal strandings exist as far back as 1878 in Guam, reporting of marine mammal strandings across the Mariana Islands has only become consistent in recent years, similar to other regions, whereas sonar use has occurred in the area around the Mariana Islands for decades. Given its proximity to eastern Asia, Navy vessels equipped with sonar have been transiting and at times conducting individual and group training events with sonar in the Study Area since modern hull-mounted active sonars became standard on Navy surface ships in the mid-1960s. Furthermore, due to reductions in the size of the Navy's fleet of sonar equipped assets since WWII, coupled with improvements to passive acoustic detection technology, it is likely that there was more active sonar use from the 1960s through the late 1980s than what is currently proposed in this SEIS/OEIS.

The first recorded stranding of a beaked whale within the Mariana Islands occurred in 2007 on Guam. From 2007 through May 2020, nine recorded beaked whale stranding events have occurred in the Mariana Islands. Eight events consisted of a single animal, and one consisted of two animals. All identified beaked whales were Cuvier's beaked whales (one unknown). All but two of the stranding events occurred at Guam; the other two events, occurred on Rota and Saipan A review of Navy records indicates that sonar use occurred within 72 hours or 80 NM of four of these stranding events: two whales on Saipan in 2011, one whale on Guam in 2015, one whale on Guam in 2016 (live and pushed back to sea), and one whale on Rota in November 2019 (milling in shallow water and pushed back to sea). This means that 55 percent of beaked whale strandings in the Mariana Islands occurred when no U.S. Navy sonar was present.

A study examining the co-occurrence of beaked whale strandings and naval sonar in the Mariana Islands was recently published (Simonis et al., 2020). The study claimed a correlation ($p<0.01$) between strandings and Navy sonar; however, the study relied on incomplete or inaccurate assumptions about U.S. Navy sonar use around the Mariana Islands in its statistical analysis. The author's assessment of sonar use was largely based on publicly available press releases and news reports about joint Navy events. The author's assumed that every day of an exercise could involve the use of sonar, and that the Navy's' sonar use in the Marianas Islands was mostly limited to these joint exercises. Both of these assumptions were incorrect, as sonar use typically only occurs during brief periods of time and not on every day of an anti-submarine warfare exercise, and joint exercises make up a small fraction of Navy sonar use in this area. The majority of sonar use in the MITT Study Area is associated with unit level training and testing. Prior to the study's publication, the Navy provided information to the researchers indicating that their assumptions about sonar use in their analysis were incorrect or incomplete; therefore, their published findings may not be valid.

In discussions with NMFS following the study's publication, including NMFS researchers who participated in the Simonis et al. study, the Navy agreed to have statisticians with appropriate security clearances examine the classified sonar record around the Mariana Islands for correlation with beaked whale strandings. The Navy contracted the Center for Naval Analysis to re-evaluate the analysis conducted by Simonis et al. (2020) using the Navy's complete classified sonar record. The Center for Naval Analysis study used the complete classified record of all U.S. Navy sonar used between 2007 and 2019, including major training events, joint exercises, and unit level training/testing. Sonar sources in this record conservatively included all hull-mounted and non-hull-mounted sources, rather than solely hull-mounted sources (which have been previously associated with a limited number of beaked whale strandings outside of this study area). The analysis also included the complete beaked whale stranding record for the Mariana Islands through 2019, including a November 2019 stranding event on Rota that

was not part of the Simonis et al dataset. Following the methods in Simonis et al. (2020), the Center for Naval Analysis conducted a Poisson distribution analysis and found that the statistical analysis yielded insufficient evidence ($p<0.10$) to claim a relationship between sonar use and beaked whale strandings in the Mariana Islands when considering the complete sonar use record.

The Center for Naval Analysis also conducted a statistical analysis specific to each island where beaked whale strandings have been observed in the Mariana Islands (Guam, Rota, and Saipan), to take into account the potential for geographically isolated sonar activities to result in strandings. This analysis similarly found no significant correlation of strandings to sonar use. For the island-specific analyses, sonar use within 80 NM (150 km) of each island was considered, a distance that is substantially greater than the farthest distance at which beaked whales have been observed to respond to sonar [see "Behavioral Reactions to Sonar and Other Transducers (Odontocetes)" in Section 3.4.2.1.1.5, Behavioral Reactions]. The finding that there is insufficient evidence supporting correlation of sonar with strandings at Rota and Saipan is based on limited data (one stranding each on both Rota and Saipan), thus has high uncertainty. The remaining seven beaked whale stranding events in the Mariana Islands occurred at Guam, providing sufficient data to find no correlation between sonar use and beaked whale strandings at this site. An unclassified summary of the Center for Naval Analysis's analysis was provided to NMFS and their scientists during the SEIS/OEIS development.

Furthermore, necropsies were conducted for a few of the strandings to attempt to determine the animal's cause of death. Necropsy examinations and high-quality tissue samples were collected from three live stranded or fresh dead individuals: from one of the whales from the August 2011 stranding on Saipan, the single whale from the March 2015 stranding on Guam, and the single whale from the January 2019 stranding on Guam. Only the animals from the 2011 and 2015 events were considered coincident with the use of Navy sonar. These three beaked whales from the Mariana Islands did not have evidence of gas bubble formation in the organs examined grossly and histologically.

Stranding response staff from the University of Hawaii conducted the examinations and compared the results to the diagnostic features of gas and fat embolic syndrome described by Bernaldo de Quiros et al. (2019). Bernaldo de Quirós et al. (2019) established that to date, strandings which have a confirmed associated with naval sonar have exhibited all seven diagnostic features. Necropsy results from the 2011 and 2015 stranded beaked whales only exhibited a few (one to three) of the diagnostic features, but not all seven, suggesting that those strandings are unlikely to be associated with sonar exposure. Additionally, a beaked whale that stranded in 2019, not coincident with sonar use, was examined and found to similarly exhibit a few of the diagnostic factors. Overall, the results of these necropsies appear to align with evidence from single beaked whale strandings that have been investigated in the Canary Islands (n=45) which stranded with no correlation in space or time with mid-frequency active sonar. These individuals had one or more diagnostic features of gas and fat embolic syndrome in beaked whales stranded in association with mid-frequency active exercises, but not all seven (Bernaldo de Quirós et al., 2019). Since 2018, the Navy has provided additional funding to NMFS's designated regional stranding responder - the University of Hawaii - to support additional necropsy efforts in the Pacific Islands region to ensure that the causes of any possible future strandings continue to be thoroughly investigated.

3.4.2.1.1.7 Long-Term Consequences

Long-term consequences to a population are determined by examining changes in the population growth rate. Physical effects that could lead to a reduction in the population growth rate include mortality or injury, which could remove animals from the reproductive pool, and permanent hearing

impairment or chronic masking, which could impact navigation, foraging, predator avoidance, or communication. The long-term consequences due to individual behavioral reactions and short-term or chronic instances of physiological stress are especially difficult to predict because individual experience over time can create complex contingencies, especially for long-lived animals like marine mammals. For example, a lost reproductive opportunity could be a measurable cost to the individual, or for very small populations to the population as a whole; however, short-term costs may be recouped during the life of an otherwise healthy individual. These factors are taken into consideration when assessing risk of long-term consequences. It is more likely that any long-term consequences to an individual would be a result of costs accumulated over a season, year, or life stage due to multiple behavioral or stress responses resulting from exposure to many sound-producing activities over significant periods.

Marine mammals exposed to high levels of human activities may leave the area, habituate to the activity, or tolerate the disturbance and remain in the area (Wartzok et al., 2003). Highly resident or localized populations may also stay in an area of disturbance because the cost of displacement may be higher than the cost of remaining (Forney et al., 2017). Longer-term displacement can lead to changes in abundance or distribution patterns of the species in the affected region (Bejder et al., 2006b; Blackwell et al., 2004; Teilmann et al., 2006). Gray whales in Baja California abandoned a historical breeding lagoon in the mid-1960s due to an increase in dredging and commercial shipping operations. However, whales did repopulate the lagoon after shipping activities had ceased for several years (Bryant et al., 1984). Mysticetes in the northeast tended to adjust to vessel traffic over a number of years, trending towards more neutral responses to passing vessels (Watkins, 1986), indicating that some animals may habituate or otherwise learn to cope with high levels of human activity. Bejder et al. (2006a) studied responses of bottlenose dolphins to vessel approaches and found that lesser reactions in populations of dolphins regularly subjected to high levels of vessel traffic could be a sign of habituation, or it could be that the more sensitive animals in this population previously abandoned the area of higher human activity.

Moore and Barlow (2013) noted a decline in the overall beaked whale population in a broad area of the Pacific Ocean along the U.S. West Coast. Moore and Barlow (2013) provide several hypotheses for the decline of beaked whales in those waters, one of which is anthropogenic sound including the use of sonar by the U.S. Navy; however, new data have been published that raise uncertainties over whether a decline in the beaked whale population occurred off the U.S. West Coast between 1996 and 2014 (Barlow, 2016). Moore and Barlow (2017) have since incorporated information from the entire 1991 to 2014 time series, which suggests an increasing abundance trend and a reversal of the declining trend along the U.S. West Coast that had been noted in their previous (2013) analysis.

In addition, studies on the Atlantic Undersea Test and Evaluation Center instrumented range in the Bahamas have shown that some Blainville's beaked whales may be resident during all or part of the year in the area. Individuals may move off the range for several days during and following a sonar event, but return within a few days (Joyce et al., 2019; McCarthy et al., 2011; Tyack et al., 2011). Photo-identification studies in the Southern California Range Complex have identified approximately 100 individual Cuvier’s beaked whale individuals, with 40 percent having been seen in one or more prior years and re-sightings up to seven years apart (Falcone et al., 2009; Falcone & Schorr, 2014). These results indicate long-term residency by individuals in an intensively used Navy training and testing area, which may suggest a lack of long-term consequences as a result of exposure to Navy training and testing activities, but could also be indicative of high-value resources that exceed the cost of remaining in the area. Long-term residency does not mean there has been no impact on population growth rates, and

there are no data existing on the reproductive rates of populations inhabiting the Navy range area around San Clemente Island as opposed to beaked whales from other areas. In that regard however, recent results from photo-identifications are beginning to provide critically needed calving and weaning rate data for resident animals on the Navy's Southern California range. Three adult females that had been sighted with calves in previous years were again sighted in 2016, one of these was associated with her second calf, and a fourth female that was first identified in 2015 without a calf, was sighted in 2016 with a calf (Schorr et al., 2017). Resident females documented with and without calves from year to year will provide the data for this population that can be applied to future research questions.

Research involving three tagged Cuvier's beaked whales in the Southern California Range Complex reported on by Falcone and Schorr (2012, 2014) has documented movements in excess of hundreds of kilometers by some of those animals. Schorr et al. (2014) reported the results for an additional eight tagged Cuvier's beaked whales in the same area. Five of these eight whales made journeys of approximately 250 km from their tag deployment location, and one of these five made an extra-regional excursion over 450 km south to Mexico and back again. Given that some beaked whales may routinely move hundreds of kilometers as part of their normal pattern (Schorr et al., 2014), temporarily leaving an area to avoid sonar or other anthropogenic activity may have little cost.

Another approach to investigating long-term consequences of anthropogenic noise exposure has been an attempt to link short-term effects to individuals from anthropogenic stressors with long-term consequences to populations using population models. Population models are well known from many fields in biology including fisheries and wildlife management. These models accept inputs for the population size and changes in vital rates of the population, such as the mean values for survival age, lifetime reproductive success, and recruitment of new individuals into the population. Unfortunately, for acoustic and explosive impacts on marine mammal populations, many of the inputs required by population models are not known. Nowacek et al. (2016) reviewed new technologies, including passive acoustic monitoring, tagging, and the use of unmanned aerial vehicles, which can improve scientists' abilities to study these model inputs and link behavioral changes to individual life functions and ultimately population-level effects. The linkage between immediate behavioral or physiological effects to an individual due to a stressor such as sound, the subsequent effects on that individual's vital rates (growth, survival, and reproduction), and in turn the consequences for the population have been reviewed in National Research Council (2005).

The Population Consequences of Acoustic Disturbance model (National Research Council, 2005) proposes a conceptual model for determining how changes in the vital rates of individuals (i.e., a biologically significant consequence to the individual) translates into biologically significant consequences to the population. In 2009, the U.S. Office of Naval Research set up a working group to transform the Population Consequences of Acoustic Disturbance framework into a mathematical model and include other stressors potentially causing disturbance in addition to noise. The model, now called Population Consequences of Disturbance, has been used for case studies involving bottlenose dolphins, North Atlantic right whales, beaked whales, southern elephant seals, California sea lions, blue whales, humpback whales, and harbor porpoise (Costa et al., 2016a; Costa et al., 2016b; Harwood & King, 2014; Hatch et al., 2012; King et al., 2015; McHuron et al., 2018; New et al., 2013a; New et al., 2013b; New et al., 2014; Pirotta et al., 2018). Currently, the Population Consequences of Disturbance model provides a theoretical framework and identifies types of data that would be needed to assess population-level impacts using this process. The process is complicated and provides a foundation for the type of data that is needed, which is currently lacking for many marine mammal species (Booth et al., 2020).

Relevant data needed for improving these analytical approaches for population-level consequences resulting from disturbances will continue to be collected during projects funded by the U.S. Navy Marine Species Monitoring Program.

Costa et al. (2016a) emphasized taking into account the size of an animal's home range, whether populations are resident and non-migratory, or if they migrate over long areas and share their feeding or breeding areas with other populations. These factors, coupled with the extent, location, and duration of a disturbance can lead to markedly different impact results. For example, Costa et al. (2016a) modeled seismic surveys with different radii of impacts on the foraging grounds of Bering Sea humpback whales, West Antarctic Peninsula humpback whales, and California Current blue whales, and used data from tagged whales to determine foraging locations and effort on those grounds. They found that for the blue whales and the West Antarctic humpback whales, less than 19 percent and 16 percent (respectively) of each population would be exposed, and less than 19 percent and 6 percent (respectively) of foraging behavior would be disturbed. This was likely due to the fact that these populations forage for krill over large areas. In contrast, the Bering Sea population of humpback whales had over 90 percent of the population exposed when the disturbance zones extended beyond 50 km, but 100 percent of their foraging time would occur during an exposure when the zone was 25 km or more. These animals forage for fish over a much smaller area, thereby having a limited range for foraging that can be disturbed. Energetic costs were estimated for western gray whales that migrated to possible wintering grounds near China or to the Baja California wintering grounds of eastern gray whales versus the energetic costs of the shorter migration of eastern gray whales (Villegas-Amtmann et al., 2017). Researchers found that when the time spent on the breeding grounds was held constant for both populations, the energetic requirements for the western gray whales were estimated to be 11 percent and 15 percent greater during the migration to Baja California and China, respectively, than for the migration of eastern gray whales, and therefore this population would be more sensitive to energy lost through disturbance.

Pirotta et al. (2018) modeled one reproductive cycle of a female North Pacific blue whale, starting with leaving the breeding grounds off Baja California to begin migrating north to feeding grounds off California, and ending with her return to the breeding grounds, giving birth, and lactating. They modeled this scenario with no disturbance and found 95 percent calf recruitment, under a "normal" environmental perturbation (El Niño-Southern Oscillation) there was a very small reduction in recruitment, and under an "unprecedented" environmental change, recruitment was reduced to 69 percent. An intense, localized anthropogenic disturbance was modeled (although the duration of the event was not provided); if the animals were not allowed to leave the area they did not forage and recruitment dropped to 63 percent. However, if animals could leave the area of the disturbance then there was almost no change to the recruitment rate. A weak but broader spatial disturbance, where foraging was reduced by 50 percent, caused only a small decrease in calf recruitment to 94 percent. Similarly, Hin et al. (2019) looked at the impacts of disturbance on long-finned pilot whales and found that the timing of the disturbance with seasonally-available resources is important. If a disturbance occurred during periods of low resource availability, the population-level consequences were greater than if the disturbance occurred during periods when resource levels were high.

Using the Population Consequences of Disturbance framework, modeling of the long-term consequences of exposure has been conducted for a variety of marine mammal species and stressors. Even when high and frequent exposure levels are included, few long-term consequences have been predicted. For example, De Silva et al. (2014) conducted a population viability analysis on the long-term

impacts of pile driving and construction noise on harbor porpoises and bottlenose dolphins. Despite including the extreme and unlikely assumptions that 25 percent of animals that received PTS would die, and that behavioral displacement from an area would lead to breeding failure, the model only found short-term impacts on the population size and no long-term effects on population viability. Similarly, King et al. (2015) developed a Population Consequences of Disturbance framework using expert elicitation data on impacts from wind farms on harbor porpoises and, even under the worst-case scenarios, predicted less than a 0.5 percent decline in harbor porpoise populations. Nabe-Nelson et al. (2014) also modeled the impact of noise from wind farms on harbor porpoises and predicted that even when assuming a 10 percent reduction in population size if prey is impacted up to two days, the presence of ships and wind turbines did not deplete the population. In contrast, Heinis and De Jong (2015) used the Population Consequences of Disturbance framework to estimate impacts from both pile driving and seismic exploration on harbor porpoises and found a 23 percent decrease in population size over six years, with an increased risk for further reduction with additional disturbance days. These seemingly contradictory results demonstrate that refinements to models need to be investigated to improve consistency and interpretation of model results. Booth (2019) modeled the foraging behavior and known prey species and sizes and found that due to their generalist feeding behavior in most scenarios the porpoises obtained more than 100 percent of their energetic needs through typical foraging behavior, and therefore would largely be robust to short-term disturbances to foraging.

The Population Consequences of Disturbance model developed by New et al. (2013b) predicted that beaked whales require energy dense prey and high quality habitat, and that non-lethal disturbances that displace whales from that habitat could lead to long-term impacts on fecundity and survival; however, the authors were forced to use many conservative assumptions within their model since many parameters are unknown for beaked whales. As discussed above in Schorr et al. (2014), beaked whales have been tracked roaming over distances of 250 km or more, indicating that temporary displacement from a small area may not preclude finding energy dense prey or high quality habitat. Farmer et al. (2018) developed a bioenergetics framework to examine the impact of foraging disruption on body reserves of individual sperm whales. The authors examined rates of daily foraging disruption to predict the number of days to terminal starvation for various life stages, assuming exposure to seismic surveys. Mothers with calves were found to be most vulnerable to disruptions.

Another Population Consequences of Disturbance model developed in New et al. (2014) predicted elephant seal populations to be relatively robust even with a greater than 50 percent reduction in foraging trips (only a 0.4 percent population decline in the following year). McHuron et al. (2018) modeled the introduction of a generalized disturbance at different times throughout the breeding cycle of California sea lions, with the behavior response being an increase in the duration of a foraging trip by the female. Very short duration disturbances or responses led to little change, particularly if the disturbance was a single event, and changes in the timing of the event in the year had little effect. However, with even relatively short disturbances or mild responses, when a disturbance was modeled as recurring there were resulting reductions in population size and pup recruitment. Often, the effects weren't noticeable for several years, as the impacts on pup recruitment didn't affect the population until those pups were mature.

Population Consequences of Disturbance models can also be used to assess the impacts of multiple stressors. For example, Farmer et al. (2018) modeled the combined impacts of an oil spill and acoustic disturbance due to seismic airgun surveys. They found that the oil spill led to declines in the population over 10 years, and some models that included behavioral response to airguns found further declines.

However, the amount of additional population decline due to acoustic disturbance depended on the way the dose-response of the noise levels were modeled, with a single step-function leading to higher impacts than a function with multiple steps and frequency weighting. In addition, the amount of impact from both disturbances was mediated when the metric in the model that described animal resilience was changed to increase resilience to disturbance (e.g., able to make up reserves through increased foraging).

It should be noted that, in all of these models, assumptions were made and many input variables were unknown and so were estimated using available data. It is still not possible to utilize individual short-term behavioral responses to estimate long-term or population level effects.

The best assessment of long-term consequences from Navy training and testing activities will be to monitor the populations over time within the Study Area. A U.S. workshop on Marine Mammals and Sound (Fitch et al., 2011) indicated a critical need for baseline biological data on marine mammal abundance, distribution, habitat, and behavior over sufficient time and space to evaluate impacts from human-generated activities on long-term population survival. The Navy has developed and implemented comprehensive monitoring plans since 2009 for protected marine mammals occurring on Navy ranges with the goal of assessing the impacts of training and testing activities on marine species and the effectiveness of the Navy's mitigation measures. The results of this long-term monitoring are now being compiled and analyzed for trends in occurrence or abundance over time (e.g., Martin et al., 2017); preliminary results of this analysis at Pacific Missile Range Facility off Kauai, Hawaii indicate no changes in detection rates for several species over the past decade, demonstrating that Navy activities may not be having long-term population-level impacts. This type of analysis can be expanded to the other Navy ranges, such as the Mariana Islands Range Complex. Continued analysis of this 15-year dataset and additional monitoring efforts over time are necessary to fully understand the long-term consequences of exposure to military readiness activities.

3.4.2.1.2 Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducer Stressors

Sonar and other transducers proposed for use could be used throughout the Study Area. Sonar and other transducers emit sound waves into the water to detect objects, safely navigate, and communicate. General categories of these systems are described in Section 3.0.4.1 (Acoustic Stressors). The overall use of sonar and other transducers for training and testing activities would be similar to what is currently conducted (see Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2 for details). Although individual activities may vary some from those previously analyzed, the overall determinations presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS remain valid. The quantitative analysis has been improved upon and updated since the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS; therefore, the new analysis is fully presented and described in further detail in the technical report *Quantitative Analysis for Estimating Acoustic and Explosive Impacts to Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles* (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2018b).

Sonar-induced acoustic resonance and bubble formation phenomena are very unlikely to occur under realistic conditions, as discussed in Section 3.4.2.1.1.1 (Injury). Non-auditory injury (i.e., other than PTS) and mortality from sonar and other transducers is so unlikely as to be discountable under normal conditions and is therefore not considered further in this analysis.

The most probable impacts from exposure to sonar and other transducers are PTS, TTS, behavioral reactions, masking, and physiological stress (Section 3.4.2.1.1.2, Hearing Loss; Section 3.4.2.1.1.3, Physiological Stress; Section 3.4.2.1.1.4, Masking; and Section 3.4.2.1.1.5, Behavioral Reactions).

3.4.2.1.2.1 Methods for Analyzing Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers

The Navy performed a quantitative analysis to estimate the number of times that marine mammals could be affected by sonars and other transducers used during Navy training and testing activities. The Navy's quantitative analysis to determine impacts on marine mammals uses the Navy Acoustic Effects Model to produce initial estimates of the number of times that animals may experience these effects; these estimates are further refined by considering animal avoidance of sound-producing activities and implementation of procedural mitigation measures. The steps of this quantitative analysis are described in Section 3.0.1.2 (Navy's Quantitative Analysis to Determine Impacts on Sea Turtles and Marine Mammals), which takes into account:

- criteria and thresholds used to predict impacts from sonar and other transducers (see below);
- the density and spatial distribution of marine mammals (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2019; Watwood et al., 2018); and
- the influence of environmental parameters (e.g., temperature, depth, salinity) on sound propagation when estimating the received sound level on the animals.


A detailed explanation of this analysis is provided in the technical report titled *Quantifying Acoustic Impacts on Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles: Methods and Analytical Approach for Phase III Training and Testing* (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2018b).

Criteria and Thresholds Used to Estimate Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers

Auditory Weighting Functions

See the technical report titled *Criteria and Thresholds for U.S. Navy Acoustic and Explosive Effects Analysis (Phase III)* (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2017a) for detailed information on how the criteria and thresholds were derived. The marine mammal criteria and thresholds developed for that technical report were relied on by National Marine Fisheries Service in establishing guidance for assessing the effects of sound on marine mammal hearing (National Marine Fisheries Service, 2016e) and were re-affirmed in the 2018 revision (National Marine Fisheries Service, 2018e). In addition, these auditory impact criteria were recently published by Southall et al. (2019c).

Animals are not equally sensitive to noise at all frequencies. To capture the frequency-dependent nature of the effects of noise, auditory weighting functions are used (Figure 3.4-5). Auditory weighting functions are mathematical functions that adjust received sound levels to emphasize ranges of best hearing and de-emphasize ranges with less or no auditory sensitivity. They are based on a generic band pass filter and incorporate species-specific hearing abilities to calculate a weighted received sound level in units SPL or SEL. Due to the band pass nature of auditory weighting functions, they resemble an inverted "U" shape with amplitude plotted as a function of frequency. The flatter portion of the plotted function, where the amplitude is closest to zero, is the emphasized frequency range (i.e., the pass-band), while the frequencies below and above this range (where amplitude declines) are de-emphasized.




Source: For parameters used to generate the functions and more information on weighting function derivation see U.S. Department of the Navy (2017b)
Notes: HF = High-Frequency Cetacean, LF = Low-Frequency Cetacean, and MF = Mid-Frequency Cetacean

Figure 3.4-5: Navy Auditory Weighting Functions for all Species Groups

Hearing Loss from Sonar and Other Transducers

Defining the TTS and PTS exposure functions (Figure 3.4-6) requires identifying the weighted exposures necessary for TTS and PTS onset from sounds produced by sonar and other transducers. The criteria used to define threshold shifts from non-impulsive sources (e.g., sonar) determines TTS onset as the SEL necessary to induce 6 dB of threshold shift. An SEL 20 dB above the onset of TTS is used in all hearing groups of marine mammals underwater to define the PTS threshold (Southall et al., 2007).



Notes: The solid curve is the exposure function for TTS onset and the large dashed curve is the exposure function for PTS onset. Small dashed lines and asterisks indicate the SEL threshold for TTS and PTS onset in the frequency range of best hearing.

Figure 3.4-6: TTS and PTS Exposure Functions for Sonar and Other Transducers

Behavioral Responses from Sonar and Other Transducers

Behavioral response criteria are used to estimate the number of animals that may exhibit a behavioral response to sonar and other transducers. See the *Criteria and Thresholds for U.S. Navy Acoustic and Explosive Effects Analysis (Phase III)* technical report for detailed information on how the Behavioral Response Functions were derived (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2017b). Developing the new behavioral criteria involved multiple steps. All peer-reviewed published behavioral response studies conducted both in the field and on captive animals were examined in order to understand the breadth of behavioral responses of marine mammals to sonar and other transducers.

The data from the behavioral studies were analyzed by looking for significant responses, or lack thereof, for each experimental session. The terms “significant response” or “significant behavioral response” are used in describing behavioral observations from field or captive animal research that may rise to the

level of "harassment" for military readiness activities. Under the MMPA, for military readiness activities, such as Navy training and testing, behavioral "harassment" is: "any act that *disturbs* or is likely to *disturb* a marine mammal or marine mammal stock in the wild by causing disruption of natural behavioral patterns, including, but not limited to, migration, surfacing, nursing, breeding, feeding, or sheltering*, to a point where such behavioral patterns are abandoned or significantly altered*" (16 U.S.C. section 1362(3)(18)(B)). Under the ESA, the National Marine Fisheries Service has issued interim guidance on the term "harass," defining it as an action that "creates the likelihood of injury to wildlife by annoying it to such an extent as to significantly disrupt normal behavior patterns which include, but are not limited to, breeding, feeding, or sheltering."

The likelihood of injury due to disruption of normal behaviors would depend on many factors, such as the duration of the response, from what the animal is being diverted, and the life history of the animal. Due to the nature of behavioral response research to date, it is not currently possible to ascertain the types of observed reactions that would lead to an abandonment or significant alteration of a natural behavior pattern. Therefore, the Navy has developed a methodology to estimate the possible significance of behavioral reactions and impacts on natural behavior patterns.

Behavioral response severity is described herein as "low," "moderate," or "high." These are derived from the Southall et al. (2007) severity scale. Low severity responses are those behavioral responses that fall within an animal's range of typical (baseline) behaviors and are unlikely to disrupt an individual to a point where natural behavior patterns are significantly altered or abandoned. Low severity responses include an orientation or startle response, change in respiration, change in heart rate, and change in group spacing or synchrony.

Moderate severity responses could become significant if sustained over a longer duration. What constitutes a long-duration response is different for each situation and species, although it is likely dependent upon the magnitude of the response and species characteristics such as age, body size, feeding strategy, and behavioral state at the time of the exposure. In general, a response could be considered "long-duration" if it lasted for tens of minutes to a few hours, or enough time to significantly disrupt an animal's daily routine.

Moderate severity responses included

- alter migration path,
- alter locomotion (speed, heading),
- alter dive profiles,
- stop/alter nursing,
- stop/alter breeding,
- stop/alter feeding/foraging,
- stop/alter sheltering/resting,
- stop/alter vocal behavior if tied to foraging or social cohesion, and
- avoid area near sound source.

For the derivation of behavioral criteria, a significant duration was defined as a response that lasted for the duration of exposure or longer, regardless of how long the exposure session may have been. This assumption was made because it was not possible to tell if the behavioral responses would have continued if the exposure had continued. The costs associated with these observed behavioral reactions

were not measured, so it is not possible to judge whether reactions would have risen to the level of significance as defined above, although it was conservatively assumed the case. High severity responses include those responses with immediate consequences (e.g., stranding, mother-calf separation), and were always considered significant behavioral reactions regardless of duration.

Marine mammal species were placed into behavioral criteria groups based on their known or suspected behavioral sensitivities to sound (Figure 3.4-7 through Figure 3.4-9). In most cases, these divisions are driven by taxonomic classifications (e.g., mysticetes, odontocetes). The Odontocete group combines most of the mid- and high-frequency cetaceans, without the beaked whales. These groups are combined as there are not enough data to separate them for behavioral responses.




Figure 3.4-7: Behavioral Response Function for Odontocetes




Figure 3.4-8: Behavioral Response Function for Mysticetes




Figure 3.4-9: Behavioral Response Function for Beaked Whales

For all taxa, distances beyond which significant behavioral responses to sonar and other transducers are unlikely to occur, denoted as "cutoff distances," were defined based on existing data (Table 3.4-3). The distance between the animal and the sound source is a strong factor in determining that animal's potential reaction (e.g., DeRuiter et al., 2013b). These cutoff distances include even the most distant detected responses to date (e.g., 28 km in northern bottlenose whales (Wensveen et al., 2019)). For training and testing events that contain multiple platforms or tactical sonar sources that exceed 215 dB re 1 µPa at 1 m, this cutoff distance is substantially increased (i.e., doubled) from values derived from the literature. The use of multiple platforms and intense sound sources are factors that probably increase responsiveness in marine mammals overall. There are currently few behavioral observations

under these circumstances; therefore, the Navy will conservatively predict significant behavioral responses at further ranges for these more intense activities.

Table 3.4-3: Cutoff Distances for Moderate Source Level, Single Platform Training and Testing Events and for All Other Events with Multiple Platforms or Sonar with Source Levels at or Exceeding 215 dB re 1 µPa at 1 m

Criteria Group	*Moderate SL/Single Platform Cutoff Distance*	*High SL/Multi-Platform Cutoff Distance*
Odontocetes	10 km	20 km
Mysticetes	10 km	20 km
Beaked Whales	25 km	50 km

Notes: dB re 1 µPa @ 1 m= decibels referenced to 1 micropascal at 1 meter, km = kilometer(s), SL = source level

Assessing the Severity of Behavioral Responses from Sonar Under Military Readiness

As discussed above, the terms "significant response" or "significant behavioral response" are used in describing behavioral reactions that may lead to an abandonment or significant alteration of a natural behavior pattern. Due to the limited amount of behavioral response research to date and relatively short durations of observation, it is not possible to ascertain the true significance of the majority of the observed reactions. When deriving the behavioral criteria, it was assumed that most reactions that lasted for the duration of the sound exposure or longer were significant, even though many of the exposures lasted for 30 minutes or less. Furthermore, the experimental designs used during many of the behavioral response studies were unlike Navy activities in many important ways. These differences include tagging subject animals, following subjects for sometimes hours before the exposure, vectoring towards the subjects after animals began to avoid the sound source, and making multiple close passes on focal groups. This makes the estimated behavioral impacts from Navy activities using the criteria derived from these experiments difficult to interpret. While the state of science does not currently support definitively distinguishing between significant and insignificant behavioral reactions, as described in the technical report titled *Criteria and Thresholds for U.S. Navy Acoustic and Explosive Effects Analysis (Phase III)* (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2017b), the Navy's analysis incorporates conservative assumptions to account for this uncertainty and therefore likely overestimates the potential impacts.

The estimated behavioral reactions from the Navy's quantitative analysis are grouped into several categories based on the most powerful sonar source, the number of platforms, the duration, and geographic extent of each Navy activity attributed to the predicted impact.

Low severity responses are within an animal's range of typical (baseline) behaviors and are unlikely to disrupt an individual to a point where natural behavior patterns are significantly altered or abandoned. Although the derivation of the Navy's behavioral criteria did not count low severity responses as significant behavioral responses, in practice, some reactions estimated using the behavioral criteria are likely to be low severity (Figure 3.4-10).




Figure 3.4-10: Relative Likelihood of a Response Being Significant Based on the Duration and Severity of Behavioral Reactions

High severity responses are those with a higher potential for direct consequences to growth, survivability, or reproduction. Examples include prolonged separation of females and dependent offspring, panic, flight, stampede, or stranding. High severity reactions would always be considered significant; however, these types of reactions are probably rare under most conditions and may still not lead to direct consequences on survivability. For example, a separation of a killer whale mother-calf pair was observed once during a behavioral response study to an active sonar source (Miller et al., 2014), but the animals were rejoined as soon as the ship had passed. Therefore, although this was a severe response, it did not lead to a negative outcome. Five beaked whale strandings have also occurred associated with U.S. Navy active sonar use as discussed above (see Section 3.4.2.1.1.6, Stranding), but the confluence of factors that contributed to those strandings is now better understood, and the avoidance of those factors has resulted in no known marine mammal strandings associated with U.S. Navy sonar activities for over a decade. The Navy is unable to predict these high severity responses for any activities since the probability of occurrence is apparently very low, although the Navy acknowledges that severe reactions could occasionally occur. In fact, no significant behavioral responses such as panic, stranding, or other severe reactions have been observed during monitoring of actual training or testing activities.

The responses estimated using the Navy's quantitative analysis are most likely to be moderate severity. Moderate severity responses would be considered significant if they were sustained for a duration long enough that it caused an animal to be outside of normal daily variations in feeding, reproduction, resting, migration/movement, or social cohesion. As mentioned previously, the behavioral response functions used within the Navy's quantitative analysis were primarily derived from experiments using short-duration sound exposures that in many cases lasted for less than 30 minutes. If animals exhibited moderate severity reactions for the duration of the exposure or longer, then it was conservatively assumed that the animal experienced a significant behavioral reaction. However, the experiments did

not include measurements of costs to animals beyond the immediately observed reactions, and no direct correlations exist between an observed behavioral response and a cost that may result in long-term consequences. Within the Navy's quantitative analysis, many behavioral reactions are estimated from exposure to sonar that may exceed an animal's behavioral threshold for only a single ping to several minutes. While the state of science does not currently support definitively distinguishing between significant and insignificant behavioral reactions, as described in the technical report titled *Criteria and Thresholds for U.S. Navy Acoustic and Explosive Effects Analysis (Phase III)* (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2017b), the Navy's analysis incorporates conservative assumptions to account for this uncertainty and therefore likely overestimates the potential impacts.

Accounting for Mitigation

The Navy will implement mitigation measures to avoid or reduce potential impacts from active sonar on marine mammals, as described in Section 5.3.2.1 (Active Sonar). The benefits of mitigation are conservatively factored into the analysis for Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 of the Proposed Action for training and testing. The Navy's mitigation measures are identical for both action alternatives.

Procedural mitigation measures include a power down or shut down (i.e., power off) of applicable active sonar sources when a marine mammal is observed in a mitigation zone. The mitigation zones for active sonar activities were designed to avoid the potential for marine mammals to be exposed to levels of sound that could result in auditory injury (i.e., PTS) from active sonar to the maximum extent practicable. The mitigation zones for active sonar extend beyond the respective average ranges to auditory injury (including PTS). Therefore, the impact analysis considers the potential for procedural mitigation to reduce the risk of PTS. Two factors are considered when quantifying the effectiveness of procedural mitigation: (1) the extent to which the type of mitigation proposed for a sound-producing activity (e.g., active sonar) allows for observation of the mitigation zone prior to and during the activity; and (2) the sightability of each species that may be present in the mitigation zone, which is determined by species-specific characteristics and the viewing platform. A detailed explanation of the analysis is provided in the technical report *Quantifying Acoustic Impacts on Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles: Methods and Analytical Approach for Phase III Training and Testing* (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2018b).

The impact analysis does not consider the potential for mitigation to reduce TTS or behavioral effects, even though mitigation could also reduce the likelihood of these effects. In practice, mitigation also protects all unobserved (below the surface) animals in the vicinity, including other species, in addition to the observed animal. However, the analysis assumes that only animals sighted at the water surface would be protected by the applied mitigation. The analysis, therefore, does not capture the protection afforded to all marine species that may be near or within the mitigation zone.

The ability to observe the ranges to PTS was estimated for each training or testing event. The ability of Navy Lookouts to detect marine mammals within a mitigation zone is dependent on the animal's presence at the surface and the characteristics of the animal that influence its sightability (such as group size or surface active behavior). The behaviors and characteristics of some species may make them easier to detect. Certain behaviors, such as leaping and breaching, are visible from a great distance and likely increase sighting distances and detections of those species. Environmental conditions under which the training or testing activity could take place are also considered, such as sea surface conditions, weather (e.g., fog or rain), and day versus night.

The Navy will also implement mitigation measures for certain active sonar activities within mitigation areas, including the Marpi Reef Mitigation Area, Chalan Kanoa Reef Mitigation Area, and Agat Bay Nearshore Mitigation Area, as described in Appendix I (Geographic Mitigation Assessment). Mitigation areas are designed to help avoid or reduce impacts during biologically important life processes within particularly important habitat areas. The benefits of mitigation areas are discussed qualitatively in terms of the context of impact avoidance or reduction.

Marine Mammal Avoidance of Sonar and other Transducers

Because a marine mammal is assumed to initiate avoidance behavior after an initial startle reaction when exposed to relatively high received levels of sound, a marine mammal could reduce its cumulative sound energy exposure over a sonar event with multiple pings (i.e., sound exposures). This would reduce risk of both PTS and TTS, although the quantitative analysis conservatively only considers the potential to reduce instances of PTS by accounting for marine mammals swimming away to avoid repeated high-level sound exposures. All reductions in PTS impacts from likely avoidance behaviors are instead considered TTS impacts.

3.4.2.1.2.2 Impact Ranges for Sonar and Other Transducers

The following section provides range to effects for sonar and other transducers to specific criteria determined using the Navy Acoustic Effects Model. Marine mammals within these ranges would be predicted to receive the associated effect. Range to effects is important information in not only predicting acoustic impacts, but also in verifying the accuracy of model results against real-world situations and assessing the level of impact that will likely be mitigated within applicable mitigation zones.

The ranges to the PTS threshold for an exposure of 30 seconds are shown in Table 3.4-4 relative to the marine mammal's functional hearing group. This period (30 seconds) was chosen based on examining the maximum amount of time a marine mammal would realistically be exposed to levels that could cause the onset of PTS based on platform (e.g., ship) speed and a nominal animal swim speed of approximately 1.5 meters per second. The ranges provided in the table include the average range to PTS, as well as the range from the minimum to the maximum distance at which PTS is possible for each hearing group. Since any hull-mounted sonar, such as the SQS-53, engaged in anti-submarine warfare training would be moving at between 10 and 15 knots and nominally pinging every 50 seconds, the vessel will have traveled a minimum distance of approximately 257 m during the time between those pings (note: 10 knots is the speed used in the Navy Acoustic Effects Model). As a result, there is little overlap of PTS footprints from successive pings, indicating that in most cases, an animal predicted to receive PTS would do so from a single exposure (i.e., ping). For all other bins (besides MF1), PTS ranges are short enough that marine mammals (with a nominal swim speed of approximately 1.5 meters per second) should be able to avoid higher sound levels capable of causing onset PTS within this 30-second period.

For all other functional hearing groups (low-frequency cetaceans and mid-frequency cetaceans), 30-second average PTS zones are substantially shorter. A scenario could occur where an animal does not leave the vicinity of a ship or travels a course parallel to the ship, however, the close distances required make PTS exposure unlikely. For a military vessel moving at a nominal 10 knots, it is unlikely a marine mammal could maintain the speed to parallel the ship and receive adequate energy over successive pings to suffer PTS.

The tables below illustrate the range to TTS for 1, 30, 60, and 120 seconds from five representative sonar systems (Table 3.4-5 through Table 3.4-9). Due to the lower acoustic thresholds for TTS versus PTS, ranges to TTS are longer. Therefore, successive pings can be expected to add together, further increasing the range to TTS onset.

Table 3.4-4: Range to Permanent Threshold Shift for Five Representative Sonar Systems

Hearing Group	*Approximate PTS (30 seconds) Ranges (meters)*[1]				
	Sonar bin HF4	*Sonar bin LF4*	*Sonar bin MF1*	*Sonar bin MF4*	*Sonar bin MF5*
High-frequency cetaceans	29 (22–35)	0 (0–0)	181 (180–190)	30 (30–30)	9 (8–10)
Low-frequency cetaceans	0 (0–0)	0 (0–0)	65 (65–65)	15 (15–15)	0 (0–0)
Mid-frequency cetaceans	1 (0–1)	0 (0–0)	16 (16–16)	3 (3–3)	0 (0–0)

[1] PTS ranges extend from the sonar or other transducers to the indicated distance. The average range to PTS is provided as well as the range from the estimated minimum to the maximum range to PTS in parentheses.
Notes: HF= high-frequency, LF = low-frequency, MF = mid-frequency, PTS = permanent threshold shift

Table 3.4-5: Ranges to Temporary Threshold Shift for Sonar Bin HF4 over a Representative Range of Environments within the Study Area

Hearing Group	*Approximate TTS Ranges (meters)*[1]			
	Sonar Bin HF4			
	1 second	*30 seconds*	*60 seconds*	*120 seconds*
High-frequency cetaceans	155 (110–210)	259 (180–350)	344 (240–480)	445 (300–600)
Low-frequency cetaceans	1 (0–2)	2 (1–3)	4 (3–5)	7 (5–8)
Mid-frequency cetaceans	10 (7–12)	17 (12–21)	24 (17–30)	33 (25–40)

[1] Ranges to TTS represent the model predictions in different areas and seasons within the Study Area. The zone in which animals are expected to suffer TTS extend from onset-PTS to the distance indicated. The average range to TTS is provided as well as the range from the estimated minimum to the maximum range to TTS in parenthesis.
Notes: HF = high-frequency, TTS = temporary threshold shift

Table 3.4-6: Ranges to Temporary Threshold Shift for Sonar Bin LF4 over a Representative Range of Environments within the Study Area

Hearing Group	*Approximate TTS Ranges (meters)*[1]			
	Sonar Bin LF4			
	1 second	*30 seconds*	*60 seconds*	*120 seconds*
High-frequency cetaceans	0 (0–0)	0 (0–0)	0 (0–0)	0 (0–0)
Low-frequency cetaceans	3 (3–3)	4 (4–4)	6 (6–6)	9 (9–9)
Mid-frequency cetaceans	0 (0–0)	0 (0–0)	0 (0–0)	0 (0–0)

[1] Ranges to TTS represent the model predictions in different areas and seasons within the Study Area. The zone in which animals are expected to suffer TTS extend from onset-PTS to the distance indicated. The average range to TTS is provided as well as the range from the estimated minimum to the maximum range to TTS in parentheses.
Notes: LF = low-frequency, TTS = temporary threshold shift

Table 3.4-7: Ranges to Temporary Threshold Shift for Sonar Bin MF1 over a Representative Range of Environments within the Study Area

Hearing Group	*Approximate TTS Ranges (meters)*[1]			
	Sonar Bin MF1			
	1 second	*30 seconds*	*60 seconds*	*120 seconds*
High-frequency cetaceans	3,181 (2,025–5,025)	3,181 (2,025–5,025)	5,298 (2,275–7,775)	6,436 (2,525–9,775)
Low-frequency cetaceans	898 (850–1,025)	898 (850–1,025)	1,271 (1,025–1,525)	1,867 (1,275–3,025)
Mid-frequency cetaceans	210 (200–210)	210 (200–210)	302 (300–310)	377 (370–390)

[1] Ranges to TTS represent the model predictions in different areas and seasons within the Study Area. The zone in which animals are expected to suffer TTS extend from onset-PTS to the distance indicated. The average range to TTS is provided as well as the range from the estimated minimum to the maximum range to TTS in parentheses.
Notes: Ranges for 1-sec and 30-sec periods are identical for Bin MF1 because this system nominally pings every 50 seconds; therefore, these periods encompass only a single ping.
Notes: MF = mid-frequency, TTS = temporary threshold shift

Table 3.4-8: Ranges to Temporary Threshold Shift for Sonar Bin MF4 over a Representative Range of Environments within the Study Area

Hearing Group	*Approximate TTS Ranges (meters)*[1]			
	Sonar Bin MF4			
	1 second	*30 seconds*	*60 seconds*	*120 seconds*
High-frequency cetaceans	232 (220–260)	454 (420–600)	601 (575–875)	878 (800–1,525)
Low-frequency cetaceans	85 (85–90)	161 (160–170)	229 (220–250)	352 (330–410)
Mid-frequency cetaceans	22 (22–22)	35 (35–35)	50 (45–50)	70 (70–70)

[1] Ranges to TTS represent the model predictions in different areas and seasons within the Study Area. The zone in which animals are expected to suffer TTS extend from onset-PTS to the distance indicated. The average range to TTS is provided as well as the range from the estimated minimum to the maximum range to TTS in parentheses.
Notes: MF = mid-frequency, TTS = temporary threshold shift

Table 3.4-9: Ranges to Temporary Threshold Shift for Sonar Bin MF5 over a Representative Range of Environments within the Study Area

Hearing Group	*Approximate TTS Ranges (meters)*[1]			
	Sonar Bin MF5			
	1 second	*30 seconds*	*60 seconds*	*120 seconds*
High-frequency cetaceans	114 (110–130)	114 (110–130)	168 (150–200)	249 (210–290)
Low-frequency cetaceans	11 (10–12)	11 (10–12)	16 (16–17)	23 (23–24)
Mid-frequency cetaceans	5 (0–9)	5 (0–9)	12 (11–13)	18 (17–18)

[1] Ranges to TTS represent the model predictions in different areas and seasons within the Study Area. The zone in which animals are expected to suffer TTS extend from onset-PTS to the distance indicated. The average range to TTS is provided as well as the range from the estimated minimum to the maximum range to TTS in parentheses.
Notes: MF = mid-frequency, TTS = temporary threshold shift

The range to received sound levels in 6-dB steps from five representative sonar bins and the percentage of animals that may exhibit a significant behavioral response under each behavioral response function are shown in Table 3.4-10 through Table 3.4-14, respectively. See Section 3.4.2.1.2.1 (Methods for Analyzing Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers) for details on the derivation and use of the behavioral response functions, thresholds, and the cutoff distances.

Table 3.4-10: Ranges to a Potentially Significant Behavioral Response for Sonar Bin HF4 over a Representative Range of Environments within the Study Area

Received Level (dB re 1 µPa)	*Mean Range (meters) with Minimum and Maximum Values in Parentheses*	*Probability of Behavioral Response for Sonar Bin HF4*		
		Odontocete	*Mysticete*	*Beaked Whale*
196	3 (2–4)	100%	100%	100%
190	8 (6–10)	100%	98%	100%
184	16 (12–20)	99%	88%	100%
178	32 (24–40)	97%	59%	100%
172	63 (45–80)	91%	30%	99%
166	120 (75–160)	78%	20%	97%
160	225 (120–310)	58%	18%	93%
154	392 (180–550)	40%	17%	83%
148	642 (280–1,275)	29%	16%	66%
142	916 (420–1,775)	25%	13%	45%
136	1,359 (625–2,525)	23%	9%	28%
130	1,821 (950–3,275)	20%	5%	18%
124	2,567 (1,275–5,025)	17%	2%	14%
118	3,457 (1,775–6,025)	12%	1%	12%
112	4,269 (2,275–7,025)	6%	0%	11%
106	5,300 (3,025–8,025)	3%	0%	11%
100	6,254 (3,775–9,275)	1%	0%	8%

Notes: dB re 1 µPa = decibels referenced to 1 micropascal, HF = high-frequency

Table 3.4-11: Ranges to a Potentially Significant Behavioral Response for Sonar Bin LF4 over a Representative Range of Environments within the Study Area

Received Level (dB re 1 µPa)	*Mean Range (meters) with Minimum and Maximum Values in Parentheses*	*Probability of Behavioral Response for Sonar Bin LF4*		
		Odontocete	*Mysticete*	*Beaked Whale*
196	1 (1–1)	100%	100%	100%
190	3 (3–3)	100%	98%	100%
184	6 (6–6)	99%	88%	100%
178	12 (12–12)	97%	59%	100%
172	25 (25–25)	91%	30%	99%
166	51 (50–55)	78%	20%	97%
160	130 (130–160)	58%	18%	93%
154	272 (270–300)	40%	17%	83%
148	560 (550–675)	29%	16%	66%
142	1,048 (1,025–1,525)	25%	13%	45%
136	2,213 (1,525–4,525)	23%	9%	28%
130	4,550 (2,275–24,025)	20%	5%	18%
124	16,903 (4,025–66,275)	17%	2%	14%
118	43,256 (7,025–87,775)	12%	1%	12%
112	60,155 (7,775–100,000*)	6%	0%	11%
106	80,689 (8,775–100,000*)	3%	0%	11%
100	92,352 (9,025–100,000*)	1%	0%	8%

* Indicates maximum range to which acoustic model was run, a distance of approximately 100 km from the sound source.

Notes: Cells are shaded if the mean range value for the specified received level exceeds the distance cutoff range for a particular hearing group. Any impacts within the cutoff range for a criteria group are included in the estimated impacts. Cut-off ranges in this table are for activities with high source levels and/or multiple platforms (see Table 3.4-3 for behavioral cut-off distances).

dB re 1 µPa = decibels referenced to 1 micropascal, LF = low-frequency

Table 3.4-12: Ranges to a Potentially Significant Behavioral Response for Sonar Bin MF1 over a Representative Range of Environments within the Study Area

Received Level (dB re 1 µPa)	*Mean Range (meters) with Minimum and Maximum Values in Parentheses*	*Probability of Behavioral Response for Sonar Bin MF1*		
		Odontocete	*Mysticete*	*Beaked Whale*
196	106 (100–110)	100%	100%	100%
190	240 (240–250)	100%	98%	100%
184	501 (490–525)	99%	88%	100%
178	1,019 (975–1,025)	97%	59%	100%
172	3,275 (2,025–5,275)	91%	30%	99%
166	7,506 (2,525–11,025)	78%	20%	97%
160	15,261 (4,775–20,775)	58%	18%	93%
154	27,759 (5,525–36,525)	40%	17%	83%
148	43,166 (7,525–65,275)	29%	16%	66%
142	58,781 (8,525–73,525)	25%	13%	45%
136	71,561 (11,275–90,775)	23%	9%	28%
130	83,711 (13,025–100,000*)	20%	5%	18%
124	88,500 (23,525–100,000*)	17%	2%	14%
118	90,601 (27,025–100,000*)	12%	1%	12%
112	92,750 (27,025–100,000*)	6%	0%	11%
106	94,469 (27,025–100,000*)	3%	0%	11%
100	95,838 (27,025–100,000*)	1%	0%	8%

* Indicates maximum range to which acoustic model was run, a distance of approximately 100 km from the sound source.

Notes: Cells are shaded if the mean range value for the specified received level exceeds the distance cutoff range for a particular hearing group. Any impacts within the cutoff range for a criteria group are included in the estimated impacts. Cut-off ranges in this table are for activities with high source levels and/or multiple platforms (see Table 3.4-3 for behavioral cut-off distances).

dB re 1 µPa = decibels referenced to 1 micropascal, MF = mid-frequency

Table 3.4-13: Ranges to a Potentially Significant Behavioral Response for Sonar Bin MF4 over a Representative Range of Environments within the Study Area

Received Level (dB re 1 µPa)	*Mean Range (meters) with Minimum and Maximum Values in Parentheses*	*Probability of Behavioral Response for Sonar Bin MF4*		
		Odontocete	*Mysticete*	*Beaked Whale*
196	8 (8–8)	100%	100%	100%
190	17 (17–17)	100%	98%	100%
184	35 (35–35)	99%	88%	100%
178	70 (65–70)	97%	59%	100%
172	141 (140–150)	91%	30%	99%
166	354 (330–420)	78%	20%	97%
160	773 (725–1,275)	58%	18%	93%
154	1,489 (1,025–3,275)	40%	17%	83%
148	3,106 (1,775–6,775)	29%	16%	66%
142	8,982 (3,025–18,775)	25%	13%	45%
136	15,659 (3,775–31,025)	23%	9%	28%
130	25,228 (4,775–65,775)	20%	5%	18%
124	41,778 (5,525–73,275)	17%	2%	14%
118	51,832 (6,025–89,775)	12%	1%	12%
112	62,390 (6,025–100,000*)	6%	0%	11%
106	69,235 (6,775–100,000*)	3%	0%	11%
100	73,656 (7,025–100,000*)	1%	0%	8%

* Indicates maximum range to which acoustic model was run, a distance of approximately 100 km from the sound source.

Notes: Cells are shaded if the mean range value for the specified received level exceeds the distance cutoff range for a particular hearing group. Any impacts within the cutoff range for a criteria group are included in the estimated impacts. Cut-off ranges in this table are for activities with high source levels and/or multiple platforms (see Table 3.4-3 for behavioral cut-off distances).

dB re 1 µPa = decibels referenced to 1 micropascal, MF = mid-frequency

Table 3.4-14: Ranges to a Potentially Significant Behavioral Response for Sonar Bin MF5 over a Representative Range of Environments within the Study Area

Received Level (dB re 1 µPa)	*Mean Range (meters) with Minimum and Maximum Values in Parentheses*	*Probability of Behavioral Response for Sonar Bin MF5*		
		Odontocete	*Mysticete*	*Beaked Whale*
196	0 (0–0)	100%	100%	100%
190	1 (0–3)	100%	98%	100%
184	4 (0–7)	99%	88%	100%
178	14 (0–15)	97%	59%	100%
172	29 (0–30)	91%	30%	99%
166	58 (0–60)	78%	20%	97%
160	125 (0–150)	58%	18%	93%
154	284 (160–525)	40%	17%	83%
148	607 (450–1,025)	29%	16%	66%
142	1,213 (875–4,025)	25%	13%	45%
136	2,695 (1,275–7,025)	23%	9%	28%
130	6,301 (2,025–12,525)	20%	5%	18%
124	10,145 (3,025–19,525)	17%	2%	14%
118	14,359 (3,525–27,025)	12%	1%	12%
112	19,194 (3,525–37,275)	6%	0%	11%
106	24,153 (4,025–48,025)	3%	0%	11%
100	29,325 (5,025–57,775)	1%	0%	8%

Notes: Cells are shaded if the mean range value for the specified received level exceeds the distance cutoff range for a particular hearing group. Any impacts within the cutoff range for a criteria group are included in the estimated impacts. Cut-off ranges in this table are for activities with high source levels and/or multiple platforms (see Table 3.4-3 for behavioral cut-off distances).
dB re 1 µPa = decibels referenced to 1 micropascal, MF = mid-frequency

3.4.2.1.2.3 Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers Under the Action Alternatives

Use of sonar and other transducers would typically be transient and temporary. General categories and characteristics of sonar systems and the number of hours these sonars would be operated during training and testing under Alternative 1 and 2 are described in Section 3.0.4.1 (Acoustic Stressors). Activities using sonars and other transducers would be conducted as described in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) and Appendix A (Training and Testing Activities Descriptions). The major differences between the action alternatives for the purposes of analyzing impacts on marine mammals are:

- Under Alternative 1, training and testing activities would fluctuate each year to account for the natural variation of training cycles and deployment schedules.

- Under Alternative 2, the same type and tempo of military training and testing activities would occur as Alternative 1, but there would be five Joint Multi-Strike Group Exercises (e.g., Valiant Shield) over any five-year period as compared to three under Alternative 1. Additionally, Alternative 2 contemplates three (vice two) Small Joint Coordinated anti-submarine warfare exercises (Multi-Sail/GUAMEX) per year with a 50 percent increase in associated unit-level events (e.g., Missile Exercise (Surface-to-Air). This would result in an increase of active sonar

training compared to Alternative 1. There would also be an increase in the use of active sonar during certain testing events. Alternative 2 reflects the maximum number of training and testing activities that could occur within a given year, and assumes that the maximum number of Fleet exercises would occur every year.

Compared to training and testing activities that use sonar and other transducers that were previously analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS under Alternatives 1 and 2, some training and testing activities would increase, decrease, or stay the same from those currently conducted (see Table 2.5-1 and Table 2.5-2 for details). In addition, some new systems using new technologies will be tested under the action alternatives.

Major training exercises are multi-day exercises that transition across large areas and involve multiple anti-submarine warfare assets. It is important to note that, while major training exercises focus on anti-submarine warfare, there are significant periods when active anti-submarine warfare sonars are not in use. Nevertheless, behavioral reactions are assumed more likely to be significant than during other anti-submarine warfare activities due to the duration (i.e., multiple days) and scale (i.e., multiple sonar platforms) of the major training exercises. Although major training exercises tend to move to different locations as the event unfolds, some animals could be exposed multiple times over the course of a few days.

Anti-submarine warfare activities also include unit-level training and coordinated/integrated training, and anti-submarine warfare sonar systems would be active when conducting surface ship and submarine sonar maintenance. Submarine and surface ship sonar maintenance activities involve the use of a single system in a limited manner; therefore, significant reactions to maintenance are less likely than with most other anti-submarine warfare activities. Furthermore, sonar maintenance activities typically occur either pierside or within entrances to harbors where higher levels of anthropogenic activity, including elevated noise levels, already exist. Unit-level training activities typically involve the use of a single vessel or aircraft and last for only a few hours over a small area of ocean. These unit-level training and sonar maintenance activities are limited in scope and duration; therefore, significant behavioral reactions are less likely than with other anti-submarine warfare activities with greater intensity and duration. Unit-level training activities are more likely to occur close to homeports and in the same general locations each time, so resident animals could be more frequently exposed to these types of activities. Coordinated/integrated exercises involve multiple assets and can last for several days transiting across large areas of a range complex. Repeated exposures to some individual marine mammals are likely during coordinated/integrated exercises. However, due to the shorter duration and smaller footprint compared to major training exercises, impacts from these activities are less likely to be significant with the possible exception of resident animals near homeports or Navy instrumented ranges that may incur some repeated exposures.

Anti-submarine warfare testing activities are typically similar to unit-level training. Vessel evaluation testing activities also use the same anti-submarine warfare sonars on ships and submarines. Testing activities that use anti-submarine warfare sonars typically occur in water deeper than approximately 200 m and therefore out of most nearshore habitats where productivity is typically higher (i.e., more food) and many marine mammals have higher abundances. Therefore, significant reactions to anti-submarine warfare and vessel evaluation testing activities are less likely than with larger anti-submarine warfare training activities discussed. These testing activities are limited in scope and duration; therefore,

many of the impacts estimated by the quantitative analysis are unlikely to rise to the level of a significant behavioral response.

Mine warfare training activities typically involve a ship, helicopter, or unmanned vehicle using a mine-hunting sonar to locate mines. Most mine warfare sonar systems have a lower source level, higher frequency, and narrower, often downward facing beam pattern as compared to most anti-submarine warfare sonars. Significant reactions in marine mammals have not been reported due to exposure to mine warfare sonars. While individual animals could show short-term and minor responses to mine warfare sonar training activities, these reactions are very unlikely to lead to any costs or long-term consequences for individuals or populations.

Mine warfare testing activities typically involve a ship, helicopter, or unmanned vehicle testing a mine-hunting sonar system. Unmanned underwater vehicle testing also employs many of the same sonar systems as mine warfare testing and usually involves only a single sonar platform (i.e., unmanned underwater vehicle). Most of the sonar systems and other transducers used during these testing activities typically have a lower source level, higher frequency, and narrower, often downward facing beam pattern as compared to most anti-submarine warfare sonars. Significant reactions in marine mammals have not been reported due to exposure to these types of systems sonars. Animals are most likely to show short-term and minor to moderate responses to these testing activities; therefore, many of the impacts estimated by the quantitative analysis are unlikely to rise to the level of a significant behavioral response.

Navigation and object detection activities typically employ ship and submarine-based sonar systems and other transducers to navigate and avoid underwater objects. Significant reactions in marine mammals have not been reported due to exposure to most of the sonars and other transducers typically used in these activities. Some hull-mounted anti-submarine warfare sonars (e.g., bin MF1) have a mode to look for objects in the water such as mines, but this mode uses different source characteristics as compared to the anti-submarine warfare mode. Significant behavioral reactions have not been observed in relation to hull-mounted sonars using object-detection mode; however, significant reactions may be more likely than for all other sonar systems and transducers used within these activities due to the additional presence of a moving vessel and higher source levels. Individual animals could show short-term and minor to moderate responses to these systems, although these reactions are very unlikely to lead to any costs or long-term consequences for individuals or populations.

Training and testing activities with unmanned underwater vehicles may also employ many of the same sonar systems as mine warfare testing. Most of the sonar systems and other transducers used during these activities typically have a lower source level; higher frequency; and narrower, often downward-facing beam pattern as compared to most anti-submarine warfare sonars. Significant reactions in marine mammals have not been reported due to exposure to these types of systems sonars. Animals are most likely to show short-term and minor to moderate responses to these activities; therefore, many of the impacts estimated by the quantitative analysis are unlikely to rise to the level of a significant behavioral response.

Other testing activities include testing of individual sonar systems and other transducers for performance and acoustic signature (e.g., required pre-underway pierside sonar system checks). Most sources used during these exercises have moderate source levels between 160 and 200 dB re 1 µPa @ 1 m and are used for a limited duration, up to a few hours in most cases. Significant reactions in marine mammals have not been reported due to exposure to the sonars and other transducers typically used in

these activities. Animals are most likely to show short-term and minor to moderate responses to these testing activities; therefore, many of the impacts estimated by the quantitative analysis are unlikely to rise to the level of a significant behavioral response.

Surface warfare activities require limited use of sonar or other transducers as compared to other types of activities discussed above, typically limited to the sonar targeting system of a few torpedoes. The limited scope and duration of sonar use in these activities makes significant behavioral reactions less likely than with other activities that use anti-submarine warfare sonar systems and other transducers, which are discussed above.

Presentation of Estimated Impacts from the Quantitative Analysis

The results of the analysis of potential impacts on marine mammals from sonars and other transducers (Section 3.4.2.1.2.1, Methods for Analyzing Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers) are discussed below. The numbers of potential impacts estimated for individual species and stocks of marine mammals from exposure to sonar for training and testing activities under each action alternative are shown in Appendix E (Estimated Marine Mammal and Sea Turtle Impacts from Exposure to Acoustic and Explosive Stressors Under Navy Training and Testing Activities) and presented below in figures for each species of marine mammal with any estimated effects (e.g., Figure 3.4-11). The activity categories that are most likely to cause impacts and the most likely region in which impacts could occur are represented in the graphics for each species. There is a potential for impacts to occur anywhere within the Study Area where sound from sonar and the species overlap, although only regions or activity categories where 0.5 percent of the impacts or greater are estimated to occur are graphically represented below. All (i.e., grand total) estimated impacts for that species are included, regardless of region or category.

It is important to note when examining the results of the quantitative analysis that the behavioral response functions used to predict the numbers of reactions in this analysis are largely derived from several studies (see Section 3.4.2.1.1.5, Behavioral Reactions). The best available science, including behavioral response studies, was used for deriving these criteria; however, many of the factors inherent in these studies that potentially increased the likelihood and severity of observed responses (e.g., close approaches by multiple vessels, tagging animals, and vectoring towards animals that have already begun avoiding the sound source) would not occur during Navy activities. Because the Navy purposely avoids approaching marine mammals, many of the behavioral responses estimated by the quantitative analysis are unlikely to occur or unlikely to rise to the severity observed during many of the behavioral response studies.

Although the statutory definition of Level B harassment for military readiness activities under the MMPA requires that the natural behavior patterns of a marine mammal be significantly altered or abandoned, the current state of science for determining those thresholds is somewhat unsettled. Therefore, in its analysis of impacts associated with acoustic sources, the Navy is adopting a conservative approach that overestimates the number of takes by Level B harassment. The responses estimated using the Navy's quantitative analysis are most likely to be moderate severity. Moderate severity responses would be considered significant if they were sustained for a duration long enough that it caused an animal to be outside of normal daily variations in feeding, reproduction, resting, migration/movement, or social cohesion. As discussed in Section 3.4.2.1.2.1 (Methods for Analyzing Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers), the behavioral response functions used within the Navy's quantitative analysis were primarily derived from experiments using short-duration sound exposures lasting, in many cases, for less than 30 minutes. If animals exhibited moderate severity reactions for the duration of the exposure or

longer, then it was conservatively assumed that the animal experienced a significant behavioral reaction. However, the experiments did not include measurements of costs to animals beyond the immediately observed reactions, and no direct correlations exist between an observed behavioral response and a cost that may result in long-term consequences. Within the Navy's quantitative analysis, many behavioral reactions are estimated from exposure to sound that may exceed an animal's behavioral threshold for only a single exposure up to several minutes. It is likely that many of the estimated behavioral reactions within the Navy's quantitative analysis would not constitute significant behavioral reactions; however, the numbers of significant verses non-significant behavioral reactions are currently impossible to predict. Consequently, there is a high likelihood that significant numbers of marine mammals exposed to acoustic sources are not significantly altering or abandoning their natural behavior patterns. As such, the overall impact of acoustic sources from military readiness activities on marine mammal species and stocks is negligible (i.e., cannot be reasonably expected to, and is not reasonably likely to, adversely affect the species or stocks through effects on annual rates of recruitment or survival).

Mysticetes

Mysticetes may be exposed to sound from sonar and other transducers associated with training and testing activities. Most low- (less than 1 kHz) and mid- (1–10 kHz) frequency sonars and other transducers produce sounds that are likely to be within the hearing range of mysticetes (Section 3.4.1.6, Hearing and Vocalization). Some high-frequency sonars (greater than 10 kHz) also produce sounds that should be audible to mysticetes, although only smaller species of mysticetes such as minke whales are likely to be able to hear higher frequencies, presumably up to 30 kHz. Therefore, some high-frequency sonars and other transducers with frequency ranges between 10 and 30 kHz may also be audible to some mysticetes. If a sound is within an animal's hearing range then behavioral reactions, physiological stress, masking and hearing loss are potential impacts that must be analyzed. If a marine mammal cannot hear a sound, then behavioral reactions, physiological stress, masking, or hearing loss is not likely to occur. Impact ranges for mysticetes are discussed under low-frequency cetaceans in Section 3.4.2.1.2 (Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducer Stressors).

Behavioral reactions in mysticetes resulting from exposure to sonar could occur, based on the quantitative analysis. Considering best available data on observed mysticete responses to sound exposure, behavioral responses would not be expected to occur beyond 20 km from events with multiple sound source platforms or high source levels, nor beyond 10 km from moderate source level, single platform events. Any predicted behavioral reactions are much more likely to occur within a few kilometers of the sound source. As discussed above in *Assessing the Severity of Behavioral Responses from Sonar and other Transducers*, the quantitative analysis very likely overestimated the numbers of behavioral reactions due to the underlying nature of the data used to derive the behavioral response functions. Research shows that if mysticetes do respond they may react in a number of ways, depending on the characteristics of the sound source, their experience with the sound source, and whether they are migrating or on seasonal grounds (i.e., breeding or feeding). Behavioral reactions may include alerting, breaking off feeding dives and surfacing, or diving or swimming away. Overall, mysticetes have been observed to be more reactive to acoustic disturbance when a noise sources is located directly on their migration route. Mysticetes disturbed while migrating could pause their migration or route around the disturbance. Animals disturbed while engaged in other activities such as feeding or reproductive behaviors may be more likely to ignore or tolerate the disturbance and continue their natural behavior

patterns. Therefore, behavioral reactions from mysticetes are likely to be short-term and low to moderate severity.

Some mysticetes may avoid larger activities such as a major training exercise as it moves through an area. Vessels and aircraft associated with training or testing activities are typically in transit during an event (they are not stationary) and activities typically do not use the same training locations day after day during multi-day activities. If an event otherwise focuses on a fixed location, mysticetes may avoid the location of the activity for the duration of the event. If animals are displaced, they would likely return quickly after the event subsides. It is unlikely that most mysticetes would encounter a major training exercise more than once per year. In the ocean, the use of sonar and other transducers is transient and is unlikely to expose the same population of animals repeatedly over a short period except around homeports and fixed instrumented ranges. Overall, a few behavioral reactions per year by a single individual are unlikely to produce long-term consequences for that individual.

Behavioral research indicates that mysticetes most likely avoid sound sources at levels that would cause any hearing loss (i.e., TTS) (Section 3.4.2.1.1.5, Behavioral Reactions). Therefore, it is likely that the quantitative analysis overestimates TTS in marine mammals because it does not account for animals avoiding sound sources at closer ranges. Mysticetes that do experience PTS or TTS from sonar sounds may have reduced ability to detect biologically important sounds around the frequency band of the sonar until their hearing recovers. Recovery from hearing loss begins almost immediately after the noise exposure ceases and can take a few minutes to a few days to fully recover, depending on the magnitude of the initial threshold shift. TTS would be recoverable and PTS would leave some residual hearing loss. Most TTS, if it does actually occur, would be more likely to be minor to moderate (i.e., less than 20 dB of TTS directly after the exposure) and would recover within a matter of minutes to hours (Section 3.4.2.1.1.2, Hearing Loss). Threshold shifts do not necessarily affect all hearing frequencies equally, and typically manifest themselves at the exposure frequency or within an octave above the exposure frequency. During the period that a mysticete had hearing loss, social calls from conspecifics could be more difficult to detect or interpret if they fell in the octave band of the sonar frequency. Killer whales are a primary predator of mysticetes. Some hearing loss could make killer whale calls more difficult to detect at farther ranges until hearing recovers. It is unclear how or if mysticetes use sound for finding prey or feeding; therefore, it is unknown whether hearing loss would affect a mysticete's ability to locate prey or rate of feeding. A single or even a few minor TTS (less than 20 dB of TTS) to an individual mysticete per year are unlikely to have any long-term consequences for that individual.

Research and observations of masking in marine mammals are discussed in Section 3.4.2.1.1.4 (Masking). Most anti-submarine warfare sonars and countermeasures use mid-frequency ranges and a few use low-frequency ranges. Most of these sonar signals are limited in the temporal, frequency, and spatial domains. The duration of most individual sounds is short, lasting up to a few seconds each. Some systems operate with higher duty cycles or nearly continuously, but typically use lower power. Nevertheless, masking may be more prevalent at closer ranges to these high-duty cycle and continuous active sonar systems. Most anti-submarine warfare activities are geographically dispersed and last for only a few hours, often with intermittent sonar use even within this period. Most anti-submarine warfare sonars also have a narrow frequency band (typically less than one-third octave). These factors reduce the likelihood of sources causing significant masking in mysticetes. High-frequency sonars are typically used for mine hunting, navigation, and object detection (avoidance). High-frequency (greater than 10 kHz) sonars fall outside of the best hearing and vocalization ranges of mysticetes (see Section 3.4.1.6, Hearing and Vocalization). Furthermore, high frequencies (above 10 kHz) attenuate more rapidly

in the water due to absorption than do lower frequency signals, thus producing only a small zone of potential masking. Masking in mysticetes due to exposure to high-frequency sonar is unlikely. Potential costs to mysticetes from masking are similar to those discussed above for mild to moderate levels of TTS, with the primary difference being that the effects of masking are only present when the sound source (i.e., sonar) is actively pinging and the effect is over the moment the sound has ceased. By contrast, hearing loss lasts beyond the exposure for a period. Nevertheless, mysticetes that do experience some masking for a short period from low- or mid-frequency sonar may have their ability to communicate with conspecifics reduced, especially at further ranges. However, larger mysticetes (e.g., blue whale, fin whale, sei whale) communicate at frequencies below those of mid-frequency sonar and even most low-frequency sonars. Mysticetes that communicate at higher frequencies (e.g., minke whale) may be affected by some short-term and intermittent masking. Sounds from mid-frequency sonar could mask killer whale vocalizations making them more difficult to detect, especially at further ranges. It is unknown whether masking would affect a mysticete's ability to feed since it is unclear how or if mysticetes use sound for finding prey or feeding. A single or even a few short periods of masking, if it were to occur, to an individual mysticete per year are unlikely to have any long-term consequences for that individual.

Many activities such as submarine under ice certification and most mine hunting exercises use only high-frequency sonars that are not within mysticetes' hearing range; therefore, there were no predicted effects. Section 3.4.1.6 (Hearing and Vocalization) discusses low-frequency cetacean (i.e., mysticetes) hearing abilities.


Blue Whale (Endangered Species Act-Listed)

Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers Under Alternative 1 for Training and Testing Activities

Blue whales may be exposed to sounds from sonar and other transducers associated with training and testing activities in the Study Area during the winter, when they are expected to be present (although few in number). The quantitative analysis estimates behavioral reactions and TTS during training and testing activities under Alternative 1 (Figure 3.4-11 and Table 3.4-15). Impact ranges for this species are discussed in Section 3.4.2.1.2.2 (Impact Ranges for Sonar and Other Transducers). For mysticetes, even a few minor to moderate TTS or behavioral reactions to an individual over the course of a year are unlikely to have any significant costs or long-term consequences for that individual. Considering these factors and the mitigation measures that will be implemented as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), long-term consequences for the species would not be expected.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of sonar and other transducers during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 1 would result in the unintentional taking of blue whales incidental to those activities.

Pursuant to the ESA, the use of sonar and other transducers during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 1 may affect ESA-listed blue whales.



Notes: (1) Region and Activity Category bar charts show categories +/- 0.5 percent of the estimated impacts, which could result in a total of 98–101 percent. The model is probabilistic and therefore a single impact could be divided among multiple regions or activity categories. (2) MIRC = Mariana Islands Range Complex

Figure 3.4-11: Blue Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1

Table 3.4-15: Estimated Impacts on Individual Blue Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1

Estimated Impacts by Effect		
Behavioral	***TTS***	***PTS***
4	19	0


Note: Estimated impacts are based on the maximum number of activities in a given year under Alternative 1.

Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers Under Alternative 2 for Training and Testing Activities

Blue whales may be exposed to sounds from sonar and other transducers associated with training and testing activities in the Study Area during the winter, when they are expected to be present (although few in number). The quantitative analysis estimates behavioral reactions and TTS under Alternative 2 during training and testing activities (Figure 3.4-12 and Table 3.4-16). Impact ranges for this species are discussed in Section 3.4.2.1.2.2 (Impact Ranges for Sonar and Other Transducers). Potential impacts under Alternative 2 from sonar and other transducers would be similar in type as Alternative 1, although the numbers of impacts would increase slightly based on the increase in sonar use associated with training and testing activities under Alternative 2.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of sonar and other transducers during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 2 would result in the unintentional taking of blue whales incidental to those activities. The Navy is requesting authorization from NMFS as required by Section 101(a)(5)(A) of the MMPA.

Pursuant to the ESA, the use of sonar and other transducers during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 2 may affect ESA-listed blue whales. The Navy is consulting with NMFS as required by Section 7(a)(2) of the ESA.



Notes: (1) Region and Activity Category bar charts show categories +/- 0.5 percent of the estimated impacts, which could result in a total of 98–101 percent. The model is probabilistic and therefore a single impact could be divided among multiple regions or activity categories. (2) MIRC = Mariana Islands Range Complex

Figure 3.4-12: Blue Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2

Table 3.4-16: Estimated Impacts on Individual Blue Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2

Estimated Impacts by Effect		
Behavioral	***TTS***	***PTS***
4	20	0

Note: Estimated impacts are based on the maximum number of activities in a given year under Alternative 2.


Bryde's Whale

Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers Under Alternative 1 for Training and Testing Activities

Bryde's whales may be exposed to sounds from sonar and other transducers associated with training and testing activities throughout the year. The quantitative analysis estimates behavioral reactions and TTS under Alternative 1 during training and testing activities (Figure 3.4-13 and Table 3.4-17). Impact

ranges for this species are discussed in Section 3.4.2.1.2.2 (Impact Ranges for Sonar and Other Transducers). As described for mysticetes above, even a few minor to moderate TTS or behavioral reactions to an individual over the course of a year are unlikely to have any significant costs or long-term consequences for that individual. Considering these factors and the mitigation measures that will be implemented as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), long-term consequences for the species would not be expected.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of sonar and other transducers during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 1 would result in the unintentional taking of Bryde's whales incidental to those activities.



Notes: (1) Region and Activity Category bar charts show categories +/- 0.5 percent of the estimated impacts, which could result in a total of 98–101 percent. The model is probabilistic and therefore a single impact could be divided among multiple regions or activity categories. (2) MIRC = Mariana Islands Range Complex

Figure 3.4-13: Bryde's Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1

Table 3.4-17: Estimated Impacts on Individual Bryde's Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1


Estimated Impacts by Effect		
Behavioral	***TTS***	***PTS***
33	236	0

Note: Estimated impacts are based on the maximum number of activities in a given year under Alternative 1.

Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers Under Alternative 2 for Training and Testing Activities

Bryde's whales may be exposed to sounds from sonar and other transducers associated with training and testing activities throughout the year. The quantitative analysis estimates behavioral reactions and TTS under Alternative 2 during training and testing activities (Figure 3.4-14 and Table 3.4-18). Impact ranges for this species are discussed in Section 3.4.2.1.2.2 (Impact Ranges for Sonar and Other Transducers). Potential impacts under Alternative 2 from sonar and other transducers would be similar in type as for Alternative 1, although the numbers of impacts would increase slightly based on the slight increase in sonar use associated with training and testing activities under Alternative 2.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of sonar and other transducers during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 2 would result in the unintentional taking of Bryde's whales incidental to those activities. The Navy is requesting authorization from NMFS as required by Section 101(a)(5)(A) of the MMPA.



Notes: (1) Region and Activity Category bar charts show categories +/- 0.5 percent of the estimated impacts, which could result in a total of 98–101 percent. The model is probabilistic and therefore a single impact could be divided among multiple regions or activity categories. (2) MIRC = Mariana Islands Range Complex

Figure 3.4-14: Bryde's Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2

Table 3.4-18: Estimated Impacts on Individual Bryde's Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2

Estimated Impacts by Effect		
Behavioral	***TTS***	***PTS***
36	256	0

Note: Estimated impacts are based on the maximum number of activities in a given year under Alternative 2.


Fin Whale (Endangered Species Act-Listed)

Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers Under Alternative 1 for Training and Testing Activities

Fin whales may be exposed to sounds from sonar and other transducers associated with training and testing activities when fin whales occur in the Study Area. Based on available habitat use information, fin whales may be present in the Study Area fall through spring (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2019). The quantitative analysis estimates behavioral reactions and TTS under Alternative 1 during training and testing activities (Figure 3.4-15 and Table 3.4-19). Impact ranges for this species are discussed in Section 3.4.2.1.2.2 (Impact Ranges for Sonar and Other Transducers). As described for mysticetes above, even a few minor to moderate TTS or behavioral reactions to an individual over the course of a year are unlikely to have any significant costs or long-term consequences for that individual. Considering these factors and the mitigation measures that will be implemented as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), long-term consequences for the species would not be expected.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of sonar and other transducers during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 1 would result in the unintentional taking of fin whales incidental to those activities.

Pursuant to the ESA, the use of sonar and other transducers during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 1 may affect ESA-listed fin whales.



Notes: (1) Region and Activity Category bar charts show categories +/- 0.5 percent of the estimated impacts, which could result in a total of 98–101 percent. The model is probabilistic and therefore a single impact could be divided among multiple regions or activity categories. (2) MIRC = Mariana Islands Range Complex

Figure 3.4-15: Fin Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1

Table 3.4-19: Estimated Impacts on Individual Fin Whale Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1

Estimated Impacts by Effect		
Behavioral	***TTS***	***PTS***
4	18	0


Note: Estimated impacts are based on the maximum number of activities in a given year under Alternative 1.

Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers Under Alternative 2 for Training and Testing Activities

Fin whales may be exposed to sounds from sonar and other transducers associated with training and testing activities from fall through spring, when fin whales may occur in the Study Area (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2019). The quantitative analysis estimates behavioral reactions and TTS under Alternative 2 during training and testing activities (Figure 3.4-16 and Table 3.4-20). Potential impacts under Alternative 2 from sonar and other transducers would be similar in type as for Alternative 1, although the numbers of impacts would increase slightly based on the slight increase in sonar use associated with training and testing activities under Alternative 2.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of sonar and other transducers during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 2 would result in the unintentional taking of fin whales incidental to those activities. The Navy is requesting authorization from NMFS as required by Section 101(a)(5)(A) of the MMPA.

Pursuant to the ESA, the use of sonar and other transducers during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 2 may affect ESA-listed fin whales. The Navy is consulting with NMFS as required by Section 7(a)(2) of the ESA.



Notes: (1) Region and Activity Category bar charts show categories +/- 0.5 percent of the estimated impacts, which could result in a total of 98–101 percent. The model is probabilistic and therefore a single impact could be divided among multiple regions or activity categories. (2) MIRC = Mariana Islands Range Complex

Figure 3.4-16: Fin Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2

Table 3.4-20: Estimated Impacts on Individual Fin Whale Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2

Estimated Impacts by Effect		
Behavioral	***TTS***	***PTS***
5	20	0

Note: Estimated impacts are based on the maximum number of activities in a given year under Alternative 2.


Humpback Whale (Endangered Species Act-Listed)

Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers Under Alternative 1 for Training and Testing Activities

Humpback whales may be exposed to sounds from sonar and other transducers associated with training and testing activities throughout the year. The quantitative analysis estimates behavioral reactions and TTS under Alternative 1 during training and testing activities (Figure 3.4-17 and Table 3.4-21). Impact ranges for this species are discussed in Section 3.4.2.1.2.2 (Impact Ranges for Sonar and Other Transducers). As described for mysticetes above, even a few minor to moderate TTS or behavioral reactions to an individual over the course of a year are unlikely to have any significant costs or long-term consequences for that individual. Considering these factors and the mitigation measures that will be implemented as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), long-term consequences for the species would not be expected.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of sonar and other transducers during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 1 would result in the unintentional taking of humpback whales incidental to those activities.

Pursuant to the ESA, the use of sonar and other transducers during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 1 may affect ESA-listed humpback whales.



Notes: (1) Region and Activity Category bar charts show categories +/- 0.5 percent of the estimated impacts, which could result in a total of 98–101 percent. The model is probabilistic and therefore a single impact could be divided among multiple regions or activity categories. (2) MIRC = Mariana Islands Range Complex

Figure 3.4-17: Humpback Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1

Table 3.4-21: Estimated Impacts on Individual Humpback Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1

Estimated Impacts by Effect		
Behavioral	***TTS***	***PTS***
46	387	0


Note: Estimated impacts are based on the maximum number of activities in a given year under Alternative 1.

Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers Under Alternative 2 for Training and Testing Activities

Humpback whales may be exposed to sounds from sonar and other transducers associated with training and testing activities throughout the year. The quantitative analysis estimates behavioral reactions and TTS under Alternative 2 during training and testing activities (Figure 3.4-18 and Table 3.4-22). Impact ranges for this species are discussed in Section 3.4.2.1.2.2 (Impact Ranges for Sonar and Other Transducers). Potential impacts under Alternative 2 from sonar and other transducers would be similar in type as for Alternative 1, although the numbers of impacts would increase slightly based on the slight increase in sonar use associated with training and testing activities under Alternative 2.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of sonar and other transducers during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 2 would result in the unintentional taking of humpback whales incidental to those activities. The Navy is requesting authorization from NMFS as required by Section 101(a)(5)(A) of the MMPA.

Pursuant to the ESA, the use of sonar and other transducers during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 2 may affect ESA-listed humpback whales. The Navy is consulting with NMFS as required by Section 7(a)(2) of the ESA.



Notes: (1) Region and Activity Category bar charts show categories +/- 0.5 percent of the estimated impacts, which could result in a total of 98–101 percent. The model is probabilistic and therefore a single impact could be divided among multiple regions or activity categories. (2) MIRC = Mariana Islands Range Complex

Figure 3.4-18: Humpback Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2

Table 3.4-22:Estimated Impacts on Individual Humpback Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2

Estimated Impacts by Effect		
Behavioral	***TTS***	***PTS***
51	419	0


Note: Estimated impacts are based on the maximum number of activities in a given year under Alternative 2.

Minke Whale

Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers Under Alternative 1 for Training and Testing Activities

Minke whales may be exposed to sounds from sonar and other transducers associated with training and testing activities throughout the year. The quantitative analysis estimates behavioral reactions and TTS under Alternative 1 during training and testing activities (Figure 3.4-19 and Table 3.4-23). Impact ranges for this species are discussed in Section 3.4.2.1.2.2 (Impact Ranges for Sonar and Other Transducers). As described for mysticetes above, even a few minor to moderate TTS or behavioral reactions to an individual over the course of a year are unlikely to have any significant costs or long-term consequences for that individual. Considering these factors and the mitigation measures that will be implemented as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), long-term consequences for the species would not be expected.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of sonar and other transducers during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 1 would result in the unintentional taking of minke whales incidental to those activities.



Notes: (1) Region and Activity Category bar charts show categories +/- 0.5 percent of the estimated impacts, which could result in a total of 98–101 percent. The model is probabilistic and therefore a single impact could be divided among multiple regions or activity categories. (2) MIRC = Mariana Islands Range Complex

Figure 3.4-19: Minke Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1

Table 3.4-23: Estimated Impacts on Individual Minke Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1


Estimated Impacts by Effect		
Behavioral	***TTS***	***PTS***
8	78	0

Note: Estimated impacts are based on the maximum number of activities in a given year under Alternative 1.

Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers Under Alternative 2 for Training and Testing Activities

Minke whales may be exposed to sounds from sonar and other transducers associated with training and testing activities throughout the year. The quantitative analysis estimates behavioral reactions and TTS under Alternative 2 during training and testing activities (Figure 3.4-20 and Table 3.4-24). Impact ranges for this species are discussed in Section 3.4.2.1.2.2 (Impact Ranges for Sonar and Other Transducers). Potential impacts under Alternative 2 from sonar and other transducers would be similar in type as for Alternative 1, although the numbers of impacts would increase slightly based on the slight increase in sonar use associated with training and testing activities under Alternative 2.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of sonar and other transducers during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 2 would result in the unintentional taking of minke whales incidental to those activities. The Navy is requesting authorization from NMFS as required by Section 101(a)(5)(A) of the MMPA.



Notes: (1) Region and Activity Category bar charts show categories +/- 0.5 percent of the estimated impacts, which could result in a total of 98–101 percent. The model is probabilistic and therefore a single impact could be divided among multiple regions or activity categories. (2) MIRC = Mariana Islands Range Complex

Figure 3.4-20: Minke Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2

Table 3.4-24: Estimated Impacts on Individual Minke Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2

Estimated Impacts by Effect		
Behavioral	***TTS***	***PTS***
9	84	0

Note: Estimated impacts are based on the maximum number of activities in a given year under Alternative 2.


Omura's Whale

Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers Under Alternative 1 for Training and Testing Activities

Omura's whales may be exposed to sounds from sonar and other transducers associated with training and testing activities throughout the year. The quantitative analysis estimates behavioral reactions and TTS under Alternative 1 during training and testing activities (Figure 3.4-21 and Table 3.4-25). Impact ranges for this species are discussed in Section 3.4.2.1.2.2 (Impact Ranges for Sonar and Other Transducers). As described for mysticetes above, even a few minor to moderate TTS or behavioral reactions to an individual over the course of a year are unlikely to have any significant costs or long-term

consequences for that individual. Considering these factors and the mitigation measures that will be implemented as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), long-term consequences for the species would not be expected.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of sonar and other transducers during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 1 would result in the unintentional taking of Omura's whales incidental to those activities.



Notes: (1) Region and Activity Category bar charts show categories +/- 0.5 percent of the estimated impacts, which could result in a total of 98–101 percent. The model is probabilistic and therefore a single impact could be divided among multiple regions or activity categories. (2) MIRC = Mariana Islands Range Complex

Figure 3.4-21: Omura's Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1

Table 3.4-25: Estimated Impacts on Individual Omura's Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1

Estimated Impacts by Effect		
Behavioral	***TTS***	***PTS***
3	23	0


Note: Estimated impacts are based on the maximum number of activities in a given year under Alternative 1.

Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers Under Alternative 2 for Training and Testing Activities

Omura's whales may be exposed to sounds from sonar and other transducers associated with training and testing activities throughout the year. The quantitative analysis estimates behavioral reactions and TTS under Alternative 2 during training and testing activities (Figure 3.4-22 and Table 3.4-26). Impact ranges for this species are discussed in Section 3.4.2.1.2.2 (Impact Ranges for Sonar and Other Transducers). Potential impacts under Alternative 2 from sonar and other transducers would be similar

in type as for Alternative 1, although the numbers of impacts would increase slightly based on the slight increase in sonar use associated with training and testing activities under Alternative 2.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of sonar and other transducers during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 2 would result in the unintentional taking of Omura's whales incidental to those activities. The Navy is requesting authorization from NMFS as required by Section 101(a)(5)(A) of the MMPA.



Notes: (1) Region and Activity Category bar charts show categories +/- 0.5 percent of the estimated impacts, which could result in a total of 98–101 percent. The model is probabilistic and therefore a single impact could be divided among multiple regions or activity categories. (2) MIRC = Mariana Islands Range Complex

Figure 3.4-22: Omura's Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2

Table 3.4-26: Estimated Impacts on Individual Omura's Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2

Estimated Impacts by Effect		
Behavioral	***TTS***	***PTS***
3	25	0

Note: Estimated impacts are based on the maximum number of activities in a given year under Alternative 2.

Sei Whale (Endangered Species Act-Listed)


Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers Under Alternative 1 for Training and Testing Activities

Sei whales may be exposed to sounds from sonar and other transducers associated with training and testing activities throughout the year. The quantitative analysis estimates behavioral reactions and TTS under Alternative 1 during training and testing activities (Figure 3.4-23 and Table 3.4-27). Impact ranges

for this species are discussed in Section 3.4.2.1.2.2 (Impact Ranges for Sonar and Other Transducers). As described for mysticetes above, even a few minor to moderate TTS or behavioral reactions to an individual over the course of a year are unlikely to have any significant costs or long-term consequences for that individual. Considering these factors and the mitigation measures that will be implemented as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), long-term consequences for the species would not be expected.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of sonar and other transducers during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 1 would result in the unintentional taking of sei whales incidental to those activities.

Pursuant to the ESA, the use of sonar and other transducers during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 1 may affect ESA-listed sei whales.



Notes: (1) Region and Activity Category bar charts show categories +/- 0.5 percent of the estimated impacts, which could result in a total of 98–101 percent. The model is probabilistic and therefore a single impact could be divided among multiple regions or activity categories. (2) MIRC = Mariana Islands Range Complex

Figure 3.4-23: Sei Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1

Table 3.4-27: Estimated Impacts on Individual Sei Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1

Estimated Impacts by Effect		
Behavioral	***TTS***	***PTS***
15	125	0


Note: Estimated impacts are based on the maximum number of activities in a given year under Alternative 1.

Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers Under Alternative 2 for Training and Testing Activities

Sei whales may be exposed to sounds from sonar and other transducers associated with training and testing activities throughout the year. The quantitative analysis estimates behavioral reactions and TTS under Alternative 2 during training and testing activities (Figure 3.4-24 and Table 3.4-28). Impact ranges for this species are discussed in Section 3.4.2.1.2.2 (Impact Ranges for Sonar and Other Transducers). Potential impacts under Alternative 2 from sonar and other transducers would be similar in type as for Alternative 1, although the numbers of impacts would increase slightly based on the slight increase in sonar use associated with training and testing activities under Alternative 2.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of sonar and other transducers during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 2 would result in the unintentional taking of sei whales incidental to those activities. The Navy is requesting authorization from NMFS as required by Section 101(a)(5)(A) of the MMPA.

Pursuant to the ESA, the use of sonar and other transducers during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 2 may affect ESA-listed sei whales. The Navy is consulting with NMFS as required by Section 7(a)(2) of the ESA.



Notes: (1) Region and Activity Category bar charts show categories +/- 0.5 percent of the estimated impacts, which could result in a total of 98–101 percent. The model is probabilistic and therefore a single impact could be divided among multiple regions or activity categories. (2) MIRC = Mariana Islands Range Complex

Figure 3.4-24: Sei Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2

Table 3.4-28: Estimated Impacts on Individual Sei Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2

Estimated Impacts by Effect		
Behavioral	***TTS***	***PTS***
17	135	0

Note: Estimated impacts are based on the maximum number of activities in a given year under Alternative 2.

Odontocetes

Odontocetes may be exposed to sound from sonar and other transducers associated with training and testing activities throughout the year. Low- (less than 1 kHz), mid- (1–10 kHz), high-frequency (10–100 kHz), and very high-frequency (100–200 kHz) sonars produce sounds that are likely to be within the audible range of odontocetes (see Section 3.4.1.6, Hearing and Vocalization). If a sound is within an animal's hearing range then behavioral reactions, physiological stress, masking and hearing loss are potential impacts that must be analyzed. If a marine mammal cannot hear a sound, then behavioral reactions, physiological stress, masking, or hearing loss could not occur. Impact ranges for odontocetes are discussed under mid-frequency cetaceans in Section 3.4.2.1.2 (Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducer Stressors).

Behavioral reactions in odontocetes (except beaked whales) resulting from exposure to sonar could take place at distances of up to 20 km. Beaked whales have demonstrated a high level of sensitivity to human-made noise and activity; therefore, the quantitative analysis assumes that some beaked whales could experience significant behavioral reactions at a distance of up to 50 km from the sound source. Behavioral reactions, however, are much more likely within a few kilometers of the sound source for most species of odontocetes such as delphinids and sperm whales. Even for beaked whales, as discussed above in *Assessing the Severity of Behavioral Responses from Sonar*, the quantitative analysis has very likely overestimated the numbers of behavioral reactions due to the underlying nature of the data used to derive the behavioral response functions.

Research shows that if odontocetes do respond they may react in a number of ways, depending on the characteristics of the sound source and their experience with the sound source. Behavioral reactions may include alerting; breaking off feeding dives and surfacing; or diving or swimming away. Animals disturbed while engaged in other activities such as feeding or reproductive behaviors may be more likely to ignore or tolerate the disturbance and continue their natural behavior patterns. Therefore, most behavioral reactions from odontocetes are likely to be short-term and low to moderate severity.

Large odontocetes such as killer whales and pilot whales have been the subject of behavioral response studies (see Section 3.4.2.1.1.5, Behavioral Reactions). Based on these studies, a number of reactions could occur such as a short-term cessation of natural behavior such as feeding, avoidance of the sound source, or even attraction towards the sound source as seen in pilot whales. Due to the factors involved in Navy training exercises versus the conditions under which pilot whales and killer whales were exposed during behavioral response studies, large odontocetes are unlikely to have more than short-term and moderate severity reactions to sounds from sonar or other human disturbance, and typically only at ranges within a few kilometers. Most estimated impacts are due to anti-submarine warfare

activities, which could vary in duration and intensity. Anti-submarine warfare unit-level exercises and maintenance typically last for a matter of a few hours and involves a limited amount of sonar use so significant responses would be less likely than with longer and more intense exercises (more sonar systems and vessels). Coordinated/integrated anti-submarine warfare exercises involve multiple sonar systems and can last for a period of days, making a significant response more likely. A single or few short-lived TTS or behavioral reactions per year are unlikely to have any significant costs or long-term consequences for individuals.

Small odontocetes have been the subject of behavioral response studies and observations in the field (see Section 3.4.2.1.1.5, Behavioral Reactions). Based on these studies, small odontocetes (dolphins) appear to be less sensitive to sound and human disturbance than other cetacean species. If reactions did occur, they could consist of a short-term behavior response such as cessation of feeding, avoidance of the sound source, or even attraction towards the sound source. Small odontocetes are unlikely to have more than short-term and moderate severity reactions to sounds from sonar or other human disturbance, and typically only at ranges within a few kilometers. Most estimated impacts are due to anti-submarine warfare activities, which could vary in duration and intensity. Anti-submarine warfare unit-level exercises and maintenance typically last for a matter of a few hours and involve a limited amount of sonar use so significant responses would be less likely than with longer and more intense exercises (more sonar systems and vessels). Coordinated/integrated anti-submarine warfare exercises involve multiple sonar systems and can last for a period of days, making significant response more likely. Some bottlenose dolphin estimated impacts could also occur due to navigation and object avoidance (detection) since these activities typically occur entering and leaving Navy homeports that overlap the distribution of coastal populations of this species. Navigation and object avoidance (detection) activities normally involve a single ship or submarine using a limited amount of sonar, therefore significant reactions are unlikely. A single or few short-lived TTS or behavioral reactions per year are unlikely to have any significant costs or long-term consequences for individuals.

Some odontocetes may avoid larger activities such as a major training exercise as it moves through an area. Vessels and aircraft associated with training or testing activities are typically in transit during an event (they are not stationary) and activities typically do not use the same training locations day-after-day during multi-day activities. If an event otherwise focuses on a fixed location, sensitive species of odontocetes, such as beaked whales, may avoid the location of the activity for the duration of the event. Section 3.4.2.1.1.5 (Behavioral Reactions) discusses these species' observed reactions to sonar and other transducers. If animals are displaced, they would likely return after the sonar activity subsides within an area, as seen in Blainville's beaked whales in the Bahamas (Tyack et al., 2011) and Hawaii (Henderson et al., 2015; Henderson et al., 2016; Manzano-Roth et al., 2016). This would allow the animal to recover from any energy expenditure or missed resources, reducing the likelihood of long-term consequences for the individual. It is unlikely that most individuals would encounter a major training exercise more than once per year due to where these activities are typically conducted. Outside of Navy instrumented ranges and homeports, the use of sonar and other transducers is transient and is unlikely to expose the same population of animals repeatedly over a short period. However, a few behavioral reactions per year from a single individual are unlikely to produce long-term consequences for that individual.

Behavioral research indicates that most odontocetes avoid sound sources at levels that would cause any temporary hearing loss (i.e., TTS) (see Section 3.4.2.1.1.5, Behavioral Reactions). TTS and even PTS is more likely for high-frequency cetaceans, such as Kogia whales, because hearing loss thresholds for these animals are lower than for all other marine mammals. These species have demonstrated a high

level of sensitivity to human-made sound and activities and may avoid at further distances. This increased distance could avoid or minimize hearing loss for these species as well, especially as compared to the estimates from the quantitative analysis. Therefore, it is likely that the quantitative analysis overestimates TTS and PTS in marine mammals because it does not account for animals avoiding sound sources at closer ranges. Recovery from hearing loss begins almost immediately after the noise exposure ceases and can take a few minutes to a few days to fully recover, depending on the magnitude of the initial threshold shift. TTS would be recoverable and PTS would leave some residual hearing loss. Most TTS, if it does actually occur, would be more likely to be minor to moderate (i.e., less than 20 dB of TTS directly after the exposure) and would recover within a matter of minutes to hours. Threshold shifts do not necessarily affect all hearing frequencies equally, and typically manifest themselves at the exposure frequency or within an octave above the exposure frequency. During the period that an odontocete had hearing loss, social calls from conspecifics could be more difficult to detect or interpret. Killer whales are a primary predator of odontocetes. Some hearing loss could make killer whale calls more difficult to detect at further ranges until hearing recovers. Odontocetes use echolocation clicks to find and capture prey. These echolocation clicks and vocalizations are at frequencies above a few tens of kHz for delphinids, beaked whales, and sperm whales, and above 100 kHz for Kogia whales. Therefore, echolocation associated with feeding and navigation in odontocetes is unlikely to be affected by threshold shift at lower frequencies and should not have any significant effect on an odontocete's ability to locate prey or navigate, even in the short-term. Therefore, a single or even a few minor TTS (less than 20 dB of TTS) to an individual odontocete per year are unlikely to have any long-term consequences for that individual. Minor PTS (a few dB or less) in an individual could have no to minor long-term consequences for individuals.

Research and observations of masking in marine mammals are discussed in Section 3.4.2.1.1.4 (Masking). Many anti-submarine warfare sonars and countermeasures use low- and mid-frequency sonar. Most low- and mid-frequency sonar signals (i.e., sounds) are limited in their temporal, frequency, and spatial domains. The duration of most individual sounds is short, lasting up to a few seconds each. Some systems operate with higher duty cycles or nearly continuously, but typically use lower power. Nevertheless, masking may be more prevalent at closer ranges to these high-duty cycle and continuous active sonar systems. Most anti-submarine warfare activities are geographically dispersed and last for only a few hours, often with intermittent sonar use even within this period. Most anti-submarine warfare sonars also have a narrow frequency band (typically much less than one-third octave). These factors reduce the likelihood of sources causing significant masking in odontocetes due to exposure to sonar used during anti-submarine warfare activities. Odontocetes may experience some limited masking at closer ranges from high-frequency sonars and other transducers; however, the frequency band of the sonar is narrow, limiting the likelihood of masking. High-frequency sonars are typically used for mine hunting, navigation, and object detection (avoidance). Potential costs to odontocetes from masking are similar to those discussed above for mild to moderate levels of TTS, with the primary difference being that the effects of masking are only present when the sound source (i.e., sonar) is actively pinging and the effect is over the moment the sound has ceased.

Nevertheless, odontocetes that do experience some masking from sonar or other transducers may have their ability to communicate with conspecifics reduced, especially at further ranges. Sounds from mid-frequency sonar could mask killer whale vocalizations making them more difficult to detect, especially at further ranges. As discussed above for TTS, odontocetes use echolocation to find prey and navigate. The echolocation clicks of odontocetes are above the frequencies of most sonar systems, especially those used during anti-submarine warfare. Therefore, echolocation associated with feeding and navigation in

odontocetes is unlikely to be masked by sounds from sonars or other transducers. A single or even a few short periods of masking, if it were to occur, to an individual odontocete per year are unlikely to have any long-term consequences for that individual.

Beaked Whales

Beaked whales within the Study Area include: Blainville's beaked whale, Cuvier's beaked whale, ginkgo-toothed beaked whale, and Longman's beaked whale. As discussed above for odontocetes overall, the quantitative analysis overestimates hearing loss in marine mammals because behavioral response research has shown that most marine mammals are likely to avoid sound levels that could cause more than minor to moderate TTS (6–20 dB). Specifically for beaked whales, behavioral response research discussed below and in Section 3.4.2.1.1.5 (Behavioral Reactions) has demonstrated that beaked whales are sensitive to sound from sonars and usually avoid sound sources by 10 or more kilometers. These are well beyond the ranges to TTS for mid-frequency cetaceans such as beaked whales. Therefore, any TTS predicted by the quantitative analysis is unlikely to occur in beaked whales.

Research and observations (Section 3.4.2.1.1.5, Behavioral Reactions) show that if beaked whales are exposed to sonar or other transducers they may startle, break off feeding dives, and avoid the area of the sound source at levels ranging between 95 and 157 dB re 1 µPa (McCarthy et al., 2011). Furthermore, in research done at the Navy's fixed tracking range in the Bahamas and Hawaii, animals leave the immediate area of the anti-submarine warfare training exercise but return within a few days after the event ends (Henderson et al., 2015; Henderson et al., 2016; Manzano-Roth et al., 2016; Tyack et al., 2011). Populations of beaked whales and other odontocetes on Navy fixed ranges that have been operating for decades appear to be stable, and analysis is ongoing. Significant behavioral reactions seem likely in most cases if beaked whales are exposed to anti-submarine sonar within a few tens of kilometers, especially for prolonged periods (a few hours or more) since this is one of the most sensitive marine mammal groups to human-made sound of any species or group studied to date.

Based on the best available science, the Navy believes beaked whales that exhibit a significant behavioral reaction due to sonar and other transducers would generally not have long-term consequences for individuals or populations. However, because of a lack of scientific consensus regarding the causal link between sonar and stranding events, NMFS has stated in a letter to the Navy dated October 2006 that it "cannot conclude with certainty the degree to which mitigation measures would eliminate or reduce the potential for serious injury or mortality." The Navy does not anticipate that marine mammal strandings or mortality would result from the operation of sonar during Navy exercises within the Study Area. The Center for Naval Analysis conducted a statistical study of correlation of beaked whale strandings around the Mariana Islands with the use of U.S. Navy sonar, finding that no statistically significant correlation exists (Center for Naval Analysis, 2020); see Section 3.4.2.1.1.6 (Stranding).


As described in Section 5.1.2.2.1 (Marine Species Research and Monitoring Programs), for this Final SEIS/OEIS, the Navy agreed to several additional research and monitoring initiatives designed to help advance the understanding of beaked whales and strandings in the MITT Study Area. The Navy will co-fund the Pacific Marine Assessment Program for Protected Species (PACMAPPS) Mariana Islands survey in spring-summer 2021 and future studies starting in 2022 to help document beaked whale occurrence, abundance, and distribution in the Mariana Islands. The Navy will also fund additional stranding response and necropsy analyses for the Pacific Islands region, and research on a framework to improve statistical stranding analysis. Collaboratively with NMFS, the Navy will fund and organize an expert panel to provide recommendations on scientific data gaps and uncertainties for further protective measure

consideration to minimize potential impacts of Navy training and testing activities on beaked whales in the Mariana Islands. Additionally, through the MMPA process (which allows for adaptive management), NMFS and the Navy will determine the appropriate way to proceed in the event that a causal relationship were to be found between Navy activities and a future stranding.

Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers Under Alternative 1 for Training and Testing Activities

Beaked whales may be exposed to sounds from sonar and other transducers associated with training and testing activities throughout the year. The quantitative analysis estimates behavioral reactions and TTS under Alternative 1 during training and testing activities (Figure 3.4-25 through Figure 3.4-28 and Table 3.4-29 through Table 3.4-32). Impact ranges for this species are discussed in Section 3.4.2.1.2.2 (Impact Ranges for Sonar and Other Transducers). As described for odontocetes above, even a few minor to moderate TTS or behavioral reactions to an individual over the course of a year are unlikely to have any significant costs or long-term consequences for that individual. Considering these factors and the mitigation measures that will be implemented as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), long-term consequences for the species would not be expected.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of sonar and other transducers during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 1 would result in the unintentional taking of Blainville's, Cuvier's, ginkgo-toothed, and Longman's beaked whales incidental to those activities.




Notes: (1) Region and Activity Category bar charts show categories +/- 0.5 percent of the estimated impacts, which could result in a total of 98–101 percent. The model is probabilistic and therefore a single impact could be divided among multiple regions or activity categories. (2) MIRC = Mariana Islands Range Complex

Figure 3.4-25: Blainville's Beaked Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1

Table 3.4-29: Estimated Impacts on Individual Blainville's Beaked Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1

Estimated Impacts by Effect		
Behavioral	***TTS***	***PTS***
1,557	26	0

Note: Estimated impacts are based on the maximum number of activities in a given year under Alternative 1.




Notes: (1) Region and Activity Category bar charts show categories +/- 0.5 percent of the estimated impacts, which could result in a total of 98–101 percent. The model is probabilistic and therefore a single impact could be divided among multiple regions or activity categories. (2) MIRC = Mariana Islands Range Complex

Figure 3.4-26: Cuvier's Beaked Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1

Table 3.4-30: Estimated Impacts on Individual Cuvier's Beaked Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1

Estimated Impacts by Effect		
Behavioral	***TTS***	***PTS***
600	4	0

Note: Estimated impacts are based on the maximum number of activities in a given year under Alternative 1.




Notes: (1) Region and Activity Category bar charts show categories +/- 0.5 percent of the estimated impacts, which could result in a total of 98–101 percent. The model is probabilistic and therefore a single impact could be divided among multiple regions or activity categories. (2) MIRC = Mariana Islands Range Complex

Figure 3.4-27: Ginkgo-Toothed Beaked Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1

Table 3.4-31: Estimated Impacts on Individual Ginkgo-Toothed Beaked Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1

Estimated Impacts by Effect		
Behavioral	***TTS***	***PTS***
3,373	63	0

Note: Estimated impacts are based on the maximum number of activities in a given year under Alternative 1.



Notes: (1) Region and Activity Category bar charts show categories +/- 0.5 percent of the estimated impacts, which could result in a total of 98–101 percent. The model is probabilistic and therefore a single impact could be divided among multiple regions or activity categories. (2) MIRC = Mariana Islands Range Complex

Figure 3.4-28: Longman's Beaked Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1

Table 3.4-32: Estimated Impacts on Individual Longman's Beaked Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1


Estimated Impacts by Effect		
Behavioral	***TTS***	***PTS***
5,483	103	0

Note: Estimated impacts are based on the maximum number of activities in a given year under Alternative 1.

Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers Under Alternative 2 for Training and Testing Activities

Beaked whales may be exposed to sounds from sonar and other transducers associated with training and testing activities throughout the year. The quantitative analysis estimates behavioral reactions and TTS under Alternative 2 during training and testing activities (Figure 3.4-29 through Figure 3.4-32 and Table 3.4-33 through Table 3.4-36). Impact ranges for this species are discussed in Section 3.4.2.1.2.2 (Impact Ranges for Sonar and Other Transducers). Potential impacts under Alternative 2 from sonar and other transducers would be similar in type as for Alternative 1, although the numbers of impacts would increase slightly based on the slight increase in sonar use associated with training and testing activities under Alternative 2.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of sonar and other transducers during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 2 would result in the unintentional taking of Blainville's, Cuvier's, ginkgo-toothed, and Longman's beaked whales incidental to those activities. The Navy is requesting authorization from NMFS as required by Section 101(a)(5)(A) of the MMPA.




Notes: (1) Region and Activity Category bar charts show categories +/- 0.5 percent of the estimated impacts, which could result in a total of 98–101 percent. The model is probabilistic and therefore a single impact could be divided among multiple regions or activity categories. (2) MIRC = Mariana Islands Range Complex

Figure 3.4-29: Blainville's Beaked Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2

Table 3.4-33: Estimated Impacts on Individual Blainville's Beaked Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2

Estimated Impacts by Effect		
Behavioral	***TTS***	***PTS***
1,691	27	0

Note: Estimated impacts are based on the maximum number of activities in a given year under Alternative 2.




Notes: (1) Region and Activity Category bar charts show categories +/- 0.5 percent of the estimated impacts, which could result in a total of 98–101 percent. The model is probabilistic and therefore a single impact could be divided among multiple regions or activity categories. (2) MIRC = Mariana Islands Range Complex

Figure 3.4-30: Cuvier's Beaked Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2

Table 3.4-34: Estimated Impacts on Individual Cuvier's Beaked Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2

Estimated Impacts by Effect		
Behavioral	***TTS***	***PTS***
642	4	0

Note: Estimated impacts are based on the maximum number of activities in a given year under Alternative 2.




Notes: (1) Region and Activity Category bar charts show categories +/- 0.5 percent of the estimated impacts, which could result in a total of 98–101 percent. The model is probabilistic and therefore a single impact could be divided among multiple regions or activity categories. (2) MIRC = Mariana Islands Range Complex

Figure 3.4-31: Ginkgo-Toothed Beaked Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2

Table 3.4-35: Estimated Impacts on Individual Ginkgo-Toothed Beaked Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2

Estimated Impacts by Effect		
Behavioral	***TTS***	***PTS***
3,659	65	0

Note: Estimated impacts are based on the maximum number of activities in a given year under Alternative 2.



Notes: (1) Region and Activity Category bar charts show categories +/- 0.5 percent of the estimated impacts, which could result in a total of 98–101 percent. The model is probabilistic and therefore a single impact could be divided among multiple regions or activity categories. (2) MIRC = Mariana Islands Range Complex

Figure 3.4-32: Longman's Beaked Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2

Table 3.4-36: Estimated Impacts on Individual Longman's Beaked Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2

Estimated Impacts by Effect		
Behavioral	***TTS***	***PTS***
5,958	106	0


Note: Estimated impacts are based on the maximum number of activities in a given year under Alternative 2.

Common Bottlenose Dolphin

Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers Under Alternative 1 for Training and Testing Activities

Bottlenose dolphins may be exposed to sounds from sonar and other transducers associated with training and testing activities throughout the year. The quantitative analysis estimates behavioral reactions and TTS under Alternative 1 during training and testing activities (Figure 3.4-33 and Table 3.4-37). Impact ranges for this species are discussed in Section 3.4.2.1.2.2 (Impact Ranges for Sonar and Other Transducers). As described for odontocetes above, even a few minor to moderate TTS or behavioral reactions to an individual over the course of a year are unlikely to have any significant costs or long-term consequences for that individual. Considering these factors and the mitigation measures that will be implemented as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), long-term consequences for the species would not be expected.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of sonar and other transducers during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 1 would result in the unintentional taking of bottlenose dolphins incidental to those activities.



Note: (1) Region and Activity Category bar charts show categories +/- 0.5 percent of the estimated impacts, which could result in a total of 98–101 percent. The model is probabilistic and therefore a single impact could be divided among multiple regions or activity categories. (2) MIRC = Mariana Islands Range Complex

Figure 3.4-33: Bottlenose Dolphin Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1

Table 3.4-37: Estimated Impacts on Individual Bottlenose Dolphins Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1


Estimated Impacts by Effect		
Behavioral	***TTS***	***PTS***
104	21	0

Note: Estimated impacts are based on the maximum number of activities in a given year under Alternative 1.

Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers Under Alternative 2 for Training and Testing Activities

Bottlenose dolphins may be exposed to sounds from sonar and other transducers associated with training and testing activities throughout the year. The quantitative analysis estimates behavioral reactions and TTS under Alternative 2 during training and testing activities (Figure 3.4-34 and Table 3.4-38). Impact ranges for this species are discussed in Section 3.4.2.1.2.2 (Impact Ranges for Sonar and Other Transducers). Potential impacts under Alternative 2 from sonar and other transducers would be similar in type as for Alternative 1, although the numbers of impacts would increase slightly based on the slight increase in sonar use associated with training and testing activities under Alternative 2.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of sonar and other transducers during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 2 would result in the unintentional taking of bottlenose dolphins incidental to those activities. The Navy is requesting authorization from NMFS as required by Section 101(a)(5)(A) of the MMPA.



Notes: (1) Region and Activity Category bar charts show categories +/- 0.5 percent of the estimated impacts, which could result in a total of 98–101 percent. The model is probabilistic and therefore a single impact could be divided among multiple regions or activity categories. (2) MIRC = Mariana Islands Range Complex

Figure 3.4-34: Bottlenose Dolphin Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2

Table 3.4-38: Estimated Impacts on Individual Bottlenose Dolphins Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2

Estimated Impacts by Effect		
Behavioral	***TTS***	***PTS***
116	21	0

Note: Estimated impacts are based on the maximum number of activities in a given year under Alternative 2.


Kogia Whales

Kogia whales include two species that are often difficult to distinguish from one another: dwarf sperm whales and pygmy sperm whales; however, impacts to the populations of dwarf and pygmy sperm whales are modeled separately. TTS and PTS thresholds for high-frequency cetaceans, such as Kogia whales are lower than for all other marine mammals, which leads to a higher number of estimated hearing loss impacts relative to the number of animals exposed to the sound as compared to other hearing groups (e.g., mid-frequency cetaceans).

Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers Under Alternative 1 for Training and Testing Activities

Kogia whales may be exposed to sounds from sonar and other transducers associated with training and testing activities throughout the year. The quantitative analysis estimates behavioral reactions, TTS, and PTS under Alternative 1 during training and testing activities (Figure 3.4-35, Figure 3.4-36, Table 3.4-39, and Table 3.4-40). Impact ranges for this species are discussed in Section 3.4.2.1.2.2 (Impact Ranges for Sonar and Other Transducers). As described for odontocetes above, even a few minor to moderate TTS or behavioral reactions to an individual over the course of a year are unlikely to have any significant costs or long-term consequences for that individual. PTS could reduce an animal's ability to detect biologically important sounds; however, as discussed above, a small threshold shift due to exposure to sonar is unlikely to affect the hearing range that Kogia whales rely upon. Nevertheless, PTS could have minor long-term consequences for individuals. This minor consequence for an individual is unlikely to have any long-term consequences for the species. Considering these factors and the mitigation measures that will be implemented as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), long-term consequences for the species would not be expected.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of sonar and other transducers during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 1 would result in the unintentional taking of Kogia whales (i.e., dwarf and pygmy sperm whales) incidental to those activities.




Notes: (1) Region and Activity Category bar charts show categories +/- 0.5 percent of the estimated impacts, which could result in a total of 98–101 percent. The model is probabilistic and therefore a single impact could be divided among multiple regions or activity categories. (2) MIRC = Mariana Islands Range Complex

Figure 3.4-35: Dwarf Sperm Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1

Table 3.4-39: Estimated Impacts on Individual Dwarf Sperm Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1

Estimated Impacts by Effect		
Behavioral	***TTS***	***PTS***
1,186	6,434	28

Note: Estimated impacts are based on the maximum number of activities in a given year under Alternative 1.



Notes: (1) Region and Activity Category bar charts show categories +/- 0.5 percent of the estimated impacts, which could result in a total of 98–101 percent. The model is probabilistic and therefore a single impact could be divided among multiple regions or activity categories. (2) MIRC = Mariana Islands Range Complex

Figure 3.4-36: Pygmy Sperm Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1

Table 3.4-40: Estimated Impacts on Individual Pygmy Sperm Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1


Estimated Impacts by Effect		
Behavioral	***TTS***	***PTS***
465	2,595	11

Note: Estimated impacts are based on the maximum number of activities in a given year under Alternative 1.

Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers Under Alternative 2 for Training and Testing Activities

Kogia whales may be exposed to sounds from sonar and other transducers associated with training and testing activities throughout the year. The quantitative analysis estimates behavioral reactions, TTS, and PTS under Alternative 2 during training and testing activities (Figure 3.4-37, Figure 3.4-38, Table 3.4-41, and Table 3.4-42). Impact ranges for this species are discussed in Section 3.4.2.1.2.2 (Impact Ranges for Sonar and Other Transducers). Potential impacts under Alternative 2 from sonar and other transducers would be similar in type as for Alternative 1, although the numbers of impacts would increase slightly based on the slight increase in sonar use associated with training and testing activities under Alternative 2.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of sonar and other transducers during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 2 would result in the unintentional taking of Kogia whales (i.e., dwarf and pygmy sperm whales) incidental to those activities. The Navy is requesting authorization from NMFS as required by Section 101(a)(5)(A) of the MMPA.




Notes: (1) Region and Activity Category bar charts show categories +/- 0.5 percent of the estimated impacts, which could result in a total of 98–101 percent. The model is probabilistic and therefore a single impact could be divided among multiple regions or activity categories. (2) MIRC = Mariana Islands Range Complex

Figure 3.4-37: Dwarf Sperm Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2

Table 3.4-41: Estimated Impacts on Individual Dwarf Sperm Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2

Estimated Impacts by Effect		
Behavioral	***TTS***	***PTS***
1,289	7,046	29

Note: Estimated impacts are based on the maximum number of activities in a given year under Alternative 2.



Notes: (1) Region and Activity Category bar charts show categories +/- 0.5 percent of the estimated impacts, which could result in a total of 98–101 percent. The model is probabilistic and therefore a single impact could be divided among multiple regions or activity categories. (2) MIRC = Mariana Islands Range Complex

Figure 3.4-38: Pygmy Sperm Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2

Table 3.4-42: Estimated Impacts on Individual Pygmy Sperm Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2

Estimated Impacts by Effect		
Behavioral	***TTS***	***PTS***
508	2,840	11


Note: Estimated impacts are based on the maximum number of activities in a given year under Alternative 2.

False Killer Whale

Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers Under Alternative 1 for Training and Testing Activities

False killer whales may be exposed to sounds from sonar and other transducers associated with training and testing activities throughout the year. The quantitative analysis estimates behavioral reactions and TTS under Alternative 1 during training and testing activities (Figure 3.4-39 and Table 3.4-43). Impact ranges for this species are discussed in Section 3.4.2.1.2.2 (Impact Ranges for Sonar and Other Transducers). As described for odontocetes above, even a few minor to moderate TTS or behavioral reactions to an individual over the course of a year are unlikely to have any significant costs or long-term consequences for that individual. Considering these factors and the mitigation measures that will be implemented as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), long-term consequences for the species would not be expected.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of sonar and other transducers during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 1 would result in the unintentional taking of false killer whales incidental to those activities.



Notes: (1) Region and Activity Category bar charts show categories +/- 0.5 percent of the estimated impacts, which could result in a total of 98–101 percent. The model is probabilistic and therefore a single impact could be divided among multiple regions or activity categories. (2) MIRC = Mariana Islands Range Complex

Figure 3.4-39: False Killer Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1

Table 3.4-43: Estimated Impacts on Individual False Killer Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1


Estimated Impacts by Effect		
Behavioral	***TTS***	***PTS***
573	117	0

Note: Estimated impacts are based on the maximum number of activities in a given year under Alternative 1.

Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers Under Alternative 2 for Training and Testing Activities

False killer whales may be exposed to sounds from sonar and other transducers associated with training and testing activities throughout the year. The quantitative analysis estimates behavioral reactions and TTS under Alternative 2 during training and testing activities (Figure 3.4-40 and Table 3.4-44). Impact ranges for this species are discussed in Section 3.4.2.1.2.2 (Impact Ranges for Sonar and Other Transducers). Potential impacts under Alternative 2 from sonar and other transducers would be similar in type as for Alternative 1, although the numbers of impacts would increase slightly based on the slight increase in sonar use associated with training and testing activities under Alternative 2.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of sonar and other transducers during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 2 would result in the unintentional taking of false killer whales incidental to those activities. The Navy is requesting authorization from NMFS as required by Section 101(a)(5)(A) of the MMPA.



Notes: (1) Region and Activity Category bar charts show categories +/- 0.5 percent of the estimated impacts, which could result in a total of 98–101 percent. The model is probabilistic and therefore a single impact could be divided among multiple regions or activity categories. (2) MIRC = Mariana Islands Range Complex

Figure 3.4-40: False Killer Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2

Table 3.4-44: Estimated Impacts on Individual False Killer Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2

Estimated Impacts by Effect		
Behavioral	***TTS***	***PTS***
641	121	0


Note: Estimated impacts are based on the maximum number of activities in a given year under Alternative 2.

Fraser's Dolphin

Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers Under Alternative 1 for Training and Testing Activities

Fraser's dolphin may be exposed to sounds from sonar and other transducers associated with training and testing activities throughout the year. The quantitative analysis estimates behavioral reactions and TTS under Alternative 1 during training and testing activities (Figure 3.4-41 and Table 3.4-45). Impact ranges for this species are discussed in Section 3.4.2.1.2.2 (Impact Ranges for Sonar and Other Transducers). As described for odontocetes above, even a few minor to moderate TTS or behavioral reactions to an individual over the course of a year are unlikely to have any significant costs or long-term consequences for that individual. Considering these factors and the mitigation measures that will be implemented as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), long-term consequences for the species would not be expected.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of sonar and other transducers during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 1 would result in the unintentional taking of Fraser's dolphin incidental to those activities.



Notes: (1) Region and Activity Category bar charts show categories +/- 0.5 percent of the estimated impacts, which could result in a total of 98–101 percent. The model is probabilistic and therefore a single impact could be divided among multiple regions or activity categories. (2) MIRC = Mariana Islands Range Complex

Figure 3.4-41: Fraser's Dolphin Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1

Table 3.4-45: Estimated Impacts on Individual Fraser's Dolphin Impacts Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1


Estimated Impacts by Effect		
Behavioral	***TTS***	***PTS***
10,150	1,896	0

Note: Estimated impacts are based on the maximum number of activities in a given year under Alternative 1.

Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers Under Alternative 2 for Training and Testing Activities

Fraser's dolphins may be exposed to sounds from sonar and other transducers associated with training and testing activities throughout the year. The quantitative analysis estimates behavioral reactions and TTS under Alternative 2 during training and testing activities (Figure 3.4-42 and Table 3.4-46). Impact ranges for this species are discussed in Section 3.4.2.1.2.2 (Impact Ranges for Sonar and Other Transducers). Potential impacts under Alternative 2 from sonar and other transducers would be similar in type as for Alternative 1, although the numbers of impacts would increase slightly based on the slight increase in sonar use associated with training and testing activities under Alternative 2.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of sonar and other transducers during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 2 would result in the unintentional taking of Fraser's dolphin incidental to those activities. The Navy is requesting authorization from NMFS as required by Section 101(a)(5)(A) of the MMPA.



Notes: (1) Region and Activity Category bar charts show categories +/- 0.5 percent of the estimated impacts, which could result in a total of 98–101 percent. The model is probabilistic and therefore a single impact could be divided among multiple regions or activity categories. (2) MIRC = Mariana Islands Range Complex

Figure 3.4-42: Fraser's Dolphin Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2

Table 3.4-46: Estimated Impacts on Individual Fraser's Dolphin Impacts Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2

Estimated Impacts by Effect		
Behavioral	***TTS***	***PTS***
11,322	1,947	0

Note: Estimated impacts are based on the maximum number of activities in a given year under Alternative 2.


Killer Whale

Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers Under Alternative 1 for Training and Testing Activities

Killer whales may be exposed to sounds from sonar and other transducers associated with training and testing activities throughout the year. The quantitative analysis estimates behavioral reactions and TTS under Alternative 1 during training and testing activities (Figure 3.4-43 and Table 3.4-47). Impact ranges for this species are discussed in Section 3.4.2.1.2.2 (Impact Ranges for Sonar and Other Transducers). As described for odontocetes above, even a few minor to moderate TTS or behavioral reactions to an

individual over the course of a year are unlikely to have any significant costs or long-term consequences for that individual. Considering these factors and the mitigation measures that will be implemented as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), long-term consequences for the species would not be expected.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of sonar and other transducers during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 1 would result in the unintentional taking of killer whales incidental to those activities.



Notes: (1) Region and Activity Category bar charts show categories +/- 0.5 percent of the estimated impacts, which could result in a total of 98–101 percent. The model is probabilistic and therefore a single impact could be divided among multiple regions or activity categories. (2) MIRC = Mariana Islands Range Complex

Figure 3.4-43: Killer Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1

Table 3.4-47: Estimated Impacts on Individual Killer Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1

Estimated Impacts by Effect		
Behavioral	***TTS***	***PTS***
32	7	0


Note: Estimated impacts are based on the maximum number of activities in a given year under Alternative 1.

Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers Under Alternative 2 for Training and Testing Activities

Killer whales may be exposed to sounds from sonar and other transducers associated with training and testing activities throughout the year. The quantitative analysis estimates behavioral reactions and TTS under Alternative 2 during training and testing activities (Figure 3.4-44 and Table 3.4-48). Impact ranges for this species are discussed in Section 3.4.2.1.2.2 (Impact Ranges for Sonar and Other Transducers).

Potential impacts under Alternative 2 from sonar and other transducers would be similar in type as for Alternative 1, although the numbers of impacts would increase slightly based on the slight increase in sonar use associated with training and testing activities under Alternative 2.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of sonar and other transducers during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 2 would result in the unintentional taking of killer whales incidental to those activities. The Navy is requesting authorization from NMFS as required by Section 101(a)(5)(A) of the MMPA.



Notes: (1) Region and Activity Category bar charts show categories +/- 0.5 percent of the estimated impacts, which could result in a total of 98–101 percent. The model is probabilistic and therefore a single impact could be divided among multiple regions or activity categories. (2) MIRC = Mariana Islands Range Complex

Figure 3.4-44: Killer Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2

Table 3.4-48: Estimated Impacts on Individual Killer Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2

Estimated Impacts by Effect		
Behavioral	***TTS***	***PTS***
36	8	0

Note: Estimated impacts are based on the maximum number of activities in a given year under Alternative 2.


Melon-Headed Whale

Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers Under Alternative 1 for Training and Testing Activities

Melon-headed whales may be exposed to sounds from sonar and other transducers associated with training and testing activities throughout the year. The quantitative analysis estimates behavioral

reactions and TTS under Alternative 1 during training and testing activities (Figure 3.4-45 and Table 3.4-49). Impact ranges for this species are discussed in Section 3.4.2.1.2.2 (Impact Ranges for Sonar and Other Transducers). As described for odontocetes above, even a few minor to moderate TTS or behavioral reactions to an individual over the course of a year are unlikely to have any significant costs or long-term consequences for that individual. Considering these factors and the mitigation measures that will be implemented as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), long-term consequences for the species would not be expected.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of sonar and other transducers during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 1 would result in the unintentional taking of melon-headed whales incidental to those activities.



Notes: (1) Region and Activity Category bar charts show categories +/- 0.5 percent of the estimated impacts, which could result in a total of 98–101 percent. The model is probabilistic and therefore a single impact could be divided among multiple regions or activity categories. (2) MIRC = Mariana Islands Range Complex

Figure 3.4-45: Melon-Headed Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1

Table 3.4-49: Estimated Impacts on Individual Melon-Headed Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1


Estimated Impacts by Effect		
Behavioral	***TTS***	***PTS***
2,064	488	0

Note: Estimated impacts are based on the maximum number of activities in a given year under Alternative 1.

Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers Under Alternative 2 for Training and Testing Activities

Melon-headed whales may be exposed to sounds from sonar and other transducers associated with training and testing activities throughout the year. The quantitative analysis estimates behavioral reactions and TTS under Alternative 2 during training and testing activities (Figure 3.4-46 and Table 3.4-50). Impact ranges for this species are discussed in Section 3.4.2.1.2.2 (Impact Ranges for Sonar and Other Transducers). Potential impacts under Alternative 2 from sonar and other transducers would be similar in type as for Alternative 1, although the numbers of impacts would increase slightly based on the slight increase in sonar use associated with training and testing activities under Alternative 2.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of sonar and other transducers during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 2 would result in the unintentional taking of melon-headed whales incidental to those activities. The Navy is requesting authorization from NMFS as required by Section 101(a)(5)(A) of the MMPA.



Notes: (1) Region and Activity Category bar charts show categories +/- 0.5 percent of the estimated impacts, which could result in a total of 98–101 percent. The model is probabilistic and therefore a single impact could be divided among multiple regions or activity categories. (2) MIRC = Mariana Islands Range Complex

Figure 3.4-46: Melon-Headed Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2

Table 3.4-50: Estimated Impacts on Individual Melon-Headed Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2

Estimated Impacts by Effect		
Behavioral	***TTS***	***PTS***
2,305	508	0


Note: Estimated impacts are based on the maximum number of activities in a given year under Alternative 2.

Pantropical Spotted Dolphin

Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers Under Alternative 1 for Training and Testing Activities

Pantropical spotted dolphins may be exposed to sounds from sonar and other transducers associated with training and testing activities throughout the year. The quantitative analysis estimates behavioral reactions and TTS under Alternative 1 during training and testing activities (Figure 3.4-47 and Table 3.4-51). Impact ranges for this species are discussed in Section 3.4.2.1.2.2 (Impact Ranges for Sonar and Other Transducers). As described for odontocetes above, even a few minor to moderate TTS or behavioral reactions to an individual over the course of a year are unlikely to have any significant costs or long-term consequences for that individual. Considering these factors and the mitigation measures that will be implemented as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), long-term consequences for the species would not be expected.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of sonar and other transducers during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 1 would result in the unintentional taking of pantropical spotted dolphins incidental to those activities.



Notes: (1) Region and Activity Category bar charts show categories +/- 0.5 percent of the estimated impacts, which could result in a total of 98–101 percent. The model is probabilistic and therefore a single impact could be divided among multiple regions or activity categories. (2) MIRC = Mariana Islands Range Complex

Figure 3.4-47: Pantropical Spotted Dolphin Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1

Table 3.4-51: Estimated Impacts on Individual Pantropical Spotted Dolphins Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1


Estimated Impacts by Effect		
Behavioral	***TTS***	***PTS***
10,764	2,717	0

Note: Estimated impacts are based on the maximum number of activities in a given year under Alternative 1.

Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers Under Alternative 2 for Training and Testing Activities

Pantropical spotted dolphins may be exposed to sounds from sonar and other transducers associated with training and testing activities throughout the year. The quantitative analysis estimates behavioral reactions and TTS under Alternative 2 during training and testing activities (Figure 3.4-48 and Table 3.4-52). Impact ranges for this species are discussed in Section 3.4.2.1.2.2 (Impact Ranges for Sonar and Other Transducers). Potential impacts under Alternative 2 from sonar and other transducers would be similar in type as for Alternative 1, although the numbers of impacts would increase slightly based on the slight increase in sonar use associated with training and testing activities under Alternative 2.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of sonar and other transducers during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 2 would result in the unintentional taking of pantropical spotted dolphins incidental to those activities. The Navy is requesting authorization from NMFS as required by Section 101(a)(5)(A) of the MMPA.



Notes: (1) Region and Activity Category bar charts show categories +/- 0.5 percent of the estimated impacts, which could result in a total of 98–101 percent. The model is probabilistic and therefore a single impact could be divided among multiple regions or activity categories. (2) MIRC = Mariana Islands Range Complex

Figure 3.4-48: Pantropical Spotted Dolphin Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2

Table 3.4-52: Estimated Impacts on Individual Pantropical Spotted Dolphins Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2

Estimated Impacts by Effect		
Behavioral	***TTS***	***PTS***
12,074	2,815	0

Note: Estimated impacts are based on the maximum number of activities in a given year under Alternative 2.


Pygmy Killer Whale

Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers Under Alternative 1 for Training and Testing Activities

Pygmy killer whales may be exposed to sounds from sonar and other transducers associated with training and testing activities throughout the year. The quantitative analysis estimates behavioral reactions and TTS under Alternative 1 during training and testing activities (Figure 3.4-49 and Table 3.4-53). Impact ranges for this species are discussed in Section 3.4.2.1.2.2 (Impact Ranges for Sonar and Other Transducers). As described for odontocetes above, even a few minor to moderate TTS

or behavioral reactions to an individual over the course of a year are unlikely to have any significant costs or long-term consequences for that individual. Considering these factors and the mitigation measures that will be implemented as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), long-term consequences for the species would not be expected.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of sonar and other transducers during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 1 would result in the unintentional taking of pygmy killer whales incidental to those activities.



Notes: (1) Region and Activity Category bar charts show categories +/- 0.5 percent of the estimated impacts, which could result in a total of 98–101 percent. The model is probabilistic and therefore a single impact could be divided among multiple regions or activity categories. (2) MIRC = Mariana Islands Range Complex

Figure 3.4-49: Pygmy Killer Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1

Table 3.4-53: Estimated Impacts on Individual Pygmy Killer Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1

Estimated Impacts by Effect		
Behavioral	***TTS***	***PTS***
78	16	0


Note: Estimated impacts are based on the maximum number of activities in a given year under Alternative 1.

Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers Under Alternative 2 for Training and Testing Activities

Pygmy killer whale may be exposed to sounds from sonar and other transducers associated with training and testing activities throughout the year. The quantitative analysis estimates behavioral reactions and TTS under Alternative 2 during training and testing activities (Figure 3.4-50 and Table 3.4-54). Impact

ranges for this species are discussed in Section 3.4.2.1.2.2 (Impact Ranges for Sonar and Other Transducers). Potential impacts under Alternative 2 from sonar and other transducers would be similar in type as for Alternative 1, although the numbers of impacts would increase slightly based on the slight increase in sonar use associated with training and testing activities under Alternative 2.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of sonar and other transducers during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 2 would result in the unintentional taking of pygmy killer whales incidental to those activities. The Navy is requesting authorization from NMFS as required by Section 101(a)(5)(A) of the MMPA.



Notes: (1) Region and Activity Category bar charts show categories +/- 0.5 percent of the estimated impacts, which could result in a total of 98–101 percent. The model is probabilistic and therefore a single impact could be divided among multiple regions or activity categories. (2) MIRC = Mariana Islands Range Complex

Figure 3.4-50: Pygmy Killer Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2

Table 3.4-54: Estimated Impacts on Individual Pygmy Killer Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2

Estimated Impacts by Effect		
Behavioral	***TTS***	***PTS***
87	17	0


Note: Estimated impacts are based on the maximum number of activities in a given year under Alternative 2.

Risso's Dolphin

Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers Under Alternative 1 for Training and Testing Activities

Risso's dolphins may be exposed to sounds from sonar and other transducers associated with training and testing activities throughout the year. The quantitative analysis estimates behavioral reactions and TTS under Alternative 1 during training and testing activities (Figure 3.4-51 and Table 3.4-55). Impact ranges for this species are discussed in Section 3.4.2.1.2.2 (Impact Ranges for Sonar and Other Transducers). As described for odontocetes above, even a few minor to moderate TTS or behavioral reactions to an individual over the course of a year are unlikely to have any significant costs or long-term consequences for the individual. Considering these factors and the mitigation measures that will be implemented as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), long-term consequences for the species would not be expected.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of sonar and other transducers during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 1 would result in the unintentional taking of Risso's dolphins incidental to those activities.



Notes: (1) Region and Activity Category bar charts show categories +/- 0.5 percent of the estimated impacts, which could result in a total of 98–101 percent. The model is probabilistic and therefore a single impact could be divided among multiple regions or activity categories. (2) MIRC = Mariana Islands Range Complex

Figure 3.4-51: Risso's Dolphin Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1

Table 3.4-55: Estimated Impacts on Individual Risso's Dolphins Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1


Estimated Impacts by Effect		
Behavioral	***TTS***	***PTS***
2,365	505	0

Note: Estimated impacts are based on the maximum number of activities in a given year under Alternative 1.

Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers Under Alternative 2 for Training and Testing Activities

Risso's dolphins may be exposed to sounds from sonar and other transducers associated with training and testing activities throughout the year. The quantitative analysis estimates behavioral reactions and TTS under Alternative 2 during training and testing activities (Figure 3.4-52 and Table 3.4-56). Impact ranges for this species are discussed in Section 3.4.2.1.2.2 (Impact Ranges for Sonar and Other Transducers). Potential impacts under Alternative 2 from sonar and other transducers would be similar in type as for Alternative 1, although the numbers of impacts would increase slightly based on the slight increase in sonar use associated with training and testing activities under Alternative 2 versus Alternative 1.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of sonar and other transducers during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 2 would result in the unintentional taking of Risso's dolphins incidental to those activities. The Navy is requesting authorization from NMFS as required by Section 101(a)(5)(A) of the MMPA.



Notes: (1) Region and Activity Category bar charts show categories +/- 0.5 percent of the estimated impacts, which could result in a total of 98–101 percent. The model is probabilistic and therefore a single impact could be divided among multiple regions or activity categories. (2) MIRC = Mariana Islands Range Complex

Figure 3.4-52: Risso's Dolphin Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2

Table 3.4-56: Estimated Impacts on Individual Risso's Dolphins Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2

Estimated Impacts by Effect		
Behavioral	***TTS***	***PTS***
2,649	519	0


Note: Estimated impacts are based on the maximum number of activities in a given year under Alternative 2.

Rough-Toothed Dolphin

Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers Under Alternative 1 for Training and Testing Activities

Rough-toothed dolphins may be exposed to sounds from sonar and other transducers associated with training and testing activities throughout the year. The quantitative analysis estimates behavioral reactions and TTS under Alternative 1 during training and testing activities (Figure 3.4-53 and Table 3.4-57). Impact ranges for this species are discussed in Section 3.4.2.1.2.2 (Impact Ranges for Sonar and Other Transducers). As described for odontocetes above, even a few minor to moderate TTS or behavioral reactions to an individual over the course of a year are unlikely to have any significant costs or long-term consequences for that individual. Considering these factors and the mitigation measures that will be implemented as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), long-term consequences for the species would not be expected.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of sonar and other transducers during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 1 would result in the unintentional taking of rough-toothed dolphins incidental to those activities.



Notes: (1) Region and Activity Category bar charts show categories +/- 0.5 percent of the estimated impacts, which could result in a total of 98–101 percent. The model is probabilistic and therefore a single impact could be divided among multiple regions or activity categories. (2) MIRC = Mariana Islands Range Complex

Figure 3.4-53: Rough-Toothed Dolphin Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1

Table 3.4-57: Estimated Impacts on Individual Rough-Toothed Dolphins Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1

Estimated Impacts by Effect		
Behavioral	***TTS***	***PTS***
146	35	0


Note: Estimated impacts are based on the maximum number of activities in a given year under Alternative 1.

Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers Under Alternative 2 for Training and Testing Activities

Rough-toothed dolphins may be exposed to sounds from sonar and other transducers associated with training and testing activities throughout the year. The quantitative analysis estimates behavioral reactions and TTS under Alternative 2 during training and testing activities (Figure 3.4-54 and Table 3.4-58). Impact ranges for this species are discussed in Section 3.4.2.1.2.2 (Impact Ranges for Sonar and Other Transducers). Potential impacts under Alternative 2 from sonar and other transducers would be similar in type as for Alternative 1, although the numbers of impacts would increase slightly

based on the slight increase in sonar use associated with training and testing activities under Alternative 2.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of sonar and other transducers during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 2 would result in the unintentional taking of rough-toothed dolphins incidental to those activities. The Navy is requesting authorization from NMFS as required by Section 101(a)(5)(A) of the MMPA.



Notes: (1) Region and Activity Category bar charts show categories +/- 0.5 percent of the estimated impacts, which could result in a total of 98–101 percent. The model is probabilistic and therefore a single impact could be divided among multiple regions or activity categories. (2) MIRC = Mariana Islands Range Complex

Figure 3.4-54: Rough-Toothed Dolphin Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2

Table 3.4-58: Estimated Impacts on Individual Rough-Toothed Dolphins Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2

Estimated Impacts by Effect		
Behavioral	***TTS***	***PTS***
161	36	0

Note: Estimated impacts are based on the maximum number of activities in a given year under Alternative 2.


Short-Finned Pilot Whale

Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers Under Alternative 1 for Training and Testing Activities

Short-finned pilot whales may be exposed to sounds from sonar and other transducers associated with training and testing activities throughout the year. The quantitative analysis estimates behavioral

reactions and TTS under Alternative 1 during training and testing activities (Figure 3.4-55 and Table 3.4-59). Impact ranges for this species are discussed in Section 3.4.2.1.2.2 (Impact Ranges for Sonar and Other Transducers). As described for odontocetes above, even a few minor to moderate TTS or behavioral reactions to an individual over the course of a year are unlikely to have any significant costs or long-term consequences for that individual. Considering these factors and the mitigation measures that will be implemented as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), long-term consequences for the species would not be expected.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of sonar and other transducers during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 1 would result in the unintentional taking of short-finned pilot whales incidental to those activities.



Notes: (1) Region and Activity Category bar charts show categories +/- 0.5 percent of the estimated impacts, which could result in a total of 98–101 percent. The model is probabilistic and therefore a single impact could be divided among multiple regions or activity categories. (2) MIRC = Mariana Islands Range Complex

Figure 3.4-55: Short-Finned Pilot Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1

Table 3.4-59: Estimated Impacts on Individual Short-Finned Pilot Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1


Estimated Impacts by Effect		
Behavioral	***TTS***	***PTS***
876	172	0

Note: Estimated impacts are based on the maximum number of activities in a given year under Alternative 1.

Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers Under Alternative 2 for Training and Testing Activities

Short-finned pilot whales may be exposed to sounds from sonar and other transducers associated with training and testing activities throughout the year. The quantitative analysis estimates behavioral reactions and TTS under Alternative 2 during training and testing activities (Figure 3.4-56 and Table 3.4-60). Impact ranges for this species are discussed in Section 3.4.2.1.2.2 (Impact Ranges for Sonar and Other Transducers). Potential impacts under Alternative 2 from sonar and other transducers would be similar in type as for Alternative 1, although the numbers of impacts would increase slightly based on the slight increase in sonar use associated with training and testing activities under Alternative 2.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of sonar and other transducers during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 2 would result in the unintentional taking of short-finned pilot whales incidental to those activities. The Navy is requesting authorization from NMFS as required by Section 101(a)(5)(A) of the MMPA.



Notes: (1) Region and Activity Category bar charts show categories +/- 0.5 percent of the estimated impacts, which could result in a total of 98–101 percent. The model is probabilistic and therefore a single impact could be divided among multiple regions or activity categories. (2) MIRC = Mariana Islands Range Complex

Figure 3.4-56: Short-Finned Pilot Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2

Table 3.4-60: Estimated Impacts on Individual Short-Finned Pilot Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2

Estimated Impacts by Effect		
Behavioral	***TTS***	***PTS***
986	176	0

Note: Estimated impacts are based on the maximum number of activities in a given year under Alternative 2.


Sperm Whale (Endangered Species Act-Listed)

Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers Under Alternative 1 for Training and Testing Activities

Sperm whales may be exposed to sounds from sonar and other transducers associated with training and testing activities throughout the year. The quantitative analysis estimates behavioral reactions and TTS under Alternative 1 during training and testing activities (Figure 3.4-57 and Table 3.4-61). Impact ranges for this species are discussed in Section 3.4.2.1.2.2 (Impact Ranges for Sonar and Other Transducers). As described for odontocetes above, even a few minor to moderate TTS or behavioral reactions to an individual over the course of a year are unlikely to have any significant costs or long-term consequences for that individual. Considering these factors and the mitigation measures that will be implemented as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), long-term consequences for the species would not be expected.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of sonar and other transducers during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 1 would result in the unintentional taking of sperm whales incidental to those activities.

Pursuant to the ESA, the use of sonar and other transducers during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 1 may affect ESA-listed sperm whales.



Notes: (1) Region and Activity Category bar charts show categories +/- 0.5 percent of the estimated impacts, which could result in a total of 98–101 percent. The model is probabilistic and therefore a single impact could be divided among multiple regions or activity categories. (2) MIRC = Mariana Islands Range Complex

Figure 3.4-57: Sperm Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1

Table 3.4-61: Estimated Impacts on Individual Sperm Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1

Estimated Impacts by Effect		
Behavioral	***TTS***	***PTS***
184	11	0


Note: Estimated impacts are based on the maximum number of activities in a given year under Alternative 1.

Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers Under Alternative 2 for Training and Testing Activities

Sperm whales may be exposed to sounds from sonar and other transducers associated with training and testing activities throughout the year. The quantitative analysis estimates behavioral reactions and TTS under Alternative 2 during training and testing activities (Figure 3.4-58 and Table 3.4-62). Impact ranges for this species are discussed in Section 3.4.2.1.2.2 (Impact Ranges for Sonar and Other Transducers). Potential impacts under Alternative 2 from sonar and other transducers would be similar in type as for Alternative 1, although the numbers of impacts would increase slightly based on the slight increase in sonar use associated with training and testing activities under Alternative 2.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of sonar and other transducers during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 2 would result in the unintentional taking of sperm whales incidental to those activities. The Navy is requesting authorization from NMFS as required by Section 101(a)(5)(A) of the MMPA.

Pursuant to the ESA, the use of sonar and other transducers during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 2 may affect ESA-listed sperm whales. The Navy is consulting with NMFS as required by Section 7(a)(2) of the ESA.



Notes: (1) Region and Activity Category bar charts show categories +/- 0.5 percent of the estimated impacts, which could result in a total of 98–101 percent. The model is probabilistic and therefore a single impact could be divided among multiple regions or activity categories. (2) MIRC = Mariana Islands Range Complex

Figure 3.4-58: Sperm Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2

Table 3.4-62: Estimated Impacts on Individual Sperm Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2

Estimated Impacts by Effect		
Behavioral	***TTS***	***PTS***
192	11	0

Note: Estimated impacts are based on the maximum number of activities in a given year under Alternative 2.


Spinner Dolphin

Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers Under Alternative 1 for Training and Testing Activities

Spinner dolphins may be exposed to sounds from sonar and other transducers associated with training and testing activities throughout the year. The quantitative analysis estimates behavioral reactions and

TTS under Alternative 1 during training and testing activities (Figure 3.4-59 and Table 3.4-63). Impact ranges for this species are discussed in Section 3.4.2.1.2.2 (Impact Ranges for Sonar and Other Transducers). As described for odontocetes above, even a few minor to moderate TTS or behavioral reactions to an individual over the course of a year are unlikely to have any significant costs or long-term consequences for that individual. In addition to procedural mitigation, the Navy will not use MF1 sonar during training and testing in the Agat Bay Nearshore Mitigation Area, where spinner dolphins have been observed resting, as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation). Considering these factors, long-term consequences for the species would not be expected.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of sonar and other transducers during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 1 would result in the unintentional taking of spinner dolphins incidental to those activities.



Notes: (1) Region and Activity Category bar charts show categories +/- 0.5 percent of the estimated impacts, which could result in a total of 98–101 percent. The model is probabilistic and therefore a single impact could be divided among multiple regions or activity categories. (2) MIRC = Mariana Islands Range Complex

Figure 3.4-59: Spinner Dolphin Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1

Table 3.4-63: Estimated Impacts on Individual Spinner Dolphins Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1


Estimated Impacts by Effect		
Behavioral	***TTS***	***PTS***
1,042	223	0

Note: Estimated impacts are based on the maximum number of activities in a given year under Alternative 1.

Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers Under Alternative 2 for Training and Testing Activities

Spinner dolphins may be exposed to sounds from sonar and other transducers associated with training and testing activities throughout the year. The quantitative analysis estimates behavioral reactions and TTS under Alternative 2 during training and testing activities (Figure 3.4-60 and Table 3.4-64). Impact ranges for this species are discussed in Section 3.4.2.1.2.2 (Impact Ranges for Sonar and Other Transducers). Potential impacts under Alternative 2 from sonar and other transducers would be similar in type as for Alternative 1, although the numbers of impacts would increase slightly based on the slight increase in sonar use associated with training and testing activities under Alternative 2.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of sonar and other transducers during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 2 would result in the unintentional taking of spinner dolphins incidental to those activities. The Navy is requesting authorization from NMFS as required by Section 101(a)(5)(A) of the MMPA.



Notes: (1) Region and Activity Category bar charts show categories +/- 0.5 percent of the estimated impacts, which could result in a total of 98–101 percent. The model is probabilistic and therefore a single impact could be divided among multiple regions or activity categories. (2) MIRC = Mariana Islands Range Complex

Figure 3.4-60: Spinner Dolphin Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2

Table 3.4-64: Estimated Impacts on Individual Spinner Dolphins Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2

Estimated Impacts by Effect		
Behavioral	***TTS***	***PTS***
1,185	228	0


Note: Estimated impacts are based on the maximum number of activities in a given year under Alternative 2.

Striped Dolphin

Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers Under Alternative 1 for Training and Testing Activities

Striped dolphins may be exposed to sounds from sonar and other transducers associated with training and testing activities throughout the year. The quantitative analysis estimates behavioral reactions and TTS under Alternative 1 during training and testing activities (Figure 3.4-61 and Table 3.4-65). Impact ranges for this species are discussed in Section 3.4.2.1.2.2 (Impact Ranges for Sonar and Other Transducers). As described for odontocetes above, even a few minor to moderate TTS or behavioral reactions to an individual over the course of a year are unlikely to have any significant costs or long-term consequences for that individual. Considering these factors and the mitigation measures that will be implemented as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), long-term consequences for the species would not be expected.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of sonar and other transducers during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 1 would result in the unintentional taking of striped dolphins incidental to those activities.



Notes: (1) Region and Activity Category bar charts show categories +/- 0.5 percent of the estimated impacts, which could result in a total of 98–101 percent. The model is probabilistic and therefore a single impact could be divided among multiple regions or activity categories. (2) MIRC = Mariana Islands Range Complex

Figure 3.4-61: Striped Dolphin Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1

Table 3.4-65: Estimated Impacts on Individual Striped Dolphins Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1


Estimated Impacts by Effect		
Behavioral	***TTS***	***PTS***
2,899	723	0

Note: Estimated impacts are based on the maximum number of activities in a given year under Alternative 1.

Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers Under Alternative 2 for Training and Testing Activities

Striped dolphins may be exposed to sounds from sonar and other transducers associated with training and testing activities throughout the year. The quantitative analysis estimates behavioral reactions and TTS under Alternative 2 during training and testing activities (Figure 3.4-62 and Table 3.4-66). Impact ranges for this species are discussed in Section 3.4.2.1.2.2 (Impact Ranges for Sonar and Other Transducers). Potential impacts under Alternative 2 from sonar and other transducers would be similar in type as for Alternative 1, although the numbers of impacts would increase slightly based on the slight increase in sonar use associated with training and testing activities under Alternative 2.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of sonar and other transducers during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 2 would result in the unintentional taking of striped dolphins incidental to those activities. The Navy is requesting authorization from NMFS as required by Section 101(a)(5)(A) of the MMPA.



Notes: (1) Region and Activity Category bar charts show categories +/- 0.5 percent of the estimated impacts, which could result in a total of 98–101 percent. The model is probabilistic and therefore a single impact could be divided among multiple regions or activity categories. (2) MIRC = Mariana Islands Range Complex

Figure 3.4-62: Striped Dolphin Impacts Estimated per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2

Table 3.4-66: Estimated Impacts on Individual Striped Dolphins Within the Study Area per Year from Sonar and Other Transducers Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2

Estimated Impacts by Effect		
Behavioral	***TTS***	***PTS***
3,255	750	0

Note: Estimated impacts are based on the maximum number of activities in a given year under Alternative 2.

3.4.2.1.2.4 Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers Under the No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, proposed training and testing activities would not occur. Other military activities not associated with this Proposed Action would continue to occur. Acoustic stressors from the use of sonar and other transducers, as described above, would not be introduced into the marine environment from the Proposed Action. Therefore, existing environmental conditions would either remain unchanged or would improve slightly after cessation of ongoing training and testing activities. Discontinuing the training and testing activities would result in fewer activities that use sonar and other transducers within the marine environment where training and testing activities have historically been

conducted. Therefore, discontinuing training and testing activities under the No Action Alternative would reduce the potential for impacts from sonar and other transducers on marine mammals, but would not measurably improve the overall distribution or abundance of marine mammals.

3.4.2.1.3 Impacts from Vessel Noise

Marine mammals may be exposed to noise from vessel movement. A detailed description of the acoustic characteristics and typical sound levels of vessel noise are in Section 3.0.4.1.2 (Vessel Noise). Vessel movements involve transits to and from ports to various locations within the Study Area, including commercial ship traffic as well as recreational vessels in addition to U.S. Navy vessels. Many ongoing and proposed training and testing activities within the Study Area involve maneuvers by various types of surface ships, boats, and submarines (collectively referred to as vessels). Section 3.4.2.1.1 (Background) summarizes and synthesizes available information on behavioral reactions, masking, and physiological stress due to noise exposure, including vessel noise (Section 3.4.2.1.1.2, Hearing Loss; Section 3.4.2.1.1.3, Physiological Stress; Section 3.4.2.1.1.4, Masking; and Section 3.4.2.1.1.5, Behavioral Reactions).

Activities may vary slightly from those previously analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, but the overall determinations presented remain valid. Increases and decreases shown in Table 2.5-1 and Table 2.5-2 for proposed activities under Alternative 1 and 2 do not appreciably change the impact conclusions presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. The Navy will implement mitigation measures for vessel movement to avoid the potential for marine mammal vessel strikes, as discussed in Section 5.3.4.1 (Vessel Movement). The mitigation for vessel movement (i.e., maneuvering to maintain a specified distance from a marine mammal) will also help the Navy avoid or reduce potential impacts from vessel noise on marine mammals.

Under the No Action Alternative, proposed training and testing activities would not occur. Other military activities not associated with this Proposed Action would continue to occur. Acoustic stressors (i.e., vessel noise) from the use of vessels, as described above, would not be introduced into the marine environment from the Proposed Action. Therefore, existing environmental conditions would either remain unchanged or would improve slightly after cessation of ongoing training and testing activities. Discontinuing the training and testing activities would result in fewer activities that produce vessel noise within the marine environment where training and testing activities have historically been conducted. Therefore, discontinuing training and testing activities under the No Action Alternative would reduce the potential for impacts from vessel noise on marine mammals, but would not measurably improve the overall distribution or abundance of marine mammals.

Pursuant to the MMPA, sound produced by vessel movement during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 would not result in the incidental taking of marine mammals.

Pursuant to the ESA, sound produced by vessel movement during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 may affect ESA-listed marine mammals. The Navy is consulting on the activities described under Alternative 2 with NMFS as required by Section 7(a)(2) of the ESA.

3.4.2.1.4 Impacts from Aircraft Noise

Marine mammals may be exposed to aircraft-generated noise throughout the Study Area. Fixed- and rotary-wing aircraft are used for a variety of training and testing activities throughout the Study Area.

Tilt-rotor impacts would be similar to fixed-wing or helicopter impacts depending which mode the aircraft is in. Most of these sounds would be concentrated around airbases and fixed ranges within the range complex. Aircraft produce extensive airborne noise from either turbofan or turbojet engines. An infrequent type of aircraft noise is the sonic boom, produced when the aircraft exceeds the speed of sound. Rotary-wing aircraft produce low-frequency sound and vibration (Pepper et al., 2003). Section 3.4.2.1.1 (Background) summarizes and synthesizes available information on behavioral reactions, masking, and physiological stress due to noise exposure, including aircraft noise (Section 3.4.2.1.1.2, Hearing Loss; Section 3.4.2.1.1.3, Physiological Stress; Section 3.4.2.1.1.4, Masking; and Section 3.4.2.1.1.5, Behavioral Reactions).

A detailed description of aircraft noise as a stressor is in Section 3.0.4.1.3 (Aircraft Noise). Activities may vary slightly from those previously analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, but the overall determinations presented remain valid. Increases and decreases shown in Table 2.5-1 and Table 2.5-2 for proposed training and testing activities under Alternative 1 and 2 do not appreciably change the impact conclusions presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

Under the No Action Alternative, proposed training and testing activities would not occur. Other military activities not associated with this Proposed Action would continue to occur. Acoustic stressors (i.e., aircraft noise) from the use of aircraft, as described above, would not be introduced into the marine environment from the Proposed Action. Therefore, existing environmental conditions would either remain unchanged or would improve slightly after cessation of ongoing training and testing activities. Discontinuing the training and testing activities would result in fewer activities that produce aircraft noise within the marine environment where training and testing activities have historically been conducted. Therefore, discontinuing training and testing activities under the No Action Alternative would reduce the potential for impacts from aircraft noise on marine mammals, but would not measurably improve the overall distribution or abundance of marine mammals.

Pursuant to the MMPA, aircraft noise during training and testing activities as described under Alternative1 and Alternative 2 would not result in the incidental taking of marine mammals.

Pursuant to the ESA, aircraft noise during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 may affect ESA-listed marine mammals. The Navy is consulting on the activities described under Alternative 2 with NMFS as required by Section 7(a)(2) of the ESA.

3.4.2.1.5 Impacts from Weapon Noise

Marine mammals may be exposed to sounds caused by the firing of weapons, objects in flight, and inert impact of non-explosive munitions on the water's surface, which are described in Section 3.0.4.1.4 (Weapon Noise). In general, these are impulsive sounds generated in close vicinity to or at the water surface, with the exception of items that are launched underwater. The firing of a weapon may have several components of associated noise. Firing of guns could include sound generated in air by firing a gun (muzzle blast) and a crack sound due to a low amplitude shock wave generated by a supersonic projectile flying through the air. Most in-air sound would be reflected at the air-water interface.

Underwater sounds would be strongest just below the surface and directly under the firing point. Any sound that enters the water only does so within a narrow cone below the firing point or path of the projectile. Vibration from the blast propagating through a ship’s hull, the sound generated by the impact of an object with the water surface, and the sound generated by launching an object underwater are

other sources of impulsive sound in the water. Sound due to missile and target launches is typically at a maximum at initiation of the booster rocket and rapidly fades as the missile or target travels downrange.

Section 3.4.2.1.1 (Background) summarizes and synthesizes available information on behavioral reactions, masking, and physiological stress due to noise exposure, including aircraft noise (Section 3.4.2.1.1.2, Hearing Loss; Section 3.4.2.1.1.3, Physiological Stress; Section 3.4.2.1.1.4, Masking; and Section 3.4.2.1.1.5, Behavioral Reactions).

Activities may vary slightly from those previously analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, but the overall determinations presented remain valid. Increases and decreases shown in Table 2.5-1 and Table 2.5-2 for proposed training and testing activities under Alternative 1 and 2 do not appreciably change the impact conclusions presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. The Navy will implement mitigation measures to avoid or reduce potential impacts from weapon noise during large-caliber gunnery activities, as discussed in Section 5.3.2.2 (Weapons Firing Noise).

Under the No Action Alternative, proposed training and testing activities would not occur. Other military activities not associated with this Proposed Action would continue to occur; however, weapon noise would not be introduced into the marine environment from the Proposed Action. Therefore, existing environmental conditions would either remain unchanged or would improve slightly after cessation of ongoing training and testing activities. Under the No Action Alternative, discontinuing training and testing activities that produce weapon noise within the marine environment where training and testing activities have historically been conducted would reduce the potential for impacts from weapon noise on marine mammals, but would not measurably improve the overall distribution or abundance of marine mammals.

Pursuant to the MMPA, weapon noise during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 would not result in the incidental taking of marine mammals.

Pursuant to the ESA, weapon noise during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 may affect ESA-listed marine mammals. The Navy is consulting on the activities described under Alternative 2 with NMFS as required by Section 7(a)(2) of the ESA.

3.4.2.2 Explosive Stressors

Assessing whether an explosive detonation may disturb or injure a marine mammal involves understanding the characteristics of the explosive sources, the marine mammals that may be present near the sources, the physiological effects of a close explosive exposure, and the effects of impulsive sound on marine mammal hearing and behavior. Many other factors besides the received level or pressure wave of an explosion, such as the animal's physical condition and size, prior experience with the explosive sound, and proximity to the explosion, may influence physiological effects and behavioral reactions.

The ways in which an explosive exposure could result in immediate effects or lead to long-term consequences for an animal are explained in Section 3.0.4.7 (Conceptual Framework for Assessing Effects from Acoustic and Explosive Activities). The following background section discusses what is currently known about explosive effects to marine mammals.

Due to new acoustic impact criteria, marine mammal densities, and revisions to the acoustics effects model, the analysis provided in Section 3.4.2.2.2 (Impacts from Explosive Stressors) of this SEIS/OEIS supplants the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS for marine mammals and changes estimated impacts for some species since the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

3.4.2.2.1 Background

3.4.2.2.1.1 Injury

Injury refers to the direct effects on the tissues or organs of an animal due to exposure to pressure waves. Injury in marine mammals can be caused directly by exposure to explosions. Section 3.0.4.7 (Conceptual Framework for Assessing Effects from Acoustic and Explosive Activities) provides additional information on injury and the framework used to analyze this potential impact.

Injury due to Explosives

Explosive injury to marine mammals would consist of primary blast injury, which refers to those injuries that result from the compression of a body exposed to a blast wave and is usually observed as barotrauma of gas-containing structures (e.g., lung and gut) and structural damage to the auditory system (Greaves et al., 1943; Office of the Surgeon General, 1991; Richmond et al., 1973). The near instantaneous high magnitude pressure change near an explosion can injure an animal where tissue material properties significantly differ from the surrounding environment, such as around air-filled cavities such as in the lungs or gastrointestinal tract. Large pressure changes at tissue-air interfaces in the lungs and gastrointestinal tract may cause tissue rupture, resulting in a range of injuries depending on degree of exposure. The lungs are typically the first site to show any damage, while the solid organs (e.g., liver, spleen, and kidney) are more resistant to blast injury (Clark & Ward, 1943). Recoverable injuries would include slight lung injury, such as capillary interstitial bleeding, and contusions to the gastrointestinal tract. More severe injuries, such as tissue lacerations, major hemorrhage, organ rupture, or air in the chest cavity (pneumothorax), would significantly reduce fitness and likely cause death in the wild. Rupture of the lung may also introduce air into the vascular system, producing air emboli that can cause a stroke or heart attack by restricting oxygen delivery to critical organs.

If an animal is exposed to an explosive blast underwater, the likelihood of injury depends on the charge size, the geometry of the exposure (distance to the charge, depth of the animal and the charge), and the size of the animal. In general, an animal would be less susceptible to injury near the water surface because the pressure wave reflected from the water surface would interfere with the direct path pressure wave, reducing positive pressure exposure. Susceptibility would increase with depth, until normal lung collapse (due to increasing hydrostatic pressure) and increasing ambient pressures again reduce susceptibility. See Appendix H (Acoustic and Explosive Concepts) for an overview of explosive propagation and an explanation of explosive effects on gas cavities.

The only known occurrence of mortality or injury to a marine mammal due to a Navy training or testing event involving explosives occurred in March 2011 in nearshore waters off San Diego, California, at the Silver Strand Training Complex. This area had been used for underwater demolitions training for at least three decades without prior known incident. On this occasion, however, a group of approximately 100–150 long-beaked common dolphins entered the mitigation zone surrounding an area where a time-delayed firing device had been initiated on an explosive with a net explosive weight of 8.76 pounds (lb.) (3.97 kilograms [kg]) placed at a depth of 48 ft. (14.6 m). Approximately one minute after detonation, three animals were observed dead at the surface. The Navy recovered those animals and transferred them to the local stranding network for necropsy. A fourth animal was discovered stranded and dead 42 NM to the north of the detonation three days later. It is unknown exactly how close those four animals were to the detonation. Upon necropsy, all four animals were found to have sustained typical mammalian primary blast injuries (Danil & St Leger, 2011).

Relatively little is known about auditory system trauma in marine mammals resulting from explosive exposure, although it is assumed that auditory structures would be vulnerable to blast injuries. Auditory trauma was found in two humpback whales that died following the detonation of a 5,000 kg explosive used off Newfoundland during demolition of an offshore oil rig platform (Ketten et al., 1993), but the proximity of the whales to the detonation was unknown. Eardrum rupture was examined in submerged terrestrial mammals exposed to underwater explosions (Richmond et al., 1973; Yelverton et al., 1973); however, results may not be applicable to the anatomical adaptations for underwater hearing in marine mammals. In this discussion, primary blast injury to auditory tissues is considered gross structural tissue damage distinct from threshold shift or other auditory effects (see Section 3.4.2.2.1.2, Hearing Loss).

Controlled tests with a variety of lab animals (mice, rats, dogs, pigs, sheep, and other species) are the best data sources on actual injury to mammals due to underwater exposure to explosions. In the early 1970s, the Lovelace Foundation for Medical Education and Research conducted a series of tests in an artificial pond at Kirtland Air Force Base, New Mexico, to determine the effects of underwater explosions on mammals, with the goal of determining safe ranges for human divers. The resulting data were summarized in two reports (Richmond et al., 1973; Yelverton et al., 1973). Specific physiological observations for each test animal are documented in Richmond et al. (1973). Gas-containing internal organs, such as lungs and intestines, were the principal damage sites in submerged terrestrial mammals; this is consistent with earlier studies of mammal exposures to underwater explosions in which lungs were consistently the first areas to show damage, with less consistent damage observed in the gastrointestinal tract (Clark & Ward, 1943; Greaves et al., 1943). Results from all of these tests suggest two explosive metrics are predictive of explosive injury: peak pressure and impulse.

Impulse as a Predictor of Explosive Injury

In the Lovelace studies, acoustic impulse was found to be the metric most related to degree of injury, and the size of an animal's gas-containing cavities was thought to play a role in blast injury susceptibility. The lungs of most marine mammals are similar in proportion to overall body size as those of terrestrial mammals, so the magnitude of lung damage in the tests may approximate the magnitude of injury to marine mammals when scaled for body size. Within the marine mammals, mysticetes and deeper divers (e.g., Kogiidae, Physeteridae, Ziphiidae) tend to have lung-to-body size ratios that are smaller and more similar to terrestrial animal ratios than the shallow diving odontocetes (e.g., Phocoenidae, Delphinidae) and pinnipeds (Fahlman et al., 2014a; Piscitelli et al., 2010). The use of test data with smaller lung-to-body ratios to set injury thresholds may result in a more conservative estimate of potential for damaging effects (i.e., lower thresholds) for animals with larger lung-to-body ratios.

For these shallow exposures of small terrestrial mammals (masses ranging from 3.4 to 50 kg) to underwater detonations, Richmond et al. (1973) reported that no blast injuries were observed when exposures were less than 6 pounds per square inch (psi) per millisecond (psi-ms) (40 pascals second [Pa-s]), no instances of slight lung hemorrhage occurred below 20 psi-ms (140 Pa-s), and instances of no lung damage were observed in some exposures at higher levels up to 40 psi-ms (280 Pa-s). An impulse of 34 psi-ms (230 Pa-s) resulted in about 50 percent incidence of slight lung hemorrhage. About half of the animals had gastrointestinal tract contusions (with slight ulceration, i.e., some perforation of the mucosal layer) at exposures of 25–27 psi-ms (170–190 Pa-s). Lung injuries were found to be slightly more prevalent than gastrointestinal tract injuries for the same exposure.

The Lovelace subject animals were exposed near the water surface; therefore, depth effects were not discernible in this data set. In addition, this data set included only small terrestrial animals, whereas marine mammals may be several orders of magnitude larger and have respiratory structures adapted for

the high pressures experienced at depth. The anatomical differences between the terrestrial animals used in the Lovelace tests and marine mammals are summarized in Fetherston et al. (2018). Goertner (1982) examined how lung cavity size would affect susceptibility to blast injury by considering both marine mammal size and depth in a bubble oscillation model of the lung; however, the Goertner (1982) model did not consider how tissues surrounding the respiratory air spaces would reflect shock wave energy or constrain oscillation (Fetherston et al., 2018). Animal depth relates to injury susceptibility in two ways: injury is related to the relative increase in explosive pressure over hydrostatic pressure, and lung collapse with depth reduces the potential for air cavity oscillatory damage. The period over which an impulse must be delivered to cause damage is assumed to be related to the natural oscillation period of an animal's lung, which depends on lung size.

Because gas-containing organs are more vulnerable to primary blast injury, adaptations for diving that allow for collapse of lung tissues with depth may make animals less vulnerable to lung injury with depth. Adaptations for diving include a flexible thoracic cavity, distensible veins that can fill space as air compresses, elastic lung tissue, and resilient tracheas with interlocking cartilaginous rings that provide strength and flexibility (Ridgway, 1972). Older literature suggested complete lung collapse depths at approximately 70 m for dolphins (Ridgway & Howard, 1979) and 20–50 m for phocid seals (Falke et al., 1985; Kooyman et al., 1972). Follow-on work by Kooyman and Sinnett (1982), in which pulmonary shunting was studied in harbor seals and sea lions, suggested that complete lung collapse for these species would be about 170 m and about 180 m, respectively. More recently, evidence in sea lions suggests that complete collapse might not occur until depths as great as 225 m; although the depth of collapse and depth of the dive are related, sea lions can affect the depth of lung collapse by varying the amount of air inhaled on a dive (McDonald & Ponganis, 2012). This is an important consideration for all divers who can modulate lung volume and gas exchange prior to diving via the degree of inhalation and during diving via exhalation (Fahlman et al., 2009); indeed, there are noted differences in pre-dive respiratory behavior, with some marine mammals exhibiting pre-dive exhalation to reduce the lung volume [e.g., phocid seals (Kooyman et al., 1973)].

Peak Pressure as a Predictor of Explosive Injury

High instantaneous peak pressures can cause damaging tissue distortion. Goertner (1982) suggested a peak overpressure gastrointestinal tract injury criterion because the size of gas bubbles in the gastrointestinal tract are variable, and their oscillation period could be short relative to primary blast wave exposure duration. The potential for gastrointestinal tract injury, therefore, may not be adequately modeled by the single oscillation bubble methodology used to estimate lung injury due to impulse. Like impulse, however, high instantaneous pressures may damage many parts of the body, but damage to the gastrointestinal tract is used as an indicator of any peak pressure-induced injury due to its vulnerability.

Older military reports documenting exposure of human divers to blast exposure generally describe peak pressure exposures around 100 psi (237 dB re 1 µPa peak) to feel like slight pressure or stinging sensation on skin, with no enduring effects (Christian & Gaspin, 1974). Around 200 psi, the shock wave felt like a blow to the head and chest. Data from the Lovelace Foundation experiments show instances of gastrointestinal tract contusions after exposures up to 1147 psi peak pressure, while exposures of up to 588 psi peak pressure resulted in many instances of no observed gastrointestinal tract effects. The lowest exposure for which slight contusions to the gastrointestinal tract were reported was 237 dB re 1 µPa peak. As a vulnerable gas-containing organ, the gastrointestinal tract is vulnerable to both high peak pressure and high impulse, which may vary to differing extents due to blast exposure

conditions (i.e., animal depth, distance from the charge). This likely explains the range of effects seen at similar peak pressure exposure levels and shows the utility of considering both peak pressure and impulse when analyzing the potential for injury due to explosives.

3.4.2.2.1.2 Hearing Loss

Exposure to intense sound may result in noise-induced hearing loss that persists after cessation of the noise exposure. Hearing loss may be temporary or permanent, depending on factors such as the exposure frequency, received SPL, temporal pattern, and duration. The frequencies affected by hearing loss may vary depending on the exposure frequency, with frequencies at and above the exposure frequency most strongly affected. The amount of hearing loss may range from slight to profound, depending on the ability of the individual to hear at the affected frequencies. Section 3.0.4.7 (Conceptual Framework for Assessing Effects from Acoustic and Explosive Activities) provides additional information on hearing loss and the framework used to analyze this potential impact.

Hearing loss has only been studied in a few species of marine mammals, although hearing studies with terrestrial mammals are also informative. There are no direct measurements of hearing loss in marine mammals due to exposure to explosive sources. The sound resulting from an explosive detonation is considered an impulsive sound and shares important qualities (e.g., short duration and fast rise time) with other impulsive sounds such as those produced by air guns. General research findings regarding TTS and PTS in marine mammals, as well as findings specific to exposure to other impulsive sound sources, are discussed in Section 3.4.2.1.1.2 (Hearing Loss).

3.4.2.2.1.3 Physiological Stress

Marine mammals naturally experience stress within their environment and as part of their life histories. The stress response is a suite of physiological changes that are meant to help an organism mitigate the impact of a stressor. However, if the magnitude and duration of the stress response is too great or too long, then it can have negative consequences to the organism (e.g., decreased immune function, decreased reproduction). Section 3.0.4.7 (Conceptual Framework for Assessing Effects from Acoustic and Explosive Activities) provides additional information on physiological stress and the framework used to analyze this potential impact.

There are no direct measurements of physiological stress in marine mammals due to exposure to explosive sources. General research findings regarding physiological stress in marine mammals due to exposure to sound and other stressors are discussed in detail in Section 3.4.2.1.1.3 (Physiological Stress). Because there are many unknowns regarding the occurrence of acoustically induced stress responses in marine mammals, it is assumed that any physiological response (e.g., hearing loss or injury) or significant behavioral response is also associated with a stress response.

3.4.2.2.1.4 Masking

Masking occurs when one sound, distinguished as the “noise,” interferes with the detection, discrimination, or recognition of another sound. The quantitative definition of masking is the amount in decibels an auditory detection, discrimination, or recognition threshold is raised in the presence of a masker (Erbe et al., 2016). As discussed in Section 3.0.4.7 (Conceptual Framework for Assessing Effects from Acoustic and Explosive Activities), masking can effectively limit the distance over which a marine mammal can communicate, detect biologically relevant sounds, and echolocate (odontocetes). Masking only occurs in the presence of the masking noise and does not persist after the cessation of the noise. Masking can lead to vocal changes (e.g., Lombard effect, increasing amplitude, or changing frequency)

and behavior changes (e.g., cessation of foraging, leaving an area) to both signalers and receivers, in an attempt to compensate for noise levels (Erbe et al., 2016).

There are no direct observations of masking in marine mammals due to exposure to explosive sources. General research findings regarding masking in marine mammals due to exposure to sound and other stressors are discussed in detail in Section 3.4.2.1.1.4 (Masking) under Acoustic Stressors above. Potential masking from explosive sounds is likely to be similar to masking studied for other impulsive sounds such as air guns.

3.4.2.2.1.5 Behavioral Reactions

As discussed in Section 3.0.4.7 (Conceptual Framework for Assessing Effects from Acoustic and Explosive Activities), any stimuli in the environment can cause a behavioral response in marine mammals, including noise from explosions. There are few direct observations of behavioral reactions from marine mammals due to exposure to explosive sounds. Lammers et al. (2017) recorded dolphin detections near naval mine neutralization exercises and found that although the immediate response (within 30 seconds of the explosion) was an increase in whistles relative to the 30 seconds before the explosion, there was a reduction in daytime acoustic activity during the day of and the day after the exercise within 6 km. However, the nighttime activity did not seem to be different than that prior to the exercise, and two days after there appeared to be an increase in daytime acoustic activity, indicating a rapid return to the area by the dolphins (Lammers et al., 2017). Vallejo et al. (2017) report on boat-based line-transect surveys which were run over 10 years in an area where an offshore wind farm was built; these surveys included the periods of preconstruction, construction, and post-construction. Harbor porpoise were observed throughout the area during all three phases, but were not detected within the footprint of the windfarm during the construction phase, and were overall less frequent throughout the study area. However, they returned after the construction was completed at a slightly higher level than in the preconstruction phase. Furthermore, there was no large-scale displacement of harbor porpoises during construction, and in fact their avoidance behavior only occurred out to about 18 km, in contrast to the approximately 25 km avoidance distance found in other windfarm construction and pile driving monitoring efforts.

Impulsive signals, particularly at close range, have a rapid rise time and higher instantaneous peak pressure than other signal types, making them more likely to cause startle responses or avoidance responses. However, at long distances the rise time increases as the signal duration lengthens (similar to a “ringing” sound), making the impulsive signal more similar to a non-impulsive signal. Behavioral reactions from explosive sounds are likely to be similar to reactions studied for other impulsive sounds, such as those produced by air guns and impact pile driving. Data on behavioral responses to impulsive sound sources are limited across all marine mammal groups, with only a few studies available for mysticetes and odontocetes. Most data have come from seismic surveys that occur over long durations (e.g., on the order of days to weeks), and typically utilize large multi-air gun arrays that fire repeatedly. While seismic data provide the best available science for assessing behavioral responses to impulsive sounds by marine mammals, it is likely that these responses represent a worst-case scenario compared to responses to explosives used in Navy activities, which would typically consist of single impulses or a cluster of impulses, rather than long-duration, repeated impulses.

See Section 3.4.2.1.1.5 (Behavioral Reactions) under Section 3.4.2.1 (Acoustic Stressors) for a summary of information on marine mammal reactions to impulsive sounds.

3.4.2.2.1.6 Stranding

When a marine mammal (alive or dead) swims or floats onto shore and becomes beached or incapable of returning to sea, the event is termed a "stranding" (Geraci et al., 1999; Geraci & Lounsbury, 2005; Perrin & Geraci, 2002). Specifically, under U.S. law, a stranding is an event in the wild where: "(A) a marine mammal is dead and is (i) on a beach or shore of the United States; or (ii) in waters under the jurisdiction of the United States (including any navigable waters); or (B) a marine mammal is alive and is (i) on a beach or shore of the United States and is unable to return to the water; (ii) on a beach or shore of the United States and, although able to return to the water, is in need of medical attention; or (iii) in the waters under the jurisdiction of the United States (including any navigable waters), but is unable to return to its natural habitat under its own power or without assistance" (16 U.S.C. section 1421h).

Impulsive sources (e.g., explosions) also have the potential to contribute to strandings, but such occurrences are even less common than those that have been related to certain sonar activities. During a Navy training event on March 4, 2011, at the Silver Strand Training Complex in San Diego, California, three long-beaked common dolphins were killed by an underwater detonation. Further details are provided above. Discussions of mitigation measures associated with these and other training and testing events are presented in Chapter 5 (Mitigation).

3.4.2.2.1.7 Long-Term Consequences

Long-term consequences to a population are determined by examining changes in the population growth rate. For additional information on the determination of long-term consequences, see Section 3.0.4.7 (Conceptual Framework for Assessing Effects from Acoustic and Explosive Activities). Physical effects from explosive sources that could lead to a reduction in the population growth rate include mortality or injury, which could remove animals from the reproductive pool, and permanent hearing impairment or chronic masking, which could impact navigation, foraging, predator avoidance, or communication. The long-term consequences due to individual behavioral reactions, masking, and short-term instances of physiological stress are especially difficult to predict because individual experience over time can create complex contingencies, especially for long-lived animals like marine mammals. For example, a lost reproductive opportunity could be a measurable cost to the individual; however, short-term costs may be recouped during the life of an otherwise healthy individual. These factors are taken into consideration when assessing risk of long-term consequences.

3.4.2.2.2 Impacts from Explosive Stressors

Marine mammals could be exposed to energy, sound, and fragments from explosions in the water and near the water surface associated with the proposed activities. Energy from an explosion is capable of causing mortality, injury, hearing loss, a behavioral response, masking, or physiological stress, depending on the level and duration of exposure.

The death of an animal would eliminate future reproductive potential, which is considered in the analysis of potential long-term consequences to the population. Exposures that result in non-auditory injuries or PTS may limit an animal's ability to find food, communicate with other animals, or interpret the surrounding environment. Impairment of these abilities can decrease an individual's chance of survival or impact its ability to successfully reproduce. TTS can also impair an animal's abilities, but the individual is likely to recover quickly with little significant effect.

Explosions in the ocean or near the water surface can introduce loud, impulsive, broadband sounds into the marine environment. These sounds, which are within the audible range of most marine mammals, could cause behavioral reactions, masking, and elevated physiological stress. Behavioral responses can

include shorter surfacings, shorter dives, fewer blows (breaths) per surfacing, longer intervals between blows, ceasing or increasing vocalizations, shortening or lengthening vocalizations, and changing frequency or intensity of vocalizations (National Research Council 2005). Sounds from explosives could also mask biologically important sounds; however, the duration of individual sounds is very short, reducing the likelihood of substantial auditory masking.

3.4.2.2.2.1 Methods for Analyzing Impacts from Explosives

The Navy performed a quantitative analysis to estimate the number of times that marine mammals could be impacted by explosions used during Navy training and testing activities. The Navy's quantitative analysis to determine impacts on marine mammals uses the Navy Acoustic Effects Model to produce initial estimates of the number of instances that animals may experience these effects; these estimates are further refined by considering animal avoidance of sound-producing activities and implementation of procedural mitigation measures. The steps of this quantitative analysis are described in Section 3.0.1.2 (Navy's Quantitative Analysis to Determine Impacts on Sea Turtles and Marine Mammals), which takes into account:

- criteria and thresholds used to predict impacts from explosives (see below);
- the density and spatial distribution of marine mammals (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2019; Watwood et al., 2018); and
- the influence of environmental parameters (e.g., temperature, depth, salinity) on sound propagation and explosive energy when estimating the received sound level and pressure on the animals.

A detailed explanation of this analysis is provided in the technical report *Quantifying Acoustic Impacts on Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles: Methods and Analytical Approach for Phase III Training and Testing* (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2018b).

Criteria and Thresholds used to Estimate Impacts to Marine Mammals from Explosives

Mortality and Injury from Explosives

As discussed above in Section 3.4.2.2.1.1 (Injury), two metrics have been identified as predictive of injury: impulse and peak pressure. Peak pressure contributes to the "crack" or "stinging" sensation of a blast wave, compared to the "thump" associated with received impulse. Older military reports documenting exposure of human divers to blast exposure generally describe peak pressure exposures around 100 psi (237 dB re 1 µPa SPL peak) to feel like slight pressure or stinging sensation on skin, with no enduring effects (Christian & Gaspin, 1974).

Because data on explosive injury do not indicate a set threshold for injury, rather a range of risk for explosive exposures, two sets of criteria are provided for use in non-auditory injury assessment. The exposure thresholds are used to estimate the number of animals that may be affected during Navy training and testing activities (Table 3.4-67). The thresholds for the farthest range to effect are based on the received level at which one percent risk is predicted and are useful for assessing potential effects to marine mammals and the level of potential impacts covered by the mitigation zones. Increasing animal mass and increasing animal depth both increase the impulse thresholds (i.e., decrease susceptibility), whereas smaller mass and decreased animal depth reduce the impulse thresholds (i.e., increase susceptibility). For impact assessment, marine mammal populations are assumed to be 70 percent adult and 30 percent calf/pup. Sub-adult masses are used to determine onset of effect, in order to estimate the farthest range at which an effect may first be observable. The derivation of these injury criteria and

the species mass estimates are provided in the technical report *Criteria and Thresholds for U.S. Navy Acoustic and Explosive Effects Analysis (Phase III)* (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2017b).

Table 3.4-67: Criteria to Quantitatively Assess Non-Auditory Injury Due to Underwater Explosions

Impact Category	*Impact Threshold*	*Threshold for Farthest Range to Effect*[2]
Mortality[1]	$144M^{1/3}\left(1+\frac{D}{10.1}\right)^{1/6}$ Pa-s	$103\left(1+\frac{D}{10.1}\right)^{1/6}$ Pa-s
Injury[1]	$65.8M^{1/3}\left(1+\frac{D}{10.1}\right)^{1/6}$ Pa-s	$47.5M^{1/3}\left(1+\frac{D}{10.1}\right)^{1/6}$ Pa-s
	243 dB re 1 µPa SPL peak	237 dB re 1 µPa SPL peak

[1] Impulse delivered over 20 percent of the estimated lung resonance period. See U.S. Department of the Navy (2017a).


[2] Threshold for one percent risk used to assess mitigation effectiveness.

Notes: D = animal depth (m), dB re 1 µPa = decibels referenced to 1 micropascal, M = animal mass (kg), Pa-s = Pascal-second, SPL = sound pressure level

When explosive ordnance (e.g., bomb or missile) detonates, fragments of the weapon are thrown at high-velocity from the detonation point, which can injure or kill marine mammals if they are struck. Risk of fragment injury reduces exponentially with distance as the fragment density is reduced. Fragments underwater tend to be larger than fragments produced by in-air explosions (Swisdak & Montanaro, 1992). Underwater, the friction of the water would quickly slow these fragments to a point where they no longer pose a threat. On the other hand, the blast wave from an explosive detonation moves efficiently through the seawater. Because the ranges to mortality and injury due to exposure to the blast wave are likely to far exceed the zone where fragments could injure or kill an animal, the above thresholds are assumed to encompass risk due to fragmentation.

Auditory Weighting Functions

Animals are not equally sensitive to noise at all frequencies. To capture the frequency-dependent nature of the effects of noise, auditory weighting functions are used (Figure 3.4-63). Auditory weighting functions are mathematical functions based on a generic band-pass filter and incorporate species-specific hearing abilities to calculate a weighted received sound level in units SPL or SEL. Due to the band pass nature of auditory weighting functions, they resemble an inverted “U” shape with amplitude plotted as a function of frequency. The flatter portion of the plotted function, where the amplitude is closest to zero, is the emphasized frequency range (i.e., the pass-band), while the frequencies below and above this range (where amplitude declines) are de-emphasized.




Source: See U.S. Department of the Navy (2017b) for parameters used to generate the functions and more information on weighting function derivation.
Notes: MF = mid-frequency cetacean, HF = high-frequency cetacean, LF = low-frequency cetacean

Figure 3.4-63: Navy Phase III Weighting Functions for All Species Groups

Hearing Loss from Explosives

Criteria used to define threshold shifts from explosions are derived from the two known studies designed to induce TTS in marine mammals from impulsive sources. Finneran et al. Finneran et al. (2002) reported behaviorally measured TTS of 6 and 7 dB in a beluga exposed to single impulses from a seismic water gun, and Lucke et al. (2009) reported auditory evoked potential-measured TTS of 7–20 dB in a harbor porpoise exposed to single impulses from a seismic air gun. Since marine mammal PTS data from impulsive noise exposures do not exist, onset-PTS levels for all groups were estimated by adding 15 dB to the threshold for non-impulsive sources. This relationship was derived by Southall et al. (2007) from impulsive noise TTS growth rates in chinchillas. These frequency-dependent thresholds are depicted by the exposure functions for each group's range of best hearing (Figure 3.4-64). Weighted sound exposure thresholds for underwater explosive sounds used in the analysis are shown in Table 3.4-68.



Notes: The dark dashed curve is the exposure function for PTS onset, the solid black curve is the exposure function for TTS onset, and the light grey curve is the exposure function for behavioral response. Small dashed lines indicate the SEL threshold for behavioral response, TTS, and PTS onset at each group's most sensitive frequency (i.e., the weighted SEL threshold).

Figure 3.4-64: Navy Phase III Behavioral, TTS, and PTS Exposure Functions for Explosives

Table 3.4-68: Navy Phase III Weighted Sound Exposure Thresholds for Underwater Explosive Sounds

Hearing Group	*Explosive Sound Source*				
	Behavior (SEL) weighted (dB)	*TTS (SEL) weighted (dB)*	*TTS (Peak SPL) unweighted (dB)*	*PTS (SEL) weighted (dB)*	*PTS (Peak SPL) unweighted (dB)*
Low-frequency Cetacean	163	168	213	183	219
Mid-frequency Cetacean	165	170	224	185	230
High-frequency Cetacean	135	140	196	155	202

Notes: dB = decibels, PTS = permanent threshold shift, SEL = sound exposure level, SPL = sound pressure level, TTS = temporary threshold shift

Behavioral Responses from Explosives

If more than one explosive event occurs within any given 24-hour period within a training or testing activity, criteria are applied to predict the number of animals that may have a behavioral reaction. For exercises with multiple explosions, the behavioral threshold used in this analysis is 5 dB less than the TTS onset threshold (in SEL). This value is derived from observed onsets of behavioral response by test subjects (bottlenose dolphins) during non-impulsive TTS testing (Schlundt et al., 2000).

Some multiple explosive exercises, such as certain naval gunnery exercises, may be treated as a single event because a few explosions occur closely spaced within a very short time (a few seconds). For single explosions at received sound levels below hearing loss thresholds, the most likely behavioral response is a brief alerting or orienting response. Since no further sounds follow the initial brief impulses, significant behavioral reactions would not be expected to occur. This assumption does not preclude the consideration of animals being behaviorally disturbed during single explosions if they are exposed above the TTS threshold. This reasoning was applied to previous shock trials (63 FR 230; 66 FR 87; 73 FR 143) and is extended to the criteria used in this analysis.

Accounting for Mitigation

The Navy will implement mitigation measures to avoid or reduce potential impacts from explosives on marine mammals, as described in Section 5.3.3 (Explosive Stressors). The benefits of mitigation are conservatively factored into the analysis for Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 of the Proposed Action for training and testing. The Navy's mitigation measures are identical for both action alternatives.

Procedural mitigation measures include delaying or ceasing applicable detonations when a marine mammal is observed in a mitigation zone. The mitigation zones for explosives extend beyond the respective average ranges to mortality. Therefore, the impact analysis quantifies the potential for procedural mitigation to reduce the risk of mortality due to exposure to explosives. Two factors are considered when quantifying the effectiveness of mitigation: (1) the extent to which the type of mitigation proposed for a sound-producing activity (e.g., an explosive activity) allows for observation of the mitigation zone prior to and during the activity; and (2) the sightability of each species that may be present in the mitigation zone, which is determined by species-specific characteristics and the viewing platform. A detailed explanation of the analysis is provided in the technical report *Quantifying Acoustic*

Impacts on Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles: Methods and Analytical Approach for Phase III Training and Testing (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2018b).

The impact analysis does not analyze the potential for mitigation to reduce non-auditory injury, PTS, TTS, or behavioral effects, even though mitigation would also reduce the likelihood of these effects. In practice, mitigation also protects all unobserved (below the surface) animals in the vicinity, including other species, in addition to the observed animal. However, the analysis assumes that only animals sighted at the water surface would be protected by the applied mitigation. The analysis, therefore, does not capture the protection afforded to all marine species that may be near or within the mitigation zone.

The ability to observe the ranges to mortality was estimated for each training or testing event. The ability of Navy Lookouts to detect marine mammals within a mitigation zone is dependent on the animal's presence at the surface and the characteristics of the animal that influence its sightability (such as group size or surface active behavior). The behaviors and characteristics of some species may make them easier to detect. Certain behaviors, such as leaping and breaching, are visible from a great distance and likely increase sighting distances and detections of those species. Environmental conditions under which the training or testing activity could take place are also considered, such as sea surface conditions, weather (e.g., fog or rain), and day versus night.

The Navy will also implement mitigation measures for certain explosive activities within mitigation areas, including the Marpi Reef Mitigation Area, Chalan Kanoa Reef Mitigation Area, and Agat Bay Nearshore Mitigation Area, as described in Appendix I (Geographic Mitigation Assessment). Mitigation areas are designed to help avoid or reduce impacts during biologically important life processes within particularly important habitat areas. The benefits of mitigation areas are discussed qualitatively in terms of the context of impact avoidance or reduction.

3.4.2.2.2.2 Impact Ranges for Explosives

The following section provides the range (distance) over which specific physiological or behavioral effects are expected to occur based on the explosive criteria and the explosive propagation calculations from the Navy Acoustic Effects Model (Section 3.4.2.2.2.1, Methods for Analyzing Impacts from Explosives). The range to effects are shown for a range of explosive bins, from E1 (up to 0.25 lb. net explosive weight) to E12 (up to 1,000 lb. net explosive weight). Ranges are determined by modeling the distance that noise from an explosion will need to propagate to reach exposure level thresholds specific to a hearing group that would cause behavioral response, TTS, PTS, and non-auditory injury. Range to effects is important information in not only predicting impacts from explosives, but also in verifying the accuracy of model results against real-world situations and assessing the level of impact that would likely be mitigated within applicable mitigation zones.

Table 3.4-69 shows the minimum, average, and maximum ranges due to varying propagation conditions to non-auditory injury as a function of animal mass and explosive bin. Ranges to gastrointestinal tract injury typically exceed ranges to slight lung injury; therefore, the maximum range to effect is not mass-dependent. Animals within these water volumes would be expected to receive minor injuries at the outer ranges, increasing to more substantial injuries, and finally mortality as an animal approaches the detonation point. Ranges to mortality, based on animal mass, are shown in Table 3.4-70.

Table 3.4-71 through Table 3.4-76 show the minimum, average, and maximum ranges to onset of auditory and behavioral effects based on the thresholds described in Section 3.4.2.2.2.1 (Methods for Analyzing Impacts from Explosives). Ranges are provided for a representative source depth and cluster

size (the number of rounds fired [or buoys dropped] within a very short duration) for each bin. For events with multiple explosions, sound from successive explosions can be expected to accumulate and increase the range to the onset of an impact based on SEL thresholds. Modeled ranges to TTS and PTS based on peak pressure for a single explosion generally exceed the modeled ranges based on SEL even when accumulated for multiple explosions. Peak pressure based ranges are estimated using the best available science; however, data on peak pressure at far distances from explosions are very limited. For additional information on how ranges to impacts from explosions were estimated, see the technical report *Quantifying Acoustic Impacts on Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles: Methods and Analytical Approach for Phase III Training and Testing* (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2018b).

Table 3.4-69: Ranges to Non-Auditory Injury (in meters) for All Marine Mammal Hearing Groups

Bin[2]	*Range to Non-Auditory Injury (meters)* [1]
E1	12 (11–13)
E2	16 (15–16)
E3	25 (25–25)
E4	30 (30–35)
E5	40 (40–65)
E6	52 (50–60)
E8	98 (90–150)
E9	123 (120–270)
E10	155 (150–430)
E11	418 (410–420)
E12	195 (180–675)

[1] Average distance is shown with the minimum and maximum distances due to varying propagation environments in parentheses.
Notes: All ranges to non-auditory injury within this table are driven by gastrointestinal tract injury thresholds regardless of animal mass.
[2] Bin (net explosive weight, lb.): E1 (0.1–0.25), E2 (>0.25–0.5), E3 (>0.5–2.5), E4 (> 2.5–5), E5 (> 5–10), E6 (> 10–20), E8 (> 60–100), E9 (> 100–250), E10 (> 250–500), E11 (> 500–650), and E12 (> 650–1,000).

Table 3.4-70: Ranges to Mortality (in meters) for All Marine Mammal Hearing Groups as a Function of Animal Mass

Bin[2]	*Range to Mortality (meters) for Various Animal Mass Intervals (kg)*[1]					
	10 kg	***250 kg***	***1,000 kg***	***5,000 kg***	***25,000 kg***	***72,000 kg***
E1	3 (3–3)	1 (0–2)	0 (0–0)	0 (0–0)	0 (0–0)	0 (0–0)
E2	4 (3–4)	2 (1–3)	1 (0–1)	0 (0–0)	0 (0–0)	0 (0–0)
E3	9 (7–10)	4 (2–8)	2 (1–2)	1 (0–1)	0 (0–0)	0 (0–0)
E4	13 (12–15)	7 (4–12)	3 (3–4)	2 (1–3)	1 (1–1)	1 (0–1)
E5	13 (12–30)	7 (4–25)	3 (2–7)	2 (1–5)	1 (1–2)	1 (0–2)
E6	16 (15–25)	9 (5–23)	4 (3–8)	3 (2–6)	1 (1–2)	1 (1–2)
E8	42 (25–65)	22 (9–50)	11 (6–19)	8 (4–13)	4 (2–6)	3 (1–5)
E9	33 (30–35)	20 (13–30)	10 (9–12)	7 (5–9)	4 (3–4)	3 (2–3)
E10	55 (40–170)	24 (16–35)	13 (11–15)	9 (7–11)	5 (4–5)	4 (3–4)
E11	206 (200–210)	98 (55–170)	44 (35–50)	30 (25–35)	16 (14–18)	12 (10–15)
E12	86 (50–270)	35 (20–210)	16 (13–19)	11 (9–13)	6 (5–6)	5 (4–5)

[1]Average distance to mortality (meters) is depicted above the minimum and maximum distances, which are in parentheses for each animal mass interval.
[2] Bin (net explosive weight, lb.): E1 (0.1–0.25), E2 (>0.25–0.5), E3 (>0.5–2.5), E4 (> 2.5–5), E5 (> 5–10), E6 (> 10–20), E8 (> 60–100), E9 (> 100–250), E10 (> 250–500), E11 (> 500–650), and E12 (> 650–1,000).
Note: Kg = kilogram

Table 3.4-71: SEL-Based Ranges to Onset PTS, Onset TTS, and Behavioral Reaction (in meters) for High-Frequency Cetaceans

Range to Effects for Explosives: High-Frequency Cetaceans[1]					
Bin[2]	***Source Depth (meters)***	***Cluster Size***	***Range to PTS (meters)***	***Range to TTS (meters)***	***Range to Behavioral (meters)***
E1	0.1	1	353 (340–370)	1,303 (1,275–1,775)	2,139 (2,025–4,275)
		18	1,031 (1,025–1,275)	3,409 (2,525–8,025)	4,208 (3,025–11,525)
E2	0.1	1	431 (410–700)	1,691 (1,525–2,775)	2,550 (2,025–4,525)
		5	819 (775–1,275)	2,896 (2,275–6,775)	3,627 (2,525–10,275)
E3	0.1	1	649 (625–700)	2,439 (2,025–4,525)	3,329 (2,525–7,525)
		12	1,682 (1,525–2,275)	4,196 (3,025–11,525)	5,388 (4,525–16,275)
	18.25	1	720 (675–775)	4,214 (2,275–6,275)	7,126 (3,525–8,775)
		12	1,798 (1,525–2,775)	10,872 (4,525–13,775)	14,553 (5,525–17,775)
E4	10	2	1,365 (1,025–2,775)	7,097 (4,275–10,025)	9,939 (5,025–15,275)
	60	2	1,056 (875–2,275)	3,746 (2,775–5,775)	5,262 (3,025–7,775)
E5	0.1	20	2,926 (1,525–6,275)	6,741 (4,525–16,025)	9,161 (4,775–20,025)
	30	20	4,199 (3,025–6,275)	13,783 (8,775–17,775)	17,360 (10,525–22,775)
E6	0.1	1	1,031 (1,025–1,275)	3,693 (2,025–8,025)	4,659 (3,025–12,775)
	30	1	1,268 (1,025–1,275)	7,277 (3,775–8,775)	10,688 (5,275–12,525)
E8	0.1	1	1,790 (1,775–3,025)	4,581 (4,025–10,775)	6,028 (4,525–15,775)
	45.75	1	1,842 (1,525–2,025)	9,040 (4,525–12,775)	12,729 (5,025–18,525)
E9	0.1	1	2,343 (2,275–4,525)	5,212 (4,025–13,275)	7,573 (5,025–17,025)

Table 3.4-71: SEL-Based Ranges to Onset PTS, Onset TTS, and Behavioral Reaction (in meters) for High-Frequency Cetaceans (continued)

Range to Effects for Explosives: High-Frequency Cetaceans[1]					
Bin	***Source Depth (meters)***	***Cluster Size***	***Range to PTS (meters)***	***Range to TTS (meters)***	***Range to Behavioral (meters)***
E10	0.1	1	2,758 (2,275–5,025)	6,209 (4,275–16,525)	8,578 (5,275–19,775)
E11	45.75	1	3,005 (2,525–3,775)	11,648 (5,025–18,775)	14,912 (6,525–24,775)
	91.4	1	3,234 (2,525–4,525)	5,772 (4,775–11,775)	7,197 (5,775–14,025)
E12	0.1	1	3,172 (3,025–6,525)	7,058 (5,025–17,025)	9,262 (6,025–21,775)
		4	4,209 (3,775–10,025)	9,817 (6,275–22,025)	12,432 (7,525–27,775)

[1]Average distance (meters) to PTS, TTS, and behavioral thresholds are depicted above the minimum and maximum distances which are in parentheses. Values depict the range produced by SEL hearing threshold criteria levels. PTS = permanent threshold shift, SEL = sound exposure level, TTS = temporary threshold shift
[2] Bin (net explosive weight, lb.): E1 (0.1–0.25), E2 (>0.25–0.5), E3 (>0.5–2.5), E4 (> 2.5–5), E5 (> 5–10), E6 (> 10–20), E8 (> 60–100), E9 (> 100–250), E10 (> 250–500), E11 (> 500–650), and E12 (> 650–1,000).

Table 3.4-72: Peak Pressure Based Ranges to Onset PTS and Onset TTS (in meters) for High-Frequency Cetaceans

Range to Effects for Explosives: High-Frequency Cetaceans[1]			
Bin	***Source Depth (meters)***	***Range to PTS (meters)***	***Range to TTS (meters)***
E1	0.1	745 (700–775)	1,275 (1,275–1,275)
E2	0.1	912 (380–975)	1,498 (725–1,525)
E3	0.1	1,525 (1,525–1,525)	2,397 (2,025–2,525)
	18.25	1,561 (1,525–2,775)	2,919 (2,775–3,525)
E4	10	2,076 (1,775–2,525)	5,565 (3,525–7,775)
	60	2,364 (1,775–4,775)	4,044 (2,025–5,275)
E5	0.1	2,267 (1,025–3,275)	3,093 (1,275–5,775)
	30	2,567 (2,275–2,775)	3,747 (3,025–5,275)

Table 3.4-72: Peak Pressure Based Ranges to Onset PTS and Onset TTS (in meters) for High-Frequency Cetaceans (continued)

Range to Effects for Explosives: High-Frequency Cetaceans[1]			
Bin[2]	***Source Depth (meters)***	***Range to PTS (meters)***	***Range to TTS (meters)***
E6	0.1	2,546 (1,275–4,525)	3,356 (1,525–6,525)
	30	3,242 (2,775–3,525)	4,598 (3,525–5,275)
E8	0.1	3,458 (3,025–6,525)	4,324 (3,775–8,275)
	45.75	4,790 (4,275–6,525)	11,013 (4,775–23,775)
E9	0.1	3,870 (3,275–8,025)	4,620 (3,775–10,275)
E10	0.1	3,993 (2,525–9,275)	5,076 (2,775–16,025)
E11	45.75	8,388 (4,775–24,275)	17,386 (5,025–33,275)
	91.4	5,051 (4,025–7,525)	7,065 (4,275–26,525)
E12	0.1	4,519 (3,775–9,775)	5,678 (4,275–13,025)

[1] Average distance (meters) is shown with the minimum and maximum distances due to varying propagation environments in parentheses. PTS = permanent threshold shift, TTS = temporary threshold shift

[2] Bin (net explosive weight, lb.): E1 (0.1–0.25), E2 (>0.25–0.5), E3 (>0.5–2.5), E4 (> 2.5–5), E5 (> 5–10), E6 (> 10–20), E8 (> 60–100), E9 (> 100–250), E10 (> 250–500), E11 (> 500–650), and E12 (> 650–1,000).

Table 3.4-73: SEL-Based Ranges to Onset PTS, Onset TTS, and Behavioral Reaction (in meters) for Low-Frequency Cetaceans

Range to Effects for Explosives: Low-Frequency Cetaceans[1]					
Bin[2]	***Source Depth (meters)***	***Cluster Size***	***Range to PTS (meters)***	***Range to TTS (meters)***	***Range to Behavioral (meters)***
E1	0.1	1	51 (50–55)	231 (200–250)	378 (280–410)
		18	183 (170–190)	691 (450–775)	934 (575–1,275)
E2	0.1	1	66 (65–70)	291 (220–320)	463 (330–500)
		5	134 (110–140)	543 (370–600)	769 (490–950)
E3	0.1	1	113 (110–120)	477 (330–525)	689 (440–825)
		12	327 (250–370)	952 (600–1,525)	1,240 (775–4,025)
	18.25	1	200 (200–200)	955 (925–1,000)	1,534 (1,275–1,775)
		12	625 (600–625)	5,517 (2,275–7,775)	10,299 (3,775–13,025)
E4	10	2	429 (370–600)	2,108 (1,775–2,775)	4,663 (3,025–6,025)
	60	2	367 (340–470)	1,595 (1,025–2,025)	2,468 (1,525–4,275)
E5	0.1	20	702 (380–1,275)	1,667 (850–11,025)	2,998 (1,025–19,775)
	30	20	1,794 (1,275–2,775)	8,341 (3,775–11,525)	13,946 (4,025–22,275)
E6	0.1	1	250 (190–410)	882 (480–1,775)	1,089 (625–6,525)
	30	1	495 (490–500)	2,315 (2,025–2,525)	5,446 (3,275–6,025)
E8	0.1	1	415 (270–725)	1,193 (625–4,275)	1,818 (825–8,525)
	45.75	1	952 (900–975)	6,294 (3,025–9,525)	12,263 (4,275–20,025)
E9	0.1	1	573 (320–1,025)	1,516 (725–7,275)	2,411 (950–14,275)

Table 3.4-73: SEL-Based Ranges to Onset PTS, Onset TTS, and Behavioral Reaction (in meters) for Low-Frequency Cetaceans (continued)

Range to Effects for Explosives: Low-Frequency Cetaceans[1]					
Bin[2]	***Source Depth (meters)***	***Cluster Size***	***Range to PTS (meters)***	***Range to TTS (meters)***	***Range to Behavioral (meters)***
E10	0.1	1	715 (370–1,525)	2,088 (825–28,275)	4,378 (1,025–32,275)
E11	45.75	1	1,881 (1,525–2,275)	12,425 (4,275–27,275)	23,054 (7,025–65,275)
	91.4	1	1,634 (1,275–2,525)	5,686 (3,775–11,275)	11,618 (5,525–64,275)
E12	0.1	1	790 (420–2,775)	2,698 (925–25,275)	6,032 (1,025–31,275)
		4	1,196 (575–6,025)	6,876 (1,525–31,275)	13,073 (3,775–64,275)

[1]Average distance (meters) to PTS, TTS, and behavioral thresholds are depicted above the minimum and maximum distances which are in parentheses. Values depict the range produced by SEL hearing threshold criteria levels.
[2] Bin (net explosive weight, lb.): E1 (0.1–0.25), E2 (>0.25–0.5), E3 (>0.5–2.5), E4 (> 2.5–5), E5 (> 5–10), E6 (> 10–20), E8 (> 60–100), E9 (> 100–250), E10 (> 250–500), E11 (> 500–650), and E12 (> 650–1,000).
Notes: PTS = permanent threshold shift, SEL = sound exposure level, TTS = temporary threshold shift

Table 3.4-74: Peak Pressure Based Ranges to Onset PTS and Onset TTS (in meters) for Low-Frequency Cetaceans

Range to Effects for Explosives: Low-Frequency Cetaceans[1]			
Bin	***Source Depth (meters)***	***Range to PTS (meters)***	***Range to TTS (meters)***
E1	0.1	135 (130–140)	249 (220–270)
E2	0.1	173 (120–180)	305 (180–330)
E3	0.1	292 (240–310)	499 (330–550)
	18.25	310 (310–310)	583 (550–600)
E4	10	396 (390–420)	738 (725–750)
	60	420 (380–775)	846 (575–2,025)
E5	0.1	451 (310–525)	740 (410–1,025)
	30	521 (490–600)	971 (925–1,025)

Table 3.4-74: Peak Pressure Based Ranges to Onset PTS and Onset TTS (in meters) for Low-Frequency Cetaceans (continued)

Range to Effects for Explosives: Low-Frequency Cetaceans[1]			
Bin[2]	***Source Depth (meters)***	***Range to PTS (meters)***	***Range to TTS (meters)***
E6	0.1	547 (350–700)	842 (460–1,275)
	30	622 (600–650)	1,025 (1,025–1,025)
E8	0.1	799 (450–925)	1,030 (575–1,775)
	45.75	1,025 (1,025–1,025)	1,778 (1,525–2,025)
E9	0.1	947 (500–1,275)	1,294 (675–3,025)
E10	0.1	1,032 (550–1,775)	1,388 (800–4,275)
E11	45.75	1,778 (1,525–2,025)	3,067 (2,275–11,275)
	91.4	1,676 (1,275–3,275)	2,442 (2,025–3,525)
E12	0.1	1,151 (625–2,525)	1,762 (900–5,275)

[1] Average distance (meters) is shown with the minimum and maximum distances due to varying propagation environments in parentheses.
[2] Bin (net explosive weight, lb.): E1 (0.1–0.25), E2 (>0.25–0.5), E3 (>0.5–2.5), E4 (> 2.5–5), E5 (> 5–10), E6 (> 10–20), E8 (> 60–100), E9 (> 100–250), E10 (> 250–500), E11 (> 500–650), and E12 (> 650–1,000).
Notes: PTS = permanent threshold shift, TTS = temporary threshold shift

Table 3.4-75: SEL-Based Ranges to Onset PTS, Onset TTS, and Behavioral Reaction (in meters) for Mid-Frequency Cetaceans

Range to Effects for Explosives: Mid-Frequency Cetaceans[1]					
Bin[2]	*Source Depth (meters)*	*Cluster Size*	*Range to PTS (meters)*	*Range to TTS (meters)*	*Range to Behavioral (meters)*
E1	0.1	1	25 (25–25)	116 (110–120)	199 (190–210)
		18	94 (90–100)	415 (390–440)	646 (525–700)
E2	0.1	1	30 (30–35)	146 (140–170)	248 (230–370)
		5	63 (60–70)	301 (280–410)	481 (430–675)
E3	0.1	1	50 (50–50)	233 (220–250)	381 (360–400)
		12	155 (150–160)	642 (525–700)	977 (700–1,025)
	18.25	1	40 (40–40)	202 (190–220)	332 (320–350)
		12	126 (120–130)	729 (675–775)	1,025 (1,025–1,025)
E4	10	2	76 (70–90)	464 (410–550)	783 (650–975)
	60	2	60 (60–60)	347 (310–675)	575 (525–900)
E5	0.1	20	290 (280–300)	1,001 (750–1,275)	1,613 (925–3,275)
	30	20	297 (240–420)	1,608 (1,275–2,775)	2,307 (2,025–2,775)
E6	0.1	1	98 (95–100)	430 (400–450)	669 (550–725)
	30	1	78 (75–80)	389 (370–410)	619 (600–650)
E8	0.1	1	162 (150–170)	665 (550–700)	982 (725–1,025)
	45.75	1	127 (120–130)	611 (600–625)	985 (950–1,025)
E9	0.1	1	215 (210–220)	866 (625–1,000)	1,218 (800–1,525)

Table 3.4-75: SEL-Based Ranges to Onset PTS, Onset TTS, and Behavioral Reaction (in meters) for Mid-Frequency Cetaceans (continued)

Range to Effects for Explosives: Mid-Frequency Cetaceans[1]					
Bin[2]	***Source Depth (meters)***	***Cluster Size***	***Range to PTS (meters)***	***Range to TTS (meters)***	***Range to Behavioral (meters)***
E10	0.1	1	270 (250–280)	985 (700–1,275)	1,506 (875–2,525)
E11	45.75	1	241 (230–250)	1,059 (1,000–1,275)	1,874 (1,525–2,025)
	91.4	1	237 (230–270)	1,123 (900–2,025)	1,731 (1,275–2,775)
E12	0.1	1	332 (320–370)	1,196 (825–1,525)	1,766 (1,025–3,525)
		4	572 (500–600)	1,932 (1,025–4,025)	2,708 (1,275–6,775)

[1]Average distance (meters) to PTS, TTS, and behavioral thresholds are depicted above the minimum and maximum distances which are in parentheses. Values depict the range produced by SEL hearing threshold criteria levels.
[2] Bin (net explosive weight, lb.): E1 (0.1–0.25), E2 (>0.25–0.5), E3 (>0.5–2.5), E4 (> 2.5–5), E5 (> 5–10), E6 (> 10–20), E8 (> 60–100), E9 (> 100–250), E10 (> 250–500), E11 (> 500–650), and E12 (> 650–1,000).
Notes: PTS = permanent threshold shift, SEL = sound exposure level, TTS = temporary threshold shift

Table 3.4-76: Peak Pressure Based Ranges to Onset PTS and Onset TTS (in meters) for Mid-Frequency Cetaceans

Range to Effects for Explosives: Mid-Frequency Cetaceans[1]			
Bin[2]	***Source Depth (meters)***	***Range to PTS (meters)***	***Range to TTS (meters)***
E1	0.1	43 (40–45)	84 (80–90)
E2	0.1	58 (55–60)	105 (95–110)
E3	0.1	98 (95–100)	183 (170–190)
	18.25	100 (100–100)	180 (180–180)
E4	10	120 (120–120)	255 (250–260)
	60	123 (120–130)	239 (230–340)
E5	0.1	155 (150–160)	288 (270–300)
	30	168 (160–190)	310 (290–350)

Table 3.4-76: Peak Pressure Based Ranges to Onset PTS and Onset TTS (in meters) for Mid-Frequency Cetaceans (continued)

Range to Effects for Explosives: Mid-Frequency Cetaceans[1]			
Bin[2]	***Source Depth (meters)***	***Range to PTS (meters)***	***Range to TTS (meters)***
E6	0.1	197 (190–210)	359 (320–400)
	30	200 (200–200)	380 (380–380)
E8	0.1	333 (310–340)	574 (440–625)
	45.75	351 (350–370)	629 (625–725)
E9	0.1	442 (370–460)	757 (500–850)
E10	0.1	546 (420–700)	939 (550–1,275)
E11	45.75	662 (650–800)	1,104 (1,025–1,275)
	91.4	748 (600–1,525)	1,353 (1,000–2,525)
E12	0.1	663 (470–725)	1,064 (625–1,275)

[1] Average distance (meters) is shown with the minimum and maximum distances due to varying propagation environments in parentheses.
[2] Bin (net explosive weight, lb.): E1 (0.1–0.25), E2 (>0.25–0.5), E3 (>0.5–2.5), E4 (> 2.5–5), E5 (> 5–10), E6 (> 10–20), E8 (> 60–100), E9 (> 100–250), E10 (> 250–500), E11 (> 500–650), and E12 (> 650–1,000).
Notes: PTS = permanent threshold shift, TTS = temporary threshold shift

3.4.2.2.2.3 Impacts from Explosive Stressors Under the Action Alternatives

The following section provides a brief description of training and testing activities as they pertain to underwater and near-surface explosions under the Action Alternatives:

As described in Chapter 2 (Description of the Action and Action Area), Table 2.5-1, and Section 3.4.2.2 (Explosive Stressors), training and testing activities under the Proposed Action would use underwater detonations and explosive ordnance. Under Alternative 1, there could be fluctuation in the amount of explosives use that could occur annually, although potential impacts would be similar from year to year. The number and type (i.e., source bin) of explosives in this SEIS/OEIS compared with the totals analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS are described in Table 2.5-1 and Table 2.5-2. This comparison applies to both Alternative 1 and Alternative 2, because the number of explosives used would be almost identical under each alternative.

The number of torpedo testing events (both explosive and non-explosive) planned under Alternative 1 testing can vary slightly from year to year; however, all other training and testing activities that involve the use of explosives would remain consistent from year to year. Alternative 1 results are presented for

a maximum explosive use year; however, during most years, explosive use would be less, resulting in fewer potential impacts. The numbers of activities planned under Alternative 2 are consistent from year to year and would increase slightly compared to activities planned under Alternative 1. The numbers of explosives used under each alternative are described in Section 3.0.4.2 (Explosive Stressors).

Presentation of Estimated Impacts from the Quantitative Analysis

The results of the analysis of potential impacts on marine mammals from explosives (see Section 3.4.2.2.2.1, Methods for Analyzing Impacts from Explosives) are discussed below. The numbers of potential impacts estimated for individual species of marine mammals from exposure to explosive energy and sound for training activities under Alternative 1 and 2 are shown in Appendix E (Estimated Marine Mammal and Sea Turtle Impacts from Exposure to Acoustic and Explosive Stressors Under Navy Training and Testing Activities). Additionally, estimated numbers of potential impacts from the quantitative analysis for each species are presented below (e.g., Figure 3.4-65). The most likely regions and activity categories from which the impacts could occur are displayed in the impact graphics for each species. There is a potential for impacts to occur anywhere within the Study Area where sound and energy from explosions and the species overlap, although only regions or activity categories where 0.5 percent of the impacts, or greater, are estimated to occur are graphically represented on the impact graphics below. All (i.e., grand total) estimated impacts are also included, regardless of region or category.

Mysticetes

Mysticetes may be exposed to sound and energy from explosions associated with training and testing activities throughout the year. Explosions produce sounds that are within the hearing range of mysticetes (see Section 3.4.1.6, Hearing and Vocalization). Potential impacts from explosive energy and sound include non-auditory injury, behavioral reactions, physiological stress, masking, and hearing loss. The quantitative analysis estimates the number of behavioral reactions and TTS in mysticetes. Impact ranges for mysticetes exposed to explosive sound and energy are discussed under low-frequency cetaceans in Section 3.4.2.2.2.2 (Impact Ranges for Explosives).

Mysticetes that do experience threshold shift from explosive sounds may have reduced ability to detect biologically important sounds (e.g., social vocalizations) until their hearing recovers. Recovery from threshold shift begins almost immediately after the noise exposure ceases and can take a few minutes to a few days, depending on the severity of the initial shift, to recover. TTS would recover fully and PTS would leave some residual hearing loss. Threshold shifts do not necessarily affect all hearing frequencies equally, and typically manifest themselves at the exposure frequency or within an octave above the exposure frequency. Noise from explosions is broadband with most energy below a few hundred Hertz; therefore, any hearing loss from exposure to explosive sounds is likely to be broadband with effects predominantly at lower frequencies. During the short period that a mysticete had TTS, or permanently for PTS, social calls from conspecifics could be more difficult to detect or interpret, the ability to detect predators may be reduced, and the ability to detect and avoid sounds from approaching vessels or other stressors might be reduced. It is unclear how or if mysticetes use sound for finding prey or feeding; therefore, it is unknown whether a TTS would affect a mysticete's ability to locate prey or rate of feeding.

Research and observations of auditory masking in marine mammals due to impulsive sounds are discussed in Section 3.4.2.2.1.4 (Masking). Explosions introduce low-frequency, broadband sounds into the environment, which could mask hearing thresholds in mysticetes that are nearby, although sounds

from explosions last for only a few seconds at most. Masking due to time-isolated detonations would not be significant. Activities that have multiple detonations such as some naval gunfire exercises could create some masking for mysticetes in the area over the short duration of the event. Potential costs to mysticetes from masking are similar to those discussed above for TTS, with the primary difference being that the effects of masking are only present when the sound from the explosion is present within the water and the effect is over the moment the sound has ceased.

Research and observations (see Section 3.4.2.2.1.5, Behavioral Reactions), show that if mysticetes are exposed to impulsive sounds such as those from explosives, they may react in a variety of ways, which may include alerting, startling, breaking off feeding dives and surfacing, diving or swimming away, changing vocalization, or showing no response at all. Overall, mysticetes have been observed to be more reactive to acoustic disturbance when a noise sources is located directly on their migration route. Mysticetes disturbed while migrating could pause their migration or route around the disturbance. Animals disturbed while engaged in other activities such as feeding or reproductive behaviors may be more likely to ignore or tolerate the disturbance and continue their natural behavior patterns. Because noise from most activities using explosives is short-term and intermittent, and because detonations usually occur within a small area, behavioral reactions from mysticetes are likely to be short-term and low to moderate severity.

Physiological stress could be caused by injury or hearing loss and could accompany any behavioral reaction as well. Research and observations of physiological stress in marine mammals are discussed in Section 3.4.2.2.1.3 (Physiological Stress). Due to the short-term and intermittent use of explosives, physiological stress is also likely to be short-term and intermittent. Long-term consequences from physiological stress due to the sound of explosives would not be expected.

Blue Whale (Endangered Species Act-Listed)

Impacts from Explosives Under Alternative 1 for Training and Testing Activities

Blue whales may be exposed to sound or energy from explosions associated with training and testing when they occur in the Study Area during the winter. The quantitative analysis estimates that any possible exposures to blue whales would not result in impacts rising to a level of take. Considering the mitigation measures that will be implemented as described in Section 2.3.4 (Mitigation Measures), and that impacts are not anticipated, long-term consequences for individuals or the species would not be expected.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of explosives during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 1 would not result in the incidental taking of blue whales.

Pursuant to the ESA, the use of explosives during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 1 may affect ESA-listed blue whales.

Impacts from Explosives Under Alternative 2 for Training and Testing Activities

Blue whales may be exposed to sound or energy from explosions associated with training and testing activities when they occur in the Study Area during the winter. The quantitative analysis estimates any exposures to blue whales would not result in impacts rising to a level of take. Considering the mitigation measures that will be implemented as described in Section 2.3.4 (Mitigation Measures), and that impacts are not anticipated, long-term consequences for individuals or the species would not be expected.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of explosives during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 2 would not result in the incidental taking of blue whales.


Pursuant to the ESA, the use of explosives during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 2 may affect ESA-listed blue whales. The Navy is consulting with NMFS as required by Section 7(a)(2) of the ESA.

Bryde's Whale

Impacts from Explosives Under Alternative 1 for Training and Testing Activities

Bryde's whales may be exposed to sound or energy from explosions associated with training and testing activities throughout the year. The quantitative analysis, using the maximum number of explosives per year under Alternative 1, estimates behavioral reactions and TTS during training and testing activities (Figure 3.4-65 and Table 3.4-77). Estimated impacts most years would be less based on fewer explosions. Impact ranges for this species are discussed in Section 3.4.2.2.2.2 (Impact Ranges for Explosives). As described for mysticetes above, even a few minor to moderate TTS or behavioral reactions to an individual over the course of a year are unlikely to have any significant costs or long-term consequences for that individual. Considering these factors and the mitigation measures that will be implemented as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), long-term consequences for the species would not be expected.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of explosives during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 1 would result in the unintentional taking of Bryde's whales incidental to those activities.



Notes: (1) Region and Activity Category bar charts show categories +/- 0.5 percent of the estimated impacts, which could result in a total of 98–101 percent. Estimated impacts most years would be less based on fewer explosions. The model is probabilistic and therefore a single impact could be divided among multiple regions or activity categories. (2) MIRC = Mariana Islands Range Complex

Figure 3.4-65: Bryde's Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1

Table 3.4-77: Estimated Impacts on Individual Bryde's Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1


Estimated Impacts by Effect			
Behavioral	***TTS***	***PTS***	***Injury***
3	2	0	0

Note: Estimated impacts are based on the maximum number of activities in a given year under Alternative 1.

Impacts from Explosives Under Alternative 2 for Training and Testing Activities

Potential annual impacts under Alternative 2 from training and testing with explosives would differ slightly in location and number (Figure 3.4-66 and Table 3.4-78) compared to the impacts shown and discussed above in Impacts from Explosives Under Alternative 1 for Training and Testing Activities. The primary distinction is that explosive use would be consistent year to year under Alternative 2 and the total number of activities would increase slightly compared to Alternative 1.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of explosives during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 2 would result in the unintentional taking of Bryde's whales incidental to those activities. The Navy is requesting authorization from NMFS as required by Section 101(a)(5)(A) of the MMPA.



Notes: (1) Region and Activity Category bar charts show categories +/- 0.5 percent of the estimated impacts, which could result in a total of 98–101 percent. Estimated impacts most years would be less based on fewer explosions. The model is probabilistic and therefore a single impact could be divided among multiple regions or activity categories. (2) MIRC = Mariana Islands Range Complex

Figure 3.4-66: Bryde's Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2

Table 3.4-78: Estimated Impacts on Individual Bryde's Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2

Estimated Impacts by Effect			
Behavioral	***TTS***	***PTS***	***Injury***
4	2	0	0

Note: Estimated impacts are based on the maximum number of activities in a given year under Alternative 2.

Fin Whale (Endangered Species Act-Listed)

Impacts from Explosives Under Alternative 1 for Training and Testing Activities

Fin whales may be exposed to sound or energy from explosions associated with training and testing activities most likely in the winter months, when fin whales typically occur in the Study Area. The quantitative analysis estimates that any possible exposures to fin whales would not result in impacts rising to a level of take. Considering the mitigation measures that will be implemented as described in Section 2.3.4 (Mitigation Measures), and that impacts are not anticipated, long-term consequences for individuals or the species would not be expected.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of explosives during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 1 would not result in the incidental taking of fin whales.

Pursuant to the ESA, the use of explosives during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 1 may affect ESA-listed fin whales.

Impacts from Explosives Under Alternative 2 for Training and Testing Activities

Fin whales may be exposed to sound or energy from explosions associated with training and testing activities, most likely in the winter months, when fin whales typically occur in the Study Area. The quantitative analysis estimates any exposures to fin whales would not result in impacts rising to a level of take. Considering the mitigation measures that will be implemented as described in Section 2.3.4 (Mitigation Measures), and that impacts are not anticipated, long-term consequences for individuals or the species would not be expected.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of explosives during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 2 would not result in the incidental taking of fin whales.

Pursuant to the ESA, the use of explosives during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 2 may affect ESA-listed fin whales. The Navy is consulting with NMFS as required by Section 7(a)(2) of the ESA.

Humpback Whale (Endangered Species Act-Listed)

Impacts from Explosives Under Alternative 1 for Training and Testing Activities

Humpback whales may be exposed to sound or energy from explosions associated with training and testing activities throughout the year. The quantitative analysis, using the maximum number of explosives per year under Alternative 1, estimates behavioral reactions and TTS during training and testing activities (Figure 3.4-67 and Table 3.4-79). Estimated impacts most years would be less based on


fewer explosions. Impact ranges for this species are discussed in Section 3.4.2.2.2.2 (Impact Ranges for Explosives).

In addition to procedural mitigation, the Navy will not use in-water explosives during training and testing within the Marpi Reef Mitigation Area and Chalan Kanoa Reef Mitigation Area, as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation). These mitigation areas are designed to avoid impacts from in-water explosives on humpback whales in important reproductive habitat. Outside of these mitigation areas, Navy training and testing activities that use in-water explosives could occur year round within the Study Area, with most activities occurring in the Mariana Islands Range Complex. As discussed above, humpback whale reactions to explosions are most likely short term and mild to moderate, especially when explosions are located more than a few kilometers away and when the animals are engaged in important biological behaviors such as reproduction. Therefore, significant impacts on humpback whale reproduction behaviors from training and testing with explosives are unlikely to occur.

As described for mysticetes above, even a few minor to moderate TTS or behavioral reactions to an individual over the course of a year are unlikely to have any significant costs or long-term consequences for that individual. Considering these factors and the mitigation measures that will be implemented as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), long-term consequences for the species would not be expected.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of explosives during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 1 would result in the unintentional taking of humpback whales incidental to those activities.

Pursuant to the ESA, the use of explosives during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 1 may affect ESA-listed humpback whales.



Notes: (1) Region and Activity Category bar charts show categories +/- 0.5 percent of the estimated impacts, which could result in a total of 98–101 percent. Estimated impacts most years would be less based on fewer explosions. The model is probabilistic and therefore a single impact could be divided among multiple regions or activity categories. (2) MIRC = Mariana Islands Range Complex

Figure 3.4-67: Humpback Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1

Table 3.4-79: Estimated Impacts on Individual Humpback Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1

Estimated Impacts by Effect			
Behavioral	***TTS***	***PTS***	***Injury***
6	3	0	0


Note: Estimated impacts are based on the maximum number of activities in a given year under Alternative 1.

Impacts from Explosives Under Alternative 2 for Training and Testing Activities

Potential annual impacts under Alternative 2 from training and testing with explosives would differ slightly in location and number (Figure 3.4-68 and Table 3.4-80) compared to the impacts shown and discussed above in Impacts from Explosives Under Alternative 1 for Training and Testing Activities. The primary distinction is that explosive use would be consistent year to year under Alternative 2 and the total number of activities would increase slightly compared to Alternative 1.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of explosives during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 2 would result in the unintentional taking of humpback whales incidental to those activities. The Navy is requesting authorization from NMFS as required by Section 101(a)(5)(A) of the MMPA.

Pursuant to the ESA, the use of explosives during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 2 may affect ESA-listed humpback whales. The Navy is consulting with NMFS as required by Section 7(a)(2) of the ESA.



Notes: (1) Region and Activity Category bar charts show categories +/- 0.5 percent of the estimated impacts, which could result in a total of 98–101 percent. Estimated impacts most years would be less based on fewer explosions. The model is probabilistic and therefore a single impact could be divided among multiple regions or activity categories. (2) MIRC = Mariana Islands Range Complex

Figure 3.4-68: Humpback Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2

Table 3.4-80: Estimated Impacts on Individual Humpback Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2

Estimated Impacts by Effect			
Behavioral	***TTS***	***PTS***	***Injury***
6	3	0	0

Note: Estimated impacts are based on the maximum number of activities in a given year under Alternative 2.


Minke Whale

Impacts from Explosives Under Alternative 1 for Training and Testing Activities

Minke whales may be exposed to sound or energy from explosions associated with training and testing activities throughout the year. The quantitative analysis, using the maximum number of explosives per year under Alternative 1, estimates behavioral reactions and TTS during training and testing activities (Figure 3.4-69 and Table 3.4-81). Estimated impacts most years would be less based on fewer explosions. Impact ranges for this species are discussed in Section 3.4.2.2.2.2 (Impact Ranges for Explosives). As described for mysticetes above, even a few minor to moderate behavioral reactions or TTS to an individual over the course of a year are unlikely to have any significant costs or long-term consequences for that individual. Considering these factors and the mitigation measures that will be

implemented as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), long-term consequences for the species would not be expected.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of explosives during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 1 would result in the unintentional taking of minke whales incidental to those activities.



Notes: (1) Region and Activity Category bar charts show categories +/- 0.5 percent of the estimated impacts, which could result in a total of 98–101 percent. Estimated impacts most years would be less based on fewer explosions. The model is probabilistic and therefore a single impact could be divided among multiple regions or activity categories. (2) MIRC = Mariana Islands Range Complex

Figure 3.4-69: Minke Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1

Table 3.4-81: Estimated Impacts on Individual Minke Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1


Estimated Impacts by Effect			
Behavioral	***TTS***	***PTS***	***Injury***
1	1	0	0

Note: Estimated impacts are based on the maximum number of activities in a given year under Alternative 1.

Impacts from Explosives Under Alternative 2 for Training and Testing Activities

Potential annual impacts under Alternative 2 from training with explosives would differ slightly in activity and location (Figure 3.4-70 and Table 3.4-82) compared to the impacts shown and discussed above in Impacts from Explosives Under Alternative 1 for Training and Testing Activities; however, the total number of impacts would remain the same.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of explosives during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 2 would result in the unintentional taking of minke whales incidental to those activities. The Navy is requesting authorization from NMFS as required by Section 101(a)(5)(A) of the MMPA.



Notes: (1) Region and Activity Category bar charts show categories +/- 0.5 percent of the estimated impacts, which could result in a total of 98–101 percent. Estimated impacts most years would be less based on fewer explosions. The model is probabilistic and therefore a single impact could be divided among multiple regions or activity categories. (2) MIRC = Mariana Islands Range Complex

Figure 3.4-70: Minke Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2

Table 3.4-82: Estimated Impacts on Individual Minke Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2

Estimated Impacts by Effect			
Behavioral	***TTS***	***PTS***	***Injury***
1	1	0	0

Note: Estimated impacts are based on the maximum number of activities in a given year under Alternative 2.

Omura's Whale

Impacts from Explosives Under Alternative 1 for Training and Testing Activities


Omura's whales may be exposed to sound or energy from explosions associated with training and testing activities throughout the year, although the quantitative analysis estimates that no Omura's whales would be impacted. Long-term consequences for individuals or the species would not be expected.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of explosives during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 1 would not result in the incidental taking of Omura's whales.

Impacts from Explosives Under Alternative 2 for Training and Testing Activities

Omura's whales may be exposed to sound or energy from explosions associated with training and testing activities throughout the year. The quantitative analysis, using the maximum number of explosives per year under Alternative 2, estimates behavioral reactions during training and testing activities (Figure 3.4-71 and Table 3.4-83). Estimated impacts most years would be less based on fewer explosions. Impact ranges for this species are discussed in Section 3.4.2.2.2.2 (Impact Ranges for Explosives). As described for mysticetes above, even a few minor to moderate behavioral reactions to an individual over the course of a year are unlikely to have any significant costs or long-term consequences for that individual. Considering these factors and the mitigation measures that will be implemented as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), long-term consequences for the species would not be expected.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of explosives during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 2 would result in the unintentional taking of Omura's whales incidental to those activities. The Navy is requesting authorization from NMFS as required by Section 101(a)(5)(A) of the MMPA.



Notes: (1) Region and Activity Category bar charts show categories +/- 0.5 percent of the estimated impacts, which could result in a total of 98–101 percent. Estimated impacts most years would be less based on fewer explosions. The model is probabilistic and therefore a single impact could be divided among multiple regions or activity categories. (2) MIRC = Mariana Islands Range Complex

Figure 3.4-71: Omura's Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2

Table 3.4-83: Estimated Impacts on Individual Omura's Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2

Estimated Impacts by Effect			
Behavioral	***TTS***	***PTS***	***Injury***
1	0	0	0

Note: Estimated impacts are based on the maximum number of activities in a given year under the Alternative 2.


Sei Whale (Endangered Species Act-Listed)

Impacts from Explosives Under Alternative 1 for Training and Testing Activities

Sei whales may be exposed to sound or energy from explosions associated with training and testing activities throughout the year. The quantitative analysis, using the maximum number of explosives per year under Alternative 1, estimates behavioral reactions and TTS during training and testing activities (Figure 3.4-72 and Table 3.4-84). Estimated impacts most years would be less based on fewer explosions. Impact ranges for this species are discussed in Section 3.4.2.2.2.2 (Impact Ranges for Explosives). As described for mysticetes above, even a few minor to moderate behavioral reactions or TTS to an individual over the course of a year are unlikely to have any significant costs or long-term consequences for that individual. Considering these factors and the mitigation measures that will be implemented as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), long-term consequences for the species would not be expected.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of explosives during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 1 would result in the unintentional taking of sei whales incidental to those activities.

Pursuant to the ESA, the use of explosives during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 1 may affect ESA-listed sei whales.



Notes: (1) Region and Activity Category bar charts show categories +/- 0.5 percent of the estimated impacts, which could result in a total of 98–101 percent. Estimated impacts most years would be less based on fewer explosions. The model is probabilistic and therefore a single impact could be divided among multiple regions or activity categories. (2) MIRC = Mariana Islands Range Complex

Figure 3.4-72: Sei Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1

Table 3.4-84: Estimated Impacts on Individual Sei Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1

Estimated Impacts by Effect			
Behavioral	***TTS***	***PTS***	***Injury***
2	1	0	0


Note: Estimated impacts are based on the maximum number of activities in a given year under the Alternative 1.

Impacts from Explosives Under Alternative 2 for Training and Testing Activities

Potential annual impacts under Alternative 2 from training with explosives would differ slightly in location (Figure 3.4-73 and Table 3.4-85) compared to the impacts shown and discussed above in Impacts from Explosives Under Alternative 1 for Training and Testing Activities; however, the total number of impacts would remain the same.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of explosives during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 2 would result in the unintentional taking of sei whales incidental to those activities. The Navy is requesting authorization from NMFS as required by Section 101(a)(5)(A) of the MMPA.

Pursuant to the ESA, the use of explosives during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 2 may affect ESA-listed sei whales. The Navy is consulting with NMFS as required by Section 7(a)(2) of the ESA.



Notes: (1) Region and Activity Category bar charts show categories +/- 0.5 percent of the estimated impacts, which could result in a total of 98–101 percent. Estimated impacts most years would be less based on fewer explosions. The model is probabilistic and therefore a single impact could be divided among multiple regions or activity categories. (2) MIRC = Mariana Islands Range Complex

Figure 3.4-73: Sei Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2

Table 3.4-85: Estimated Impacts on Individual Sei Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2

Estimated Impacts by Effect			
Behavioral	***TTS***	***PTS***	***Injury***
2	1	0	0

Note: Estimated impacts are based on the maximum number of activities in a given year under the Alternative 2.

Odontocetes

Odontocetes may be exposed to sound and energy from explosives associated with training and testing activities throughout the year. Explosions produce sounds that are within the hearing range of odontocetes (see Section 3.4.1.6, Hearing and Vocalization). Potential impacts from explosive energy

and sound include non-auditory injury, behavioral reactions, physiological stress, masking, and hearing loss. Impact ranges for odontocetes exposed to explosive sound and energy are discussed in Section 3.4.2.2.2.2 (Impact Ranges for Explosives) under mid-frequency cetaceans for most species, and under high-frequency cetaceans for Kogia whales.

Non-auditory injuries to odontocetes, if they did occur, could include anything from mild injuries that are recoverable and are unlikely to have long-term consequences, to more serious injuries, including mortality. It is possible for marine mammals to be injured or killed by an explosion in isolated instances. Animals that did sustain injury could have long-term consequences for that individual. Considering that dolphin species for which these impacts are predicted have populations with tens to hundreds of thousands of animals, removing several animals from the population would be unlikely to have measurable long-term consequences for the species or stocks. As discussed in Section 5.3.3 (Explosive Stressors), the Navy will implement procedural mitigation measures to delay or cease detonations when a marine mammal is sighted in a mitigation zone to avoid or reduce potential explosive impacts.

Odontocetes that do experience a hearing threshold shift from explosive sounds may have reduced ability to detect biologically important sounds (e.g., social vocalizations) until their hearing recovers. Recovery from a hearing threshold shift begins almost immediately after the noise exposure ceases. A threshold shift can take a few minutes to a few days, depending on the severity of the initial shift, to recover. TTS would recover fully and PTS would leave some residual hearing loss. Threshold shifts do not necessarily affect all hearing frequencies equally, and typically manifest themselves at the exposure frequency or within an octave above the exposure frequency. Noise from explosions is broadband with most energy below a few hundred Hertz; therefore, any hearing loss from exposure to explosive sounds is likely to be broadband with effects predominantly at lower frequencies. During the period that an odontocete had hearing loss, social calls from conspecifics and sounds from predators such as killer whale vocalizations could be more difficult to detect or interpret, although many of these sounds may be above the frequencies of the threshold shift. Odontocetes use echolocation clicks to find and capture prey. These echolocation clicks and vocalizations are at frequencies above a few kHz, which are less likely to be affected by threshold shift at lower frequencies, and should not affect odontocete's ability to locate prey or rate of feeding.

Research and observations of masking in marine mammals due to impulsive sounds are discussed in Section 3.4.2.2.1.4 (Masking). Explosions introduce low-frequency, broadband sounds into the environment, which could mask hearing thresholds in odontocetes that are nearby, although sounds from explosions last for only a few seconds at most. Also, odontocetes typically communicate, vocalize, and echolocate at higher frequencies that would be less affected by masking noise at lower frequencies such as those produced by an explosion. Masking due to time-isolated detonations would not be significant. Activities that have multiple detonations such as some naval gunfire exercises could create some masking for odontocetes in the area over the short duration of the event. Potential costs to odontocetes from masking are similar to those discussed above for TTS, with the primary difference being that the effects of masking are only present when the sound from the explosion is present within the water and the effect is over the moment the sound has ceased.

Research and observations (see Section 3.4.2.2.1.5, Behavioral Reactions) show that odontocetes do not typically show strong behavioral reactions to impulsive sounds such as explosions. Reactions, if they did occur, would likely be limited to short ranges, within a few kilometers of multiple explosions. Reactions could include alerting, startling, breaking off feeding dives and surfacing, diving or swimming away, change in vocalization, or showing no response at all. Animals disturbed while engaged in other

activities such as feeding or reproductive behaviors may be more likely to ignore or tolerate the disturbance and continue their natural behavior patterns. Because noise from most activities using explosives is short-term and intermittent, and because detonations usually occur within a small area, behavioral reactions from odontocetes are likely to be short-term and low to moderate severity.

Physiological stress could be caused by injury or hearing loss and could accompany any behavioral reaction as well. Research and observations of physiological stress in marine mammals are discussed in Section 3.4.2.2.1.3 (Physiological Stress). Due to the short-term and intermittent use of explosives, physiological stress is also likely to be short-term and intermittent. Long-term consequences from physiological stress due to the sound of explosives would not be expected.


Beaked Whales

Beaked whales within the Study Area include: Blainville's beaked whale, Cuvier's beaked whale, ginkgo-toothed beaked whale, and Longman's beaked whale. Research and observations (Section 3.4.2.2.1.5, Behavioral Reactions) show that beaked whales are sensitive to human disturbance including noise from sonars, although no research on specific reactions to impulsive or explosion noise is available. Odontocetes overall have shown little responsiveness to impulsive sounds although it is likely that beaked whales are more reactive than most other odontocetes. Reactions could include alerting, startling, breaking off feeding dives and surfacing, diving or swimming away, change in vocalization, or showing no response at all. Beaked whales on Navy ranges have been observed leaving the area for a few days during sonar training exercises. It is reasonable to expect that animals may leave an area of more intense explosive activity for a few days, however most explosive use during Navy activities is short-duration consisting of only a single or few closely timed explosions (i.e., detonated within a few minutes) with a limited footprint due to a single detonation point. Because noise from most activities using explosives is short-term and intermittent and because detonations usually occur within a small area, behavioral reactions from beaked whales are likely to be short-term and moderate severity.

Impacts from Explosives Under Alternative 1 for Training and Testing Activities

Beaked whales may be exposed to sound or energy from explosions associated with training and testing activities throughout the year. The quantitative analysis, using the maximum number of explosives per year under Alternative 1, estimates behavioral reactions and TTS for ginkgo-toothed and Longman's beaked whales during training and testing activities (Figure 3.4-74, Figure 3.4-75, Table 3.4-86, and Table 3.4-87). Estimated impacts most years would be less based on fewer explosions. Impact ranges for these species are discussed in Section 3.4.2.2.2.2 (Impact Ranges for Explosives). No impacts are estimated for Blainville's beaked whale or Cuvier's beaked whale. As described for odontocetes above, even a few minor to moderate TTS or behavioral reactions to an individual over the course of a year are unlikely to have any significant costs or long-term consequences for that individual. Considering these factors and the mitigation measures that will be implemented as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), long-term consequences for the species would not be expected.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of explosives during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 1 would result in the unintentional taking of ginkgo-toothed and Longman's beaked whales incidental to those activities.




Notes: (1) Region and Activity Category bar charts show categories +/- 0.5 percent of the estimated impacts, which could result in a total of 98–101 percent. Estimated impacts most years would be less based on fewer explosions. The model is probabilistic and therefore a single impact could be divided among multiple regions or activity categories. (2) MIRC = Mariana Islands Range Complex

Figure 3.4-74: Ginkgo-Toothed Beaked Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1

Table 3.4-86: Estimated Impacts on Individual Ginkgo-Toothed Beaked Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1

Estimated Impacts by Effect			
Behavioral	***TTS***	***PTS***	***Injury***
0	1	0	0

Note: Estimated impacts are based on the maximum number of activities in a given year under Alternative 1.



Notes: (1) Region and Activity Category bar charts show categories +/- 0.5 percent of the estimated impacts, which could result in a total of 98–101 percent. Estimated impacts most years would be less based on fewer explosions. The model is probabilistic and therefore a single impact could be divided among multiple regions or activity categories. (2) MIRC = Mariana Islands Range Complex

Figure 3.4-75: Longman's Beaked Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1

Table 3.4-87: Estimated Impacts on Individual Longman's Beaked Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1


Estimated Impacts by Effect			
Behavioral	***TTS***	***PTS***	***Injury***
1	1	0	0

Note: Estimated impacts are based on the maximum number of activities in a given year under the Alternative 1.

Impacts from Explosives Under Alternative 2 for Training and Testing Activities

The quantitative analysis, using the maximum number of explosives per year under Alternative 1, estimates behavioral reactions and TTS for ginkgo-toothed and Longman's beaked whales. No impacts are estimated for Blainville's beaked whale or Cuvier's beaked whale. Potential annual impacts under Alternative 2 from training and testing with explosives would differ slightly in location (Figure 3.4-76, Figure 3.4-77, Table 3.4-88, and Table 3.4-89) compared to the impacts shown and discussed above in Impacts from Explosives Under Alternative 1 for Training and Testing Activities; however, the total number of impacts would remain the same.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of explosives during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 2 would result in the unintentional taking of ginkgo-toothed and Longman's beaked whales incidental to those activities. The Navy is requesting authorization from NMFS as required by Section 101(a)(5)(A) of the MMPA.




Notes: (1) Region and Activity Category bar charts show categories +/- 0.5 percent of the estimated impacts, which could result in a total of 98–101 percent. Estimated impacts most years would be less based on fewer explosions. The model is probabilistic and therefore a single impact could be divided among multiple regions or activity categories. (2) MIRC = Mariana Islands Range Complex

Figure 3.4-76: Ginkgo-Toothed Beaked Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2

Table 3.4-88: Estimated Impacts on Individual Ginkgo-Toothed Beaked Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2

Estimated Impacts by Effect			
Behavioral	***TTS***	***PTS***	***Injury***
1	1	0	0

Note: Estimated impacts are based on the maximum number of activities in a given year under Alternative 2.



Notes: (1) Region and Activity Category bar charts show categories +/- 0.5 percent of the estimated impacts, which could result in a total of 98–101 percent. Estimated impacts most years would be less based on fewer explosions. The model is probabilistic and therefore a single impact could be divided among multiple regions or activity categories. (2) MIRC = Mariana Islands Range Complex

Figure 3.4-77: Longman's Beaked Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2

Table 3.4-89: Estimated Impacts on Individual Longman's Beaked Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2

Estimated Impacts by Effect			
Behavioral	***TTS***	***PTS***	***Injury***
1	1	0	0

Note: Estimated impacts are based on the maximum number of activities in a given year under Alternative 2.

Common Bottlenose Dolphin

Impacts from Explosives Under Alternative 1 for Training and Testing Activities

Bottlenose dolphins may be exposed to sound or energy from explosions associated with training and testing activities throughout the year, although the quantitative analysis estimates that no bottlenose dolphins would be impacted. Considering the mitigation measures that will be implemented as described in Section 2.3.4 (Mitigation Measures), and that impacts are not anticipated, long-term consequences for individuals or the species would not be expected.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of explosives during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 1 would not result in the incidental taking of bottlenose dolphins.

Impacts from Explosives Under Alternative 2 for Training and Testing Activities

Bottlenose dolphins may be exposed to sound or energy from explosions associated with training and testing activities throughout the year, although the quantitative analysis estimates that no bottlenose dolphins would be impacted. Considering the mitigation measures that will be implemented as described in Section 2.3.4 (Mitigation Measures), and that impacts are not anticipated, long-term consequences for individuals or the species would not be expected.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of explosives during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 2 would not result in the incidental taking of bottlenose dolphins.


Kogia Whales

Kogia whales include two species that are often difficult to distinguish from one another: dwarf sperm whales and pygmy sperm whales; however, impacts to the populations of dwarf and pygmy sperm whales are modeled separately. TTS and PTS thresholds for high-frequency cetaceans, such as Kogia whales are lower than for all other marine mammals, which leads to a higher number of estimated hearing loss impacts relative to the number of animals exposed to the sound as compared to other hearing groups (e.g., mid-frequency cetaceans).

Impacts from Explosives Under Alternative 1 for Training and Testing Activities

Kogia whales may be exposed to sound or energy from explosions associated with training and testing activities throughout the year. The quantitative analysis, using the maximum number of explosives per year under Alternative 1, estimates behavioral reactions, TTS, and PTS during training and testing activities (Figure 3.4-78, Figure 3.4-79, Table 3.4-90, and Table 3.4-91). Estimated impacts most years would be less based on fewer explosions. Impact ranges for these species are discussed in Section 3.4.2.2.2.2 (Impact Ranges for Explosives). As described for odontocetes above, even a few minor to moderate TTS or behavioral reactions to an individual over the course of a year are unlikely to have any significant costs or long-term consequences for that individual. PTS could reduce an animal's ability to detect biologically important sounds; however, as discussed above, a small threshold shift due to exposure to explosive energy and sound is unlikely to affect the hearing range that kogia species rely upon. Nevertheless, PTS could have minor long-term consequences for individuals. This minor consequence for an individual is unlikely to have any long-term consequences for the species. Considering these factors and the mitigation measures that will be implemented as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), long-term consequences for the species would not be expected.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of explosives during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 1 would result in the unintentional taking of dwarf and pygmy sperm whales incidental to those activities.




Notes: (1) Region and Activity Category bar charts show categories +/- 0.5 percent of the estimated impacts, which could result in a total of 98–101 percent. Estimated impacts most years would be less based on fewer explosions. The model is probabilistic and therefore a single impact could be divided among multiple regions or activity categories. (2) MIRC = Mariana Islands Range Complex

Figure 3.4-78: Dwarf Sperm Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1

Table 3.4-90: Estimated Impacts on Individual Dwarf Sperm Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1

Estimated Impacts by Effect			
Behavioral	***TTS***	***PTS***	***Injury***
58	92	18	0

Note: Estimated impacts are based on the maximum number of activities in a given year under Alternative 1.



Notes: (1) Region and Activity Category bar charts show categories +/- 0.5 percent of the estimated impacts, which could result in a total of 98–101 percent. Estimated impacts most years would be less based on fewer explosions. The model is probabilistic and therefore a single impact could be divided among multiple regions or activity categories. (2) MIRC = Mariana Islands Range Complex

Figure 3.4-79: Pygmy Sperm Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1

Table 3.4-91: Estimated Impacts on Individual Pygmy Sperm Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1


Estimated Impacts by Effect			
Behavioral	***TTS***	***PTS***	***Injury***
23	33	8	0

Note: Estimated impacts are based on the maximum number of activities in a given year under Alternative 1.

Impacts from Explosives Under Alternative 2 for Training and Testing Activities

Potential annual impacts under Alternative 2 from training and testing with explosives would differ slightly (Figure 3.4-80, Figure 3.4-81, Table 3.4-92, and Table 3.4-93) compared to the impacts shown and discussed above in Impacts from Explosives Under Alternative 1 for Training and Testing Activities.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of explosives during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 2 would result in the unintentional taking of dwarf and pygmy sperm whales incidental to those activities. The Navy is requesting authorization from NMFS as required by Section 101(a)(5)(A) of the MMPA.




Notes: (1) Region and Activity Category bar charts show categories +/- 0.5 percent of the estimated impacts, which could result in a total of 98–101 percent. Estimated impacts most years would be less based on fewer explosions. The model is probabilistic and therefore a single impact could be divided among multiple regions or activity categories. (2) MIRC = Mariana Islands Range Complex

Figure 3.4-80: Dwarf Sperm Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2

Table 3.4-92: Estimated Impacts on Individual Dwarf Sperm Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2

Estimated Impacts by Effect			
Behavioral	***TTS***	***PTS***	***Injury***
64	100	21	0

Note: Estimated impacts are based on the maximum number of activities in a given year under the Alternative 2.



Notes: (1) Region and Activity Category bar charts show categories +/- 0.5 percent of the estimated impacts, which could result in a total of 98–101 percent. Estimated impacts most years would be less based on fewer explosions. The model is probabilistic and therefore a single impact could be divided among multiple regions or activity categories. (2) MIRC = Mariana Islands Range Complex

Figure 3.4-81: Pygmy Sperm Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2

Table 3.4-93: Estimated Impacts on Individual Pygmy Sperm Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2

Estimated Impacts by Effect			
Behavioral	***TTS***	***PTS***	***Injury***
25	37	8	0

Note: Estimated impacts are based on the maximum number of activities in a given year under the Alternative 2.

False Killer Whale

Impacts from Explosives Under Alternative 1 for Training and Testing Activities

False killer whales may be exposed to sound or energy from explosions associated with training and testing activities throughout the year, although the quantitative analysis estimates that no false killer whales would be impacted. Considering the mitigation measures that will be implemented as described in Section 2.3.4 (Mitigation Measures), and that impacts are not anticipated, long-term consequences for individuals or the species would not be expected.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of explosives during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 1 would not result in the incidental taking of false killer whales.

Impacts from Explosives Under Alternative 2 for Training and Testing Activities

False killer whales may be exposed to sound or energy from explosions associated with training and testing activities throughout the year, although the quantitative analysis estimates that no false killer whales would be impacted. Long-term consequences for individuals or the species would not be expected.


Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of explosives during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 2 would not result in the incidental taking of false killer whales.

Fraser's Dolphin

Impacts from Explosives Under Alternative 1 for Training and Testing Activities

Fraser's dolphin may be exposed to sound or energy from explosions associated with training and testing activities throughout the year. The quantitative analysis, using the maximum number of explosions per year under Alternative 1, estimates behavioral reaction, TTS, and PTS during training and testing activities (Figure 3.4-82 and Table 3.4-94). Estimated impacts most years would be less based on fewer explosions. Impact ranges for this species are discussed in Section 3.4.2.2.2.2 (Impact Ranges for Explosives). As described for odontocetes above, even a few minor to moderate TTS or behavioral reactions to an individual over the course of a year are unlikely to have any significant costs or long-term consequences for that individual. PTS could reduce an animal's ability to detect biologically important sounds; however, as discussed above, a small threshold shift due to exposure to explosive energy and sound is unlikely to affect the hearing range that pantropical spotted dolphins rely upon. Nevertheless, PTS could have minor long-term consequences for individuals. This minor consequence for an individual is unlikely to have any long-term consequences for the species. Considering these factors and the mitigation measures that will be implemented as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), long-term consequences for the species would not be expected.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of explosives during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 1 would result in the unintentional taking of Fraser's dolphins incidental to those activities.



Notes: (1) Region and Activity Category bar charts show categories +/- 0.5 percent of the estimated impacts, which could result in a total of 98–101 percent. Estimated impacts most years would be less based on fewer explosions. The model is probabilistic and therefore a single impact could be divided among multiple regions or activity categories. (2) MIRC = Mariana Islands Range Complex

Figure 3.4-82: Fraser's Dolphin Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1

Table 3.4-94: Estimated Impacts on Individual Fraser's Dolphins Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1


Estimated Impacts by Effect			
Behavioral	***TTS***	***PTS***	***Injury***
4	4	1	0

Note: Estimated impacts are based on the maximum number of activities in a given year under Alternative 1.

Impacts from Explosives Under Alternative 2 for Training and Testing Activities

Potential annual impacts under Alternative 2 from training and testing with explosives would increase slightly (Figure 3.4-83 and Table 3.4-95) compared to the impacts shown and discussed above in Impacts from Explosives Under Alternative 1 for Training and Testing Activities.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of explosives during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 2 would result in the unintentional taking of Fraser's dolphins incidental to those activities. The Navy is requesting authorization from NMFS as required by Section 101(a)(5)(A) of the MMPA.



Notes: (1) Region and Activity Category bar charts show categories +/- 0.5 percent of the estimated impacts, which could result in a total of 98–101 percent. Estimated impacts most years would be less based on fewer explosions. The model is probabilistic and therefore a single impact could be divided among multiple regions or activity categories. (2) MIRC = Mariana Islands Range Complex

Figure 3.4-83: Fraser's Dolphin Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2

Table 3.4-95: Estimated Impacts on Individual Fraser's Dolphins Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2

Estimated Impacts by Effect			
Behavioral	***TTS***	***PTS***	***Injury***
4	5	1	0

Note: Estimated impacts are based on the maximum number of activities in a given year under the Alternative 2.

Killer Whale

Impacts from Explosives Under Alternative 1 for Training and Testing Activities

Killer whales may be exposed to sound or energy from explosions associated with training and testing activities throughout the year, although the quantitative analysis estimates that no killer whales would be impacted. Considering the mitigation measures that will be implemented as described in Section 2.3.4 (Mitigation Measures), and that impacts are not anticipated, long-term consequences for individuals or the species would not be expected.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of explosives during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 1 would not result in the incidental taking of killer whales.

Impacts from Explosives Under Alternative 2 for Training and Testing Activities

Killer whales may be exposed to sound or energy from explosions associated with training and testing activities throughout the year, although the quantitative analysis estimates that no killer whales would be impacted. Long-term consequences for individuals or the species would not be expected.


Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of explosives during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 2 would not result in the incidental taking of killer whales.

Melon-Headed Whale

Impacts from Explosives Under Alternative 1 for Training and Testing Activities

Melon-headed whales may be exposed to sound or energy from explosions associated with training and testing activities throughout the year. The quantitative analysis, using the maximum number of explosions per year under Alternative 1, estimates behavioral reaction and TTS during training and testing activities (Figure 3.4-84 and Table 3.4-96). Estimated impacts most years would be less based on fewer explosions. Impact ranges for this species are discussed in Section 3.4.2.2.2.2 (Impact Ranges for Explosives). As described for odontocetes above, even a few minor to moderate TTS or behavioral reactions to an individual over the course of a year are unlikely to have any significant costs or long-term consequences for that individual. Considering these factors and the mitigation measures that will be implemented as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), long-term consequences for the species would not be expected.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of explosives during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 1 would result in the unintentional taking of melon-headed whales incidental to those activities.



Notes: (1) Region and Activity Category bar charts show categories +/- 0.5 percent of the estimated impacts, which could result in a total of 98–101 percent. Estimated impacts most years would be less based on fewer explosions. The model is probabilistic and therefore a single impact could be divided among multiple regions or activity categories. (2) MIRC = Mariana Islands Range Complex

Figure 3.4-84: Melon-Headed Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1

Table 3.4-96: Estimated Impacts on Individual Melon-Headed Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1


Estimated Impacts by Effect			
Behavioral	***TTS***	***PTS***	***Injury***
1	1	0	0

Note: Estimated impacts are based on the maximum number of activities in a given year under Alternative 1.

Impacts from Explosives Under Alternative 2 for Training and Testing Activities

Potential annual impacts under Alternative 2 from training and testing with explosives would differ slightly by activity and location (Figure 3.4-85 and Table 3.4-97) compared to the impacts shown and discussed above in Impacts from Explosives Under Alternative 1 for Training and Testing Activities; however, the total number of impacts would remain the same.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of explosives during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 2 would result in the unintentional taking of melon-headed whales incidental to those activities. The Navy is requesting authorization from NMFS as required by Section 101(a)(5)(A) of the MMPA.



Notes: (1) Region and Activity Category bar charts show categories +/- 0.5 percent of the estimated impacts, which could result in a total of 98–101 percent. Estimated impacts most years would be less based on fewer explosions. The model is probabilistic and therefore a single impact could be divided among multiple regions or activity categories. (2) MIRC = Mariana Islands Range Complex

Figure 3.4-85: Melon-Headed Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2

Table 3.4-97: Estimated Impacts on Individual Melon-Headed Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2

Estimated Impacts by Effect			
Behavioral	***TTS***	***PTS***	***Injury***
1	1	0	0


Note: Estimated impacts are based on the maximum number of activities in a given year under Alternative 2.

Pantropical Spotted Dolphin

Impacts from Explosives Under Alternative 1 for Training and Testing Activities

Pantropical spotted dolphins may be exposed to sound or energy from explosions associated with training and testing activities throughout the year. The quantitative analysis, using the maximum number of explosives per year under Alternative 1, estimates behavioral reactions, TTS, and PTS during training and testing activities (Figure 3.4-86 and Table 3.4-98). Estimated impacts most years would be less based on fewer explosions. Impact ranges for this species are discussed in Section 3.4.2.2.2.2 (Impact Ranges for Explosives). As described for odontocetes above, even a few minor to moderate TTS to an individual over the course of a year are unlikely to have any significant costs or long-term consequences for that individual. PTS could reduce an animal's ability to detect biologically important sounds; however, as discussed above, a small threshold shift due to exposure to explosive energy and sound is unlikely to affect the hearing range that pantropical spotted dolphins rely upon. Nevertheless, PTS could have minor long-term consequences for individuals. This minor consequence for an individual is unlikely to have any long-term consequences for the species. Considering these factors and the mitigation measures that will be implemented as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), long-term consequences for the species would not be expected.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of explosives during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 1 would result in the unintentional taking of pantropical spotted dolphins incidental to those activities.



Notes: (1) Region and Activity Category bar charts show categories +/- 0.5 percent of the estimated impacts, which could result in a total of 98–101 percent. Estimated impacts most years would be less based on fewer explosions. The model is probabilistic and therefore a single impact could be divided among multiple regions or activity categories. (2) MIRC = Mariana Islands Range Complex

Figure 3.4-86: Pantropical Spotted Dolphin Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1

Table 3.4-98: Estimated Impacts on Individual Pantropical Spotted Dolphins Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1


Estimated Impacts by Effect			
Behavioral	***TTS***	***PTS***	***Injury***
4	2	1	0

Note: Estimated impacts are based on the maximum number of activities in a given year under Alternative 1.

Impacts from Explosives Under Alternative 2 for Training and Testing Activities

Potential annual impacts under Alternative 2 from training and testing with explosives would increase slightly (Figure 3.4-87 and Table 3.4-99) compared to the impacts shown and discussed above in Impacts from Explosives Under Alternative 1 for Training and Testing Activities.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of explosives during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 2 would result in the unintentional taking of pantropical spotted dolphins incidental to those activities. The Navy is requesting authorization from NMFS as required by Section 101(a)(5)(A) of the MMPA.



Notes: (1) Region and Activity Category bar charts show categories +/- 0.5 percent of the estimated impacts, which could result in a total of 98–101 percent. Estimated impacts most years would be less based on fewer explosions. The model is probabilistic and therefore a single impact could be divided among multiple regions or activity categories. (2) MIRC = Mariana Islands Range Complex

Figure 3.4-87: Pantropical Spotted Dolphin Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2

Table 3.4-99: Estimated Impacts on Individual Pantropical Spotted Dolphins Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2

Estimated Impacts by Effect			
Behavioral	***TTS***	***PTS***	***Injury***
4	3	1	0

Note: Estimated impacts are based on the maximum number of activities in a given year under Alternative 2.

Pygmy Killer Whale

Impacts from Explosives Under Alternative 1 for Training and Testing Activities

Pygmy killer whales may be exposed to sound or energy from explosions associated with training and testing activities throughout the year, although the quantitative analysis estimates that no pygmy killer whales would be impacted. Considering the mitigation measures that will be implemented as described in Section 2.3.4 (Mitigation Measures), and that impacts are not anticipated, long-term consequences for individuals or the species would not be expected.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of explosives during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 1 would not result in the incidental taking of pygmy killer whales.

Impacts from Explosives Under Alternative 2 for Training and Testing Activities

Pygmy killer whales may be exposed to sound or energy from explosions associated with training and testing activities throughout the year, although the quantitative analysis estimates that no pygmy killer whales would be impacted. Long-term consequences for individuals or the species would not be expected.


Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of explosives during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 2 would not result in the incidental taking of pygmy killer whales.

Risso's Dolphin

Impacts from Explosives Under Alternative 1 for Training and Testing Activities

Risso's dolphins may be exposed to sound or energy from explosions associated with training and testing activities throughout the year. The quantitative analysis, using the maximum number of explosions per year under Alternative 1, estimates a behavioral reaction and TTS during training and testing activities (Figure 3.4-88 and Table 3.4-100). Estimated impacts most years would be less based on fewer explosions. Impact ranges for this species are discussed in Section 3.4.2.2.2.2 (Impact Ranges for Explosives). As described for odontocetes above, even a few minor to moderate TTS or behavioral reactions to an individual over the course of a year are unlikely to have any significant costs or long-term consequences for that individual. Considering these factors and the mitigation measures that will be implemented as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), long-term consequences for the species would not be expected.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of explosives during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 1 would result in the unintentional taking of Risso's dolphins incidental to those activities.



Notes: (1) Region and Activity Category bar charts show categories +/- 0.5 percent of the estimated impacts, which could result in a total of 98–101 percent. Estimated impacts most years would be less based on fewer explosions. The model is probabilistic and therefore a single impact could be divided among multiple regions or activity categories. (2) MIRC = Mariana Islands Range Complex

Figure 3.4-88: Risso's Dolphin Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1

Table 3.4-100: Estimated Impacts on Individual Risso's Dolphin Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1


Estimated Impacts by Effect			
Behavioral	***TTS***	***PTS***	***Injury***
1	1	0	0

Note: Estimated impacts are based on the maximum number of activities in a given year under Alternative 1.

Impacts from Explosives Under Alternative 2 for Training and Testing Activities

Potential annual impacts under Alternative 2 from training and testing with explosives would differ slightly (Figure 3.4-89 and Table 3.4-101) compared to the impacts shown and discussed above in Impacts from Explosives Under Alternative 1 for Training and Testing Activities.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of explosives during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 2 would result in the unintentional taking of Risso's dolphins incidental to those activities. The Navy is requesting authorization from NMFS as required by Section 101(a)(5)(A) of the MMPA.



Notes: (1) Region and Activity Category bar charts show categories +/- 0.5 percent of the estimated impacts, which could result in a total of 98–101 percent. Estimated impacts most years would be less based on fewer explosions. The model is probabilistic and therefore a single impact could be divided among multiple regions or activity categories. (2) MIRC = Mariana Islands Range Complex

Figure 3.4-89: Risso's Dolphin Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2

Table 3.4-101: Estimated Impacts on Individual Risso's Dolphin Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2

Estimated Impacts by Effect			
Behavioral	***TTS***	***PTS***	***Injury***
1	1	0	0

Note: Estimated impacts are based on the maximum number of activities in a given year under Alternative 2.

Rough-Toothed Dolphin

Impacts from Explosives Under Alternative 1 for Training and Testing Activities

Rough-toothed dolphins may be exposed to sound or energy from explosions associated with training and testing activities throughout the year, although the quantitative analysis estimates that no rough-toothed dolphins would be impacted. Considering the mitigation measures that will be implemented as described in Section 2.3.4 (Mitigation Measures), and that impacts are not anticipated, long-term consequences for individuals or the species would not be expected.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of explosives during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 1 would not result in the incidental taking of rough-toothed dolphins.

Impacts from Explosives Under Alternative 2 for Training and Testing Activities

Rough-toothed dolphins may be exposed to sound or energy from explosions associated with training and testing activities throughout the year, although the quantitative analysis estimates that no rough-toothed dolphins would be impacted. Long-term consequences for individuals or the species would not be expected.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of explosives during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 2 would not result in the incidental taking of rough-toothed dolphins.

Short-Finned Pilot Whale

Impacts from Explosives Under Alternative 1 for Training and Testing Activities


Short-finned pilot whales may be exposed to sound or energy from explosions associated with training and testing activities throughout the year, although the quantitative analysis estimates that no short-finned pilot whales would be impacted. Long-term consequences for individuals or the species would not be expected.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of explosives during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 1 would not result in the incidental taking of short-finned pilot whales.

Impacts from Explosives Under Alternative 2 for Training and Testing Activities

Short-finned pilot whales may be exposed to sound or energy from explosions associated with training and testing activities throughout the year. The quantitative analysis, using the maximum number of explosions per year under Alternative 2, estimates behavioral reaction during training and testing activities (Figure 3.4-90 and Table 3.4-102). Estimated impacts most years would be less based on fewer explosions. Impact ranges for this species are discussed in Section 3.4.2.2.2.2 (Impact Ranges for Explosives). As described for odontocetes above, even a few minor to moderate behavioral reactions to an individual over the course of a year are unlikely to have any significant costs or long-term consequences for that individual. Considering these factors and the mitigation measures that will be implemented as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), long-term consequences for the species would not be expected.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of explosives during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 2 would result in the unintentional taking of short-finned pilot whales incidental to those activities. The Navy is requesting authorization from NMFS as required by Section 101(a)(5)(A) of the MMPA.



Notes: (1) Region and Activity Category bar charts show categories +/- 0.5 percent of the estimated impacts, which could result in a total of 98–101 percent. Estimated impacts most years would be less based on fewer explosions. The model is probabilistic and therefore a single impact could be divided among multiple regions or activity categories. (2) MIRC = Mariana Islands Range Complex

Figure 3.4-90: Short-Finned Pilot Whale Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2

Table 3.4-102: Estimated Impacts on Individual Short-Finned Pilot Whales Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2

Estimated Impacts by Effect			
Behavioral	***TTS***	***PTS***	***Injury***
1	0	0	0

Note: Estimated impacts are based on the maximum number of activities in a given year under Alternative 2.

Sperm Whale (Endangered Species Act-Listed)

Impacts from Explosives Under Alternative 1 for Training and Testing Activities

Sperm whales may be exposed to sound or energy from explosions associated with training and testing activities throughout the year. The quantitative analysis estimates that any exposures to sperm whales would not result in impacts rising to a level of take. Long-term consequences for individuals or the species would not be expected.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of explosives during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 1 would not result in the incidental taking of sperm whales.

Pursuant to the ESA, the use of explosives during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 1 would not affect ESA-listed sperm whales.

Impacts from Explosives Under Alternative 2 for Training and Testing Activities

Sperm whales may be exposed to sound or energy from explosions associated with training and testing activities throughout the year, although the quantitative analysis estimates any exposures to sperm whales would not result in impacts rising to a level of take. Long-term consequences for individuals or the species would not be expected.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of explosives during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 2 would not result in the incidental taking of sperm whales.


Pursuant to the ESA, the use of explosives during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 2 would not affect ESA-listed sperm whales.

Spinner Dolphin

Impacts from Explosives Under Alternative 1 for Training and Testing Activities

Spinner dolphins may be exposed to sound or energy from explosions associated with training and testing activities throughout the year. The quantitative analysis, using the maximum number of explosions per year under Alternative 1, estimates TTS during training and testing activities (Figure 3.4-91 and Table 3.4-103). Estimated impacts most years would be less based on fewer explosions. Impact ranges for this species are discussed in Section 3.4.2.2.2.2 (Impact Ranges for Explosives). As described for odontocetes above, even a few minor to moderate TTS to an individual over the course of a year are unlikely to have any significant costs or long-term consequences for that individual. In addition to procedural mitigation, the Navy will not use in-water explosives during training and testing within the Agat Bay Nearshore Mitigation Area, where spinner dolphins have been observed resting, as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation). Considering these factors and the mitigation measures that will be implemented as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), long-term consequences for the species would not be expected.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of explosives during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 1 would result in the unintentional taking of spinner dolphins incidental to those activities.



Notes: (1) Region and Activity Category bar charts show categories +/- 0.5 percent of the estimated impacts, which could result in a total of 98–101 percent. Estimated impacts most years would be less based on fewer explosions. The model is probabilistic and therefore a single impact could be divided among multiple regions or activity categories. (2) MIRC = Mariana Islands Range Complex

Figure 3.4-91: Spinner Dolphin Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1

Table 3.4-103: Estimated Impacts on Individual Spinner Dolphins Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1

Estimated Impacts by Effect			
Behavioral	***TTS***	***PTS***	***Injury***
0	1	0	0


Note: Estimated impacts are based on the maximum number of activities in a given year under Alternative 1.

Impacts from Explosives Under Alternative 2 for Training and Testing Activities

Spinner dolphins may be exposed to sound or energy from explosions associated with training and testing activities throughout the year. The quantitative analysis, using the maximum number of explosions per year under Alternative 2, estimates TTS and PTS during training and testing activities (Figure 3.4-92 and Table 3.4-104). Estimated impacts most years would be less based on fewer explosions. As described for odontocetes above, even a few minor to moderate TTS to an individual over the course of a year are unlikely to have any significant costs or long-term consequences for that individual. PTS could reduce an animal's ability to detect biologically important sounds; however, as discussed above, a small threshold shift due to exposure to explosive energy and sound is unlikely to affect the hearing range that spinner dolphins rely upon. Nevertheless, PTS could have minor long-term consequences for individuals. This minor consequence for an individual is unlikely to have any long-term consequences for the species. Considering these factors and the mitigation measures that will be

implemented as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), long-term consequences for the species would not be expected.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of explosives during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 2 would result in the unintentional taking of spinner dolphins incidental to those activities. The Navy is requesting authorization from NMFS as required by Section 101(a)(5)(A) of the MMPA.



Notes: (1) Region and Activity Category bar charts show categories +/- 0.5 percent of the estimated impacts, which could result in a total of 98–101 percent. Estimated impacts most years would be less based on fewer explosions. The model is probabilistic and therefore a single impact could be divided among multiple regions or activity categories. (2) MIRC = Mariana Islands Range Complex

Figure 3.4-92: Spinner Dolphin Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2

Table 3.4-104: Estimated Impacts on Individual Spinner Dolphins Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2

Estimated Impacts by Effect			
Behavioral	***TTS***	***PTS***	***Injury***
0	1	1	0

Note: Estimated impacts are based on the maximum number of activities in a given year under the Alternative 2.


Striped Dolphin

Impacts from Explosives Under Alternative 1 for Training and Testing Activities

Striped dolphins may be exposed to sound or energy from explosions associated with training and testing activities throughout the year. The quantitative analysis, using the maximum number of explosions per year under Alternative 1, estimates behavioral reaction and TTS during training and

testing activities (Figure 3.4-93 and Table 3.4-105). Estimated impacts most years would be less based on fewer explosions. Impact ranges for this species are discussed in Section 3.4.2.2.2.2 (Impact Ranges for Explosives). As described for odontocetes above, even a few minor to moderate TTS or behavioral reaction to an individual over the course of a year are unlikely to have any significant costs or long-term consequences for that individual. Considering these factors and the mitigation measures that will be implemented as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), long-term consequences for the species would not be expected.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of explosives during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 1 would result in the unintentional taking of striped dolphins incidental to those activities.



Notes: (1) Region and Activity Category bar charts show categories +/- 0.5 percent of the estimated impacts, which could result in a total of 98–101 percent. Estimated impacts most years would be less based on fewer explosions. The model is probabilistic and therefore a single impact could be divided among multiple regions or activity categories. (2) MIRC = Mariana Islands Range Complex

Figure 3.4-93: Striped Dolphin Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1

Table 3.4-105: Estimated Impacts on Individual Striped Dolphins Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1


Estimated Impacts by Effect			
Behavioral	***TTS***	***PTS***	***Injury***
1	1	0	0

Note: Estimated impacts are based on the maximum number of activities in a given year under Alternative 1.

Impacts from Explosives Under Alternative 2 for Training and Testing Activities

Potential annual impacts under Alternative 2 from training and testing with explosives would differ slightly (Figure 3.4-94 and Table 3.4-106) compared to the impacts shown and discussed above in Impacts from Explosives Under Alternative 1 for Training and Testing Activities; however, the total number of impacts would remain the same.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of explosives during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 2 would result in the unintentional taking of striped dolphins incidental to those activities. The Navy is requesting authorization from NMFS as required by Section 101(a)(5)(A) of the MMPA.



Notes: (1) Region and Activity Category bar charts show categories +/- 0.5 percent of the estimated impacts, which could result in a total of 98–101 percent. Estimated impacts most years would be less based on fewer explosions. The model is probabilistic and therefore a single impact could be divided among multiple regions or activity categories. (2) MIRC = Mariana Islands Range Complex

Figure 3.4-94: Striped Dolphin Impacts Estimated per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2

Table 3.4-106: Estimated Impacts on Individual Striped Dolphins Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2

Estimated Impacts by Effect			
Behavioral	***TTS***	***PTS***	***Injury***
1	1	0	0

Note: Estimated impacts are based on the maximum number of activities in a given year under Alternative 2.

3.4.2.2.2.4 Impacts from Explosive Stressors Under the No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, proposed training and testing activities would not occur. Other military activities not associated with this Proposed Action would continue to occur. Explosive stressors, as described above, would not be introduced into the marine environment from the Proposed Action. Therefore, existing environmental conditions would either remain unchanged or would improve slightly after cessation of ongoing training and testing activities. Discontinuing the training and testing activities would result in fewer activities that use explosives within the marine environment where training and testing activities have historically been conducted. Therefore, discontinuing training and testing activities under the No Action Alternative would reduce the potential for impacts from explosive stressors on marine mammals, but would not measurably improve the overall distribution or abundance of marine mammals.

3.4.2.3 Energy Stressors

Energy stressors are discussed in Section 3.0.4.3 (Energy Stressors) of this SEIS/OEIS. The energy stressors that may impact marine mammals include in-water electromagnetic devices and high-energy lasers. NMFS has previously determined in documents and analyses associated with two prior Navy training and testing EIS/OEISs within the MITT Study Area that in-water electromagnetic devices would not result in harassment or the incidental taking of marine mammals (80 FR 46112) and would not result in significant adverse impacts or jeopardize the continued existence of any ESA-listed marine mammals (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2015b). These determinations for this stressor were recently reaffirmed for a third time by NMFS for the same actions elsewhere (83 FR 10954, 83 FR 29872, 83 FR 66846, and 83 FR 57076). Since the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and with the increased use of undersea power cables associated with offshore energy generation, there has been renewed scientific interest in electromagnetic fields possibly affecting migrating marine mammals (Gill et al., 2014; Kremers et al., 2014; Kremers et al., 2016; Zellar et al., 2017). Horton et al. (2017) have indicated that future experiments involving empirical observation of free-ranging animals are still required for there to be sufficient evidence demonstrating causal relations between marine mammal movement decisions and environmental cues such as the earth's magnetic field. These additional scientific findings do not change in any way the rationale for the dismissal of in-water electromagnetic devices as presented in the 2015 analyses given a negligible or discountable impact on marine mammal populations or species.

The 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS covered the use of low-energy lasers in Section 3.0.5.2.2.3 (Lasers), but high-energy laser weapons were not part of the Proposed Action in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. The use of high-energy lasers represents a new sub-stressor as part of an existing activity in this SEIS/OEIS. As discussed in this SEIS/OEIS, Section 3.0.4.3.2.2 (High-Energy Lasers), high-energy lasers are designed to disable surface targets, rendering them immobile. The primary concern is the potential for a marine mammal to be struck with the laser beam at or near the water's surface, where extended exposure could result in injury or death.

As described in Section 3.0.4.3.2 (Lasers), high-energy laser weapons testing activities involve evaluating the effectiveness of a high-energy laser deployed from a surface ship to create small but critical failures in potential targets from short ranges. The concern with the proposed use of high-energy lasers is the potential for a marine mammal to be exposed to the laser beam if the laser beam missed the target, if the animal was above the ocean surface, and if the animal was in the direct path of the laser beam in front of or directly behind the target. The Navy conducted statistical modeling to estimate the probability of a marine mammal being struck by a high-energy laser during training and testing activities. The probability was estimated for a location off Southern California where the density of marine

mammals is generally higher than in the Study Area and where more training and testing activities using high-energy lasers are conducted. The results of the analysis showed that there is a very low probability of a direct strike by a high-energy laser on a marine mammal, and that the likelihood of a strike occurring is therefore discountable (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2017d). Given that marine mammal densities are lower in the Study Area and fewer activities using high-energy lasers would be conducted in the Study Area, it is reasonable to conclude that the probability of a direct strike is even lower than predicted off Southern California. Therefore, it is reasonable to conclude that marine mammals in the Study Area are not likely to be struck by a high-energy laser. Training and testing activities have the potential to expose marine mammals that occur within the Study Area to this energy stressor. However, given the short ranges involved in the activities involving high-energy lasers, the aim point being a surface target, the inherent precision of the weapon and its targeting system, and the fact that marine mammals spend up to 90 percent of their time under the water (Costa, 1993; Costa & Block, 2009), indicates that impacts on marine mammals from high-energy lasers should not be expected to occur.

3.4.2.3.1 Impacts from Energy Stressors Under Alternative 1

Under Alternative 1, the number of proposed training and testing activities involving the use of in-water electromagnetic devices would decrease in comparison to the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (see Table 3.0-9). These activities would occur in the same locations and in a similar manner as previously analyzed. Therefore, as stated in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and based on the new science summarized above, impacts on marine mammals from in-water electromagnetic devices are not expected.

Under Alternative 1, there would be up to 54 activities annually that include the use of high-energy lasers (Table 3.0-10). As discussed above, impacts on marine mammals from high-energy lasers are not expected because of the very low probability of a direct strike by a high-energy laser on a marine mammal.

Impacts on marine mammals from energy stressors, including in-water electromagnetic devices and high-energy lasers, are not expected to occur under Alternative 1.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of in-water electromagnetic devices and high-energy lasers as described under Alternative 1 would not result in the incidental taking of marine mammals.

Pursuant to the ESA, the use of in-water electromagnetic devices and high-energy lasers as described under Alternative 1 may affect ESA-listed marine mammals.

3.4.2.3.2 Impacts from Energy Stressors Under Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)

Under Alternative 2, the number of proposed training and testing activities involving energy stressors would be the same as Alternative 1 for in-water electromagnetic devices (Table 3.0-9). Under Alternative 2, the use of high-energy lasers would increase as compared to Alternative 1 (Table 3.0-10). There would be no change regarding the impact conclusions for energy stressors as summarized above under Alternative 1 and as presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Therefore, impacts on marine mammals under Alternative 2 from energy stressors, including high-energy lasers, are not expected to occur.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of in-water electromagnetic devices and high-energy lasers as described under Alternative 2 would not result in the incidental taking of marine mammals.

Pursuant to the ESA, the use of in-water electromagnetic devices and high-energy lasers as described under Alternative 2 may affect ESA-listed marine mammals. The Navy is consulting with NMFS as required by Section 7(a)(2) of the ESA.

3.4.2.3.3 Impacts from Energy Stressors Under the No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, proposed training and testing activities would not occur. Other military activities not associated with the Proposed Action would continue to occur. Energy stressors from the use of in-water electromagnetic devices and high-energy lasers, as described above, would not be introduced into the marine environment from the Proposed Action. Therefore, existing environmental conditions would either remain unchanged or would improve slightly after cessation of ongoing training and testing activities. Discontinuing the training and testing activities would result in fewer activities that produce energy stressors within the marine environment where training and testing activities have historically been conducted. Therefore, discontinuing training and testing activities under the No Action Alternative would reduce the potential for impacts from energy stressors on marine mammals, but would not measurably improve the overall distribution or abundance of marine mammals.

3.4.2.4 Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors

Physical disturbance and strike stressors are discussed in Section 3.0.4.4 (Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors) of this SEIS/OEIS. The physical disturbance and strike stressors that may impact marine mammals include (1) vessels and in-water devices, (2) military expended materials, and (3) seafloor devices. The annual number of activities including vessels and in-water devices, the annual number of military expended materials, and the annual number of activities including seafloor devices are shown in Table 3.0-12 through Table 3.0-17 and Table 3.0-19.

Since 1995, the U.S. Navy has reported all known or suspected vessel collisions with whales to NMFS, and there have been no known collisions between Navy vessels and whales in the MITT Study Area associated with any of the proposed training or testing activities. The Navy has several standard operating procedures and mitigation measures for vessel safety that will benefit marine mammals through a reduction in the potential for vessel strike, as discussed in Section 2.3.3 (Standard Operating Procedures) and Chapter 5 (Mitigation). Based on the absence of any Navy vessel strikes associated with the Proposed Action in the Study Area, the general reduction in strike incidents Navy-wide since introduction of the Marine Species Awareness Training in 2006, and the future reduction in vessel and in-water device use in comparison to the ongoing actions (see Tables 3.0-12 and 3.0-13), the Navy does not anticipate the occurrence of future vessel strikes to marine mammals within the Study Area during training and testing activities. For these reasons, the Navy is not requesting authorization of a take by vessel strike during Navy training and testing activities in the MITT Study Area.

Most in-water devices, such as unmanned underwater vehicles and towed devices, will move slowly through the water and are highly unlikely to strike marine mammals because the mammal could easily avoid the device. In-water devices towed by manned platforms are unlikely to strike a marine mammal because of the observers on the towing platform and other standard safety measures employed when towing in-water devices. In-water devices that could pose a higher risk to marine mammals are those operated at high speeds and unmanned, such as torpedoes. The Navy reviewed torpedo design features and a large number of previous anti-submarine warfare torpedo exercises to assess the potential of torpedo strikes on marine mammals. The tactical software that guides U.S. Navy torpedoes is

sophisticated and should not identify a marine mammal as a target. All training and testing torpedoes are recovered after being fired at targets and are reconfigured for re-use. Review of the exercise torpedo records indicates there has never been an impact on a marine mammal. In thousands of exercises in which torpedoes were fired or in-water devices used, there have been no recorded or reported instances of a marine mammal strike.

As part of military expended materials, small-caliber munitions are inert, are meant to be aimed at targets, and are not long-range weapons. As a result, marine mammals are extremely unlikely to be disturbed or struck by expended small-caliber munitions. There have been no known instances of a seafloor device (such as an anchor) striking a marine mammal as it was being deployed or recovered.

In short, there have been no known instances of physical disturbance or strike to any marine mammals as a result of training and testing activities prior to or since the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. As described in Section 5.3.4 (Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors), the Navy will continue to implement mitigation measures for applicable vessel movements, towed in-water devices, and military expended materials during non-explosive activities. The mitigation measures will further avoid or reduce the already low potential for impacts on marine mammals during activities involving physical disturbance or strike stressors.

NMFS has previously determined in documents and analyses associated with two prior Navy training and testing EIS/OEISs within the MITT Study Area that physical disturbance and strike stressors would not result in harassment or the incidental taking of marine mammals (80 FR 46112) and would not result in significant adverse impacts or jeopardize the continued existence of any ESA-listed marine mammals (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2015b). There has been no subsequent emergent science that would necessitate changes to these conclusions, reached in association with the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS analyses, regarding physical disturbance and strike stressors being dismissed as having a negligible or discountable impact on marine mammal populations or species.

3.4.2.4.1 Impacts from Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors Under Alternative 1

Under Alternative 1, analysis of the individual sub-stressors including the use of vessels and in-water devices, military expended materials, and seafloor devices presented in Section 3.0.4.4 (Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors) indicates that those items having the most potential to affect marine mammals have decreased in comparison to the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (Tables 3.0-12 through 3.0-17 and Table 3.0-19). This assumes the dismissal of small-caliber munitions for the reasons noted above.

Given the reduction in physical disturbance and strike stressors for this SEIS/OEIS, the findings presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, Section 3.4.4.4 (Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors), the MMPA authorization (80 FR 46112), and the NMFS Biological Opinion, the findings associated with the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2015b) remain valid.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of vessels and in-water devices, military expended materials, and seafloor devices under Alternative 1 would not result in the incidental taking of marine mammals.

Pursuant to the ESA, the use of vessels and in-water devices, military expended materials, and seafloor devices as summarized above under Alternative 1 may affect ESA-listed marine mammals.

3.4.2.4.2 Impacts from Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors Under Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)

Under Alternative 2, physical disturbance and strike stressors during training and testing activities would decrease in comparison to the 2015 (Tables 3.0-12 through 3.0-17 and Table 3.0-19) assuming the

dismissal of small-caliber munitions use for the reasons noted above. Under Alternative 2, there would be additional physical disturbance and strike stressors in comparison to Alternative 1, but the conclusions remain the same. Therefore, impacts on marine mammals from physical disturbance and strike stressors are not expected to occur.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of vessels and in-water devices, military expended materials, and seafloor devices under Alternative 2 would not result in the incidental taking of marine mammals.

Pursuant to the ESA, the use of vessels and in-water devices, military expended materials, and seafloor devices under Alternative 2 may affect ESA-listed marine mammals. The Navy is consulting with NMFS as required by Section 7(a)(2) of the ESA.

3.4.2.4.3 Impacts from Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors Under the No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, proposed training and testing activities would not occur. Other military activities not associated with the Proposed Action would continue to occur. Physical disturbance and strike stressors from the use of vessels and in-water devices, military expended materials, and seafloor devices, as described above, would not be introduced into the marine environment from the Proposed Action. Therefore, existing environmental conditions would either remain unchanged or would improve slightly after cessation of ongoing training and testing activities. Discontinuing training and testing activities would result in fewer activities that produce physical disturbance and strike stressors within the marine environment where training and testing activities have historically been conducted. Therefore, discontinuing training and testing activities under the No Action Alternative would reduce the potential for impacts from physical disturbance and strike stressors on marine mammals, but would not measurably improve the overall distribution or abundance of marine mammals.

3.4.2.5 Entanglement Stressors

Entanglement stressors are discussed in Section 3.0.4.5 (Entanglement Stressors) of this SEIS/OEIS. Entanglement stressors considered for marine mammals include (1) wires and cables, and (2) decelerators/parachutes. The annual numbers of wires and cables and decelerators/parachutes proposed under the alternatives and in comparison to current ongoing activities are presented in Tables 3.0-22 through 3.0-24. There have been no known instances of any marine mammals being entangled in wires and cables, or decelerators/parachutes associated with Navy training and testing activities prior to or since the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

NMFS has previously determined in documents and analyses associated with two prior Navy training and testing EIS/OEISs within the MITT Study Area that entanglement stressors would not result in harassment or the incidental taking of marine mammals (80 FR 46112) and would not result in significant adverse impacts or jeopardize the continued existence of any ESA-listed marine mammals (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2015b). There has been no subsequent emergent science that would necessitate changes to these conclusions, reached in association with the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS analyses, regarding this stressor being dismissed as having a negligible or discountable impact on marine mammal populations or species. These determinations for this stressor were recently reaffirmed for a third time by NMFS for the same actions elsewhere (83 FR 10954 & 83 FR 29872).

3.4.2.5.1 Impacts from Entanglement Stressors Under Alternative 1

Under Alternative 1, the annual number of entanglement stressors would decrease in comparison to the current ongoing activities (Tables 3.0-22 through 3.0-24). Therefore, the analysis from the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS remains valid. The analysis presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (Section 3.4.4.5,

Entanglement Stressors), the MMPA authorization (80 FR 46112), and the NMFS Biological Opinion for the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2015b) determined that entanglement stressors associated with the Navy's Proposed Action can be dismissed as having a negligible or discountable impact on marine mammal populations or species.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of wires and cables and decelerators/parachutes as described under Alternative 1 would not result in the incidental taking of marine mammals.

Pursuant to the ESA, the use of wires and cables and parachutes/decelerators as described under Alternative 1 may affect ESA-listed marine mammals.

3.4.2.5.2 Impacts from Entanglement Stressors Under Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)

Under Alternative 2, the number of entanglement stressors would decrease in comparison to current ongoing activities (Tables 3.0-22 through 3.0-24). In comparison to Alternative 1, there would be a slight increase under Alternative 2 for entanglement stressors; however, the combined number of annual entanglement stressors (fiber optic cable, guidance wire, and decelerators/parachutes) decreases when compared to the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Therefore, the analysis and conclusions presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (Section 3.4.4.5, Entanglement Stressors), the MMPA authorization (80 FR 46112), and the NMFS Biological Opinion for the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2015b) remain valid. Impacts on marine mammals from the use of entanglement stressors are not anticipated.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of wires and cables and decelerators/parachutes as described under Alternative 2 would not result in the incidental taking of marine mammals.

Pursuant to the ESA, the use of wires and cables and parachutes/decelerators as described under Alternative 2 may affect ESA-listed marine mammals. The Navy is consulting with NMFS as required by Section 7(a)(2) of the ESA.

3.4.2.5.2.1 Impacts from Entanglement Stressors Under the No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, proposed training and testing activities would not occur. Other military activities not associated with the Proposed Action would continue to occur. Entanglement stressors from the use of wires and cables and decelerators/parachutes, as described above, would not be introduced into the marine environment from the Proposed Action. Therefore, existing environmental conditions would either remain unchanged or would improve slightly after cessation of ongoing training and testing activities. Discontinuing the training and testing activities would result in fewer activities that use entanglement stressors within the marine environment where Navy training and testing activities have historically been conducted. Therefore, discontinuing training and testing activities under the No Action Alternative would reduce the potential for impacts from entanglement stressors on marine mammals, but would not measurably improve the overall distribution or abundance of marine mammals.

3.4.2.6 Ingestion Stressors

Ingestion stressors are discussed in Section 3.0.4.6 (Ingestion Stressors) of this SEIS/OEIS. Types of materials that could become ingestion stressors during training and testing in the Study Area include military expended materials – munitions and military expended materials – other than munitions. The annual number of activities including military expended materials are shown in Tables 3.0-14 through 3.0-17 and Tables 3.0-25 and 3.0-26. As discussed in Section 3.4.4.6.3 (Impacts from Munitions) of the

2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, the number of munitions and explosive munitions fragments that an individual marine mammal could encounter would generally be low, based on the patchy distribution of both the munitions and the habitats where marine mammals forage. For the more numerous small-caliber munitions, these expended material type items are inert, small, do not resemble prey items, and end up as part of the seafloor, where they are unlikely to be encountered by most marine mammals. In addition, it is assumed for marine mammal species that may feed at the seafloor, that they would not ingest every munition or munition's fragment encountered; if a munition or munition's fragment were ingested, an animal may attempt to reject it when it realizes the item is not food. There is evidence indicating that even ingestion of certain metal items (e.g., hooks) may not result in injury or mortality to the individual (Wells et al., 2008; West, 2016).

NMFS has previously determined in documents and analyses associated with two prior Navy training and testing EIS/OEISs within the MITT Study Area that ingestion stressors would not result in harassment or the incidental taking of marine mammals (80 FR 46112) and would not result in significant adverse impacts or jeopardize the continued existence of any ESA-listed marine mammals (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2015b). There has been no subsequent emergent science that would necessitate changes to these conclusions reached in association with the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS analyses regarding this stressor being dismissed as having a negligible or discountable impact on marine mammal populations or species. These determinations for this stressor were recently reaffirmed for a third time by NMFS for the same actions elsewhere (83 FR 10954 & 83 FR 29872).

3.4.2.6.1 Impacts from Ingestion Stressors Under Alternative 1

Under Alternative 1, analysis of the individual sub-stressors presented in Section 3.0.4.6 (Ingestion Stressors) indicates that those items considered ingestion stressors (military expended materials – munitions and military expended materials – other than munitions) having the most potential to affect marine mammals have decreased (Tables 3.0-14 through 3.0.17 and Tables 3.0-25 and 3.0-26). For the reasons noted above, the Navy has determined that potential impacts from ingestion stressors (military expended materials – munitions and military expended materials – other than munitions) would not be substantially different from the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. In the 2015 analysis of training and testing activities within the Study Area, NMFS determined that ingestion stressors (military expended materials – munitions and military expended materials – other than munitions) would not result in harassment or the incidental taking of marine mammals activities (80 FR 46112) and would not result in significant adverse impacts or jeopardize the continued existence of any ESA-listed marine mammals (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2015b). The activities expending munitions and other military expended materials analyzed in this SEIS/OEIS under Alternative 1 are not a significant change over what was analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, and there has been no new science necessitating a revision of the 2015 conclusions in that regard. Impacts on marine mammals from ingestion stressors (military expended materials – munitions and military expended materials – other than munitions) associated with Navy activities in the Study Area are not anticipated.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of military expended materials as described under Alternative 1 would not result in the incidental taking of marine mammals.

Pursuant to the ESA, the use of military expended materials as described under Alternative 1 may affect ESA-listed marine mammals.

3.4.2.6.2 Impacts from Ingestion Stressors Under Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)

Under Alternative 2, the use of military expended materials would decrease under this SEIS/OEIS in comparison to the ongoing activities, with the exception of increased small-caliber munitions use (Tables 3.0-14 through 3-17 and Tables 3.0-25 and 3.0-26). Under Alternative 2, increases as compared to Alternative 1 do not change the impact conclusions for ingestion stressors (military expended materials – munitions and military expended materials – other than munitions) as summarized above under Alternative 1 and as presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Therefore, impacts on marine mammals from ingestion of military expended materials under Alternative 2 are not expected.

Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of military expended materials as described under Alternative 2 would not result in the incidental taking of marine mammals.

Pursuant to the ESA, the use of military expended materials as described under Alternative 2 may affect ESA-listed marine mammals. The Navy is consulting with NMFS as required by Section 7(a)(2) of the ESA.

3.4.2.6.3 Impacts from Ingestion Stressors Under the No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, proposed training and testing activities would not occur. Other military activities not associated with the Proposed Action would continue to occur. Ingestion stressors from the use of military expended materials – munitions and military expended materials – other than munitions, as described above, would not be introduced into the marine environment under the Proposed Action. Therefore, existing environmental conditions would either remain unchanged or would improve slightly after cessation of on-going training and testing activities. Discontinuing the training and testing activities would result in fewer activities that produce ingestion stressors within the marine environment where training and testing activities have historically been conducted. Therefore, discontinuing training and testing activities under the No Action Alternative would reduce the potential for impacts from ingestion stressors on marine mammals, but would not measurably improve the overall distribution or abundance of marine mammals.

3.4.2.7 Secondary Stressors

As discussed in Section 3.4.4.7 (Secondary Stressors) of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, secondary stressors from training and testing activities were analyzed for potential indirect impacts on marine mammals via habitat degradation or an effect on prey availability. These stressors included (1) explosives, (2) explosive byproducts and unexploded ordnance, (3) metals, (4) chemicals, and (5) transmission of marine mammal diseases and parasites. Analyses of the potential impacts on sediments and water quality are discussed in detail in Section 3.1 (Sediments and Water Quality) of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and in Section 3.1 (Sediments and Water Quality) of this SEIS/OEIS. NMFS has previously determined in documents and analyses associated with two prior Navy training and testing EIS/OEISs within the MITT Study Area that secondary stressors would not result in harassment or the incidental taking of marine mammals (80 FR 46112) and would not result in significant adverse impacts or jeopardize the continued existence of any ESA-listed marine mammals (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2015b). There has been no subsequent emergent science since 2015 that would necessitate changes to the analysis of secondary stressors being dismissed as having a negligible or discountable impact on marine mammal populations or species. These determinations for secondary stressors were recently reaffirmed for a third time by NMFS for the same actions elsewhere (83 FR 10954 and 83 FR 29872).

The current analysis has concluded that the relatively low solubility of most explosives and their degradation products means that concentrations of these contaminants in the marine environment, from either high-order or low-order detonations, are relatively low and readily diluted. For example, degradation products of Royal Demolition Explosive are not toxic to marine organisms at realistic exposure levels (Rosen & Lotufo, 2010). Any remnant undetonated components from explosives such as TNT, royal demolition explosive, and high melting explosive experience rapid biological and photochemical degradation in marine systems (Cruz-Uribe et al., 2007; Juhasz & Naidu, 2007; Pavlostathis & Jackson, 2002; Singh et al., 2009; Walker et al., 2006).

For undetonated munitions, the concentration of unexploded ordnance, explosion byproducts, metals, and other chemicals would never exceed that of a World War II dump site, where studies found minimal concentrations were detected only within a few ft. of the ordnance (Briggs et al., 2016; Edwards & Bełdowski, 2016; Edwards et al., 2016a; Edwards et al., 2016b; Kelley et al., 2016; Koide et al., 2016; University of Hawaii, 2010). Annual surveys conducted in the waters off Farallon de Medinilla from 1999 through 2012 found no evidence that the habitat had changed or been adversely impacted to a significant degree by the training activities that have been conducted there (Smith & Marx, 2016). Therefore, long-term secondary effects on marine mammal habitat or prey would be negligible.

The potential transmission of diseases or parasites from Navy marine mammals to indigenous marine mammals is highly unlikely for the following reasons: the Navy marine mammals spend a very small amount of time in the open ocean; the Navy trainers have excellent control over the animals; the Navy follows procedures for the collection and proper disposal of marine mammal waste; the Navy's marine mammals are screened and receive exceptional veterinarian care; the Navy conducts visual monitoring for indigenous marine mammals to avoid any interactions with Navy marine mammals; and the Navy has a track record of over 40 years, with zero known incidents. As described in detail in Section 3.4.4.7.5 (Transmission of Marine Mammal Diseases and Parasites) in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, there is no scientific basis to conclude that the use of Navy marine mammals during training and testing activities would have an indirect impact on wild marine mammals.

Pursuant to the MMPA, secondary stressors from training and testing activities, as described under Alternative 1, Alternative 2, and the No Action Alternative, would not result in the incidental taking of marine mammals.

Pursuant to the ESA, secondary stressors from training and testing activities, as described under Alternative 1, Alternative 2, and the No Action Alternative, may affect ESA-listed marine mammals. The Navy is consulting with NMFS as required by Section 7(a)(2) of the ESA.

3.4.3 Summary of Potential Impacts on Marine Mammals

As described in Section 3.0.5.4 (Resource-Specific Impacts Analysis for Multiple Stressors) in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, this section evaluates the potential for combined impacts of all the stressors from the Proposed Action. The analysis and conclusions for the potential impacts from each of the individual stressors are discussed in Section 3.4.2.1 (Acoustic Stressors) through Section 3.4.2.6 (Ingestion Stressors) and, for ESA-listed species, summarized in Section 3.4.5 (Endangered Species Act Determinations).

Understanding the combined effects of stressors on marine organisms in general and marine mammal populations in particular is extremely difficult to predict (National Academies of Sciences Engineering

and Medicine, 2017). Recognizing the difficulties with measuring trends in marine mammal populations, the focus has been on indicators for adverse impacts, including health and other population metrics (National Academies of Sciences Engineering and Medicine, 2017). This recommended use of population indicators is the approach Navy presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (Section 3.4.5, Summary of Impacts on Marine Mammals) and formed part of the 2015 analyses by NMFS in their MMPA authorization (80 FR 46112), and the Biological Opinion for the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2015b).

Stressors associated with training and testing activities do not typically occur in isolation but rather occur in some combination. For example, mine neutralization activities include elements of acoustic, physical disturbance and strike, entanglement, ingestion, and secondary stressors that are all coincident in space and time. An analysis of the combined impacts of all stressors considers the potential consequences of additive stressors and synergistic stressors, as described below. This analysis makes the reasonable assumption, which is supported by the acoustic effects modeling, that the majority of exposures to stressors are non-lethal, and instead focuses on consequences potentially impacting marine mammal fitness (e.g., physiology, behavior, reproductive potential).

There are generally two ways that a marine mammal could be exposed to multiple additive stressors. The first would be if a marine mammal were exposed to multiple sources of stress from a single event or activity within a single event (e.g., a mine warfare event may include the use of a sound source and a vessel). The potential for a combination of these impacts from a single activity would depend on the range to effects of each of the stressors and the response or lack of response to that stressor. Most of the activities proposed under Alternative 1 generally involve the use of moving platforms (e.g., ships, torpedoes, aircraft) that may produce one or more stressors; therefore, it is likely that if a marine mammal were within the potential impact range of those activities, it may be impacted by multiple stressors simultaneously. Individual stressors that would otherwise have minimal to no impact may combine to have a measurable response. However, due to the wide dispersion of stressors, speed of the platforms, general dynamic movement of many training and testing activities, and behavioral avoidance exhibited by many marine mammal species, it is very unlikely that a marine mammal would remain in the potential impact range of multiple sources or sequential events. Exposure to multiple stressors is more likely to occur at an instrumented range where training and testing activities using multiple platforms may be concentrated during a particular event. In such cases involving a relatively small area on an instrumented range, a behavioral reaction resulting in avoidance of the immediate vicinity of the activity would reduce the likelihood of exposure to additional stressors. Nevertheless, the majority of the proposed activities are unit-level training and testing activities, which are conducted in the open ocean. Unit-level events occur over a small spatial scale (one to a few square miles) and with few participants (usually one or two) or short duration (the order of a few hours or less).

Secondly, a marine mammal could be exposed to multiple training and testing activities over the course of its life; however, training and testing activities are generally separated in space and time in such a way that it would be unlikely that any individual marine mammal would be exposed to stressors from multiple activities within a short timeframe. However, animals with a home range intersecting an area of concentrated Navy activity have elevated exposure risks relative to animals that simply transit the area through a migratory corridor.

Multiple stressors may also have synergistic effects. For example, marine mammals that experience temporary hearing loss or injury from acoustic stressors could be more susceptible to physical disturbance and strike stressors through a decreased ability to detect and avoid threats. Marine

mammals that experience behavioral and physiological consequences of ingestion stressors could be more susceptible to entanglement and physical strike stressors via malnourishment and disorientation. These cumulative, synergistic, and antagonistic interactions between multiple stressors, both natural and anthropogenic, have just begun to be investigated and the exact mechanisms each stressor contributes to individual fitness is poorly understood. To date, the majority of scientific investigations on this topic have been on marine mammals rather than marine mammals (Murray et al., 2020; National Academies of Sciences Engineering and Medicine, 2017). Based on current best available science, the effects of multiple synergistic stressors over time cannot be realistically or precisely modeled for marine mammals. The Navy's quantitative and qualitative analyses are consistently conservative and likely over-predict impacts on marine mammals.

Research and monitoring efforts have included before-, during-, and after-event observations and surveys; data collection through long-term studies in areas where the Navy conducts activities; occurrence surveys over large geographic areas; biopsy of animals occurring in areas of Navy activity; and tagging studies where animals are exposed to Navy stressors. These efforts are intended to contribute to the overall understanding of the types of impacts that animals may be experiencing in these areas. To date, the findings from the research and monitoring efforts and the regulatory conclusions from previous analyses by NMFS, including the NMFS Biological Opinion for the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (National Marine Fisheries Service, 2015d; National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2015b), have been that the majority of impacts from training and testing activities are not expected to have deleterious impacts on the fitness of any individuals or long-term consequences to populations of marine mammals.

3.4.3.1 Combined Impacts of All Stressors Under Alternative 1

Although potential impacts on certain marine mammal species from training and testing activities under Alternative 1 may include injury to individuals, those injuries are not expected to lead to long-term consequences for populations. The potential impacts anticipated from Alternative 1 are summarized in Section 3.4.4 (Marine Mammal Protection Act Determinations) and Section 3.4.5 (Endangered Species Act Determinations) for each regulation applicable to marine mammals. For a discussion of cumulative impacts, see Chapter 4 (Cumulative Impacts). For a discussion of mitigation, see Chapter 5 (Mitigation). and Appendix I (Geographic Mitigation Assessment).

3.4.3.2 Combined Impacts of All Stressors Under Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)

As detailed previously in this section, some training and testing activities proposed under Alternative 2 would be an increase over what is proposed for Alternative 1. However, this increase is not expected to significantly increase the potential for impacts over what is analyzed for Alternative 1. The analysis presented in Section 3.4.3.1 (Combined Impacts of All Stressors Under Alternative 1) would similarly apply to Alternative 2. The combined impacts of all stressors for training and testing activities under Alternative 2 are not expected to have deleterious impacts or long-term consequences to populations of marine mammals.

3.4.3.3 Combined Impacts of All Stressors Under the No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, proposed training and testing activities would not occur. Other military activities not associated with the Proposed Action would continue to occur. All stressors associated with training and testing activities would not be introduced into the marine environment. Therefore, baseline conditions of the existing environment would either remain unchanged or would improve slightly after cessation of ongoing training and testing activities.

3.4.3.4 Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015

As provided in detail in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, Section 3.4.5.2 (Summary of Observations During Previous Navy Activities), the results of previous monitoring and research since 2006 taking place in and around Navy ranges and occurring before, during, and after Navy training and testing events, have been included as part of the Navy analyses as well as the analyses by NMFS in their MMPA authorization (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2015b), and the Biological Opinion for the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (National Marine Fisheries Service, 2015c, 2017).

Since 2006, the Navy, non-Navy marine mammal scientists, and research groups and institutions have conducted scientific monitoring and research in and around ocean areas in the Atlantic and Pacific where the Navy has been and proposes to continue training and testing. The analysis provided in this SEIS/OEIS will be the third time Navy training and testing activities at sea have been comprehensively analyzed in the Study Area. Data collected from Navy monitoring, scientific research findings, and annual reports have been provided to NMFS; this public record is informative as part of the analysis of impacts on marine mammals in general for a variety of reasons, including species distribution, habitat use, and evaluation of potential responses to Navy activities.

Monitoring across Navy training and testing ranges is performed using a variety of methods, including visual surveys from surface vessels and aircraft; in addition, passive acoustics before, during, and after Navy activities have been conducted. The Navy also has continued to contribute to funding of basic research, including behavioral response studies specifically designed to determine the effects to marine mammals from the Navy's use of mid-frequency sonar and other transducers.

The majority of the training and testing activities Navy is proposing in the Study Area are similar if not nearly identical to activities that have been occurring in the same locations for decades. For example, the mid-frequency sonar system on the Navy's cruisers and destroyers training in the Study Area have the same sonar system components in the water as those first deployed in the 1970s. While the signal analysis and computing processes onboard these ships have been upgraded with modern technology, the sonar transducers, which put signals into the water, have not changed. For this reason, the history of past marine mammal observations, research, and monitoring remain applicable to the analysis of effects from the proposed future training and testing activities in the Study Area.

It is still the case that in the Pacific, the vast majority of scientific field work, research, and monitoring efforts have been expended in Southern California and Hawaii where Navy training and testing activities have been most concentrated. Since 2006, the Navy has been submitting exercise reports and monitoring reports to NMFS for the Navy's range complexes, including monitoring conducted before, during, and after training and testing activities. These publicly available exercise reports, monitoring reports, and the associated scientific research findings have been integrated into decisions regarding the focus for subsequent research and monitoring as determined in collaborations between Navy, NMFS, Marine Mammal Commission, and other marine resource subject matter experts using an adaptive management approach.

In the Study Area, because training and testing events are less frequent and general small in scope by comparison to other Navy areas, the majority of Navy's research effort has been focused elsewhere. Despite this, funding by the Navy has provided nearly the entirety of marine mammal science collected in the Mariana Islands. In fact, prior to Navy funding of marine mammal science, there had not been any dedicated marine mammal surveys performed in the Mariana Islands. The bulk of these Navy-funded research efforts span two primary methodologies: small-vessel surveys and bottom-moored acoustic

deployments. These primary data collection methods have been supplemented by additional results from autonomous gliders acoustic survey, acoustic towed-arrays, visual survey from shore-stations, marine mammal observers on large-vessel surveys, and further analysis and collection of incidental and stranding data. Since the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, new research has continued to be funded by Navy in the Mariana Islands and has included, but is not limited to the following findings:

- The continuation of annual small vessel nearshore surveys, sightings, satellite tagging, biopsy and genetic analysis, photo-identification, and opportunistic acoustic recording off Guam, Saipan, Tinian, Rota, and Aguigan in partnership with NMFS (Hill et al., 2015b; Hill et al., 2016b; Hill et al., 2017a; Hill et al., 2018c; Hill et al., 2019). The satellite tagging and genetic analyses have resulted in the first information discovered on the movement patterns, habitat preference, and population structure of multiple odontocete species in the Study Area.
- Since 2015, the addition of a series of small vessel surveys in the winter season dedicated to humpback whales has provided new information relating to the occurrence, calving behavior, and population identity of this species (Hill et al., 2016a; Hill et al., 2017b; Hill et al., 2018c; Hill et al., 2019), which has not previously been sighted during the previous small vessel surveys in the summer or winter. This work has included sighting data, photo ID matches of individuals to other areas demonstrating migration as well as re-sights within the Mariana Islands across different years, and the collection of biopsy samples for genetic analyses of populations.
- The continued deployment of passive acoustic monitoring devices and analysis of acoustic data obtained using bottom-moored acoustic recording devices deployed by NMFS has provided information on the presence and seasonal occurrence of mysticetes, as well as the occurrence of cryptic odontocetes typically found offshore, including beaked whales and Kogia whales (Hill et al., 2015b; Hill et al., 2016a; Hill et al., 2016b; Hill et al., 2017a; Hill et al., 2018c; Munger et al., 2015; Norris et al., 2017; Oleson et al., 2015; Yack et al., 2016).
- Acoustic surveys using autonomous gliders were used to characterize the occurrence of odontocetes and mysticetes in abyssal offshore waters near Guam and Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, including species not seen in the small vessel visual survey series such as killer whales and Risso's dolphins. Analysis of collected data also provided new information on the seasonality of baleen whales, patterns of beaked whale occurrence and potential call variability, and identification of new unknown marine mammal calls (Klinck et al., 2016a; Nieukirk et al., 2016).
- Visual surveys were conducted from a shore-station at high elevation on the north shore of Guam to document the nearshore occurrence of marine mammals in waters where small vessel visual surveys are challenging due to regularly high sea states (Deakos & Richlen, 2015; Deakos et al., 2016).
- Analysis of archive data, including marine mammal sightings during Guam Department of Agriculture Division of Aquatic and Wildlife Resources aerial surveys undertaken between 1963 and 2012 (Martin et al., 2016).
- Analysis of archived acoustic towed-array data for an assessment of the abundance and density of minke whales (Norris et al., 2017), abundance and density of sperm whales (Yack et al., 2016), and the characterization of sei and humpback whale vocalizations (Norris et al., 2014).

As detailed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, these reporting, monitoring, and research efforts by the Navy have added to the baseline data for marine mammal species inhabiting the Study Area. In addition, subsequent research and monitoring across the Navy has continued to broaden the sample of observations regarding the general health of marine mammal populations in locations where Navy has been conducting training and testing activities for decades, which has been considered in the analysis of

marine mammal impacts presented in this SEIS/OEIS in the same manner that the previous findings were used in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, the NMFS authorization of takes under MMPA (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2015b), and the NMFS Biological Opinion pursuant to the ESA (National Marine Fisheries Service, 2015c).

This public record of training and testing activities, monitoring, and research from across the Navy range complexes in the Pacific and Atlantic now spans more than 13 years. Given that this record involves many of the same Navy training and testing activities being considered for the Study Area, and includes all the marine mammal taxonomic families present in the Study Area, many of the same species, and perhaps some of the same populations as they seasonally migrate from other range complexes, this compendium of Navy reporting is directly applicable to the Study Area. It was the Navy's assessment in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and that of NMFS, as reflected in their analysis of previous Navy training and testing in the Study Area (National Marine Fisheries Service, 2015c; National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2015b), that it was unlikely there would be impacts on populations of marine mammals (including whales and dolphins) having any long-term consequences as a result of the proposed continuation of training and testing in the Study Area. This assessment of likelihood is based on four indicators from areas in the eastern Pacific where Navy training and testing has been ongoing for decades: (1) evidence suggesting or documenting increases in the numbers of marine mammals present, (2) examples of documented presence and site fidelity of species and long-term residence by individual animals of some species, (3) use of training and testing areas for breeding and nursing activities, and (4) 13 years of comprehensive monitoring data indicating a lack of obvious observable effects such as direct mortalities or strandings occurring in marine mammal populations as a result of Navy training and testing activities. Consistent with the presentation in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, the evidence to date and since 2015 continues to suggest the viability of marine mammal populations where the Navy trains and tests and does not show any direct evidence suggesting Navy training and testing has had or may have any long-term consequences to marine mammal populations. Barring any evidence to the contrary, therefore, what limited evidence there is from monitoring reports and additional other focused scientific investigations should be considered in the analysis of impacts on marine mammals. For the Study Area in particular and since the analysis in 2015, examples include

- the most current information suggesting that the ESA-listed blue whale population in the Pacific, which includes the Study Area as part of their habitat, may have recovered and been at a stable level based on recent surveys and scientific findings (Barlow, 2016; Campbell et al., 2015; Carretta et al., 2017d; Carretta et al., 2019c; Monnahan et al., 2015; Rockwood et al., 2017; Širović et al., 2015; Valdivia et al., 2019); and
- humpback whales continue to use Northern Mariana Islands as a winter calving area (Fulling et al., 2011; Hill et al., 2016a; Hill et al., 2017b; Hill et al., 2018b; Hill et al., 2018c; Hill et al., 2020).

To summarize and bring up to date the findings from the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, the evidence from reporting, monitoring, and research across the Pacific over more than a decade indicates that while the Proposed Action would result in harassment of marine mammals and may include injury to some individuals, these impacts are expected to be inconsequential at the level of their marine mammal populations. Monitoring of Navy training and testing will continue to confirm this expectation, as it has in the past in locations where Navy training and testing occurs. Across this past monitoring as well as the broader scientific literature, no direct evidence exists that routine Navy training and testing spanning decades has negatively impacted marine mammal populations at any Navy Range Complex or the Study Area. In particular, there is no evidence that would directly contradict the analysis in the 2015 MITT Final

EIS/OEIS or this SEIS/OEIS, such as the regular observation of strandings, injuries, or mortalities associated temporarily and spatially with Navy training and testing events.

For some of the most intensively used Navy training and testing areas, evidence such as the continued multi-year presence of long-term resident individual animals and small populations (Baird et al., 2015; Baird et al., 2016; Baird et al., 2017; Schorr et al., 2014; Schorr et al., 2018, 2019; U.S. Department of the Navy, 2017d), resident females documented with and without calves from year to year, and high abundances on the Navy ranges for some species in comparison to other off-range locations (Moore & Barlow, 2017; Schorr et al., 2018, 2019; U.S. Department of the Navy, 2017d), indicates generally healthy marine mammal populations. Therefore, based on the best available science, including data developed in exercise and monitoring reports submitted to NMFS for over a decade, long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area.

3.4.4 Marine Mammal Protection Act Determinations

As required by Section 101(a)(5)(A) of the MMPA, the Navy is seeking a Letter of Authorization from NMFS for the use of sonar and other transducers and explosives during Navy activities under Alternative 1 or Alternative 2 of the Proposed Action. The use of sonar and other transducers may result in Level A and Level B harassment of certain marine mammals. The use of explosives may result in Level A harassment, Level B harassment. Refer to Section 3.4.2.1.2 (Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducer Stressors) for details on the estimated impacts from sonar and other transducers and Section 3.4.2.2.2 (Impacts from Explosive Stressors) for impacts from explosives. Based on best available science, the Navy concludes that impacts from sonar and other transducers and from explosives to marine mammal species and stocks would result in only short-term effects on most individuals exposed and would not affect annual rates of recruitment or survival for the following reasons:

- Most acoustic exposures are within the non-injurious temporary threshold shift or behavioral effects zones (Level B harassment).
- Although the numbers presented in Appendix E (Estimated Marine Mammal and Sea Turtle Impacts from Exposure to Acoustic and Explosive Stressors Under Navy Training and Testing Activities) represent estimated harassment under the MMPA and they are conservative estimates (i.e., overpredictions) of harassment, primarily by behavioral disturbance.
- The Navy Acoustic Effects Model calculates harassment without taking into consideration mitigation measures, and is not indicative of a likelihood of either injury or harm. Additionally, the mitigation measures described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) are designed to avoid or reduce sound exposure and explosive effects on marine mammals to levels below those that may cause injury and to achieve the least practicable adverse effect on marine mammal species or stocks.

Weapons noise, vessel noise, aircraft noise, the use of in-water electromagnetic devices, in-air electromagnetic devices, high-energy lasers, vessels, in-water devices, seafloor devices, wires and cables, decelerators/parachutes, and military expended materials are not expected to result in Level A or Level B harassment of any marine mammals.

3.4.5 Endangered Species Act Determinations

Pursuant to the ESA, Navy training and testing activities presented in this SEIS/OEIS may affect ESA-listed marine mammals. There is no designated critical habitat for any marine mammal species in the MITT Study Area. The Navy is consulting with NMFS as required by section 7(a)(2) of the ESA. The outcome of those consultations pursuant to ESA are described in this MITT Final SEIS/OEIS.

3.4.6 Public Comments

The public raised a number of issues during the scoping period and during public review and comment on the draft for this supplement in regard to marine mammals. Comments received from the public during the Draft SEIS/OEIS commenting period related to marine mammals are addressed in Appendix I (Public Comment Responses).

The issues are summarized in the list below.

- **Concern that there be analysis of impacts on marine mammals from various stressors associated with the Proposed Action (e.g., sonar, explosives, "chemical pollution," destruction of habitat) –** Section 3.4.2 (Environmental Consequences) analyzed potential impacts from sonar and other active acoustic stressors, explosives, electromagnetic energy, physical disturbances and strikes, entanglement, ingestion, and secondary stressors. Impacts from sonar and explosives were reanalyzed for several reasons described in Section 3.4.2.1 (Acoustic Stressors) and Section 3.4.2.2 (Explosive Stressors). The analysis of other stressors is summarized in the Section 3.4.2.3 (Energy Stressors) through Section 3.4.2.7 (Secondary Stressors) and described in detail in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.
- **Concerns over the amount of take of marine mammals authorized –** The number and species of marine mammals exposed to sonar and explosives (the only stressors predicted to result in a "take" of a marine mammal) are presented in Section 3.4.2.1.2 (Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducer Stressors) and Section 3.4.2.2.2 (Impacts from Explosive Stressors). The vast majority of predicted impacts are behavioral reactions to sonar or explosives.
- **The analysis must address direct and cumulative impacts on marine mammals –** Direct impacts on marine mammals are addressed in the stressor sections above. A detailed analysis of impacts from acoustic and explosive stressors is provided in Section 3.4.2.1 (Acoustic Stressors) and Section 3.4.2.2 (Explosive Stressors). Impacts from other stressors are summarized in Section 3.4.2.3 (Energy Stressors) through Section 3.4.2.7 (Secondary Stressors) and described in detail in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Chapter 4 (Cumulative Impacts) addresses potential impacts from the Proposed Action in combination with other past, present, and future activities occurring in the Study Area. Cumulative impacts on marine mammals are likely when considering the variety of stressors (e.g., bycatch) that pose a threat to marine mammal populations. Refer to Section 3.4.1.7 (General Threats).
- **Recommendation that this SEIS/OEIS must evaluate alternatives that include temporal and habitat avoidance or time/area closures including restrictions on activities in areas biologically sensitive or important areas –** Regarding the development of alternatives considered, see Section 2.4 (Action Alternatives Development). With regard to the topic specifically, see Section 2.4.1.4 (Alternatives Including Geographic Mitigation Measures within the Study Area) for a discussion on why alternatives including these types of mitigation measures are not generally feasible. Appendix I (Geographic Mitigation Assessment) has been included in this SEIS/OEIS to further evaluate areas specifically identified in public scoping comments as areas to consider for geographic/temporal mitigation. Based on the analysis in Appendix I (Geographic Mitigation Assessment) in association with the MMPA and the ESA permitting processes, and other required regulatory consultations, consideration of geographic mitigation has been considered for implementation under both action alternatives.
- **This supplement must include analysis and description of mitigation measures implemented to reduce impacts on marine mammals –** Chapter 5 (Mitigation) provides a detailed description of mitigation measures associated with training and testing activities that would avoid or reduce potential impacts on marine mammals.

- **In-water surveys within the 3 miles around FDM should be conducted for marine mammals –** In-water surveys of marine resources within the 3 NM danger zone surrounding FDM have been conducted for more than a decade by Navy divers (see Smith and Marx (2009); Smith et al. (2013b); Smith and Marx (2016)). Research funding is allocated via the Integrated Comprehensive Monitoring Program (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2010, 2013a), which provides the overarching framework for coordination of the Navy's marine species research and monitoring efforts and serves as a planning tool to focus Navy monitoring priorities pursuant to ESA and MMPA requirements. The purpose of the Integrated Comprehensive Monitoring Program is to coordinate monitoring efforts across all regions and to allocate the most appropriate level and type of monitoring effort for each range complex based on a set of standardized objectives, regional expertise, and resource availability. Although the Integrated Comprehensive Monitoring Program does not identify specific field work or individual projects, it is designed to provide a flexible, scalable, and adaptable framework using adaptive management and strategic planning processes that periodically assess progress and reevaluate objectives. The adaptive management review process is anticipated to continue between the Navy, NMFS, and the Marine Mammal Commission through technical review meetings and ongoing discussions.
- **This supplement must include the most recently published science cetacean reports for the Mariana Archipelago –** Relevant literature published since the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS has been used throughout Section 3.4 (Marine Mammals) of this SEIS/OEIS. This includes approximately 160 new references cited in the section, which were published between January 2016 and June 2018 in addition to additional emergent works of science that considered in the analysis although not necessarily cited in this section.
- **The EIS must analyze humpback whale calving areas discussed by Hill et al. (2017b) –** Section 3.4.1.11 (Humpback Whale (*Megaptera novaeangliae*)) presents the current information and references with regard to the presence of humpback whales in the Mariana Islands. Note that Hill et al. (2017b) did not identify the location specific calving areas in the Mariana Islands, but indicated, "that the Marianas are a wintering area." Subsequent to Hill et al. (2017b) and recently, scientists have confirmed the Mariana Islands as a new breeding location for humpback whales in the western North Pacific (Hill et al., 2018c; Hill et al., 2019; Hill et al., 2020; National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2018c). Chapter 5 (Mitigation) and Appendix I (Geographic Mitigation Assessment) contain detailed discussions of potential mitigation measures that were evaluated, including temporal and geographic mitigation for areas where humpback whales have been routinely sighted as detailed in various reports (Fulling et al., 2011; Hill et al., 2015a; Hill et al., 2015b; Hill et al., 2016a; Hill et al., 2016b; Hill et al., 2017a; Hill et al., 2017b; Hill et al., 2018b; Hill et al., 2018c; Hill et al., 2019; National Marine Fisheries Service, 2019; National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2018c; Uyeyama, 2014). Based on the analysis in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) and Appendix I (Geographic Mitigation Assessment), the MMPA and the ESA permitting processes, and other required regulatory consultations, practical science-based mitigation measures, including temporal or geographic constraints within the Study Area, would be implemented under Alternative 1 or Alternative 2.

This page intentionally left blank.

REFERENCES

Abecassis, M., J. Polovina, R. W. Baird, A. Copeland, J. C. Drazen, R. Domokos, E. Oleson, Y. Jia, G. S. Schorr, D. L. Webster, and R. D. Andrews. (2015). Characterizing a foraging hotspot for short-finned pilot whales and Blainville's beaked whales located off the west side of Hawaii island by using tagging and oceanographic data. *PLoS ONE, 10*(11), e0142628.

Accomando, A. W., J. Mulsow, B. K. Branstetter, C. E. Schlundt, and J. F. Finneran. (2020). Directional hearing sensitivity for 2-30 kHz sounds in the bottlenose dolphin (*Tursiops truncatus*). *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 14*(1), 388–398.

Acevedo-Whitehouse, K., A. Rocha-Gosselin, and D. Gendron. (2010). A novel non-invasive tool for disease surveillance of freeranging whales and its relevance to conservation programs. *Animal Conservation, 13*, 217–225.

Acevedo, A. (1991). Interactions between boats and bottlenose dolphins, *Tursiops truncatus*, in the entrance to Ensenada De La Paz, Mexico. *Aquatic Mammals, 17*(3), 120–124.

Afsal, V. V., P. P. Manojkumar, K. S. S. M. Yousuf, B. Anoop, and E. Vivekanandan. (2009). The first sighting of Longman's beaked whale, *Indopacetus pacificus* in the southern Bay of Bengal. *Marine Biodiversity Records, 2*, 3.

Aguilar de Soto, N., M. Johnson, P. T. Madsen, P. L. Tyack, A. Bocconcelli, and J. F. Borsani. (2006). Does intense ship noise disrupt foraging in deep-diving Cuvier's beaked whales (*Ziphius cavirostris*)? *Marine Mammal Science, 22*(3), 690–789.

Aguilar de Soto, N., M. P. Johnson, P. T. Madsen, F. Diaz, I. Dominguez, A. Brito, and P. Tyack. (2008). Cheetahs of the deep sea: Deep foraging sprints in short-finned pilot whales off Tenerife (Canary Islands). *The Journal of Animal Ecology, 77*(5), 936–947.

Akkaya Bas, A., F. Christiansen, A. Amaha Ozturk, B. Ozturk, and C. McIntosh. (2017). The effects of marine traffic on the behaviour of Black Sea harbour porpoises (*Phocoena phocoena relicta*) within the Istanbul Strait, Turkey. *PLoS ONE, 12*(3), e0172970.

Allen, A. N., J. J. Schanze, A. R. Solow, and P. L. Tyack. (2014). Analysis of a Blainville's beaked whale's movement response to playback of killer whale vocalizations. *Marine Mammal Science, 30*(1), 154–168.

Allen, S. D., and J. R. Amesbury. (2012). *Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands As a Fishing Community* (NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-PIFSC-36). Honolulu, HI: Pacific Island Fisheries Science Center.

Alter, S. E., M. P. Simmonds, and J. R. Brandon. (2010). Forecasting the consequences of climate-driven shifts in human behavior on cetaceans. *Marine Policy, 34*(5), 943–954.

Alves, A., R. Antunes, A. Bird, P. L. Tyack, P. J. O. Miller, F. P. A. Lam, and P. H. Kvadsheim. (2014). Vocal matching of naval sonar signals by long-finned pilot whales (*Globicephala melas*). *Marine Mammal Science, 30*(3), 1248–1257.

Amano, M., N. Miyazaki, and F. Yanagisawa. (1996). Life history of Fraser's dolphin, *Lagenodelphis hosei*, based on a school captured off the Pacific Coast of Japan. *Marine Mammal Science, 12*(2), 199–214.

American National Standards Institute, and Acoustical Society of America. (2018). *Procedure for Determining Audiograms in Toothed Whales through Evoked Potential Methods*. Melville, NY: Acoustical Society of America.

Amesbury, S., R. Bonito, R. K. C. Chang, L. Kirkendale, C. Meyer, G. Paulay, R. Ritson-Williams, and T. Rongo. (2001). *Marine Biodiversity Resource Survey and Baseline Reef Monitoring Survey of the Haputo Ecological Reserve Area, COMNAVMARIANAS*. Mangilao, GU: University of Guam.

Anderson, R. C., R. Clark, P. T. Madsen, C. Johnson, J. Kiszka, and O. Breysse. (2006). Observations of Longman's Beaked Whale (*Indopacetus pacificus*) in the Western Indian Ocean. *Aquatic Mammals, 32*(2), 223–231.

Anderwald, P., A. Brandecker, M. Coleman, C. Collins, H. Denniston, M. D. Haberlin, M. O'Donovan, R. Pinfield, F. Visser, and L. Walshe. (2013). Displacement responses of a mysticete, an odontocete, and a phocid seal to construction-related vessel traffic. *Endangered Species Research, 21*(3), 231–240.

Ando-Mizobata, N., K. Ichikawa, N. Arai, and H. Kato. (2014). Does boat noise affect dugong (*Dugong dugon*) vocalization? *Mammal Study, 39*(2), 121–127.

Andrady, A. (2015). Persistence of plastic litter in the oceans. In M. Bergmann, L. Gutow, & M. Klages (Eds.), *Marine Anthropogenic Litter*. New York, NY: Springer International Publishing.

Antunes, R., P. H. Kvadsheim, F. P. Lam, P. L. Tyack, L. Thomas, P. J. Wensveen, and P. J. Miller. (2014). High thresholds for avoidance of sonar by free-ranging long-finned pilot whales (*Globicephala melas*). *Marine Pollution Bulletin, 83*(1), 165–180.

Aragones, L., M. Roque, M. Flores, R. Encomienda, G. Laule, B. Espinos, F. Maniago, G. Diaz, E. Alesna, and R. Braun. (2010). The Philippine marine mammal strandings from 1998 to 2009: Animals in the Philippines in peril? *Aquatic Mammals, 36*(3), 219–233.

Arbelo, M., Y. B. De Quiro´s, E. Sierra, A. Godinho, G. Ramirez, M. J. Caballero, and A. Fernandez. (2008). Atypical beaked whale mass stranding in Almeria's coasts: pathological study. *Bioacoustics: the International Journal of Animal Sound and its Recording, 17*, 293–323.

Arcangeli, A., and R. Crosti. (2009). The short-term impact of dolphin-watching on the behaviour of bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*) in western Australia. *Journal of Marine Animals and Their Ecology, 2*(1), 3–9.

Archer, F. I., S. L. Mesnick, and A. C. Allen. (2010). *Variation and Predictors of Vessel-Response Behavior in a Tropical Dolphin Community* (NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SWFSC-457). La Jolla, CA: National Marine Fisheries Service, Southwest Fisheries Science Center.

Archer, F. I., II, and W. F. Perrin. (1999). *Stenella coeruleoalba*. *American Society of Mammalogists, 603*, 1–9.

Arnbom, T., V. Papastavrou, S. Weilgart, and H. Whitehead. (1987). Sperm Whales React to an Attack by Killer Whales. *Journal of Mammalogy, 68*(2), 450.

Atkinson, S., D. Crocker, D. Houser, and K. Mashburn. (2015). Stress physiology in marine mammals: How well do they fit the terrestrial model? *Journal of Comparative Physiology B, 185*, 463–486.

Au, D. W. K., and W. L. Perryman. (1985). Dolphin habitats in the eastern tropical Pacific. *Fishery Bulletin, 83*, 623–643.

Au, W., and P. Moore. (1984). Receiving beam patterns and directivity indices of the Atlantic bottlenose dolphin (*Tursiops truncatus*). *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 75*, 255–262.

Au, W. W. L., R. W. Floyd, R. H. Penner, and A. E. Murchison. (1974). Measurement of echolocation signals of the Atlantic bottlenose dolphin, *Tursiops truncatus* Montagu, in open waters. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 56*(4), 1280–1290.

Au, W. W. L., and P. W. B. Moore. (1990). Critical ratio and critical bandwidth for the Atlantic bottlenose dolphin. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 88*(3), 1635–1638.

Au, W. W. L. (1993). *The Sonar of Dolphins*. New York, NY: Springer-Verlag.

Au, W. W. L., and M. Green. (2000). Acoustic interaction of humpback whales and whale-watching boats. *Marine Environmental Research, 49*(5), 469–481.

Avens, L. (2003). Use of multiple orientation cues by juvenile loggerhead sea turtles *Caretta caretta*. *The Journal of Experimental Biology, 206*(23), 4317–4325.

Ayres, K. L., R. K. Booth, J. A. Hempelmann, K. L. Koski, C. K. Emmons, R. W. Baird, K. Balcomb-Bartok, M. B. Hanson, M. J. Ford, and S. K. Wasser. (2012). Distinguishing the impacts of inadequate prey and vessel traffic on an endangered killer whale (*Orcinus orca*) population. *PLoS ONE, 7*(6), e36842.

Azzara, A. J., W. M. von Zharen, and J. J. Newcomb. (2013). Mixed-methods analytic approach for determining potential impacts of vessel noise on sperm whale click behavior. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 134*(6), 4566–4574.

Bachara, W., and D. Blatchley. (2018). *Blainville's beaked whale strandings in the Philippines* (Report WB2018/2). Unpublished report to Cetal Fauna.

Bachman, M. J., J. M. Keller, K. L. West, and B. A. Jensen. (2014). Persistent organic pollutant concentrations in blubber of 16 species of cetaceans stranded in the Pacific Islands from 1997 through 2011. *Science of the Total Environment, 488–489*, 115–123.

Bachman, M. J., K. M. Foltz, J. M. Lynch, K. L. West, and B. A. Jensen. (2015). Using cytochrome P4501A1 expression in liver and blubber to understand effects of persistent organic pollutant exposure in stranded Pacific Island cetaceans. *Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry, 34*(9), 1989–1995.

Bain, D. E. (2002). *A Model Linking Energetic Effects of Whale Watching to Killer Whale (Orcinus orca) Population Dynamics*. Friday Harbor, WA: Friday Harbor Laboratories, University of Washington.

Baird, R., D. McSweeney, C. Bane, J. Barlow, D. Salden, L. Antoine, R. LeDuc, and D. Webster. (2006a). Killer Whales in Hawaiian Waters: Information on Population Identity and Feeding Habits. *Pacific Science, 60*(4), 523–530.

Baird, R. (2013). Odontocete Cetaceans Around the Main Hawaiian Islands: Habitat Use and Relative Abundance from Small-Boat Sighting Surveys. *Aquatic Mammals, 39*(3), 253–269.

Baird, R. W., A. D. Ligon, S. K. Hooker, and A. M. Gorgone. (2001). Subsurface and nighttime behaviour of pantropical spotted dolphins in Hawai'i. *Canadian Journal of Zoology, 79*(6), 988–996.

Baird, R. W., D. J. McSweeney, D. L. Webster, A. M. Gorgone, and A. D. Ligon. (2003). *Studies of Odontocete Population Structure in Hawaiian Waters: Results of a Survey Through the Main Hawaiian Islands in May and June 2003*. Seattle, WA: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

Baird, R. W., and A. M. Gorgone. (2005). False killer whale dorsal fin disfigurements as a possible indicator of long-line fishery interactions in Hawaiian waters. *Pacific Science, 59*(4), 593–601.

Baird, R. W., D. L. Webster, D. J. McSweeney, A. D. Ligon, and G. S. Schorr. (2005). *Diving Behavior and Ecology of Cuvier's (Ziphius cavirostris) and Blainville's Beaked Whales (Mesoplodon densirostris) in Hawaii*. La Jolla, CA: U.S. Department of Commerce.

Baird, R. W., D. McSweeney, C. Bane, J. Barlow, D. Salden, L. Antoine, R. LeDuc, and D. Webster. (2006b). Killer whales in Hawaiian waters: Information on population identity and feeding habits. *Pacific Science, 60*(4), 523–530.

Baird, R. W., G. S. Schorr, D. L. Webster, D. J. McSweeney, and S. D. Mahaffy. (2006c). *Studies of Beaked Whale Diving Behavior and Odontocete Stock Structure in Hawaii in March/April 2006*. Olympia, WA: Cascadia Research Collective.

Baird, R. W., A. M. Gorgone, D. J. McSweeney, D. B. Webster, D. R. Salden, M. H. Deakos, A. D. Ligon, G. Schorr, J. Barlow, and S. D. Mahaffy. (2008). False killer whales (*Psuedorca crassidens*) around the main Hawaiian Islands: Long-term site fidelity, inter-island movements, and association patterns. *Marine Mammal Science, 24*(3), 591–612.

Baird, R. W. (2009a). False killer whale *Pseudorca crassidens*. In W. F. Perrin, B. Wursig, & J. G. M. Thewissen (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Marine Mammals* (2nd ed., pp. 405–406). Cambridge, MA: Academic Press.

Baird, R. W. (2009b). *A Review of False Killer Whales in Hawaiian Waters: Biology, Status, and Risk Factors*. Olympia, WA: Marine Mammal Commission.

Baird, R. W., A. M. Gorgone, D. J. McSweeney, A. D. Ligon, M. H. Deakos, D. L. Webster, G. S. Schorr, K. K. Martien, D. R. Salden, and S. D. Mahaffy. (2009a). Population structure of island-associated dolphins: Evidence from photo-identification of common bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*) in the Main Hawaiian Islands. *Marine Mammal Science, 25*(2), 251–274.

Baird, R. W., D. J. McSweeney, G. S. Schorr, S. D. Mahaffy, D. L. Webster, J. Barlow, M. B. Hanson, J. P. Turner, and R. D. Andrews. (2009b). Studies of beaked whales in Hawaii: Population size, movements, trophic ecology, social organization, and behaviour. In S. J. Dolman, C. D. MacLeod, & P. G. H. Evans (Eds.), *Beaked Whale Research* (pp. 23–25). San Sebastián, Spain: European Cetacean Society.

Baird, R. W., J. M. Aschettino, D. J. McSweeney, D. L. Webster, G. S. Schorr, S. Baumann-Pickering, and S. D. Mahaffy. (2010a). *Melon-headed Whales in the Hawaiian Archipelago: An Assessment of Population Structure and Long-term Site Fidelity based on Photo-Identification*. La Jolla, CA: Southwest Fisheries Science Center, National Marine Fisheries Service.

Baird, R. W., G. S. Schorr, D. L. Webster, D. J. McSweeney, M. B. Hanson, and R. D. Andrews. (2010b). Movements and habitat use of satellite-tagged false killer whales around the main Hawaiian Islands. *Endangered Species Research, 10*, 107–121.

Baird, R. W. (2011). Short Note: Open-Ocean Movements of a Satellite-Tagged Blainville's Beaked Whale (*Mesoplodon densirostris*): Evidence for an Offshore Population in Hawai'i? *Aquatic Mammals, 37*(4), 506–511.

Baird, R. W. (2012). *Preliminary Results from Photo-Identification and Satellite-Tagging of False Killer Whales Off the Island of Kaua'i in June 2012*. Olympia, WA: Cascadia Research Collective.

Baird, R. W., E. M. Oleson, J. Barlow, A. D. Ligon, A. M. Gorgone, and S. D. Mahaffy. (2013a). Evidence of an Island-Associated Population of False Killer Whales (*Pseudorca crassidens*) in the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands. *Pacific Science, 67*(4), 513–521.

Baird, R. W., J. A. Shaffer, D. L. Webster, S. D. Fisher, J. M. Aschettino, A. M. Gorgone, B. K. Rone, S. D. Mahaffy, and D. J. Moretti. (2013b). *Odontocete Studies Off the Pacific Missile Range Facility in February 2013: Satellite-Tagging, Photo Identification, and Passive Acoustic Monitoring for Species Verification*. Olympia, WA and Newport, RI: U.S. Navy Pacific Fleet.

Baird, R. W., D. L. Webster, S. D. Mahaffy, G. S. Schorr, J. M. Aschettino, and A. M. Gorgone. (2013c). *Movements and Spatial Use of Odontocetes in the Western Main Hawaiian Islands: Results of a Three-year Study off Oahu and Kauai*. Olympia, WA: Cascadia Research Collective.

Baird, R. W., S. M. Jarvis, D. L. Webster, B. K. Rone, J. A. Shaffer, S. D. Mahaffy, A. M. Gorgone, and D. J. Moretti. (2014). *Odontocete Studies on the Pacific Missile Range Facility in July/August 2013: Satellite-Tagging, Photo Identification, and Passive Acoustic Monitoring*. Olympia, WA and Newport, RI: U.S. Navy Pacific Fleet.

Baird, R. W., D. Cholewiak, D. L. Webster, G. S. Schorr, S. D. Mahaffy, C. Curtice, J. Harrison, and S. M. Van Parijs. (2015). Biologically Important Areas for Cetaceans within U.S. Waters—Hawaii region. In S. M. Van Parijs, C. Curtice, & M. C. Ferguson (Eds.), *Biologically Important Areas for Cetaceans Within U.S. Waters* (Vol. 41, pp. 54–64). Olympia, WA: Cascadia Research Collective.

Baird, R. W., D. L. Webster, S. Watwood, R. Morrissey, B. K. Rone, S. D. Mahaffy, A. M. Gorgone, D. B. Anderson, and D. J. Moretti. (2016). *Odontocete Studies on the Pacific Missile Range Facility in February 2015: Satellite-Tagging, Photo-Identification, and Passive Acoustic Monitoring. Final Report*. Olympia, WA: HDR Environmental Inc.

Baird, R. W., S. W. Martin, R. Manzano-Roth, D. L. Webster, and B. L. Southall. (2017). *Assessing Exposure and Response of Three Species of Odontocetes to Mid-frequency Active Sonar During Submarine Commanders Courses at the Pacific Missile Range Facility: August 2013 through February 2015. Draft Report*. Honolulu, HI: HDR, Inc.

Baker, A. N., and B. Madon. (2007). Bryde's whales (*Balaenoptera cf. brydei*) in the Hauraki Gulf and northeastern New Zealand waters. *Science for Conservation, 272*, 4–14.

Baker, C. S., L. M. Herman, B. G. Bays, and G. B. Bauer. (1983). *The Impact of Vessel Traffic on the Behavior of Humpback Whales in Southeast Alaska: 1982 Season*. Honolulu, HI: Kewalo Basin Marine Mammal Laboratory, University of Hawaii.

Baker, C. S., V. Lukoschek, S. Lavery, M. L. Dalebout, M. Yong-un, T. Endo, and N. Funahashi. (2006a). Incomplete reporting of whale, dolphin and porpoise 'bycatch' revealed by molecular monitoring of Korean markets. *Animal Conservation, 9*(4), 474–482.

Baker, J. D., A. L. Harting, and T. C. Johanos. (2006b). Use of discovery curves to assess abundance of Hawiian monk seals. *Marine Mammal Science, 22*(4), 847–861.

Bakhchina, A. V., L. M. Mukhametov, V. V. Rozhnov, and O. I. Lyamin. (2017). Spectral analysis of heart rate variability in the beluga (*Delphinapterus leucas*) during exposure to acoustic noise. *Journal of Evolutionary Biochemistry and Physiology, 53*(1), 60–65.

Bangs, C. (2001). A sperm whale calf swims next to its mother and a pod of sperm whales, about four miles off the coast of the Agat Marina in Guam in 2001. Guam Variety News.

Barlow, J. (2006). Cetacean abundance in Hawaiian waters estimated from a Summer–Fall survey in 2002. *Marine Mammal Science, 22*(2), 446–464.

Barlow, J., J. Calambokidis, E. A. Falcone, C. S. Baker, A. M. Burdin, P. J. Clapham, J. K. B. Ford, C. M. Gabriele, R. LeDuc, D. K. Mattila, T. J. Quinn, II, L. Rojas-Bracho, J. M. Straley, B. L. Taylor, J. Urbán R, P. Wade, D. Weller, B. H. Witteveen, and M. Yamaguchi. (2011). Humpback whale abundance in the North Pacific estimated by photographic capture-recapture with bias correction from simulation studies. *Marine Mammal Science, 27*(4), 793–818.

Barlow, J. (2016). *Cetacean Abundance in the California Current Estimated from Ship-based Line-transect Surveys in 1991–2014.* (NOAA Administrative Report NMFS-SWFSC-LJ-1601). La Jolla, CA: Southwest Fisheries Science Center.

Bassett, C., J. Thomson, and B. Polagye. (2010). *Characteristics of Underwater Ambient Noise at a Proposed Tidal Energy Site in Puget Sound*. Seattle, WA: Northwest National Marine Renewable Energy Center.

Baulch, S., and C. Perry. (2014). Evaluating the impacts of marine debris on cetaceans. *Marine Pollution Bulletin, 80*(1–2), 210–221.

Baumann-Pickering, S., A. E. Simonis, M. A. Roch, M. A. McDonald, A. Solsona-Berga, E. M. Oleson, S. M. Wiggins, R. L. Brownell, Jr., and J. A. Hildebrand. (2012). *Spatio-temporal patterns of beaked whale echolocation signals in the North Pacific* (2012 Marine Mammal & Biology Program Review). Arlington, VA: Office of Naval Research.

Baumann-Pickering, S., A. J. Debich, J. T. Trickey, A. Širović, R. Gresalfi, M. A. Roche, S. M. Wiggins, J. A. Hildebrand, and J. A. Carretta. (2013). *Examining Explosions in Southern California and Their Potential Impact on Cetacean Acoustic Behavior*. La Jolla, CA: Southwest Fisheries Science Center.

BBC News. (2019). *Japan whaling: Why commercial hunts have resumed despite outcry*. Retrieved from https://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-48592682.

Bejder, L., A. Samuels, H. Whitehead, and N. Gales. (2006a). Interpreting short-term behavioural responses to disturbance within a longitudinal perspective. *Animal Behaviour, 72*, 1149–1158.

Bejder, L., A. Samuels, H. Whitehead, N. Gales, J. Mann, R. Connor, M. Heithaus, J. Waston-Capps, C. Flaherty, and M. Krützen. (2006b). Decline in relative abundance of bottlenose dolphins exposed to long-term disturbance. *Conservation Biology, 20*(6), 1791–1798.

Benoit-Bird, K. J., W. W. L. Au, R. E. Brainard, and M. O. Lammers. (2001). Diel horizontal migration of the Hawaiian mesopelagic boundary community observed acoustically. *Marine Ecology Progress Series, 217*, 1–14.

Benoit-Bird, K. J., and W. W. L. Au. (2003). Prey dynamics affect foraging by a pelagic predator (*Stenella longirostris*) over a range of spatial and temporal scales. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology, 53*, 364–373.

Benoit-Bird, K. J. (2004). Prey caloric value and predator energy needs: Foraging predictions for wild spinner dolphins. *Marine Biology, 145*(3), 435–444.

Benoit-Bird, K. J., and W. W. L. Au. (2004). Diel migration dynamics of an island-associated sound-scattering layer. *Deep-Sea Research I, 51*, 707–719.

Benoit-Bird, K. J., and W. W. L. Au. (2009). Cooperative prey herding by the pelagic dolphin, *Stenella longirostris*. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 125*(1), 125–137.

Bergström, L., L. Kautsky, T. Malm, R. Rosenberg, M. Wahlberg, N. Åstrand Capetillo, and D. Wilhelmsson. (2014). Effects of offshore wind farms on marine wildlife–A generalized impact assessment. *Environmental Research Letters, 9*(3), 12.

Berini, C. R., L. M. Kracker, and W. E. McFee. (2015). *Modeling Pygmy Sperm Whale (Kogia breviceps) Strandings Along the Southeast Coast of the United States from 1992 to 2006 in Relation to Environmental Factors* (NOAA Technical Memorandum NOS-NCCOS-203). Charleston, SC: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

Berman-Kowalewski, M., F. M. D. Gulland, S. Wilkin, J. Calambokidis, B. Mate, J. Cordaro, D. Rotstein, J. S. Leger, P. Collins, K. Fahy, and S. Dover. (2010). Association Between Blue Whale (*Balaenoptera musculus*) Mortality and Ship Strikes Along the California Coast. *Aquatic Mammals, 36*(1), 59–66.

Bernaldo de Quiros, Y., O. Gonzalez-Diaz, M. Arbelo, E. Sierra, S. Sacchini, and A. Fernandex. (2012). Decompression vs. decomposition: Distribution, amount, and gas composition of bubbles in stranded marine mammals. *Frontiers in Physiology, 3 Article 177*, 19.

Bernaldo de Quiros, Y., O. Gonzalez-Diaz, A. Mollerlokken, A. O. Brubakk, A. Hjelde, P. Saavedra, and A. Fernandez. (2013a). Differentiation at autopsy between in vivo gas embolism and putrefaction using gas composition analysis. *International Journal of Legal Medicine, 127*(2), 437–445.

Bernaldo de Quiros, Y., J. S. Seewald, S. P. Sylva, B. Greer, M. Niemeyer, A. L. Bogomolni, and M. J. Moore. (2013b). Compositional discrimination of decompression and decomposition gas bubbles in bycaught seals and dolphins. *PLoS ONE, 8*(12), e83994.

Bernaldo de Quirós, Y., A. Fernandez, R. W. Baird, R. L. Brownell, N. Aguilar de Soto, D. Allen, M. Arbelo, M. Arregui, A. Costidis, A. Fahlman, A. Frantzis, F. M. D. Gulland, M. Iñíguez, M. Johnson, A. Komnenou, H. Koopman, D. A. Pabst, W. D. Roe, E. Sierra, M. Tejedor, and G. Schorr. (2019). Advances in research on the impacts of anti-submarine sonar on beaked whales. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 286*(1895), 20182533.

Bernard, H. J., and S. B. Reilly. (1999). Pilot whales, *Globicephala* Lesson, 1828. In S. H. Ridgway & R. Harrison (Eds.), *Handbook of Marine Mammals* (Vol. 6, pp. 245–280). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Bernasconi, M., R. Patel, and L. Nøttestad. (2012). Behavioral observations of baleen whales in proximity of a modern fishing vessel. In A. N. Popper & A. Hawkins (Eds.), *The Effects of Noise on Aquatic Life*. New York, NY: Springer.

Berrow, S. D., and B. Holmes. (1999). Tour boats and dolphins: A note on quantifying the activities of whalewatching boats in the Shannon Estuary, Ireland. *Journal of Cetacean Research and Management, 1*(2), 199–204.

Besseling, E., E. M. Foekema, J. A. Van Franeker, M. F. Leopold, S. Kuhn, E. L. B. Rebolledo, E. Hebe, L. Mielke, J. Ijzer, P. Kamminga, and A. A. Koelmans. (2015). Microplastic in a macro filter feeder: Humpback whale *Megaptera novaeangliae*. *Marine Pollution Bulletin, 95*(1), 248–252.

Bettridge, S., C. S. Baker, J. Barlow, P. J. Clapham, M. Ford, D. Gouveia, D. K. Mattila, R. M. Pace, III, P. E. Rosel, G. K. Silber, and P. R. Wade. (2015). *Status Review of the Humpback Whale (Megaptera novaeangliae) under the Endangered Species Act* (NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SWFSC-540). La Jolla, CA: Southwest Fisheries Science Center.

Blackwell, S. B., J. W. Lawson, and M. T. Williams. (2004). Tolerance by ringed seals (*Phoca hispida*) to impact pipe-driving and construction sounds at an oil production island. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 115*(5 [Pt. 1]), 2346–2357.

Blackwell, S. B., C. S. Nations, T. L. McDonald, C. R. Greene, A. M. Thode, M. Guerra, and A. M. Macrander. (2013). Effects of airgun sounds on bowhead whale calling rates in the Alaskan Beaufort Sea. *Marine Mammal Science, 29*, E342–E365.

Blackwell, S. B., C. S. Nations, T. L. McDonald, A. M. Thode, D. Mathias, K. H. Kim, C. R. Greene, Jr., and A. M. Macrander. (2015). Effects of airgun sounds on bowhead whale calling rates: Evidence for two behavioral thresholds. *PLoS ONE, 10*(6), e0125720.

Blackwell, S. B., C. S. Nations, A. M. Thode, M. E. Kauffman, A. S. Conrad, R. G. Norman, and K. H. Kim. (2017). Effects of tones associated with drilling activities on bowhead whale calling rates. *PLoS ONE, 12*(11), e0188459.

Blix, A. S., L. Walløe, and E. B. Messelt. (2013). On how whales avoid decompression sickness and why they sometimes strand. *Journal of Experimental Biology, 216*(18), 3385–3387.

Bonito, L. T., A. Hamdoun, and S. A. Sandin. (2016). Evaluation of the global impacts of mitigation on persistent, bioaccumulative and toxic pollutants in marine fish. *PeerJ, 4*, e1573.

Booth, C. G. (2019). Food for thought: Harbor porpoise foraging behavior and diet inform vulnerability to disturbance. *Marine Mammal Science*, 1–14.

Booth, C. G., R. R. Sinclair, and J. Harwood. (2020). Methods for Monitoring for the Population Consequences of Disturbance in Marine Mammals: A Review. *Frontiers in Marine Science, 7*.

Bowles, A. E., M. Smultea, B. Wursig, D. P. DeMaster, and D. Palka. (1994). Relative abundance and behavior of marine mammals exposed to transmissions from the Heard Island Feasibility Test. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 96*, 2469–2484.

Bowles, A. E., and C. Anderson. (2012). Behavioral responses and habitation of pinnipeds and small cetaceans to novel objects and simulated fishing gear with and without a pinger. *Aquatic Mammals, 38*(2), 161–188.

Boyd, I., D. Claridge, C. Clark, and B. Southall. (2008). *BRS 2008 Preliminary Report*. Washington, DC: U.S. Navy NAVSEA PEO IWS 5, ONR, U.S. Navy Environmental Readiness Division, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program.

Boyd, J. D., and D. J. Brightsmith. (2013). Error properties of Argos satellite telemetry locations using least squares and Kalman filtering. *PLoS ONE, 8*(5), e63051.

Bradford, A. L., and K. A. Forney. (2014). *Injury Determinations for Cetaceans Observed Interacting with Hawaii and American Samoa Longline Fisheries During 2008–2012* (NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS- PIFSC-41). Honolulu, HI: Pacific Islands Fisheries Science Center.

Bradford, A. L., K. A. Forney, E. M. Oleson, and J. Barlow. (2014). Accounting for subgroup structure in line-transect abundance estimates of false killer whales (*Pseudorca crassidens*) in Hawaiian waters. *PLoS ONE, 9*(2), e90464.

Bradford, A. L., and E. Lyman. (2015). *Injury Determinations for Humpback Whales and Other Cetaceans Reported to NOAA Response Networks in the Hawaiian Islands During 2007–2012* (NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-PIFSC-45). Honolulu, HI: Pacific Islands Fisheries Science Center.

Bradford, A. L., E. A. Oleson, R. W. Baird, C. H. Boggs, K. A. Forney, and N. C. Young. (2015). *Revised Stock Boundaries for False Killer Whales (Psuedorca crassidens) in Hawaiian Waters* (NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-PIFSC-47). Honolulu, HI: Pacific Islands Fisheries Science Center.

Bradford, A. L., and K. A. Forney. (2016). *Injury Determinations for Marine Mammals Observed Interacting with Hawaii and American Samoa Longline Fisheries During 2009–2013* (NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-PIFSC-50). Honolulu, HI: Pacific Islands Fisheries Science Center.

Bradford, A. L., and K. A. Forney. (2017). *Injury Determinations for Marine Mammals Observed Interacting with Hawaii and American Samoa Longline Fisheries During 2010–2014* (NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-PIFSC-62). Honolulu, HI: Pacific Islands Fisheries Science Center.

Bradford, A. L., K. A. Forney, E. M. Oleson, and J. Barlow. (2017). Abundance estimates of cetaceans from a line-transect survey within the U.S. Hawaiian Islands Exclusive Economic Zone. *Fishery Bulletin, 115*(2), 129–142.

Bradshaw, C. J. A., K. Evans, and M. A. Hindell. (2006). Mass cetacean strandings—A plea for empiricism. *Conservation Biology, 20*(2), 584–586.

Branch, T. A. (2007). Abundance of Antarctic blue whales south of 60°S from three complete circumpolar sets of surveys. *Journal of Cetacean Research and Management, 9*(3), 253–262.

Brandt, M. J., A. Diederichs, K. Betke, and G. Nehls. (2011). Responses of harbour porpoises to pile driving at the Horns Rev II offshore wind farm in the Danish North Sea. *Marine Ecology Progress Series, 421*, 205–216.

Branstetter, B. K., J. S. Trickey, K. Bakhtiari, A. Black, H. Aihara, and J. J. Finneran. (2013). Auditory masking patterns in bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*) with natural, anthropogenic, and synthesized noise. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 133*(3), 1811–1818.

Branstetter, B. K., K. Bakhtiari, A. Black, J. S. Trickey, J. J. Finneran, and H. Aihara. (2016). Energetic and informational masking of complex sounds by a bottlenose dolphin (*Tursiops truncatus*). *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 140*(3), 1904–1917.

Branstetter, B. K., J. St. Leger, D. Acton, J. Stewart, D. Houser, J. J. Finneran, and K. Jenkins. (2017a). Killer whale (*Orcinus orca*) behavioral audiograms. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 141*, 2387–2398.

Branstetter, B. K., K. R. Van Alstyne, T. A. Wu, R. A. Simmons, L. D. Curtis, and M. J. Xitco, Jr. (2017b). Critical ratio functions for odontocete cetaceans. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 142*(4), 1897–1900.

Briggs, C., S. M. Shjegstad, J. A. K. Silva, and M. H. Edwards. (2016). Distribution of chemical warfare agent, energetics, and metals in sediments at a deep-water discarded military munitions site. *Deep Sea Research Part II: Topical Studies in Oceanography, 128*, 63–69.

Browne, M. A., P. Crump, S. J. Niven, E. Teuten, A. Tonkin, T. Galloway, and R. Thompson. (2011). Accumulation of microplastic on shorelines worldwide: Sources and sinks. *Environmental Science & Technology, 45*(21), 9175–9179.

Brownell, R. L., Jr., K. Ralls, S. Baumann-Pickering, and M. M. Poole. (2009a). Behavior of melon-headed whales, *Peponocephala electra*, near oceanic islands. *Marine Mammal Science, 25*(3), 639–658.

Brownell, R. L., Jr., C.-J. Yao, C.-S. Lee, and M.-C. Wang. (2009b). *Worldwide Review Of Pygmy Killer Whales, Feresa attenuate, Mass Strandings Reveals Taiwan Hot Spot* (Paper 141). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Commerce.

Brumm, H., and H. Slabbekoorn. (2005). Acoustic communication in noise. *Advances in the Study of Behavior, 35*, 151–209.

Bryant, P. J., C. M. Lafferty, and S. K. Lafferty. (1984). Reoccupation of Laguna Guerrero Negro, Baja California, Mexico, by Gray Whales. In M. L. Jones, S. L. Swartz, & S. Leatherwood (Eds.), *The Gray Whale: Eschrichtius robustus* (pp. 375–387). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Bull, J. C., P. D. Jepson, R. K. Ssuna, R. Deaville, C. R. Allchin, R. J. Law, and A. Fenton. (2006). The relationship between polychlorinated biphenyls in blubber and levels of nematode infestations in harbour porpoises, *Phocoena phocoena*. *Parasitology, 132*(Pt 4), 565–573.

Burkhardt-Holm, P., and A. N'Guyen. (2019). Ingestion of microplastics by fish and other prey organisms of cetaceans, exemplified for two large baleen whale species. *Marine Pollution Bulletin, 144*, 224–234.

Burkholder, J., D. Eggleston, H. Glasgow, C. Brownie, R. Reed, G. Janowitz, M. Posey, G. Mella, C. Kinder, R. Corbett, D. Toms, T. Alphin, N. Deamer, and J. Springer. (2004). Comparative impacts of two major hurricane seasons on the Neuse River and western Pamlico Sound ecosystems. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 101*(25), 9291–9296.

Calambokidis, J., E. A. Falcone, T. J. Quinn, A. M. Burdin, P. J. Clapham, J. K. B. Ford, C. M. Gabriele, R. LeDuc, D. Mattila, L. Rojas-Bracho, J. M. Straley, B. L. Taylor, J. Urbán R., D. Weller, B. H. Witteveen, M. Yamaguchi, A. Bendlin, D. Camacho, K. Flynn, A. Havron, J. Huggins, and N. Maloney. (2008). *SPLASH: Structure of Populations, Levels of Abundance and Status of Humpback Whales in the North Pacific*. Olympia, WA: Cascadia Research.

Calambokidis, J., J. Barlow, J. K. B. Ford, T. E. Chandler, and A. B. Douglas. (2009a). Insights into the population structure of blue whales in the Eastern North Pacific from recent sightings and photographic identification. *Marine Mammal Science, 25*(4), 816–832.

Calambokidis, J., E. M. Oleson, M. F. McKenna, and J. A. Hildebrand. (2009b). *Blue whale behavior in shipping lanes and response to ships.* Paper presented at the 2009 Office of Naval Research Marine Mammal Program Review. Alexandria, VA.

Calambokidis, J., J. L. Laake, and A. Klimek. (2010). *Abundance and Population Structure of Seasonal Gray Whales in the Pacific Northwest, 1998–2008*. Washington, DC: International Whaling Commission Scientific Committee.

Calambokidis, J. (2012). *Summary of Ship-Strike Related Research on Blue Whales in 2011*. Olympia, WA: Cascadia Research.

Caldwell, D. K., and M. C. Caldwell. (1989). Pygmy sperm whale, *Kogia breviceps* (de Blainville, 1838): Dwarf sperm whale *Kogia simus* Owen, 1866. In S. H. Ridgway & R. Harrison (Eds.), *Handbook of Marine Mammals* (Vol. 4, pp. 234–260). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Campbell, G. S., D. W. Weller, and J. A. Hildebrand. (2010). *SIO Small Boat Based Marine Mammal Surveys in Southern California: Report of Results for August 2009–July 2010: Annual Range Complex Monitoring Report for Hawaii and Southern California. Draft submission to the National Marine Fisheries Service September 15, 2010*. San Diego, CA: U.S. Department of the Navy.

Campbell, G. S., L. Thomas, K. Whitaker, A. B. Douglas, J. Calambokidis, and J. A. Hildebrand. (2015). Inter-annual and seasonal trends in cetacean distribution, density and abundance off southern California. *Deep Sea Research Part II: Topical Studies in Oceanography, 112*, 143–157.

Cañadas, A., R. Sagarminaga, and S. García-Tiscar. (2002). Cetacean distribution related with depth and slope in the Mediterranean waters off southern Spain. *Deep-Sea Research I, 49*, 2053–2073.

Carlos de Sá, L., M. Oliveira, F. Ribeiro, T. L. Rocha, and M. N. Futter. (2018). Studies of the effects of microplastics on aquatic organisms: What do we know and where should we focus our efforts in the future? *Science of the Total Environment, 645*, 1029–1039.

Carrera, M. L., E. G. P. Favaro, and A. Souto. (2008). The response of marine tucuxis (*Sotalia fluviatilis*) towards tourist boats involves avoidance behaviour and a reduction in foraging. *Animal Welfare, 17*, 117–123.

Carretta, J., V. Helker, M. Muto, J. Greenman, K. Wilkinson, D. Lawson, J. Viezbicke, and J. Jannot. (2019a). *Sources of Human-Related Injury and Mortality for U.S. Pacific Coast Marine Mammal Stock Assessments, 2013–2017*. Silver Spring, MD: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Technical Memorandum.

Carretta, J., J. Moore, and K. Forney. (2019b). *Estimates of Marine Mammal, Sea Turtle, and Seabird Bycatch from the California Large-Mesh Drift Gillnet Fishery: 1990-2017*. La Jolla, CA: National Oceanic Atmospheric Administration.

Carretta, J. V., J. Barlow, and L. Enriquez. (2008). Acoustic pingers eliminate beaked whale bycatch in a gill net fishery. *Marine Mammal Science, 24*(4), 2053–2073.

Carretta, J. V. (2013). *A Review of Sperm Whale (Physeter macrocephalus) Bycatch in the California Swordfish and Thresher Shark Drift Gillnet Fishery*. La Jolla, CA: Southwest Fisheries Science Center.

Carretta, J. V., S. M. Wilkin, M. M. Muto, and K. Wilkinson. (2013). *Sources of Human-Related Injury and Mortality for U.S. Pacific West Coast Marine Mammal Stock Assessments, 2007–2011* (NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SWFSC-514). La Jolla, CA: Southwest Fisheries Science Center.

Carretta, J. V., S. M. Wilkin, M. M. Muto, K. Wilkinson, and J. Rustin. (2014). *Sources of Human-Related Injury and Mortality for U.S. Pacific West Coast Marine Mammal Stock Assessments, 2008–2012*. (NOAA-TM-NMFS-SWFSC-533). La Jolla, CA: Southwest Fisheries Science Center.

Carretta, J. V., K. Danil, S. J. Chivers, D. W. Weller, D. S. Janiger, M. Berman-Kowalewski, K. M. Hernandez, J. T. Harvey, R. C. Dunkin, D. R. Casper, S. Stoudt, M. Flannery, K. Wilkinson, J. Huggins, and D. M. Lambourn. (2016a). Recovery rates of bottlenose dolphin (*Tursiops truncatus*) carcasses estimated from stranding and survival rate data. *Marine Mammal Science, 32*(1), 349–362.

Carretta, J. V., M. M. Muto, S. Wilkin, J. Greenman, K. Wilkinson, M. DeAngelis, J. Viezbicke, D. Lawson, and J. Jannot. (2016b). *Sources of Human-Related Injury and Mortality for U.S. Pacific West Coast Marine Mammal Stock Assessments, 2010–2014*. La Jolla, CA: Southwest Fisheries Science Center.

Carretta, J. V., E. M. Oleson, J. Baker, D. W. Weller, A. R. Lang, K. A. Forney, M. M. Muto, B. Hanson, A. J. Orr, H. Huber, M. S. Lowry, J. Barlow, J. E. Moore, D. Lynch, L. Carswell, and R. L. Brownell Jr. (2016c). *U.S. Pacific Marine Mammal Stock Assessments: 2015*. La Jolla, CA: Southwest Fisheries Science Center.

Carretta, J. V., J. E. Moore, and K. A. Forney. (2017a). *Regression Tree and Ratio Estimates of Marine Mammal, Sea Turtle, and Seabird Bycatch in the California Drift Gillnet Fishery: 1990–2015*. La Jolla, CA: Southwest Fisheries Science Center.

Carretta, J. V., M. M. Muto, J. Greenman, K. Wilkinson, D. Lawson, J. Viezbicke, and J. Jannot. (2017b). *Sources of Human-Related Injury and Mortality for U.S. Pacific West Coast Marine Mammal Stock Assessments, 2011–2015* (NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SWFSC-579). La Jolla, CA: Southwest Fisheries Science Center.

Carretta, J. V., E. M. Oleson, J. Baker, D. W. Weller, A. R. Lang, K. A. Forney, M. M. Muto, B. Hanson, A. J. Orr, H. Huber, M. S. Lowry, J. Barlow, J. E. Moore, D. Lynch, L. Carswell, and R. L. Brownell, Jr. (2017c). *U.S. Pacific Marine Mammal Stock Assessments: 2016* (NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SWFSC-561). La Jolla, CA: Southwest Fisheries Science Center.

Carretta, J. V., E. M. Oleson, K. A. Forney, J. Baker, J. E. Moore, D. W. Weller, A. R. Lang, M. M. Muto, B. Hanson, A. J. Orr, H. Huber, M. S. Lowry, J. Barlow, D. Lynch, L. Carswell, and R. L. Brownell, Jr. (2017d). *U.S. Pacific Marine Mammal Stock Assessments: 2017* (NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SWFSC-602). La Jolla, CA: Southwest Fisheries Science Center.

Carretta, J. V., K. A. Forney, E. M. Oleson, D. W. Weller, A. R. Lang, J. Baker, M. M. Muto, B. Hanson, A. J. Orr, H. Huber, M. S. Lowry, J. Barlow, J. E. Moore, D. Lynch, L. Carswell, and R. L. Brownell, Jr. (2018a). *U.S. Pacific Draft Marine Mammal Stock Assessments: 2018* (NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SWFSC-XXX). La Jolla, CA: National Marine Fisheries Service, Southwest Fisheries Science Center.

Carretta, J. V., K. A. Forney, E. M. Oleson, D. W. Weller, A. R. Lang, J. Baker, M. M. Muto, B. Hanson, A. J. Orr, H. Huber, M. S. Lowry, J. Barlow, J. E. Moore, D. Lynch, L. Carswell, and R. L. Brownell, Jr. (2018b). *U.S. Pacific Marine Mammal Stock Assessments: 2017*. La Jolla, CA: Southwest Fisheries Science Center.

Carretta, J. V., K. A. Forney, E. M. Oleson, D. W. Weller, A. R. Lang, J. Baker, M. M. Muto, B. Hanson, A. J. Orr, H. Huber, M. S. Lowry, J. Barlow, J. E. Moore, D. Lynch, L. Carswell, and R. L. Brownell Jr. (2019c). *U.S. Pacific Marine Mammal Stock Assessments: 2019* (NOAA Technical Memorandum). La Jolla, CA: U.S. Department of Commerce.

Castellote, M., C. W. Clark, and M. O. Lammers. (2012). Acoustic and behavioral changes by fin whales (*Balaenoptera physalus*) in responses to shipping and airgun noise. *Biological Conservation, 147*, 115–122.

Castellote, M., T. A. Mooney, L. Quakenbush, R. Hobbs, C. Goertz, and E. Gaglione. (2014). Baseline hearing abilities and variability in wild beluga whales (*Delphinapterus leucas*). *The Journal of Experimental Biology, 217*(Pt 10), 1682–1691.

Cecchetti, A., K. A. Stockin, J. Gordon, and J. M. N. Azevedo. (2017). Short-term effects of tourism on the behaviour of common dolphins (*Delphinus delphis*) in the Azores. *Journal of the Marine Biological Association of the United Kingdom, 98*(5), 1187–1196.

Center for Naval Analysis. (2020). *Sonar Use and Beaked Whale: Strandings in the Mariana Islands* (Brief prepared for the Chief of Naval Operations Energy and Environmental Readiness Division). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Navy, Naval Operations Energy and Environmental Readiness Division.

Cerchio, S., S. Strindberg, T. Collins, C. Bennett, and H. Rosenbaum. (2014). Seismic surveys negatively affect humpback whale singing activity off northern Angola. *PLoS ONE, 9*(3), e86464.

Cerchio, S., B. Andrianantenaina, A. Lindsay, M. Rekdahl, N. Andrianarivelo, and T. Rasoloarijao. (2015). Omura's whales (*Balaenoptera omurai*) off northwest Madagascar: Ecology, behaviour and conservation needs. *Royal Society Open Science, 2*(10), 150301.

Cerchio, S., T. K. Yamada, and R. L. Brownell, Jr. (2019). Global distribution of Omura's Whales (*Balaenoptera omurai*) and assessment of range-wide threats. *Frontiers in Marine Science, 6*(67), 1–18.

Charif, R. A., C. S. Oedekoven, A. Rahaman, B. J. Estabrook, L. Thomas, and A. N. Rice. (2015). *Development of Statistical Methods for Assessing Changes in Whale Vocal Behavior in Response to Mid-Frequency Active Sonar. Final Report*. Virginia Beach, VA: U.S. Fleet Forces Command.

Chivers, S. J., R. W. Baird, D. J. McSweeney, D. L. Webster, N. M. Hedrick, and J. C. Salinas. (2007). Genetic variation and evidence for population structure in eastern North Pacific false killer whales (*Pseudorca crassidens*). *Canadian Journal of Zoology, 85*(7), 783–794.

Cholewiak, D., A. I. DeAngelis, D. Palka, P. J. Corkeron, and S. M. Van Parijs. (2017). Beaked whales demonstrate a marked acoustic response to the use of shipboard echosounders. *Royal Society Open Science, 4*(12), 170940.

Cholewiak, D., C. W. Clark, D. Ponirakis, A. Frankel, L. T. Hatch, D. Risch, J. E. Stanistreet, M. Thompson, E. Vu, and S. M. Van Parijs. (2018). Communicating amidst the noise: Modeling the aggregate influence of ambient and vessel noise on baleen whale communication space in a national marine sanctuary. *Endangered Species Research, 36*, 59–75.

Choy, C. A., and J. C. Drazen. (2013). Plastic for dinner? Observations of frequent debris ingestion by pelagic predatory fishes from the central North Pacific. *Marine Ecology Progress Series, 485*, 155–163.

Christian, E. A., and J. B. Gaspin. (1974). *Swimmer Safe Standoffs from Underwater Explosions. Navy Science Assistance Program Project No. PHP-11-73*. White Oak, MD: Naval Ordnance Laboratory.

Christiansen, F., D. Lusseau, E. Stensland, and P. Berggren. (2010). Effects of tourist boats on the behaviour of Indo-Pacific bottlenose dolphins off the south coast of Zanzibar. *Endangered Species Research, 11*, 91–99.

Christiansen, F., M. Rasmussen, and D. Lusseau. (2013). Whale watching disrupts feeding activities of minke whales on a feeding ground. *Marine Ecology Progress Series, 478*, 239–251.

Christiansen, F., M. Rasmussen, and D. Lusseau. (2014). Inferring energy expenditure from respiration rates in minke whales to measure the effects of whale watching boat interactions. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology, 459*, 96–104.

Christiansen, F., and D. Lusseau. (2015). Linking behavior to vital rates to measure the effects of non-lethal disturbance on wildlife. *Conservation Letters, 8*(6), 424–431.

Christiansen, F., A. M. Dujon, K. R. Sprogis, J. P. Y. Arnould, and L. Bejder. (2016a). Noninvasive unmanned aerial vehicle provides estimates of the energetic cost of reproduction in humpback whales. *Ecosphere, 7*(10), e01468.

Christiansen, F., L. Rojano-Doñate, P. T. Madsen, and L. Bejder. (2016b). Noise levels of multi-rotor unmanned aerial vehicles with implications for potential underwater impacts on marine mammals. *Frontiers in Marine Science, 3*(277), 1–9.

Clapham, P. J., and J. G. Mead. (1999). *Megaptera novaeangliae*. *American Society of Mammalogists, 604*, 1–9.

Claridge, D., D. Charlotte, and J. Durban. (2009). *Abundance and movement patterns of Blainville's beaked whales at the Atlantic Undersea Test and Evaluation Center.* Paper presented at the 2009 Office of Naval Research Marine Mammal Program Review. Alexandria, VA.

Clark, C. (2015). *Potential Acoustic Impacts of Vessel Traffic from the Trans Mountain Expansion Project on Southern Resident Killer Whales*. Sidney, Canada: Prepared for Raincoast Conservation Foundation.

Clark, C. W., and K. M. Fristrup. (2001). Baleen whale responses to low-frequency human-made underwater sounds. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 110*(5), 2751.

Clark, C. W., W. T. Ellison, B. L. Southall, L. Hatch, S. M. Van Parijs, A. Frankel, and D. Ponirakis. (2009). Acoustic masking in marine ecosystems: Intuitions, analysis, and implication. *Marine Ecology Progress Series, 395*, 201–222.

Clark, S. L., and J. W. Ward. (1943). The effects of rapid compression waves on animals submerged in water. *Surgery, Gynecology & Obstetrics, 77*, 403–412.

Clarke, M. R. (1996). Cephalopods as prey III. Cetaceans. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London, 351*, 1053–1065.

Clarkson, C. J., F. Christiansen, T. Awbrey, L. Abbiss, N. Nikpaljevic, and A. Akkaya. (2020). Non-targeted tourism affects the behavioural budgets of bottlenose dolphins *Tursiops truncatus* in the South Adriatic (Montenegro). *Marine Ecology Press Series, 638*, 165–176.

Constantine, R., T. Iwata, S. L. Nieukirk, and G. S. Penry. (2018). Future Directions in Research on Byrde's Whales. *Frontiers in Marine Science, 5*(333), 1–7.

Costa, D. P. (1993). The relationship between reproductive and foraging energetics and the evolution of the Pinnipedia. *Symposium of the Zoological Society of London, 66*, 293–314.

Costa, D. P., and B. A. Block. (2009). *Use of Electronic Tag Data and Associated Analytical Tools to Identify and Predict Habitat Utilization of Marine Predators* (Marine Mammals & Biological Oceanography Annual Reports: FY09). Santa Cruz, CA and Stanford, CA: Office of Naval Research.

Costa, D. P., L. A. Hückstädt, L. K. Schwarz, A. S. Friedlaender, B. R. Mate, A. N. Zerbini, A. Kennedy, and N. J. Gales. (2016a). *Assessing the exposure of animals to acoustic disturbance: Towards an understanding of the population consequences of disturbance.* Paper presented at the Fourth International Conference on the Effects of Noise on Aquatic Life. Dublin, Ireland.

Costa, D. P., L. Schwarz, P. Robinson, R. S. Schick, P. A. Morris, R. Condit, D. E. Crocker, and A. M. Kilpatrick. (2016b). A bioenergetics approach to understanding the population consequences of disturbance: Elephant seals as a model system. In *The Effects of Noise on Aquatic Life II* (pp. 116–169). New York, NY: Springer.

Costidis, A. M., and S. A. Rommel. (2016). The extracranial venous system in the heads of beaked whales, with implications on diving physiology and pathogenesis. *Journal of Morphology, 277*(1), 34–64.

Courbis, S., and G. Timmel. (2008). Effects of vessels and swimmers on behavior of Hawaiian spinner dolphins (*Stenella longirostris*) in Kealake'akua, Honaunau, and Kauhako bays, Hawai'i. *Marine Mammal Science, 25*(2), 430–440.

Cox, T. M., T. J. Ragen, A. J. Read, E. Vox, R. W. Baird, K. Balcomb, J. Barlow, J. Caldwell, T. Cranford, L. Crum, A. D'Amico, G. D'Spain, A. Fernandez, J. Finneran, R. Gentry, W. Gerth, F. Gulland, J. Hildebrand, D. Houser, T. Hullar, P. D. Jepson, D. Ketten, C. D. MacLeod, P. Miller, S. Moore, D. C. Mountain, D. Palka, P. Ponganis, S. Rommel, T. Rowles, B. Taylor, P. Tyack, D. Wartzok, R. Gisiner, J. Mead, and L. Benner. (2006). Understanding the impacts of anthropogenic sound on beaked whales. *Journal of Cetacean Research and Management, 7*(3), 177–187.

Cozar, A., F. Echevarria, J. I. Gonzalez-Gordillo, X. Irigoien, B. Ubeda, S. Hernandez-Leon, A. T. Palma, S. Navarro, J. Garcia-de-Lomas, A. Ruiz, M. L. Fernandez-de-Puelles, and C. M. Duarte. (2014). Plastic debris in the open ocean. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science of the United States of America, 111*(28), 10239–10244.

Croll, D. A., C. W. Clark, J. Calambokidis, W. T. Ellison, and B. R. Tershy. (2001). Effect of anthropogenic low-frequency noise on the foraging ecology of *Balaenoptera* whales. *Animal Conservation, 4*, 13–27.

Crum, L., and Y. Mao. (1996). Acoustically enhanced bubble growth at low frequencies and its implications for human diver and marine mammal safety. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 99*(5), 2898–2907.

Crum, L., M. Bailey, J. Guan, P. Hilmo, S. Kargl, and T. Matula. (2005). Monitoring bubble growth in supersaturated blood and tissue *ex vivo* and the relevance to marine mammal bioeffects. *Acoustics Research Letters Online, 6*(3), 214–220.

Cruz-Uribe, O., D. P. Cheney, and G. L. Rorrer. (2007). Comparison of TNT removal from seawater by three marine macroalgae. *Chemsphere, 67*, 1469–1476.

Culik, B. M., S. Koschinski, N. Tregenza, and G. M. Ellis. (2001). Reactions of harbor porpoises *Phocoena phocoena* and herring *Clupea harengus* to acoustic alarms. *Marine Ecological Progress Series, 211*, 255–260.

Culik, B. M. (2004). *Review of Small Cetaceans Distribution, Behaviour, Migration and Threats*. Bonn, Germany: United National Environment Programme and the Secretariat of the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals.

Cummings, W. C., and P. O. Thompson. (1971). Gray whales, *Eschrichtius robustus*, avoid the underwater sounds of killer whales, *Orcinus orca*. *Fishery Bulletin, 69*(3), 525–530.

Cunningham, K. A., B. L. Southall, and C. Reichmuth. (2014). Auditory sensitivity of seals and sea lions in complex listening scenarios. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 136*(6), 3410–3421.

Curé, C., R. Antunes, F. Samarra, A. C. Alves, F. Visser, P. H. Kvadsheim, and P. J. Miller. (2012). Pilot whales attracted to killer whale sounds: Acoustically-mediated interspecific interactions in cetaceans. *PLoS ONE, 7*(12), e52201.

Curé, C., L. D. Sivle, F. Visser, P. J. Wensveen, S. Isojunno, C. M. Harris, P. H. Kvadsheim, F. P. A. Lam, and P. J. O. Miller. (2015). Predator sound playbacks reveal strong avoidance responses in a fight strategist baleen whale. *Marine Ecology Progress Series, 526*, 267–282.

Curé, C., S. Isojunno, F. Visser, P. J. Wensveen, L. D. Sivle, P. H. Kvadsheim, F. P. A. Lam, and P. J. O. Miller. (2016). Biological significance of sperm whale responses to sonar: Comparison with anti-predator responses. *Endangered Species Research, 31*, 89–102.

Currie, J. J., S. H. Stack, J. A. McCordic, and G. D. Kaufman. (2017). Quantifying the risk that marine debris poses to cetaceans in coastal waters of the 4-island region of Maui. *Marine Pollution Bulletin, 121*(1–2), 69–77.

D'Vincent, C. G., R. M. Nilson, and R. E. Hanna. (1985). Vocalization and coordinated feeding behavior of the humpback whale in southeastern Alaska. *Scientific Reports of the Whales Research Institute, 36*, 41–47.

Dähne, M., V. Peschko, A. Gilles, K. Lucke, S. Adler, K. Ronnenberg, and U. Siebert. (2014). Marine mammals and windfarms: Effects of alpha ventus on harbour porpoises. In *Ecological Research at the Offshore Windfarm alpha ventus* (pp. 133–149). New York, NY: Springer Publishing.

Dähne, M., J. Tougaard, J. Carstensen, A. Rose, and J. Nabe-Nielsen. (2017). Bubble curtains attenuate noise from offshore wind farm construction and reduce temporary habitat loss for harbour porpoises. *Marine Ecology Progress Series, 580*, 221–237.

Dalebout, M. L., G. M. Lento, F. Cipriano, N. Funahashi, and C. S. Baker. (2002a). How many protected minke whales are sold in Japan and Korea? A census by microsatellite. *Animal Conservation, 5*, 143–152.

Dalebout, M. L., J. G. Mead, C. S. Baker, A. N. Baker, and A. L. van Helden. (2002b). A new species of beaked whale *Mesoplodon perrini* sp. n. (Cetacea: Ziphiidae) discovered through phylogenetic analyses of mitochondrial DNA sequences. *Marine Mammal Science, 18*(3), 577–608.

Dalebout, M. L., G. J. B. Ross, C. S. Baker, R. C. Anderson, P. B. Best, V. G. Cockcroft, H. L. Hinsz, V. Peddemors, and R. L. Pitman. (2003). Appearance, distribution and genetic distinctiveness of Longman's beaked whale, *Indopacetus pacificus*. *Marine Mammal Science, 19*(3), 421–461.

Danil, K., and J. A. St Leger. (2011). Seabird and dolphin mortality associated with underwater detonation exercises. *Marine Technology Society Journal, 45*(6), 89–95.

Darling, J. D., J. Calambokidis, K. C. Balcomb, P. Bloedel, K. Flynn, A. Mochizuki, K. Mori, F. Sato, H. Suganuma, and M. Yamaguchi. (1996). Movement of a humpback whale (*Megaptera Novaeangliae*) from Japan to British Columbia and return. *Marine Mammal Science, 12*(2), 281–287.

Darling, J. D., J. M. V. Acebes, O. Frey, R. J. Urban, and M. Yamaguchi. (2019). Convergence and divergence of songs suggests ongoing, but annually variable, mixing of humpback whale populations throughout the North Pacific. *Scientific Reports, 9*(7002), 1–14.

Davis, R. W., N. Jaquet, D. Gendron, U. Markaida, G. Bazzino, and W. Gilly. (2007). Diving behavior of sperm whales in relation to behavior of a major prey species, the jumbo squid, in the Gulf of California, Mexico. *Marine Ecology Progress Series, 333*, 291–302.

De Pierrepont, J. F., B. Dubois, S. Desormonts, M. B. Santos, and J. P. Robin. (2005). Stomach contents of English Channel cetaceans stranded on the coast of Normandy. *Journal of the Marine Biological Association of the United Kingdom, 85*, 1539–1546.

De Silva, R., K. Grellier, G. Lye, N. McLean, and P. Thompson. (2014). *Use of population viability analysis to assess the potential for long term impacts from piling noise on marine mammal populations - a case study from the Scottish east coast.* Paper presented at the Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Environmental Interactions of Marine Renewable Energy Technologies (EIMR2014). Stornoway. Isle of Lewis, Outer Hebrides, Scotland.

De Soto, N. A., F. Visser, P. L. Tyack, J. Alcazar, G. Ruxton, P. Arranz, P. T. Madsen, and M. Johnson. (2020). Fear of killer whales drives extreme synchrony in deep diving beaked whales. *Scientific Reports, 10*(13).

de Vos, A. (2017). First record of Omura's whale, *Balaenoptera omurai,* in Sri Lankan waters. *Marine Biodiversity Records, 10*(18), 1–4.

De Vos, A., C. E. Faux, J. Marthick, J. Dickinson, and S. N. Jarman. (2018). New determination of prey and parasite species for Northern Indian Ocean blue whales. *Frontiers in Marine Science, 5*(104), 1–8.

Deakos, M. H., and M. F. Richlen. (2015). *Vessel-Based Marine Mammal Survey on the Navy Range off Kauai in Support of Passive Acoustic Monitoring and Satellite-Tagging Efforts: 1–9 February 2014*. Honolulu, HI: HDR Inc.

Deakos, M. H., R. K. Uyeyama, M. W. Richie, M. F. Richlen, and J. M. Aschettino. (2016). *Guam Marine Species Monitoring Survey, Shore Station Study: May 2013 and March 2015. Final Field Report*. Honolulu, HI: HDR Inc.

Deecke, V. B., P. J. B. Slater, and J. K. B. Ford. (2002). Selective habituation shapes acoustic predator recognition in harbour seals. *Nature, 420*(November 14), 171–173.

Defence Science and Technology Laboratory. (2007). *Observations of Marine Mammal Behaviour in Response of Active Sonar*. Salisbury, United Kingdom: Ministry of Defence.

DeForges, J. P. W., M. Galbraith, N. Dangerfield, and P. S. Ross. (2014). Widespread distribution of microplastics in subsurface seawater in the NE Pacific Ocean. *Marine Pollution Bulletin, 79*, 94–99.

Deng, Z. D., B. L. Southall, T. J. Carlson, J. Xu, J. J. Martinez, M. A. Weiland, and J. M. Ingraham. (2014). 200 kHz commercial sonar systems generate lower frequency side lobes audible to some marine mammals. *PLoS ONE, 9*(4), e95315.

Dennison, S., M. J. Moore, A. Fahlman, K. Moore, S. Sharp, C. T. Harry, J. Hoppe, M. Niemeyer, B. Lentell, and R. S. Wells. (2012). Bubbles in live-stranded dolphins. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 279*(1732), 1396–1404.

Derraik, J. G. B. (2002). The pollution of the marine environment by plastic debris: A review. *Marine Pollution Bulletin, 44*, 842–852.

DeRuiter, S. L., I. L. Boyd, D. E. Claridge, C. W. Clark, C. Gagon, B. L. Southall, and P. L. Tyack. (2013a). Delphinid whistle production and call matching during playback of simulated military sonar. *Marine Mammal Science, 29*(2), E46–59.

DeRuiter, S. L., B. L. Southall, J. Calambokidis, W. M. Zimmer, D. Sadykova, E. A. Falcone, A. S. Friedlaender, J. E. Joseph, D. Moretti, G. S. Schorr, L. Thomas, and P. L. Tyack. (2013b). First direct measurements of behavioural responses by Cuvier's beaked whales to mid-frequency active sonar. *Biology Letters, 9*(4), 20130223.

DeRuiter, S. L., R. Langrock, T. Skirbutas, J. A. Goldbogen, J. Calambokidis, A. S. Friedlaender, and B. L. Southall. (2017). A multivariate mixed hidden Markov model for blue whale behaviour and responses to sound exposure. *The Annals of Applied Statistics, 11*(1), 362–392.

Desforges, J. P., C. Sonne, M. Levin, U. Siebert, S. De Guise, and R. Dietz. (2016). Immunotoxic effects of environmental pollutants in marine mammals. *Environment International, 86*, 126–139.

Di Clemente, J., F. Christiansen, E. Pirotta, D. Steckler, M. Wahlberg, and H. C. Pearson. (2018). Effects of whale watching on the activity budgets of humpback whales, *Megaptera novaeangliae* (Borowski, 1781), on a feeding ground. *Aquatic Conservation: Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems, 28*(4), 810–820.

Di Lorenzo, E., K. M. Cobb, J. C. Furtado, N. Schneider, B. T. Anderson, A. Bracco, M. A. Alexander, and D. J. Vimont. (2010). Central Pacific El Niño and decadal climate change in the North Pacific Ocean. *Nature Geoscience, 3*(11), 762–765.

Di Lorio, L., and C. W. Clark. (2010). Exposure to seismic survey alters blue whale acoustic communication. *Biology Letters, 6*, 51–54.

DiMarzio, N., S. Watwood, T. Fetherston, and D. Moretti. (2019). *Marine Mammal Monitoring on Navy Ranges (M3R) on the Southern California Anti-Submarine Warfare Range (SOAR) and the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF)* (Prepared for: U.S. Navy, U.S. Pacific Fleet, Pearl Harbor, HI). Newport, RI: Naval Undersea Warfare Center.

Dolar, M. L. L. (2009). Fraser's dolphin, *Lagenodelphis hosei*. In W. F. Perrin, B. Wursig, & J. G. M. Thewissen (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Marine Mammals* (2nd ed., pp. 485–487). Cambridge, MA: Academic Press.

Donaldson, T. J. (1983). Further investigations of the whales *Peponocephala electra* and *Globicephala macrorhynchus* reported from Guam. *Micronesica, 19*(1-2), 173–181.

Doney, S. C., M. Ruckelshaus, D. J. Emmett, J. P. Barry, F. Chan, C. A. English, H. M. Galindo, J. M. Grebmeier, A. B. Hollowed, N. Knowlton, J. Polovina, N. N. Rabalais, W. J. Sydeman, and L. D. Talley. (2012). Climate change impacts on marine ecosystems. *Annual Review of Marine Science, 4*(1), 11–37.

Dunlop, R. A., D. H. Cato, and M. J. Noad. (2010). Your attention please: Increasing ambient noise levels elicits a change in communication behaviour in humpback whales (*Megoptera novaeangliae*). *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 277*, 2521–2529.

Dunlop, R. A., M. J. Noad, D. H. Cato, E. Kniest, P. J. Miller, J. N. Smith, and M. D. Stokes. (2013). Multivariate analysis of behavioural response experiments in humpback whales (*Megaptera novaeangliae*). *The Journal of Experimental Biology, 216*(5), 759–770.

Dunlop, R. A., D. H. Cato, and M. J. Noad. (2014). Evidence of a Lombard response in migrating humpback whales (*Megaptera novaeangliae*). *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 136*(1), 430–437.

Dunlop, R. A., M. J. Noad, R. D. McCauley, E. Kniest, D. Paton, and D. H. Cato. (2015). The behavioural response of humpback whales (*Megaptera novaeangliae*) to a 20 cubic inch air gun. *Aquatic Mammals, 41*(4), 412.

Dunlop, R. A. (2016). The effect of vessel noise on humpback whale, *Megaptera novaeangliae*, communication behaviour. *Animal Behaviour, 111*, 13–21.

Dunlop, R. A., M. J. Noad, R. D. McCauley, E. Kniest, R. Slade, D. Paton, and D. H. Cato. (2016). Response of humpback whales (*Megaptera novaeangliae*) to ramp-up of a small experimental air gun array. *Marine Pollution Bulletin, 103*(1–2), 72–83.

Dunlop, R. A., M. J. Noad, R. D. McCauley, L. Scott-Hayward, E. Kniest, R. Slade, D. Paton, and D. H. Cato. (2017). Determining the behavioural dose-response relationship of marine mammals to air gun noise and source proximity. *The Journal of Experimental Biology, 220*(16), 2878–2886.

Dunlop, R. A. (2019). The effects of vessel noise on the communication network of humpback whales. *Royal Society of Open Science, 6*(11).

Dunn, C. A., D. E. Claridge, and T. L. Pusser. (2007). Killer whale (*Orcinus orca*) occurrence and predation in the Bahamas. *Journal of the Marine Biological Association of the United Kingdom 94*(06), 1305–1309.

Dunphy-Daly, M. M., M. R. Heithaus, and D. E. Claridge. (2008). Temporal variation in dwarf sperm whale (*Kogia sima*) habitat use and group size off Great Abaco Island, Bahamas. *Marine Mammal Science, 24*(1), 171–182.

Durban, J. W., H. Fearnbach, L. G. Barrett–Lennard, W. L. Perryman, and D. J. Leroi. (2015). Photogrammetry of killer whales using a small hexacopter launched at sea. *Journal of Unmanned Vehicle Systems, 3*(3), 131–135.

Dyndo, M., D. M. Wisniewska, L. Rojano-Donate, and P. T. Madsen. (2015). Harbour porpoises react to low levels of high frequency vessel noise. *Scientific Reports, 5*, 11083.

Edds-Walton, P. L. (1997). Acoustic communication signals of mysticete whales. *Bioacoustics, 8*, 47–60.

Edwards, H. H. (2013). Potential impacts of climate change on warmwater megafauna: The Florida manatee example (*Trichechus manatus latirostris*). *Climatic Change, 121*(4), 727–738.

Edwards, M., and J. Bełdowski. (2016). Chemical munitions dumped at sea. *Deep Sea Research Part II: Topical Studies in Oceanography, 128*, 1–3.

Edwards, M. H., D. J. Fornari, M. R. Rognstad, C. D. Kelley, C. L. Mah, L. K. Davis, K. R. M. Flores, E. L. Main, and N. L. Bruso. (2016a). Time-lapse camera studies of sea-disposed chemical munitions in Hawaii. *Deep-Sea Research II: Topical Studies in Oceanography, 128*, 25–33.

Edwards, M. H., S. M. Shjegstad, R. Wilkens, J. C. King, G. Carton, D. Bala, B. Bingham, M. C. Bissonnette, C. Briggs, N. S. Bruso, R. Camilli, M. Cremer, R. B. Davis, E. H. DeCarlo, C. DuVal, D. J. Fornari, I. Kaneakua-Pia, C. D. Kelley, S. Koide, C. L. Mah, T. Kerby, G. J. Kurras, M. R. Rognstad, L. Sheild, J. Silva, B. Wellington, and M. V. Woerkom. (2016b). The Hawaii undersea military munitions assessment. *Deep Sea Research Part II: Topical Studies in Oceanography, 128*, 4–13.

Efroymson, R. A., W. H. Rose, and G. W. Suter, II. (2001). *Ecological Risk Assessment Framework for Low-altitude Overflights by Fixed-Wing and Rotary-Wing Military Aircraft*. Oak Ridge, TN: Oak Ridge National Laboratory.

Eisenhardt, E. (2014). *Recent Trends of Vessel Activities in Proximity to Cetaceans in the Central Salish Sea.* Paper presented at the Salish Sea Ecosystem Conference. Seattle, WA.

Eldredge, L. G. (1991). Annotated checklist of the marine mammals of Micronesia. *Micronesica, 24*(2), 217–230.

Eldredge, L. G. (2003). A retrospective look at Guam's marine biodiversity. *Micronesica, 35-36*, 26–37.

Ellison, W. T., B. L. Southall, C. W. Clark, and A. S. Frankel. (2011). A new context-based approach to assess marine mammal behavioral responses to anthropogenic sounds. *Conservation Biology, 26*(1), 21–28.

Engelhardt, R. (1983). Petroleum effects on marine mammals. *Aquatic Toxicology, 4*, 199–217.

Erbe, C. (2002). Underwater noise of whale-watching boats and potential effects on killer whales (*Orcinus orca*), based on an acoustic impact model. *Marine Mammal Science, 18*(2), 394–418.

Erbe, C., A. MacGillivray, and R. Williams. (2012). Mapping cumulative noise from shipping to inform marine spatial planning. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 132*(5), EL423–EL428.

Erbe, C., R. Williams, D. Sandilands, and E. Ashe. (2014). Identifying modeled ship noise hotspots for marine mammals of Canada's Pacific region. *PLoS ONE, 9*(3), e89820.

Erbe, C., C. Reichmuth, K. Cunningham, K. Lucke, and R. Dooling. (2016). Communication masking in marine mammals: A review and research strategy. *Marine Pollution Bulletin, 103*(1–2), 15–38.

Erbe, C., R. Williams, M. Parsons, S. K. Parsons, I. G. Hendrawan, and I. M. I. Dewantama. (2018). Underwater noise from airplanes: An overlooked source of ocean noise. *Marine Pollution Bulletin, 137*, 656–661.

Evans, P. G. H., and L. A. Miller. (2003). *Proceedings of the workshop on active sonar and cetaceans* (European Cetacean Society newsletter, No. 42—Special Issue). Las Palmas, Gran Canaria: European Cetacean Society.

Fahlman, A., A. Olszowka, B. Bostrom, and D. R. Jones. (2006). Deep diving mammals: Dive behavior and circulatory adjustments contribute to bends avoidance. *Respiratory Physiology and Neurobiology, 153*, 66–77.

Fahlman, A., S. K. Hooker, A. Olszowka, B. L. Bostrom, and D. R. Jones. (2009). Estimating the effect of lung collapse and pulmonary shunt on gas exchange during breath-hold diving: The Scholander and Kooyman legacy. *Respiratory Physiology & Neurobiology, 165*(1), 28–39.

Fahlman, A., S. H. Loring, S. P. Johnson, M. Haulena, A. W. Trites, V. A. Fravel, and W. G. Van Bonn. (2014a). Inflation and deflation pressure-volume loops in anesthetized pinnipeds confirms compliant chest and lungs. *Frontiers in Physiology, 5*(433), 1–7.

Fahlman, A., P. L. Tyack, P. J. O. Miller, and P. H. Kvadsheim. (2014b). How man-made interference might cause gas bubble emboli in deep diving whales. *Frontiers in Physiology, 5*(13), 1–6.

Fair, P. A., J. Adams, G. Mitchum, T. C. Hulsey, J. S. Reif, M. Houde, D. Muir, E. Wirth, D. Wetzel, E. Zolman, W. McFee, and G. D. Bossart. (2010). Contaminant blubber burdens in Atlantic bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*) from two southeastern U.S. estuarine areas: Concentrations and patterns of PCBs, pesticides, PBDEs, PFCs, and PAHs. *The Science of the Total Environment, 408*(7), 1577–1597.

Fair, P. A., A. M. Schaefer, T. A. Romano, G. D. Bossart, S. V. Lamb, and J. S. Reif. (2014). Stress response of wild bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*) during capture-release health assessment studies. *General and Comparative Endocrinology, 206*, 203–212.

Falcone, E. A., G. S. Schorr, A. B. Douglas, J. Calambokidis, E. Henderson, M. F. McKenna, J. Hildebrand, and D. Moretti. (2009). Sighting characteristics and photo-identification of Cuvier's beaked whales (*Ziphius cavirostris*) near San Clemente Island, California: A key area for beaked whales and the military? *Marine Biology, 156*, 2631–2640.

Falcone, E. A., and G. S. Schorr. (2012). *Distribution and Demographics of Marine Mammals in SOCAL Through Photo-Identification, Genetics, and Satellite Telemetry: A Summary of Surveys Conducted 1 July 2011 – 15 June 2012*. Monterey, CA: Naval Postgraduate School.

Falcone, E. A., and G. S. Schorr. (2014). *Distribution and Demographics of Marine Mammals in SOCAL through Photo-Identification, Genetics, and Satellite Telemetry* (Prepared for Chief of Naval Operations Energy and Environmental Readiness Division: NPS-OC-14-005CR). Monterey, CA: Naval Postgraduate School.

Falcone, E. A., G. S. Schorr, S. L. Watwood, S. L. DeRuiter, A. N. Zerbini, R. D. Andrews, R. P. Morrissey, and D. J. Moretti. (2017). Diving behaviour of Cuvier's beaked whales exposed to two types of military sonar. *Royal Society Open Science, 4*(170629), 1–21.

Falke, K. J., R. D. Hill, J. Qvist, R. C. Schneider, M. Guppy, G. C. Liggins, P. W. Hochachka, R. E. Elliott, and W. M. Zapol. (1985). Seal lungs collapse during free diving: Evidence from arterial nitrogen tensions. *Science, 229*, 556–558.

Farak, A. M., M. W. Richie, J. A. Rivers, and R. K. Uyeyama. (2011). *Cruise Report, Marine Species Monitoring and Lookout Effectiveness Study Koa Kai, November 2010, Hawaii Range Complex*. Washington, DC: Commander, U.S. Pacific Fleet.

Farmer, N. A., D. P. Noren, E. M. Fougères, A. Machernis, and K. Baker. (2018). Resilience of the endangered sperm whale *Physeter macrocephalus* to foraging disturbance in the Gulf of Mexico, USA: A bioenergetic approach. *Marine Ecology Progress Series, 589*, 241–261.

Fauquier, D. A., M. J. Kinsel, M. D. Dailey, G. E. Sutton, M. K. Stolen, R. S. Wells, and F. M. D. Gulland. (2009). Prevalence and pathology of lungworm infection in bottlenose dolphins, *Tursiops truncatus,* from southwest Florida. *Diseases of Aquatic Organisms, 88*, 85–90.

Fay, R. R. (1988). *Hearing in Vertebrates: A Psychophysics Databook*. Winnetka, IL: Hill-Fay Associates.

Fay, R. R., and A. N. Popper. (1994). *Comparative Hearing: Mammals*. New York, NY: Springer-Verlag.

Ferguson, M. C., J. Barlow, P. Feidler, S. B. Reilly, and T. Gerrodette. (2006a). Spatial models of delphinid (family Delphinidae) encounter rate and group size in the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean. *Ecological Modelling, 193*, 645–662.

Ferguson, M. C., J. Barlow, S. B. Reilly, and T. Gerrodette. (2006b). Predicting Cuvier's (*Ziphius cavirostris*) and Mesoplodon beaked whale population density from habitat characteristics in the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean. *Journal of Cetacean Research and Management, 7*(3), 287–289.

Ferguson, S. H., J. W. Higdon, and K. H. Westdal. (2012). Prey items and predation behavior of killer whales (*Orcinus orca*) in Nunavut, Canada based on Inuit hunter interviews. *Aquatic Biosystems, 8*(3).

Fernandez, A., J. Edwards, F. Rodriguez, A. Espinosa De Los Monteros, P. Herraez, P. Castro, J. Jaber, V. Martin, and M. Arbelo. (2005). "Gas and fat embolic syndrome" involving a mass stranding of beaked whales (Family *Ziphiidae*) exposed to anthropogenic sonar signals. *Veterinary Pathology, 42*(4), 446–457.

Fernandez, A. (2006). *Beaked Whale (Ziphius cavirostris) Mass Stranding on Almeria's Coasts in Southern Spain*. Las Palmas, Canary Islands: University of Las Palmas de Gran Canaria.

Fernandez, A., E. Sierra, J. Diaz-Delgado, S. Sacchini, Y. Sanchez-Paz, C. Suarez-Santana, M. Arregui, M. Arbelo, and Y. Bernaldo de Quiros. (2017). Deadly acute decompression sickness in Risso's dolphins. *Scientific Reports, 7*(1), 13621.

Fertl, D., A. Acevedo-Gutiérrez, and F. L. Darby. (1996). A report of killer whales (*Orcinus orca*) feeding on a carcharhinid shark in Costa Rica. *Marine Mammal Science, 12*(4), 606–611.

Fetherston, T., S. Turner, G. Mitchell, and E. Guzas. (2018). Marine mammal lung dynamics when exposed to underwater explosion impulse. *The Anatomical Record, 302*(5), 718–734.

Filadelfo, R., J. Mintz, E. Michlovich, A. D'Amico, and D. R. Ketten. (2009a). Correlating military sonar use with beaked whale mass strandings: What do the historical data show? *Aquatic Mammals, 35*(4), 435–444.

Filadelfo, R., Y. K. Pinelis, S. Davis, R. Chase, J. Mintz, J. Wolfanger, P. L. Tyack, D. R. Ketten, and A. D'Amico. (2009b). Correlating whale strandings with Navy exercises off Southern California. *Aquatic Mammals, 35*(4), 445–451.

Finneran, J. F. (2016). *Auditory weighting functions and TTS/PTS exposure functions for marine mammals exposed to underwater noise* (Technical Report 3026). San Diego, CA: SSC Pacific.

Finneran, J. J., C. E. Schlundt, D. A. Carder, J. A. Clark, J. A. Young, J. B. Gaspin, and S. H. Ridgway. (2000). Auditory and behavioral responses of bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*) and a beluga whale (*Delphinapterus leucas*) to impulsive sounds resembling distant signatures of underwater explosions. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 108*(1), 417–431.

Finneran, J. J., D. A. Carder, and S. H. Ridgway. (2001). Temporary threshold shift (TTS) in bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*) exposed to tonal signals. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 110*(5), 2749(A).

Finneran, J. J., C. E. Schlundt, R. Dear, D. A. Carder, and S. H. Ridgway. (2002). Temporary shift in masked hearing thresholds in odontocetes after exposure to single underwater impulses from a seismic watergun. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 111*(6), 2929–2940.

Finneran, J. J., D. A. Carder, R. Dear, T. Belting, and S. H. Ridgway. (2003a). Pure-tone audiograms and hearing loss in the white whale (*Delphinapterus leucas*). *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 114*, 2434(A).

Finneran, J. J., R. Dear, D. A. Carder, and S. H. Ridgway. (2003b). Auditory and behavioral responses of California sea lions (*Zalophus californianus*) to single underwater impulses from an arc-gap transducer. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 114*(3), 1667–1677.

Finneran, J. J., and C. E. Schlundt. (2004). *Effects of Intense Pure Tones on the Behavior of Trained Odontocetes*. San Diego, CA: Space and Naval Warfare Systems Center Pacific.

Finneran, J. J., D. A. Carder, R. Dear, T. Belting, J. McBain, L. Dalton, and S. H. Ridgway. (2005a). Pure tone audiograms and possible aminoglycoside-induced hearing loss in belugas (*Delphinapterus leucas*). *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 117*, 3936–3943.

Finneran, J. J., D. A. Carder, C. E. Schlundt, and S. H. Ridgway. (2005b). Temporary threshold shift (TTS) in bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*) exposed to mid-frequency tones. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 118*(4), 2696–2705.

Finneran, J. J., and D. S. Houser. (2006). Comparison of in-air evoked potential and underwater behavioral hearing thresholds in four bottlenose dolphins (*Turiops truncatus*). *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 119*(5), 3181–3192.

Finneran, J. J., C. E. Schlundt, B. Branstetter, and R. L. Dear. (2007). Assessing temporary threshold shift in a bottlenose dolphin (*Tursiops truncatus*) using multiple simultaneous auditory evoked potentials. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 122*(2), 1249–1264.

Finneran, J. J., D. S. Houser, B. Mase-Guthrie, R. Y. Ewing, and R. G. Lingenfelser. (2009). Auditory evoked potentials in a stranded Gervais' beaked whale (*Mesoplodon europaeus*). *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 126*(1), 484–490.

Finneran, J. J., D. A. Carder, C. E. Schlundt, and R. L. Dear. (2010a). Growth and recovery of temporary threshold shift at 3 kHz in bottlenose dolphins: Experimental data and mathematical models. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 127*(5), 3256–3266.

Finneran, J. J., D. A. Carder, C. E. Schlundt, and R. L. Dear. (2010b). Temporary threshold shift in a bottlenose dolphin (*Tursiops truncatus*) exposed to intermittent tones. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 127*(5), 3267–3272.

Finneran, J. J., and B. K. Branstetter. (2013). Effects of Noise on Sound Perception in Marine Mammals *Animal Communication and Noise* (Vol. 2, pp. 273–308). Berlin, Germany: Springer Berlin Heidelberg.

Finneran, J. J., and C. E. Schlundt. (2013). Effects of fatiguing tone frequency on temporary threshold shift in bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*). *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 133*(3), 1819–1826.

Finneran, J. J. (2015). Noise-induced hearing loss in marine mammals: A review of temporary threshold shift studies from 1996 to 2015. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 138*(3), 1702–1726.

Finneran, J. J., C. E. Schlundt, B. K. Branstetter, J. S. Trickey, V. Bowman, and K. Jenkins. (2015). Effects of multiple impulses from a seismic air gun on bottlenose dolphin hearing and behavior. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 137*(4), 1634–1646.

Finneran, J. J., J. Mulsow, D. S. Houser, and R. F. Burkard. (2016). Place specificity of the click-evoked auditory brainstem response in the bottlenose dolphin (*Tursiops truncatus*). *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 140*(4), 2593–2602.

Finneran, J. J. (2018). Conditioned attenuation of auditory brainstem responses in dolphins warned of an intense noise exposure: Temporal and spectral patterns. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 143*(2), 795.

Fish, J. F., and J. S. Vania. (1971). Killer whale, *Orcinus orca*, sounds repel white whales, *Delphinapterus leucas*. *Fishery Bulletin, 69*(3), 531–535.

Fitch, R., J. Harrison, and J. Lewandowski. (2011). *Marine Mammal and Sound Workshop July 13th and 14th, 2010: Report to the National Ocean Council Ocean Science and Technology Interagency Policy Committee*. Washington, DC: Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Department of the Navy, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

Fleming, A. H., C. T. Clark, J. Calambokidis, and J. Barlow. (2016). Humpback whale diets respond to variance in ocean climate and ecosystem conditions in the California Current. *Global Change Biology, 22*(3), 1214–1224.

Foltz, K. M., R. W. Baird, G. M. Ylitalo, and B. A. Jensen. (2014). Cytochrome P4501A1 expression in blubber biopsies of endangered false killer whales (*Pseudorca crassidens*) and nine other odontocete species from Hawaii. *Ecotoxicology, 23*(9), 1607–1618.

Foote, A. D., R. W. Osborne, and A. R. Hoelzel. (2004). Whale-call response to masking boat noise. *Nature, 428,* 910.

Ford, J. K. B., and G. M. Ellis. (1999). *Transients: Mammal-Hunting Killer Whales of British Columbia, Washington, and Southeastern Alaska*. Vancouver, Canada and Seattle, WA: UBC Press and University of Washington Press.

Ford, J. K. B., G. M. Ellis, D. R. Matkin, K. C. Balcomb, D. Briggs, and A. B. Morton. (2005). Killer whale attacks on minke whales: Prey capture and antipredator tactics. *Marine Mammal Science, 21*(4), 603–618.

Ford, J. K. B. (2008). Killer whale, *Orcinus orca*. In W. F. Perrin, B. Wursig, & J. G. M. Thewissen (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Marine Mammals* (2nd ed., pp. 650–657). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Ford, J. K. B., E. H. Stredulinsky, J. R. Towers, and G. M. Ellis. (2013). *Information in Support of the Identification of Critical Habitat for Transient Killer Whales (Orcinus orca) off the West Coast of Canada DFO* (Science Advisory Report 2013/025). Nanaimo, Canada: Canadian Science Advisory Secretariat.

Ford, J. K. B., E. H. Stredulinsky, G. M. Ellis, J. W. Durban, and J. F. Pilkington. (2014). *Offshore Killer Whales in Canadian Pacific Waters: Distribution, Seasonality, Foraging Ecology, Population Status and Potential for Recovery*. (Document 2014/088). Ottawa, Canada: Department of Fisheries and Oceans Canada, Canadian Science Advisory, Secretariat.

Forney, K. A., and P. R. Wade. (2006). Worldwide Distribution and Abundance of Killer Whales. In J. A. Estes, R. L. Brownell, Jr., D. P. DeMaster, D. F. Doak, & T. M. Williams (Eds.), *Whales, Whaling and Ocean Ecosystems* (pp. 145–162). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Forney, K. A., B. L. Southall, E. Slooten, S. Dawson, A. J. Read, R. W. Baird, and R. L. Brownell, Jr. (2017). Nowhere to go: Noise impact assessments for marine mammal populations with high site fidelity. *Endangered Species Research, 32*, 391–413.

Fournet, M. E. H., L. P. Matthews, C. M. Bagriele, S. Haver, D. K. Mellinger, and H. Klinck. (2018). Humpback whales *Megaptera novaeangliae* alter calling behavior in response to natural sounds and vessel noise. *Marine Ecology Progress Series, 607*, 251–268.

Frankel, A. S., and C. W. Clark. (2000). Behavioral responses of humpback whales (*Megaptera novaeangliae*) to full-scale ATOC signals. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 108*(4), 1930–1937.

Friedlaender, A. S., E. L. Hazen, J. A. Goldbogen, A. K. Stimpert, J. Calambokidis, and B. L. Southall. (2016). Prey-mediated behavioral responses of feeding blue whales in controlled sound exposure experiments. *Ecological Applications, 26*(4), 1075–1085.

Frisk, G. V. (2012). Noiseonomics: The relationship between ambient noise levels in the sea and global economic trends. *Scientific Reports, 2*(437), 1–4.

Fristrup, K. M., L. T. Hatch, and C. W. Clark. (2003). Variation in humpback whale (*Megaptera novaeangliae*) song length in relation to low-frequency sound broadcasts. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 113*(6), 3411–3424.

Fromm, D. M., J. R. Mobley, S. W. Martin, and P. E. Nachtigall. (2006). Analysis of melon-headed whale aggregation in Hanalei Bay, July 2004. *Animal Bioacoustics: Marine Mammal Acoustics II, 120*(5), 3266.

Fromm, D. M. (2009). *Reconstruction of Acoustic Exposure on Orcas in Haro Strait* (Acoustics). Washington, DC: U.S. Naval Research Laboratory.

Fulling, G. L., P. H. Thorson, and J. Rivers. (2011). Distribution and Abundance Estimates for Cetaceans in the Waters off Guam and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. *Pacific Science, 65*(3), 321–343.

Fulling, G. L., T. A. Jefferson, D. Fertl, J. C. S. Vega, C. S. Oedekoven, and S. A. Kuczaj, II. (2017). Sperm Whale (*Physeter macrocephalus*) Collision with a Research Vessel: Accidental Collision or Deliberate Ramming? *Aquatic Mammals, 43*(4), 421–429.

Fumagalli, M., A. Cesario, M. Costa, J. Harraway, G. Notarbartolo di Sciara, and E. Slooten. (2018). Behavioural responses of spinner dolphins to human interactions. *Royal Society Open Science, 5*(4), 172044.

Gabriele, C. M., D. W. Ponirakis, C. W. Clark, J. N. Womble, and P. B. S. Vanselow. (2018). Underwater Acoustic Ecology Metrics in an Alaska Marine Protected Area Reveal Marine Mammal Communication Masking and Management Alternatives. *Frontiers in Marine Science, 5*(270), 1–17.

Gailey, G., B. Wursig, and T. L. McDonald. (2007). Abundance, behavior, and movement patterns of western gray whales in relation to a 3-D seismic survey, Northeast Sakhalin Island, Russia. *Environmental Monitoring and Assessment, 134*, 75–91.

Gailey, G., O. Sychenko, T. McDonald, R. Racca, A. Rutenko, and K. Bröker. (2016). Behavioural responses of western gray whales to a 4-D seismic survey off northeastern Sakhalin Island, Russia. *Endangered Species Research, 30*, 53–71.

Gallo, F., C. Fossi, R. Weber, D. Santillo, J. Sousa, I. Ingram, A. Nadal, and D. Romano. (2018). Marine litter plastics and microplastics and their toxic chemicals components: The need for urgent preventive measures. *Environmental Sciences Europe, 30*(13), 1–14.

Gannier, A. (2002). Cetaceans of the Marquesas Islands (French Polynesia): Distribution and relative abundance as obtained from a small boat dedicated survey. *Aquatic Mammals, 28*(2), 198–210.

Gannier, A., and K. L. West. (2005). Distribution of the rough-toothed dolphin (*Steno bredanensis*) around the Windward Islands (French Polynesia). *Pacific Science, 59*, 17–24.

Gannon, D. P., N. B. Barros, D. P. Nowacek, A. J. Read, D. M. Waples, and R. S. Wells. (2005). Prey detection by bottlenose dolphins, *Tursiops truncatus*: An experimental test of the passive listening hypothesis. *Animal Behaviour, 69*, 709–720.

Garcia Parraga, D., M. Moore, and A. Fahlman. (2018). Pulmonary ventilation-perfusion mismatch: A novel hypothesis for how diving vertebrates may avoid the bends. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 285*(1877).

Garibaldi, F., and M. Podesta. (2014). Stomach contents of a sperm whale (*Physeter macrocephalus*) stranded in Italy (Ligurian Sea, north-western Mediterranean). *Journal of the Marine Biological Association of the United Kingdom, 94*(6), 1087–1091.

Garrigue, C., M. Oremus, R. Dodémont, P. Bustamante, O. Kwiatek, G. Libeau, C. Lockyer, J. C. Vivier, and M. L. Dalebout. (2016). A mass stranding of seven Longman's beaked whales (*Indopacetus pacificus*) in New Caledonia, South Pacific. *Marine Mammal Science, 32*(3), 884–910.

Gaspard, J. C., G. B. Bauer, R. L. Reep, K. Dziuk, A. Cardwell, L. Read, and D. A. Mann. (2012). Audiogram and auditory critical ratios of two Florida manatees (*Trichechus manatus latirostris*). *The Journal of Experimental Biology, 215*(Pt 9), 1442–1447.

Gedamke, J., M. Ferguson, J. Harrison, L. Hatch, L. Henderson, M. B. Porter, B. L. Southall, and S. Van Parijs. (2016). Predicting Anthropogenic Noise Contributions to U.S. Waters. *Advances in Experimental Medicine and Biology, 875*, 341–347.

Geijer, C. K. A., and A. J. Read. (2013). Mitigation of marine mammal bycatch in U.S. fisheries since 1994. *Biological Conservation, 159*, 54–60.

Gende, S. M., A. N. Hendrix, K. R. Harris, B. Eichenlaub, J. Nielsen, and S. Pyare. (2011). A Bayesian approach for understanding the role of ship speed in whale-ship encounters. *Ecological Applications, 21*(6), 2232–2240.

Geraci, J., J. Harwood, and V. Lounsbury. (1999). Marine Mammal Die-Offs: Causes, Investigations, and Issues. In J. Twiss & R. Reeves (Eds.), *Conservation and Management of Marine Mammals* (pp. 367–395). Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press.

Geraci, J., and V. Lounsbury. (2005). *Marine Mammals Ashore: A Field Guide for Strandings* (Second ed.). Baltimore, MD: National Aquarium in Baltimore.

Gervaise, C., Y. Simard, N. Roy, B. Kinda, and N. Menard. (2012). Shipping noise in whale habitat: Characteristics, sources, budget, and impact on belugas in Saguenay–St. Lawrence Marine Park hub. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 132*(1), 76–89.

Ghoul, A., and C. Reichmuth. (2014). Hearing in the sea otter (*Enhydra lutris*): Auditory profiles for an amphibious marine carnivore. *Journal of Comparative Physiology A: Neuroethology, Sensory Neural, and Behavioral Physiology, 200*(11), 967–981.

Gibbs, S., C. Salgado Kent, B. Slat, D. Morales, L. Founda, and J. Reisser. (2019). Cetacean sightings within the Great Pacific Garbage Patch. *Marine Biodiversity, 49*(4), 2021–2027.

Gill, A. B., I. Gloyne-Philips, J. Kimber, and P. Sigray. (2014). Marine Renewable Energy, Electromagnetic (EM) Fields and EM-Sensitive Animals. In M. Shields & A. Payne (Eds.), *Marine Renewable Energy Technology and Environmental Interactions. Humanity and the Sea* (pp. 61–79). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer.

Giorli, G., and W. W. L. Au. (2017). Spatio-temporal variation and seasonality of Odontocetes' foraging activity in the leeward side of the island of Hawaii. *Deep-Sea Research I, 121*, 202–209.

Godard-Codding, C. A. J., R. Clark, M. C. Fossi, L. Marsili, S. Maltese, A. G. West, L. Valenzuela, V. Rowntree, I. Polyak, J. C. Cannon, K. Pinkerton, N. Rubio-Cisneros, S. L. Mesnick, S. B. Cox, I. Kerr, R. Payne, and J. J. Stegeman. (2011). Pacific Ocean–Wide Profile of CYP1A1 Expression, Stable Carbon and Nitrogen Isotope Ratios, and Organic Contaminant Burden in Sperm Whale Skin Biopsies. *Environmental Health Perspectives, 119*(3), 337–343.

Goertner, J. F. (1982). *Prediction of Underwater Explosion Safe Ranges for Sea Mammals*. Dahlgren, VA: Naval Surface Weapons Center.

Goldbogen, J. A., J. Calambokidis, R. E. Shadwick, E. M. Oleson, M. A. McDonald, and J. A. Hildebrand. (2006). Kinematics of foraging dives and lunge-feeding in fin whales. *The Journal of Experimental Biology, 209*(Pt 7), 1231–1244.

Goldbogen, J. A., A. S. Friedlaender, J. Calambokidis, M. F. McKenna, M. Simon, and D. Nowacek. (2013a). Integrative Approaches to the Study of Baleen Whale Diving Behavior, Feeding Performance, and Foraging Ecology. *BioScience, 63*(2), 90–100.

Goldbogen, J. A., B. L. Southall, S. L. DeRuiter, J. Calambokidis, A. S. Friedlaender, E. L. Hazen, E. A. Falcone, G. S. Schorr, A. Douglas, D. J. Moretti, C. Kyburg, M. F. McKenna, and P. L. Tyack. (2013b). Blue whales respond to simulated mid-frequency military sonar. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 280*(1765), 20130657.

Gong, Z., A. D. Jain, D. Tran, D. H. Yi, F. Wu, A. Zorn, P. Ratilal, and N. C. Makris. (2014). Ecosystem scale acoustic sensing reveals humpback whale behavior synchronous with herring spawning processes and re-evaluation finds no effect of sonar on humpback song occurrence in the Gulf of Maine in fall 2006. *PLoS ONE, 9*(10), e104733.

Gordon, J., D. Gillespie, J. Potter, A. Frantzis, M. P. Simmonds, R. Swift, and D. Thompson. (2003). A review of the effects of seismic surveys on marine mammals. *Marine Technology Society Journal, 37*(4), 16–34.

Gospić, N. R., and M. Picciulin. (2016). Changes in whistle structure of resident bottlenose dolphins in relation to underwater noise and boat traffic. *Marine Pollution Bulletin, 105*, 193–198.

Gotz, T., A. F. Pacini, P. E. Nachtigall, and V. M. Janik. (2020). The startle reflex in ecological odontocetes: Basic physiology and practical implications. *Journal of Experimental Biology, 223*.

Graham, I. M., E. Pirotta, N. D. Merchant, A. Farcas, T. R. Barton, B. Cheney, G. D. Hastie, and P. M. Thompson. (2017). Responses of bottlenose dolphins and harbor porpoises to impact and vibration piling noise during harbor construction. *Ecosphere, 8*(5), 1–16.

Greaves, F. C., R. H. Draeger, O. A. Brines, J. S. Shaver, and E. L. Corey. (1943). An experimental study of concussion. *United States Naval Medical Bulletin, 41*(1), 339–352.

Green, D. M. (1994). Sound's effects on marine mammals need investigation. *Eos, 75(27)*, 305–306.

Green, D. M., H. DeFerrari, D. McFadden, J. Pearse, A. Popper, W. J. Richardson, S. H. Ridgway, and P. Tyack. (1994). *Low-Frequency Sound and Marine Mammals: Current Knowledge and Research Needs*. Washington, DC: Ocean Studies Board, Commission on Geosciences, Environment, and Resources, National Research Council.

Green, G. A., J. J. Brueggeman, R. A. Grotefendt, C. E. Bowlby, M. L. Bonnell, and K. C. Balcomb, III. (1992). *Cetacean Distribution and Abundance off Oregon and Washington, 1989–1990*. Los Angeles, CA: U.S. Department of the Interior, Minerals Management Service.

Gregory, P. R., and A. A. Rowden. (2001). Behaviour patterns of bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*) relative to tidal state, time-of-day, and boat traffic in Cardigan Bay, West Wales. *Aquatic Mammals, 27.2*, 105–114.

Guan, S., B. L. Southall, J. F. Vignola, J. A. Judge, and D. Turo. (2017). Sonar inter-ping noise field characterization during cetacean behavioral response studies off Southern California. *Acoustical Physics, 63*(2), 204–215.

Guerra, M., S. M. Dawson, T. E. Brough, and W. J. Rayment. (2014). Effects of boats on the surface and acoustic behaviour of an endangered population of bottlenose dolphins. *Endangered Species Research, 24*(3), 221–236.

Haelters, J., V. Dulière, L. Vigin, and S. Degraer. (2014). Towards a numerical model to simulate the observed displacement of harbour porpoises *Phocoena phocoena* due to pile driving in Belgian waters. *Hydrobiologia, 756*(1), 105–116.

Hall, A., K. Hugunin, R. Deaville, R. Law, C. R. Allchin, and P. Jepson. (2006). The Risk of Infection from Polychlorinated Biphenyl Exposure in the Harbor Porpoise (*Phocoena phocoena*): A Case-Control Approach. *Environmental Health Perspectives, 114*, 704–711.

Hamer, D. J., S. J. Childerhouse, and N. J. Gales. (2010). *Mitigating Operational Interactions Between Odontocetes and the Longline Fishing Industry: A Preliminary Global Review of the Problem and of Potential Solutions*. Tasmania, Australia: International Whaling Commission.

Hamilton, T. A., J. V. Redfern, J. Barlow, L. T. Ballance, T. Gerrodette, R. S. Holt, K. A. Forney, and B. L. Taylor. (2009). *Atlas of Cetacean Sightings for Southwest Fisheries Science Center Cetacean and Ecosystem Surveys: 1986–2005* (NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SWFSC-440). La Jolla, CA: Southwest Fisheries Science Center.

Hance, A. J., E. D. Robin, J. B. Halter, N. Lewiston, D. A. Robin, L. Cornell, M. Caligiuri, and J. Theodore. (1982). Hormonal changes and enforced diving in the harbor seal *Phoca vitulina* II. Plasma catecholamines. *American Journal of Physiology - Regulatory, Integrative and Comparative Physiology, 242*(5), R528–R532.

Hansen, A. M. K., C. E. Bryan, K. West, and B. A. Jensen. (2015). Trace Element Concentrations in Liver of 16 Species of Cetaceans Stranded on Pacific Islands from 1997 through 2013. *Archives of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology, 70*(1), 75–95.

Harcourt, R., V. Pirotta, G. Heller, V. Peddemors, and D. Slip. (2014). A whale alarm fails to deter migrating humpback whales: An empirical test. *Endangered Species Research, 25*(1), 35–42.

Hardesty, B. D., and C. Wilcox. (2017). A risk framework for tackling marine debris. *Royal Society of Chemistry, 9*, 1429–1436.

Harris, C., and L. Thomas. (2015). *Status and Future of Research on the Behavioral Responses of Marine Mammals to U.S. Navy Sonar* (Centre for Research into Ecological & Environmental Modelling Technical Report 2015-3). St. Andrews, United Kingdom: University of St. Andrews.

Harris, C. M., D. Sadykova, S. L. DeRuiter, P. L. Tyack, P. J. O. Miller, P. H. Kvadsheim, F. P. A. Lam, and L. Thomas. (2015). Dose response severity functions for acoustic disturbance in cetaceans using recurrent event survival analysis. *Ecosphere, 6*(11), art236.

Harris, C. M., M. L. Burt, A. N. Allen, P. J. Wensveen, P. J. O. Miller, and L. D. Sivle. (2019a). Foraging behavior and disruption in Blue, Fin, and Humpback Whales in relation to sonar exposure: The challenges of generalizing responsiveness in species with high individual variability. *Aquatic Mammals, 45*(6), 646–660.

Harris, C. M., S. W. Martin, C. Martin, T. A. Helble, E. E. Henderson, C. G. M. Paxton, and L. Thomas. (2019b). Changes in the spatial distribution of acoustically derived minke whale (*Balaenoptera acutorostrata*) tracks in response to Navy training. *Aquatic Mammals, 45*(6), 661-674.

Harwood, J., and S. L. King. (2014). *The Sensitivity of UK Marine Mammal Populations to Marine Renewables Developments*. Submitted to the Natural Environment Research Council (unpublished).

Hastie, G. D., C. Donovan, T. Gotz, and V. M. Janik. (2014). Behavioral responses by grey seals (*Halichoerus grypus*) to high frequency sonar. *Marine Pollution Bulletin, 79*(1-2), 205–210.

Hatch, L. T., and A. J. Wright. (2007). A brief review of anthropogenic sound in the oceans. *International Journal of Comparative Psychology, 20*, 121–133.

Hatch, L. T., C. W. Clark, S. M. Van Parijs, A. S. Frankel, and D. W. Ponirakis. (2012). Quantifying loss of acoustic communication space for right whales in and around a U.S. National Marine Sanctuary. *Conservation Biology, 26*(6), 983–994.

Haviland-Howell, G., A. S. Frankel, C. M. Powell, A. Bocconcelli, R. L. Herman, and L. S. Sayigh. (2007). Recreational boating traffic: A chronic source of anthropogenic noise in the Wilmington, North Carolina Intracoastal Waterway. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 122*(1), 151–160.

Hawaii Pacific University. (2012). *HPU scientists pioneer research on rare whale*. Retrieved from http://www.hpu.edu/HPUNews/2012/10/whale-research.html.

HDR. (2011a). *Jacksonville Southeast Anti-Submarine Warfare Integration Training Initiative Marine Species Monitoring Aerial Monitoring Surveys Trip Report, 3–5 December 2010*. Jacksonville, FL: U.S. Navy Marine Species Monitoring Program.

HDR. (2011b). *Guam Marine Species Monitoring Survey: Vessel-Based Monitoring Surveys Winter 2011*. Mariana Islands, Guam: U.S. Navy Marine Species Monitoring Program.

HDR. (2012). *Summary Report: Compilation of Visual Survey Effort and Sightings for Marine Species Monitoring in the Hawaii Range Complex, 2005–2012*. Pearl Harbor, HI: U.S. Pacific Fleet.

HDR EOC. (2012). *Guam and Saipan Marine Species Monitoring Winter-Spring Survey, March 2012*. Pearl Harbor, HI: Naval Facilities Engineering Command.

Heenehan, H. L., D. W. Johnston, S. M. Van Parijs, L. Bejder, and J. A. Tyne. (2016). *Acoustic response of Hawaiian spinner dolphins to human disturbances.* Paper presented at the Meetings on Acoustics. Dublin, Ireland.

Heenehan, H. L., S. M. Van Parijs, L. Bejder, J. A. Tyne, and D. W. Johnston. (2017a). Using acoustics to prioritize management decisions to protect coastal dolphins: A case study using Hawaiian spinner dolphins. *Marine Policy, 75*, 84–90.

Heenehan, H. L., S. M. Van Parijs, L. Bejder, J. A. Tyne, B. L. Southall, H. Southall, and D. W. Johnston. (2017b). Natural and anthropogenic events influence the soundscapes of four bays on Hawaii Island. *Marine Pollution Bulletin, 124*(1), 9–20.

Heffner, R. S., and H. E. Heffner. (1982). Hearing in the elephant (*Elephas maximus*): Absolute sensitivity, frequency discrimination, and sound localization. *Journal of Comparative and Physiological Psychology, 96*(6), 926–944.

Heinis, F., C. A. F. De Jong, and Rijkswaterstaat Underwater Sound Working Group. (2015). *Framework for Assessing Ecological and Cumulative Effects of Offshore Wind Farms: Cumulative Effects of Impulsive Underwater Sound on Marine Mammals* (TNO Report R10335-A). The Hague, Netherlands: Rijkswaterstaat Zee en Delta.

Heithaus, M. (2001a). Predator-prey and competitive interactions between sharks (order Selachii) and dolphins (suborder Odontoceti): A review. *Journal of the Zoological Society of London, 253*, 53–68.

Heithaus, M. R. (2001b). Shark attacks on bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops aduncus*) in Shark Bay, Western Australia: Attack rate, bite scar frequencies and attack seasonality. *Marine Mammal Science, 17*(3), 526–539.

Helber, R. W., and R. H. Weisberg. (2001). Equatorial upwelling in the western Pacific warm pool. *Journal of Geophysical Research, 106*(C5), 8989–9003.

Helble, T. A., R. A. Guazzo, C. R. Martin, I. N. Durbach, G. C. Alongi, S. W. Martin, J. K. Boyle, and E. E. Henderson. (2020). Lombard effect: Minke whale boing call source levels vary with natural variations in ocean noise. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 147*(2), 698–712.

Helker, V., M. Muto, K. Savage, S. Teerlink, L. Jemison, K. Wilkinson, and J. Jannot. (2019). *Human-Caused Mortality and Injury of NMFS-Managed Alaska Marine Mammal Stocks, 2012–2016*. Silver Spring, MD: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

Helker, V. T., B. M. Allen, and L. A. Jemison. (2015). *Human-Caused Injury and Mortality of National Marine Fisheries Service-Managed Alaska Marine Mammal Stocks, 2009–2013*. Seattle, WA, and Dillingham, AK: Alaska Fisheries Science Center.

Helker, V. T., M. M. Muto, K. Savage, S. Teerlink, L. A. Jemison, K. Wilkinson, and J. Jannot. (2017). *Human-Caused Mortality and Injury of NMFS-Managed Alaska Marine Mammal Stocks, 2011–2015* (NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-AFSC-354). Seattle, WA: Alaska Fisheries Science Center.

Henderson, E. E., M. H. Smith, M. Gassmann, S. M. Wiggins, A. B. Douglas, and J. A. Hildebrand. (2014). Delphinid behavioral responses to incidental mid-frequency active sonar. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 136*(4), 2003–2014.

Henderson, E. E., R. A. Manzano-Roth, S. W. Martin, and B. Matsuyama. (2015). *Impacts of U.S. Navy Training Events on Beaked Whale Foraging Dives in Hawaiian Waters: Update*. San Diego, CA: Space and Naval Warfare Systems Command Systems Center Pacific.

Henderson, E. E., S. W. Martin, R. Manzano-Roth, and B. M. Matsuyama. (2016). Occurrence and habitat use of foraging Blainville's beaked whales (*Mesoplodon densirostris*) on a U.S. Navy range in Hawai'i. *Aquatic Mammals, 42*(4), 549–562.

Henderson, E. E., J. Aschettino, M. Deakos, G. Alongi, and T. Leota. (2019). Quantifying the behavior of humpback whales (*Megaptera novaeangliae*) and potential responses to sonar. *Aquatic Mammals, 45*(6), 612-631.

Hermannsen, L., K. Beedholm, J. Tougaard, and P. T. Madsen. (2014). High frequency components of ship noise in shallow water with a discussion of implications for harbor porpoises (*Phocoena phocoena*). *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 136*(4), 1640–1653.

Hewitt, R. P. (1985). Reaction of dolphins to a survey vessel: Effects on census data. *Fishery Bulletin, 83*(2), 187–193.

Heyning, J. E., and J. G. Mead. (1996). Suction feeding in beaked whales: Morphological and observational evidence. *Contributions in Science, 464*, 1–12.

Heyning, J. E., and J. G. Mead. (2009). Cuvier's beaked whale *Ziphius cavirostris*. In W. F. Perrin, B. Wursig, & J. G. M. Thewissen (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Marine Mammals* (2nd ed., pp. 294–295). Cambridge, MA: Academic Press.

Hickmott, L. S. (2005). *Diving behaviour and foraging ecology of Blainville's and Cuvier's beaked whales in the Northern Bahamas.* (Unpublished master's thesis). University of St. Andrews, Scotland, United Kingdom.

Hidalgo-Ruz, V., L. Gutow, R. C. Thompson, and M. Thiel. (2012). Microplastics in the marine environment: A review of methods used for identification and quantification. *Environmental Science and Technology, 46*, 3060–3075.

Hildebrand, J. (2009). Anthropogenic and natural sources of ambient noise in the ocean. *Marine Ecology Progress Series, 395*, 5–20.

Hildebrand, J. A. (2005). Impacts of anthropogenic sound. In J. E. Reynolds, III, W. F. Perrin, R. R. Reeves, T. J. Ragen, & S. Montgomery (Eds.), *Marine Mammal Research: Conservation Beyond Crisis* (pp. 101–123). Baltimore, MD: The John Hopkins University Press.

Hill, M., A. D. Ligon, M. H. Deakos, U. Adam, E. Norris, and E. M. Oleson. (2011). *Cetacean Surveys of Guam and CNMI Waters: August–September, 2011* (MIRC Survey Report FY2011). Honolulu, HI: Pacific Islands Fisheries Science Center.

Hill, M., A. Ligon, M. Deakos, A. Ü, A. Milette-Winfree, and E. Oleson. (2013a). *Cetacean Surveys of Guam and CNMI Waters: May–July, 2012: Including Individual Photo-Identification of Pilot Whales, Spinner Dolphins and Bottlenose Dolphins (2010–2012)* (PIFSC Data Report). Pearl Harbor, HI: U.S. Pacific Fleet Environmental Readiness Office.

Hill, M., A. Ligon, A. Ü, and A. Bradford. (2015a). *Humpback Whales in the Marianas*. Honolulu, HI: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Pacific Islands Fisheries Science Center.

Hill, M. C., A. D. Ligon, M. H. Deakos, A. C. U, and E. M. Oleson. (2013b). *Cetacean Surveys of Guam and SNMI Waters: June–July 2013*. Pearl Harbor, HI: U.S. Pacific Fleet Environmental Readiness Office.

Hill, M. C., A. D. Ligon, M. H. Deakos, A. C. Ü, A. Milette-Winfree, A. R. Bendlin, and E. M. Oleson. (2014). *Cetacean Surveys in the Waters of the Southern Mariana Archipelago (February 2010–April 2014)*. Honolulu, HI: U.S. Pacific Fleet Environmental Readiness Office.

Hill, M. C., E. M. Oleson, A. D. Ligon, K. K. Martien, F. I. Archer, S. Baumann-Pickering, A. R. Bendlin, L. Dolar, K. P. B. Merkens, A. Milette-Winfree, P. A. Morin, A. Rice, K. M. Robertson, J. S. Trickey, A. C. Ü, A. Van Cise, and S. M. Woodman. (2015b). *Cetacean Monitoring in the Mariana Islands Range Complex, 2014*. Honolulu, HI: U.S. Pacific Fleet.

Hill, M. C., A. L. Bradford, A. D. Ligon, A. C. U, J. Rivers, R. K. Uyeyama, R. L. Brownell, Jr., and E. M. Oleson. (2016a). *Are Humpback Whales (Megaptera novaeangliae) Breeding and Calving in the Mariana Islands?* Cambridge, United Kingdom: International Whaling Commission.

Hill, M. C., E. M. Oleson, S. Baumann-Pickering, A. M. VanCise, A. D. Ligon, A. R. Bendlin, A. C. Ü, J. S. Trickey, and A. L. Bradford. (2016b). *Cetacean Monitoring in the Mariana Islands Range Complex, 2015*. Honolulu, HI: U.S. Pacific Fleet Environmental Readiness Office.

Hill, M. C., A. R. Bendlin, A. C. Ü, K. M. Yano, A. L. Bradford, A. D. Ligon, and E. M. Oleson. (2017a). *Cetacean Monitoring in the Mariana Islands Range Complex, 2016* (PIFSC Data Report DR-17-002). Honolulu, HI: U.S. Pacific Fleet Environmental Readiness Office.

Hill, M. C., A. L. Bradford, A. D. Ligon, A. C. Ü, C. S. Baker, D. Dietrich-Steel, J. Rivers, R. K. Uyeyama, and E. M. Oleson. (2017b). *Discovery of a Western North Pacific Humpback Whale (Megaptera novaeangliae) Wintering Area in the Mariana Archipelago (Poster)*. Paper presented at the Society for Marine Mammalogy Conference. Halifax, Nova Scotia.

Hill, M. C., A. R. Bendlin, A. M. Van Cise, A. Milette-Winfree, A. D. Ligon, A. C. Ü, M. H. Deakos, and E. M. Oleson. (2018a). Short-finned pilot whales (*Globicephala macrorhynchus*) of the Mariana Archipelago: Individual affiliations, movements, and spatial use. *Marine Mammal Science* (Online version of record before inclusion in an issue), 1–28.

Hill, M. C., A. L. Bradford, A. D. Ligon, A. C. Ü, and E. M. Oleson. (2018b). *Cetacean Monitoring in the Mariana Islands Range Complex, 2017* (PIFSC Data Report DR-18-002). Honolulu, HI: Pacific Islands Fisheries Science Center.

Hill, M. C., E. M. Oleson, A. L. Bradford, K. K. Martien, D. Steel, and C. S. Baker. (2018c). *Pacific Islands Fisheries Science Center Mariana Archipelago Cetacean Surveys: A review of available data and analyses through February 2018*. Pearl Harbor, HI: Prepared for the U.S. Pacific Fleet Environmental Readiness Office.

Hill, M. C., E. M. Oleson, A. L. Bradford, K. K. Martien, D. Steel, and C. S. Baker. (2018d). *Draft Pacific Islands Fisheries Science Center Mariana Archipelago Cetacean Surveys: A Review of Available Data and Analyses Through March 2018*. (PIFSC Data Report DR-18-xxx). Pearl Harbor, HI: U.S. Pacific Fleet Environmental Readiness Office.

Hill, M. C., A. D. Ligon, A. C. Ü, and E. M. Oleson. (2019). *Cetacean Monitoring in the Mariana Islands Range Complex, August-September 2018.* (Prepared for the U.S. Pacific Fleet Environmental Readiness Office). Honolulu, HI.

Hill, M. C., A. L. Bradford, D. Steel, C. S. Baker, A. D. Ligon, A. C. Ü, J. M. V. Acebes, O. A. Filatova, S. Hakala, N. Kobayashi, Y. Morimoto, H. Okabe, R. Okamoto, J. Rivers, T. Sato, O. V. Titova, R. K. Uyeyama, and E. M. Oleson. (2020). Found: A missing breeding ground for endangered western North Pacific humpback whales in the Mariana Archipelago. *Endangered Species Research, 41*, 91–103.

Hin, V., J. Harwood, and A. Roos. (2019). Bio-energetic modeling of medium-sized cetaceans shows high sensitivity to disturbance in seasons of low resource supply. *Ecological Applications, 25*(5), 1–19.

Hochachka, P. W., G. C. Liggins, G. P. Guyton, R. C. Schneider, K. S. Stanek, W. E. Hurford, R. K. Creasy, D. G. Zapol, and W. M. Zapol. (1995). Hormonal regulatory adjustments during voluntary diving in Weddell seals. *Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology B, 112*, 361–375.

Hoelzel, A. R., E. M. Dorsey, and S. J. Stern. (1989). The foraging specializations of individual minke whales. *Animal Behaviour, 38*, 786–794.

Holst, M., C. Greene, J. Richardson, T. McDonald, K. Bay, S. Schwartz, and G. Smith. (2011). Responses of pinnipeds to Navy missile launches at San Nicolas Island, California. *Aquatic Animals, 37*(2), 139–150.

Holt, M. M., D. P. Noren, V. Veirs, C. K. Emmons, and S. Veirs. (2008). Speaking up: Killer whales (*Orcinus orca*) increase their call amplitude in response to vessel noise. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 125*(1), EL27–EL32.

Holt, M. M., D. P. Noren, and C. K. Emmons. (2011). Effects of noise levels and call types on the source levels of killer whale calls. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 130*(5), 3100–3106.

Holt, M. M., D. P. Noren, R. C. Dunkin, and T. M. Williams. (2015). Vocal performance affects metabolic rate in dolphins: Implications for animals communicating in noisy environments. *The Journal of Experimental Biology, 218*(Pt 11), 1647–1654.

Holt, M. M., M. B. Hanson, D. A. Giles, C. K. Emmons, and J. T. Hogan. (2017). Noise levels received by endangered killer whales *Orcinus orca* before and after implementation of vessel regulations. *Endangered Species Research, 34*, 15–26.

Hooker, S. K., R. W. Baird, and A. Fahlman. (2009). Could beaked whales get the bends? Effect of diving behaviour and physiology on modelled gas exchange for three species: *Ziphius cavirostris, Mesoplodon densirostris* and *Hyperoodon ampullatus*. *Respiratory Physiology & Neurobiology, 167*(3), 235–246.

Hooker, S. K., A. Fahlman, M. J. Moore, N. A. de Soto, Y. B. de Quiros, A. O. Brubakk, D. P. Costa, A. M. Costidis, S. Dennison, K. J. Falke, A. Fernandez, M. Ferrigno, J. R. Fitz-Clarke, M. M. Garner, D. S. Houser, P. D. Jepson, D. R. Ketten, P. H. Kvadsheim, P. T. Madsen, N. W. Pollock, D. S. Rotstein, T. K. Rowles, S. E. Simmons, W. Van Bonn, P. K. Weathersby, M. J. Weise, T. M. Williams, and P. L. Tyack. (2012). Deadly diving? Physiological and behavioural management of decompression stress in diving mammals. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 279*(1731), 1041–1050.

Horton, T. W., N. Hauser, A. N. Zerbini, M. P. Francis, M. L. Domeier, A. Andriolo, D. P. Costa, P. W. Robinson, C. A. J. Duffy, N. Nasby-Lucas, R. N. Holdaway, and P. J. Clapham. (2017). Route fidelity during marine megafauna migration. *Frontiers in Marine Science, 4*, 1–21.

Horwood, J. (1987). *The Sei Whale: Population Biology, Ecology, and Management*. New York, NY: Croom Helm.

Horwood, J. (2009). Sei whale, *Balaenoptera borealis*. In W. F. Perrin, B. Wursig, & J. G. M. Thewissen (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Marine Mammals* (2nd ed., pp. 1001–1003). Cambridge, MA: Academic Press.

Hotchkin, C., and S. Parks. (2013). The Lombard effect and other noise-induced vocal modifications: Insight from mammalian communication systems. *Biological Reviews of the Cambridge Philosophical Society, 88*(4), 809–824.

Houser, D. S., R. Howard, and S. Ridgway. (2001). Can diving-induced tissue nitrogen supersaturation increase the chance of acoustically driven bubble growth in marine mammals? *Journal of Theoretical Biology, 213*, 183–195.

Houser, D. S., L. A. Dankiewicz-Talmadge, T. K. Stockard, and P. J. Ponganis. (2009). Investigation of the potential for vascular bubble formation in a repetitively diving dolphin. *The Journal of Experimental Biology, 213*, 52–62.

Houser, D. S., L. C. Yeates, and D. E. Crocker. (2011). Cold stress induces an adrenocortical response in bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*). *Journal of Zoo and Wildlife Medicine, 42*(4), 565–571.

Houser, D. S., S. W. Martin, and J. J. Finneran. (2013a). Behavioral responses of California sea lions to mid-frequency (3250-3450 Hz) sonar signals. *Marine Environmental Research, 92*, 268–278.

Houser, D. S., S. W. Martin, and J. J. Finneran. (2013b). Exposure amplitude and repetition affect bottlenose dolphin behavioral responses to simulated mid-frequency sonar signals. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology, 443*, 123–133.

Houser, D. S., S. Martin, D. E. Crocker, and J. J. Finneran. (2020). Endocrine response to simulated U.S. Navy mid-frequency sonar exposures in the bottlenose dolphin (*Tursiops truncatus*). *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 147*(3), 1681–1687.

Huggins, J. L., S. A. Raverty, S. A. Norman, J. Calambokidis, J. K. Gaydos, D. A. Duffield, D. M. Lambourn, J. M. Rice, B. Hanson, K. Wilkinson, S. J. Jeffries, B. Norberg, and L. Barre. (2015). Increased harbor porpoise mortality in the Pacific Northwest, USA: Understanding when higher levels may be normal. *Diseases of Aquatic Organisms, 115*(2), 93–102.

Hurford, W. E., P. W. Hochachka, R. C. Schneider, G. P. Guyton, K. S. Stanek, D. G. Zapol, G. C. Liggins, and W. M. Zapol. (1996). Splenic contraction, catecholamine release, and blood volume redistribution during diving in the Weddell seal. *Journal of Applied Physiology, 80*(1), 298–306.

Ilyashenko, V., P. J. Chapham, and R. L. Brownell. (2013). Soviet catches of whales in the North Pacific: Revised totals. *Journal of Cetacean Resource Management, 13*(1), 59–71.

Ilyashenko, V., R. L. Brownell, and P. J. Chapham. (2014). Distribution of Soviet catches of sperm whales (*Physeter macrocephalus)* in the North Pacific. *Endangered Species Research, 25*, 249–263.

Ilyashenko, V., and P. J. Chapham. (2014). Too much is never enough: The cautionary tale of Soviet illegal whaling. *Marine Fisheries Review, 76*(1–2), 21.

Ilyashenko, V., P. J. Chapham, and R. L. Brownell. (2015). *New Data on Soviet Blue Whale Catches in the Eastern North Pacific in 1972*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: International Whaling Committee Scientific Committee.

International Whaling Commission. (2016). Report of the Scientific Committee. *Journal of Cetacean Research and Management, 17*, 1–92.

Isojunno, S., and P. J. O. Miller. (2015). Sperm whale response to tag boat presence: Biologically informed hidden state models quantify lost feeding opportunities. *Ecosphere, 6*(1), 1–6.

Isojunno, S., C. Curé, P. H. Kvadsheim, F. A. Lam, P. L. Tyack, P. Jacobus, P. J. Wensveen, and P. J. O. Miller. (2016). Sperm whales reduce foraging effort during exposure to 1–2 kHz sonar and killer whale sounds. *Ecological Applications, 26*(1), 77–93.

Isojunno, S., D. Sadykova, S. DeRuiter, C. Cure, F. Visser, L. Thomas, P. J. O. Miller, and C. M. Harris. (2017). Individual, ecological, and anthropogenic influences on activity budgets of long-finned pilot whales. *Ecosphere, 8*(12), 1–26.

Isojunno, S., K. Aoki, C. Cure, P. H. Kvadsheim, and P. J. O. Miller. (2018). Breathing patterns indicate cost of exercise during diving and response to experimental sound exposures in Long-Finned Pilot Whales. *Frontiers in Physiology, 9*, 1462.

Isojunno, S., P. J. Wensveen, F. P. A. Lam, P. H. Kvadsheim, A. M. Von Benda-Beckmann, L. M. M. Lopez, L. Kleivane, E. M. Siegal, and P. J. O. Miller. (2020). When the noise goes on: Received sound energy predicts sperm whale responses to both intermittent and continuous navy sonar. *Journal of Experimental Biology, 223*(7).

Jacobsen, J. K., L. Massey, and F. Gulland. (2010). Fatal ingestion of floating net debris by two sperm whales (*Physeter macrocephalus*). *Marine Pollution Bulletin, 60*(5), 765–767.

Jahoda, M., C. L. Lafortuna, N. Biassoni, C. Almirante, A. Azzellino, S. Panigada, M. Zanardelli, and G. N. Di Sciara. (2003). Mediterranean fin whale's (*Balaenoptera physalus*) response to small vessels and biopsy sampling assessed through passive tracking and timing of respiration. *Marine Mammal Science, 19*(1), 96–110.

Jambeck, J. R., R. Geyer, C. Wilcox, T. R. Siegler, M. Perryman, A. Andrady, R. Narayan, and K. L. Law. (2015). Plastic waste inputs from land into the ocean. *Science, 347*(6223), 768–771.

Janik, V. M., and P. M. Thompson. (1996). Changes in surfacing patterns of bottlenose dolphins in response to boat traffic. *Marine Mammal Science, 12*(4), 597–602.

Jefferson, T. A., and S. Leatherwood. (1994). *Lagenodelphis hosei*. *American Society of Mammalogists, 470*, 1–5.

Jefferson, T. A., and B. E. Curry. (1996). Acoustic methods of reducing or eliminating marine mammal-fishery interactions: Do they work? *Ocean & Coastal Management, 31*(1), 41–70.

Jefferson, T. A., and N. B. Barros. (1997). *Peponocephala electra*. *Mammalian Species, 553*, 1–6.

Jefferson, T. A., D. Fertl, M. Michael, and T. D. Fagin. (2006). An unusual encounter with a mixed school of melon-headed whales (*Peponocephala electra*) and rough-toothed dolphins (*Steno bredanensis*) at Rota, Northern Mariana Islands. *Micronesica, 38*(2), 23–244.

Jefferson, T. A., M. A. Webber, and R. L. Pitman. (2008). *Marine Mammals of the World: A Comprehensive Guide to Their Identification*. London, United Kingdom: Elsevier.

Jefferson, T. A., M. A. Webber, and R. L. Pitman. (2015). *Marine Mammals of the World: A Comprehensive Guide to Their Identification* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, MA: Academic Press.

Jepson, P. D., M. Arbelo, R. Deaville, I. A. R. Patterson, P. Castro, J. R. Baker, E. Degollada, H. M. Ross, P. Herráez, A. M. Pocknell, F. Rodriguez, F. E. Howie, A. Espinosa, R. J. Reid, J. R. Jaber, V. Martin, A. A. Cunningham, and A. Fernandez. (2003). Gas-bubble lesions in stranded cetaceans: Was sonar responsible for a spate of whale deaths after an Atlantic military exercise? *Nature, 425*, 575–576.

Jepson, P. D., P. M. Bennett, R. Deaville, C. R. Allchin, J. R. Baker, and R. J. Law. (2005). Relationships between polychlorinated biphenyls and health status in harbor porpoises (*Phocoena phocoena*) stranded in the United Kingdom. *Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry, 24*(1), 238–248.

Jepson, P. D., and R. J. Law. (2016). Persistent pollutants, persistent threats; polychlorinated biphenyls remain a major threat to marine apex predators such as orcas. *Science, 352*(6292), 1388–1389.

Johnson, C. S., M. W. McManus, and D. Skaar. (1989). Masked tonal hearing thresholds in the beluga whale. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 85*(6), 2651–2654.

Joyce, K. E., S. Duce, S. M. Leahy, J. Leon, and S. W. Maier. (2018). Principles and practice of acquiring drone-based image data in marine environments. *Marine and Freshwater Research*.

Joyce, T. W., J. W. Durban, D. E. Claridge , C. a. Dunn, L. S. Hickmott, H. Fearnbach, K. Dolan, and D. Moretti. (2019). Behavioral responses of satellite tracked Blainville's beaked whales (*Mesoplodon densirostris*) to mid-frequency active sonar. *Marine Mammal Science*, 1–18.

Juhasz, A. L., and R. Naidu. (2007). Explosives: Fate, dynamics, and ecological impact in terrestrial and marine environments. *Reviews of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology, 191*, 163–215.

Kaluza, P., A. Kölzsch, M. T. Gastner, and B. Blasius. (2010). The complex network of global cargo ship movements. *Proceedings of the Royal Society, 7*(48), 11.

Kami, H. T. (1982). Recent Beachings of Whales on Guam. *Micronesica, 18*, 133–135.

Kastak, D., B. L. Southall, R. J. Schusterman, and C. R. Kastak. (2005). Underwater temporary threshold shift in pinnipeds: Effects of noise level and duration. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 118*(5), 3154–3163.

Kastak, D., C. Reichmuth, M. M. Holt, J. Mulsow, B. L. Southall, and R. J. Schusterman. (2007). Onset, growth, and recovery of in-air temporary threshold shift in a California sea lion (*Zalophus californianus*). *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 122*(5), 2916–2924.

Kastelein, R., N. Jennings, W. Verboom, D. de Haan, and N. M. Schooneman. (2006). Differences in the response of a striped dolphin *(Stenella coeruleoalba)* and a harbor porpoise *(Phocoena phocoena)* to an acoustic alarm. *Marine Environmental Research, 61*, 363–378.

Kastelein, R. A., D. de Haan, N. Vaughan, C. Staal, and N. M. Schooneman. (2001). The influence of three acoustic alarms on the behaviour of harbour porpoises (*Phocoena phocoena*) in a floating pen. *Marine Environmental Research, 52*, 351–371.

Kastelein, R. A., M. Janssen, W. C. Verboom, and D. de Haan. (2005a). Receiving beam patterns in the horizontal plane of a harbor porpoise (*Phocoena phocoena*). *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 118*(2), 1172–1179.

Kastelein, R. A., W. C. Verboom, M. Muijsers, N. V. Jennings, and S. van der Heul. (2005b). The influence of acoustic emissions for underwater data transmission on the behaviour of harbour porpoises (*Phocoena phocoena)* in a floating pen. *Marine Environmental Research, 59*, 287–307.

Kastelein, R. A., and P. J. Wensveen. (2008). Effect of two levels of masking noise on the hearing threshold of a harbor porpoise (*Phocoena phocoena*) for a 4.0 kHz signal. *Aquatic Mammals, 34*(4), 420–425.

Kastelein, R. A., R. Gransier, L. Hoek, A. Macleod, and J. M. Terhune. (2012a). Hearing threshold shifts and recovery in harbor seals (*Phoca vitulina*) after octave-band noise exposure at 4 kHz. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 132*(4), 2745–2761.

Kastelein, R. A., R. Gransier, L. Hoek, and J. Olthuis. (2012b). Temporary threshold shifts and recovery in a harbor porpoise (*Phocoena phocoena*) after octave-band noise at 4 kHz. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 132*(5), 3525–3537.

Kastelein, R. A., R. Gransier, L. Hoek, and M. Rambags. (2013a). Hearing frequency thresholds of a harbor porpoise (*Phocoena phocoena*) temporarily affected by a continuous 1.5 kHz tone. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 134*(3), 2286–2292.

Kastelein, R. A., D. van Heerden, R. Gransier, and L. Hoek. (2013b). Behavioral responses of a harbor porpoise (*Phoceoena phocoena*) to playbacks of broadband pile driving sounds. *Marine Environmental Research, 92*, 206–214.

Kastelein, R. A., L. Hoek, R. Gransier, C. A. F. de Jong, J. M. Terhune, and N. Jennings. (2014a). Hearing thresholds of a harbor porpoise (*Phocoena phocoena*) for playbacks of seal scarer signals, and effects of the signals on behavior. *Hydrobiologia, 756*(1), 89–103.

Kastelein, R. A., L. Hoek, R. Gransier, M. Rambags, and N. Claeys. (2014b). Effect of level, duration, and inter-pulse interval of 1–2 kHz sonar signal exposures on harbor porpoise hearing. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 136*(1), 412–422.

Kastelein, R. A., J. Schop, R. Gransier, and L. Hoek. (2014c). Frequency of greatest temporary hearing threshold shift in harbor porpoises (*Phocoena phocoena*) depends on the noise level. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 136*(3), 1410–1418.

Kastelein, R. A., J. Schop, R. Gransier, N. Steen, and N. Jennings. (2014d). Effect of series of 1 to 2 kHz and 6 to 7 kHz up-sweeps and down-sweeps on the behavior of a harbor porpoise (*Phocoena phocoena*). *Aquatic Mammals, 40*(3), 232–242.

Kastelein, R. A., R. Gransier, M. A. T. Marijt, and L. Hoek. (2015a). Hearing frequency thresholds of harbor porpoises (*Phocoena phocoena*) temporarily affected by played back offshore pile driving sounds. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 137*(2), 556–564.

Kastelein, R. A., R. Gransier, J. Schop, and L. Hoek. (2015b). Effects of exposure to intermittent and continuous 6–7 kHz sonar sweeps on harbor porpoise (*Phocoena phocoena*) hearing. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 137*(4), 1623–1633.

Kastelein, R. A., I. van den Belt, R. Gransier, and T. Johansson. (2015c). Behavioral responses of a harbor porpoise (*Phocoena phocoena*) to 25.5- to 24.5-kHz sonar down-sweeps with and without side bands. *Aquatic Mammals, 41*(4), 400–411.

Kastelein, R. A., I. van den Belt, L. Helder-Hoek, R. Gransier, and T. Johansson. (2015d). Behavioral responses of a harbor porpoise (*Phocoena phocoena*) to 25-kHz FM sonar signals. *Aquatic Mammals, 41*(3), 311–326.

Kastelein, R. A., L. Helder-Hoek, J. Covi, and R. Gransier. (2016). Pile driving playback sounds and temporary threshold shift in harbor porpoises (*Phocoena phocoena*): Effect of exposure duration. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 139*(5), 2842–2851.

Kastelein, R. A., L. Helder-Hoek, and S. Van de Voorde. (2017a). Hearing thresholds of a male and a female harbor porpoise (*Phocoena phocoena*). *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 142*(2), 1006–1010.

Kastelein, R. A., L. Helder-Hoek, and S. Van de Voorde. (2017b). Effects of exposure to sonar playback sounds (3.5 - 4.1 kHz) on harbor porpoise (*Phocoena phocoena*) hearing. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 142*(4), 1965.

Kastelein, R. A., L. Helder-Hoek, S. Van de Voorde, A. M. von Benda-Beckmann, F. A. Lam, E. Jansen, C. A. F. de Jong, and M. A. Ainslie. (2017c). Temporary hearing threshold shift in a harbor porpoise (*Phocoena phocoena*) after exposure to multiple airgun sounds. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 142*(4), 2430.

Kastelein, R. A., J. Huybrechts, J. Covi, and L. Helder-Hoek. (2017d). Behavioral responses of a harbor porpoise (*Phocoena phocoena*) to sounds from an acoustic porpoise deterrent. *Aquatic Mammals, 43*(3), 233–244.

Kastelein, R. A., L. Helder-Hoek, S. Van de Voorde, S. de Winter, S. Janssen, and M. A. Ainslie. (2018). Behavioral responses of harbor porpoises (*Phocoena phocoena*) to sonar playback sequences of sweeps and tones (3.5-4.1 kHz). *Aquatic Mammals, 44*(4), 389–404.

Kastelein, R. A., M. A. Ainslie, and R. van Kester. (2019a). Behavioral Responses of Harbor Porpoises (*Phocoena phocoena*) to U.S. Navy 53C Sonar Signals in Noise. *Aquatic Mammals, 45*(4), 359-366.

Kastelein, R. A., L. Helder-Hoek, and R. Gransier. (2019b). Frequency of greatest temporary hearing threshold shift in harbor seals (*Phoca vitulina*) depends on fatiguing sound level. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 145*(3), 1353–1362.

Kastelein, R. A., S. A. Cornelisse, L. A. Huijser, and L. Helder-Hoek. (2020). Temporary hearing threshold shift in harbor porpoises (*Phocoena phocoena*) due to one-sixth-octave noise bands at 63 kHz. *Aquatic Mammals, 46*(2), 167–182.

Kasuya, T. (1971). Consideration of distribution and migration of toothed whales off the Pacific coast of Japan based upon aerial sighting record. *Scientific Reports of the Whales Research Institute, 23*, 37–60.

Kato, H., and W. F. Perrin. (2009). Bryde's whales, *Balaenoptera edeni/brydei*. In W. F. Perrin, B. Wursig, & J. G. M. Thewissen (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Marine Mammals* (2nd ed., pp. 158–163). Cambridge, MA: Academic Press.

Keck, N., O. Kwiatek, F. Dhermain, F. Dupraz, H. Boulet, C. Danes, C. Laprie, A. Perrin, J. Godenir, L. Micout, and G. Libeau. (2010). Resurgence of *Morbillivirus* infection in Mediterranean dolphins off the French coast. *Veterinary Record, 166*(21), 654–655.

Kelley, C., G. Carton, M. Tomlinson, and A. Gleason. (2016). Analysis of towed camera images to determine the effects of disposed mustard-filled bombs on the deep water benthic community off south Oahu. *Deep Sea Research Part II: Topical Studies in Oceanography, 128*, 34–42.

Kemp, N. J. (1996). Habitat loss and degradation. In M. P. Simmonds & J. D. Hutchinson (Eds.), *The Conservation of Whales and Dolphins* (pp. 263–280). New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.

Ketten, D. R., J. Lien, and S. Todd. (1993). Blast injury in humpback whale ears: Evidence and implications. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 94*(3), 1849–1850.

Ketten, D. R. (1998). *Marine Mammal Auditory Systems: A Summary of Audiometric and Anatomical Data and Its Implications for Underwater Acoustic Impacts*. La Jolla, CA: U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service, Southwest Fisheries Science Center.

Ketten, D. R. (2000). Cetacean Ears. In W. Au, A. N. Popper, & R. R. Fay (Eds.), *Hearing by Whales and Dolphins* (1st ed., pp. 43–108). New York, NY: Springer-Verlag.

Kindt-Larsen, L., C. W. Berg, S. Northridge, and F. Larsen. (2019). Harbor porpoise (*Phocoena phocoena*) reactions to pingers. *Marine Mammal Science*, 1–38.

King, S. L., R. S. Schick, C. Donovan, C. G. Booth, M. Burgman, L. Thomas, and J. Harwood. (2015). An interim framework for assessing the population consequences of disturbance. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution, 6*(10), 1150–1158.

Kishiro, T. (1996). Movements of marked Bryde's whales in the western North Pacific. *Reports of the International Whaling Commission, 46*, 421–428.

Klinck, H., S. L. Nieukirk, S. Fregosi, K. Klinck, D. K. Mellinger, S. Lastuka, G. B. Shilling, and J. C. Luby. (2016a). *Final Report Cetacean Studies on the Mariana Islands Range Complex in March–April 2015: Passive Acoustic Monitoring of Marine Mammals Using Gliders* (Submitted to Naval Facilities Engineering Command (NAVFAC) Pacific, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii). Honolulu, HI: HDR Inc.

Klinck, H., S. L. Nieukirk, S. Fregosi, K. Klinck, D. K. Mellinger, S. Lastuka, G. B. Shilling, and J. C. Luby. (2016b). *Cetacean Studies on the Kona Coast in March 2010: Passive Acoustic Monitoring of Marine Mammals Using Gliders–Results from an Engineering Test. Final Report*. Honolulu, HI: HDR Inc.

Kobayashi, N., H. Okabe, I. Kawazu, N. Higashi, H. Miyahara, H. Kato, and S. Uchida. (2016). Spatial distribution and habitat use patterns of humpack whales in Okinawa, Japan. *Mammal Study, 41*, 207–214.

Koen-Alonso, M., S. N. Pedraza, A. C. M. Schiavini, R. N. P. Goodall, and E. A. Crespo. (1999). Stomach contents of false killer whales (*Pseudorca crassidens*) stranded on the coasts of the Strait of Magellan, Tierra Del Fuego. *Marine Mammal Science, 15*(3), 712–724.

Koide, S., J. A. K. Silva, V. Dupra, and M. Edwards. (2016). Bioaccumulation of chemical warfare agents, energetic materials, and metals in deep-sea shrimp from discarded military munitions sites off Pearl Harbor. *Deep Sea Research Part II: Topical Studies in Oceanography, 128*, 53–62.

Kooyman, G. L., J. P. Schroeder, D. M. Denison, D. D. Hammond, J. J. Wright, and W. P. Bergman. (1972). Blood nitrogen tensions of seals during simulated deep dives. *American Journal of Physiology, 223*(5), 1016–1020.

Kooyman, G. L., D. H. Kerem, W. B. Campbell, and J. J. Wright. (1973). Pulmonary gas exchange in freely diving Weddell seals, *Leptonychotes weddelli*. *Respiration Physiology, 17*, 283–290.

Kooyman, G. L., and E. E. Sinnett. (1982). Pulmonary shunts in harbor seals and sea lions during simulated dives to depth. *Physiological Zoology 55*(1), 105–111.

Koski, W. R., J. W. Lawson, D. H. Thomson, and W. J. Richardson. (1998). *Point Mugu Sea Range Marine Mammal Technical Report*. San Diego, CA: Naval Air Warfare Center, Weapons Division and Southwest Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command.

Koski, W. R., G. Gamage, A. R. Davis, T. Mathews, B. LeBlanc, and S. H. Ferguson. (2015). Evaluation of UAS for photographic re-identification of bowhead whales, *Balaena mysticetus*. *Journal of Unmanned Vehicle Systems, 3*(1), 22–29.

Krahn, M. M., M. B. Hanson, R. W. Baird, R. H. Boyer, D. G. Burrows, C. K. Emmons, J. K. Ford, L. L. Jones, D. P. Noren, P. S. Ross, G. S. Schorr, and T. K. Collier. (2007). Persistent organic pollutants and stable isotopes in biopsy samples (2004/2006) from Southern Resident killer whales. *Marine Pollution Bulletin, 54*(12), 1903–1911.

Krahn, M. M., M. B. Hanson, G. S. Schorr, C. K. Emmons, D. G. Burrows, J. L. Bolton, R. W. Baird, and G. M. Ylitalo. (2009). Effects of age, sex and reproductive status on persistent organic pollutant concentrations in "Southern Resident" killer whales. *Marine Pollution Bulletin, 58*(10), 1522–1529.

Kremers, D., J. Lopez Marulanda, M. Hausberger, and A. Lemasson. (2014). Behavioural evidence of magnetoreception in dolphins: Detection of experimental magnetic fields. *Die Naturwissenschaften, 101*(11), 907–911.

Kremers, D., A. Celerier, B. Schaal, S. Campagna, M. Trabalon, M. Boye, M. Hausberger, and A. Lemasson. (2016). Sensory Perception in Cetaceans: Part II—Promising Experimental Approaches to Study Chemoreception in Dolphins. *Frontiers in Ecology and Evolution, 4*(50), 1–9.

Kruse, S. (1991). The interactions between killer whales and boats in Johnstone Strait, B.C. In K. Pryor & K. S. Norris (Eds.), *Dolphin Societies: Discoveries and Puzzles* (pp. 149–159). Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.

Kryter, K. D., W. D. Ward, J. D. Miller, and D. H. Eldredge. (1965). Hazardous exposure to intermittent and steady-state noise. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 39*(3), 451–464.

Kujawa, S. G., and M. C. Liberman. (2009). Adding insult to injury: Cochlear nerve degeneration after "temporary" noise-induced hearing loss. *The Journal of Neuroscience, 29*(45), 14077–14085.

Kuker, K. J., J. A. Thomson, and U. Tscherter. (2005). Novel surface feeding tactics of minke whales, *Balaenoptera acutorostrata*, in the Saguenay-St. Lawrence National Marine Park. *Canadian Field-Naturalist, 119*(2), 214–218.

Kuningas, S., P. H. Kvadsheim, F. P. A. Lam, and P. J. O. Miller. (2013). Killer whale presence in relation to naval sonar activity and prey abundance in northern Norway. *ICES Journal of Marine Science, 70*(7), 1287–1293.

Kvadsheim, P. H., E. M. Sevaldsen, L. P. Folkow, and A. S. Blix. (2010). Behavioural and physiological responses of hooded seals (*Cytophora cristata*) to 1 to 7 kHz sonar signals. *Aquatic Mammals, 36*(3), 239–247.

Kvadsheim, P. H., P. J. Miller, P. L. Tyack, L. D. Sivle, F. P. Lam, and A. Fahlman. (2012). Estimated Tissue and Blood N_2 Levels and Risk of Decompression Sickness in Deep-, Intermediate-, and Shallow-Diving Toothed Whales during Exposure to Naval Sonar. *Frontiers in Physiology, 3*(Article 125), 125.

Kvadsheim, P. H., S. DeRuiter, L. D. Sivle, J. Goldbogen, R. Roland-Hansen, P. J. O. Miller, F. A. Lam, J. Calambokidis, A. Friedlaender, F. Visser, P. L. Tyack, L. Kleivane, and B. Southall. (2017). Avoidance responses of minke whales to 1-4 kHz naval sonar. *Marine Pollution Bulletin, 121*(1–2), 60–68.

Kyhn, L. A., P. B. Jørgensen, J. Carstensen, N. I. Bech, J. Tougaard, T. Dabelsteen, and J. Teilmann. (2015). Pingers cause temporary habitat displacement in the harbour porpoise *Phocoena phocoena*. *Marine Ecology Progress Series, 526*, 253–265.

Laggner, D. (2009). *Blue whale (Baleanoptera musculus) ship strike threat assessment in the Santa Barbara Channel, California.* (Unpublished master's thesis). The Evergreen State College, Olympia, WA. Retrieved from http://archives.evergreen.edu.

Laist, D. W. (1997). Impacts of marine debris: Entanglement of marine life in marine debris including a comprehensive list of species with entanglement and ingestion records. In J. M. Coe & D. B.

Rogers (Eds.), *Marine Debris: Sources, Impacts, and Solutions* (pp. 99–140). New York, NY: Springer-Verlag.

Laist, D. W., A. R. Knowlton, J. G. Mead, A. S. Collet, and M. Podesta. (2001). Collisions between ships and whales. *Marine Mammal Science, 17*(1), 35–75.

Lammers, M. O. (2004). Occurence and behavior of Hawaiian spinner dolphins (*Stenella longirostris*) along Oahu's leeward and south shores. *Aquatic Mammals, 30*(2), 237–250.

Lammers, M. O., M. Howe, E. Zang, M. McElligott, A. Engelhaupt, and L. Munger. (2017). Acoustic monitoring of coastal dolphins and their response to naval mine neutralization exercises. *Royal Society Open Science, 4*(12), e170558.

Law, R. J. (2014). An overview of time trends in organic contaminant concentrations in marine mammals: Going up or down? *Marine Pollution Bulletin, 82*(1–2), 7–10.

Leatherwood, S., W. F. Perrin, V. L. Kirby, C. L. Hubbs, and M. Dahlheim. (1980). Distribution and movements of Risso's dolphin, *Grampus griseus*, in the eastern North Pacific. *Fishery Bulletin, 77*(4), 951–963.

Leatherwood, S., F. T. Awbrey, and J. A. Thomas. (1982). Minke whale response to a transiting survey vessel. *Reports of the International Whaling Commission, 32*, 795–802.

Lefebvre, K. A., L. Quakenbush, E. Frame, K. B. Huntington, G. Sheffield, R. Stimmelmayr, A. Bryan, P. Kendrick, H. Ziel, T. Goldstein, J. A. Snyder, T. Gelatt, F. Gulland, b. Dickerson, and V. Gill. (2016). Prevalence of algal toxins in Alaskan marine mammals foraging in a changing arctic and subarctic environment. *Harmful Algae, 55*(2016), 13–24.

Lemonds, D. W., L. N. Kloepper, P. E. Nachtigall, W. W. Au, S. A. Vlachos, and B. K. Branstetter. (2011). A re-evaluation of auditory filter shape in delphinid odontocetes: Evidence of constant-bandwidth filters. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 130*(5), 3107–3114.

Lent, R., and D. Squires. (2017). Reducing marine mammal bycatch in global fisheries: An economics approach. *Deep-Sea Research II: Topical Studies in Oceanography, 140*, 268–277.

Lesage, V., C. Barrette, M. C. S. Kingsley, and B. Sjare. (1999). The effect of vessel noise on the vocal behavior of belugas in the St. Lawrence River estuary, Canada. *Marine Mammal Science, 15*(1), 65–84.

Lesage, V., A. Omrane, T. Daniol-Valcroze, and A. Mosnier. (2017). Increased proximity of vessels reduces feeding opportunities of blue whales in the St. Lawrence Estuary, Canada. *Endangered Species Research, 32*, 351–361.

Leslie, M. S., and P. A. Morin. (2018). Structure and phylogeography of two tropical predators, spinner (*Stenella longirostris*) and pantropical spotted (*S. attenuata*) dolphins, from SNP data. *Royal Society Open Science, 5*(4), 171615.

Li, S., T. Akamatsu, D. Wang, K. Wang, S. Dong, X. Zhao, Z. Wei, X. Zhang, B. Taylor, L. A. Barrett, S. T. Turvey, R. R. Reeves, B. S. Stewart, M. Richlen, and J. R. Brandon. (2008). Indirect evidence of boat avoidance behavior of Yangtze finless porpoises. *Bioacoustics, 17*, 174–176.

Li, S., H. Wu, Y. Xu, C. Peng, L. Fang, M. Lin, L. Xing, and P. Zhang. (2015). Mid- to high-frequency noise from high-speed boats and its potential impacts on humpback dolphins. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 138*(2), 942–952.

Ligon, A. D., M. H. Deakos, and C. U. Adam. (2011). *Small-boat cetacean surveys off Guam and Saipan, Mariana Islands, February - March 2010*. Honolulu, HI: Pacific Island Fisheries Science Center.

Lin, H. W., A. C. Furman, S. G. Kujawa, and M. C. Liberman. (2011). Primary neural degeneration in the guinea pig cochlea after reversible noise-induced threshold shift. *Journal of the Association for Research in Otolaryngology, 12*(5), 605–616.

Lindstrom, U., and T. Haug. (2001). Feeding strategy and prey selectivity in common minke whales (*Balaenoptera acutorostrata*) foraging in the southern Barents Sea during early summer. *Journal of Cetacean Research and Management, 3*(3), 239–250.

Liu, M., L. Dong, M. Lin, and S. Li. (2017). Broadband ship noise and its potential impacts on Indo-Pacific humpback dolphins: Implications for conservation and management. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 142*(5), 2766.

Long, D. J. (1991). Apparent Predation by a White Shark *Carcharodon carcharias* on a Pygmy Sperm Whale *Kogia breviceps*. *Fishery Bulletin, 89*, 538–540.

Lucke, K., U. Siebert, P. A. Lepper, and M. Blanchet. (2009). Temporary shift in masked hearing thresholds in a harbor porpoise (*Phocoena phocoena*) after exposure to seismic airgun stimuli. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 125*(6), 4060–4070.

Luís, A. R., M. N. Couchinho, and M. E. dos Santos. (2014). Changes in the acoustic behavior of resident bottlenose dolphins near operating vessels. *Marine Mammal Science, 30*(4), 1417–1426.

Lukoschek, V., N. Funahashi, S. Lavery, M. L. Dalebout, F. Cipriano, and C. S. Baker. (2009). The rise of commercial 'by-catch whaling' in Japan and Korea. *Animal Conservation, 12*, 398–399.

Luksenburg, J. A., and E. C. M. Parsons. (2009). *The effects of aircraft on cetaceans: Implications for aerial whalewatching*. Paper presented at the 61st Meeting of the International Whaling Commission. Madeira, Portugal.

Lusseau, D. (2004). The hidden cost of tourism: Detecting long-term effects of tourism using behavioral information. *Ecology and Society, 9*(1), 2.

Lusseau, D. (2006). The short-term behavioral reactions of bottlenose dolphins to interactions with boats in Doubtful Sound, New Zealand. *Marine Mammal Science, 22*(4), 802–818.

Lusseau, D., and L. Bejder. (2007). The long-term consequences of short-term responses to disturbance experiences from whalewatching impact assessment. *International Journal of Comparative Psychology, 20*, 228–236.

Lusseau, D., D. E. Bain, R. Williams, and J. C. Smith. (2009). Vessel traffic disrupts the foraging behavior of southern resident killer whales, *Orcinus orca*. *Endangered Species Research, 6*, 211–221.

Lyamin, O. I., S. M. Korneva, V. V. Rozhnov, and L. M. Mukhametov. (2011). Cardiorespiratory changes in beluga in response to acoustic noise. *Doklady Biological Sciences, 440*(5), 704–707.

Lynch, J. F., G. G. Glen, Y. Lin, T. F. Duda, and A. E. Newhall. (2018). Impacts of ocean warming on acoustic propogation over continental shelf and slope regions. *Oceanography, 31,* 174–181.

Machernis, A., J. R. Powell, L. K. Engleby, and T. R. Spradlin. (2018). *An Updated Literature Review Examining the Impacts of Tourism on Marine Mammals over the Last Fifteen Years (2000-2015) to Inform Research and Management Programs*. St. Petersburg, FL: National Marine Fisheries Service, Southeast Regional Office.

MacLeod, C., W. F. Perrin, R. Pitman, J. Barlow, L. Ballance, A. D'Amico, T. Gerrodette, G. Joyce, K. D. Mullin, D. L. Palka, and G. T. Waring. (2006). Known and inferred distributions of beaked whale species (family Ziphiidae; Order Cetacea). *Journal of Cetacean Research and Management, 7*(3), 271–286.

MacLeod, C. D. (2000). Review of the distribution of *Mesoplodon* species (order Cetacea, family Ziphiidae) in the North Atlantic. *Mammal Review, 30*(1), 1–8.

MacLeod, C. D., N. Hauser, and H. Peckham. (2004). Diversity, relative density and structure of the cetacean community in summer months east of Great Abaco, Bahamas. *Journal of the Marine Biological Association of the United Kingdom, 84*, 469–474.

MacLeod, C. D., and A. D'Amico. (2006). A review of beaked whale behaviour and ecology in relation to assessing and mitigating impacts of anthropogenic noise. *Journal of Cetacean Research and Management, 7*(3), 211–222.

MacLeod, C. D., and G. Mitchell. (2006). Key areas for beaked whales worldwide. *Journal of Cetacean Research and Management, 7*(3), 309–322.

Madsen, P., M. Johnson, P. Miller, N. Soto, J. Lynch, and P. Tyack. (2006). Quantitative measures of air-gun pulses recorded on sperm whales (*Physeter macrocephalus*) using acoustic tags during controlled exposure experiments. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 120*(4), 2366–2379.

Madsen, P. T., D. A. Carder, K. Bedholm, and S. H. Ridgway. (2005). Porpoise clicks from a sperm whale nose—Convergent evolution of 130 kHz pulses in toothed whale sonars? *Bioacoustics, 15*, 195–206.

Magalhães, S., R. Prieto, M. A. Silva, J. Gonçalves, M. Afonso-Dias, and R. S. Santos. (2002). Short-term reactions of sperm whales (*Physeter macrocephalus*) to whale-watching vessels in the Azores. *Aquatic Mammals, 28*(3), 267–274.

Malme, C. I., B. Würsig, J. E. Bird, and P. Tyack. (1986). *Behavioral responses of gray whales to industrial noise: Feeding observations and predictive modelling* (Outer Continental Shelf Environmental Assessment Program, Final Report of Principal Investigators MMS 88-0048). Anchorage, AK: Bolt Beranek, & Newman, Inc.

Malme, C. I., B. Würsig, J. E. Bird, and P. Tyack. (1988). Observations of feeding gray whale responses to controlled industrial noise exposure. In W. M. Sackinger, M. O. Jeffries, J. L. Imm, & S. D. Tracey (Eds.), *Port and Ocean Engineering Under Arctic Conditions* (Vol. 2, pp. 55–73). Fairbanks, AK: Geophysical Institute, University of Alaska.

Manci, K. M., D. N. Gladwin, R. Villella, and M. G. Cavendish. (1988). *Effects of Aircraft Noise and Sonic Booms on Domestic Animals and Wildlife: A Literature Synthesis* (NERC-88/29). Fort Collins, CO: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Ecology Research Center.

Manzano-Roth, R., E. E. Henderson, S. W. Martin, C. Martin, and B. M. Matsuyama. (2016). Impacts of U.S. Navy training events on Blainville's beaked whale (*Mesoplodon densirostris*) foraging dives in Hawaiian waters. *Aquatic Mammals, 42*(4), 507–518.

Marcoux, M., H. Whitehead, and L. Rendell. (2007). Sperm whale feeding variations by location, year, social group and clan: Evidence from stable isotopes. *Marine Ecology Progress Series, 333*, 309–314.

Marega, M., G. Henrique, Y. Le Pendu, P. da Silva, and A. Schiavetti. (2018). Behavioral responses of *Sotalia guianensis* (Cetartiodactyla, Delphinidae) to boat approaches in northeast Brazil. *Latin American Journal of Aquatic Research, 46*(2), 268–279.

Marine Mammal Commission. (2010). *The Marine Mammal Commission Annual Report to Congress 2009*. Bethesda, MD: Marine Mammal Commission.

Marsh, H. E. (1989). Mass stranding of dugongs by a tropical cyclone in northern Australia. *Marine Mammal Science, 5*(1), 78–84.

Marten, K., and S. Psarakos. (1999). Long-term site fidelity and possible long-term associations of wild spinner dolphins (*Stenella longirostris*) seen off Oahu, Hawaii. *Marine Mammal Science, 15*(4), 1329–1336.

Martien, K. K., R. W. Baird, N. M. Hedrick, A. M. Gorgone, J. L. Thieleking, D. J. McSweeney, K. M. Robertson, and D. L. Webster. (2012). Population structure of island-associated dolphins: Evidence from mitochondrial and microsatellite markers for common bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*) around the main Hawaiian Islands. *Marine Mammal Science, 28*(3), E208–E232.

Martien, K. K., S. J. Chivers, R. W. Baird, F. I. Archer, A. M. Gorgone, B. L. Hancock-Hanser, D. Mattila, D. J. McSweeney, E. M. Oleson, C. Palmer, V. L. Pease, K. M. Robertson, G. S. Schorr, M. B. Schultz, D. L. Webster, and B. L. Taylor. (2014a). Nuclear and mitochondrial patterns of population structure in North Pacific false killer whales (*Pseudorca crassidens*). *The Journal of Heredity, 105*(5), 611–626.

Martien, K. K., M. C. Hill, A. M. Van Cise, K. M. Robertson, S. M. Woodman, L. Dollar, V. L. Pease, and E. M. Oleson. (2014b). *Genetic Diversity and Population Structure in Four Species of Cetaceans Around the Mariana Islands* (NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SWFSC-536). La Jolla, CA: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service, Southwest Fisheries Science Center.

Martin, C. R., S. W. Martin, E. E. Henderson, T. A. Helble, R. A. Manzano-Roth, B. M. Matsuyama, and G. C. Alongi. (2017). *SSC Pacific FY16 annual report on PMRF Marine Mammal Monitoring. Final Report*. San Diego, CA: National Marine Mammal Foundation and Space and Naval Warfare Systems Center Pacific.

Martin, S. L., K. S. Van Houtan, T. T. Jones, C. F. Aguon, J. T. Gutierrez, R. B. Tibbatts, S. B. Wusstig, and J. D. Bass. (2016). Five decades of marine megafauna surveys from Micronesia. *Frontiers in Marine Science, 2*(116), 1–13.

Martin, S. W., C. R. Martin, B. M. Matsuyama, and E. E. Henderson. (2015). Minke whales (*Balaenoptera acutorostrata*) respond to navy training. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 137*(5), 2533–2541.

Masaki, Y. (1972). Tagging Investigations of Whales in the Ogasawara and Mariana Islands. *Japan Whaling Association Institute of Cetacean Research, 249*, 35–42.

Matkin, C. O., E. L. Saulitis, G. M. Ellis, P. Olesiuk, and S. D. Rice. (2008). Ongoing population-level impacts on killer whales, *Orcinus orca,* following the 'Exxon Valdez' oil spill in Prince William Sound, Alaska. *Marine Ecology Progress Series, 356*, 269–281.

Mattson, M. C., J. A. Thomas, and D. St. Aubin. (2005). Effects of boat activity on the behavior of bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*) in waters surrounding Hilton Head Island, South Carolina. *Aquatic Mammals, 31*(1), 133–140.

May-Collado, L. J., and D. Wartzok. (2008). A comparison of bottlenose dolphin whistles in the Atlantic Ocean: Factors promoting whistle variation. *Journal of Mammalogy, 89*(5), 1229–1240.

McAlpine, D. F. (2009). Pygmy and dwarf sperm whales *Kogia breviceps* and *K. sima*. In W. F. Perrin, B. Wursig, & J. G. M. Thewissen (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Marine Mammals* (2nd ed., pp. 936–938). Cambridge, MA: Academic Press.

McCarthy, E., D. Moretti, L. Thomas, N. DiMarzio, R. Morrissey, S. Jarvis, J. Ward, A. Izzi, and A. Dilley. (2011). Changes in spatial and temporal distribution and vocal behavior of Blainville's beaked whales (*Mesoplodon densirostris*) during multiship exercises with mid-frequency sonar. *Marine Mammal Science, 27*(3), E206–E226.

McCauley, R. D., M. N. Jenner, C. Jenner, K. A. McCabe, and J. Murdoch. (1998). The response of humpback whales (*Megaptera novaeangliae*) to offshore seismic survey noise: Preliminary results of observations about a working seismic vessel and experimental exposures. *Australian Petroleum Production and Exploration Association Journal, 38*, 692–706.

McCauley, R. D., J. Fewtrell, A. J. Duncan, C. Jenner, M.-N. Jenner, J. D. Penrose, R. I. T. Prince, A. Adhitya, J. Murdoch, and K. A. McCabe. (2000). *Marine Seismic Surveys: Analysis and Propagation of Air-gun Signals; and Effects of Air-gun Exposure on Humpback Whales, Sea Turtles, Fishes and Squid*. Bentley, Australia: Centre for Marine Science and Technology.

McDonald, B. I., and P. J. Ponganis. (2012). Lung collapse in the diving sea lion: Hold the nitrogen and save the oxygen. *Biology Letters, 8*, 1047–1049.

McDonald, M., J. Hildebrand, S. Wiggins, and D. Ross. (2008). A 50 year comparison of ambient ocean noise near San Clemente Island: A bathymetrically complex coastal region off Southern California. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 124*(4), 1985–1992.

McDonald, M. A., J. A. Hildebrand, and S. C. Webb. (1995). Blue and fin whales observed on a seafloor array in the Northeast Pacific. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 98*(2), 712–721.

McDonald, M. A., J. A. Hildebrand, S. M. Wiggins, D. W. Johnston, and J. J. Polovina. (2009). An acoustic survey of beaked whales at Cross Seamount near Hawaii. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 125*(2), 624–627.

McHuron, E. A., L. K. Schwarz, D. P. Costa, and M. Mangel. (2018). A state-dependent model for assessing the population consequences of disturbance on income-breeding mammals. *Ecological Modelling, 385*, 133–144.

McKenna, M. F., D. Ross, S. M. Wiggins, and J. A. Hildebrand. (2012). Underwater radiated noise from modern commercial ships. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 131*(1), 92–103.

McSweeney, D. J., R. W. Baird, and S. D. Mahaffy. (2007). Site fidelity, associations, and movements of Cuvier's (*Ziphius Cavirostris*) and Blainville's (*Mesoplodon Densirostris*) beaked whales off the island of Hawaii. *Marine Mammal Science, 23*(3), 666–687.

Mead, J. G., and C. W. Potter. (1995). Recognizing two populations of the bottlenose dolphin (*Tursiops truncatus*) off the Atlantic Coast of North America: Morphologic and ecologic considerations. *IBI Reports, 5*, 31–44.

Meissner, A. M., F. Christiansen, E. Martinez, M. D. Pawley, M. B. Orams, and K. A. Stockin. (2015). Behavioural effects of tourism on oceanic common dolphins, *Delphinus* sp., in New Zealand: The effects of Markov analysis variations and current tour operator compliance with regulations. *PLoS ONE, 10*(1), e0116962.

Melcón, M. L., A. J. Cummins, S. M. Kerosky, L. K. Roche, S. M. Wiggins, and J. A. Hildebrand. (2012). Blue whales respond to anthropogenic noise. *PLoS ONE, 7*(2).

Mesnick, S. L., B. L. Taylor, F. I. Archer, K. K. Martien, S. E. Trevino, B. L. Hancock-Hanser, S. C. M. Medina, V. L. Pease, K. M. Robertson, J. M. Straley, R. W. Baird, J. Calambokidis, G. S. Schorr, P. Wade, V. Burkanov, C. R. Lunsford, L. Rendell, and P. A. Morin. (2011). Sperm whale population structure in the eastern and central North Pacific inferred by the use of single-nucleotide polymorphisms, microsatellites and mitochondrial DNA. *Molecular Ecology Resources, 11 (Supplement 1)*, 278–298.

Meyers, M. T., W. P. Cochlan, E. J. Carpenter, and W. J. Kimmerer. (2019). Effect of ocean acidification on the nutritional quality of marine phytoplankton for copepod reproduction. *PLoS ONE, 14*(5), 22.

Mignucci-Giannoni, A. A., B. Pinto-Rodríguez, M. Velasco-Escudero, R. A. Montoya-Ospina, N. M. Jiménez-Marrero, M. A. Rodríguez-López, E. H. Williams, Jr., and D. K. Odell. (1999). Cetacean strandings in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. *Journal of Cetacean Research and Management, 1*(2), 191–198.

Mikkelsen, L., L. Hermannsen, K. Beedholm, P. T. Madsen, and J. Tougaard. (2017). Simulated seal scarer sounds scare porpoises, but not seals: Species-specific responses to 12 kHz deterrence sounds. *Royal Society Open Science, 4*(7), 170286.

Miksis-Olds, J. L., and S. M. Nichols. (2016). Is low frequency ocean sound increasing globally? *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 139*(1), 501–511.

Miksis, J. L., R. C. Connor, M. D. Grund, D. P. Nowacek, A. R. Solow, and P. L. Tyack. (2001). Cardiac responses to acoustic playback experiments in the captive bottlenose dolphin (*Tursiops truncatus*). *Journal of Comparative Psychology, 115*(3), 227–232.

Miller, J. D., C. S. Watson, and W. P. Covell. (1963). Deafening effects of noise on the cat. *Acta Oto-Laryngologica, Supplement 176*, 1–88.

Miller, L. J., A. D. Mackey, T. Hoffland, and S. A. Kuczaj, II. (2010). Potential effects of a major hurricane on Atlantic bottlenose dolphin (*Tursiops truncatus*) reproduction in the Mississippi Sound. *Marine Mammal Science, 26*(3), 707–715.

Miller, P., M. Johnson, P. Madsen, N. Biassoni, M. Quero, and P. Tyack. (2009). Using at-sea experiments to study the effects of airguns on the foraging behavior of sperm whales in the Gulf of Mexico. *Deep Sea Research I, 56*(7), 1168–1181.

Miller, P., R. Antunes, A. C. Alves, P. Wensveen, P. Kvadsheim, L. Kleivane, N. Nordlund, F.-P. Lam, S. van IJsselmuide, F. Visser, and P. Tyack. (2011). *The 3S experiments: Studying the behavioural effects of naval sonar on killer whales (Orcinus orca), sperm whales (Physeter macrocephalus), and long-finned pilot whales (Globicephala melas) in Norwegian waters* (Technical Report SOI-2011-001). St. Andrews, United Kingdom: Scottish Oceans Institute.

Miller, P. (2012). The severity of behavioral changes observed during experimental exposures of killer (*Orcinus orca*), long-finned pilot (*Globicephala melas*), and sperm (*Physeter macrocephalus*) whales to naval sonar. *Aquatic Mammals, 38*(4), 362–401.

Miller, P. J., R. N. Antunes, P. J. Wensveen, F. I. Samarra, A. C. Alves, P. L. Tyack, P. H. Kvadsheim, L. Kleivane, F. P. Lam, M. A. Ainslie, and L. Thomas. (2014). Dose-response relationships for the onset of avoidance of sonar by free-ranging killer whales. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 135*(2), 975–993.

Miller, P. J., P. H. Kvadsheim, F. P. Lam, P. L. Tyack, C. Cure, S. L. DeRuiter, L. Kleivane, L. D. Sivle, I. S. P. van, F. Visser, P. J. Wensveen, A. M. von Benda-Beckmann, L. M. Martin Lopez, T. Narazaki, and S. K. Hooker. (2015). First indications that northern bottlenose whales are sensitive to behavioural disturbance from anthropogenic noise. *Royal Society Open Science, 2*(6), 140484.

Miller, P. J. O., N. Biassoni, A. Samuels, and P. L. Tyack. (2000). Whale songs lengthen in response to sonar. *Nature, 405*(6789), 903.

Miyashita, T. (1993a). Abundance of dolphin stocks in the western North Pacific taken by the Japanese drive fishery. *Reports of the International Whaling Commission, 43*, 417–437.

Miyashita, T. (1993b). Distribution and abundance of some dolphins taken in the North Pacific driftnet fisheries. *International North Pacific Fisheries Commission Bulletin, 53*(3), 435–450.

Miyashita, T., H. Kato, and T. Kasuya. (1995). *Worldwide Map of Cetacean Distribution Based on Japanese Sighting Data*. Shimizu, Japan: National Research Institute of Far Seas Fisheries.

Miyashita, T., T. Kishiro, N. Higashi, F. Sato, K. Mori, and H. Kato. (1996). Winter distribution of cetaceans in the western North Pacific inferred from sighting cruises 1993–1995. *Reports of the International Whaling Commission, 46*, 437–442.

Miyazaki, N., and W. F. Perrin. (1994). Rough-toothed dolphin, *Steno bredanensis* (Lesson, 1828). In S. H. Ridgway & R. Harrison (Eds.), *Handbook of Marine Mammals* (Vol. 5, pp. 1–21). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Mizroch, S. A., D. W. Rice, D. Zwiefelhofer, J. M. Waite, and W. L. Perryman. (2009). Distribution and movements of fin whales in the North Pacific Ocean. *Mammal Review, 39*(3), 193–227.

Mizroch, S. A., and D. W. Rice. (2013). Ocean nomads: Distribution and movements of sperm whales in the North Pacific shown by whaling data and discovery marks. *Marine Mammal Science, 29*(2), E136–E165.

Moberg, G. P., and J. A. Mench. (2000). *The Biology of Animal Stress; Basic Principles and Implications for Animal Welfare*. London, United Kingdom: CAB International.

Mobley, J. R. (2007). *Marine Mammal Monitoring Surveys in Support of "Valiant Shield" Training Exercises (Aug. 13-17, 2007)—Final Report*. Pearl Harbor, HI: Commander, U.S. Pacific Fleet.

Mobley, J. R., S. W. Martin, D. Fromm, and P. E. Nachtigall. (2007). *Lunar influences as possible cause for simultaneous aggregations of melon-headed whales in Hanalei Bay, Kaua'i, and Sasanhaya Bay, Rota*. Paper presented at the Abstract, 17th Biennial Meeting on the Biology of Marine Mammals, Society for Marine Mammalogy. Cape Town, South Africa.

Mobley, J. R., and A. Milette. (2010). *Aerial Survey Monitoring for Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles in the Hawaiian Range Complex in Conjunction with a Navy Training Event, SCC February 16–21, 2010, Final Field Report*. Pearl Harbor, HI: Commander, U.S. Pacific Fleet.

Mobley, J. R. (2011). *Aerial Survey Monitoring for Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles in the Hawaii Range Complex in Conjunction with Two Navy Training Events. SCC and USWEX February 16–March 5, 2011. Final Field Report*. San Diego, CA: HDR Inc.

Mobley, J. R., and A. F. Pacini. (2012). *Aerial Survey Monitoring for Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles in the Hawaii Range Complex in Conjunction with a Navy Training Event, SCC February 15–25, 2012, Final Field Report*. Pearl Harbor, HI: Commander, U.S. Pacific Fleet.

Mobley, J. R., M. A. Smultea, C. E. Bacon, and A. S. Frankel. (2012). *Preliminary Report: Aerial Survey Monitoring for Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles in the Hawaii Range Complex—Summary of Focal Follow Analysis for 2008–2012 SCC Events: Preliminary Report*. Pearl Harbor, HI: Commander, U.S. Pacific Fleet.

Mobley, J. R., and M. H. Deakos. (2015). *Aerial Shoreline Surveys for Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles in the Hawaii Range Complex, Conducted after Navy Training Events. Koa Kai Surveys: 31 January and 5 February 2014. RIMPAC Surveys: 1 and 4–6 July 2014*. Pearl Harbor, HI: Commander, U.S. Pacific Fleet.

Møller, A. R. (2013). *Hearing: Anatomy, Physiology, and Disorders of the Auditory System*. San Diego, CA: Plural Publishing.

Monnahan, C. C. (2013). *Population Trends of the Eastern North Pacific Blue Whale.* (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Washington, Seattle, WA. Retrieved from http://digital.lib.washington.edu.

Monnahan, C. C., T. A. Branch, K. M. Stafford, Y. V. Ivashchenko, and E. M. Oleson. (2014). Estimating historical eastern North Pacific blue whale catches using spatial calling patterns. *PLoS ONE, 9*(6), e98974.

Monnahan, C. C., T. A. Branch, and A. E. Punt. (2015). Do ship strikes threaten the recovery of endangered eastern North Pacific blue whales? *Marine Mammal Science, 31*(1), 279–297.

Montie, E. W., C. A. Manire, and D. A. Mann. (2011). Live CT imaging of sound reception anatomy and hearing measurements in the pygmy killer whale, *Feresa attenuata*. *The Journal of Experimental Biology, 214*, 945–955.

Moon, H. B., K. Kannan, M. Choi, J. Yu, H. G. Choi, Y. R. An, S. G. Choi, J. Y. Park, and Z. G. Kim. (2010). Chlorinated and brominated contaminants including PCBs and PBDEs in minke whales and common dolphins from Korean coastal waters. *Journal of Hazardous Materials, 179*(1–3), 735–741.

Mooney, T. A., P. E. Nachtigall, M. Breese, S. Vlachos, W. Whitlow, and L. Au. (2009a). Predicting temporary threshold shifts in a bottlenose dolphin (*Tursiops truncatus*): The effects of noise level and duration. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 125*(3), 1816–1826.

Mooney, T. A., P. E. Nachtigall, and S. Vlachos. (2009b). Sonar-induced temporary hearing loss in dolphins. *Biology Letters, 5*(4), 565–567.

Mooney, T. A., M. Yamato, and B. K. Branstetter. (2012). *Hearing in Cetaceans: From Natural History to Experimental Biology*. Woods Hole, MA: Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution and the National Marine Mammal Foundation.

Moore, C. J. (2008). Synthetic polymers in the marine environment: A rapidly increasing, long-term threat. *Environmental Research, 108*(2), 131–139.

Moore, J., and J. Barlow. (2017). *Population Abundance and Trend Estimates for Beaked Whales and Sperm Whales in the California Current from Ship-Based Visual Line-Transect Survey Data, 1991–2014* (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Technical Memorandum NMFS-SWFSC-585). La Jolla, CA: Southwest Fisheries Science Center.

Moore, J. C. (1972). More skull characters of the beaked whale, *Indopacetus pacificus,* and comparative measurements of austral relatives. *Fieldiana Zoology, 62*(1), 1–19.

Moore, J. E., and J. P. Barlow. (2013). Declining abundance of beaked whales (Family Ziphiidae) in the California Current Large Marine Ecosystem. *PLoS ONE, 8*(1), e52770.

Moore, M. J., and G. A. Early. (2004). Cumulative sperm whale bone damage and the bends. *Science, 306*, 2215.

Moore, M. J., A. L. Bogomolni, S. E. Dennison, G. Early, M. M. Garner, B. A. Hayward, B. J. Lentell, and D. S. Rotstein. (2009). Gas bubbles in seals, dolphins, and porpoises entangled and drowned at depth in gillnets. *Veterinary Pathology 46*, 536–547.

Moore, M. J., J. van der Hoop, S. G. Barco, A. M. Costidis, F. M. Gulland, P. D. Jepson, K. T. Moore, S. Raverty, and W. A. McLellan. (2013). Criteria and case definitions for serious injury and death of pinnipeds and cetaceans caused by anthropogenic trauma. *Diseases of Aquatic Organisms, 103*(3), 229–264.

Moretti, D., N. DiMarzio, R. Morrissey, E. McCarthy, and S. Jarvis. (2009). *An opportunistic study of the effect of sonar on marine mammals, marine mammal monitoring on Navy ranges (M3R).* Paper presented at the 2009 ONR Marine Mammal Program Review. Alexandria, VA.

Moretti, D., L. Thomas, T. Marques, J. Harwood, A. Dilley, B. Neales, J. Shaffer, E. McCarthy, L. New, S. Jarvis, and R. Morrissey. (2014). A risk function for behavioral disruption of Blainville's beaked whales (*Mesoplodon densirostris*) from mid-frequency active sonar. *PLoS ONE, 9*(1), e85064.

Moretti, D. (2017). *Marine Mammal Monitoring on Navy Ranges (M3R) Passive Acoustic Monitoring of Abundance on the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) and Southern California Offshore Range (SCORE)*. Newport, RI: Naval Undersea Warfare Center.

Moretti, D. J., and R. W. Baird. (2015). *Marine Mammal Monitoring on Navy Ranges (M3R), An Opportunistic Study of the Effect of Sonar on Marine Mammals on the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF): FY14 Summary*. Newport, RI: Cascadia Research Collective, Naval Undersea Warfare Center.

Morton, A. B., and H. K. Symonds. (2002). Displacement of *Orcinus orca* (L.) by high amplitude sound in British Columbia, Canada. *ICES Journal of Marine Science, 59*(1), 71–80.

Mu, J., S. Zhang, L. Qu, F. Jin, C. Fang, X. Ma, W. Zhang, and J. Wang. (2019). Microplastics abundance and characteristics in surface waters from the Northwest Pacific, the Bering Sea, and the Chukchi Sea. *Marine Pollution Bulletin, 143*, 58–65.

Mulsow, J., and C. Reichmuth. (2010). Psychophysical and electrophysiological aerial audiograms of a Steller sea lion (*Eumetopias jubatus*). *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 127*(4), 2692–2701.

Mulsow, J. L., J. J. Finneran, and D. S. Houser. (2011). California sea lion (*Zalophus californianus*) aerial hearing sensitivity measured using auditory steady-state response and psychophysical methods. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 129*(4), 2298–2306.

Munger, L. M., M. O. Lammers, and W. W. L. Au. (2014). *Passive Acoustic Monitoring for Cetaceans within the Marianas Islands Range Complex. Preliminary Report*. Pearl Harbor, HI: Naval Facilities Engineering Command Pacific.

Munger, L. M., M. O. Lammers, J. N. Oswald, T. M. Yack, and W. W. L. Au. (2015). *Passive Acoustic Monitoring of Cetaceans within the Mariana Islands Range Complex Using Ecological Acoustic Recorders. Final Report*. Pearl Harbor, HI: Naval Facilities Engineering Command Pacific.

Murase, H., T. Tamura, S. Otani, and S. Nishiwaki. (2015). Satellite tracking of Bryde's whales *Balaenoptera edeni* in the offshore western North Pacific in summer 2006 and 2008. *Fisheries Science, 82*(1), 35–45.

Murray, C., L. Hannah, and A. Locke. (2020). *A Review of Cumulative Effects Research and Assessment in Fisheries and Oceans Canada*. Sidney, Canada: Canadian Technical Report of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences.

Muto, M. M., V. T. Helker, R. P. Angliss, B. A. Allen, P. L. Boveng, J. M. Breiwick, M. F. Cameron, P. J. Clapham, S. P. Dahle, M. E. Dahlheim, B. S. Fadely, M. C. Ferguson, L. W. Fritz, R. C. Hobbs, Y. V. Ivashchenko, A. S. Kennedy, J. M. London, S. A. Mizroch, R. R. Ream, E. L. Richmond, K. E. W. Shelden, R. G. Towell, P. R. Wade, J. M. Waite, and A. R. Zerbini. (2017). *Alaska Marine Mammal Stock Assessments, 2016* (NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-AFSC-323). Seattle, WA: National Marine Mammal Laboratory.

Muto, M. M., V. T. Helker, R. P. Angliss, B. A. Allen, P. L. Boveng, J. M. Breiwick, M. F. Cameron, P. J. Clapham, S. P. Dahle, M. E. Dahlheim, B. S. Fadely, J. M. London, S. A. Mizroch, R. R. Ream, E. L. Richmond, K. E. W. Shelden, R. G. Towell, P. R. Wade, J. M. Waite, and A. N. Zerbini. (2018). *Alaska Marine Mammal Stock Assessments, 2017* (NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-AFSC-378). Seattle, WA: Alaska Fisheries Science Center.

Muto, M. M., V. T. Helker, B. J. Delean, R. P. Angliss, P. L. Boveng, J. M. Breiwick, B. M. Brost, M. F. Cameron, P. J. Clapham, S. P. Dahle, M. E. Dahlheim, B. S. Fadely, M. C. Ferguson, L. W. Fritz, R. C. Hobbs, Y. V. Ivashchenko, A. S. Kennedy, J. M. London, S. A. Mizroch, R. R. Ream, E. L. Richmond, K. E. W. Shelden, K. L. Sweeney, R. G. Towell, P. R. Wade, J. M. Waite, and A. N. Zerbini. (2019). *Alaska Marine Mammal Stock Assessments, 2019*. Seattle, WA: Marine Mammal Laboratory, Alaska Fisheries Science Center.

Nabe-Nielsen, J., R. M. Sibly, J. Tougaard, J. Teilmann, and S. Sveegaard. (2014). Effects of noise and by-catch on a Danish harbour porpoise population. *Ecological Modelling, 272*, 242–251.

Nachtigall, P. E., D. W. Lemonds, and H. L. Roitblat. (2000). Psychoacoustic Studies of Dolphin and Whale Hearing. In W. W. L. Au , R. R. Fay, & A. N. Popper (Eds.), *Hearing by Whales and Dolphins* (pp. 330–363). New York, NY: Springer.

Nachtigall, P. E., J. L. Pawloski, and W. W. L. Au. (2003). Temporary threshold shifts and recovery following noise exposure in the Atlantic bottlenosed dolphin (*Tursiops truncatus*). *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 113*(6), 3425–3429.

Nachtigall, P. E., A. Y. Supin, J. Pawloski, and W. W. L. Au. (2004). Temporary threshold shifts after noise exposure in the bottlenose dolphin (*Tursiops truncatus*) measured using evoked auditory potentials. *Marine Mammal Science, 20*(4), 673–687.

Nachtigall, P. E., A. Y. Supin, M. Amundin, B. Roken, T. Møller, T. A. Mooney, K. A. Taylor, and M. Yuen. (2007). Polar bear, *Ursus maritimus,* hearing measured with auditory evoked potentials. *The Journal of Experimental Biology, 210*(7), 1116–1122.

Nachtigall, P. E., T. A. Mooney, K. A. Taylor, L. A. Miller, M. H. Rasmussen, T. Akamatsu, J. Teilmann, M. Linnenschmidt, and G. A. Vikingsson. (2008). Shipboard Measurements of the Hearing of the White-Beaked Dolphin, *Lagenorhynchus albirostris*. *The Journal of Experimental Biology, 211*, 642–647.

Nachtigall, P. E., and A. Y. Supin. (2013). A false killer whale reduces its hearing sensitivity when a loud sound is preceded by a warning. *Journal of Experimental Biology, 216*(16), 3062–3070.

Nachtigall, P. E., and A. Y. Supin. (2014). Conditioned hearing sensitivity reduction in a bottlenose dolphin (*Tursiops truncatus*). *The Journal of Experimental Biology, 217*(Pt 15), 2806–2813.

Nachtigall, P. E., and A. Y. Supin. (2015). Conditioned frequency-dependent hearing sensitivity reduction in the bottlenose dolphin (*Tursiops truncatus*). *The Journal of Experimental Biology, 218*(7), 999–1005.

Nachtigall, P. E., A. Y. Supin, J. A. Estaban, and A. F. Pacini. (2016a). Learning and extinction of conditioned hearing sensation change in the beluga whale (*Delphinapterus leucas*). *Journal of Comparative Physiology A, 202*(2), 105–113.

Nachtigall, P. E., A. Y. Supin, A. F. Pacini, and R. A. Kastelein. (2016b). Conditioned hearing sensitivity change in the harbor porpoise (*Phocoena phocoena*). *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 140*(2), 960–967.

Nachtigall, P. E., A. Y. Supin, A. B. Smith, and A. F. Pacini. (2016c). Expectancy and conditioned hearing levels in the bottlenose dolphin (*Tursiops truncatus*). *Journal of Experimental Biology, 219*(6), 844–850.

Nachtigall, P. E., A. Y. Supin, A. F. Pacini, and R. A. Kastelein. (2018). Four odontocete species change hearing levels when warned of impending loud sound. *Integrative Zoology, 13*, 2–20.

National Academies of Sciences Engineering and Medicine. (2017). *Approaches to Understanding the Cumulative Effects of Stressors on Marine Mammals*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.

National Marine Fisheries Service. (2005). *Assessment of Acoustic Exposures on Marine Mammals in Conjunction with USS Shoup Active Sonar Transmissions in the Eastern Strait of Juan de Fuca and Haro Strait, Washington (5 May 2003)*. Seattle, WA: National Marine Fisheries Service.

National Marine Fisheries Service. (2007a). *Biological Opinion on the U.S. Navy's Proposed Undersea Warfare Training Exercises in the Hawaii Range Complex from January 2007 Through January 2009*. Silver Spring, MD: U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service.

National Marine Fisheries Service. (2007b). *Report to Congress on the Impact of Hurricanes Katrina, Rita, and Wilman on Commercial and Recreational Fisheries Habitat of Alabama, Florida, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas*. Silver Spring, MD: U.S. Department of Commerce.

National Marine Fisheries Service. (2011a). *Southwest Region Stranding Database Excel file containing stranding from Southwest Region. Provided to Navy, Manuscript on file*. Provided to Navy, Manuscript on file.

National Marine Fisheries Service. (2011b). *Hawaiian Monk Seal Recovery; 2009–2010 Program Update and Accomplishments Report*. Honolulu, HI: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Pacific Service; Pacific Islands Region.

National Marine Fisheries Service. (2011c). Pacific Science Center Stranding Data. Excel file containing stranding from the Hawaiian Islands, manuscript on file.

National Marine Fisheries Service. (2011d). *Marine Mammal Health and Stranding Response Program (MMHSRP)*. Retrieved from https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/national/marine-life-distress/marine-mammal-health-and-stranding-response-program.

National Marine Fisheries Service. (2011e). *A Decade of Support to Save and Conserve Stranded Marine Mammals*. Retrieved from http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/pr/health/.

National Marine Fisheries Service. (2015a). *Sperm Whale (Physeter macrocephalus) 5-Year Review: Summary and Evaluation, June 2015*. Silver Spring, MD: Office of Protected Resources.

National Marine Fisheries Service. (2015b). *Marine Mammal Non-Lethal Deterrents: Summary of the Technical Expert Workshop on Marine Mammal Non-Lethal Deterrents, 10–12 February 2015*. Seattle, WA: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

National Marine Fisheries Service. (2015c). *National Marine Fisheries Service Endangered Species Act Section 7 Consultation Biological Opinion and Conference Report for U.S. Military Mariana Islands Training and Testing Activities and the National Marine Fisheries Services' promulgation of regulations and issuance of a letter of authorization pursuant to the Marine Mammal Protection Act for the U.S. Navy to "take" marine mammals incidental to Mariana Islands Training and Testing activities from August 2015 through August 2020*. Silver Spring, MD: National Marine Fisheries Service.

National Marine Fisheries Service. (2015d). *National Marine Fisheries Service Endangered Species Act Section 7 Consultation Biological Opinion and Conference Report; Biological Opinion and Conference Report on Mariana Islands Training and Testing and Issuance of an MMPA Rule and LOA*. Silver Spring, MD: Endangered Species Act Interagency Cooperation Division of the Office of Protected Resources, National Marine Fisheries Service.

National Marine Fisheries Service. (2015e). *Environmental Changes Stress West Coast Sea Lions*. Retrieved from https://www.nwfsc.noaa.gov/news/features/west_coast_sea_lions/index.cfm.

National Marine Fisheries Service. (2015f). *Programmatic Environmental Assessment for the Implementation of Decisions of the Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission on Management of Tropical Tunas in the Western and Central Ocean from 2015–2020*. Honolulu, HI: Pacific Islands Regional Office.

National Marine Fisheries Service. (2016a). *FAQs: Whale, Dolphin, Seal, and Sea Lion (Marine Mammal) Strandings*. Retrieved from http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/pr/health/faq.htm (accessed in June 2016).

National Marine Fisheries Service. (2016b). Endangered and Threatened Species; Identification of 14 Distinct Population Segments of the Humpback Whale (*Megaptera novaeangliae*) and Revision of Species-Wide Listing. *Federal Register, 81*(174), 62260–62320.

National Marine Fisheries Service. (2016c). *Fisheries Interactions and Protected Species Bycatch*. Silver Spring, MD: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

National Marine Fisheries Service. (2016d). *National Marine Fisheries Service, Alaska Region Occurrence of Endangered Species Act (ESA) Listed Humpback Whales off Alaska*. Silver Spring, MD: National Marine Fisheries Service.

National Marine Fisheries Service. (2016e). *Technical Guidance for Assessing the Effects of Anthropogenic Sound on Marine Mammal Hearing Underwater Acoustic Thresholds for Onset of Permanent and Temporary Threshold Shifts*. (NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-OPR-55). Silver Spring, MD: U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service.

National Marine Fisheries Service. (2016f). *Guidelines for Preparing Stock Assessment Reports Pursuant to Section 117 of the Marine Mammal Protection Act*. Silver Spring, MD: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

National Marine Fisheries Service. (2017). *Biological Opinion on (1) U.S. Military Mariana Islands Training and Testing Activities; and (2) the National Marine Fisheries Service's Promulgation of regulations and issuance of a letter of authorization pursuant to the Marine Mammal Protection Act for the U.S. Navy to "take" marine mammals incidental to Mariana Islands Training and Testing activities from August 2015 through August 2020*. Silver Spring, MD: National Marine Fisheries Service, Office of Protected Resources.

National Marine Fisheries Service. (2018a). *Biological Opinion on U.S. Navy Hawaii-Southern California Training and Testing and the National Marine Fisheries Service's Promulgation of Regulations Pursuant to the Marine Mammal Protection Act for the Navy to "Take" Marine Mammals Incidental to Hawaii-Southern California Training and Testing*. Silver Spring, MD: National Marine Fisheries Service, Office of Protected Resources.

National Marine Fisheries Service. (2018b). *Draft Recovery Plan for the Blue Whale (Balaenoptera musculus): Revision*. Silver Spring, MD: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Office of Protected Resources and West Coast Region.

National Marine Fisheries Service. (2018c). *#MIhumpbacks: Humpback Whales of the Mariana Islands*. Honolulu, HI: Pacific Islands Fisheries Science Center.

National Marine Fisheries Service. (2018d). *Proposed Rule for Western and Central Pacific Fisheries for Highly Migratory Species; Fishing Limits in Purse Seine and Longline Fisheries, Restrictions on the Use of Fish Aggregating Devices in Purse Seine Fisheries, and Transshipment Prohibitions (TIN 0648-BH77). Supplemental Information Report on National Environmental Policy Act Analyses*. Honolulu, HI: Pacific Islands Regional Office.

National Marine Fisheries Service. (2018e). *2018 Revision 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*. Silver Spring, MD: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service, Office of Protected Resources.

National Marine Fisheries Service (2019). [Email from Stephanie Egger (NMFS) to Chip Johnson (Navy Pacific Fleet) regarding marine mammal sightings data in the Mariana Islands in 2018-2019].

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. (2002). *Report of the Workshop on acoustic resonance as a source of tissue trauma in cetaceans*. Silver Spring, MD: U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service.

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. (2014). *Southern Resident Killer Whales: 10 Years of Research & Conservation*. Seattle, WA: Northwest Fisheries Science Center West Coast Region.

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. (2015a). Endangered and Threatened Species; Identification of 14 Distinct Population Segments of the Humpback Whale (*Megaptera novaeangliae*) and Proposed Revision of Species-Wide Listing; Proposed Rule. *Federal Register, 80*(76), 22304–22356.

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. (2015b). Takes of marine mammals incidental to specified activities; U.S. Navy training and testing activities in the Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area. *Federal Register, 80*(148), 46112–46171.

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. (2016). *Testing Detects Algal Toxins in Alaska Marine Mammals*. Retrieved from http://www.nwfsc.noaa.gov/news/features/algal_blooms_in_arctic_waters/index.cfm.

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. (2017). *2016 West Coast Entanglement Summary*. Seattle, WA: National Marine Fisheries Service.

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. (2018a). International Fisheries; Western and Central Pacific Fisheries for Highly Migratory Species; Fishing Limits in Purse Seine and Longline Fisheries, Restrictions on the Use of Fish Aggregating Devices in Purse Seine Fisheries, and Transshipment Prohibitions. *Federal Register, 83*(91), 21748–21761.

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. (2018b). *2015–2018 Guadalupe Fur Seal Unusual Mortality Event in California*. Retrieved from https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/national/marine-life-distress/2015-2018-guadalupe-fur-seal-unusual-mortality-event-california.

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. (2018c). *#MIhumpbacks: Humpback Whales of the Mariana Islands*. Retrieved from https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/feature-story/mihumpbacks-humpback-whales-mariana-islands.

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. (2018d). *Removal and Research: The Marine Debris Team Strikes Again*. Retrieved from https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/feature-story/removal-and-research-marine-debris-team-strikes-again.

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. (2019). *2018 West Coast Whale Entanglement Summary*. Silver Spring, MD: National Ocean and Atmospheric Administration.

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Marine Debris Program. (2014a). *Report on the Occurrence of Health Effects of Anthropogenic Debris Ingested by Marine Organisms*. Silver Spring, MD: National Ocean Service.

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Marine Debris Program. (2014b). *Report on the Entanglement of Marine Species in Marine Debris with an Emphasis on Species in the United States*. Silver Spring, MD: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

National Research Council. (2003). *Ocean Noise and Marine Mammals*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.

National Research Council. (2005). *Marine Mammal Populations and Ocean Noise*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.

National Research Council. (2006). *Dynamic Changes in Marine Ecosystems: Fishing, Food Webs, and Future Options, Committee on Ecosystem Effects of Fishing: Phase II–Assessments of the Extent of Change and the Implications for Policy*. Washington, DC: National Research Council.

Nedwell, J. R., B. Edwards, A. W. H. Turnpenny, and J. Gordon. (2004). *Fish and Marine Mammal Audiograms: A Summary of Available Information*. Hampshire, United Kingdom: Subacoustech Ltd.

Nelms, S. E., T. S. Galloway, B. J. Godley, D. S. Jarvis, and P. K. Lindeque. (2018). Investigating microplastic trophic transfer in marine top predators. *Environmental Pollution, 238*, 999–1007.

Nemoto, T., and A. Kawamura. (1977). Characteristics of food habits and distribution of baleen whales with special reference to the abundance of North Pacific sei and Bryde's whales. *Reports of the International Whaling Commission, Special Issue 1*, 80–87.

New, L. F., J. Harwood, L. Thomas, C. Donovan, J. S. Clark, G. Hastie, P. M. Thompson, B. Cheney, L. Scott-Hayward, D. Lusseau, and D. Costa. (2013a). Modelling the biological significance of behavioural change in coastal bottlenose dolphins in response to disturbance. *Functional Ecology, 27*(2), 314–322.

New, L. F., D. J. Moretti, S. K. Hooker, D. P. Costa, and S. E. Simmons. (2013b). Using energetic models to investigate the survival and reproduction of beaked whales (family Ziphiidae). *PLoS ONE, 8*(7), e68725.

New, L. F., J. S. Clark, D. P. Costa, E. Fleishman, M. A. Hindell, T. Klanjšček, D. Lusseau, S. Kraus, C. R. McMahon, P. W. Robinson, R. S. Schick, L. K. Schwarz, S. E. Simmons, L. Thomas, P. Tyack, and J. Harwood. (2014). Using short-term measures of behaviour to estimate long-term fitness of southern elephant seals. *Marine Ecology Progress Series, 496*, 99–108.

Ng, S. L., and S. Leung. (2003). Behavioral response of Indo-Pacific humpback dolphin (*Sousa chinensis*) to vessel traffic. *Marine Environmental Research, 56*(5), 555–567.

Nieukirk, S. L., D. K. Mellinger, S. E. Moore, K. Klinck, R. P. Dziak, and J. Goslin. (2012). Sounds from airguns and fin whales recorded in the mid-Atlantic Ocean, 1999–2009. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 131*(2), 1102–1112.

Nieukirk, S. L., S. Fregosi, D. K. Mellinger, and H. Klinck. (2016). A complex baleen whale call recorded in the Mariana Trench Marine National Monument. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 140*(3), EL274.

Nishimura, K. (2019). Japan's whale restaurants cheer resumption of commercial hunts. *The Japan Times*, July 8, 2019.

Noren, D. P., A. H. Johnson, D. Rehder, and A. Larson. (2009). Close approaches by vessels elicit surface active behaviors by southern resident killer whales. *Endangered Species Research, 8*(3), 179–192.

Norris, K. S., and J. H. Prescott. (1961). Observations on Pacific cetaceans of Californian and Mexican waters. *University of California Publications in Zoology, 63*(4), 291–402.

Norris, K. S., B. Wursig, R. S. Wells, and M. Würsig. (1994). *The Hawaiian Spinner Dolphin*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Norris, T. F., J. Oswald, T. Yack, E. Ferguson, C. Hom-Weaver, K. Dunleavy, S. Coates, and T. Dominello. (2012a). *An Analysis of Acoustic Data from the Mariana Islands Sea Turtle and Cetacean Survey (MISTCS)*. Encinitas, CA: Bio-Waves, Inc.

Norris, T. F., J. O. Oswald, T. M. Yack, and E. L. Ferguson. (2012b). *An Analysis of Marine Acoustic Recording Unit (MARU) Data Collected off Jacksonville, Florida in Fall 2009 and Winter 2009–2010*. Norfolk, VA: Naval Facilities Engineering Command Atlantic.

Norris, T. F., J. Oswald, T. Yack, E. Ferguson, C. Hom-Weaver, K. Dunleavy, S. Coates, and T. Dominello. (2014). *An Analysis of Acoustic Data from the Mariana Islands Sea Turtle and Cetacean Survey (MISTCS) March 2014 Revision*. Encinitas, CA: Bio-Waves, Inc.

Norris, T. F., K. J. Dunleavy, T. M. Yack, and E. L. Ferguson. (2017). Estimation of minke whale abundance from an acoustic line transect survey of the Mariana Islands. *Marine Mammal Science, 33*(2), 574–592.

Northridge, S. (2009). Fishing industry, effects of. In W. F. Perrin, B. Wursig, & J. G. M. Thewissen (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Marine Mammals* (2nd ed., pp. 443–447). Cambridge, MA: Academic Press.

Nowacek, D., M. Johnson, and P. Tyack. (2004). North Atlantic right whales (*Eubalaena glacialis*) ignore ships but respond to alerting stimuli. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London, 271*(B), 227–231.

Nowacek, D., L. H. Thorne, D. Johnston, and P. Tyack. (2007). Responses of cetaceans to anthropogenic noise. *Mammal Review, 37*(2), 81–115.

Nowacek, D. P., C. W. Clark, D. Mann, P. J. O. Miller, H. C. Rosenbaum, J. S. Golden, M. Jasny, J. Kraska, and B. L. Southall. (2015). Marine seismic surveys and ocean noise: Time for coordinated and prudent planning. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment, 13*(7), 378–386.

Nowacek, D. P., F. Christiansen, L. Bejder, J. A. Goldbogen, and A. S. Friedlaender. (2016). Studying cetacean behaviour: New technological approaches and conservation applications. *Animal Behaviour, 120*, 235–244.

Oakley, J. A., A. T. Williams, and T. Thomas. (2017). Reactions of harbour porpoise (*Phocoena phocoena*) to vessel traffic in the coastal waters of South West Wales, UK. *Ocean & Coastal Management, 138*, 158–169.

Obusan, M. C. M., W. L. Rivera, M. A. T. Siringan, and L. V. Aragones. (2016). Stranding events in the Philippines provide evidence for impacts of human interactions on cetaceans. *Ocean & Coastal Management, 134*, 41–51.

Ocean Alliance. (2010). *The Voyage of the Odyssey: Executive Summary*. Lincoln, MA: Public Broadcasting System.

Odell, D. K., and K. M. McClune. (1999). False killer whale—*Pseudorca crassidens* (Owen, 1846). In S. H. Ridgway & S. R. Harrison (Eds.), *Handbook of Marine Mammals* (Vol. 6, pp. 213–244). New York, NY: Academic Press.

Office of the Surgeon General. (1991). Conventional warfare ballistic, blast, and burn injuries. In R. Zajitchuk, Col. (Ed.), *U.S.A. Textbook of Military Medicine*. Washington, DC: Office of the Surgeon General.

Oleson, E. (2017). *Mariana Archipelago Cetacean Survey (MACS) 2015 Cruise Report*. Honolulu, HI: National Marine Fisheries Service, Pacific Islands Fisheries Science Center.

Oleson, E. M., C. H. Boggs, K. A. Forney, M. B. Hanson, D. R. Kobayashi, B. L. Taylor, P. R. Wade, and G. M. Ylitalo. (2010). *Status Review of Hawaiian Insular False Killer Whales (Pseudorca crassidens) under the Endangered Species Act* (NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-PIFSC-22). Honolulu, HI: Pacific Islands Fisheries Science Center.

Oleson, E. M., and M. C. Hill. (2010a). *2010 Report to PACFLT: Report to Cetacean Surveys in Guam, CNMI, and the High-seas*. Honolulu, HI: National Marine Fisheries Service, Pacific Islands Fisheries Science Center.

Oleson, E. M., and M. C. Hill. (2010b). *2010 Report to PACFLT: Report of Cetacean Surveys in Guam, CNMI, and the High-seas & Follow up on 2009 Main Hawaiian Islands Cetacean Survey*. Honolulu, HI: Pacific Islands Fisheries Science Center.

Oleson, E. M., R. W. Baird, K. K. Martien, and B. L. Taylor. (2013). *Island-associated stocks of odontocetes in the main Hawaiian Islands: A synthesis of available information to facilitate evaluation of stock structure* (Pacific Islands Fisheries Science Center Working Paper WP-13-003). Honolulu, HI: Pacific Islands Fisheries Science Center.

Oleson, E. M., S. Baumann-Pickering, A. Širović, K. P. Merkens, L. M. Munger, J. S. Trickey, and P. Fisher-Pool. (2015). *Analysis of long-term acoustic datasets for baleen whales and beaked whales within the Mariana Islands Range Complex (MIRC) for 2010 to 2013* (Pacific Islands Fisheries Science Center Data Report DR-15-002). Honolulu, HI: Pacific Islands Fisheries Science Center.

Olson, P. A. (2009). Pilot whales, *Globicephala melas* and *G. macrorhynchus*. In W. F. Perrin, B. Wursig, & J. G. M. Thewissen (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Marine Mammals* (2nd ed., pp. 898–903). Cambridge, MA: Academic Press.

Oregon State University. (2017). *Southern and Central California 2016 Whale Approach Summary from Bruce Mate regarding body condition of blue and fin whales off Southern and Central California*. Corvallis, OR: Oregon State University.

Owen, M. A., and A. E. Bowles. (2011). In-air auditory psychophysics and the management of a threatened carnivore, the polar bear (*Ursus maritimus)*. *International Journal of Comparative Psychology, 24*, 244–254.

Pack, A. A., L. M. Herman, A. S. Craig, S. S. Spitz, J. O. Waterman, E. Y. K. Herman, M. H. Deakos, S. Hakala, and C. Lowe. (2017). Habitat preferences by individual humpback whale mothers in the Hawaiian breeding grounds vary with the age and size of their calves. *Animal Behaviour, 133*, 131–144.

Palacios, D. M., and B. R. Mate. (1996). Attack by false killer whales (*Pseudorca crassidens*) on sperm whales (*Physeter macrocephalus*) in the Galápagos Islands. *Marine Mammal Science, 12*(4), 582–587.

Paniz-Mondolfi, A. E., and L. Sander-Hoffmann. (2009). Lobomycosis in inshore and estuarine dolphins. *Emerging Infectious Diseases, 15*(4), 672–673.

Papale, E., M. Gamba, M. Perez-Gil, V. M. Martin, and C. Giacoma. (2015). Dolphins adjust species-specific frequency parameters to compensate for increasing background noise. *PLoS ONE, 10*(4), e0121711.

Parks, S. E., C. W. Clark, and P. L. Tyack. (2007). Short- and long-term changes in right whale calling behavior: The potential effects of noise on acoustic communication. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 122*(6), 3725–3731.

Parks, S. E. (2009). *Assessment of acoustic adaptations for noise compensation in marine mammals.* Paper presented at the 2009 Office of Naval Research Marine Mammal Program Review. Alexandria, VA.

Parks, S. E., M. Johnson, D. Nowacek, and P. L. Tyack. (2011). Individual right whales call louder in increased environmental noise. *Biology Letters, 7*, 33–35.

Patenaude, N. J., W. J. Richardson, M. A. Smultea, W. R. Koski, G. W. Miller, B. Würsig, and C. R. Greene, Jr. (2002). Aircraft sound and disturbance to bowhead and beluga whales during spring migration in the Alaskan Beaufort Sea. *Marine Mammal Science, 18*(2), 309–335.

Paul, D. (2019). Whales keep eating plastic and dying. This one's stomach had 88 pounds of calcifying trash. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from https://www.washingtonpost.com/science/2019/03/18/whales-keep-eating-plastic-dying-this-ones-stomach-had-pounds-calcifying-trash/?utm_term=.5eb6156679ab.

Pavlostathis, S. G., and G. H. Jackson. (2002). Biotransformation of 2, 4, 6-trinitrotoluene in a continuous-flow *Anabaena* sp. system. *Water Research, 36*, 1699–1706.

Pepper, C. B., M. A. Nascarella, and R. J. Kendall. (2003). A review of the effects of aircraft noise on wildlife and humans, current control mechanisms, and the need for further study. *Environmental Management, 32*(4), 418–432.

Perkins, J. S., and G. W. Miller. (1983). Mass stranding of *Steno bredanensis* in Belize. *Biotropica, 15*(3), 235–236.

Perrin, W. F., and J. W. Gilpatrick, Jr. (1994). Spinner dolphin, *Stenella longirostris* (Gray, 1828). In S. H. Ridgway & R. Harrison (Eds.), *Handbook of Marine Mammals* (Vol. 5, pp. 99–128). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Perrin, W. F., and A. A. Hohn. (1994). Pantropical spotted dolphin, *Stenella attenuata*. In S. H. Ridgway & R. Harrison (Eds.), *Handbook of Marine Mammals* (Vol. 5, pp. 71–98). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Perrin, W. F., S. Leatherwood, and A. Collet. (1994a). Fraser's dolphin, *Lagenodelphis hosei* Fraser, 1956. In S. H. Ridgway & R. Harrison (Eds.), *Handbook of Marine Mammals* (Vol. 5, pp. 225–240). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Perrin, W. F., C. E. Wilson, and F. I. Archer, II. (1994b). Striped dolphin—*Stenella coeruleoalba* (Meyen, 1833). In S. H. Ridgway & R. Harrison (Eds.), *Handbook of Marine Mammals* (Vol. 5, pp. 129–159). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Perrin, W. F., and J. R. Geraci. (2002). Stranding. In W. F. Perrin, B. Wursig, & J. G. M. Thewissen (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Marine Mammals* (pp. 1192–1197). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Perrin, W. F. (2009a). Spinner dolphin, *Stenella longirostris*. In W. F. Perrin, B. Wursig, & J. G. M. Thewissen (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Marine Mammals* (2nd ed., pp. 1100–1103). Cambridge, MA: Academic Press.

Perrin, W. F. (2009b). Pantropical spotted dolphin, *Stenella attenuata*. In W. F. Perrin, B. Wursig, & J. G. M. Thewissen (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Marine Mammals* (2nd ed., pp. 819–821). Cambridge, MA: Academic Press.

Perrin, W. F., B. Würsig, and J. G. M. Thewissen. (2009). *Encyclopedia of Marine Mammals* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, MA: Academic Press.

Perryman, W. L., and T. C. Foster. (1980). *Preliminary Report on Predation by Small Whales, Mainly the False Killer Whale, Pseudorca crassidens, on Dolphins (Stenella spp. and Delphinus delphis) in the Eastern Tropical Pacific*. (LJ-80-05). La Jolla, CA: U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service, Southwest Fisheries Science Center.

Peterson, S. H., J. L. Hassrick, A. Lafontaine, J. P. Thome, D. E. Crocker, C. Debier, and D. P. Costa. (2014). Effects of age, adipose percent, and reproduction on PCB concentrations and profiles in an extreme fasting North Pacific marine mammal. *PLoS ONE, 9*(4), e96191.

Peterson, S. H., J. T. Ackerman, and D. P. Costa. (2015). Marine foraging ecology influences mercury bioaccumulation in deep-diving northern elephant seals. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 282*(20150710), 10.

Piantadosi, C. A., and E. D. Thalmann. (2004). Whales, sonar and decompression sickness. *Nature, 425*, 575–576.

Pine, M. K., A. G. Jeffs, D. Wang, and C. A. Radford. (2016). The potential for vessel noise to mask biologically important sounds within ecologically significant embayments. *Ocean & Coastal Management, 127*, 63–73.

Pirotta, E., R. Milor, N. Quick, D. Moretti, N. Di Marzio, P. Tyack, I. Boyd, and G. Hastie. (2012). Vessel noise affects beaked whale behavior: Results of a dedicated acoustic response study. *PLoS ONE, 7*(8), e42535.

Pirotta, E., K. L. Brookes, I. M. Graham, and P. M. Thompson. (2014). Variation in harbour porpoise activity in response to seismic survey noise. *Biology Letters, 10*(5), 20131090.

Pirotta, E., J. Harwood, P. M. Thompson, L. New, B. Cheney, M. Arso, P. S. Hammond, C. Donovan, and D. Lusseau. (2015a). Predicting the effects of human developments on individual dolphins to understand potential long-term population consequences. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 282*(1818), 20152109.

Pirotta, E., N. D. Merchant, P. M. Thompson, T. R. Barton, and D. Lusseau. (2015b). Quantifying the effect of boat disturbance on bottlenose dolphin foraging activity. *Biological Conservation, 181*, 82–89.

Pirotta, E., M. Mangel, D. P. Costa, B. Mate, J. A. Goldbogen, D. M. Palacios, L. A. Hückstädt, E. A. McHuron, L. Schwarz, and L. New. (2018). A Dynamic State Model of Migratory Behavior and Physiology to Assess the Consequences of Environmental Variation and Anthropogenic Disturbance on Marine Vertebrates. *The American Naturalist, 191*(2), 17.

Piscitelli, M. A., W. A. McLellan, A. S. Rommel, J. E. Blum, S. G. Barco, and D. A. Pabst. (2010). Lung size and thoracic morphology in shallow and deep-diving cetaceans. *Journal of Morphology, 271*, 654–673.

Pitman, R., L. Ballance, S. Mesnick, and S. Chivers. (2001). Killer whale predation on sperm whales: Observations and implications. *Marine Mammal Science, 17*(3), 494–507.

Pitman, R. (2009). Mesoplodont whales (*Mesoplodon spp.*). In W. F. Perrin, B. Wursig, & J. G. M. Thewissen (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Marine Mammals* (2nd ed., pp. 721–726). Cambridge, MA: Academic Press.

Pitman, R. L., D. W. K. Au, M. D. Scott, and J. M. Cotton. (1988). *Observations of Beaked Whales (Ziphiidae) from the Eastern Tropical Pacific Ocean*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: International Whaling Commission.

Pitman, R. L., and C. Stinchcomb. (2002). Rough-toothed dolphins (*Steno bredanensis*) as predators of mahimahi (*Coryphaena hippurus*). *Pacific Science, 56*(4), 447–450.

Pitman, R. L., H. Fearnbach, R. LeDuc, J. W. Gilpatrick, Jr., J. K. B. Ford, and L. T. Ballance. (2007). Killer whales preying on a blue whale calf on the Costa Rica Dome: Genetics, morphometrics,

vocalisations and composition of the group. *Journal of Cetacean Research and Management, 9*(2), 151–157.

Polacheck, T., and L. Thorpe. (1990). The swimming direction of harbor porpoise in relationship to a survey vessel. *Reports of the International Whaling Commission, 40*, 463–470.

Poloczanska, E. S., M. T. Burrows, C. J. Brown, J. G. Molinos, B. S. Halpern, O. Hoegh-Guldberg, C. V. Kappel, P. J. Moore, A. J. Richardson, D. S. Schoeman, and W. J. Sydeman. (2016). Responses of marine organisms to climate change across oceans. *Frontiers in Marine Science, 3*(62), 1–21.

Popov, V. V., and A. Y. Supin. (2009). Comparison of directional selectivity of hearing in a beluga whale and a bottlenose dolphin. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 126*(3), 1581–1587.

Popov, V. V., A. Y. Supin, D. Wang, K. Wang, L. Dong, and S. Wang. (2011). Noise-induced temporary threshold shift and recovery in Yangtze finless porpoises, *Neophocaena phocaenoides asiaeorientalis*. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 130*(1), 574–584.

Popov, V. V., A. Y. Supin, V. V. Rozhnov, D. I. Nechaev, E. V. Sysuyeva, V. O. Klishin, M. G. Pletenko, and M. B. Tarakanov. (2013). Hearing threshold shifts and recovery after noise exposure in beluga whales, *Delphinapterus leucas*. *The Journal of Experimental Biology, 216*(9), 1587–1596.

Popov, V. V., A. Y. Supin, V. V. Rozhnov, D. I. Nechaev, and E. V. Sysueva. (2014). The limits of applicability of the sound exposure level (SEL) metric to temporal threshold shifts (TTS) in beluga whales, *Delphinapterus leucas*. *The Journal of Experimental Biology, 217*(Pt 10), 1804–1810.

Popov, V. V., E. V. Sysueva, D. I. Nechaev, V. V. Rozhnov, and A. Y. Supin. (2017). Influence of fatiguing noise on auditory evoked responses to stimuli of various levels in a beluga whale, *Delphinapterus leucas*. *Journal of Experimental Biology, 220*(6), 1090–1096.

Puig-Lozano, R., Y. Bernaldo de Quirós, J. Díaz-Delgado, N. García-Álvarez, E. Sierra, J. De la Fuente, S. Sacchini, C. M. Suárez-Santana, D. Zucca, N. Câmara, P. Saavedra, J. Almunia, M. A. Rivero, A. Fernaández, and M. Arbelo. (2018). Retrospective study of foreign body-associated pathology in stranded cetaceans, Canary Islands (2000–2015). *Environmental Pollution, 243*, 519–527.

Quick, N., L. Scott-Hayward, D. Sadykova, D. Nowacek, and A. Read. (2017). Effects of a scientific echo sounder on the behavior of short-finned pilot whales (*Globicephala macrorhynchus*). *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences, 74*(5), 716–726.

Ramos, E. A., B. Maloney, M. O. Magnasco, and D. Reiss. (2018). Bottlenose dolphins and Antillean manatees respond to small multi-rotor unmanned aerial systems. *Frontiers in Marine Science, 5*, 316.

Ramp, C., J. Delarue, P. J. Palsboll, R. Sears, and P. S. Hammond. (2015). Adapting to a warmer ocean—Seasonal shift of baleen whale movements over three decades. *PLoS ONE, 10*(3), e0121374.

Read, A., P. Drinker, and S. Northridge. (2006). Bycatch of marine mammals in U.S. and global fisheries. *Conservation Biology, 20*(1), 163–169.

Read, A. J. (2008). The looming crisis: Interactions between marine mammals and fisheries. *Journal of Mammalogy, 89*(3), 541–548.

Redfern, J. V., L. T. Hatch, C. Caldow, M. L. DeAngelis, J. Gedamke, S. Hastings, L. Henderson, M. F. McKenna, T. J. Moore, and M. B. Porter. (2017). Assessing the risk of chronic shipping noise to baleen whales off Southern California, USA. *Endangered Species Research, 32*, 153–167.

Reeves, R. R., G. K. Silber, and P. M. Payne. (1998). *Draft recovery plan for the fin whale Balaenoptera physalus and sei whale Balaenoptera borealis*. Silver Spring, MD: Office of Protected Resources, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

Reeves, R. R., B. S. Stewart, P. J. Clapham, and J. A. Powell. (2002). *National Audubon Society Guide to Marine Mammals of the World*. New York, NY: Alfred A. Knopf.

Reeves, R. R., S. Leatherwood, and R. W. Baird. (2009). Evidence of a possible decline since 1989 in false killer whales (*Pseudorca crassidens*) around the main Hawaiian islands. *Pacific Science, 63*(2), 253–261.

Reichmuth, C., M. M. Holt, J. Mulsow, J. M. Sills, and B. L. Southall. (2013). Comparative assessment of amphibious hearing in pinnipeds. *Journal of Comparative Physiology A: Neuroethology, Sensory Neural, and Behavioral Physiology, 199*(6), 491–507.

Reichmuth, C., J. M. Sills, J. Mulsow, and A. Ghoul. (2019). Long-term evidence of noise-induced permanent threshold shift in a harbor seal (*Phoca vitulina*). *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 146*(4), 2552–2561.

Reilly, S. B. (1990). Seasonal changes in distribution and habitat differences among dolphins in the eastern tropical Pacific. *Marine Ecology Progress Series, 66*, 1–11.

Rice, A. C., S. Baumann-Pickering, A. Širović, J. A. Hildebrand, A. M. Brewer, A. J. Debich, S. T. Herbert, B. J. Thayre, J. S. Trickey, and S. M. Wiggins. (2015). *Passive Acoustic Monitoring for Marine Mammals in the Gulf of Alaska Temporary Maritime Activities Area 2014-2015*. (W9126G-14-2-0040). La Jolla, CA: Whale Acoustics Laboratory, Marine Physical Laboratory, Scripps Institution of Oceanography.

Rice, D. W. (1989). Sperm whale *Physeter macrocephalus* Linnaeus, 1758. In S. H. Ridgway & R. Harrison (Eds.), *Handbook of Marine Mammals* (Vol. 4, pp. 177–234). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Rice, D. W. (1998). *Marine Mammals of the World: Systematics and Distribution* (Society for Marine Mammalogy Special Publication). Lawrence, KS: Society for Marine Mammalogy.

Richardson, K., D. Haynes, A. Talouli, and M. Donoghue. (2016). Marine pollution originating from purse seine and longline fishing vessel operations in the Western and Central Pacific Ocean, 2003–2015. *Ambio, 46*(2), 190–200.

Richardson, W. J., M. A. Fraker, B. Würsig, and R. S. Wells. (1985). Behaviour of bowhead whales (*Balaena mysticetus*) summering in the Beaufort Sea: Reactions to industrial activities. *Biological Conservation, 32*, 195–230.

Richardson, W. J., C. R. Greene, Jr., J. S. Hanna, W. R. Koski, G. W. Miller, N. J. Patenaude, and M. A. Smultea. (1995a). *Acoustic Effects of Oil Production Activities on Bowhead and White Whales Visible during Spring Migration near Pt. Barrow, Alaska – 1991 and 1994 Phases: Sound Propagation and Whale Responses to Playbacks of Icebreaker Noise*. Anchorage, AK: U.S. Minerals Management Service, Procurement Operations.

Richardson, W. J., C. R. Greene, Jr., C. I. Malme, and D. H. Thomson. (1995b). *Marine Mammals and Noise*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Richardson, W. J., G. W. Miller, and C. R. Greene. (1999). Displacement of migrating bowhead whales by sounds from seismic surveys in shallow waters of the Beaufort Sea. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 106*(4), 2281.

Richmond, D. R., J. T. Yelverton, and E. R. Fletcher. (1973). *Far-Field Underwater-Blast Injuries Produced by Small Charges*. Washington, DC: Lovelace Foundation for Medical Education and Research, Defense Nuclear Agency.

Richter, C., S. M. Dawson, and E. Slooten. (2003). Sperm whale watching off Kaikoura, New Zealand: Effects of current activities on surfacing and vocalisation patterns. *Science for Conservation, 219*, 78.

Richter, C., S. Dawson, and E. Slooten. (2006). Impacts of commercial whale watching on male sperm whales at Kaikoura, New Zealand. *Marine Mammal Science, 22*(1), 46–63.

Ridgway, S. H. (1972). Homeostasis in the Aquatic Environment. In S. H. Ridgway (Ed.), *Mammals of the Sea: Biology and Medicine* (pp. 590–747). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.

Ridgway, S. H., and R. Howard. (1979). Dolphin lung collapse and intramuscular circulation during free diving: Evidence from nitrogen washout. *Science, 206*, 1182–1183.

Ridgway, S. H., D. A. Carder, R. R. Smith, T. Kamolnick, C. E. Schlundt, and W. R. Elsberry. (1997). *Behavioral Responses and Temporary Shift in Masked Hearing Threshold of Bottlenose Dolphins, Tursiops truncatus, to 1-second Tones of 141 to 201 dB re 1 µPa*. (Technical Report 1751, Revision 1). San Diego, CA: U.S. Department of Navy, Naval Command, Control and Ocean Surveillance Center, Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation Division.

Risch, D., P. J. Corkeron, W. T. Ellison, and S. M. Van Parijs. (2012). Changes in humpback whale song occurrence in response to an acoustic source 200 km away. *PLoS ONE, 7*(1), e29741.

Risch, D., P. J. Corkeron, W. T. Ellison, and S. M. Van Parijs. (2014). Formal comment to Gong et al.: Ecosystem scale acoustic sensing reveals humpback whale behavior synchronous with herring spawning processes and re-evaluation finds no effect of sonar on humpback song occurrence in the Gulf of Maine in fall 2006. *PLoS ONE, 9*(10), e109225.

Ritter, F. (2002). Behavioural observations of rough-toothed dolphins (*Steno bredanensis*) off La Gomera, Canary Islands (1995–2000), with special reference to their interactions with humans. *Aquatic Mammals, 28*(1), 46–59.

Robertson, F. C. (2014). *Effects of Seismic Operations on Bowhead Whale Behavior: Implications for Distribution and Abundance Assessments.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). The University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada. Retrieved from http://www.marinemammal.org/wp-content/pdfs/Robertson_2014.pdf.

Rocha, R. C., P. J. J. Clapham, and Y. V. Ivashchenko. (2014). Emptying the Oceans: A Summary of Industrial Whaling Catches in the 20th Century. *Marine Fisheries Review, 76*(4), 37–48.

Rock, T. (1993, April 12). Killer whales of the tropics. *Pacific Daily News,* p. 19.

Rockwood, R. C., J. Calambokidis, and J. Jahncke. (2017). High mortality of blue, humpack and fin whales from modeling of vessel collisions on the U.S. West Coast suggests population impacts and insufficient protection. *PLoS ONE, 12*(8), e0183052.

Rogers, K. S. (2016). Feral cats are a serious threat to Hawaii's endangered birds, monk seals and dolphins. *Honolulu Magazine*. Retrieved from http://www.honolulumagazine.com/Honolulu-Magazine/October-2016/Cats-vs-Birds-and-Everyone-Else/.

Rolland, R. M., S. E. Parks, K. E. Hunt, M. Castellote, P. J. Corkeron, D. P. Nowacek, S. K. Wasser, and S. D. Kraus. (2012). Evidence that ship noise increases stress in right whales. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 279*(1737), 2363–2368.

Rolland, R. M., W. A. McLellan, M. J. Moore, C. A. Harms, E. A. Burgess, and K. E. Hunt. (2017). Fecal glucocorticoids and anthropogenic injury and mortality in North Atlantic right whales Eubalaena glacialis. *Endangered Species Research, 34*, 417-429.

Roman, J., I. Altman, M. M. Dunphy-Daly, C. Campbell, M. Jasny, and A. J. Read. (2013). The Marine Mammal Protection Act at 40: Status, Recovery, and Future of U.S. Marine Mammals. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, 1286*, 29–49.

Romano, T. A., M. J. Keogh, C. Kelly, P. Feng, L. Berk, C. E. Schlundt, D. A. Carder, and J. J. Finneran. (2004). Anthropogenic sound and marine mammal health: Measures of the nervous and immune systems before and after intense sound exposures. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences, 61*, 1124–1134.

Rosel, P. E., and H. Watts. (2008). Hurricane impacts on bottlenose dolphins in the northern Gulf of Mexico. *Gulf of Mexico Science, 25*(1), 88–94.

Rosen, G., and G. R. Lotufo. (2010). Fate and effects of composition B in multispecies marine exposures. *Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry, 29*(6), 1330–1337.

Rosen, Y. (2015). More whales found dead in southern Alaska waters. *Alaska Dispatch News*. Retrieved from http://www.adn.com/article/20150710/more-whales-found-dead-southern-alaska-waters.

Rosowski, J. J. (1994). Outer and Middle Ears. In R. R. Fay & A. N. Popper (Eds.), *Comparative Hearing: Mammals* (pp. 172–247). Berlin, Germany: Springer-Verlag.

Ross, G. J. B., and A. J. Bass. (1971). Shark attack on an ailing dolphin *Stenella coeruleoalba* (Meyen). *South African Journal of Science, 67*, 413–414.

Ross, G. J. B., and S. Leatherwood. (1994). Pygmy killer whale *Feresa attenuata* Gray, 1874. In S. H. Ridgway & R. Harrison (Eds.), *Handbook of Marine Mammals* (Vol. 5, pp. 387–404). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Rossi, T., S. D. Connell, and I. Nagelkerken. (2016). Silent oceans: Ocean acidification impoverishes natural soundscapes by altering sound production of the world's noisiest marine invertebrate. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 283*(1826), 20153046.

Rossman, S., E. B. McCabe, N. B. Barros, H. G. Gandhi, P. H. Ostrom, C. A. Stricker, and R. S. Wells. (2015). Foraging habits in a generalist predator: Sex and age influence habitat selection and resource use among bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*). *Marine Mammal Science, 31*(1), 155–168.

Sadove, S. S., and S. J. Morreale. (1989). *Marine Mammal and Sea Turtle Encounters with Marine Debris in the New York Bight and the Northeast Atlantic.* Paper presented at the Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Marine Debris. Honolulu, HI.

Saez, L., D. Lawson, M. DeAngelis, S. Wilkin, E. Petras, and C. Fahy. (2012). *Marine mammal entanglements along the United States west coast: A reference guide for gear identification*. In Ocean Associates Inc. and National Marine Fisheries Service (Ed.). Long Beach, CA.

Saez, L., D. Lawson, M. DeAngelis, E. Petras, S. Wilkin, and C. Fahy. (2013). *Understanding the Co-Occurrence of Large Whales and Commercial Fixed Gear Fisheries Off the West Coast of the United States* (NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SWR-044). Long Beach, CA: Southwest Regional Office, Protected Resources Division.

Saipan Tribune. (2011). *Necropsy found abnormalities in kidneys, intestines of beached whale*. Retrieved from http://www.saipantribune.com/newsstory.aspx?newsID=112203

Sairanen, E. E. (2014). *Weather and Ship Induced Sounds and the Effect of Shipping on Harbor Porpoise (Phocoena phocoena) Activity.* (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland. Retrieved from helda.helsinki.fi.

Salvadeo, C. J., D. Lluch-Belda, A. Gómez-Gallardo, J. Urbán-Ramírez, and C. D. MacLeod. (2010). Climate change and a poleward shift in the distribution of the Pacific white-sided dolphin in the northeastern Pacific. *Endangered Species Research, 11*, 13–19.

Salvadeo, C. J., A. Gomez-Gallardo U., M. Najera-Caballero, J. Urban-Ramirez, and D. Lluch-Belda. (2015). The effect of climate variability on gray whales (*Eschrichtius robustus*) within their wintering areas. *PLoS ONE, 10*(8), 1–17.

Sanford, E., J. L. Sones, M. García-Reyes, J. H. R. Goddard, and J. L. Largier. (2019). Widespread shifts in the coastal biota of northern California during the 2014–2016 marine heatwaves. *Scientific Reports, 9*(1), 1–14.

Santos, M. B., V. Martin, M. Arbelo, A. Fernandez, and G. J. Pierce. (2007). Insights into the diet of beaked whales from the atypical mass strandings in the Canary Islands in September 2002. *Journal of the Marine Biological Association of the United Kingdom, 87*, 243–251.

Saunders, K. J., P. R. White, and T. G. Leighton. (2008). Models for Predicting Nitrogen Tensions and Decompression Sickness Risk in Diving Beaked Whales. *Proceedings of the Institute of Acoustics, 30*(5), 1–8.

Savage, K., D. Fauquier, S. Raverty, K. B. Huntington, J. Moran, M. Migura, P. Cottrell, K. Wynne, B. Witteveen, and F. Van Dolah. (2017). *Abstract: 2015 Gulf of Alaska Large Whale Unusual Mortality Event*. Paper presented at the Kodiak Area Marine Science Symposium April 18–21, 2017. Kodiak, AK. Retrieved from https://seagrant.uaf.edu/events/2017/kamss/kamssprog-2017.pdf.

Scarpaci, C., S. W. Bigger, P. J. Corkeron, and D. Nugegoda. (2000). Bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*) increase whistling in the presence of 'swim-with-dolphin' tour operations. *Journal of Cetacean Research and Management, 2*(3), 183–185.

Schakner, Z. A., and D. T. Blumstein. (2013). Behavioral biology of marine mammal deterrents: A review and prospectus. *Biological Conservation, 167*, 380–389.

Scheifele, P. M., S. Andrew, R. A. Cooper, M. Darre, R. E. Musiek, and L. Max. (2005). Indication of a Lombard vocal response in the St. Lawrence River beluga. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 117*(3), 1486–1492.

Schlundt, C. E., J. J. Finneran, D. A. Carder, and S. H. Ridgway. (2000). Temporary shift in masked hearing thresholds of bottlenose dolphins, *Tursiops truncatus*, and white whales, *Delphinapterus leucas*, after exposure to intense tones. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 107*(6), 3496–3508.

Schlundt, C. E., R. L. Dear, L. Green, D. S. Houser, and J. J. Finneran. (2007). Simultaneously measured behavioral and electrophysiological hearing thresholds in a bottlenose dolphin (*Tursiops truncatus*). *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 122*(1), 615–622.

Schorr, G. S., E. A. Falcone, D. J. Moretti, and R. D. Andrews. (2014). First long-term behavioral records from Cuvier's beaked whales (*Ziphius cavirostris*) reveal record-breaking dives. *PLoS ONE, 9*(3), e92633.

Schorr, G. S., E. A. Falcone, and B. K. Rone. (2017). *Distribution and Demographics of Cuvier's Beaked Whales and Fin Whales in the Southern California Bight* (Annual report for on-water surveys conducted in conjunction with Marine Mammal Monitoring on Navy Ranges). Seabeck, WA: Marine Ecology and Telemetry Research.

Schorr, G. S., E. A. Falcone, B. K. Rone, and E. L. Keene. (2018). *Distribution and Demographics of Cuvier's Beaked Whales in the Southern California Bight*. Seabeck, WA: Marine Ecology and Telemetry Research.

Schorr, G. S., E. A. Falcone, B. K. Rone, and E. L. Keene. (2019). *Distribution and demographic of Cuvier's beaked whales and fin whales in the Southern California Bight*. Seabeck, WA: Marine Ecology and Telemetry Research.

Schuler, A. R., S. Piwetz, J. Di Clemente, D. Steckler, F. Mueter, and H. C. Pearson. (2019). Humpback whale movements and behavior in response to whale-watching vessels in Juneau, AK. *Frontiers in Marine Science, 6*.

Sears, R., and W. F. Perrin. (2009). Blue whale. In W. F. Perrin, B. Wursig, & J. G. M. Thewissen (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Marine Mammals* (2nd ed., pp. 120–124). Cambridge, MA: Academic Press.

Sekiguchi, K., N. T. W. Klages, and P. B. Best. (1992). Comparative analysis of the diets of smaller odontocete cetaceans along the coast of southern Africa. *South African Journal of Marine Science, 12*, 843–861.

Serrano, L., C. A. Simeone, K. M. Colegrove, P. J. Duignan, T. Goldstein, and F. M. D. Gulland. (2017). Cetacean Morbillivirus in Odontocetes Stranded Along the Central California Coast, 2000–2015. *Journal of Wildife Diseases, 53*(2), 1–7.

Shane, S. H., R. S. Wells, and B. Wursig. (1986). Ecology, behavior and social organization of the bottlenose dolphin: A review. *Marine Mammal Science, 2*(1), 34–63.

Shane, S. H. (1990). Comparison of bottlenose dolphin behavior in Texas and Florida, with a critique of methods for studying dolphin behavior. In S. Leatherwood & R. R. Reeves (Eds.), *The Bottlenose Dolphin* (pp. 541–558). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Shirasago-Germán, B., E. L. Pérez-Lezama, E. A. Chávez, and R. García-Morales. (2015). Influence of El Niño-Southern Oscillation on the population structure of a sea lion breeding colony in the Gulf of California. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science, 154*, 69–76.

Silber, G. K., M. D. Lettrich, P. O. Thomas, J. D. Baker, M. Baumgartner, E. A. Becker, P. Boveng, D. M. Dick, J. Fiechter, J. Forcada, K. A. Forney, R. B. Griffis, J. A. Hare, A. J. Hobday, D. Howell, K. L. Laidre, N. Mantua, L. Quakenbush, J. A. Santora, K. M. Stafford, P. Spencer, C. Stock, W. Sydeman, K. Van Houtan, and R. S. Waples. (2017). Projecting Marine Mammal Distribution in a Changing Climate. *Frontiers in Marine Science, 4*, 14.

Sills, J. M., B. L. Southall, and C. Reichmuth. (2017). The influence of temporally varying noise from seismic air guns on the detection of underwater sounds by seals. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 141*(2), 996–1008.

Silva, T. L., T. A. Mooney, L. S. Sayigh, P. L. Tyack, R. W. Baird, and J. N. Oswald. (2016). Whistle characteristics and daytime dive behavior in pantropical spotted dolphins (*Stenella attenuata*) in Hawai measured using digital acoustic recording tags (DTAGs). *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 140*(1), 421–429.

Simeone, C. A., F. M. Gulland, T. Norris, and T. K. Rowles. (2015). A systematic review of changes in marine mammal health in North America, 1972–2012: The need for a novel integrated approach. *PLoS ONE, 10*(11), e0142105.

Simmonds, M. P., and W. J. Eliott. (2009). Climate change and cetaceans: Concerns and recent developments. *Journal of the Marine Biological Association of the United Kingdom, 89*(1), 203–210.

Simonis, A. E., R. L. Brownell, B. J. Thayre, J. S. Trickey, E. M. Oleson, R. Huntington, and S. Baumann-Pickering. (2020). Co-occurrence of beaked whale strandings and naval sonar in the Mariana Islands, Western Pacific. *Proceedings of the Royal Society, 287*.

Singh, R., P. Soni, P. Kumar, S. Purohit, and A. Singh. (2009). Biodegradation of high explosive production effluent containing RDX and HMX by denitrifying bacteria. *World Journal of Microbiology and Biotechnology, 25*, 269–275.

Širović, A., J. A. Hildebrand, S. M. Wiggins, M. A. McDonald, S. E. Moore, and D. Thiele. (2004). Seasonality of blue and fin whale calls and the influence of sea ice in the Western Antarctic Peninsula. *Deep Sea Research II, 51*(17–19), 2327–2344.

Širović, A., J. A. Hildebrand, and S. M. Wiggins. (2007). Blue and fin whale call source levels and propagation range in the Southern Ocean. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 122*(2), 1208–1215.

Širović, A., A. Rice, E. Chou, J. A. Hildebrand, S. M. Wiggins, and M. A. Roch. (2015). Seven years of blue and fin whale call abundance in the Southern California Bight. *Endangered Species Research, 28*, 61–76.

Sivle, L. D., P. H. Kvadsheim, A. Fahlman, F. P. Lam, P. L. Tyack, and P. J. Miller. (2012). Changes in dive behavior during naval sonar exposure in killer whales, long-finned pilot whales, and sperm whales. *Frontiers in Physiolology, 3*, 400.

Sivle, L. D., P. H. Kvadsheim, C. Curé, S. Isojunno, P. J. Wensveen, F. A. Lam, F. Visser, L. Kleivane, P. L. Tyack, C. M. Harris, and P. J. O. Miller. (2015). Severity of expert-identified behavioural responses of humpback whale, minke whale, and northern bottlenose whale to naval sonar. *Aquatic Mammals, 41*(4), 469–502.

Sivle, L. D., P. J. Wensveen, P. H. Kvadsheim, F. P. A. Lam, F. Visser, C. Curé, C. M. Harris, P. L. Tyack, and P. J. O. Miller. (2016). Naval sonar disrupts foraging in humpback whales. *Marine Ecology Progress Series, 562*, 211–220.

Skarke, A., C. Ruppel, M. Kodis, D. Brothers, and E. Lobecker. (2014). Widespread methane leakage from the sea floor on the northern US Atlantic margin. *Nature Geoscience, 7*, 657–661.

Smith, B. D., G. Braulik, S. Strindberg, R. Mansur, M. A. A. Diyan, and B. Ahmed. (2009). Habitat selection of freshwater-dependent cetaceans and the potential effects of declining freshwater flows and sea-level rise in waterways of the Sundarbans mangrove forest, Bangladesh. *Aquatic Conservation: Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems, 19*(2), 209–225.

Smith, C. E., B. J. Hurley, C. N. Toms, A. D. Mackey, M. Solangi, and S. A. Kuczaj Ii. (2013a). Hurricane impacts on the foraging patterns of bottlenose dolphins *Tursiops truncatus* in Mississippi Sound. *Marine Ecology Progress Series, 487*, 231–244.

Smith, C. E., S. T. Sykora–Bodie, B. Bloodworth, S. M. Pack, T. R. Spradlin, and N. R. LeBoeuf. (2016). Assessment of known impacts of unmanned aerial systems (UAS) on marine mammals: Data

gaps and recommendations for researchers in the United States. *Journal of Unmanned Vehicle Systems, 4*(1), 31–44.

Smith, S. D. A. (2012). Marine debris: A proximate threat to marine sustainability in Bootless Bay, Papua New Guinea. *Marine Pollution Bulletin, 64*, 1880–1883.

Smith, S. H., and D. E. Marx, Jr. (2009). *Assessment of Near Shore Marine Resources at Farallon De Medinilla: 2006, 2007 and 2008*. Capitol Hill, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands: Pacific Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command.

Smith, S. H., J. Marx, D. E., and L. H. Shannon. (2013b). *Calendar Year 2012 Assessment of Near Shore Marine Resources at Farallon de Medinilla, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands*. Port Hueneme, CA: U.S. Department of the Navy.

Smith, S. H., and D. E. Marx, Jr. (2016). De-facto marine protection from a Navy bombing range: Farallon de Medinilla, Mariana Archipelago, 1997 to 2012. *Marine Pollution Bulletin, 102*(1), 187–198.

Smultea, M. A., J. L. Hopkins, and A. M. Zoidis. (2008). *Marine Mammal and Sea Turtle Monitoring Survey in Support of Navy Training Exercises in the Hawai'i Range Complex November 11—17, 2007*. Oakland, CA: Cetos Research Organization.

Smultea, M. A., and J. R. Mobley, Jr. (2009). *Aerial Survey Monitoring of Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles in Conjunction with SCC OPS Navy Exercises off Kauai, 18–21 August 2008, Final Report, May 2009*. Pearl Harbor, HI: Naval Facilities Engineering Command Pacific.

Smultea, M. A., J. R. Mobley, Jr., and K. Lomac-MacNair. (2009). *Aerial Survey Monitoring for Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles in the Hawaii Range Complex in Conjunction with a Navy Training Event, SSC OPS February 15–19, 2009, Final Field Report*. Honolulu, HI: Marine Mammal Research Consultants and Issaquah, WA: Smultea Environmental Sciences, LLC.

Smultea, M. A., C. E. Bacon, and J. S. D. Black. (2011). *Aerial Survey Marine Mammal Monitoring off Southern California in Conjunction with US Navy Major Training Events (MTE), July 27–August 3 and September 23–28, 2010—Final Report, June 2011*. Issaquah, WA: Smultea Environmental Sciences.

Smultea, M. A., C. E. Bacon, T. F. Norris, and D. Steckler. (2012). *Aerial Surveys Conducted in the SOCAL OPAREA From 1 August 2011–31 July 2012*. San Diego, CA: HDR, Inc.

Smultea, M. A., and K. Lomac-MacNair. (2016). Assessing 'Observer Effects' from a Research Aircraft on Behavior of Three Delphinidae Species (*Grampus griseus*, *Delphinus delphis*, and *Orcinus orca*). *Wildlife Biology in Practice, 12*(2), 75–90.

Song, K.-J. (2017). Bycatch of cetaceans on Korea fisheries in the East Sea. *Fisheries Research, 197*, 7–9.

Sousa-Lima, R. S., and C. W. Clark. (2008). Modeling the effect of boat traffic on the fluctuation of humpback whale singing activity in the Abrolhos National Marine Park, Brazil. *Canadian Acoustics, 36*(1), 174–181.

Southall, B., A. Bowles, W. Ellison, J. Finneran, R. Gentry, C. Greene, D. Kastak, D. Ketten, J. Miller, P. Nachtigall, W. Richardson, J. Thomas, and P. Tyack. (2007). Marine mammal noise exposure criteria: Initial scientific recommendations. *Aquatic Mammals, 33*(4), 122.

Southall, B., J. Calambokidis, P. Tyack, D. Moretti, J. Hildebrand, C. Kyburg, R. Carlson, A. Friedlaender, E. Falcone, G. Schorr, A. Douglas, S. DeRuiter, J. Goldbogen, and J. Barlow. (2011). *Biological and Behavioral Response Studies of Marine Mammals in Southern California, 2010 ("SOCAL-10") Project Report*. Pearl Harbor, HI: U.S. Navy Pacific Fleet.

Southall, B., J. Calambokidis, P. Tyack, D. Moretti, A. Friedlaender, S. DeRuiter, J. Goldbogen, E. Falcone, G. Schorr, A. Douglas, A. K. Stimpert, J. Hildebrand, C. Kyburg, R. Carlson, T. Yack, and J. Barlow. (2012). *Biological and Behavioral Response Studies of Marine Mammals in Southern California, 2011 ("SOCAL-11") Final Project Report*. Pearl Harbor, HI: U.S. Navy Pacific Fleet.

Southall, B., J. Calambokidis, J. Barlow, D. Moretti, A. Friedlaender, A. Stimpert, A. Douglas, K. Southall, S. Arranz, S. DeRuiter, E. Hazen, J. Goldbogen, E. Falcone, and G. Schorr. (2013). *Biological and Behavioral Response Studies of Marine Mammals in Southern California, 2012 ("SOCAL-12") Final Project Report*. Pearl Harbor, HI: U.S. Navy Pacific Fleet.

Southall, B., J. Calambokidis, J. Barlow, D. Moretti, A. Friedlaender, A. Stimpert, A. Douglas, K. Southall, P. Arranz, S. DeRuiter, J. Goldbogen, E. Falcone, and G. Schorr. (2014). *Biological and Behavioral Response Studies of Marine Mammals in Southern California, 2013 ("SOCAL-13") Final Project Report*. Pearl Harbor, HI: U.S. Navy Pacific Fleet.

Southall, B., J. Calambokidis, D. Moretti, A. Stimpert, A. Douglas, J. Barlow, R. W. Rankin, K. Southall, A. Friedlaender, E. Hazen, J. Goldbogen, E. Falcone, G. Schorr, G. Gailey, and A. Allen. (2015). *Biological and Behavioral Response Studies of Marine Mammals in Southern California, 2014 ("SOCAL-14") Final Project Report*. Pearl Harbor, HI: U.S. Navy Pacific Fleet.

Southall, B. L., R. J. Schusterman, and D. Kastak. (2000). Masking in three pinnipeds: Underwater, low-frequency critical ratios. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 108*(3), 1322–1326.

Southall, B. L., R. J. Schusterman, and D. Kastak. (2003). Auditory masking in three pinnipeds: Aerial critical ratios and direct critical bandwidth measurements. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 114*(3), 1660–1666.

Southall, B. L., R. Braun, F. M. D. Gulland, A. D. Heard, R. W. Baird, S. M. Wilkin, and T. K. Rowles. (2006). *Hawaiian Melon-headed Whales (Peponacephala electra) Mass Stranding Event of July 3–4, 2004* (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Technical Memorandum NMFS-OPR-31). Silver Spring, MD: National Marine Fisheries Service.

Southall, B. L., P. L. Tyack, D. Moretti, C. Clark, D. Claridge, and I. Boyd. (2009). *Behavioral responses of beaked whales and other cetaceans to controlled exposures of simulated sonar and other sounds*. Paper presented at the 18th Biennial Conference on the Biology of Marine Mammals. Quebec City, Canada.

Southall, B. L., D. P. Nowacek, P. J. O. Miller, and P. L. Tyack. (2016). Experimental field studies to measure behavioral responses of cetaceans to sonar. *Endangered Species Research, 31*, 293–315.

Southall, B. L., L. Hatch, A. Scholik-Schlomer, T. Bergmann, M. Jasny, K. Metcalf, L. Weilgart, A. J. Wright, and M. E. Perera. (2018). Reducing Noise from Large Commercial Ships. *Proceedings of the Marine Safety & Security Council, 75*(1), 1–8.

Southall, B. L., K. J. Benoit-Bird, M. A. Moline, and D. Moretti. (2019a). Quantifying deep-sea predator-prey dynamics: Implications of biological heterogeneity for beaked whale conservation. *Journal of Applied Ecology, 2019*, 1–10.

Southall, B. L., S. L. DeRuiter, A. Friedlaender, A. K. Stimpert, J. A. Goldbogen, E. Hazen, C. Casey, S. Fregosi, D. E. Cade, A. N. Allen, C. M. Harris, G. Schorr, D. Moretti, S. Guan, and J. Calambokidis. (2019b). Behavioral responses of individual blue whales (*Balaenoptera musculus*) to mid-frequency military sonar. *Journal of Experimental Biology, 222*(Pt 5).

Southall, B. L., J. J. Finneran, C. Reichmuth, P. E. Nachtigall, D. R. Ketten, A. E. Bowles, W. T. Ellison, D. P. Nowacek, and P. L. Tyack. (2019c). Marine mammal noise exposure criteria: Updated scientific recommendations for residual hearing effects. *Aquatic Mammals, 45*(2), 125–232.

Spiesberger, J. L., and K. M. Fristrup. (1990). Passive localization of calling animals and sensing of their acoustic environment using acoustic tomography. *The American Naturalist, 135*(1), 107–153.

Sprogis, K. R., C. King, L. Bejder, and N. R. Loneragan. (2018). Frequency and temporal trends of shark predation attempts on bottlenose dolphins (Tursiops aduncus) in temperate Australian waters. *Journal of Experiemental Marine Biology and Ecology, 508*(1), 35–43.

St. Aubin, D., and L. A. Dierauf. (2001). Stress and Marine Mammals. In L. A. Dierauf & F. M. D. Gulland (Eds.), *Marine Mammal Medicine* (2nd ed., pp. 253–269). Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.

St. Aubin, D. J., and J. R. Geraci. (1989). Adaptive changes in hematologic and plasma chemical constituents in captive beluga whales, *Delphinapterus leucas*. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences, 46*, 796–803.

St. Aubin, D. J., S. H. Ridgway, R. S. Wells, and H. Rhinehart. (1996). Dolphin thyroid and adrenal hormones: Circulating levels in wild and semidomesticated *Tursiops truncatus*, and influence of sex, age, and season. *Marine Mammal Science, 12*(1), 1–13.

Stamation, K. A., D. B. Croft, P. D. Shaughnessy, K. A. Waples, and S. V. Briggs. (2009). Behavioral responses of humpback whales (*Megaptera novaeangliae*) to whale-watching vessels on the southeastern coast of Australia. *Marine Mammal Science, 26*(1), 98–122.

Stamper, M. A., B. R. Whitaker, and T. D. Schofield. (2006). Case study: Morbidity in a pygmy sperm whale *Kogia breviceps* due to ocean-bourne plastic. *Marine Mammal Science, 22*(3), 719–722.

State of Hawaii. (2015). *Friends of the Future to help Lapakahi State Park*. Retrieved from http://www.bigislandvideonews.com/2015/10/21/friends-of-the-future-to-help-lapakahi-state-park/.

Steckenreuter, A., R. Harcourt, and L. Moller. (2011). Distance does matter: Close approaches by boats impede feeding and resting behaviour of Indo-Pacific bottlenose dolphins. *Wildlife Research, 38*(6), 455–463.

Steiger, G. H., J. Calambokidis, J. M. Straley, L. M. Herman, S. Cerchio, D. R. Salden, J. Urban-R, J. K. Jacobsen, O. von Ziegesar, K. C. Balcomb, C. M. Gabriele, M. E. Dahlheim, S. Uchida, J. K. B. Ford, P. Ladron de Guevara-P., M. Yamaguchi, and J. Barlow. (2008). Geographic variation in killer whale attacks on humpback whales in the North Pacific: Implications for predation pressure. *Endangered Species Research, 4*, 247–256.

Stevens, P. W., D. A. Blewett, and J. P. Casey. (2006). Short-term effects of a low dissolved oxygen event on estuarine fish assemblages following passage of Hurricane Charley. *Estuaries and Coasts, 29*(6A), 997–1003.

Stimpert, A. K., D. N. Wiley, W. W. Au, M. P. Johnson, and R. Arsenault. (2007). 'Megapclicks': Acoustic click trains and buzzes produced during night-time foraging of humpback whales (*Megaptera novaeangliae*). *Biology Letters, 3*(5), 467–470.

Stimpert, A. K., S. L. DeRuiter, B. L. Southall, D. J. Moretti, E. A. Falcone, J. A. Goldbogen, A. Friedlaender, G. S. Schorr, and J. Calambokidis. (2014). Acoustic and foraging behavior of a Baird's beaked whale, *Berardius bairdii,* exposed to simulated sonar. *Scientific Reports, 4*, 7031.

Stockin, K. A., D. Lusseau, V. Binedell, N. Wiseman, and M. B. Orams. (2008). Tourism affects the behavioural budget of the common dolphin *Delphinus* sp. in the Hauraki Gulf, New Zealand. *Marine Ecology Progress Series, 355*, 287–295.

Sullivan, F. A., and L. G. Torres. (2018). Assessment of vessel disturbance to gray whales to inform sustainable ecotourism. *The Journal of Wildlife Management, 82*(5), 896–905.

Summers, D. J. (2017). Algal toxins found in Alaska marine mammals for first time. *Alaska Journal of Commerce*(3), 3.

Supin, A. Y., V. V. Popov, and A. M. Mass. (2001). *The Sensory Physiology of Aquatic Mammals*. Boston, MA: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Swisdak, M. M., Jr., and P. E. Montanaro. (1992). *Airblast and Fragmentation Hazards from Underwater Explosions*. Silver Spring, MD: Naval Surface Warfare Center.

Sydeman, W. J., and S. G. Allen. (1999). Pinniped population dynamics in central California: Correlations with sea surface temperature and upwelling indices. *Marine Mammal Science, 15*(2), 446–461.

Sylvestre, J.-P. (1988). Note on three Dwarf Sperm Whales Kogia simus (Owen 1866) and comments on Kogiids of Japanese Coasts. *Aquatic Mammals, 14.3*, 120–122.

Tarpley, R. J., and S. Marwitz. (1993). Plastic debris ingestion by cetaceans along the Texas coast: Two case reports. *Aquatic Mammals, 19*(2), 93–98.

Teilmann, J., J. Tougaard, L. A. Miller, T. Kirketerp, K. Hansen, and S. Brando. (2006). Reactions of captive harbor porpoises (*Phocoena phocoena*) to pinger-like sounds. *Marine Mammal Science, 22*(2), 240–260.

Tennessen, J. B., and S. E. Parks. (2016). Acoustic propagation modeling indicates vocal compensation in noise improves communication range for North Atlantic right whales. *Endangered Species Research, 30*, 225–237.

Terhune, J. M., and W. C. Verboom. (1999). Right whales and ship noises. *Marine Mammal Science, 15*(1), 256–258.

Tetra Tech Inc. (2014). *Marine Mammal Survey Report in Support of the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands Joint Military Training Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement. Final (Version 3)*. Oakland, CA: TEC-AECOM Pacific Joint Venture

Tezanos-Pinto, G., C. S. Baker, K. Russell, K. Martien, R. W. Baird, A. Hutt, G. Stone, A. A. Mignucci-Giannoni, S. Caballero, T. Endo, S. Lavery, M. Oremus, C. Olavarria, and C. Garrigue. (2009). A worldwide perspective on the population structure and genetic diversity of bottlenose dolphins (Tursiops truncatus) in New Zealand. *Journal of Heredity, 100*(1), 11–24.

Thiel, M., G. Luna-Jorquera, R. Álvarez-Varas, C. Gallardo, I. A. Hinojosa, N. Luna, D. Miranda-Urbina, N. Morales, N. Ory, A. S. Pacheco, M. Portflitt-Toro, and C. Zavalaga. (2018). Impacts of Marine Plastic Pollution From Continental Coasts to Subtropical Gyres—Fish, Seabirds, and Other Vertebrates in the SE Pacific. *Frontiers in Marine Science, 5*, 1–16.

Thomas, J., P. Moore, R. Withrow, and M. Stoermer. (1990a). Underwater audiogram of a Hawaiian monk seal (*Monachus schauinslandi*). *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 87*(1), 417–420.

Thomas, J. A., R. A. Kastelein, and F. T. Awbrey. (1990b). Behavior and blood catecholamines of captive belugas during playbacks of noise from an oil drilling platform. *Zoo Biology, 9*(5), 393–402.

Thompson, D., M. Sjoberg, M. E. Bryant, P. Lovell, and A. Bjorge. (1998). *Behavioral and physiological responses of harbour (Phoca vitulina) and grey (Halichoerus grypus) seals to seismic surveys* (Report to European Commission of BROMMAD Project. MAS2 C7940098). Brussels, Belgium: European Commission.

Thompson, P. M., D. Lusseau, T. Barton, D. Simmons, J. Rusin, and H. Bailey. (2010). Assessing the responses of coastal cetaceans to the construction of offshore wind turbines. *Marine Pollution Bulletin, 60*(8), 1200–1208.

Thompson, P. M., K. L. Brookes, I. M. Graham, T. R. Barton, K. Needham, G. Bradbury, and N. D. Merchant. (2013). Short-term disturbance by a commercial two-dimensional seismic survey does not lead to long-term displacement of harbour porpoises. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 280*(1771), 20132001.

Thompson, R., Y. Olsen, R. Mitchell, A. Davis, S. Rowland, A. John, D. McGonigle, and A. Russell. (2004). Lost at sea: Where is all the plastic? *Science, New Series, 304*(5672), 838.

Tirard, P., M. J. Manning, I. Jollit, C. Duffy, and P. Borsa. (2010). Records of great white shark (Carcharodon carcharias) in New Caledonian waters. *Pacific Science, 64*, 567–576.

Titova, O. V., O. A. Filatova, I. D. Fedutin, E. N. Ovsyanikova, H. Okabe, N. Kobayashi, J. M. V. Acebes, A. M. Burdin, and E. Hoyt. (2017). Photo-identification matches of humpback whales (*Megaptera novaeangliae*) from feeding areas in Russian Far East seas and breeding grounds in the North Pacific. *Marine Mammal Science, 34*(1), 100–112.

Tixier, P., N. Gasco, G. Duhamel, and C. Guinet. (2014). Habituation to an acoustic harassment device by killer whales depredating demersal longlines. *ICES Journal of Marine Science, 72*(5), 1673–1681.

Todd, S., P. Stevick, J. Lien, F. Marques, and D. Ketten. (1996). Behavioural effects of exposure to underwater explosions in humpback whales (*Megaptera novaeanlgiae*). *Canadian Journal of Zoology, 74*, 1661–1672.

Tougaard, J., J. Carstensen, J. Teilmann, N. I. Bech, H. Skov, and O. D. Henriksen. (2005). *Effects of the Nysted Offshore Wind Farm on Harbour Porpoises* (Annual Status Report for the T-POD Monitoring Program). Roskilde, Denmark: National Environmental Research Institute.

Tougaard, J., J. Carstensen, J. Teilmann, H. Skov, and P. Rasmussen. (2009). Pile driving zone of responsiveness extends beyond 20 km for harbor porpoises (*Phocoena phocoena* [L.]). *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 126*(1), 11.

Townsend, C. H. (1935). The Distribution of Certain Whales As Shown by Logbook Records of American Whaleships. *Zoologica, XIX*(1), 3–40.

Trianni, M. S., and C. C. Kessler. (2002). Incidence and strandings of the Spinner Dolphin, *Stenella longirostris*, in Saipan Lagoon. *Micronesica, 34*(2), 249–260.

Trianni, M. S., and M. C. Tenorio. (2012). Summary of recorded cetacean strandings in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. *Micronesica, 43*(1), 1–13.

Trickey, J. S., B. K. Branstetter, and J. J. Finneran. (2010). Auditory masking of a 10 kHz tone with environmental, comodulated, and Gaussian noise in bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*). *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 128*(6), 3799–3804.

Trickey, J. S., S. Baumann-Pickering, A. Širović, J. A. Hildebrand, A. M. Brewer, A. J. Debich, S. Herbert, A. C. Rice, B. Thayre, and S. M. Wiggins. (2015). *Passive Acoustic Monitoring for Marine Mammals in the Northwest Training Range Complex July 2013–April 2014*. La Jolla, CA: Marine Physical Laboratory, Scripps Institution of Oceanography, University of California, San Diego.

Trites, A. W., and D. E. Bain. (2000). *Short- and long-term effects of whale watching on killer whales (Orcinus orca) in British Columbia*. Adelaide, Australia: International Whaling Commission.

Twiss, J. R., Jr., and R. R. Reeves. (1999). *Conservation and Managment of Marine Mammals*. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press.

Tyack, P., W. Zimmer, D. Moretti, B. Southall, D. Claridge, J. Durban, C. Clark, A. D'Amico, N. DiMarzio, S. Jarvis, E. McCarthy, R. Morrissey, J. Ward, and I. Boyd. (2011). Beaked Whales Respond to Simulated and Actual Navy Sonar. *PLoS ONE, 6*(3), 15.

Tyack, P. L., M. Johnson, N. Aguilar Soto, A. Sturlese, and P. T. Madsen. (2006). Extreme deep diving of beaked whales. *The Journal of Experimental Biology, 209*, 4238–4253.

Tyack, P. L. (2009). Human-generated sound and marine mammals. *Physics Today*, 39–44.

Tyne, J. A., K. H. Pollock, D. W. Johnston, and L. Bejder. (2014). Abundance and survival rates of the Hawaii Island associated spinner dolphin (*Stenella longirostris*) stock. *PLoS ONE, 9*(1), e86132.

Tyne, J. A. (2015). *A scientific foundation for informed management decisions: Quantifying the abundance, important habitat and cumulative exposure of the Hawaii Island spinner dolphin (Stenella longirostris) stock to human activities.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation in Philosophy). Murdoch University, Murdoch, Australia. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/311608220_A_scientific_foundation_for_informed_management_decisions_Quantifying_the_abundance_important_habitat_and_cumulative_exposure_of_the_Hawaii_Island_spinner_dolphin_Stenella_longirostris_stock_to_human_.

Tyne, J. A., D. W. Johnston, R. Rankin, N. R. Loneragan, L. Bejder, and A. Punt. (2015). The importance of spinner dolphin (*Stenella longirostris*) resting habitat: Implications for management. *Journal of Applied Ecology, 52*(3), 621–630.

Tyne, J. A., D. W. Johnston, F. Christiansen, and L. Bejder. (2017). Temporally and spatially partitioned behaviours of spinner dolphins: Implications for resilience to human disturbance. *Royal Society Open Science, 4*(1), 160626.

Tyne, J. A., F. Christiansen, H. L. Heenehan, D. W. Johnston, and L. Bejder. (2018). Chronic exposure of Hawaii Island spinner dolphins (*Stenella longirostris*) to human activities. *Royal Society Open Science, 5*, e171506.

U.S. Department of Commerce, and U.S. Department of the Navy. (2001). *Joint Interim Report Bahamas Marine Mammal Stranding Event of 15–16 March 2000*. Washington, DC: Department of Commerce.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2004). *Report on the Results of the Inquiry into Allegations of Marine Mammal Impacts Surrounding the Use of Active Sonar by USS SHOUP (DDG 86) in the Haro Strait on or about 5 May 2003*. Pearl Harbor, HI: Commander, U.S. Pacific Fleet.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2005). *Marine Resources Assessment for the Marianas Operating Area (Final Report)*. Pearl Harbor, HI: Commander, U.S. Pacific Fleet.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2007). *Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for Surveillance Towed Array Sensor System Low Frequency Active (SURTASS LFA) Sonar Volume 1 of 2*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Navy.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2010). *Navy Integrated Comprehensive Monitoring Plan*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Navy.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2011a). *Marine Species Monitoring for the U.S. Navy's Hawaii Range Complex and the Southern California Range Complex, 2011 Annual Report*. Pearl Harbor, HI: U.S. Navy Pacific Fleet.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2011b). *Marine Species Monitoring, Information on Sightings Recorded by U.S. Navy MMOs on Vessels during Sonar Test Events in the Naval Surface Warfare Center Panama City Division (NSWC PCD)*. Norfolk, VA: United States Fleet Forces Command.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2013a). *U.S. Navy Strategic Planning Process for Marine Species Monitoring*. Washington, DC: Chief of Naval Operations, Energy & Environmental Readiness Division.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2013b). *Comprehensive Exercise and Marine Species Monitoring Report for the U.S. Navy's Atlantic Fleet Active Sonar Training (AFAST) and Virginia Capes, Cherry Point, Jacksonville, and Gulf of Mexico Range Complexes 2009–2012*. Norfolk, VA: United States Fleet Forces Command.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2013c). *Comprehensive Exercise and Marine Species Monitoring Report for the U.S. Navy's Hawaii Range Complex 2009–2012*. Pearl Harbor, HI: U.S. Navy Pacific Fleet.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2014a). *Unclassified Annual Range Complex Exercise Report, 2 August 2012 to 25 November 2013, for the U.S. Navy's Atlantic Fleet Active Sonar Training (AFAST) Study Area*. Silver Spring, MD: National Marine Fisheries Service, Office of Protected Resources.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2014b). *Marine Species Monitoring Report for the U.S. Navy's Atlantic Fleet Active Sonar Training (AFAST) and Virginia Capes, Cherry Point, Jacksonville, and Gulf of Mexico Range Complexes - Annual Report 2013*. Norfolk, VA: United States Fleet Forces Command.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2015a). *Final Mariana Islands Training and Testing Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement*. Pearl Harbor, HI: Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Pacific.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2015b). *Unclassified 2014 Annual Atlantic Fleet Training and Testing (AFTT) Exercise and Testing Report 14 November 2013 to 13 November 2014*. Silver Spring, MD: National Marine Fisheries Service, Office of Protected Resources.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2017a). *Marine Mammal Strandings Associated with U.S. Navy Sonar Activities*. San Diego, CA: U.S. Navy Marine Mammal Program and SPAWAR Naval Facilities Engineering Command.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2017b). *Criteria and Thresholds for U.S. Navy Acoustic and Explosive Effects Analysis (Phase III)*. San Diego, CA: Space and Naval Warfare Systems Command, Pacific.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2017c). *Dive Distribution and Group Size Parameters for Marine Species Occurring in the U.S. Navy's Atlantic and Hawaii-Southern California Training and Testing Study Areas*. Newport, RI: Naval Undersea Warfare Center Division.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2017d). *Hawaii-Southern California Training and Testing Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement*. Pearl Harbor, HI: Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Pacific.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2018a). *U.S. Navy Marine Species Density Database Phase III for the Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area* (Naval Facilities Engineering Command Pacific Technical Report). Pearl Harbor, HI: Naval Facilities Engineering Command Pacific.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2018b). *Quantifying Acoustic Impacts on Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles: Methods and Analytical Approach for Phase III Training and Testing* (Technical Report prepared by NUWC Division Newport, Space and Naval Warfare Systems Center Pacific, G2 Software Systems, and the National Marine Mammal Foundation). Newport, RI: Naval Undersea Warfare Center.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2019). *U.S. Navy Marine Species Density Database Phase III for the Northwest Training and Testing Study Area* (Naval Facilities Engineering Command Pacific Technical Report). Pearl Harbor, HI: Naval Facilities Engineering Command Pacific.

Unger, B., E. L. Rebolledo, R. Deaville, A. Grone, L. L. IJsseldijk, M. F. Leopold, U. Siebert, J. Spitz, P. Wohlsein, and H. Herr. (2016). Large amounts of marine debris found in sperm whales stranded along the North Sea coast in early 2016. *Marine Pollution Bulletin, 112*(1-2), 134–141.

University of Hawaii. (2010). *Hawaii Undersea Military Munitions Assessment, Final Investigation Report HI-05, South of Pearl Harbor, Oahu, HI*. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii at Manoa.

Uyeyama, R. (2014). *Compilation of Incidental Marine Mammal and Sea Turtle Sightings in the Mariana Islands Range Complex*. Pearl Harbor, HI: Commander, U.S. Pacific Fleet.

Uyeyama, R. K., M. A. Fagan, and L. H. Shannon. (2012). *Cruise Report Marine Mammal and Sea Turtle Observer UNDET Monitoring Hawaii Range Complex: 19 & 26 October and 2 November 2011*. Pearl Harbor, HI: Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Pacific.

Valdivia, A., S. Wolf, and K. Suckling. (2019). Marine mammals and sea turtles listed under the U.S. Endangered Species Act are recovering. *PLoS ONE, 14*(1), e0210164.

Vallejo, G. C., K. Grellier, E. J. Nelson, R. M. McGregor, S. J. Canning, F. M. Caryl, and N. McLean. (2017). Responses of two marine top predators to an offshore wind farm. *Ecology and Evolution, 7*(21), 8698–8708.

van Beest, F. M., L. Kindt-Larsen, F. Bastardie, V. Bartolino, and J. Nabe-Nielsen. (2017). Predicting the population-level impact of mitigating harbor porpoise bycatch with pingers and time-area fishing closures. *Ecosphere, 8*(4), e01785.

Veirs, S., V. Veirs, and J. Wood. (2015). Ship noise in an urban estuary extends to frequencies used for echolocation by endangered killer whales. *PeerJ, 4*, e1657.

Victor, D. (2018). Japan to Resume Commercial Whaling, Defying International Ban. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from https://www.nytimes.com/2018/12/26/world/asia/japan-whaling-withdrawal.html.

Vilela, R., U. Pena, R. Esteban, and R. Koemans. (2016). Bayesian spatial modeling of cetacean sightings during a seismic acquisition survey. *Marine Pollution Bulletin, 109*(1), 512–520.

Villadsgaard, A., M. Wahlberg, and J. Tougaard. (2007). Echolocation signals of wild harbour porpoises, *Phocoena phocoena*. *The Journal of Experimental Biology, 210*, 56–64.

Villegas-Amtmann, S., L. K. Schwarz, G. Gailey, O. Sychenko, and D. P. Costa. (2017). East or west: The energetic cost of being a gray whale and the consequence of losing energy to disturbance. *Endangered Species Research, 34*, 167–183.

Vincent, C., B. J. McConnell, V. Ridoux, and M. A. Fedak. (2002). Assessment of Argos location accuracy from satellite tags deployed on captive grey seals. *Marine Mammal Science, 18*(1), 156–166.

Visser, F., C. Cure, P. H. Kvadsheim, F. P. Lam, P. L. Tyack, and P. J. Miller. (2016). Disturbance-specific social responses in long-finned pilot whales, *Globicephala melas*. *Scientific Reports, 6*, 28641.

Vogt, S. (2008). *Fiscal Years 2007-2008 Annual Report for 61755NR410 Wildlife Surveys on Military Leased Lands, Farallon de Medinilla, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands*. Honolulu, HI: Naval Facilities Engineering Command Pacific.

von Benda-Beckmann, A. M., P. J. Wensveen, P. H. Kvadsheim, F. P. Lam, P. J. Miller, P. L. Tyack, and M. A. Ainslie. (2014). Modeling effectiveness of gradual increases in source level to mitigate effects of sonar on marine mammals. *Conservation Biology, 28*(1), 119–128.

von Benda-Beckmann, A. M., P. J. Wensveen, P. H. Kvadsheim, F. P. A. Lam, P. J. Miller, P. L. Tyack, and M. A. Ainslie. (2016). Assessing the effectiveness of ramp-up during sonar operations using exposure models. In A. N. Popper & A. Hawkins (Eds.), *The Effects of Noise on Aquatic Life II* (pp. 1197–1203). New York, NY: Springer.

von Benda-Beckmann, A. M., P. J. Wensveen, M. Prior, M. A. Ainslie, R. R. Hansen, S. Isojunno, F. P. A. Lam, P. H. Kvadsheim, and P. J. O. Miller. (2019). Predicting acoustic dose associated with marine mammal behavioural responses to sound as detected with fixed acoustic recorders and satellite tags. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 145*(3), 1401–1416.

Wada, S., M. Oishi, and T. K. Yamada. (2003). A newly discovered species of living baleen whale. *Nature, 426*, 278–281.

Wade, P. R., T. J. Quinn, II, J. Barlow, C. S. Baker, A. M. Burdin, J. Calambokidis, P. J. Clapham, E. A. Falcone, J. K. B. Ford, C. M. Gabriele, D. K. Mattila, L. Rojas-Bracho, J. M. Straley, and B. Taylor. (2016). *Estimates of Abundance and Migratory Destination for North Pacific Humpback Whales in Both Summer Feeding Areas and Winter Mating and Calving Areas* (SC/66b/IA/21). Washington, DC: International Whaling Commission.

Walker, R. J., E. O. Keith, A. E. Yankovsky, and D. K. Odell. (2005). Environmental correlates of cetacean mass stranding sites in Florida. *Marine Mammal Science, 21*(2), 327–335.

Walker, S. W., C. L. Osburn, T. J. Boyd, L. J. Hamdan, R. B. Coffin, M. T. Montgomery, J. P. Smith, Q. X. Li, C. Hennessee, F. Monteil, and J. Hawari. (2006). *Mineralization of 2, 4, 6-Trinitrotoluene (TNT) in Coastal Waters and Sediments*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Navy, Naval Research Laboratory.

Wang, J. Y., S. C. Yang, and H. C. Liao. (2001). Species composition, distribution and relative abundance of cetaceans in the waters of southern Taiwan: Implications for conservation and eco-tourism. *Journal of the National Parks of Taiwan, 11*(2), 136–158.

Wang, J. Y., and S. C. Yang. (2006). Unusual cetacean stranding events of Taiwan in 2004 and 2005. *Journal of Cetacean Research and Management, 8*(3), 283–292.

Ward, W. D., A. Glorig, and D. L. Sklar. (1958). Dependence of temporary threshold shift at 4 kc on intensity and time. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 30*(10), 944–954.

Ward, W. D., A. Glorig, and D. L. Sklar. (1959). Relation between recovery from temporary threshold shift and duration of exposure. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 31*(5), 600–602.

Ward, W. D. (1960). Recovery from high values of temporary threshold shift. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 32*(4), 497–500.

Wartzok, D., and D. R. Ketten. (1999). Marine Mammal Sensory Systems. In J. E. Reynolds, III & S. A. Rommel (Eds.), *Biology of Marine Mammals* (pp. 117–175). Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press.

Wartzok, D., A. N. Popper, J. Gordon, and J. Merrill. (2003). Factors affecting the responses of marine mammals to acoustic disturbance. *Marine Technology Society Journal, 37*(4), 6–15.

Watkins, W. A., and W. E. Schevill. (1975). Sperm whales (*Physeter catodon*) react to pingers. *Deep-Sea Research, 22*, 123–129.

Watkins, W. A. (1981). Reaction of three species of whales *Balaenoptera physalus*, *Megaptera novaeangliae*, and *Balaenoptera edeni* to implanted radio tags. *Deep-Sea Research, 28A*(6), 589–599.

Watkins, W. A., K. E. Moore, and P. Tyack. (1985). Sperm whale acoustic behavior in the southeast Caribbean. *Cetology, 49*, 1–15.

Watkins, W. A. (1986). Whale reactions to human activities in Cape Cod waters. *Marine Mammal Science, 2*(4), 251–262.

Watkins, W. A., M. A. Daher, K. M. Fristrup, and G. Notarbartolo di Sciara. (1994). Fishing and acoustic behavior of Fraser's dolphin (*Lagenodelphis hosei*) near Dominica, southeast Caribbean. *Caribbean Journal of Science, 30*, 76–82.

Watwood, S., M. Fagan, A. D'Amico, and T. Jefferson. (2012). *Cruise Report, Marine Species Monitoring and Lookout Effectiveness Study, Koa Kai, November 2011, Hawaii Range Complex*. Pearl Harbor, HI: Commander, U.S. Pacific Fleet.

Watwood, S., E. McCarthy, N. DiMarzio, R. Morrissey, S. Jarvis, and D. Moretti. (2017). *Beaked whale foraging behavior before, during, and after sonar exposure on a Navy test range.* Paper presented at the 22nd Biennial Conference on the Biology of Marine Mammals. Halifax, Canada.

Watwood, S., J. R. Borcuk, E. M. Oliveira, and E. R. Robinson. (2018). *Dive Distribution and Group Size Parameters for Marine Species Occurring in the U.S. Navy's Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area*. Newport, RI: Naval Undersea Warfare Center Division.

Weaver, A. (2015). Sex difference in bottlenose dolphin sightings during a long-term bridge construction project. *Animal Behavior and Cognition, 2*(1), 1–13.

Weir, C. R. (2008). Overt responses of humpback whales (*Megaptera novaeangliae*), sperm whales (*Physeter macrocephalus*), and Atlantic spotted dolphins (*Stenella frontalis*) to seismic exploration off Angola. *Aquatic Mammals, 34*(1), 71–83.

Wellard, R., K. Lightbody, L. Fouda, M. Blewitt, D. Riggs, and C. Erbe. (2016). Killer Whale (*Orcinus orca*) Predation on Beaked Whales (*Mesoplodon* spp.) in the Bremer Sub-Basin, Western Australia. *PLoS ONE, 11*(12).

Weller, D. W. (2009). Predation on marine mammals. In W. F. Perrin, B. Wursig, & J. G. M. Thewissen (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Marine Mammals* (2nd ed., pp. 923–931). Cambridge, MA: Academic Press.

Wells, R. S., and M. D. Scott. (1999). Bottlenose dolphin, *Tursiops truncatus* (Montagu, 1821). In S. H. Ridgway & R. Harrison (Eds.), *Handbook of Marine Mammals* (Vol. 6, pp. 137–182). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Wells, R. S., J. B. Allen, S. Hofmann, K. Bassos-Hull, D. A. Fauquier, N. B. Barros, R. E. DeLynn, G. Sutton, V. Socha, and M. D. Scott. (2008). Consequences of injuries on survival and reproduction of common bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*) along the west coast of Florida. *Marine Mammal Science, 24*(4), 774–794.

Wells, R. S., and M. D. Scott. (2009). Common bottlenose dolphin, *Tursiops truncatus*. In W. F. Perrin, W. B., & J. G. M. Thewissen (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Marine Mammals* (2nd ed., pp. 249–255). Cambridge, MA: Academic Press.

Wenninger, P. (2010). *FY 2010 Annual Report Wildlife Surveys on Military Leased Lands, Farallon de Medinilla CNMI*. Apra Harbor, GU: U.S. Department of the Navy, Naval Base Guam Public Works Department.

Wensveen, P. J., A. M. von Benda-Beckmann, M. A. Ainslie, F. P. Lam, P. H. Kvadsheim, P. L. Tyack, and P. J. Miller. (2015). How effectively do horizontal and vertical response strategies of long-finned pilot whales reduce sound exposure from naval sonar? *Marine Environmental Research, 106*, 68–81.

Wensveen, P. J., P. H. Kvadsheim, F.-P. A. Lam, A. M. Von Benda-Beckmann, L. D. Sivle, F. Visser, C. Curé, P. Tyack, and P. J. O. Miller. (2017). Lack of behavioural responses of humpback whales (*Megaptera novaeangliae*) indicate limited effectiveness of sonar mitigation. *The Journal of Experimental Biology, 220*, 1–12.

Wensveen, P. J., S. Isojunno, R. R. Hansen, A. M. von Benda-Beckmann, L. Kleivane, v. I. S., F. A. Lam, P. H. Kvadsheim, S. L. DeRuiter, C. Cure, T. Narazaki, P. L. Tyack, and P. J. O. Miller. (2019). Northern bottlenose whales in a pristine environment respond strongly to close and distant navy sonar signals. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 286*(1899), 20182592.

Werth, A. J. (2006a). Odontocete suction feeding: Experimental analysis of water flow and head shape. *Journal of Morphology, 267*(12), 1415–1428.

Werth, A. J. (2006b). Mandibular and dental variation and the evolution of suction feeding in Odontoceti. *Journal of Mammalogy, 87*(3), 579–588.

West, K. (2016). *Necropsy Findings, Stomach Contents and Hook Ingestion in IFKW's*. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii, Hawaii Pacific University.

West, K. (2018). [Personal Communication between Kristi West and Julie Rivers regarding spinner dolphin and monk seal strandings].

West, K. L., W. A. Walker, R. W. Baird, W. White, G. Levine, E. Brown, and D. Schofield. (2009). Diet of pygmy sperm whales (*Kogia breviceps*) in the Hawaiian Archipelago. *Marine Mammal Science, 25*(4), 931–943.

West, K. L., S. Sanchez, D. Rotstein, K. M. Robertson, S. Dennison, G. Levine, N. Davis, D. Schofield, C. W. Potter, and B. Jensen. (2012). A Longman's beaked whale (*Indopacetus pacificus*) strands in Maui, Hawaii, with first case of morbillivirus in the central Pacific. *Marine Mammal Science, 29*, 767–776.

West, K. L., G. Levine, J. Jacob, B. Jensen, S. Sanchez, K. Colegrove, and D. Rotstein. (2015). Coinfection and Vertical Transmission of *Brucella* and *Morbillivirus* in a Neonatal Sperm Whale (*Physeter macrocephalus*) in Hawaii, USA. *Journal of Wildlife Diseases, 51*(1), 227–232.

Wiggins, S., A. Krumpel, L. Dorman, J. Hildebrand, and S. Baumann-Pickering. (2019). *Seal Bomb Sound Source Characterization*. La Jolla, CA: Marine Physical Laboratory of the Scripps Institution of Oceanography.

Williams, R., D. E. Bain, J. K. B. Ford, and A. W. Trites. (2002a). Behavioural responses of male killer whales to a 'leapfrogging' vessel. *Journal of Cetacean Research and Management, 4*(3), 305–310.

Williams, R., A. W. Trites, and D. E. Bain. (2002b). Behavioural responses of killer whales (*Orcinus orca*) to whale-watching boats: Opportunistic observations and experimental approaches. *Journal of Zoology, London, 256*, 255–270.

Williams, R., D. Lusseau, and P. S. Hammond. (2006). Estimating relative energetic costs of human disturbance to killer whales (*Orcinus orca*). *Biological Conservation, 133*, 301–311.

Williams, R., D. E. Bain, J. C. Smith, and D. Lusseau. (2009). Effects of vessels on behaviour patterns of individual southern resident killer whales, *Orcinus orca*. *Endangered Species Research, 6*, 199–209.

Williams, R., E. Ashe, L. Blight, M. Jasny, and L. Nowlan. (2014a). Marine mammals and ocean noise: Future directions and information needs with respect to science, policy and law in Canada. *Marine Pollution Bulletin, 86*(1-2), 29–38.

Williams, R., C. W. Clark, D. Ponirakis, and E. Ashe. (2014b). Acoustic quality of critical habitats for three threatened whale populations. *Animal Conservation, 17*(2), 174–185.

Williams, R., C. Erbe, E. Ashe, A. Beerman, and J. Smith. (2014c). Severity of killer whale behavioral responses to ship noise: A dose-response study. *Marine Pollution Bulletin, 79*(1–2), 254–260.

Williams, T. M., S. B. Blackwell, B. Richter, M. H. S. Sinding, and M. P. Heide-Jørgensen. (2017a). Paradoxical escape responses by narwhals (*Monodon monoceros*). *Science, 358*(6368), 1328–1331.

Williams, T. M., T. L. Kendall, B. P. Richter, C. R. Ribeiro-French, J. S. John, K. L. Odell, B. A. Losch, D. A. Feuerbach, and M. A. Stamper. (2017b). Swimming and diving energetics in dolphins: A stroke-by-stroke analysis for predicting the cost of flight responses in wild odontocetes. *The Journal of Experimental Biology, 220*(6), 1135–1145.

Williamson, M. J., A. S. Kavanagh, M. J. Noad, E. Kniest, and R. A. Dunlop. (2016). The effect of close approaches for tagging activities by small research vessels on the behavior of humpback whales (*Megaptera novaeangliae*). *Marine Mammal Science, 32*(4), 1234–1253.

Wisniewska, D. M., M. Johnson, J. Teilmann, U. Siebert, A. Galatius, R. Dietz, and P. T. Madsen. (2018). High rates of vessel noise disrupt foraging in wild harbour porpoises (*Phocoena phocoena*). *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 285*(1872), 10.

Woodworth, P. A., G. S. Schorr, R. W. Baird, D. L. Webster, D. J. McSweeney, M. B. Hanson, R. D. Andrews, and J. J. Polovina. (2012). Eddies as offshore foraging grounds for melon-headed whales (*Peponocephala electra*). *Marine Mammal Science, 28*(3), 638–647.

Würsig, B., S. K. Lynn, T. A. Jefferson, and K. D. Mullin. (1998). Behaviour of cetaceans in the northern Gulf of Mexico relative to survey ships and aircraft. *Aquatic Mammals, 24*(1), 41–50.

Würsig, B., and W. J. Richardson. (2009). Noise, effects of. In W. F. Perrin, B. Wursig, & J. G. M. Thewissen (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Marine Mammals* (2nd ed., pp. 765–773). Cambridge, MA: Academic Press.

Yack, T. M., T. F. Norris, and N. Novak. (2016). *Acoustic Based Habitat Models for Sperm Whales in the Mariana Islands Region*. Encinitas, CA: Bio-Waves, Inc.

Yang, W.-C., L.-S. Chou, P. D. Jepson, R. L. Brownell, Jr., D. Cowan, P.-H. Chang, H.-I. Chiou, C.-J. Yao, T. K. Yamada, J.-T. Chiu, P.-J. Wang, and A. Fernández. (2008). Unusual cetacean mortality event in Taiwan, possibly linked to naval activities. *Veterinary Record, 162*, 184–186.

Yazvenko, S. B., T. L. McDonald, S. A. Blokhin, S. R. Johnson, H. R. Melton, M. W. Newcomer, R. Nielson, and P. W. Wainwright. (2007). Feeding of western gray whales during a seismic survey near Sakhalin Island, Russia. *Environmental Monitoring and Assessment, 134*(1–3), 93–106.

Yelverton, J. T., D. R. Richmond, E. R. Fletcher, and R. K. Jones. (1973). *Safe Distances From Underwater Explosions for Mammals and Birds*. Albuquerque, NM: Lovelace Foundation for Medical Education and Research.

Ylitalo, G. M., J. E. Stein, T. Hom, L. L. Johnson, K. L. Tilbury, A. J. Hall, T. Rowles, D. Greig, L. J. Lowenstine, and F. M. D. Gulland. (2005). The role of organochlorines in cancer-associated mortality in California sea lions (*Zalophus californianus*). *Marine Pollution Bulletin, 50*, 30–39.

Ylitalo, G. M., R. W. Baird, G. K. Yanagida, D. L. Webster, S. J. Chivers, J. L. Bolton, G. S. Schorr, and D. J. McSweeney. (2009). High levels of persistent organic pollutants measured in blubber of island-associated false killer whales (*Pseudorca crassidens*) around the main Hawaiian Islands. *Marine Pollution Bulletin, 58*, 1922–1952.

Yuen, M. M. L., P. E. Nachtigall, M. Breese, and A. Y. Supin. (2005). Behavioral and auditory evoked potential audiograms of a false killer whale (*Pseudorca crassidens*). *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 118*(4), 2688–2695.

Zellar, R., A. Pulkkinen, K. Moore, D. Reeb, E. Karakoylu, and O. Uritskaya. (2017). *Statistical Assessment of Cetacean Stranding Events in Cape Cod (Massachusetts, USA) Area OS21A-1345*. Greenbelt, MD: National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Zimmer, W. M. X., and P. L. Tyack. (2007). Repetitive shallow dives pose decompression risk in deep-diving beaked whales. *Marine Mammal Science, 23*(4), 888–925.

Zoidis, A. M., M. A. Smultea, A. S. Frankel, J. L. Hopkins, A. Day, and A. S. McFarland. (2008). Vocalizations produced by humpback whale (*Megaptera novaeangliae*) calves recorded in Hawaii. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 123*(3), 1737–1746.

3.5 Sea Turtles

Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/ Overseas Environmental Impact Statement Mariana Islands Training and Testing

TABLE OF CONTENTS

3.5 Sea Turtles 3.5-1
3.5.1 Affected Environment 3.5-1
3.5.1.1 Group Size 3.5-2
3.5.1.2 Habitat Use 3.5-3
3.5.1.3 Dive Behavior 3.5-3
3.5.1.4 Hearing and Vocalization 3.5-4
3.5.1.5 General Threats 3.5-5
3.5.1.6 Green Sea Turtle (*Chelonia mydas*) 3.5-7
3.5.1.7 Hawksbill Sea Turtle (*Eretmochelys imbricata*) 3.5-8
3.5.1.8 Loggerhead Sea Turtle (*Caretta caretta*) 3.5-9
3.5.1.9 Olive Ridley Sea Turtle (*Lepidochelys olivacea*) 3.5-9
3.5.1.10 Leatherback Sea Turtle (*Dermochelys coriacea*) 3.5-9
3.5.2 Environmental Consequences 3.5-9
3.5.2.1 Acoustic Stressors 3.5-11
3.5.2.2 Explosive Stressors 3.5-24
3.5.2.3 Energy Stressors 3.5-46
3.5.2.4 Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors 3.5-49
3.5.2.5 Entanglement Stressors 3.5-50
3.5.2.6 Ingestion Stressors 3.5-51
3.5.2.7 Secondary Stressors 3.5-52
3.5.3 Summary of Potential Impacts on Sea Turtles 3.5-53
3.5.4 Endangered Species Act Determination 3.5-54
3.5.5 Public Comments 3.5-54

List of Figures

Figure 3.5-1: Dive Depth and Duration Summaries for Sea Turtle Species 3.5-3
Figure 3.5-2: Generalized Dive Profiles and Activities Described for Sea Turtles 3.5-4

Figure 3.5-3: Composite Underwater Audiogram for Sea Turtles 3.5-5
Figure 3.5-4: Auditory Weighting Function for Sea Turtles 3.5-18
Figure 3.5-5: TTS and PTS Exposure Functions for Sonar and Other Transducers.....3.5-18
Figure 3.5-6: Auditory Weighting Functions for Sea Turtles.....3.5-32
Figure 3.5-7: TTS and PTS Exposure Functions for Impulsive Sounds.....3.5-33
Figure 3.5-8: Green Sea Turtle Estimated Impacts per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1 .....3.5-42
Figure 3.5-9: Green Sea Turtle Impacts Estimated per Year from Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2.....3.5-45

List of Tables

Table 3.5-1: Endangered Species Act Status and Presence of Endangered Species Act Listed Sea Turtles in the Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area 3.5-2
Table 3.5-2: Criteria to Quantitatively Assess Non-Auditory Injury due to Underwater Explosions....3.5-31
Table 3.5-3: TTS and PTS Peak Pressure Thresholds Derived for Sea Turtles Exposed to Impulsive Sounds. 3.5-34
Table 3.5-4: Ranges to Non-Auditory Injury[1] (in meters) for Sea Turtles Exposed to Explosives as a Function of Animal Mass.....3.5-36
Table 3.5-5: Ranges to Mortality for Sea Turtles Exposed to Explosives as a Function of Animal Mass[1] 3.5-37
Table 3.5-6: Peak Pressure Based Ranges to TTS and PTS for Sea Turtles Exposed to Explosives 3.5-38
Table 3.5-7: SEL Based Ranges to TTS and PTS for Sea Turtles Exposed to Explosives.....3.5-39
Table 3.5-8: Estimated Impacts on Individual Green Sea Turtles Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1.....3.5-42
Table 3.5-9: Estimated Impacts on Individual Green Sea Turtles Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2.....3.5-45

3.5 Sea Turtles

3.5.1 Affected Environment

The purpose of this section is to supplement the analysis of impacts on sea turtles presented in the 2015 Mariana Islands Training and Testing (MITT) Final Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (EIS/OEIS) with new information relevant to proposed changes in training and testing activities conducted at sea. Information presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS that remains valid is noted as such and referenced to the appropriate sections. Any new or updated information describing the affected environment and analysis of impacts on sea turtles associated with the Proposed Action is provided in this section. Comments received from the public during scoping related to sea turtles are addressed in Section 3.5.5 (Public Comments). Comments received from the public during the Draft Supplemental EIS (SEIS)/OEIS commenting period related to sea turtles are addressed in Appendix K (Public Comment Responses).

Only at-sea and Farallon de Medinilla (FDM) training and testing activities are subject to this SEIS/OEIS. Therefore, only effects within the nearshore and pelagic habitats for sea turtles are analyzed. The analysis of sea turtle presence and nesting on land presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS remains valid and continues to support these activities conducted within the Marianas.

The five sea turtle species potentially found in the Study Area are the same as those presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and all are listed under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) as endangered or threatened (green sea turtle [*Chelonia mydas*], hawksbill sea turtle [*Eretmochelys imbricata*], loggerhead sea turtle [*Caretta caretta*], olive ridley sea turtle [*Lepidochelys olivacea*], and leatherback sea turtle [*Dermochelys coriacea*]). There is no critical habitat designated for sea turtle species within the Study Area. Similar to the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, this section provides an overview of the species, distribution, and occurrence of sea turtles, as well as new information released since the publication of the 2015 document. The status, presence, and nesting occurrence of sea turtles in the Study Area are listed by region in Table 3.5-1. Since the publication of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) classified the global distribution of green sea turtles into distinct population segments (DPS). Within the area analyzed in this SEIS/OEIS, the endangered green sea turtle in the Mariana Islands has been determined to be part of the Central West Pacific DPS.

The Navy also reviewed the status and distribution of other pelagic reptile species, such as sea snakes, to evaluate if these species should be included in this SEIS/OEIS. There are no verified records of sea snakes in nearshore waters of the Mariana Islands. Eldredge (2003) notes that the few anecdotal reports of sea snakes are probably the result of confusion between the sea krate *Laticauda colubrina* commonly found on Palau and the snake eel *Myrichthys colubrinus*, indigenous to Guam. In the early 1970s there was a newspaper report of a yellow-bellied sea snake (*Pelamis platurus*) found on a Saipan beach (Eldredge, 2003). Sea snake occurrence in both pelagic and nearshore waters of the Study Area is extremely rare; therefore, sea snakes are not included in this SEIS/OEIS.

The 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS provided a general overview of sea turtle dive behavior, group size, and general threats. New information since the publication of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS is included below to better understand potential stressors and impacts on sea turtles resulting from training and testing activities.

Table 3.5-1: Endangered Species Act Status and Presence of Endangered Species Act Listed Sea Turtles in the Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area

Species Name and Regulatory Status				Presence in Study Area[1]	
Common Name		Scientific Name	Endangered Species Act Status	Open Ocean/Transit Corridor	Coastal/Ocean
Family Cheloniidae (hard-shelled sea turtles)					
Green sea turtle[2]	Central West Pacific DPS	*Chelonia mydas*	Endangered	Yes	Yes[3]
	East Indian-West Pacific DPS		Threatened		No
	Central North Pacific DPS		Threatened		No
Hawksbill sea turtle (throughout range)		*Eretmochelys imbricata*	Endangered	Yes	Yes[3,4]
Loggerhead sea turtle North Pacific DPS		*Caretta caretta*	Endangered[4]	Yes[5]	Yes[5]
Olive ridley sea turtle (Breeding populations on the Pacific coast of Mexico)		*Lepidochelys olivacea*	Endangered[6]	Yes[5]	Yes[5]
Family Dermochelyidae (leatherback sea turtle)					
Leatherback sea turtle (throughout range)		*Dermochelys coriacea*	Endangered	Yes[5]	Yes[5]

[1] MITT Study Area = Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area
[2] In 2015, NMFS published a final rule that classifies green sea turtles within the Study Area as part of the Western Pacific Distinct Population Segment. Green sea turtles within other DPS may occur within the Study Area—the East Indian-West Pacific DPS and the Central North Pacific DPS. These three DPS are analyzed individually in the section 7(a)(2) consultation between the Navy and NMFS.
[3] Indicates nesting activity within the Study Area. Only green sea turtles and hawksbill sea turtles are known to nest in the Study Area.
[4] The Northeast Atlantic Ocean, Mediterranean Sea, North Indian Ocean, North Pacific Ocean, and South Pacific Ocean Distinct Population Segments are listed as Endangered; the Northwest Atlantic Ocean, South Atlantic Ocean, Southeast Indo-Pacific Ocean, and Southwest Indian Ocean Distinct Population Segments are listed as threatened. Only loggerheads within the North Pacific Ocean DPS are within the Study Area.
[5] Species occurrence is only expected during migratory movements through the Study Area and therefore may be present, albeit at extremely low densities.
[6] Breeding populations of olive ridley sea turtles on the Pacific coast of Mexico are listed as endangered, and all other populations are listed as threatened. Both threatened and endangered populations could occur in the Study Area.

3.5.1.1 Group Size

Sea turtles are generally solitary animals, but they tend to group during migrations and mating. Because they do not show territoriality, foraging areas often overlap. New hatchlings, which often emerge from nesting beaches in groups, are solitary until they reach sexual maturity (Bolten, 2003; Bowen et al., 2004; James et al., 2005; Schroeder et al., 2003).


3.5.1.2 Habitat Use

Sea turtles are dependent on beaches for nesting habitat, in locations that have sand deposits that are not inundated with tides or storm events prior to hatching. In the water, sea turtle habitat use is dependent on species and corresponds to dive behavior because of foraging and migration strategies, as well as behavior state (e.g., diving deep at night for resting purposes) (Rieth et al., 2011).

3.5.1.3 Dive Behavior

Sea turtle dive depth and duration varies by species, the age of the animal, the location of the animal, and the activity (foraging, resting, and migrating). In addition, their relative distribution through the water column is an important consideration when conducting acoustic exposure analyses. The following text briefly describes the dive behavior of each species. Dive durations are often a function of turtle size, with larger turtles being capable of diving to greater depths and for longer periods. Methods of collecting dive behavior data over the years have varied in study design, configuration of electronic tags, parameters collected in the field, and data analyses.


New information is available that improves the analysis for sea turtle dive behavior. Hochscheid (2014) has completed a species-specific summary for sea turtles within the Study Area that was not included in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Hochscheid (2014) collected data from 57 studies published between 1986 and 2013, which summarized depths and durations of dives of datasets including an overall total of 538 sea turtles. Figure 3.5-1 presents the ranges of maximum dive depths for each sea turtle species found in the Study Area. This summary is used to improve exposure analysis for stressors analyzed in Section 3.5.2 (Environmental Consequences).



Sources: Hochscheid (2014), Sakamoto et al. (1993), Rice and Balazs (2008), Gitschlag (1996), Salmon et al. (2004)

Figure 3.5-1: Dive Depth and Duration Summaries for Sea Turtle Species

Hochscheid (2014) also collected information on generalized dive profiles, with correlations to specific activities. Generalized dive profiles compiled from 11 different studies show 8 distinct profiles tied to specific activities. These profiles and activities are shown in Figure 3.5-2.



Sources: Hochscheid (2014); Rice and Balazs (2008), Sakamoto et al. (1993), Houghton et al. (2003), Fossette et al. (2007), Salmon et al. (2004), Hays et al. (2004); Southwood et al. (1999).


Notes: Profiles A-H, as reported in the literature and compiled by Hochscheid (2014). The depth and time arrows indicate the axis variables, but the figure does not represent true proportions of depths and durations for the various profiles. In other words, the depths can vary greatly, but behavioral activity seems to dictate the shape of the profile. Profiles G and H have only been described for shallow dives (less than 5 meters).

Figure 3.5-2: Generalized Dive Profiles and Activities Described for Sea Turtles

3.5.1.4 Hearing and Vocalization

Sea turtle ears are adapted for hearing underwater and in air, with auditory structures that may receive sound via bone conduction (Lenhardt et al., 1985), via resonance of the middle ear cavity (Willis et al., 2013), or via standard tympanic middle ear path (Hetherington, 2008). Studies of hearing ability show that sea turtles' ranges of in-water hearing detection generally lie between 50 and 1,600 hertz (Hz), with maximum sensitivity between 100 and 400 Hz, and that hearing sensitivity drops off rapidly at higher frequencies. Sea turtles are also limited to low frequency hearing in air, with hearing detection in juveniles possible between 50 to 800 Hz, with a maximum hearing sensitivity around 300–400 Hz (Bartol & Ketten, 2006; Piniak et al., 2016). Hearing abilities have primarily been studied with sub-adult, juvenile, and hatchling subjects in four sea turtle species, including green (Bartol & Ketten, 2006; Ketten & Moein-Bartol, 2006; Piniak et al., 2016; Ridgway et al., 1969; Yudhana et al., 2010), olive ridley (Bartol & Ketten, 2006), loggerhead (Bartol et al., 1999; Lavender et al., 2014; Martin et al., 2012), and leatherback (Dow Piniak et al., 2012). Only one study examined the auditory capabilities of an adult sea turtle (Martin et al., 2012); the hearing range of the adult loggerhead sea turtle was similar to other measurements of juvenile and hatchling sea turtle hearing ranges.

Using existing data on sea turtle hearing sensitivity, the U.S. Department of the Navy (Navy) developed a composite sea turtle audiogram for underwater hearing (Figure 3.5-3), as described in the technical report *Criteria and Thresholds for U.S. Navy Acoustic and Explosive Effects Analysis (Phase III)* (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2017a).



Source: U.S. Department of the Navy (2017a)
Notes: dB re 1 µPa = decibels referenced to 1 micropascal, kHz = kilohertz

Figure 3.5-3: Composite Underwater Audiogram for Sea Turtles

The role of underwater hearing in sea turtles is unclear. Sea turtles may use acoustic signals from their environment as guideposts during migration and as cues to identify their natal beaches (Lenhardt et al., 1983). However, they may rely more on other senses, such as vision and magnetic orientation, to interact with their environment (Avens, 2003; Narazaki et al., 2013).

Sea turtles are not known to vocalize underwater. Some sounds have been recorded during nesting activities ashore, including belch-like sounds and sighs (Mrosovsky, 1972), exhale/inhales, gular pumps, and grunts (Cook & Forrest, 2005) by nesting female leatherback sea turtles and low-frequency pulsed and harmonic sounds by leatherback embryos in eggs and hatchlings (Ferrara et al., 2014).

3.5.1.5 General Threats

The general threats to sea turtles are described in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. New information is available that provides a more refined understanding of how marine debris, potential invasive species introductions, and climate change can potentially threaten sea turtle species within the Study Area. Since the publication of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, NMFS has classified green sea turtles occurring within the Mariana Islands as the Central West Pacific DPS. By doing so, the NMFS further defined threats to green sea turtles within this DPS; these threats are described below under species-specific threats for the green sea turtle. Although the information summarized below is from more recent literature since the publication of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, the information and analysis presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS remains valid, including the general threats to sea turtles.

3.5.1.5.1 Marine Debris

Ingestion of marine debris can cause injury or mortality to sea turtles if the debris does not pass through the digestive track. The United Nations Environment Program estimates that approximately 6.4 million tons of anthropogenic debris enters the marine environment every year (United Nations Environmental Program, 2005). This estimate, however, does not account for cataclysmic events, such as the 2011 Japanese tsunami estimated to have generated 1.5 million tons of floating debris (Murray et al., 2015). Plastic is the primary type of debris found in marine and coastal environments, and plastics are the most

common type of marine debris ingested by sea turtles (Schuyler et al., 2014). Sea turtles can mistake debris for prey; one study found 37 percent of dead leatherback sea turtles ingested various types of plastic (Mrosovsky et al., 2009), and Narazaki et al. (2013) observed a loggerhead exhibiting hunting behavior on approach to a plastic bag, possibly mistaking the bag for a jelly fish. Ingesting even small amounts of plastic can cause an obstruction in a sea turtle's digestive track and mortality (Bjorndal et al., 1994; Bjorndal, 1997), and hatchlings are at risk for ingesting small plastic fragments. Plastics absorb toxins, such as bisphenol-A (commonly known as "BPA") and phthalates, as well as heavy metals from the ocean, and can be harmful to the tissues when ingested. (Fukuoka et al., 2016; Teuten et al., 2007). Life stage and feeding preference affects the likelihood of ingestion. Sea turtles living in oceanic or coastal environments and feeding in the open ocean or on the seafloor may encounter different types and densities of debris, and may therefore have different probabilities of ingesting debris. In 2014, Schuyler et al. (2014) reviewed 37 studies of debris ingestion by sea turtles, showing that young oceanic sea turtles are more likely to ingest debris (particularly plastic), and that green and loggerhead sea turtles were significantly more likely to ingest debris than other sea turtle species.

3.5.1.5.2 Invasive Species

Impacts on sea turtles associated with invasive species primarily concern nest predation and prey base. Some of the invasive species introduced to the larger, more populated islands in the Mariana archipelago are known nest predators (e.g., rats, feral dogs and cats, pigs, ants). Nests on populated islands are also at risk for illegal poaching (Kolinski et al., 2006). In foraging grounds, sea turtles have been shown to adapt their foraging preferences for invasive seagrass and algae. Becking et al. (2014) showed green sea turtle foraging behavior shift to consumption of *Halophila stipulacea*, a rapidly spreading seagrass in the Caribbean. In Hawaii, green sea turtles in Kaneohe Bay have modified their diets over several decades to include seven non-native species (*Acanthophora spicifera, Hypnea musciformis, Gracilaria salicornia, Eucheuma denticulatum, Gracilaria tikvahiae, Kappaphycus striatum,* and *Kappaphycus alvarezii*), with non-native algae accounting for over 60 percent of sea turtle diet (Russell & Balazs, 2015).

Since the publication of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, the Navy has funded the *Regional Biosecurity Plan for Micronesia and Hawaii,* completed in 2015. Volume I, Appendix K of the biosecurity plan addresses general biosecurity recommendations for Guam and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and Appendix M includes recommendations for U.S. Department of Defense activities (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2015d). Volume III includes a risk assessment for marine environments (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2015c), and Volume IV includes a risk assessment for potential introductions on land in terrestrial environments (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2015b). The 2015 biosecurity plan describes ongoing measures that reduce the potential for transport and introduction of invasive species resulting from military training and testing activities. Some of these species have the potential to degrade sea turtle habitats, reduce prey availability, or directly harm sea turtles. Because of the Navy's active biosecurity program, it is unlikely that training and testing activities would result in invasive species' introductions that would impact sea turtles. Therefore, invasive species are not analyzed as a new stressor in this SEIS/OEIS.

3.5.1.5.3 Climate Change

Since the publication of the MITT Final EIS/OEIS, the Navy has obtained and consolidated additional information to conceptualize the potential of climate change to threaten sea turtle species within the Study Area. Sea turtles are particularly susceptible to climate change effects because their life history, physiology, and behavior are extremely sensitive to environmental temperatures (Fuentes et al., 2013).

Climate change models predict sea level rise and increased intensity of storms and hurricanes in tropical sea turtle nesting areas (Patino-Martinez et al., 2008). These factors could significantly increase beach inundation and erosion, thus affecting water content of sea turtle nesting beaches and potentially inundating nests (Pike et al., 2015). Climate change may negatively impact turtles in multiple ways and at all life stages. These impacts may include the potential loss of nesting beaches due to sea level rise and increasingly intense storm surge (Patino-Martinez et al., 2008), feminization of turtle populations from elevated nest temperatures (and skewing populations from more males to females unless nesting shifts to northward cooler beaches) (Reneker & Kamel, 2016), decreased reproductive success (Clark & Gobler, 2016; Hawkes et al., 2006; Laloë et al., 2016; Pike, 2014), shifts in reproductive periodicity and latitudinal ranges (Birney et al., 2015; Pike, 2014), disruption of hatchling dispersal and migration, and indirect effects to food availability (Witt et al., 2010).

3.5.1.6 Green Sea Turtle (*Chelonia mydas*)

This section has been updated based on a change in the regulatory status of the green sea turtle and new information regarding trends and distributions of green sea turtles in nearshore waters of the Mariana Islands. As such, the life history and regulatory status descriptions for each sea turtle species differs in detail.

3.5.1.6.1 Status and Management

As presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, green sea turtles are listed as threatened under the ESA throughout their Pacific range, except for the population that nests on the Pacific coast of Mexico (endangered). However, NMFS and United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) reclassified the species in 2016 into 11 DPSs, which maintains federal protections while providing a more tailored approach for managers to address specific threats facing different populations (see the NMFS and USFWS Final Rule published on April 6, 2016). Only the Central West Pacific DPS occurs within the Study Area. This DPS is listed as endangered under the ESA. Only this distinct population segment is discussed further in the document; however, it should be noted that minimal mixing (gene flow) may occur with other distinct population segments (Seminoff et al., 2015).

3.5.1.6.2 Habitat and Geographic Range

The habitat and geographic range of green sea turtles is described in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Following a review of recent literature, information on green sea turtles related to habitat and geographic range has not changed since the publication of the MITT Final EIS/OEIS. As such, the information and analysis presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS remains valid. There is no critical habitat designated for this species in the Study Area. Seminoff et al. (2015), however, provides specific information for the Central West Pacific DPS and determined that this DPS is spatially bounded by the Asian continent to the west and north, the Solomon Islands to the south, the Marshall Islands in the east, and Palau in the west.

3.5.1.6.2.1 Population and Abundance

The population and abundance of green sea turtles is described in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS; however, new information is available for estimating abundance in waters within the Study Area. Martin et al. (2016) analyzed five decades of aerial surveys (from 1962 through 2012) to assess changes in marine megafauna on the insular coral reef ecosystem of Guam. Turtle observations (assumed to be primarily green sea turtles, but reported observations likely included some hawksbills) increased and varied spatially around Guam, with the highest densities occurring along the south, east, and north coasts, particularly in areas having low human density, reefs with coral cover, and either seagrass beds

or a marine protected area. Observed individuals per survey ranged from 1.1 to 44.6 across all years. Based on this information, Martin et al. (2016) calculated a population growth rate of approximately 90 percent over the past five decades. Based on studies of in-water capture rates (where swimmers would capture and tag individual sea turtles), Martin et al. (2016) estimated that 85 percent of the sea turtles in waters off of Guam are green sea turtles, while 15 percent are hawksbill sea turtles. The Navy is currently funding in-water tagging of sea turtles in waters off of Guam, Tinian, and Saipan. Since November 2015 when tagging began, Falcone et al. (2017) report that the majority of sea turtles observed or captured (65 of 68 total sea turtles observed, or 96 percent) have been green sea turtles.

3.5.1.6.2.2 Predator-Prey Interactions

The predator-prey interactions relevant to green sea turtles are described in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Following a review of recent literature, information on green sea turtles related to predator-prey interactions has not changed since the publication of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. As such, the information and analysis presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS remains valid. When NMFS classified green sea turtles within the Central West Pacific DPS, no information on predator-prey interactions were used that were not included in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

3.5.1.6.2.3 Species-Specific Threats

Since the publication of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, the NMFS has further defined threats to green sea turtles included in the Central West Pacific DPS. Damage to seagrass beds and declines in seagrass distribution can reduce foraging habitat for green sea turtles (National Marine Fisheries Service & U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 1991; Seminoff et al., 2015; Williams, 1988). Green sea turtles are susceptible to the disease fibropapillomatosis, which causes tumor-like growths (fibropapillomas) resulting in reduced vision, disorientation, blindness, physical obstruction to swimming and feeding, increased susceptibility to parasites, and increased susceptibility to entanglement (Balazs, 1986; National Marine Fisheries Service & U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 1991; Patrício et al., 2016; Work & Balazs, 2013). The potential effects of disease and endoparasites also exist for green sea turtles found in the Central West Pacific Ocean. The loss of eggs to non-human predators is a severe problem in some areas. These predators include domestic animals, such as cats, dogs, and pigs, as well as wild species such as rats, mongoose, birds, monitor lizards, snakes, crabs, ants, and other invertebrates (Seminoff et al., 2015).

3.5.1.7 Hawksbill Sea Turtle (*Eretmochelys imbricata*)

The hawksbill sea turtle is listed as endangered under the ESA (35 Federal Register 8491). While the current listing as a single global population remains valid, data may support separating populations at least by ocean basin under the distinct population segment policy (National Marine Fisheries Service, 2013). The most recent status review was released in 2013 by the NMFS and USFWS (National Marine Fisheries Service, 2013). There is no critical habitat designated for this species in the Study Area. The regulatory status for the hawksbill sea turtle has remained unchanged since the publication of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

In addition, the life history information for hawksbill sea turtles occurring in nearshore and open ocean habitats within the Study Area has not changed since the publication of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. New information is available for estimating hawksbill sea turtle population and abundance based off of five decades of aerial surveys in the nearshore waters of Guam. While Martin et al. (2016) estimated that approximately 15 percent of sea turtles observed in waters off of Guam are hawksbill sea turtles, tagging from November 2015 has revealed that only 4 percent of observed turtles are hawksbill sea turtles (Summers et al., 2017). Overall, the trend data over this time period suggests a dramatic increase

in green and hawksbill sea turtle populations in waters around Guam. The Navy is currently funding in-water tagging of sea turtles in waters off of Guam, Tinian, and Saipan.

3.5.1.8 Loggerhead Sea Turtle (*Caretta caretta*)

In 2009, a status review was conducted for the loggerhead identified nine distinct population segments within the global population (Conant et al., 2009). In 2011, NMFS and USFWS listed five of these distinct population segments as endangered and kept four as threatened under the ESA. Only the North Pacific Ocean distinct population segment occurs within the Study Area; however, mixing is known to occur between other populations in the Pacific and Indian Oceans, enabling a limited amount of gene flow with other distinct population segments (National Marine Fisheries Service & U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2008). There is no critical habitat designated for this species in the Study Area. The regulatory status for the loggerhead sea turtle has remained unchanged since the publication of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. In addition, the life history information for loggerhead sea turtles occurring in nearshore and open ocean habitats within the Study Area has not changed since the publication of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. As such, the information and analysis presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS remains valid.

3.5.1.9 Olive Ridley Sea Turtle (*Lepidochelys olivacea*)

Olive ridley sea turtles that nest along the Pacific coast of Mexico are listed as endangered under the ESA, while all other populations are listed under the ESA as threatened (43 Federal Register 32800). Based on genetic data, the worldwide olive ridley population is composed of four main lineages: east India, Indo-Western Pacific, Atlantic, and eastern Pacific Ocean (National Marine Fisheries Service & U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2014; Shankar et al., 2004). Most olive ridley sea turtles found within the Study Area are of the Indo-Western Pacific lineage (National Marine Fisheries Service & U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2014). There is no critical habitat designated for this species in the Study Area. The regulatory status for the olive ridley sea turtle has remained unchanged since the publication of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

In addition, the life history information for olive ridley sea turtles occurring in nearshore and open ocean habitats within the Study Area has not changed since the publication of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. As such, the information and analysis presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS remains valid.

3.5.1.10 Leatherback Sea Turtle (*Dermochelys coriacea*)

The leatherback sea turtle is listed as a single population and is classified as endangered under the ESA (35 Federal Register 8491). Recent information on population structure (through genetic studies) and distribution (through telemetry, tagging, and genetic studies) have led to an increased understanding and refinement of the global stock structure (Clark et al., 2010). There is no critical habitat designated for this species in the Study Area. The regulatory status for the leatherback sea turtle has remained unchanged since the publication of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. In addition, the life history information for leatherback sea turtles occurring in nearshore and open ocean habitats within the Study Area has not changed since the publication of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. As such, the information and analysis presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS remains valid.

3.5.2 Environmental Consequences

Under the Proposed Action for this SEIS/OEIS, there have been some modifications to the quantity and type of acoustic stressors under the two action alternatives. Additionally, one new substressor

(high-energy lasers) is being analyzed because of its potential to affect marine species, as detailed in Section 3.0.4.3.2.2 (High-Energy Lasers).

In general, there have been no substantial changes to the activities analyzed as the Proposed Action in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS which would change the conclusions reached regarding populations of sea turtles in the Study Area. Acoustic stressors (sonar and other transducers) and explosives have occurred since the 2015 completion of the MITT Record of Decision and ESA Biological Opinion. There have been no known impacts on sea turtles that were not otherwise previously analyzed or accounted for in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2015a), the NMFS Biological Opinion pursuant to ESA (National Marine Fisheries Service, 2015a), or the USFWS Biological Opinion.

In this SEIS/OEIS, the Navy has reviewed the analysis of impacts from these ongoing activities and additionally analyzed the new or changing training and testing activities as projected into the reasonably foreseeable future. The projected future actions are based on evolving operational requirements, including those associated with any anticipated new platforms or systems not previously analyzed. The Navy has completed a literature review for information on sea turtles within the Study Area, which included a search for the best available science since the publication of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Where there has been no substantive or otherwise meaningful change in the action, science, or regulations, the Navy will rely on the previous 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS analysis. Where there has been substantive change in the action, science, or regulations, the information and analysis provided in in this SEIS/OEIS will supplement the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS to support environmental compliance with applicable environmental statutes for sea turtles.

The stressors applicable to sea turtles in the Study Area for this SEIS/OEIS include the new stressor (high-energy lasers) and the same stressors considered in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS:

- **Acoustic** (sonar and other transducers, vessel noise, aircraft noise, and weapon noise)
- **Explosive** (in-air explosions and in-water explosions)
- **Energy** (in-water electromagnetic devices, high-energy lasers)
- **Physical disturbance and strike** (vessels and in-water devices, military expended materials, seafloor devices)
- **Entanglement** (wires and cables, decelerators/parachutes)
- **Ingestion** (military expended materials – munitions and military expended materials – other than munitions)
- **Secondary** (impacts on habitat, impacts on prey availability)

This section of this SEIS/OEIS evaluates how and to what degree potential impacts on sea turtles from stressors described in Section 3.0 (Introduction) may have changed since the analysis presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS was completed. Table 2.5-1 and Table 2.5-2 in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) list the proposed training and testing activities and include the number of times each activity would be conducted annually and the locations within the Study Area where the activity would typically occur under each alternative. The tables also present the same information for activities described in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS so that the proposed levels of training and testing under this SEIS/OEIS can be easily compared. The analysis in this SEIS/OEIS includes consideration of the Navy's standard operating procedures and mitigation that the Navy will implement to avoid or reduce potential impacts on sea turtles from acoustic, explosive, and physical disturbance and strike stressors. Mitigation for sea turtles has been coordinated with NMFS through the ESA

consultation processes, and is detailed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) and Appendix I (Geographic Mitigation Assessment) of this SEIS/OEIS.

In their biological opinion, NMFS determined that within the Study Area, only acoustic stressors and explosive stressors could potentially result in adverse effects on ESA-listed sea turtles from training and testing activities and that none of the other stressors would result in significant adverse impacts or jeopardize the continued existence of any ESA-listed sea turtle (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2015).

The analysis presented in this section of this SEIS/OEIS also considers standard operating procedures that are described in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) and mitigation measures that are described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation). The Navy will implement these measures to avoid or reduce potential impacts on sea turtles from stressors associated with the proposed training and testing activities. Mitigation for sea turtles has been coordinated with NMFS through the ESA consultation process.

As presented in Section 3.0 (Introduction), since completion of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS there have been refinements made in the modeling of estimated impacts from sonar and other transduces and in-water explosives. These changes have been incorporated into the re-analysis of acoustic and explosive stressors presented in this SEIS/OEIS. In addition to the new effects criteria, weighting functions, and thresholds across multiple species, new information for sea turtles includes the integration of new sea turtle density data based on new survey data.

3.5.2.1 Acoustic Stressors

The analysis of effects to sea turtles follows the concepts outlined in Section 3.0.4.7 (Conceptual Framework for Assessing Effects from Acoustic and Explosive Activities). This section begins with a summary of relevant data regarding acoustic impacts on sea turtles in Section 3.5.2.1.1 (Background). This is followed by an analysis of estimated impacts on sea turtles due to specific Navy acoustic stressors (sonar and other transducers, vessel noise, aircraft noise, and weapon noise). Additional explanations of the acoustic terms and sound energy concepts used in this section are found in Appendix H (Acoustic and Explosive Concepts). Studies of the effects of sound on sea turtles are limited; therefore, where necessary, knowledge of impacts on other species from acoustic stressors is used to assess impacts on sea turtles.

The Navy will rely on the previous 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS for the analysis of vessel noise, aircraft noise, and weapon noise, and new applicable and emergent science in regard to these substressors is presented in the sections that follow. Due to new acoustic impact criteria, sea turtle densities, and acoustic effects model, the analysis provided in Section 3.5.2.1.2 (Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers) of this SEIS/OEIS will supplant the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS for sea turtles, and may result in changes to estimated impacts for some species since the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

3.5.2.1.1 Background

The sections below include a survey and synthesis of best-available-science published in peer-reviewed journals, technical reports, and other scientific sources pertinent to impacts on sea turtles potentially resulting from Navy training and testing activities. Sea turtles could be exposed to a range of impacts depending on the sound source and context of the exposure. Exposures to sound-producing activities may result in auditory or non-auditory trauma, hearing loss resulting in temporary or permanent hearing threshold shift, auditory masking, physiological stress, or changes in behavior.

3.5.2.1.1.1 Injury

The high peak pressures close to some non-explosive impulsive underwater sound sources may be injurious, although there are no reported instances of injury to sea turtles caused by these sources. A Working Group organized under the American National Standards Institute-Accredited Standards Committee S3, Subcommittee 1, Animal Bioacoustics, developed sound exposure guidelines for fish and sea turtles (Popper et al., 2014), hereafter referred to as the *ANSI Sound Exposure Guidelines*. Lacking any data on non-auditory sea turtle injuries due to sonars, the working group estimated the risk to sea turtles from low-frequency sonar to be low and mid-frequency sonar to be non-existent.

As discussed in Section 3.0.4.7 (Conceptual Framework for Assessing Effects from Acoustic and Explosive Activities, specifically Section 3.0.4.7.1, Injury), mechanisms for non-auditory injury due to acoustic exposure have been hypothesized for diving breath-hold animals. Acoustically induced bubble formation, rectified diffusion, and acoustic resonance of air cavities are considered for their similarity to pathologies observed in marine mammals stranded coincident with sonar exposures but were found to not be likely causal mechanisms (Section 3.5.2.1.1.1, Injury), and findings are applicable to sea turtles.

Nitrogen decompression due to modifications to dive behavior has never been observed in sea turtles. Sea turtles are thought to deal with nitrogen loads in their blood and other tissues, caused by gas exchange from the lungs under conditions of high ambient pressure during diving, through anatomical, behavioral, and physiological adaptations (Lutcavage & Lutz, 1997). Although diving sea turtles experience gas supersaturation, gas embolism has only been observed in sea turtles bycaught in fisheries (Garcia-Parraga et al., 2014). Therefore, nitrogen decompression due to changes in diving behavior is not considered a potential consequence to diving sea turtles.

3.5.2.1.1.2 Hearing Loss

Exposure to intense sound may result in hearing loss, typically quantified as threshold shift, which persists after cessation of the noise exposure. Threshold shift is a loss of hearing sensitivity at an affected frequency of hearing. This noise-induced hearing loss may manifest as temporary threshold shift (TTS), if hearing thresholds recover over time, or permanent threshold shift (PTS), if hearing thresholds do not recover to pre-exposure thresholds. Because studies on inducing threshold shift in sea turtles are very limited (e.g., alligator lizards: Dew et al., 1993; Henry & Mulroy, 1995), are not sufficient to estimate TTS and PTS onset thresholds, and have not been conducted on any of the sea turtles present in the Study Area, auditory threshold shift in sea turtles is considered to be consistent with general knowledge about noise-induced hearing loss described in Section 3.0.4.7 (Conceptual Framework for Assessing Effects from Acoustic and Explosive Activities).

Because there are no data on auditory effects on sea turtles, the *ANSI Sound Exposure Guidelines* (Popper et al., 2014) do not include numeric sound exposure thresholds for auditory effects on sea turtles. Rather, the guidelines qualitatively estimate that sea turtles are less likely to incur TTS or PTS with increasing distance from various sound sources. The guidelines also suggest that data from fishes may be more relevant than data from marine mammals when estimating impacts on sea turtles, because, in general, fish hearing range is more similar to the limited hearing range of sea turtles. As shown in Section 3.5.1.4 (Hearing and Vocalization), sea turtle hearing is most sensitive around 100–400 Hz in-water, is limited over 1 kilohertz (kHz), and is much less sensitive than that of any marine mammal. Therefore, sound exposures from most mid-frequency and all high-frequency sound sources are not anticipated to affect sea turtle hearing, and sea turtles are likely only susceptible to auditory impacts when exposed to very high levels of sound within their limited hearing range.

3.5.2.1.1.3 Physiological Stress

A stress response is a suite of physiological changes that are meant to help an organism mitigate the impact of a stressor. If the magnitude and duration of the stress response is too great or too long, then it can have negative consequences to the animal (e.g., decreased immune function, decreased reproduction). Physiological stress is typically analyzed by measuring stress hormones, other biochemical markers, or vital signs. Physiological stress has been measured for sea turtles during nesting (Flower et al., 2015; Valverde et al., 1999), capture and handling (Flower et al., 2015; Gregory & Schmid, 2001), and when caught in entanglement nets (Hoopes et al., 2000; Snoddy et al., 2009) and trawls (Stabenau et al., 1991). However, the stress caused by acoustic exposure has not been studied for sea turtles. Therefore, the stress response in sea turtles in the Study Area due to acoustic exposures is considered to be consistent with general knowledge about physiological stress responses described in Section 3.0.4.7 (Conceptual Framework for Assessing Effects from Acoustic and Explosive Activities).

Marine animals naturally experience stressors within their environment and as part of their life histories. Changing weather and ocean conditions, exposure to diseases and naturally occurring toxins, lack of prey availability, social interactions with members of the same species, nesting, and interactions with predators all contribute to stress. Anthropogenic sound-producing activities have the potential to provide additional stressors beyond those that naturally occur.

Due to the limited information about acoustically induced stress responses, the Navy conservatively assumes in its effects analysis that any physiological response (e.g., hearing loss or injury) or significant behavioral response is also associated with a stress response.

3.5.2.1.1.4 Masking

As described in Section 3.0.4.7 (Conceptual Framework for Assessing Effects from Acoustic and Explosive Activities), auditory masking occurs when one sound, distinguished as the “noise,” interferes with the detection or recognition of another sound or limits the distance over which other biologically relevant sounds, including those produced by prey, predators, or conspecifics, can be detected. Masking only occurs when the sound source is operating; therefore, direct masking effects stop immediately upon cessation of the sound-producing activity. Any sound above ambient noise and within an animal’s hearing range may potentially cause masking.

Compared to other marine animals, such as marine mammals that are highly adapted to use sound in the marine environment, sea turtle hearing is limited to lower frequencies and is less sensitive. Because sea turtles likely use their hearing to detect broadband low-frequency sounds in their environment, the potential for masking would be limited to certain similar sound exposures. Only continuous human-generated sounds that have a significant low-frequency component, are not brief in duration, and are of sufficient received level, would create a meaningful masking situation (e.g., proximate vessel noise). Other intermittent, short-duration sound sources with low-frequency components (e.g., low-frequency sonars) would have more limited potential for masking depending on duty cycle.

There is evidence that sea turtles may rely primarily on senses other than hearing for interacting with their environment, such as vision (Narazaki et al., 2013) and magnetic orientation (Avens, 2003; Putman et al., 2015). Any effect of masking may be mediated by reliance on other environmental inputs.

3.5.2.1.1.5 Behavioral Reactions

Behavioral responses fall into two major categories: Alterations in natural behavior patterns and avoidance. These types of reactions are not mutually exclusive and reactions may be combinations of

behaviors or a sequence of behaviors. As described in Section 3.0.4.7 (Conceptual Framework for Assessing Effects from Acoustic and Explosive Activities), the response of a sea turtle to an anthropogenic sound would likely depend on the frequency, duration, temporal pattern, and amplitude of the sound as well as the animal's prior experience with the sound and the context in which the sound is encountered (i.e., what the animal is doing at the time of the exposure). Distance from the sound source and whether it is perceived as approaching or moving away may also affect the way a sea turtle responds to a sound.

Sea turtles may detect sources below 2 kHz but have limited hearing ability above 1 kHz. They likely detect most broadband sources (including vessel noise) and low-frequency sonars, so they may respond to these sources. Because auditory abilities are poor above 1 kHz, detection and consequent reaction to any mid-frequency source is unlikely.

In the *ANSI Sound Exposure Guideline* technical report (Popper et al., 2014), qualitative risk factors were developed to assess the potential for sea turtles to respond to various underwater sound sources. The guidelines state that there is a low likelihood that sea turtles would respond within tens of meters of low-frequency sonars, and that it is highly unlikely that sea turtles would respond to mid-frequency sources. The risk that sea turtles would respond to other broadband sources, such as shipping, is considered high within tens of meters of the sound source, but moderate to low at farther distances.

Behavioral Reactions to Impulsive Sound Sources

There are limited studies of sea turtle responses to sounds from impulsive sound sources, and all data come from sea turtles exposed to seismic air guns, although air guns are not used during MITT training or testing activities. These exposures consist of multiple air gun shots, either in close proximity or over long durations, so it is likely that observed responses may over-estimate responses to single or short-duration impulsive exposures. Studies of responses to air guns are used to inform sea turtle responses to other impulsive sounds (e.g., some weapon noise).

O'Hara and Wilcox (1990) attempted to create a sound barrier at the end of a canal using seismic air guns. They reported that loggerhead sea turtles kept in a 300-meter by 45-meter enclosure in a 10-meter deep canal maintained a minimum standoff range of 30 meters from air guns fired simultaneously at intervals of 15 seconds with strongest sound components within the 25–1,000 Hz frequency range. McCauley et al. (2000) estimated that the received sound pressure level (SPL) at which turtles avoided sound in the O'Hara and Wilcox (1990) experiment was 175–176 decibels referenced to 1 micropascal (dB re 1 µPa).

Moein Bartol et al. (1995) investigated the use of air guns to repel juvenile loggerhead sea turtles from hopper dredges. Sound frequencies of the air guns ranged from 100 to 1,000 Hz at three source SPLs: 175, 177, and 179 dB re 1 µPa at 1 m. The turtles avoided the air guns during the initial exposures (mean range of 24 meters), but additional exposures on the same day and several days afterward did not elicit statistically significant avoidance behavior. They concluded that this was likely due to habituation.

McCauley et al. (2000) exposed a caged green and a caged loggerhead sea turtle to an approaching-departing single air gun to gauge behavioral responses. The trials showed that above a received SPL of 166 dB re 1 µPa, the turtles noticeably increased their swimming activity compared to nonoperational periods, with swimming time increasing as air gun SPLs increased during approach. Above 175 dB re 1 µPa, behavior became more erratic, possibly indicating the turtles were in an agitated state. The authors noted that the point at which the turtles showed more erratic behavior and exhibited

possible agitation would be expected to approximate the point at which active avoidance to air guns would occur for unrestrained turtles.

No obvious avoidance reactions by free-ranging sea turtles, such as swimming away, were observed during a multi-month seismic survey using air gun arrays, although fewer sea turtles were observed when the seismic air guns were active than when they were inactive (Weir, 2007). The author noted that sea state and the time of day affected both air gun operations and sea turtle surface basking behavior, making it difficult to draw conclusions from the data. However, DeRuiter and Doukara (2012) noted several possible startle or avoidance reactions to a seismic air gun array in the Mediterranean by loggerhead sea turtles that had been motionlessly basking at the water surface.

Based on the limited sea turtle behavioral response data discussed above, sea turtle behavioral responses to impulsive sounds could consist of temporary avoidance, increased swim speed, or changes in depth; or no response. Based on the behavioral response severity scale developed by Southall et al. (2007), the severity of these responses can be categorized as non-existent, low, and moderate.

Behavioral Reactions to Sonar and Other Transducers

Studies of sea turtle responses to non-impulsive sounds are very limited. Lenhardt (1994) used very low frequency vibrations (< 100 Hz) coupled to a shallow tank to elicit swimming behavior responses by two loggerhead sea turtles. Watwood et al. (2016) tagged green sea turtles with acoustic transponders and monitored them using acoustic telemetry arrays in Port Canaveral, FL. Sea turtles were monitored before, during, and after a routine pier-side submarine sonar test that utilized typical source levels, signals, and duty cycle. The sea turtles did not exhibit significant long-term displacement in this study. The authors note that Port Canaveral is an urban marine habitat and that resident sea turtles may be less likely to respond than naïve populations.

According to the qualitative risk factors developed in the *ANSI Sound Exposure Guideline* technical report (Popper et al., 2014), the likelihood of sea turtles responding to low- and mid-frequency sonar is low and highly unlikely, respectively. Based on the limited sea turtle behavioral response data discussed above, sea turtle behavioral responses to non-impulsive sounds could consist of temporary avoidance, increased swim speed, or no response. Using the behavioral response severity scale developed by Southall et al. (2007), the severity of these responses can be categorized as non-existent, low, and moderate.

3.5.2.1.1.6 Long-Term Consequences

For the sea turtles present in the Study Area, long-term consequences to individuals and populations due to acoustic exposures have not been studied. Therefore, long-term consequences to sea turtles due to acoustic exposures are considered following the framework presented in Section 3.0.4.7 (Conceptual Framework for Assessing Effects from Acoustic and Explosive Activities).

The long-term consequences due to individual behavioral reactions and short-term (seconds to minutes) instances of physiological stress are especially difficult to predict because individual experience over time can create complex contingencies. It is more likely that any long-term consequences to an individual would be a result of costs accumulated over a season, year, or life stage due to multiple behavioral or stress responses resulting from exposures to multiple stressors over significant periods of time. Conversely, some sea turtles may habituate to or become tolerant of repeated acoustic exposures over time, learning to ignore a stimulus that in the past did not accompany any overt threat. For example, loggerhead sea turtles exposed to air guns with a source SPL of 179 dB re 1 µPa initially

exhibited avoidance reactions. However, they may have habituated to the sound source after multiple exposures, since a habituation behavior was retained when exposures were separated by several days (Moein Bartol et al., 1995). Intermittent exposures are assumed to be less likely to have lasting consequences.

3.5.2.1.2 Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers

The overall use of sonar and other transducers for training and testing would be similar to what is currently conducted (see Table 2.5-1 and Table 3.0-2 for details). Although individual activities may vary somewhat from those previously analyzed, the overall determinations presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS remain valid. In addition, some new systems using new technologies would be tested under Alternatives 1 and 2. The quantitative analysis has been updated since the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS; therefore, the new analysis is fully presented and described in further detail in the technical report *Quantifying Acoustic Impacts on Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles: Methods and Analytical Approach for Phase III Training and Testing* (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2017b).

Activities using sonars and other transducers would be conducted as described in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) and Appendix A (Training and Testing Activities Descriptions). Sonar and other transducers proposed for use are transient in most locations because activities that involve sonar and other transducers take place at different locations and many platforms are generally moving throughout the Study Area. Sonar and other transducers emit sound waves into the water to detect objects, safely navigate, and communicate. General categories of these systems are described in Section 3.0.4.1 (Acoustic Stressors). The activities that use sonar and other transducers are described in Appendix A (Training and Testing Activities Descriptions).

Sonar-induced acoustic resonance and bubble formation phenomena are very unlikely to occur under realistic conditions, as discussed in Section 3.5.2.1.1.1 (Injury). Non-auditory injury (i.e., other than PTS) and mortality from sonar and other transducers is so unlikely as to be discountable under normal conditions and is therefore not considered further in this analysis.

Potential impacts considered from exposure to sonar and other transducers are hearing loss due to threshold shift (permanent or temporary), physiological stress, masking of other biologically relevant sounds, and changes in behaviors, as described in Sections 3.5.2.1.1.2 (Hearing Loss and Auditory Injury), Section 3.5.2.1.1.3 (Physiological Stress), Section 3.5.2.1.1.4 (Masking) and Section 3.5.2.1.1.5 (Behavioral Reactions).

3.5.2.1.2.1 Methods for Analyzing Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers

The Navy performed a quantitative analysis to estimate the number of times that sea turtles could be affected by sonars and other transducers used during Navy training and testing activities. The Navy's quantitative analysis to determine impacts on sea turtles and marine mammals uses the Navy Acoustic Effects Model to produce initial estimates of the number of times these animals may experience these effects; these estimates are further refined by considering animal avoidance of sound-producing activities and implementation of mitigation. The steps of this quantitative analysis take into account

- criteria and thresholds used to predict impacts from sonar and other transducers (see below);
- the density and spatial distribution of sea turtles; and
- the influence of environmental parameters (e.g., temperature, depth, salinity) on sound propagation when estimating the received sound level on the animals.

A further detailed explanation of this analysis is provided in the technical report titled *Quantifying Acoustic Impacts on Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles: Methods and Analytical Approach for Phase III Training and Testing* (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2018).

Criteria and Thresholds Used to Predict Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers


Auditory Weighting Functions

Animals are not equally sensitive to noise at all frequencies. To capture the frequency-dependent nature of the effects of noise, auditory weighting functions are used. Auditory weighting functions are mathematical functions that adjust received sound levels to emphasize ranges of best hearing and de-emphasize ranges with less or no auditory sensitivity. The adjusted received sound level is referred to as a weighted received sound level.

The auditory weighting function for sea turtles is shown in Figure 3.5-4. The derivation of this weighting function is described in the technical report *Criteria and Thresholds for U.S. Navy Acoustic and Explosive Effects Analysis (Phase III)* (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2017a). The frequencies around the top portion of the function, where the amplitude is closest to zero, are emphasized, while the frequencies below and above this range (where amplitude declines) are de-emphasized, when summing acoustic energy received by a sea turtle.


Hearing Loss from Sonar and Other Transducers

No studies of hearing loss have been conducted on sea turtles. Therefore, sea turtle susceptibility to hearing loss due to an acoustic exposure is evaluated using knowledge about sea turtle hearing abilities in combination with non-impulsive auditory effect data from other species (marine mammals and fish). This yields sea turtle exposure functions, shown in Figure 3.5-5, which are mathematical functions that relate the sound exposure levels (SELs) for onset of TTS or PTS to the frequency of the sonar sound exposure. The derivation of the sea turtle exposure functions are provided in the technical report *Criteria and Thresholds for U.S. Navy Acoustic and Explosive Effects Analysis (Phase III)* (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2017a).



Source: U.S. Department of the Navy (2017a)
Notes: dB = decibels, kHz = kilohertz, TU = sea turtle species group

Figure 3.5-4: Auditory Weighting Function for Sea Turtles



Source: U.S. Department of the Navy (2017a)
Notes: dB re 1 µPa2s: decibels referenced to 1 micropascal second squared, kHz = kilohertz. The solid black curve is the exposure function for TTS and the dashed black curve is the exposure function for PTS onset. Small dashed lines and asterisks indicate the SEL thresholds at the most sensitive frequency for TTS (200 dB) and PTS (220 dB).

Figure 3.5-5: TTS and PTS Exposure Functions for Sonar and Other Transducers

Accounting for Mitigation

The Navy will implement mitigation measures to avoid or reduce potential impacts from active sonar on sea turtles, as described in Section 5.3.2.1 (Active Sonar). The benefits of mitigation are conservatively factored into the analysis for Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 of the Proposed Action for training and testing. The Navy's mitigation measures are identical for both action alternatives.

Procedural mitigation measures include a power down or shut down (i.e., power off) of applicable active sonar sources when a sea turtle is observed in a mitigation zone. The mitigation zones for active sonar activities were designed to avoid or reduce the potential for sea turtles to be exposed to levels of sound that could result in auditory injury (i.e., PTS) from active sonar to the maximum extent practicable. The mitigation zones encompass the estimated ranges to injury (including PTS) for a given sonar exposure. Therefore, the impact analysis quantifies the potential for mitigation to reduce the risk of PTS. Two factors are considered when quantifying the effectiveness of mitigation: (1) the extent to which the type of mitigation proposed for a sound-producing activity (e.g., active sonar) allows for observation of the mitigation zone prior to and during the activity; and (2) the sightability of each species that may be present in the mitigation zone, which is determined by species-specific characteristics and the viewing platform. A detailed explanation of the analysis is provided in the technical report *Quantifying Acoustic Impacts on Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles: Methods and Analytical Approach for Phase III Training and Testing* (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2018).

In the quantitative analysis, consideration of mitigation measures means that, for activities where mitigation is feasible, some model-estimated PTS is considered mitigated to the level of TTS. The impact analysis does not analyze the potential for mitigation to reduce TTS or behavioral effects, even though mitigation could also reduce the likelihood of these effects. In practice, mitigation also protects all unobserved (below the surface) animals in the vicinity, including other species, in addition to the observed animal. However, the analysis assumes that only animals sighted at the water surface would be protected by the applied mitigation. The analysis, therefore, does not capture the protection afforded to all marine species that may be near or within the mitigation zone.

The ability to observe the range to PTS was estimated for each training or testing event. The ability of Navy Lookouts to detect sea turtles in or approaching the mitigation zone is dependent on the animal's presence at the surface and the characteristics of the animal that influence its sightability (such as size or surface active behavior). The behaviors and characteristics of some species may make them easier to detect. Environmental conditions under which the training or testing activity could take place are also considered such as the sea surface conditions, weather (e.g., fog or rain), and day versus night.

The Navy will also implement mitigation measures for certain active sonar activities within mitigation areas, including the Marpi Reef Mitigation Area, Chalan Kanoa Reef Mitigation Area, and Agat Bay Nearshore Mitigation Area, as described in Appendix I (Geographic Mitigation Assessment). Mitigation areas are designed to help avoid or reduce impacts during biologically important life processes within particularly important habitat areas. The benefits of mitigation areas are discussed qualitatively in terms of the context of impact avoidance or reduction.

3.5.2.1.2.2 Impact Ranges for Sonar and Other Transducers

Because sea turtle hearing range is limited to a narrow range of frequencies and thresholds for auditory impacts are relatively high, there are few sonar sources that could result in exposures exceeding the sea turtle TTS and PTS thresholds. The representative bin of LF4 for PTS and TTS is zero meters. Ranges

would be greater (i.e., up to tens of meters) for sonars and other transducers with higher source levels (within their hearing range); however, specific ranges cannot be provided in an unclassified document.

3.5.2.1.2.3 Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers Under the Alternative 1

Sonar and other transducers emit sound waves into the water to detect objects, safely navigate, and communicate. General categories and characteristics of sonar systems and the number of hours these sonars would be operated during training and testing activities under Alternative 1 are described in Section 3.0.1.2.4.1 (Sonar and Other Transducers). Activities using sonars and other transducers would be conducted as described in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) and Appendix A (Training and Testing Activities Descriptions). Low-frequency sources are operated more frequently during testing activities than during training activities. Although the general impacts from sonar and other transducers during testing would be similar in severity to those described during training, there may be slightly more impacts during testing activities as sea turtles can detect low frequency sources.

Under Alternative 1, training and testing activities would fluctuate each year to account for the natural variation of training cycles and deployment schedules. Training and testing activities, including low-frequency sonars within sea turtle hearing range (<2 kHz), could take place throughout the Study Area.

The quantitative analysis, using the number of hours of sonar and other transducers for a maximum year of training activities under Alternative 1, predicts that no sea turtles of any species are likely to be exposed to the high received levels of sound from sonars or other transducers that could cause TTS or PTS. Exposures were only modeled for green, hawksbill, leatherback, and loggerhead sea turtles in the Study Area and transit corridor. Olive ridley sea turtle presence in the Study Area is limited, and density data does not exist due to low occurrence in this region. Only a limited number of sonars and other transducers with frequencies within the range of sea turtle hearing (<2 kHz) and high source levels have the potential to cause TTS and PTS.

The *ANSI Sound Exposure Guidelines* estimate that the risk of a sea turtle responding to a low-frequency sonar (less than 1 kHz) is low regardless of proximity to the source, and that there is no risk of a sea turtle responding to a mid-frequency sonar (1–10 kHz) (Popper et al., 2014). A sea turtle could respond to sounds detected within their limited hearing range if they are close enough to the source. The few studies of sea turtle reactions to sounds, discussed in Section 3.5.2.1.1.5 (Behavioral Reactions), suggest that a behavioral response could consist of temporary avoidance, increased swim speed, or changes in depth, or that there may be no observable response. Use of sonar and other transducers would typically be transient and temporary and there is no evidence to suggest that any behavioral response would persist after a sound exposure. It is assumed that a stress response could accompany any behavioral response.

Implementation of mitigation may further reduce the already low risk of auditory impacts on sea turtles. Depending on the sonar source, mitigation includes powering down the sonar or ceasing active sonar transmission if a sea turtle is observed in the mitigation zone, as discussed in Section 3.5.2.1.2.1 (Methods for Analyzing Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers – Accounting for Mitigation).

Although masking of biologically relevant sounds by the limited number of sonars and other transducers operated in sea turtle hearing range is possible, this may only occur in certain circumstances. Sea turtles most likely use sound to detect nearby broadband, continuous environmental sounds, such as the sounds of waves crashing on the beach. The use characteristics of low-frequency active sonars, including

limited band width, beam directionality, limited beam width, relatively low source levels, low duty cycle, and limited duration of use, would both greatly limit the potential for a sea turtle to detect these sources and limit the potential for masking of broadband, continuous environmental sounds. In addition, broadband sources within sea turtle hearing range, such as countermeasures used during anti-submarine warfare, would typically be used in off-shore areas, not in near-shore areas where detection of beaches or concentrated vessel traffic is relevant.

Considering the above factors and the mitigation measures that would be implemented as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), long-term consequences to sea turtle individuals or populations would not be expected.

Pursuant to the ESA, the use of sonar and other transducers during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 1 may affect ESA-listed green, hawksbill, leatherback, loggerhead, and olive ridley sea turtles.

3.5.2.1.2.4 Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers Under Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)

Sonar and other transducers emit sound waves into the water to detect objects, safely navigate, and communicate. Use of sonar and other transducers would typically be transient and temporary. General categories and characteristics of sonar systems and the number of hours these sonars would be operated during training under Alternative 2 are described in Section 3.0.1.2.4.1 (Sonar and Other Transducers). Activities using sonars and other transducers would be conducted as described in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) and Appendix A (Training and Testing Activities Descriptions). Low-frequency sources are operated more frequently during testing activities than during training activities. Although the general impacts from sonar and other transducers during testing would be similar in severity to those described during training, there may be slightly more impacts during testing activities as sea turtles can detect low frequency sources.

Under Alternative 2, the same type and tempo of training and testing activities could occur as Alternative 1, but would include five Joint multi-strike group exercises (i.e., Valiant Shield) over five years as compared to three under Alternative 1. Additionally, Alternative 2 contemplates three (vice two) small joint coordinated anti-submarine warfare exercises (Multi-Sail/Guam Exercises) per year with a 50 percent increase in associated unit-level events (e.g., missile exercise [surface-to-air]). This would result in an increase of sonar use compared to Alternative 1. There would also be an increase in the use of active sonar during certain testing events. Alternative 2 reflects the maximum number of training and testing activities that could occur within a given year, and assumes that the maximum number of Fleet exercises would occur every year.

The quantitative analysis predicts that no sea turtles of any species are likely to be exposed to the high received levels of sound from sonars or other transducers that could cause TTS or PTS during a maximum year of training activities under Alternative 2. Although there would be an increase in sonar use compared to Alternative 1, potential for and type of impacts on sea turtles would be the similar. This is because sea turtles are capable of detecting only a limited number of sonars due to their limited hearing range. Olive ridley sea turtle presence in the Study Area is limited and density data does not exist due to low occurrence in this region. Therefore, exposures were only modeled for green, hawksbill, leatherback, and loggerhead sea turtles in the Study Area and transit corridor. The NMFS's 2015 Biological Opinion (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2015) on training and testing activities analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS considered sonars and other transducers to result in take incidental to military activities for green and hawksbill sea turtles.

Considering the above factors and the mitigation measures that would be implemented as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), long-term consequences to sea turtle individuals or populations would not be expected.

Pursuant to the ESA, the use of sonar and other transducers during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 2 may affect ESA-listed green, hawksbill, leatherback, loggerhead, and olive ridley sea turtles. The Navy is consulting with NMFS as required by section 7(a)(2) of the ESA.

3.5.2.1.2.5 Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers Under the No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, proposed training and testing activities would not occur. Other military activities not associated with this Proposed Action would continue to occur. Sonar and other transducers as listed above would not be introduced into the marine environment. Therefore, existing environmental conditions would either remain unchanged or would improve slightly after cessation of ongoing training and testing activities.

Discontinuing the training and testing activities would result in fewer acoustic stressors within the marine environment where training and testing activities have historically been conducted. Therefore, discontinuing training and testing activities under the No Action Alternative would lessen the potential for acoustics stressors on individual sea turtles, but would not measurably improve the status of sea turtle populations or subpopulations.

3.5.2.1.3 Impacts from Vessel Noise

Sea turtles may be exposed to noise from vessel movement. A detailed description of the acoustic characteristics and typical sound levels of vessel noise is in Section 3.0.4.1.2 (Vessel Noise). Vessel movements involve transits to and from ports to various locations within the Study Area, including commercial ship traffic and recreational vessels, in addition to U.S. Navy vessels. Many ongoing and proposed training and testing activities within the Study Area involve maneuvers by various types of surface ships, boats, and submarines (collectively referred to as vessels).

Activities may vary slightly from those previously analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, but the overall determinations presented remain valid. Increases and decreases shown in Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2 for proposed training and testing activities under Alternative 1 and 2 do not appreciably change the impact conclusions presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

Under the No Action Alternative, proposed training and testing activities would not occur. Other military activities not associated with this Proposed Action would continue to occur. Acoustic stressors (e.g., vessel noise) as listed above would not be introduced into the marine environment. Therefore, existing environmental conditions would either remain unchanged or would improve slightly after cessation of ongoing training and testing activities.

Discontinuing the training and testing activities would result in fewer acoustic stressors within the marine environment where training and testing activities have historically been conducted. Therefore, discontinuing training and testing activities under the No Action Alternative would lessen the potential for vessel noise impacts on individual sea turtles, but would not measurably improve the status of sea turtle populations or subpopulations.

Pursuant to the ESA, vessel noise during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 may affect ESA-listed green, hawksbill, leatherback, loggerhead and olive ridley sea turtles. The Navy is consulting on the activities described under Alternative 2 with NMFS as required by section 7(a)(2) of the ESA.

3.5.2.1.4 Impacts from Aircraft Noise

Sea turtles may be exposed to aircraft-generated noise throughout the Study Area. Fixed- and rotary-wing aircraft are used during a variety of training and testing activities throughout the Study Area. Tilt-rotor impacts would be similar to fixed-wing or helicopter impacts, depending on the aircraft's mode. Most of these sounds would be concentrated around airbases and fixed ranges within the range complex. Aircraft produce extensive airborne noise from either turbofan or turbojet engines. An infrequent type of aircraft noise is the sonic boom, produced when the aircraft exceeds the speed of sound. Rotary-wing aircraft (helicopters) produce low-frequency sound and vibration (Pepper et al., 2003).

A detailed description of aircraft noise as a stressor is in Section 3.0.4.1.3 (Aircraft Noise). Activities may vary slightly from those previously analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, but the overall determinations presented remain valid. Increases and decreases shown in Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2 for proposed training and testing activities under Alternative 1 and 2 do not appreciably change the impact conclusions presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

Under the No Action Alternative, proposed training and testing activities would not occur. Other military activities not associated with this Proposed Action would continue to occur. Acoustic stressors (e.g., aircraft noise) as listed above would not be introduced into the marine environment. Therefore, existing environmental conditions would either remain unchanged or would improve slightly after cessation of ongoing training and testing activities.

Discontinuing the training and testing activities would result in fewer acoustic stressors within the marine environment where training and testing activities have historically been conducted. Therefore, discontinuing training and testing activities under the No Action Alternative would lessen the potential for aircraft noise impacts on individual sea turtles, but would not measurably improve the status of sea turtle populations or subpopulations.

Pursuant to the ESA, aircraft noise during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 may affect ESA-listed green, hawksbill, leatherback, loggerhead and olive ridley sea turtles. The Navy is consulting on the activities described under Alternative 2 with NMFS as required by section 7(a)(2) of the ESA.

3.5.2.1.5 Impacts from Weapon Noise

Sea turtles may be exposed to sounds caused by the firing of weapons, objects in flight, and impact of non-explosive munitions on the water's surface, which are described in Section 3.0.4.1.4 (Weapon Noise). In general, these are impulsive sounds generated in close vicinity to or at the water surface, with the exception of items that are launched underwater. The firing of a weapon may have several components of associated noise. Firing of guns could include sound generated in air by firing a gun (muzzle blast) and a crack sound due to a low-amplitude shock wave generated by a supersonic projectile flying through the air. Most in-air sound would be reflected at the air-water interface.

Underwater sounds would be strongest just below the surface and directly under the firing point. Any sound that enters the water only does so within a narrow cone below the firing point or path of the projectile. Vibration from the blast propagating through a ship's hull, the sound generated by the impact of an object with the water surface, and the sound generated by launching an object underwater are other sources of impulsive sound in the water. Sound due to missile and target launches is typically at a maximum at initiation of the booster rocket and rapidly fades as the missile or target travels downrange.

Activities may vary slightly from those previously analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, but the overall determinations presented remain valid. Increases and decreases shown in Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2 for proposed training and testing activities under Alternative 1 and 2 do not appreciably change the impact conclusions presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Implementation of mitigation may further reduce the already low risk of auditory impacts on sea turtles from weapon noise during large-caliber gunnery events, as discussed in Section 5.3.2.2 (Weapons Firing Noise).

Under the No Action Alternative, proposed training and testing activities would not occur. Other military activities not associated with this Proposed Action would continue to occur. Acoustic stressors (e.g., weapon noise) as listed above would not be introduced into the marine environment. Therefore, existing environmental conditions would either remain unchanged or would improve slightly after cessation of ongoing training and testing activities.

Discontinuing the training and testing activities would result in fewer acoustic stressors within the marine environment where training and testing activities have historically been conducted. Therefore, discontinuing training and testing activities under the No Action Alternative would lessen the potential for weapon noise impacts on individual sea turtles, but would not measurably improve the status of sea turtle populations or subpopulations.

Pursuant to the ESA, weapon noise during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 may affect ESA-listed green, hawksbill, leatherback, loggerhead and olive ridley sea turtles. The Navy is consulting on the activities described under Alternative 2 with NMFS as required by section 7(a)(2) of the ESA.

3.5.2.2 Explosive Stressors

Explosions in the water or near the water surface can introduce loud, impulsive, broadband sounds into the marine environment. Unlike other acoustic stressors, explosives release energy at a high rate producing a shock wave that can be injurious and even deadly. Therefore, explosive impacts on sea turtles are discussed separately from other acoustic stressors, even though the analysis of explosive impacts will rely on data for sea turtle impacts due to impulsive sound exposure where appropriate.

Explosives are usually described by their net explosive weight, which accounts for the weight and type of explosive material. Additional explanation of the acoustic and explosive terms and sound energy concepts used in this section is found in Appendix H (Acoustic and Explosive Concepts).

This section begins with a summary of relevant data regarding explosive impacts on sea turtles in Section 3.5.2.2.1 (Background). The ways in which an explosive exposure could result in immediate effects or lead to long-term consequences for an animal are explained in Section 3.0.4.7 (Conceptual Framework for Assessing Effects from Acoustic and Explosive Activities), and this section follows that framework. Studies of the effects of sound and explosives on sea turtles are limited; therefore, where necessary, knowledge of impacts on other species from explosives is used to assess impacts on sea turtles.

Due to new acoustic impact criteria, sea turtle densities, and acoustics effects model, the analysis provided in Section 3.5.2.2.2 (Impacts from Explosives) of this SEIS/OEIS will supplant the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS for sea turtles, and may result in changes to estimated impacts for some species since the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

3.5.2.2.1 Background

The sections below include a survey and synthesis of best available science published in peer-reviewed journals, technical reports, and other scientific sources pertinent to impacts on sea turtles potentially resulting from Navy training and testing activities. Sea turtles could be exposed to a range of impacts depending on the explosive source and context of the exposure. In addition to acoustic impacts including temporary or permanent hearing loss, auditory masking, physiological stress, or changes in behavior; potential impacts from an explosive exposure can include non-lethal injury and mortality.

3.5.2.2.1.1 Injury

Because direct studies of explosive impacts on sea turtles have not been conducted, the below discussion of injurious effects is based on studies of other animals, generally mammals. The generalizations that can be made about in-water explosive injuries to other species should be applicable to sea turtles, with consideration of the unique anatomy of sea turtles. For example, it is unknown if the sea turtle shell may afford it some protection from internal injury.

If an animal is exposed to an explosive blast underwater, the likelihood of injury depends on the charge size, the geometry of the exposure (distance to the charge, depth of the animal and the charge), and the size of the animal. In general, an animal would be less susceptible to injury near the water surface because the pressure wave reflected from the water surface would interfere with the direct path pressure wave, reducing positive pressure exposure. However, rapid under-pressure phase caused by the negative surface-reflected pressure wave above an underwater detonation may create a zone of cavitation that may contribute to potential injury. In general, blast injury susceptibility would increase with depth, until normal lung collapse (due to increasing hydrostatic pressure) and increasing ambient pressures again reduce susceptibility.

See Appendix H (Acoustic and Explosive Concepts) for an overview of explosive propagation and an explanation of explosive effects on gas cavities.

Primary blast injury is injury that results from the compression of a body exposed to a blast wave. This is usually observed as barotrauma of gas-containing structures (e.g., lung and gut) and structural damage to the auditory system (Greaves et al., 1943; Office of the Surgeon General, 1991; Richmond et al., 1973). The lungs are typically the first site to show any damage, while the solid organs (e.g., liver, spleen, and kidney) are more resistant to blast injury (Clark & Ward, 1943). Recoverable injuries would include slight lung injury, such as capillary interstitial bleeding, and contusions to the gastrointestinal tract. More severe injuries would significantly reduce fitness and likely cause death in the wild. Rupture of the lung may also introduce air into the vascular system, producing air emboli that can cause a stroke or heart attack by restricting oxygen delivery to critical organs. In this discussion, primary blast injury to auditory tissues is considered gross structural tissue injury distinct from noise-induced hearing loss, which is considered below in Section 3.5.2.2.1.2 (Hearing Loss).

Data on observed injuries to sea turtles from explosives is generally limited to animals found following explosive removal of offshore structures (Viada et al., 2008), which can attract sea turtles for feeding opportunities or shelter. Klima et al. (1988) observed a turtle mortality subsequent to an oil platform

removal blast, although sufficient information was not available to determine the animal's exposure. Klima et al. (1988) also placed small sea turtles (less than 7 kilograms) at varying distances from piling detonations. Some of the turtles were immediately knocked unconscious or exhibited vasodilation over the following weeks, but others at the same exposure distance exhibited no effects.

Incidental injuries to sea turtles due to a military explosion have been documented in a few instances. In one incident, a single 1,200-pound (lb.) trinitrotoluene (TNT) underwater charge was detonated off Panama City, FL in 1981. The charge was detonated at a mid-water depth of 120 feet (ft.). Although details are limited, the following were recorded: at a distance of 500–700 ft., a 400 lb. sea turtle was killed; at 1,200 ft., a 200–300 lb. sea turtle experienced "minor" injury; and at 2,000 ft. a 200–300 lb. sea turtle was not injured (O'Keeffe & Young, 1984). In another incident, two "immature" green sea turtles (size unspecified) were found dead about 100-150 ft. away from detonation of 20 lb. of C-4 in a shallow water environment.

Results from limited experimental data suggest two explosive metrics are predictive of explosive injury: peak pressure and impulse.

Impulse as a Predictor of Explosive Injury

Without measurements of the explosive exposures in the above incidents, it is difficult to draw conclusions about what amount of explosive exposure would be injurious to sea turtles. Studies of observed in-water explosive injuries showed that terrestrial mammals were more susceptible than comparably sized fish with swim bladders (Yelverton & Richmond, 1981), and that fish with swim bladders may have increased susceptibility to swim bladder oscillation injury depending on exposure geometry (Goertner, 1978; Wiley et al., 1981). Therefore, controlled tests with a variety of terrestrial mammals (mice, rats, dogs, pigs, sheep and other species) are the best available data sources on actual injury to similar-sized animals due to underwater exposure to explosions.

In the early 1970s, the Lovelace Foundation for Medical Education and Research conducted a series of tests in an artificial pond to determine the effects of underwater explosions on mammals, with the goal of determining safe ranges for human divers. The resulting data were summarized in two reports (Richmond et al., 1973; Yelverton et al., 1973). Specific physiological observations for each test animal are documented in Richmond et al. (1973). Gas-containing internal organs, such as lungs and intestines, were the principle damage sites in submerged terrestrial mammals, consistent with earlier studies of mammal exposures to underwater explosions (Clark & Ward, 1943; Greaves et al., 1943).

In the Lovelace studies, acoustic impulse was found to be the metric most related to degree of injury, and size of an animal's gas-containing cavities was thought to play a role in blast injury susceptibility. The proportion of lung volume to overall body size is similar between sea turtles and terrestrial mammals, so the magnitude of lung damage in the tests may approximate the magnitude of injury to sea turtles when scaled for body size. Measurements of some shallower diving sea turtles (Hochscheid et al., 2007) show lung-to-body size ratios that are larger than terrestrial animals, whereas the lung-to-body mass ratio of the deeper diving leatherback sea turtle is smaller (Lutcavage et al., 1992). The use of test data with smaller lung-to-body ratios to set injury thresholds may result in a more conservative estimate of potential for damaging effects (i.e., lower thresholds) for animals with larger lung-to-body ratios.

For these shallow exposures of small terrestrial mammals (masses ranging from 3.4 to 50 kilograms) to underwater detonations, Richmond et al. (1973) reported that no blast injuries were observed when exposures were less than 6 lb. per square inch (in.) per millisecond (psi-ms) (40 pascal-seconds [Pa-s]),

no instances of slight lung hemorrhage occurred below 20 psi-ms (140 Pa-s), and instances of no lung damage were observed in some exposures at higher levels up to 40 psi-ms (280 Pa-s). An impulse of 34 psi-ms (230 Pa-s) resulted in about 50 percent incidence of slight lung hemorrhage. About half of the animals had gastrointestinal tract contusions (with slight ulceration, i.e., some perforation of the mucosal layer) at exposures of 25–27 psi-ms (170–190 Pa-s). Lung injuries were found to be slightly more prevalent than gastrointestinal tract injuries for the same exposure.

The Lovelace subject animals were exposed near the water surface; therefore, depth effects were not discernible in this data set. In addition, this data set included only small terrestrial animals, whereas adult sea turtles may be substantially larger and have respiratory structures adapted for the high pressures experienced at depth. Goertner (1982) examined how lung cavity size would affect susceptibility to blast injury by considering both size and depth in a bubble oscillation model of the lung, which is assumed to be applicable to sea turtles as well for this analysis. Animal depth relates to injury susceptibility in two ways: injury is related to the relative increase in explosive pressure over hydrostatic pressure, and lung collapse with depth reduces the potential for air cavity oscillatory damage. The time period over which an impulse must be delivered to cause damage is assumed to be related to the natural oscillation period of an animal's lung, which depends on lung size. Based on a study of green sea turtles, Berkson (1967) predicted sea turtle lung collapse would be complete around 80–160 meter depth.

Peak Pressure as a Predictor of Explosive Trauma

High instantaneous peak pressures can cause damaging tissue distortion. Goertner (1982) suggested a peak overpressure gastrointestinal tract injury criterion because the size of gas bubbles in the gastrointestinal tract are variable, and their oscillation period could be short relative to primary blast wave exposure duration. The potential for gastrointestinal tract injury, therefore, may not be adequately modeled by the single oscillation bubble methodology used to estimate lung injury due to impulse. Like impulse, however, high instantaneous pressures may damage many parts of the body, but damage to the gastrointestinal tract is used as an indicator of any peak pressure-induced injury due to its vulnerability.

Older military reports documenting exposure of human divers to blast exposure generally describe peak pressure exposures around 100 lb. psi (237 dB re 1 µPa peak) to feel like a slight pressure or stinging sensation on skin, with no enduring effects (Christian & Gaspin, 1974). Around 200 psi, the shock wave felt like a blow to the head and chest. Data from the Lovelace Foundation experiments show instances of gastrointestinal tract contusions after exposures up to 1,147 psi peak pressure, while exposures of up to 588 psi peak pressure resulted in many instances of no observed gastrointestinal tract effects. The lowest exposure for which slight contusions to the gastrointestinal tract were reported was 237 dB re 1 µPa peak. As a vulnerable gas-containing organ, the gastrointestinal tract is vulnerable to both high peak pressure and high impulse, which may vary to differing extents due to blast exposure conditions (i.e., animal depth, distance from the charge). This likely explains the range of effects seen at similar peak pressure exposure levels and shows the utility of considering both peak pressure and impulse when analyzing the potential for injury due to explosives.

The *ANSI Sound Exposure Guidelines* (Popper et al., 2014) recommended peak pressure guidelines for sea turtle injury from explosives. Lacking any direct data for sea turtles, these recommendations were based on fish data. Of the fish data available, the working group conservatively chose the study with the lowest peak pressures associated with fish mortality to set guidelines (Hubbs & Rechnitzer, 1952), and did not consider the Lovelace studies discussed above.

3.5.2.2.1.2 Hearing Loss

An underwater explosion produces broadband, impulsive sound that can cause noise-induced hearing loss, typically quantified as threshold shift, which persists after cessation of the noise exposure. This noise-induced hearing loss may manifest as TTS or PTS. Because studies on inducing threshold shift in sea turtles are very limited (e.g., alligator lizards: Dew et al., 1993; Henry & Mulroy, 1995) and have not been conducted on any of the sea turtles present in the Study Area, auditory threshold shift in sea turtles is considered to be consistent with general knowledge about noise-induced hearing loss described in Section 3.0.4.7 (Conceptual Framework for Assessing Effects from Acoustic and Explosive Activities).

Little is known about how sea turtles use sound in their environment. The *ANSI Sound Exposure Guidelines* (Popper et al., 2014) do not suggest numeric sound exposure thresholds for auditory effects on sea turtles due to lack of data. Rather, the guidelines qualitatively advise that sea turtles are less likely to incur TTS or PTS with increasing distance from an explosive. The guidelines also suggest that data from fishes may be more relevant than data from marine mammals when estimating auditory impacts on sea turtles, because, in general, fish hearing range is more similar to the limited hearing range of sea turtles. As shown in Section 3.5.1.4 (Hearing and Vocalization), sea turtle hearing is most sensitive around 100–400 Hz in-water, is limited over 1 kHz, and is much less sensitive than that of any marine mammal.

3.5.2.2.1.3 Physiological Stress

A stress response is a suite of physiological changes that are meant to help an organism mitigate the impact of a stressor. If the magnitude and duration of the stress response is too great or too long, it can have negative consequences to the animal (e.g. decreased immune function, decreased reproduction). Physiological stress is typically analyzed by measuring stress hormones, other biochemical markers, or vital signs. Physiological stress has been measured for sea turtles during nesting (Flower et al., 2015; Valverde et al., 1999) and capture and handling (Flower et al., 2015; Gregory & Schmid, 2001), but the stress caused by acoustic exposure has not been studied for sea turtles. Therefore, the stress response in sea turtles in the Study Area due to acoustic exposures is considered to be consistent with general knowledge about physiological stress responses described in Section 3.0.4.7 (Conceptual Framework for Assessing Effects from Acoustic and Explosive Activities).

Marine animals naturally experience stressors within their environment and as part of their life histories. Changing weather and ocean conditions, exposure to diseases and naturally occurring toxins, lack of prey availability, social interactions with members of the same species, nesting, and interactions with predators all contribute to stress. Anthropogenic sound-producing activities have the potential to provide additional stressors beyond those that naturally occur.

Due to the limited information about acoustically induced stress responses, the Navy conservatively assumes in its effect analysis that any physiological response (e.g., hearing loss or injury) or significant behavioral response is also associated with a stress response.

3.5.2.2.1.4 Masking

As described in Section 3.0.4.7 (Conceptual Framework for Assessing Effects from Acoustic and Explosive Activities), auditory masking occurs when one sound, distinguished as the “noise,” interferes with the detection or recognition of another sound or limits the distance over which other biologically relevant sounds can be detected. Masking only occurs when the sound source is operating; therefore, direct masking effects stop immediately upon cessation of the sound-producing activity. Any unwanted sound

above ambient noise and within an animal's hearing range may potentially cause masking which can interfere with an animal's ability to detect, understand, or recognize biologically relevant sounds of interest.

Masking occurs in all vertebrate groups and can effectively limit the distance over which an animal can communicate and detect biologically relevant sounds. The effect of masking has not been studied for sea turtles. The potential for masking in sea turtles would be limited to certain sound exposures due to their limited hearing range to broadband low-frequency sounds and lower sensitivity to noise in the marine environment. Only continuous human-generated sounds that have a significant low-frequency component, are not of brief duration, and are of sufficient received level could create a meaningful masking situation. While explosives produce intense, broadband sounds with significant low-frequency content, these sounds are very brief with limited potential to mask relevant sounds.

There is evidence that sea turtles may rely primarily on senses other than hearing for interacting with their environment, such as vision (Narazaki et al., 2013) and magnetic orientation (Avens, 2003; Putman et al., 2015). Any effect of masking may be mediated by reliance on other environmental inputs.

3.5.2.2.1.5 Behavioral Reactions

There are no observations of behavioral reactions by sea turtles to exposure to explosive sounds. Impulsive signals, particularly at close range, have a rapid rise time and higher instantaneous peak pressure than other signal types, making them more likely to cause startle responses or avoidance responses. Although explosive sources are more energetic than air guns, the few studies of sea turtle responses to air guns, which are not used during MITT training or testing activities, may show the types of behavioral responses that sea turtles may have towards explosives. General research findings regarding behavioral reactions from sea turtles due to exposure to impulsive sounds, such as those associated with explosions, are discussed in detail in Behavioral Reactions to Impulsive Sound Sources under Section 3.5.2.1 (Acoustic Stressors).

3.5.2.2.1.6 Long-Term Consequences

For sea turtles present in the Study Area, long-term consequences to individuals and populations due to acoustic exposures have not been studied. Therefore, long term consequences to sea turtles due to explosive exposures are considered following Section 3.0.4.7 (Conceptual Framework for Assessing Effects from Acoustic and Explosive Activities).

Long-term consequences to a population are determined by examining changes in the population growth rate. Physical effects that could lead to a reduction in the population growth rate include mortality or injury, which could remove animals from the reproductive pool, and permanent hearing impairment, which could impact navigation. The long-term consequences due to individual behavioral reactions and short-term instances of physiological stress are especially difficult to predict because individual experience over time can create complex contingencies. It is more likely that any long-term consequences to an individual would be a result of costs accumulated over a season, year, or life stage due to multiple behavioral or stress responses resulting from exposures to multiple stressors over significant periods of time. Conversely, some sea turtles may habituate to or become tolerant of repeated acoustic exposures over time, learning to ignore a stimulus that in the past did not accompany any overt threat. For example, loggerhead sea turtles exposed to air guns with a source SPL of 179 dB re 1 µPa initially exhibited avoidance reactions. However, they may have habituated to the sound source after multiple exposures since a habituation behavior was retained when exposures were separated by several days (Moein Bartol et al., 1995). More research is needed to better understand the long-term

consequences of human-made noise on sea turtles, although intermittent exposures are assumed to be less likely to have lasting consequences.

3.5.2.2.2 Impacts from Explosives

Sea turtles could be exposed to energy, sound, and fragments from explosions in the water and near the water surface associated with the proposed activities. Energy and sound from an explosion are capable of causing mortality, injury, hearing loss, a behavioral response, masking, or physiological stress, depending on the level and duration of exposure. The death of an animal would eliminate future reproductive potential, which is considered in the analysis of potential long-term consequences to the population. Exposures that result in non-auditory injuries may limit an animal's ability interpret the surrounding environment. Impairment of these abilities can decrease an individual's chance of survival or affect its ability to reproduce. Temporary threshold shift can also impair an animal's abilities, although the individual may recover quickly with little significant effect.

Overall, the locations, types, and severity of predicted impacts for the use of explosives during training and testing activities would be similar to what is currently conducted, with the addition of several new testing activities as described in Table 2.5-1. Although individual activities may vary in the number of events or ordnances some from those previously analyzed, the overall determinations presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS remain valid, and has been developed further under the current SEIS/EIS.

The quantitative analysis has been improved upon and updated since the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS; therefore, the new analysis is fully presented and described in further detail in the technical report *Quantitative Analysis for Estimating Acoustic and Explosive Impacts to Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles* (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2018).

3.5.2.2.2.1 Methods for Analyzing Impacts from Explosives

Potential impacts considered are mortality, injury, hearing loss due to threshold shift (permanent or temporary), masking of other biologically relevant sounds, physiological stress, and changes in behavior.

The Navy's quantitative analysis to determine impacts on sea turtles and marine mammals uses the Navy Acoustic Effects Model to produce initial estimates of the number of times these animals may experience these effects; these estimates are further refined by considering animal avoidance of sound-producing activities and implementation of mitigation. The steps of this quantitative analysis are described in Section 3.0.1.2 (Navy's Quantitative Analysis to Determine Impacts on Sea Turtles and Marine Mammals), which takes into account

- criteria and thresholds used to predict impacts from explosives (see below),
- the density and spatial distribution of sea turtles, and
- the influence of environmental parameters (e.g., temperature, depth, salinity) on sound propagation and explosive energy when estimating the received sound level and pressure on the animals.

A further detailed explanation of this analysis is provided in the technical report titled *Quantitative Analysis for Impacts on Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles: Methods and Analytical Approach for Phase III Training and Testing* (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2018).

Criteria and Thresholds used to Predict Impacts on Sea Turtles from Explosives

Mortality and Injury from Explosives

As discussed above in Section 3.5.2.2.1.1 (Injury), two metrics have been identified as predictive of injury: impulse and peak pressure. Peak pressure contributes to the "crack" or "stinging" sensation of a blast wave, compared to the "thump" associated with received impulse. Older military reports documenting exposure of human divers to blast exposure generally describe peak pressure exposures around 100 psi (237 dB re 1 µPa SPL peak) to feel like slight pressure or stinging sensation on skin, with no enduring effects (Christian & Gaspin, 1974).

Two sets of thresholds are provided for use in non-auditory injury assessment. The exposure thresholds are used to estimate the number of animals that may be affected during Navy training and testing activities (Table 3.5-2). The thresholds for the farthest range to effect are based on the received level at which 1 percent risk is predicted and are useful for assessing potential effects to sea turtles and marine mammals, and the range at which mitigation could be effective. Increasing animal mass and increasing animal depth both increase the impulse thresholds (i.e., decrease susceptibility), whereas smaller mass and decreased animal depth reduce the impulse thresholds (i.e., increase susceptibility). For impact assessment, sea turtle populations are assumed to be 5 percent adult and 95 percent sub-adult. This adult to sub-adult population ratio is estimated from what is known about the population age structure for sea turtles. Sea turtles typically lay multiple clutches of 100 or more eggs with little parental investment and generally have low survival in early life. However, sea turtles that are able to survive past early life generally have high age-specific survival in later life.

The derivation of these injury criteria and the species mass estimates are provided in the technical report *Criteria and Thresholds for U.S. Navy Acoustic and Explosive Effects Analysis (Phase III)* (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2017a).

Table 3.5-2: Criteria to Quantitatively Assess Non-Auditory Injury due to Underwater Explosions

Impact Category	*Exposure Threshold*	*Threshold for Farthest Range to Effect*
Mortality[1]	$144M^{1/3}\left(1+\frac{D}{10.1}\right)^{1/6}$ Pa-s	$103M^{1/3}\left(1+\frac{D}{10.1}\right)^{1/6}$ Pa-s
Injury[1]	$65.8\mathrm{M}^{1/3}\left(1+\frac{\mathrm{D}}{10.1}\right)^{1/6}$ Pa-s	$47.5\mathrm{M}^{1/3}\left(1+\frac{\mathrm{D}}{10.1}\right)^{1/6}$ Pa-s
	243 dB re 1 µPa SPL peak	237 dB re 1 µPa SPL peak

[1] Impulse delivered over 20 percent of the estimated lung resonance period. See U.S. Department of the Navy (2017a).
[2] Threshold for 1 percent risk used to assess mitigation effectiveness.
Note: dB re 1 µPa = decibels referenced to 1 micropascal, SPL = sound pressure level, M = animal mass (kg), D = animal depth (m), and Pa-s = Pascal-second

When explosive munitions (e.g., a bomb or missile) detonates, fragments of the weapon are thrown at high-velocity from the detonation point, which can injure or kill sea turtles if they are struck. Risk of fragment injury reduces exponentially with distance as the fragment density is reduced. Fragments underwater tend to be larger than fragments produced by in-air explosions (Swisdak & Montanaro, 1992). Underwater, the friction of the water would quickly slow these fragments to a point where they


no longer pose a threat. On the other hand, the blast wave from an explosive detonation moves efficiently through the seawater. Because the ranges to mortality and injury due to exposure to the blast wave are likely to far exceed the zone where fragments could injure or kill an animal, the above thresholds are assumed to encompass risk due to fragmentation.

Fragments produced by exploding munitions at or near the surface may present a high-speed strike hazard for an animal at or near the surface. In water, however, fragmentation velocities decrease rapidly due to drag (Swisdak & Montanaro, 1992). Because blast waves propagate efficiently through water, the range to injury from the blast wave would likely extend beyond the range of fragmentation risk.

Auditory Weighting Functions

Animals are not equally sensitive to noise at all frequencies. To capture the frequency-dependent nature of the effects of noise, auditory weighting functions are used. Auditory weighting functions are mathematical functions that adjust received sound levels to emphasize ranges of best hearing and de-emphasize ranges with less or no auditory sensitivity. The adjusted received sound level is referred to as a weighted received sound level.

The auditory weighting function for sea turtles is shown in Figure 3.5-6. The derivation of this weighting function is described in the technical report *Criteria and Thresholds for U.S. Navy Acoustic and Explosive Effects Analysis (Phase III)* (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2017a). The frequencies around the top portion of the function, where the amplitude is closest to zero, are emphasized, while the frequencies below and above this range (where amplitude declines) are de-emphasized, when summing acoustic energy received by a sea turtle.



Source: U.S. Department of the Navy (2017a)
Notes: dB = decibels, kHz = kilohertz, TU = sea turtle hearing group


Figure 3.5-6: Auditory Weighting Functions for Sea Turtles

Hearing Loss from Explosives

No studies of hearing loss have been conducted on sea turtles. Therefore, sea turtle susceptibility to hearing loss due to an acoustic exposure is evaluated using knowledge about sea turtle hearing abilities

in combination with non-impulsive auditory effect data from other species (marine mammals and fish). This yields sea turtle exposure functions, shown in Figure 3.5-7, which are mathematical functions that relate the SELs for onset of TTS or PTS to the frequency of the sonar sound exposure. The derivation of the sea turtle exposure functions are provided in the technical report *Criteria and Thresholds for U.S. Navy Acoustic and Explosive Effects Analysis (Phase III)* (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2017a).

For impulsive sounds, hearing loss in other species has also been observed to be related to the unweighted peak pressure of a received sound. Because this data does not exist for sea turtles, unweighted peak pressure thresholds for TTS and PTS were developed by applying relationships observed between impulsive peak pressure TTS thresholds and auditory sensitivity in marine mammals to sea turtles. This results in dual-metric hearing loss criteria for sea turtles for impulsive sound exposure: the SEL-based exposure functions in Figure 3.5-7 and the peak pressure thresholds in Table 3.5-3. The derivation of the sea turtle impulsive peak pressure TTS and PTS thresholds are provided in the technical report *Criteria and Thresholds for U.S. Navy Acoustic and Explosive Effects Analysis (Phase III)* (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2017a).



Notes: kHz = kilohertz, SEL = Sound Exposure Level, dB re 1 μPa^2s = decibels referenced to 1 micropascal squared second. The solid black curve is the exposure function for TTS onset and the dashed black curve is the exposure function for PTS onset. Small dashed lines and asterisks indicate the SEL thresholds and most sensitive frequency for TTS and PTS.

Figure 3.5-7: TTS and PTS Exposure Functions for Impulsive Sounds

Table 3.5-3: TTS and PTS Peak Pressure Thresholds Derived for Sea Turtles Exposed to Impulsive Sounds

Auditory Effect	*Unweighted Peak Pressure Threshold*
TTS	226 dB re 1 µPa SPL peak
PTS	232 dB re 1 µPa SPL peak

Notes: dB re 1 µPa = decibels referenced to 1 micropascal, PTS = permanent threshold shift, SPL = sound pressure level, TTS = temporary threshold shift

Accounting for Mitigation

The Navy will implement mitigation measures to avoid or reduce potential impacts from explosives on sea turtles, as described in Section 5.3.3 (Explosive Stressors). The benefits of mitigation are conservatively factored into the analysis for Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 of the Proposed Action for training and testing. The Navy's mitigation measures are identical for both action alternatives.

Procedural mitigation measures include delaying or ceasing applicable detonations when a sea turtle is observed in a mitigation zone. The mitigation zones for explosives extend beyond the respective average ranges to mortality. The mitigation zones encompass the estimated ranges to mortality for a given explosive. Therefore, the impact analysis quantifies the potential for mitigation to reduce the risk of mortality due to exposure to explosives. Two factors are considered when quantifying the effectiveness of mitigation: (1) the extent to which the type of mitigation proposed for a sound-producing activity (e.g., active sonar) allows for observation of the mitigation zone prior to and during the activity; and (2) the sightability of each species that may be present in the mitigation zone, which is determined by species-specific characteristics and the viewing platform. A detailed explanation of the analysis is provided in the technical report *Quantifying Acoustic Impacts on Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles: Methods and Analytical Approach for Phase III Training and Testing* (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2017a).

In the quantitative analysis, consideration of mitigation measures means that, for activities where mitigation is feasible, model-estimated mortality is considered mitigated to the level of injury. The impact analysis does not analyze the potential for mitigation to reduce TTS or behavioral effects, even though mitigation could also reduce the likelihood of these effects. In practice, mitigation also protects all unobserved (below the surface) animals in the vicinity, including other species, in addition to the observed animal. However, the analysis assumes that only animals sighted at the water surface would be protected by the applied mitigation. The analysis, therefore, does not capture the protection afforded to all marine species that may be near or within the mitigation zone.

The Navy will also implement mitigation measures for certain explosive activities within mitigation areas, including the Marpi Reef Mitigation Area, Chalan Kanoa Reef Mitigation Area, and Agat Bay Nearshore Mitigation Area, as described in Appendix I (Geographic Mitigation Assessment). Mitigation areas are designed to help avoid or reduce impacts during biologically important life processes within particularly important habitat areas. The benefits of mitigation areas are discussed qualitatively in terms of the context of impact avoidance or reduction.

3.5.2.2.2.2 Impact Ranges for Explosives

The following section provides the range (distance) over which specific physiological or behavioral effects are expected to occur based on the explosive criteria and the explosive propagation calculations from the Navy Acoustic Effects Model (Section 3.5.2.2.2.1, Methods for Analyzing Impacts from Explosives). The range to effects is shown for a range of explosive bins, from E1 (up to 0.25 lb. net explosive weight) to E12 (up to 1,000 lb. net explosive weight). Ranges are determined by modeling the distance that noise from an explosion would need to propagate to reach exposure level thresholds specific to a hearing group that would cause TTS, PTS, non-auditory injury, and mortality. Range to effects is important information in not only predicting impacts from explosives, but also in verifying the accuracy of model results against real-world situations and assessing the level of impact that will likely be mitigated within applicable mitigation zones.

Table 3.5-4 shows the minimum, average, and maximum ranges due to varying propagation conditions to non-auditory injury based on the larger of the range to slight lung injury or gastrointestinal tract injury for representative animal masses ranging from 10 to 1,000 kilograms and different explosive bins ranging from 0.25 to 1,000 lb. net explosive weight. Animals within these water volumes would be expected to receive minor injuries at the outer ranges, increasing to more substantial injuries, and finally mortality as an animal approaches the detonation point. Ranges to mortality, based on animal mass, are shown in Table 3.5-5.

The following tables (Table 3.5-6 and Table 3.5-7) show the minimum, average, and maximum ranges to onset of auditory and behavioral effects based on the thresholds described in Section 3.5.2.2.2.1 (Methods for Analyzing Impacts from Explosives). Ranges are provided for a representative source depth and cluster size (the number of rounds fired [or buoys dropped] within a very short duration) for each bin. For events with multiple explosions, sound from successive explosions can be expected to accumulate and increase the range to the onset of an impact based on SEL thresholds. Modeled ranges to TTS and PTS based on peak pressure for a single explosion generally exceed the modeled ranges based on SEL even when accumulated for multiple explosions. Peak pressure-based ranges are estimated using the best available science; however, data on peak pressure at far distances from explosions are very limited. For additional information on how ranges to impacts from explosions were estimated, see the technical report *Quantifying Acoustic Impacts on Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles: Methods and Analytical Approach for Phase III Training and Testing Ranges* (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2017b).

Table 3.5-4: Ranges to Non-Auditory Injury[1] (in meters) for Sea Turtles Exposed to Explosives as a Function of Animal Mass

Bin[2]	*Range to Non-Auditory Injury (meters) for Various Animal Mass Intervals (kg)* [1]		
	10 kg	***250 kg***	***1,000 kg***
E1	12 (11–13)	12 (11–13)	12 (11–13)
E2	16 (15–16)	16 (15–16)	16 (15–16)
E3	25 (25–25)	25 (25–25)	25 (25–25)
E4	30 (30–35)	30 (30–35)	30 (30–35)
E5	40 (40–65)	40 (40–50)	40 (40–50)
E6	52 (50–60)	52 (50–55)	52 (50–55)
E8	93 (90–150)	91 (90–95)	91 (90–95)
E9	123 (120–270)	123 (120–140)	123 (120–130)
E10	155 (150–420)	155 (150–240)	155 (150–160)
E11	398 (380–420)	219 (170–260)	172 (160–220)
E12	195 (190–650)	195 (190–380)	195 (190–200)

[1] Average distance (m) to non-auditory injury is depicted above the minimum and maximum distances which are in parentheses. The ranges depicted are the further of the ranges for gastrointestinal tract injury or slight lung injury for an explosive bin and animal mass interval combination.

[2] Bin (net explosive weight, lb.): E1 (0.1–0.25), E2 (>0.25–0.5), E3 (>0.5–2.5), E4 (> 2.5–5), E5 (> 5–10), E6 (> 10–20), E8 (> 60–100), E9 (> 100–250), E10 (> 250–500), E11 (> 500–650), and E12 (> 650–1,000).

Table 3.5-5: Ranges to Mortality for Sea Turtles Exposed to Explosives as a Function of Animal Mass[1]

Bin	*Ranges to Mortality (meters) for Various Animal Mass Intervals (kg)[1]*		
	10 kg	*250 kg*	*1,000 kg*
E1	2 (2–3)	1 (0–1)	0 (0–0)
E2	4 (3–4)	1 (1–2)	1 (1–1)
E3	8 (6–9)	4 (3–6)	2 (2–2)
E4	13 (11–15)	7 (5–9)	4 (4–5)
E5	12 (11–30)	7 (5–18)	4 (4–7)
E6	15 (14–25)	9 (7–17)	5 (5–9)
E8	40 (24–65)	22 (12–40)	14 (9–21)
E9	31 (30–35)	20 (16–24)	13 (12–13)
E10	54 (40–170)	24 (20–25)	16 (15–17)
E11	194 (180–210)	96 (70–130)	53 (50–55)
E12	83 (50–260)	31 (25–90)	20 (19–20)

[1] Average distance (m) to mortality is depicted above the minimum and maximum distances which are in parentheses.

[2] Bin (net explosive weight, lb.): E1 (0.1–0.25), E2 (>0.25–0.5), E3 (>0.5–2.5), E4 (> 2.5–5), E5 (> 5–10), E6 (> 10–20), E8 (> 60–100), E9 (> 100–250), E10 (> 250–500), E11 (> 500–650), and E12 (> 650–1,000).

Table 3.5-6: Peak Pressure Based Ranges to TTS and PTS for Sea Turtles Exposed to Explosives

Range to Effects for Explosives: Sea turtles[1]				
Bin	***Source Depth (meters)***	***Cluster Size***	***Range to PTS (meters)***	***Range to TTS (meters)***
E1	0.1	1	35 (35–35)	68 (65–70)
		18	35 (35–35)	68 (65–70)
E2	0.1	1	48 (45–50)	87 (80–90)
		5	48 (45–50)	87 (80–90)
E3	0.1	1	81 (75–85)	145 (140–150)
		12	81 (75–85)	145 (140–150)
	18.25	1	80 (80–80)	150 (150–150)
		12	80 (80–80)	150 (150–150)
E4	10	2	100 (100–100)	192 (190–200)
	60	2	101 (100–110)	194 (190–220)
E5	0.1	20	125 (120–130)	235 (230–250)
	30	20	138 (130–160)	257 (240–290)
E6	0.1	1	163 (160–170)	292 (270–320)
	30	1	160 (160–160)	300 (300–300)
E8	0.1	1	273 (260–280)	451 (370–500)
	45.75	1	281 (280–300)	527 (525–575)
E9	0.1	1	355 (320–380)	566 (440–675)

Table 3.5-6: Peak Pressure Based Ranges to TTS and PTS for Sea Turtles Exposed to Explosives (continued)

Range to Effects for Explosives: Sea turtles[1]				
Bin	***Source Depth (meters)***	***Cluster Size***	***Range to PTS (meters)***	***Range to TTS (meters)***
E10	0.1	1	432 (360–550)	690 (480–1,025)
E11	45.75	1	540 (525–625)	977 (950–1,025)
	91.4	1	558 (500–800)	1,053 (825–2,025)
E12	0.1	1	509 (410–575)	784 (550–1,025)
		4	509 (410–575)	784 (550–1,025)

[1]Average distance (m) to TTS and PTS are depicted above the minimum and maximum distances which are in parentheses. Values depict ranges to TTS and PTS based on the peak pressure metric.

[2] Bin (net explosive weight, lb.): E1 (0.1–0.25), E2 (>0.25–0.5), E3 (>0.5–2.5), E4 (> 2.5–5), E5 (> 5–10), E6 (> 10–20), E8 (> 60–100), E9 (> 100–250), E10 (> 250–500), E11 (> 500–650), and E12 (> 650–1,000).

Table 3.5-7: SEL Based Ranges to TTS and PTS for Sea Turtles Exposed to Explosives

Range to Effects for Explosives: Sea turtles[1]				
Bin	***Source Depth (meters)***	***Cluster Size***	***Range to PTS (meters)***	***Range to TTS (meters)***
E1	0.1	1	0 (0–0)	0 (0–0)
		18	0 (0–0)	2 (2–2)
E2	0.1	1	0 (0–0)	1 (1–1)
		5	0 (0–0)	2 (2–2)
E3	0.1	1	0 (0–0)	3 (2–3)
		12	2 (1–2)	8 (8–18)
	18.25	1	3 (3–3)	17 (16–17)
		12	10 (10–10)	70 (70–70)

Table 3.5-7: SEL Based Ranges to TTS and PTS for Sea Turtles Exposed to Explosives (continued)

Range to Effects for Explosives: Sea turtles[1]				
Bin	***Source Depth (meters)***	***Cluster Size***	***Range to PTS (meters)***	***Range to TTS (meters)***
E4	10	2	7 (7–8)	52 (50–55)
	60	2	7 (7–7)	35 (35–35)
E5	0.1	20	5 (5–5)	36 (25–270)
	30	20	48 (40–65)	293 (240–400)
E6	0.1	1	2 (2–2)	10 (10–180)
	30	1	14 (14–14)	95 (95–95)
E8	0.1	1	5 (5–5)	39 (25–290)
	45.75	1	40 (40–40)	271 (270–280)
E9	0.1	1	9 (9–9)	87 (40–410)
E10	0.1	1	13 (13–270)	164 (60–1,000)
E11	45.75	1	170 (170–180)	832 (750–850)
	91.4	1	150 (150–170)	794 (750–875)
E12	0.1	1	31 (18–120)	200 (80–950)
		4	59 (30–380)	377 (140–5,025)

[1]Average distance (m) to TTS and PTS are depicted above the minimum and maximum distances which are in parentheses. Values depict ranges to TTS and PTS based on the SEL metric.

[2] Bin (net explosive weight, lb.): E1 (0.1–0.25), E2 (>0.25–0.5), E3 (>0.5–2.5), E4 (> 2.5–5), E5 (> 5–10), E6 (> 10–20), E8 (> 60–100), E9 (> 100–250), E10 (> 250–500), E11 (> 500–650), and E12 (> 650–1,000).

3.5.2.2.2.3 Presentation of Estimated Impacts from the Quantitative Analysis

The results of the analysis of potential impacts to sea turtles from explosives as described in Section 3.5.2.2.2.1 (Methods for Analyzing Impacts from Explosives) are discussed below. Estimated numbers of potential impacts from the quantitative analysis for sea turtles are presented below. The most likely regions and activity categories from which the impacts could occur are displayed in the figures. There is a potential for impacts to occur anywhere within the Study Area where sound and energy from explosives and the species overlap, although only areas or categories where 0.5 percent of the impact, or greater, are estimated to occur are graphically represented on the species-specific figures below. All (i.e., grand total) estimated impacts are included in the graphics, regardless of region or category.

The numbers of activities planned can vary slightly from year-to-year. Results are presented for a maximum explosive use year; however, during most years, explosive use would be less resulting in fewer potential impacts. The number of explosives used are described in Section 3.0.4.2 (Explosive Stressors).

Ranges to effect (see Table 3.5-4 through Table 3.5-7) were developed in the Navy Acoustic Effects Model based on the thresholds for TTS, PTS, injury, and mortality discussed above.

3.5.2.2.2.4 Impacts from Explosives Under Alternative 1

Activities using explosives would be conducted as described in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) and Appendix A (Training and Testing Activities Descriptions). General characteristics, quantities, and net explosive weights of in-water explosives used during training and testing activities under Alternative 1 are provided in Section 3.0.4.2 (Explosive Stressors). Quantities and locations of fragment-producing explosives during training and testing activities under Alternative 1 are shown in 3.0.4.4.4 (Military Expended Materials).


Under Alternative 1, there could be fluctuation in the number of explosions that could occur annually, although potential impacts would be similar from year to year. The number of impulsive sources in this SEIS/OEIS compared with the totals analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS are described in Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2.

The number of torpedo testing events (both explosive and non-explosive) planned under Alternative 1 testing can vary slightly from year-to-year however all other training and testing activities would remain consistent from year-to-year. Alternative 1 results are presented for a maximum explosive use year; however, during most years, explosive use would be less resulting in fewer potential impacts, as described in Section 3.0.4.2 (Explosive Stressors).

Detonations would typically occur in waters greater than 200 ft. in depth, and greater than 3 nautical miles from shore, with the exception of existing mine warfare areas, including Outer Apra Harbor, Piti, and Agat. Section 5.3.3 (Explosive Stressors) outlines the procedural mitigation measures for explosive stressors to reduce potential impacts on biological resources.

The quantitative analysis, using a maximum year of training and testing activities, estimates that no sea turtles would be killed, however, a small number of green sea turtles would be exposed to levels of explosive sound and energy in the outer Apra Harbor that could cause TTS or PTS (Table 3.5-8). The quantitative analysis predicts that no hawksbill, leatherback, or loggerhead sea turtles are likely to be exposed to the levels of explosive sound and energy that could cause TTS or PTS during training and testing activities under Alternative 1 (for impact tables, see Appendix E, Estimated Marine Mammal and Sea Turtle Impacts from Exposure to Acoustic and Explosive Stressors Under Navy Training and Testing Activities). Olive ridley sea turtle presence in the Study Area is limited and density data does not exist

due to low occurrence in this region. Therefore, exposures were only modeled for green, hawksbill, leatherback, and loggerhead sea turtles in the Study Area and transit corridor. Fractional estimated impacts per region and activity area represent the probability that the number of estimated impacts by effect would occur in a certain region or be due to a certain activity category.



Note: Region and Activity Category bar charts show categories +/- 0.5 percent of the estimated impacts, which could result in a total of 98–101 percent. Estimated impacts most years would be less based on fewer explosions. The model is probabilistic and therefore a single impact could be divided up among multiple regions or activity categories.

Figure 3.5-8: Green Sea Turtle Estimated Impacts per Year from the Maximum Number of Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1

Table 3.5-8: Estimated Impacts on Individual Green Sea Turtles Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 1

Estimated Impacts by Effect		
TTS	***PTS***	***Injury***
6	3	0

Note: Estimated impacts are based on the maximum number of activities in a given year under Alternative 1.

Threshold shifts and injuries could reduce the fitness of an individual animal, causing a reduction in foraging success, reproduction, or increased susceptibility to predators. This reduction in fitness would be temporary for recoverable impacts, such as TTS, but there could be long-term consequences to some individuals. However, no population-level impact is expected due to the low number of estimated injuries for any sea turtle species relative to total population size. This can also be assumed for olive ridley turtles if exposed to explosions.

As discussed in Section 5.3.3 (Explosive Stressors), procedural mitigation includes ceasing explosive detonations (e.g., ceasing deployment of an explosive bomb) if a sea turtle is observed in the mitigation zone whenever and wherever applicable activities occur. In addition to this procedural mitigation, the

Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce impacts from explosions on seafloor resources in mitigation areas throughout the Study Area, as described in Section 5.4.1 (Mitigation Areas for Seafloor Resources). This will further reduce the potential for impacts on sea turtles that shelter and feed on shallow-water coral reefs, live hard bottom, artificial reefs, and shipwrecks.

Sea turtle hearing is less sensitive than other marine mammals, and the role of their underwater hearing is unclear. Sea turtle's limited hearing range (<2 kHz) is most likely used to detect nearby broadband, continuous environmental sounds, such as the sounds of waves crashing on the beach, that may be important for identifying their habitat. Recovery from a hearing threshold shift begins almost immediately after the noise exposure ceases. A temporary threshold shift is expected to take a few minutes to a few days, depending on the severity of the initial shift, to fully recover (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2017a). If any hearing loss remains after recovery, that remaining hearing threshold shift is permanent. Because explosions produce broadband sounds with low-frequency content, hearing loss due to explosive sound could occur across a sea turtle's very limited hearing range, reducing the distance over which relevant sounds, such as beach sounds, may be detected for the duration of the threshold shift.

Some sea turtles may behaviorally respond to the sound of an explosive. A sea turtle's behavioral response to a single detonation or explosive cluster is expected to be limited to a short-term (seconds to minutes) startle response, as the duration of noise from these events is very brief. Limited research and observations from air gun studies (See Section 3.5.2.2.2.1, Methods for Analyzing Impacts from Explosives) suggest that if sea turtles are exposed to repetitive impulsive sounds in close proximity, they may react by increasing swim speed, avoiding the source, or changing their position in the water column. There is no evidence to suggest that any behavioral response would persist beyond the sound exposure. Because the duration of most explosive events is brief, the potential for masking is low. The *ANSI Sound Exposure Guidelines* (Popper et al., 2014) consider masking to not be a concern for sea turtles exposed to explosions.

A physiological stress response is assumed to accompany any injury, hearing loss, or behavioral reaction. A stress response is a suite of physiological changes that are meant to help an organism mitigate the impact of a stressor. While the stress response is a normal function for an animal dealing with natural stressors in their environment, chronic stress responses could reduce an individual's fitness. Due to the low number of estimated impacts, it is not likely that any sea turtle would experience repeated stress responses due to explosive impacts.

Pursuant to the ESA, use of explosives during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 1 may affect ESA-listed green, hawksbill, leatherback, loggerhead, and olive ridley sea turtles.

3.5.2.2.2.5 Impacts from Explosives Under Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)

Activities using explosives would be conducted as described in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) and Appendix A (Training and Testing Activities Descriptions). General characteristics, quantities, and net explosive weights of in-water explosives used during training under Alternative 2 are provided in Section 3.0.4.2 (Explosive Stressors). Quantities and locations of fragment-producing explosives during training under Alternative 2 are shown in 3.0.4.4.4 (Military Expended Materials).

Under Alternative 2, there could be fluctuation in the amount of explosions that could occur annually, although potential impacts would be similar from year to year. The number of impulsive sources in this

SEIS/OEIS compared with the totals analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS are described in Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2.


The numbers of activities planned under Alternative 2 are consistent from year-to-year and would increase slightly compared to activities planned under Alternative 1. The numbers of explosives used under each alternative are described in Section 3.0.4.2 (Explosive Stressors).

Under Alternative 2, it is possible that impacts would be slightly increased in some years, as explosive use would fluctuate. The quantitative analysis, using a maximum year of training and testing activities, estimates that no sea turtles would be killed, however, a small number of green sea turtles would be exposed to levels of explosive sound and energy in the outer Apra Harbor that could cause TTS or PTS (Table 3.5-9). The quantitative analysis predicts that no hawksbill, leatherback, or loggerhead sea turtles are likely to be exposed to the levels of explosive sound and energy that could cause TTS, PTS, or injury during training and testing activities under Alternative 2. Olive ridley sea turtle presence in the Study Area is limited and density data does not exist due to low occurrence in this region. Therefore, exposures were only modeled for green, hawksbill, leatherback, and loggerhead sea turtles in the Study Area and transit corridor. Fractional estimated impacts per region and activity area represent the probability that the number of estimated impacts by effect would occur in a certain region or be due to a certain activity category.

Threshold shifts and injuries could reduce the fitness of an individual animal, causing a reduction in foraging success, reproduction, or increased susceptibility to predators. This reduction in fitness would be temporary for recoverable impacts, such as TTS, but there could be long-term consequences to some individuals. However, no population-level impact is expected due to the low number of estimated injuries for any sea turtle species relative to total population size. This can also be assumed for olive ridley turtles exposed to explosions.

As discussed in Section 5.3.3 (Explosive Stressors), procedural mitigation includes ceasing explosive detonations (e.g., ceasing deployment of an explosive bomb) if a sea turtle is observed in the mitigation zone whenever and wherever applicable activities occur. In addition to this procedural mitigation, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce impacts from explosions on seafloor resources in mitigation areas throughout the Study Area, as described in Section 5.4.1 (Mitigation Areas for Seafloor Resources). This would further reduce the potential for impacts on sea turtles that shelter and feed on shallow-water coral reefs, live hard bottom, artificial reefs, and shipwrecks.

Sea turtle hearing is less sensitive than other marine animals (i.e., marine mammals), and the role of their underwater hearing is unclear. Sea turtle's limited hearing range (<2 kHz) is most likely used to detect nearby broadband, continuous environmental sounds, such as the sounds of waves crashing on the beach, that may be important for identifying their habitat. Recovery from a hearing threshold shift begins almost immediately after the noise exposure ceases. A temporary threshold shift is expected to take a few minutes to a few days, depending on the severity of the initial shift, to fully recover (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2017a). If any hearing loss remains after recovery, that remaining hearing threshold shift is permanent. Because explosions produce broadband sounds with low-frequency content, hearing loss due to explosive sound could occur across a sea turtle's very limited hearing range, reducing the distance over which relevant sounds, such as beach sounds, may be detected for the duration of the threshold shift.



Note: Region and Activity Category bar charts show categories +/- 0.5 percent of the estimated impacts, which could result in a total of 98–101 percent. Estimated impacts most years would be less based on fewer explosions. The model is probabilistic and therefore a single impact could be divided up among multiple regions or activity categories.

Figure 3.5-9: Green Sea Turtle Impacts Estimated per Year from Explosions During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2

Table 3.5-9: Estimated Impacts on Individual Green Sea Turtles Within the Study Area per Year from Explosions Used During Training and Testing Under Alternative 2

Estimated Impacts by Effect		
TTS	***PTS***	***Injury***
6	3	0

Note: Estimated impacts are based on the maximum number of activities in a given year under Alternative 2.

Some sea turtles may behaviorally respond to the sound of an explosive. A sea turtle's behavioral response to a single detonation or explosive cluster is expected to be limited to a short-term (seconds to minutes) startle response, as the duration of noise from these events is very brief. Limited research and observations from air gun studies suggest that if sea turtles are exposed to repetitive impulsive sounds in close proximity, they may react by increasing swim speed, avoiding the source, or changing their position in the water column. There is no evidence to suggest that any behavioral response would persist beyond the sound exposure. Because the duration of most explosive events is brief, the potential for masking is low. The *ANSI Sound Exposure Guidelines* (Popper et al., 2014) consider masking to not be a concern for sea turtles exposed to explosions.

A physiological stress response is assumed to accompany any injury, hearing loss, or behavioral reaction. A stress response is a suite of physiological changes that are meant to help an organism mitigate the impact of a stressor. While the stress response is a normal function for an animal dealing with natural stressors in their environment, chronic stress responses could reduce an individual's fitness. Due to the

low number of estimated impacts, it is not likely that any sea turtle would experience repeated stress responses due to explosive impacts.

Pursuant to the ESA, use of explosives during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 2 may affect ESA-listed green, hawksbill, leatherback, loggerhead, and olive ridley sea turtles. The Navy is consulting with NMFS as required by section 7(a)(2) of the ESA.

3.5.2.2.2.6 Impacts from Explosives Under the No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, proposed training and testing activities would not occur. Other military activities not associated with this Proposed Action would continue to occur. Explosives stressors (e.g., explosive shock wave and sound, explosive fragments) as listed above would not be introduced into the marine environment. Therefore, existing environmental conditions would either remain unchanged or would improve slightly after cessation of ongoing training and testing activities.

Discontinuing the training and testing activities would result in fewer explosive stressors within the marine environment where training and testing activities have historically been conducted. Therefore, discontinuing training and testing activities under the No Action Alternative would lessen the potential for explosive impacts on individual sea turtles, but would not measurably improve the status of sea turtle populations or subpopulations.

3.5.2.3 Energy Stressors

This section analyzes the potential impacts of the various types of energy stressors that can occur during training and testing activities within the Study Area. This section includes analysis of the potential effects of (1) in-water electromagnetic devices, and (2) high-energy lasers on sea turtles within the Study Area. Energy stressors are discussed in Section 3.0.4.3.

Energy stressors that may impact sea turtles include in-water electromagnetic devices and high-energy lasers. With the increased use of undersea power cables associated with offshore energy generation, there has been renewed scientific interest in electromagnetic fields possibly affecting migrating marine animals (Brothers & Lohmann, 2015; Endres et al., 2016; Gill et al., 2014; Kremers et al., 2014; Kremers et al., 2016; Putman et al., 2015; Zellar et al., 2017). There is no new information that changes the basis of the conclusion. These additional scientific findings do not change in any way the rationale for the dismissal of in-water electromagnetic devices as presented in the 2015 analyses. While the number of training and testing activities using in-water electromagnetic devices would change under this SEIS/OEIS, the analysis presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, Section 3.5.4.3 (Energy Stressors), and the NMFS Biological Opinion for the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (National Marine Fisheries Service, 2015b) remains valid for in-water electromagnetic devices.

High-energy laser use was not covered in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and represents a new activity analyzed in this SEIS/OEIS. The primary concern is the potential for a sea turtle to be exposed to the laser beam at or near the water's surface, which could result in injury or death. However, sea turtles could only be exposed if the laser beam missed the target. As discussed in Section 3.0.4.3.2.2 (High-Energy Lasers), if there is a miss from a boat target, the laser beam may strike the water in the 200 meters (219 yards) to 6.5 kilometers (7,108 yards) range or more, assuming an engagement range of 200–5,000 meters. At these ranges, the low angles to the water will reflect most of the laser energy, and sea turtles would only be exposed if they were in the same exact position as the laser beam on the surface.

3.5.2.3.1 Impacts from In-Water Electromagnetic Devices Under Alternative 1

Under Alternative 1, the number of proposed training and testing activities involving the use of in-water electromagnetic devices would decrease in comparison to the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (Table 3.0-9). The activities would occur in the same locations and in a similar manner as were analyzed previously.

Therefore, impacts on sea turtles under Alternative 1 from energy stressors, including in-water electromagnetic devices, would be negligible.

Pursuant to the ESA, the use of in-water electromagnetic devices during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 1 would have no effect on ESA-listed sea turtles.

3.5.2.3.2 Impacts from In-Water Electromagnetic Devices Under Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)

Under Alternative 2, the number of proposed training and testing activities involving the use of in-water electromagnetic devices would decrease in comparison to the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (Table 3.0-9). The activities would occur in the same locations and in a similar manner as were analyzed previously and above for Alternative 1.

Therefore, impacts on sea turtles under Alternative 2 from energy stressors, including in-water electromagnetic devices, would be negligible.

Pursuant to the ESA, the use of in-water electromagnetic devices during training and testing activities, as described under Alternative 2 would have no effect on ESA-listed sea turtles. The Navy is consulting with NMFS as required by section 7(a)(2) of the ESA.

3.5.2.3.3 Impacts from In-Water Electromagnetic Devices Under the No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, proposed training and testing activities would not occur. Other military activities not associated with this Proposed Action would continue to occur. Energy stressors as listed above would not be introduced into the marine environment. Therefore, existing environmental conditions would either remain unchanged or would improve slightly after cessation of ongoing training and testing activities.

Discontinuing the training and testing activities would result in fewer energy stressors within the marine environment where Navy training and testing activities have historically been conducted. Therefore, discontinuing training and testing activities under the No Action Alternative would lessen the potential for energy impacts on individual sea turtles, but would not measurably improve the status of sea turtle populations or subpopulations.

3.5.2.3.4 Impacts from High-Energy Lasers Under Alternative 1

Alternative 1 would introduce high-energy lasers into the Study Area, which is analyzed in this SEIS/OEIS as a new substressor not previously analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. As stated previously, the Navy conducted statistical modeling to estimate the number of potential exposures of sea turtles to high-energy laser beams. The statistical probability and methods calculation are included in Appendix J (Statistical Probability Analysis for Estimating Direct Strike Impact and Number of Potential Exposures from Military Expended Materials) in this SEIS/OEIS (see Table J-2). The modeling estimated the potential direct strike exposures to a sea turtle for a worst-case scenario. Model input values include high-energy laser use data (e.g., number of high-energy laser exercises and laser beam footprint), size of the training or testing area, sea turtle density data, and animal footprint. To estimate the probability of hitting a sea turtle in a worst-case scenario (based on assumptions listed below), the impact area for all

laser training and testing events was summed over one year. Finally, the sea turtle with the highest average seasonal density within the training or testing area (green sea turtles) was used in the analysis. This approach ensures that all other species with a lower density would have a lower probability of being struck by the laser.

Under Alternative 1, the modeling estimated 0.000025 annual sea turtle exposures, an extremely low estimate (see Table J-2, in Appendix J, Statistical Probability Analysis for Estimating Direct Strike Impact and Number of Potential Exposures from Military Expended Materials). Based on the very low number of annual exposures, the characteristics of activities that would use high-energy lasers (e.g., short range distance from source to target, high-precision targeting, short duration of the energized beam), and likely avoidance behavior of sea turtles to other stressors (e.g., vessel or aircraft noise), there is a reasonable assurance that there is no risk to sea turtles from high-energy laser use within the Study Area, and that the risk of exposure is discountable.

Pursuant to the ESA, the use of high-energy lasers during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 1 may affect ESA-listed sea turtles.

3.5.2.3.5 Impacts from High-Energy Lasers Under Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)

Under Alternative 2, the number of proposed activities involving the use of high-energy lasers would increase from Alternative 1 (Table 3.0-10) and the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. The increase in the number of events that use high-energy lasers is reflected in the Navy's statistical modeling of potential exposures of sea turtles with a slight increase in the model's estimates. As shown in Table J-2 in Appendix J (Statistical Probability Analysis for Estimating Direct Strike Impact and Number of Potential Exposures from Military Expended Materials) high-energy laser use under Alternative 2 would result in 0.000027 exposures every year. As with Alternative 1, based on the very low number of annual exposures, the characteristics of activities that would use high-energy lasers (e.g., short range distance from source to target, high-precision targeting, short duration of the energized beam), and likely avoidance behavior of sea turtles to other stressors (e.g., vessel or aircraft noise), there is a reasonable assurance that there is no risk to sea turtles from high-energy laser use within the Study Area, and that the risk of exposure is discountable.

Pursuant to the ESA, the use of in-water electromagnetic devices and high-energy lasers during training and testing activities as described under Alternative 2 may affect ESA-listed sea turtles. The Navy is consulting with NMFS as required by section 7(a)(2) of the ESA.

3.5.2.3.6 Impacts from High-Energy Lasers Under the No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, proposed training and testing activities would not occur. Other military activities not associated with this Proposed Action would continue to occur. Energy stressors as listed above would not be introduced into the marine environment. Therefore, existing environmental conditions would either remain unchanged or would improve slightly after cessation of ongoing training and testing activities.

Discontinuing the training and testing activities would result in fewer energy stressors within the marine environment where Navy training and testing activities have historically been conducted. Therefore, discontinuing training and testing activities under the No Action Alternative would lessen the potential for energy impacts on individual sea turtles, but would not measurably improve the status of sea turtle populations or subpopulations.

3.5.2.4 Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors

Physical disturbance and strike stressors are discussed in Section 3.0.4.4 (Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors). Physical disturbance and strike stressors that may impact sea turtles include (1) vessels and in-water devices, (2) military expended materials, and (3) seafloor devices. The annual number of events including vessels and in-water devices, the annual number of military expended materials, and the annual number of events including seafloor devices are shown in Tables 3.0-12 through 3.0-17 and Table 3.0-19. The Navy will implement further mitigation measures to avoid or reduce potential impacts of towed in-water devices, non-explosive practice munitions, and vessel movements (see Sections 5.3.4.1 through 5.3.4.3).

There have been no known instances of physical disturbance or strike to any sea turtle in the Study Area as a result of Navy training and testing activities prior to or since the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

3.5.2.4.1 Impacts from Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors Under Alternative 1

Under Alternative 1, analysis of the individual substressors including the use of vessels and in-water devices, military expended materials, and seafloor devices presented in Section 3.0.4.4 (Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors) indicates that those items having the most potential to affect sea turtles have decreased in comparison to the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (Tables 3.0-12 through 3.0-17 and Table 3.0-19). The number of small-caliber munitions would increase under Alternative 1. Small-caliber munitions are inert, are meant to be aimed at targets, and are not long-range weapons. As a result, sea turtles are extremely unlikely to be disturbed or struck by expended small-caliber munitions.

It is likely that green sea turtles within nearshore waters of western Guam and Apra Harbor would be at risk for vessel strike. During the section 7(a)(2) consultation between the Navy and NMFS, NMFS provided unpublished data to the Navy regarding green sea turtle strandings on Guam. For 2018, the only year provided by NMFS, there were three reported green sea turtle strandings attributable to vessel strikes (see Section 3.5.1.6.2.3, Species-Specific Threats). Whether these strandings were from Navy, commercial, or recreational vessels is not determinable; however, no vessel strikes for sea turtles were reported by the Navy during the reporting time period. Further, according to Apra Harbor vessel transit information included in the section 7(a)(2) consultation between the Navy and NMFS, there are more civilian vessel transits through Apra Harbor (86 percent) than Navy transits (14 percent). In areas outside the Study Area (e.g., Hawaii and Southern California), there have been recorded military vessel strikes of sea turtles. However, these are areas where the number of military vessels is much higher and training and testing activities occur more often than in the Study Area. Given the reduction in physical disturbance and strike stressors for this SEIS/OEIS, the findings presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, Section 3.5.2.4 (Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors) and the NMFS Biological Opinion for the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2015) remain valid.

Pursuant to the ESA, the use of vessels and in-water devices, military expended materials, and seafloor devices as described under Alternative 1 may affect ESA-listed sea turtles.

3.5.2.4.2 Impacts from Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors Under Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)

Under Alternative 2, physical disturbance and strike stressors during training and testing activities would decrease compared to the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (Tables 3.0-12 through 3.0-17 and Table 3.0-19), assuming the dismissal of small-caliber munitions use for the reasons noted above. Under Alternative 2, there would be additional physical disturbance and strike stressors in comparison to Alternative 1, but the conclusions remain the same. Therefore, the potential for strikes of sea turtles from in-water

devices, military expended materials, and seafloor devices are unlikely to occur. As described above for Alternative 1, vessel strikes of sea turtles have been reported within Apra Harbor. These vessel strikes are not likely attributable to Navy activities because no vessel strikes were reported by the Navy, and the majority of vessel traffic is comprised of civilian vessels. Because vessel strike by military vessels cannot be wholly discounted, the Navy is consulting with NMFS on this stressor type and has included procedural mitigation to decrease the potential of vessel strike of sea turtles within Apra Harbor, other inshore areas, and training and testing areas at sea.

Pursuant to the ESA, the use of vessels and in-water devices, military expended materials, and seafloor devices as described under Alternative 2 may affect ESA-listed sea turtles. The Navy is consulting with NMFS as required by section 7(a)(2) of the ESA.

3.5.2.4.3 Impacts from Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors Under the No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, proposed training and testing activities would not occur. Other military activities not associated with this Proposed Action would continue to occur. Physical disturbance and strike stressors as listed above would not be introduced into the marine environment. Therefore, existing environmental conditions would either remain unchanged or would improve slightly after cessation of ongoing training and testing activities.

Discontinuing the training and testing activities would result in fewer physical disturbance and strike stressors within the marine environment where Navy training and testing activities have historically been conducted. Therefore, discontinuing training and testing activities under the No Action Alternative would lessen the potential for physical disturbance and strike impacts on individual sea turtles, but would not measurably improve the status of sea turtle populations or subpopulations.

3.5.2.5 Entanglement Stressors

Entanglement stressors are discussed in Section 3.0.4.5. Entanglement stressors considered for sea turtles include (1) fiber optic cables and guidance wires, and (2) decelerators/parachutes. The annual number of wires and cables and decelerators/parachutes proposed under the alternatives and in comparison to current ongoing activities are presented in Tables 3.0-22 through 3.0-24. There have been no known instances of any sea turtle being entangled in wires and cables, or decelerators/ parachutes associated with training and testing activities prior to or since the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

3.5.2.5.1 Impacts from Entanglement Stressors Under Alternative 1

Under Alternative 1, the annual number of entanglement stressors would decrease compared to the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (Tables 3.0-22 through 3.0-24). Therefore, the analysis from the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS remains valid. The analysis presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (Section 3.5.2.5, Entanglement Stressors) and the NMFS Biological Opinion for the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2015) determined that impacts on sea turtles from entanglement stressors are not anticipated.

Pursuant to the ESA, the use of fiber optic cable and guidance wires and decelerators/parachutes as described under Alternative 1 may affect ESA-listed sea turtles.

3.5.2.5.2 Impacts from Entanglement Stressors Under Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)

Under Alternative 2, the number of entanglement stressors would decrease in comparison to current ongoing activities for fiber optic cable and decelerators/parachutes but would increase for the annual number of expended guidance wire (Tables 3.0-22 through 3.0-24). In comparison to Alternative 1, there

would be a slight increase under Alternative 2 for entanglement stressors; however, the combined number of annual entanglement stressors (fiber optic cable, guidance wire, and decelerators/parachutes) decreases when compared to the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Therefore, the analysis and conclusions presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (Section 3.5.2.5, Entanglement Stressors) and the NMFS Biological Opinion for the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2015) remain valid. Impacts on sea turtles from entanglement stressors are not anticipated.

Pursuant to the ESA, the use of fiber optic cable and guidance wires and decelerators/parachutes as described above under Alternative 2 may affect ESA-listed sea turtles. The Navy is consulting with NMFS as required by section 7(a)(2) of the ESA.

3.5.2.5.3 Impacts from Entanglement Stressors Under the No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, proposed training and testing activities would not occur. Other military activities not associated with this Proposed Action would continue to occur. Entanglement stressors as listed above would not be introduced into the marine environment. Therefore, existing environmental conditions would either remain unchanged or would improve slightly after cessation of ongoing training and testing activities.

Discontinuing the training and testing activities would result in fewer entanglement stressors within the marine environment where Navy training and testing activities have historically been conducted. Therefore, discontinuing training and testing activities under the No Action Alternative would lessen the potential for entanglement of individual sea turtles, but would not measurably improve the status of sea turtle populations or subpopulations.

3.5.2.6 Ingestion Stressors

Ingestion stressors (military expended materials – munitions and military expended materials – other than munitions) are discussed in Section 3.0.4.6. Types of materials that could become ingestion stressors (military expended materials – munitions and military expended materials – other than munitions) during training and testing in the Study Area include non-explosive practice munitions (small- and medium-caliber), fragments from explosives, fragments from targets, chaff, flare casings (including plastic end caps and pistons), and decelerators/parachutes. The annual number of events including military expended materials are shown in Tables 3.0-14 through 3.0-17 and Tables 3.0-25 through 3.0-26. As discussed in Section 3.5.4.6.3 (Impacts from Munitions) of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, the number of munitions and explosive munitions fragments that an individual sea turtle could encounter would generally be low, based on the patchy distribution of both the munitions and the habitats where sea turtles forage. For the more numerous small-caliber munitions, these expended material-type items are inert, small in size, do not resemble prey items, and end up as part of the seafloor, where they are unlikely to be encountered by most sea turtles. In addition, it is assumed for sea turtle species that may feed at the seafloor, that they would not ingest every munition or munition's fragment encountered; if a munition or munition's fragment were ingested, an animal may attempt to reject it when it realizes the item is not food.

3.5.2.6.1 Impacts from Ingestion Stressors Under Alternative 1

Under Alternative 1, analysis of the individual substressors presented in Section 3.0.4.6 (Ingestion Stressors) indicates that those items considered ingestion stressors (military expended materials – munitions and military expended materials – other than munitions) having the most potential to affect

sea turtles have decreased (Tables 3.0-14 through 3.0-17 and Tables 3.0-25 through 3.0-26). For the reasons noted above, the Navy has determined that potential impacts from ingestion stressors would not be substantially different from the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. In the 2015 analysis of training and testing activities within the Study Area, NMFS determined that ingestion stressors (military expended materials – munitions and military expended materials – other than munitions) would not result in harassment or harm of sea turtles or jeopardize the continued existence of any sea turtle species (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2015). The activities expending munitions and other military expended materials analyzed in this SEIS/OEIS under Alternative 1 are not a significant change over what was analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, and there has been no new science necessitating a revision of the 2015 conclusions in that regard. Impacts on sea turtles from ingestion stressors (military expended materials – munitions and military expended materials – other than munitions) in the Study Area are not anticipated.

Pursuant to the ESA, the use of munitions and other military expended materials as described under Alternative 1 may affect ESA-listed sea turtles.

3.5.2.6.2 Impacts from Ingestion Stressors Under Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)

Under Alternative 2, of the number of military expended materials would decrease compared to the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, with the exception of increased use of small-caliber munitions (Tables 3.0-14 through 3.0-17 and Tables 3.0-25 through 3.0-26). Under Alternative 2, increases as compared to Alternative 1 do not change the impact conclusions for ingestion stressors (military expended materials – munitions and military expended materials – other than munitions) as summarized above under Alternative 1 and as presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Therefore, impacts on sea turtles from ingestion of military expended materials under Alternative 2 are not expected.

Pursuant to the ESA, the use of munitions and other military expended materials as described under Alternative 2 may affect ESA-listed sea turtles. The Navy is consulting with NMFS as required by section 7(a)(2) of the ESA.

3.5.2.6.3 Impacts from Ingestion Stressors Under the No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, proposed training and testing activities would not occur. Other military activities not associated with this Proposed Action would continue to occur. Ingestion stressors as listed above would not be introduced into the marine environment. Therefore, existing environmental conditions would either remain unchanged or would improve slightly after cessation of ongoing training and testing activities.

Discontinuing the training and testing activities would result in fewer ingestion stressors within the marine environment where Navy training and testing activities have historically been conducted. Therefore, discontinuing training and testing activities under the No Action Alternative would lessen the potential for individual sea turtles to ingest items expended during training and testing activities, but would not measurably improve the status of sea turtle populations or subpopulations.

3.5.2.7 Secondary Stressors

As discussed in Section 3.5.3.6 (Secondary Stressors) of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, secondary stressors from training and testing activities could pose indirect impacts on sea turtles via habitat degradation or an effect on prey availability. These stressors include (1) explosives, (2) explosive byproducts and unexploded ordnance, (3) metals, and (4) chemicals. Analyses of the potential impacts

on sediments and water quality from the proposed training and testing activities are discussed in detail in Section 3.1 (Sediments and Water Quality) of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. The analysis of explosives, explosive byproducts, metals, chemicals, and the transmission of diseases and parasites and their potential to indirectly impact sea turtles has not appreciably changed and is presented in detail in Section 3.5.4.7 (Secondary Stressors) of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

The analysis concluded that the relatively low solubility of most explosives and their degradation products means that concentrations of these contaminants in the marine environment, from either high-order or low-order detonations, are relatively low and readily diluted. Given that the concentration of unexploded ordnance, explosion byproducts, metals, and other chemicals would never exceed that of a World War II dump site where minimal concentrations were detected only within a few feet of the ordnance (Briggs et al., 2016; Edwards et al., 2016; Kelley et al., 2016; Smith & Marx, 2016), indirect impacts on sea turtles from the Proposed Action would be negligible and would have no long-term effect on habitat or prey.

3.5.3 Summary of Potential Impacts on Sea Turtles

As described in Section 3.0.5.4 (Resource-Specific Impacts Analysis for Multiple Stressors) in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, this section evaluates the potential for combined impacts of all the stressors from the Proposed Action. The analysis and conclusions for the potential impacts from each of the individual stressors are discussed in Section 3.5.2.1 (Acoustic Stressors) through Section 3.5.2.6 (Ingestion Stressors) and, for ESA-listed species, summarized in Section 3.5.4 (Endangered Species Act Determinations).

There are generally two ways that a sea turtle could be exposed to multiple stressors. The first would be if a sea turtle were exposed to multiple sources of stress from a single event or activity within a single event (e.g., a mine warfare event may include the use of a sound source and a vessel). The potential for a combination of these impacts from a single activity would depend on the range to effects of each of the stressors and the response or lack of response to that stressor. Most of the activities proposed under Alternative 1 generally involve the use of moving platforms (e.g., ships, torpedoes, aircraft) that may produce one or more stressors; therefore, it is likely that if a sea turtle were within the potential impact range of those activities, it may be impacted by multiple stressors simultaneously. Individual stressors that would otherwise have minimal to no impact may combine to have a measurable response. However, due to the wide dispersion of stressors, speed of the platforms, general dynamic movement of many training and testing activities, and behavioral avoidance exhibited by many sea turtle species, it is very unlikely that a sea turtle would remain in the potential impact range of multiple sources or sequential events. Exposure to multiple stressors is more likely to occur at an instrumented range where training and testing activities using multiple platforms may be concentrated during a particular event. In such cases involving a relatively small area on an instrumented range, a behavioral reaction resulting in avoidance of the immediate vicinity of the activity would reduce the likelihood of exposure to additional stressors. Nevertheless, the majority of the proposed activities are unit-level training and testing activities, which are conducted in the open ocean. Unit-level events occur over a small spatial scale (one to a few square miles) and with few participants (usually one or two) or short duration (the order of a few hours or less).

Secondly, a sea turtle could be exposed to multiple training and testing activities over the course of its life; however, training and testing activities are generally separated in space and time in such a way that it would be unlikely that any individual sea turtle would be exposed to stressors from multiple activities

within a short timeframe. However, animals with a home range intersecting an area of concentrated Navy activity have elevated exposure risks relative to animals that simply transit the area through a migratory corridor.

Multiple stressors may also have synergistic effects. For example, sea turtles that experience temporary hearing loss or injury from acoustic stressors could be more susceptible to physical disturbance and strike stressors through a decreased ability to detect and avoid threats. Sea turtles that experience behavioral and physiological consequences of ingestion stressors could be more susceptible to entanglement and physical strike stressors via malnourishment and disorientation. These cumulative, synergistic, and antagonistic interactions between multiple stressors both natural and anthropogenic have just begun to be investigated and the exact mechanisms each stressor contributes to individual fitness is poorly understood. To date, the majority of scientific investigations on this topic have been on marine mammals rather than sea turtles (Murray et al., 2020; National Academies of Sciences Engineering and Medicine, 2017). Based on current best available science, the effects of multiple synergistic stressors over time cannot be realistically or precisely modeled for sea turtles. The Navy's quantitative and qualitative analyses are consistently conservative and likely over-predict impacts on sea turtles.

Research and monitoring efforts have included before-, during-, and after-event observations and surveys; data collection through long-term studies in areas where the Navy conducts activities; occurrence surveys over large geographic areas; biopsy of animals occurring in areas of Navy activity; and tagging studies where animals are exposed to Navy stressors. These efforts are intended to contribute to the overall understanding of the types of impacts that animals may be experiencing in these areas. To date, the findings from the research and monitoring efforts and the regulatory conclusions from previous analyses by NMFS, including the NMFS Biological Opinion for the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (National Marine Fisheries Service, 2015b), have been that the majority of impacts from training and testing activities are not expected to have deleterious impacts on the fitness of any individuals or long-term consequences to populations of sea turtles.

3.5.4 Endangered Species Act Determination

Pursuant to the ESA, Navy training and testing activities presented in this SEIS/OEIS may affect ESA-listed sea turtles. There is no designated critical habitat for any sea turtle species in the MITT Study Area. The Navy is consulting with NMFS as required by section 7(a)(2) of the ESA, with training and testing activities described under Alternative 2 in this SEIS/OEIS as the action description in the consultation process. The outcome of those consultations pursuant to the ESA are described in this MITT Final SEIS/OEIS.

3.5.5 Public Comments

The public raised a number of issues during the scoping period in regard to Sea Turtles. The issues are summarized in the list below. Comments received from the public during the Draft SEIS/OEIS commenting period related to sea turtles are addressed in Appendix K (Public Comment Responses).

- **Lack of sea turtle information in waters surrounding FDM –** One commenter noted a lack of studies documenting the condition of sea turtles in waters surrounding FDM. Multi-year dive studies conducted by Smith and Marx (2016) have reported roughly comparable numbers of sea turtles (only green sea turtles and hawksbill sea turtles have been observed in waters surrounding FDM) during every survey between 1999 and 2012. None of the specimens seen by the authors had any visible fibropapilloma tumors, barnacles, lesions, or other visible

abnormalities. The number of sea turtle sightings during each dive session was low, ranging from 0.13 to 0.36 per biologist per dive in each year. For comparative purposes, some study sites off Oahu, Hawaii which have been surveyed since 1999 by the authors have averaged more than 10 sea turtles sighted per dive during all seasons. This equates to 28 times higher than the FDM densities. The precipitous sea cliffs, lack of suitable haulout sites or beaches preclude nesting or basking at FDM. In addition, Smith and Marx (2016) noted that no sea turtle remains, such as carapace or bone fragments, have ever been sighted or reported at FDM (the authors have encountered such remains at various locations in the Bahamas, Cayman Islands, Hawaiian Islands and Malaysia, which support resident sea turtle populations). In summary, sea turtles around FDM probably represent transient individuals and not a resident population. Although waters surrounding FDM likely maintain healthy foraging grounds for transient turtles, they do not congregate in high concentrations in these waters.

- **Habitat, prey availability, and overall health of sea turtles –** The Navy received comments expressing concerns over impacts on the general marine environment from military training and testing activities. The Navy has included a detailed summary of recent published studies that describe multi-year dive studies conducted by Smith and Marx (2016), which provide an indication of habitat quality in waters surrounding a location of concentrated and intensive military activities. The results of these surveys are included in Section 3.1.1.1.4 (Farallon de Medinilla) of this SEIS/OEIS. Throughout all dive surveys, the coral fauna at FDM were observed to be healthy and robust, which suggests healthy foraging habitats for sea turtles. The nearshore physical environment and basic habitat types at FDM have remained unchanged over the 13 years of survey activity. These conclusions are based on (1) a limited amount of physical damage, (2) very low levels of partial mortality and disease (less than 1 percent of all species observed), (3) absence of excessive mucus production, (4) good coral recruitment, (5) complete recovery by 2012 of the 2007 bleaching event, and (6) a limited number of macrobioeroders and an absence of invasive crown of thorns starfish (*Acanthaster planci*). These factors suggest that potential impacts from training and testing activities are not sufficient as to adversely impact water quality, substantiated by repeated dive surveys discussed above (Smith & Marx, 2016), and thereby reduce habitat quality for sea turtle populations.

REFERENCES

Avens, L. (2003). Use of multiple orientation cues by juvenile loggerhead sea turtles *Caretta caretta*. *The Journal of Experimental Biology, 206*(23), 4317–4325.

Balazs, G. H. (1986). Fibropapillomas in Hawaiian green turtles. *Marine Turtle Newsletter, 39*, 1–3.

Bartol, S. M., J. A. Musick, and M. L. Lenhardt. (1999). Auditory evoked potentials of the loggerhead sea turtle (*Caretta caretta*). *Copeia, 1999*(3), 836–840.

Bartol, S. M., and D. R. Ketten. (2006). *Turtle and Tuna Hearing* (NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-PIFSC-7). Honolulu, HI: Pacific Islands Fisheries Science Center.

Becking, L. E., T. C. J. M. van Bussel, A. O. Debrot, and M. J. A. Christianen. (2014). First record of a Caribbean green turtle (*Chelonia mydas*) grazing on invasive seagrass (*Halophila stipulacea*). *Caribbean Journal of Science, 48*(2–3), 162–163.

Berkson, H. (1967). Physiological adjustments to deep diving in the Pacific green turtle (*Chelonia mydas agassizii*). *Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology, 21*(3), 507–524.

Birney, K., M. Byrd, S. Hastings, S. Herron, B. Shafritz, and R. Freedman. (2015). *Report on the 2014 Vessel Speed Reduction Incentive Trial in the Santa Barbara Channel* (Protecting Blue Whales and Blue Skies). Santa Barbara, CA: National Marine Sanctuaries Channel Islands, Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District, Environmental Defense Center, and the National Marine Sanctuary Foundation.

Bjorndal, K. A., A. B. Bolten, and C. Lagueux. (1994). Ingestion of Marine Debris by Juvenile Sea Turtles in Coastal Florida Habitats. *Marine Pollution Bulletin, 28*(3), 154–158.

Bjorndal, K. A. (1997). Foraging ecology and nutrition of sea turtles. In P. L. Lutz & J. A. Musick (Eds.), *The Biology of Sea Turtles* (pp. 199–231). Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.

Bolten, A. B. (2003). Active swimmers-passive drifters: The oceanic juvenile stage of loggerheads in the Atlantic system. In A. B. Bolten & B. E. Witherington (Eds.), *Loggerhead Sea Turtles* (pp. 63–78). Washington, DC: Smithsonian Books.

Bowen, B. W., A. L. Bass, S.-M. Chow, M. Bostrom, K. A. Bjorndal, A. B. Bolten, T. Okuyama, B. M. Bolker, S. Epperly, E. Lacasella, D. Shaver, M. Dodd, S. R. Hopkins-Murphy, J. A. Musick, M. Swingle, K. Rankin-Baransky, W. Teas, W. N. Witzell, and P. H. Dutton. (2004). Natal homing in juvenile loggerhead turtles *(Caretta caretta)*. *Molecular Ecology, 13*, 3797–3808.

Briggs, C., S. M. Shjegstad, J. A. K. Silva, and M. H. Edwards. (2016). Distribution of chemical warfare agent, energetics, and metals in sediments at a deep-water discarded military munitions site. *Deep Sea Research Part II: Topical Studies in Oceanography, 128*, 63–69.

Brothers, J. R., and K. J. Lohmann. (2015). Evidence for geomagnetic imprinting and magnetic navigation in the natal homing of sea turtles. *Current Biology, 25*(3), 392–396.

Christian, E. A., and J. B. Gaspin. (1974). *Swimmer Safe Standoffs from Underwater Explosions. Navy Science Assistance Program Project No. PHP-11-73*. White Oak, MD: Naval Ordnance Laboratory.

Clark, C. W., M. W. Brown, and P. Corkeron. (2010). Visual and acoustic surveys for North Atlantic right whales, *Eubalaena glacialis*, in Cape Cod Bay, Massachusetts, 2001–2005: Management implications. *Marine Mammal Science, 26*(4), 837–843.

Clark, H. R., and C. J. Gobler. (2016). Diurnal fluctuations in CO_2 and dissolved oxygen concentrations do not provide a refuge from hypoxia and acidification for early-life-stage bivalves. *Marine Ecology Progress Series, 558*, 1–14.

Clark, S. L., and J. W. Ward. (1943). The effects of rapid compression waves on animals submerged in water. *Surgery, Gynecology & Obstetrics, 77*, 403–412.

Conant, T. A., P. H. Dutton, T. Eguchi, S. P. Epperly, C. C. Fahy, M. H. Godfrey, S. L. MacPherson, E. E. Possardt, B. A. Schroeder, J. A. Seminoff, M. L. Snover, C. M. Upite, and B. E. Witherington. (2009). *Loggerhead sea turtle (Caretta caretta) 2009 status review under the U.S. Endangered Species Act* (Report of the loggerhead biological review team to the National Marine Fisheries Service, August 2009). Silver Spring, MD: Loggerhead Biological Review Team.

Cook, S. L., and T. G. Forrest. (2005). Sounds produced by nesting leatherback sea turtles (*Dermochelys coriacea*). *Herpetological Review, 36*(4), 387–389.

DeRuiter, S. L., and K. L. Doukara. (2012). Loggerhead turtles dive in response to airgun sound exposure. *Endangered Species Research, 16*(1), 55–63.

Dew, L. A., R. G. Owen, and M. J. Mulroy. (1993). Changes in size and shape of auditory hair cells in vivo during noise-induced temporary threshold shift. *Hearing Research, 66*(1), 99–107.

Dow Piniak, W. E., S. A. Eckert, C. A. Harms, and E. M. Stringer. (2012). *Underwater Hearing Sensitivity of the Leatherback Sea Turtle (Dermochelys coriacea): Assessing the Potential Effect of Anthropogenic Noise* (OCS Study BOEM 2012-01156). Herndon, VA: U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Ocean Energy Management.

Edwards, M. H., S. M. Shjegstad, R. Wilkens, J. C. King, G. Carton, D. Bala, B. Bingham, M. C. Bissonnette, C. Briggs, N. S. Bruso, R. Camilli, M. Cremer, R. B. Davis, E. H. DeCarlo, C. DuVal, D. J. Fornari, I. Kaneakua-Pia, C. D. Kelley, S. Koide, C. L. Mah, T. Kerby, G. J. Kurras, M. R. Rognstad, L. Sheild, J. Silva, B. Wellington, and M. V. Woerkom. (2016). The Hawaii undersea military munitions assessment. *Deep Sea Research Part II: Topical Studies in Oceanography, 128*, 4–13.

Eldredge, L. G. (2003). The marine reptiles and mammals of Guam. *Micronesica, 35-36*, 653–660.

Endres, C. S., N. F. Putman, D. A. Ernst, J. A. Kurth, C. M. F. Lohmann, and K. J. Lohmann. (2016). Multi-modal homing in sea turtles: Modeling dual use of geomagnetic and chemical cues in island-finding. *Frontiers in Behavioral Neuroscience, 10*, 19.

Falcone, E. A., G. S. Schorr, S. L. Watwood, S. L. DeRuiter, A. N. Zerbini, R. D. Andrews, R. P. Morrissey, and D. J. Moretti. (2017). Diving behaviour of Cuvier's beaked whales exposed to two types of military sonar. *Royal Society Open Science, 4*(170629), 1–21.

Ferrara, C. R., R. C. Vogt, M. R. Harfush, R. S. Sousa-Lima, E. Albavera, and A. Tavera. (2014). First evidence of leatherback turtle (*Dermochelys coriacea*) embryos and hatchlings emitting sounds. *Chelonian Conservation and Biology, 13*(1), 110–114.

Flower, J. E., T. M. Norton, K. M. Andrews, S. E. Nelson, Jr., C. E. Parker, L. M. Romero, and M. A. Mitchell. (2015). Baseline plasma corticosterone, haematological and biochemical results in nesting and rehabilitating loggerhead sea turtles (*Caretta caretta*). *Conservation Physiology, 3*(1), cov003.

Fossette, S., S. Ferraroli, H. Tanaka, Y. Ropert-Coudert, N. Arai, K. Sato, Y. Naito, Y. Le Maho, and J. Georges. (2007). Dispersal and dive patterns in gravid leatherback turtles during the nesting season in French Guiana. *Marine Ecology Progress Series, 338*, 233–247.

Fuentes, M. M. P. B., D. A. Pike, A. Dimatteo, and B. P. Wallace. (2013). Resilience of marine turtle regional management units to climate change. *Global Change Biology, 19*(5), 1399–1406.

Fukuoka, T., M. Yamane, C. Kinoshita, T. Narazaki, G. J. Marshall, K. J. Abernathy, N. Miyazaki, and K. Sato. (2016). The feeding habit of sea turtles influences their reaction to artificial marine debris. *Scientific Reports, 6*, 28015.

Garcia-Parraga, D., J. L. Crespo-Picazo, Y. B. de Quiros, V. Cervera, L. Marti-Bonmati, J. Diaz-Delgado, M. Arbelo, M. J. Moore, P. D. Jepson, and A. Fernandez. (2014). Decompression sickness ('the bends') in sea turtles. *Diseases of Aquatic Organisms, 111*(3), 191–205.

Gill, A. B., I. Gloyne-Philips, J. Kimber, and P. Sigray. (2014). Marine Renewable Energy, Electromagnetic (EM) Fields and EM-Sensitive Animals. In M. Shields & A. Payne (Eds.), *Marine Renewable Energy Technology and Environmental Interactions. Humanity and the Sea* (pp. 61–79). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer.

Gitschlag, G. R. (1996). Migration and diving behavior of Kemp's ridley (Garman) sea turtles along the U.S. southeastern Atlantic coast. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology, 205*, 115–135.

Goertner, J. F. (1978). *Dynamical Model for Explosion Injury to Fish*. Dalgren, VA: U.S. Department of the Navy, Naval Surface Weapons Center.

Goertner, J. F. (1982). *Prediction of Underwater Explosion Safe Ranges for Sea Mammals*. Dahlgren, VA: Naval Surface Weapons Center.

Greaves, F. C., R. H. Draeger, O. A. Brines, J. S. Shaver, and E. L. Corey. (1943). An experimental study of concussion. *United States Naval Medical Bulletin, 41*(1), 339–352.

Gregory, L. F., and J. R. Schmid. (2001). Stress response and sexing of wild Kemp's ridley sea turtles (*Lepidochelys kempii*) in the Northeastern Gulf of Mexico. *General and Comparative Endocrinology, 124*, 66–74.

Hawkes, L. A., A. C. Broderick, M. S. Coyne, M. H. Godfrey, L.-F. Lopez-Jurado, P. Lopez-Suarez, S. E. Merino, N. Varo-Cruz, and B. J. Godley. (2006). Phenotypically linked dichotomy in sea turtle foraging requires multiple conservation approaches. *Current Biology, 16*, 990–995.

Hays, G. C., J. D. R. Houghton, C. Isaacs, R. S. King, C. Lloyd, and P. Lovell. (2004). First records of oceanic dive profiles for leatherback turtles, *Dermochelys coriacea*, indicate behavioural plasticity associated with long-distance migration. *Animal Behaviour, 67*, 733–743.

Henry, W. R., and M. J. Mulroy. (1995). Afferent synaptic changes in auditory hair cells during noise-induced temporary threshold shift. *Hearing Research, 84*(1), 81–90.

Hetherington, T. (2008). Comparative anatomy and function of hearing in aquatic amphibians, reptiles, and birds. In J. G. M. Thewissen & S. Nummela (Eds.), *Sensory Evolution on the Threshold* (pp. 182–209). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Hochscheid, S., C. R. McMahon, C. J. A. Bradshaw, F. Maffucci, F. Bentivegna, and G. C. Hays. (2007). Allometric scaling of lung volume and its consequences for marine turtle diving performance. *Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology Part A: Molecular & Integrative Physiology, 148*(2), 360–367.

Hochscheid, S. (2014). Why we mind sea turtles' underwater business: A review on the study of diving behavior. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology, 450*, 118–136.

Hoopes, L. A., A. M. Landry Jr., and E. K. Stabenau. (2000). Physiological effects of capturing Kemp's ridley sea turtles, *Lepidochelys kempii*, in entanglement nets. *Canadian Journal of Zoology, 78*(11), 1941–1947.

Houghton, J. D. R., M. J. Callow, and G. C. Hays. (2003). Habitat utilization by juvenile hawksbill turtles (*Eretmochelys imbricata*, Linnaeus, 1766) around a shallow water coral reef. *Journal of Natural History, 37*, 1269–1280.

Hubbs, C., and A. Rechnitzer. (1952). Report on experiments designed to determine effects of underwater explosions on fish life. *California Fish and Game, 38*, 333–366.

James, M. C., S. A. Eckert, and R. A. Myers. (2005). Migratory and reproductive movements of male leatherback turtles (*Dermochelys coriacea)*. *Marine Biology, 147*, 845–853.

Kelley, C., G. Carton, M. Tomlinson, and A. Gleason. (2016). Analysis of towed camera images to determine the effects of disposed mustard-filled bombs on the deep water benthic community off south Oahu. *Deep Sea Research Part II: Topical Studies in Oceanography, 128*, 34–42.

Ketten, D. R., and S. Moein-Bartol. (2006). *Functional Measures of Sea Turtle Hearing*. Woods Hole, MA: Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution.

Klima, E. F., G. R. Gitschlag, and M. L. Renaud. (1988). Impacts of the explosive removal of offshore petroleum platforms on sea turtles and dolphins. *Marine Fisheries Review, 50*(3), 33–42.

Kolinski, S. P., R. K. Hoeke, S. R. Holzwarth, L. I. Ilo, E. F. Cox, R. C. O'Conner, and P. S. Vroom. (2006). Nearshore distribution and an abundance estimate for green sea turtles, *Chelonia mydas*, at Rota Island, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. *Pacific Science, 60*(4), 509–522.

Kremers, D., J. Lopez Marulanda, M. Hausberger, and A. Lemasson. (2014). Behavioural evidence of magnetoreception in dolphins: Detection of experimental magnetic fields. *Die Naturwissenschaften, 101*(11), 907–911.

Kremers, D., A. Celerier, B. Schaal, S. Campagna, M. Trabalon, M. Boye, M. Hausberger, and A. Lemasson. (2016). Sensory Perception in Cetaceans: Part II—Promising Experimental Approaches to Study Chemoreception in Dolphins. *Frontiers in Ecology and Evolution, 4*(50), 1–9.

Laloë, J.-O., N. Esteban, J. Berkel, and G. C. Hays. (2016). Sand temperatures for nesting sea turtles in the Caribbean: Implications for hatchling sex ratios in the face of climate change. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology, 474*, 92–99.

Lavender, A. L., S. M. Bartol, and I. K. Bartol. (2014). Ontogenetic investigation of underwater hearing capabilities in loggerhead sea turtles (*Caretta caretta*) using a dual testing approach. *The Journal of Experimental Biology, 217*(Pt 14), 2580–2589.

Lenhardt, M. L., S. Bellmund, R. A. Byles, S. W. Harkins, and J. A. Musick. (1983). Marine turtle reception of bone-conducted sound. *The Journal of Auditory Research, 23*, 119–125.

Lenhardt, M. L., R. C. Klinger, and J. A. Musick. (1985). Marine turtle middle-ear anatomy. *The Journal of Auditory Research, 25*, 66–72.

Lenhardt, M. L. (1994). *Seismic and very low frequency sound induced behaviors in captive loggerhead marine turtles (Caretta caretta).* Paper presented at the Proceedings of the Fourteenth Annual Symposium on Sea Turtle Biology and Conservation. Hilton Head, SC.

Lutcavage, M. E., P. G. Bushnell, and D. R. Jones. (1992). Oxygen stores and aerobic metabolism in the leatherback sea turtle. *Canadian Journal of Zoology, 70*(2), 348–351.

Lutcavage, M. E., and P. L. Lutz. (1997). Diving Physiology. In P. L. Lutz & J. A. Musick (Eds.), *The Biology of Sea Turtles* (pp. 277–296). Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.

Martin, K. J., S. C. Alessi, J. C. Gaspard, A. D. Tucker, G. B. Bauer, and D. A. Mann. (2012). Underwater hearing in the loggerhead turtle (*Caretta caretta*): A comparison of behavioral and auditory evoked potential audiograms. *The Journal of Experimental Biology, 215*(17), 3001–3009.

Martin, S. L., K. S. Van Houtan, T. T. Jones, C. F. Aguon, J. T. Gutierrez, R. B. Tibbatts, S. B. Wusstig, and J. D. Bass. (2016). Five decades of marine megafauna surveys from Micronesia. *Frontiers in Marine Science, 2*(116), 1–13.

McCauley, R. D., J. Fewtrell, A. J. Duncan, C. Jenner, M.-N. Jenner, J. D. Penrose, R. I. T. Prince, A. Adhitya, J. Murdoch, and K. A. McCabe. (2000). *Marine Seismic Surveys: Analysis and Propagation of Air-gun Signals; and Effects of Air-gun Exposure on Humpback Whales, Sea Turtles, Fishes and Squid*. Bentley, Australia: Centre for Marine Science and Technology.

Moein Bartol, S. E., J. A. Musick, J. A. Keinath, D. E. Barnard, M. L. Lenhardt, and R. George. (1995). Evaluation of Seismic Sources for Repelling Sea Turtles from Hopper Dredges. In L. Z. Hales (Ed.), *Sea Turtle Research Program: Summary Report* (Vol. Technical Report CERC-95, pp. 90–93). Kings Bay, GA: U.S. Army Engineer Division, South Atlantic, Atlanta, GA and U.S. Naval Submarine Base.

Mrosovsky, N. (1972). Spectrographs of the sounds of leatherback turtles. *Herpetologica, 28*(3), 256–258.

Mrosovsky, N., G. D. Ryan, and M. C. James. (2009). Leatherback turtles: The menace of plastic. *Marine Pollution Bulletin, 58*(2), 287–289.

Murray, C., L. Hannah, and A. Locke. (2020). *A Review of Cumulative Effects Research and Assessment in Fisheries and Oceans Canada*. Sidney, Canada: Canadian Technical Report of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences.

Murray, C. C., A. Bychkov, T. Therriault, H. Maki, and N. Wallace. (2015). The impact of Japanese tsunami debris on North America. *PICES Press, 23*(1), 28.

Narazaki, T., K. Sato, K. J. Abernathy, G. J. Marshall, and N. Miyazaki. (2013). Loggerhead turtles (*Caretta caretta*) use vision to forage on gelatinous prey in mid-water. *PLoS ONE, 8*(6), e66043.

National Academies of Sciences Engineering and Medicine. (2017). *Approaches to Understanding the Cumulative Effects of Stressors on Marine Mammals*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.

National Marine Fisheries Service, and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. (1991). *Recovery Plan for U.S. Populations of Atlantic Green Turtle (Chelonia mydas)*. Washington, DC: National Marine Fisheries Service.

National Marine Fisheries Service, and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. (2008). *Recovery Plan for the Northwest Atlantic Population of the Loggerhead Sea Turtle (Caretta caretta), Second Revision*. Silver Spring, MD: National Marine Fisheries Service.

National Marine Fisheries Service. (2013). *2013 Annual Report of a Comprehensive Assessment of Marine Mammal, Marine Turtle, and Seabird Abundance and Spatial Distribution in US Waters of the Western North Atlantic Ocean*. Woods Hole, MA and Miami, FL: Northeast Fisheries Science Center and Southeast Fisheries Science Center.

National Marine Fisheries Service, and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. (2014). *Olive Ridley Sea Turtle (Lepidochelys olivacea) 5-Year Review: Summary and Evaluation*. Silver Spring, MD: National Marine Fisheries Service Office of Protected Resources and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Southeast Region.

National Marine Fisheries Service. (2015a). *National Marine Fisheries Service Endangered Species Act Section 7 Consultation Biological Opinion and Conference Report; Biological Opinion and Conference Report on Mariana Islands Training and Testing and Issuance of an MMPA Rule and LOA*. Silver Spring, MD: Endangered Species Act Interagency Cooperation Division of the Office of Protected Resources, National Marine Fisheries Service.

National Marine Fisheries Service. (2015b). *Endangered Species Act Section 7 Biological Opinion and Conference Report U.S. Navy's Surveillance Towed Array Sensor System Low Frequency Active Sonar Routine Training, Testing, and Military Operations and NOAA's National Marine Fisheries Service, Office of Protected Resources' issuance of four letters of authorization for the U.S. Navy to "take" marine mammals incidental to Surveillance Towed Array Sensor System Low Frequency Active Sonar Routine Training, Testing, and Military Operations in areas of the Pacific Ocean for the period of August 15, 2015 through August 14, 2016 pursuant to the fiveyear MMPA regulation*. (FPR-2015-9119). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Navy.

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. (2015). Takes of marine mammals incidental to specified activities; U.S. Navy training and testing activities in the Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area. *Federal Register, 80*(148), 46112–46171.

O'Hara, J., and J. R. Wilcox. (1990). Avoidance responses of loggerhead turtles, *Caretta caretta*, to low frequency sound. *Copeia, 1990*(2), 564–567.

O'Keeffe, D. J., and G. A. Young. (1984). *Handbook on the Environmental Effects of Underwater Explosions*. Silver Spring, MD: U.S. Navy, Naval Surface Weapons Center (Code R14).

Office of the Surgeon General. (1991). Conventional warfare ballistic, blast, and burn injuries. In R. Zajitchuk, Col. (Ed.), *U.S.A. Textbook of Military Medicine*. Washington, DC: Office of the Surgeon General.

Patino-Martinez, J., A. Marco, L. Quinones, and B. Godley. (2008). Globally significant nesting of the leatherback turtle (*Dermochelys coriacea*) on the Caribbean coast of Colombia and Panama. *Biological Conservation, 141*(8), 1982–1988.

Patrício, A. R., C. E. Diez, R. P. Van Dam, and B. J. Godley. (2016). Novel insights into the dynamics of green turtle fibropapillomatosis. *Marine Ecology Progress Series, 547*, 247–255.

Pepper, C. B., M. A. Nascarella, and R. J. Kendall. (2003). A review of the effects of aircraft noise on wildlife and humans, current control mechanisms, and the need for further study. *Environmental Management, 32*(4), 418–432.

Pike, D. A. (2014). Forecasting the viability of sea turtle eggs in a warming world. *Global Change Biology, 20*(1), 7–15.

Pike, D. A., E. A. Roznik, and I. Bell. (2015). Nest inundation from sea-level rise threatens sea turtle population viability. *Royal Society Open Science, 2*(7), 150127.

Piniak, W. E. D., D. A. Mann, C. A. Harms, T. T. Jones, and S. A. Eckert. (2016). Hearing in the juvenile green sea turtle (*Chelonia mydas*): A comparison of underwater and aerial hearing using auditory evoked potentials. *PLoS ONE, 11*(10), e0159711.

Popper, A. N., A. D. Hawkins, R. R. Fay, D. A. Mann, S. M. Bartol, T. J. Carlson, S. Coombs, W. T. Ellison, R. L. Gentry, M. B. Halvorsen, S. Løkkeborg, P. H. Rogers, B. L. Southall, D. G. Zeddies, and W. N. Tavolga. (2014). *ASA S3/SC1.4 TR-2014 Sound Exposure Guidelines for Fishes and Sea Turtles: A Technical Report prepared by ANSI-Accredited Standards Committee S3/SC1 and registered with ANSI*. New York, NY and London, United Kingdom: Acoustical Society of America Press and Springer Briefs in Oceanography.

Putman, N. F., P. Verley, C. S. Endres, and K. J. Lohmann. (2015). Magnetic navigation behavior and the oceanic ecology of young loggerhead sea turtles. *The Journal of Experimental Biology, 218*(7), 1044–1050.

Reneker, J. L., and S. J. Kamel. (2016). Climate change increases the production of female hatchlings at a northern sea turtle rookery. *Ecology, 97*(12), 3257–3264.

Rice, M. R., and G. H. Balazs. (2008). Diving behavior of the Hawaiian green turtle (*Chelonia mydas*) during oceanic migrations. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology, 356*(1–2), 121–127.

Richmond, D. R., J. T. Yelverton, and E. R. Fletcher. (1973). *Far-Field Underwater-Blast Injuries Produced by Small Charges*. Washington, DC: Lovelace Foundation for Medical Education and Research, Defense Nuclear Agency.

Ridgway, S. H., E. G. Wever, J. G. McCormick, J. Palin, and J. H. Anderson. (1969). Hearing in the giant sea turtle, *Chelonia mydas*. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences U.S.A., 64*(3), 884–890.

Rieth, T. M., T. L. Hunt, C. Lipo, and J. M. Wilmshurst. (2011). The 13th century Polynesian colonization of Hawaii Island. *Journal of Archaeological Science, 28*, 2740–2749.

Russell, D. J., and G. H. Balazs. (2015). Increased use of non-native algae species in the diet of the green turtle (*Chelonia mydas*) in a primary pasture ecosystem in Hawaii. *Aquatic Ecosystem Health & Management, 18*(3), 342–346.

Sakamoto, W., K. Sato, H. Tanaka, and Y. Naito. (1993). Diving patterns and swimming environment of two loggerhead turtles during internesting. *Nippon Suisan Gakkaishi, 59*(7), 1129–1137.

Salmon, M., T. T. Jones, and K. W. Horch. (2004). Ontogeny of diving and feeding behavior in juvenile seaturtles: Leatherback seaturtles (*Dermochelys coriacea* L) and green seaturtles (*Chelonia mydas* L) in the Florida current. *Journal of Herpetology, 38*(1), 36–43.

Schroeder, B. A., A. M. Foley, and D. A. Bagley. (2003). Nesting patterns, reproductive migrations, and adult foraging areas of loggerhead turtles. In A. B. Bolten & B. E. Witherington (Eds.), *Loggerhead Sea Turtles* (pp. 114–124). Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press.

Schuyler, Q., B. D. Hardesty, C. Wilcox, and K. Townsend. (2014). Global analysis of anthropogenic debris ingestion by sea turtles. *Conservation Biology, 28*(1), 129–139.

Seminoff, J. A., C. D. Allen, G. H. Balazs, P. H. Dutton, T. Eguchi, H. L. Haas, S. A. Hargrove, M. P. Jensen, D. L. Klemm, A. M. Lauritsen, S. L. MacPherson, P. Opay, E. E. Possardt, S. L. Pultz, E. E. Seney, K. S. Van Houtan, and R. S. Waples. (2015). *Status Review of the Green Turtle (Chelonia mydas) Under the U.S. Endangered Species Act*. (NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SWFSC-592). La Jolla, CA: Southwest Fisheries Science Center.

Shankar, K., J. Ramadevi, B. C. Choudhary, L. Singh, and R. K. Aggarwal. (2004). Phylogeography of olive ridley turtles (*Lepidochelys olivacea*) on the east coast of India: Implications for conservation theory. *Molecular Ecology, 13*, 1899–1909.

Smith, S. H., and D. E. Marx, Jr. (2016). De-facto marine protection from a Navy bombing range: Farallon de Medinilla, Mariana Archipelago, 1997 to 2012. *Marine Pollution Bulletin, 102*(1), 187–198.

Snoddy, J. E., M. Landon, G. Blanvillain, and A. Southwood. (2009). Blood biochemistry of sea turtles captured in gillnets in the lower Cape Fear River, North Carolina, USA. *Journal of Wildlife Management, 73*(8), 1394–1401.

Southall, B., A. Bowles, W. Ellison, J. Finneran, R. Gentry, C. Greene, D. Kastak, D. Ketten, J. Miller, P. Nachtigall, W. Richardson, J. Thomas, and P. Tyack. (2007). Marine mammal noise exposure criteria: Initial scientific recommendations. *Aquatic Mammals, 33*(4), 122.

Southwood, A. L., R. D. Andrews, M. E. Lutcavage, F. V. Paladino, N. H. West, R. H. George, and D. R. Jones. (1999). Heart rates and diving behavior of leatherback sea turtles in the eastern Pacific Ocean. *The Journal of Experimental Biology, 202*, 1115–1125.

Stabenau, E. K., T. A. Heming, and J. F. Mitchell. (1991). Respiratory, acid-base and ionic status of Kemp's ridley sea turtles (*Lepidochelys kempii*) subjected to trawling. *Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology Part A: Physiology, 99*(1), 107–111.

Summers, T. M., T. T. Jones, S. L. Martin, J. R. Hapdei, J. K. Ruak, and C. A. Lepczyk. (2017). Demography of marine turtles in the nearshore environments of the Northern Mariana Islands. *Pacific Science, 71*(3), 269–286.

Swisdak, M. M., Jr., and P. E. Montanaro. (1992). *Airblast and Fragmentation Hazards from Underwater Explosions*. Silver Spring, MD: Naval Surface Warfare Center.

Teuten, E. L., S. J. Rowland, T. S. Galloway, and R. C. Thompson. (2007). Potential for plastics to transport hydrophobic contaminants. *Environmental Science and Technology, 41*(22), 7759–7764.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2015a). *Final Mariana Islands Training and Testing Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement*. Pearl Harbor, HI: Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Pacific.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2015b). *Regional Biosecurity Plan for Micronesia and Hawaii, Volume IV*. Mangilao, GU: University of Guam and the Secretariat of the Pacific Community.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2015c). *Regional Biosecurity Plan for Micronesia and Hawaii, Volume III*. Mangilao, GU: University of Guam and the Secretariat of the Pacific Community.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2015d). *Regional Biosecurity Plan for Micronesia and Hawaii, Volume I*. Mangilao, GU: University of Guam and the Secretariat of the Pacific Community.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2017a). *Criteria and Thresholds for U.S. Navy Acoustic and Explosive Effects Analysis (Phase III)*. San Diego, CA: Space and Naval Warfare Systems Command, Pacific.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2017b). *Quantifying Acoustic Impacts on Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles: Methods and Analytical Approach for Phase III Training and Testing* (Technical Report prepared by Space and Naval Warfare Systems Center Pacific). San Diego, CA: Naval Undersea Warfare Center.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2018). *2017 Living Marine Resources (LMR) Program Annual Report*. Port Hueneme, CA: Naval Facilities Engineering.

United Nations Environmental Program. (2005). *Marine Litter: An analytical overview*. Nairobi, Kenya: United Nations Environment Programme's Regional Seas Programme.

Valverde, R. A., D. W. Owens, D. S. MacKenzie, and M. S. Amoss. (1999). Basal and stress-induced corticosterone levels in olive ridley sea turtles (*Lepidochelys olivacea*) in relation to their mass nesting behavior. *Journal of Experimental Zoology, 284*(6), 652–662.

Viada, S. T., R. M. Hammer, R. Racca, D. Hannay, M. J. Thompson, B. J. Balcom, and N. W. Phillips. (2008). Review of potential impacts to sea turtles from underwater explosive removal of offshore structures. *Environmental Impact Assessment Review, 28*, 267–285.

Watwood, S. L., J. D. Iafrate, E. A. Reyier, and W. E. Redfoot. (2016). Behavioral Response of Reef Fish and Green Sea Turtles to Mid-Frequency Sonar. In A. N. Popper & A. Hawkins (Eds.), *The Effects of Noise on Aquatic Life II* (pp. 1213–1221). New York, NY: Springer.

Weir, C. R. (2007). Observations of marine turtles in relation to seismic airgun sound off Angola. *Marine Turtle Newsletter, 116*, 17–20.

Wiley, M. L., J. B. Gaspin, and J. F. Goertner. (1981). Effects of underwater explosions on fish with a dynamical model to predict fishkill. *Ocean Science and Engineering, 6*(2), 223–284.

Williams, S. L. (1988). *Thalassia testudinum* productivity and grazing by green turtles in a highly disturbed seagrass bed. *Marine Biology, 98*, 447–455.

Willis, K. L., J. Christensen-Dalsgaard, D. R. Ketten, and C. E. Carr. (2013). Middle ear cavity morphology is consistent with an aquatic origin for testudines. *PLoS ONE, 8*(1), e54086.

Witt, M. J., L. A. Hawkes, M. H. Godfrey, B. J. Godley, and A. C. Broderick. (2010). Predicting the impacts of climate change on a globally distributed species: The case of the loggerhead turtle. *The Journal of Experimental Biology, 213*(6), 901–911.

Work, T. M., and G. H. Balazs. (2013). Tumors in sea turtles: The insidious menace of fibropapillomatosis. *The Wildlife Professional, Fall 2013*, 44–47.

Yelverton, J. T., D. R. Richmond, E. R. Fletcher, and R. K. Jones. (1973). *Safe Distances From Underwater Explosions for Mammals and Birds*. Albuquerque, NM: Lovelace Foundation for Medical Education and Research.

Yelverton, J. T., and D. R. Richmond. (1981). *Underwater Explosion Damage Risk Criteria for Fish, Birds, and Mammals.* Paper presented at the 102nd Meeting of the Acoustical Society of America. Miami Beach, FL.

Yudhana, A., J. Din, Sundari, S. Abdullah, and R. B. R. Hassan. (2010). Green turtle hearing identification based on frequency spectral analysis. *Applied Physics Research, 2*(1), 125–134.

Zellar, R., A. Pulkkinen, K. Moore, D. Reeb, E. Karakoylu, and O. Uritskaya. (2017). *Statistical Assessment of Cetacean Stranding Events in Cape Cod (Massachusetts, USA) Area OS21A-1345*. Greenbelt, MD: National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

3.6 Marine Birds

Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/ Overseas Environmental Impact Statement Mariana Islands Training and Testing

TABLE OF CONTENTS

3.6 Marine Birds 3.6-1
3.6.1 Affected Environment 3.6-1
3.6.1.1 Group Size 3.6-2
3.6.1.2 Diving Behavior 3.6-2
3.6.1.3 Flight Altitudes 3.6-2
3.6.1.4 Distance from Shore 3.6-3
3.6.1.5 Hearing and Vocalization 3.6-3
3.6.1.6 General Threats 3.6-5
3.6.1.7 Rookery Locations and Breeding Activities on FDM 3.6-5
3.6.2 Environmental Consequences 3.6-6
3.6.2.1 Acoustic Stressors 3.6-11
3.6.2.2 Explosives Stressors (explosive shock wave and sound, explosive fragments) 3.6-19
3.6.2.3 Energy Stressors 3.6-23
3.6.2.4 Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors 3.6-25
3.6.2.5 Ingestion Stressors 3.6-28
3.6.2.6 Secondary Stressors (impacts on habitat, impacts on prey availability) 3.6-30
3.6.3 Migratory Bird Treaty Act 3.6-30
3.6.4 Public Comments 3.6-31

List of Figures

There are no figures in this section.

List of Tables

Table 3.6-1: Number of Events by Activity Type on Farallon de Medinilla.....3.6-8
Table 3.6-2: Number of Munitions by Activity Type on Farallon de Medinilla.....3.6-9
Table 3.6-3: Munitions Use on Farallon de Medinilla, Net Explosive Weight Comparisons.....3.6-9

3.6 Marine Birds

The purpose of this section is to supplement the analysis of impacts on marine birds presented in the 2015 Mariana Islands Training and Testing (MITT) Final Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (EIS/OEIS) with new information relevant to proposed changes in training and testing activities conducted at sea and on Farallon de Medinilla (FDM). Information presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS that remains valid is noted as such and referenced in the appropriate sections. Any new or updated information describing the affected environment and analysis of impacts on marine birds associated with the Proposed Action is provided in this section. Comments received from the public during scoping related to marine birds are addressed in Section 3.6.6 (Public Comments). Comments received from the public during the Draft Supplemental EIS (SEIS)/OEIS commenting period related to marine birds are addressed in Appendix K (Public Comment Responses).

3.6.1 Affected Environment

As presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, the habitat found within the MITT Study Area supports a wide diversity of resident and migratory marine birds, with regionally important rookeries for numerous species on FDM. Descriptions of the climate, productivity, and oceanographic conditions were presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, as well as important rookery locations throughout the Mariana Islands. Because FDM is the only land area within the Study Area that would be impacted by the proposed changes in activities described in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives), the other rookery locations analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS are not included in the Study Area for this SEIS/OEIS. The species assemblage in open ocean portions of the Study Area has not changed, nor has the status of rookeries on FDM changed since the publication of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. As such, the general description in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS of the existing conditions within the Study Area remains valid.

Endangered Species Act Listed Marine Bird Species

Three marine birds present in the Study Area are listed under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) as threatened or endangered species. The short-tailed albatross (*Phoebastria albatrus*) and Hawaiian petrel (*Pterodroma sandwichensis*) are listed as endangered, and the Newell's shearwater (*Puffinus auricularis newelli*)[1] is listed as threatened (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2010, 2015). None of these species have been observed on FDM or within other rookery locations for other species within the Mariana Islands. The short-tailed albatross, Hawaiian petrel, and Newell's shearwater nest outside the Study Area and are thought to occur only rarely within the Study Area (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2010, 2015), and there would be little to no overlap with at-sea training and testing activities. The 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS relied in part on information collected in 2007 from the Navy-funded Mariana Islands Sea Turtle and Cetacean Survey (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2007). Because the short-tailed albatross, Hawaiian petrel, and Newell's shearwater were not expected to be impacted by activities analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, the section 7(a)(2) ESA consultation between the Navy and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) did not include these species (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2015). No new

[1] The current taxonomic classification of this species holds that the Newell's shearwater is a subspecies of the Townsend's shearwater. In some instances, this subspecies is also named the Newell's Townsend's shearwater; however, both Newell's shearwater and Newell's Townsend's shearwater refer to the same subspecies (scientific name *Puffinus auricularis newelli*).

survey information is available on at-sea observations of marine birds and shorebirds that would change the analysis from the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. As such, the description regarding at-sea observations of marine birds presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS remains valid.

3.6.1.1 Group Size

Section 3.6.2.1 of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS included a description of marine bird group sizes and reasons why some marine birds congregate in groups. Within the Study Area, the largest grouping of marine birds is anticipated during large upwelling events for feeding, and on-land rookery locations (at FDM). There is no new information that changes the basis of the conclusion on the group size analysis from the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. As such, the additional description regarding group sizes of marine birds presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS remains valid.

3.6.1.2 Diving Behavior

Section 3.6.2.2 (Diving) of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS describes dive behaviors exhibited by different types of marine birds. Marine birds will dive to various depths in pursuit of prey items, exhibiting plunge diving. Many of the marine bird species found in the Study Area will dive, skim, or grasp prey at the water's surface or within the upper portion (1–2 meters [m]) of the water column (Cook et al., 2011; Jiménez et al., 2012; Sibley, 2014), although some marine birds will dive to depths greater than 30 m in pursuit of prey, with dive durations lasting from a few seconds to several minutes for deep diving marine birds. Dive durations are correlated with depth and range from a few seconds in shallow divers to several minutes in alcids (Ponganis, 2015). No new information is available on dive behavior that would alter the analysis from the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. As such, the additional description regarding dive behavior presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS remains valid.

3.6.1.3 Flight Altitudes

While foraging birds will be present near the water surface, migrating birds may fly at various altitudes. Flight altitudes for birds have traditionally been estimated from on the ground (or boat) observations, or from planes; however, flight altitude information increasingly relies on radar studies and telemetry techniques, where the bird's measured altitude is subtracted from the ground elevation (Poessel et al., 2018). Jongbloed (2016) completed a literature review to determine flight height of marine birds to assess potential risks from wind turbine collisions. This review found that most seabird species fly beneath the rotor blade altitudes of offshore wind turbines, which reduces the risk for collision. Some species such as sea ducks and loons may be commonly seen flying just above the water's surface, but the same species can also be spotted flying high enough (5,800 feet [ft.]) that they are barely visible through binoculars (Lincoln et al., 1998). While there is considerable variation, the favored altitude for most small birds appears to be between 500 ft. (152 m) and 1,000 ft. (305 m). Radar studies have demonstrated that 95 percent of the migratory movements occur at less than 10,000 ft. (3,050 m), with the bulk of the movements occurring under 3,000 ft. (914 m) (Lincoln et al., 1998). Weather factors may also influence flight heights. Tarroux et al. (2016) examined the flying tactics of Antarctic petrels, (*Thalassoica antarctica)*, in Antarctica revealing the flexibility of flight strategies. Birds tend to fly higher with favorable wind conditions, and fly at near ground level during strong winds. Birds were found to adjust their speed and heading during stronger winds to limit drift, however, they were able to tolerate a limited amount of drift (Tarroux et al., 2016). This was also found by Stumpf et al. (2011) for marbled murrelets using radar to quantify flight heights off of the Olympic Peninsula and by Sanzenbacher et al. (2014) off of Northern California. In summary, most marine birds can be expected to fly relatively close to the surface, but may range upwards in altitude depending on a number of factors such as wind speed

and direction, precipitation avoidance, time of day or night, foraging behaviors, migration, and distance to coast. In general, the flight altitude of low migrating birds is likely distinctly lower offshore than along the coast or inland of islands within the Mariana Archipelago.

3.6.1.4 Distance from Shore

Pelagic ranges, as a function of distance from shore, can range widely for different species. Much of the recent research regarding abundance and distribution as a function of distance from shore for marine birds was conducted to better understand potential impacts on marine birds from offshore energy development. Spiegel et al. (2017) tracked the movements of over 400 individuals of three species (northern gannets, red-footed loon, and surf-scooter) over the course of five years off of the mid-Atlantic coast. In winter, all three species exhibited a largely near-shore, coastal, or in-shore distribution. Habitat use was concentrated in or around large bays, with the most extensive use at bay mouths. Northern gannets ranged much farther offshore than the other two species, and covered a much larger area (including instances of individuals using both the Gulf of Mexico and the mid-Atlantic within a single season). Spiegel et al. (2017) determined that the differences among species distributions were likely due to differences in motility and distribution of their preferred prey. In summary, marine bird distance from shore can depend on a variety of factors, such as physiological abilities of a particular species to tolerate long distance and duration flights, mobility of prey, and seasonal variations in ranges.

Pelagic marine birds are widely distributed throughout the Marianas, but they tend to congregate in areas of high productivity and prey availability. The 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS relied on information collected in 2007 from the Navy-funded Mariana Islands Sea Turtle and Cetacean Survey (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2007). No new information is available on at-sea observations of marine birds and shorebirds that would change the analysis from the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. As such, the description regarding at-sea observations of marine birds presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS remains valid.

3.6.1.5 Hearing and Vocalization

Section 3.6.2.3 of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS includes a description of marine bird hearing in air, as well as under water. The Navy's literature review of updated information since the publication of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS has found new information regarding in-air and underwater hearing sensitivities of marine birds.

The Navy conducted a literature search for new information since the publication of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS on bird hearing and vocalizations that may change the analysis of potential impacts on birds. New information regarding hearing sensitivities of waterbirds, including various duck species and lesser scaups, is summarized below, along with recent publications that show differences in hearing sensitivities between freshwater divers and pelagic birds. This information is summarized below with an overview of the most current best available science regarding bird hearing and vocalization.

Although hearing range and sensitivity has been measured for many land birds, little is known of seabird hearing. The majority of the published literature on bird hearing focuses on terrestrial birds and their ability to hear in air. A review of 32 terrestrial and marine species indicates that birds generally have greatest hearing sensitivity between 1 and 4 kilohertz (kHz) (Beason, 2004; Dooling, 2002). Very few can hear below 20 hertz, most have an upper frequency hearing limit of 10 kHz, and none exhibit hearing at frequencies higher than 15 kHz (Dooling, 2002; Dooling & Popper, 2000). Hearing capabilities have been studied for only a few seabirds (Beason, 2004; Beuter et al., 1986; Crowell et al., 2015; Johansen et al.,

2016; Thiessen, 1958; Wever et al., 1969); these studies show that seabird hearing ranges and sensitivity in air are consistent with what is known about bird hearing in general.

Auditory abilities have been measured in 10 diving bird species in-air using electrophysiological techniques (Crowell et al., 2015; Maxwell et al., 2017). All species tested had the best hearing sensitivity from 1 to 3 kHz. The red-throated loon (*Gavia stellata*) and northern gannet (*Morus bassanus*) (both non-duck species) had the highest thresholds while the lesser scaup (*Aythya affinis*) and ruddy duck (*Oxyura jamaicensis*) (both duck species) had the lowest thresholds (Crowell et al., 2015). Auditory sensitivity varied amongst the species tested, spanning over 30 decibels (dB) in the frequency range of best hearing. While electrophysiological techniques provide insight into hearing abilities, auditory sensitivity is more accurately obtained using behavioral techniques. Crowell et al. (2016) used behavioral methods to obtain an in-air audiogram of the lesser scaup. Hearing frequency range in air was similar to other birds, with best sensitivity at 2.86 kHz with a threshold of 14 dB referenced to (re) 20 micropascals (µPa).

Crowell et al. (2015) also compared the vocalizations of the same 10 diving bird species to the region of highest sensitivity of in-air hearing. Of the birds studied, vocalizations of only eight species were obtained due to the relatively silent nature of two of the species. The peak frequency of the vocalizations of seven of the eight species fell within the range of highest sensitivity of in-air hearing. Crowell et al. (2015) suggested that the colonial nesters tested had relatively reduced hearing sensitivity because they relied on individually distinctive vocalizations over short ranges. Additionally, Crowell et al. (2015) observed that the species with more sensitive hearing were those associated with freshwater habitats, which are relatively quieter compared to marine habitats with wind and wave noise.

Although important to seabirds in air, it is unknown if seabirds use hearing or vocalizations underwater for foraging, communication, predator avoidance or navigation (Crowell, 2016; Dooling & Therrien, 2012). Some scientists suggest that birds must rely on vision rather than hearing while underwater (Hetherington, 2008), while others suggest birds must rely on an alternative sense in order to coordinate cooperative foraging and foraging in low light conditions (e.g., night, depth) (Dooling & Therrien, 2012).

There is little known about the hearing abilities of birds underwater (Dooling & Therrien, 2012). In air, the size of the bird is usually correlated with the sensitivity to sound (Johansen et al., 2016); for example, songbirds tend to be more sensitive to higher frequencies and larger non-songbirds tend to be more sensitive to lower frequencies (Dooling & Popper, 2000). Two studies have tested the ability of a single diving bird, a great cormorant (*Phalacrocorax carbo sinensis*), to respond to underwater sounds (Hansen et al., 2017; Johansen et al., 2016). These studies suggest that the cormorant's hearing in air is less sensitive than birds of similar size; however, the hearing capabilities in water are better than what would be expected for a purely in-air adapted ear (Johansen et al., 2016). The frequency range of best hearing underwater was observed to be narrower than the frequency range of best hearing in air, with greatest sensitivity underwater observed around 2 kHz (about 71 dB re 1 µPa based on behavioral responses). Although results were not sufficient to be used to generate an audiogram, Therrien (2014) also examined underwater hearing sensitivity of long-tailed ducks (*Clangula hyemalis*) by examining behavioral responses. The research showed that auditory thresholds at frequencies within the expected range of best sensitivity (1, 2, and 2.86 kHz) are expected to be between 77 and 127 dB re 1 µPa.

Diving birds may not hear as well underwater, compared to other (non-avian) species, based on adaptations to protect their ears from pressure changes (Dooling & Therrien, 2012). Because reproduction and communication with conspecifics occurs in air, adaptations for diving may have

evolved to protect in-air hearing ability and may contribute to reduced sensitivity underwater (Hetherington, 2008). There are many anatomical adaptations in diving birds that may reduce sensitivity both in air and underwater. Anatomical ear adaptations are not well investigated, but include cavernous tissue in the meatus and middle ear that may fill with blood during dives to compensate for increased pressure on the tympanum, active muscular control of the meatus to prevent water entering the ear, and interlocking feathers to create a waterproof outer covering (Crowell et al., 2015; Rijke, 1970; Sade et al., 2008). The northern gannet, a plunge diver, has unique adaptations to hitting the water at high speeds, including additional air spaces in the head and neck to cushion the impact and a thicker tympanic membrane than similar-sized birds (Crowell et al., 2015). All of these adaptions could explain why best hearing frequencies are narrower under water than on the surface or in flight.

This new information increases the understanding of bird auditory abilities; however, no new information is available on bird hearing that would alter the analysis from the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. As such, the additional description regarding dive behavior presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS remains valid.

3.6.1.6 General Threats

Section 3.6.2.4 (General Threats) of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS described the general threats facing marine birds within the Study Area. No new information is available that would change the characterization of threats described in the 2015 document; therefore, the description regarding general threats presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS remains valid. Since the publication of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, more complete information regarding potential climate change-related impacts on water quality, which in turn may impact prey base and rookery resiliency to storm events, has become available and been included in this SEIS/OEIS. Section 3.1 (Sediments and Water Quality) describes the updated information included in this SEIS/OEIS in regards to potential impacts on water quality from climate change. These changes (e.g., air and sea temperatures, precipitation, frequency and intensity of storms, pH level of sea water, sea level rise) may potentially impact marine birds by reducing overall marine productivity and biodiversity, which could affect the food resources, distribution, and reproductive success of marine birds (Duffy, 2011; Frost et al., 2017; Lorrain et al., 2017; Ostrom et al., 2017; Ramírez et al., 2017; Trainer, 2017). In the long term, climate change could be the largest threat to marine birds.

On FDM, the primary threats to marine bird rookeries include invasive species currently on the island (e.g., rodents that prey on marine bird eggs and chicks). Extensive biosecurity planning by range operators is in place for land-based training activities on FDM to prevent the accidental introduction of other invasive species, such as the brown treesnake (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2010, 2015). A more detailed description of stressors on the terrestrial environment of FDM is provided in Section 3.10 (Terrestrial Species and Habitats).

3.6.1.7 Rookery Locations and Breeding Activities on FDM

The 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS included a summary of statistical analyses conducted on marine bird counts collected since 1997 and the findings from a non-published technical report produced by the same authors as the published report. Since the publication of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, Camp et al. (2016) published this information. During the 159 counts conducted between February 1997 and August 2014, the numbers detected during each count ranged from 0 to 447 for brown booby, 6 to 404 for masked booby, and 42 to 915 for red-footed booby. From 1997 to 2014, there is some evidence that masked and red-footed booby populations on FDM have declined, while brown booby populations have

increased. However, the general conclusion is that all three species exhibited population fluctuations over time. Combined with the level of variability observed in the count data, this precluded any definite conclusions about long-term population trends (i.e., the data showed no statistically significant trends) (Camp et al., 2016). Since the publication of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, one additional aerial survey was completed in September 2016. Because of a lack of commercial helicopter transit services, surveys have not been conducted since 2016.

3.6.2 Environmental Consequences

In the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, the Navy considered all potential stressors associated with ongoing training and testing activities in the Mariana Islands and then analyzed their potential impacts on marine birds in the Study Area. In this SEIS/OEIS, the Navy has reviewed the analysis of impacts from these ongoing activities and additionally analyzed new or changing training and testing activities as projected into the reasonably foreseeable future. The Navy has completed a literature review for information on marine birds within the Study Area, which included a search for the best available science since the publication of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Where there has been no substantive or otherwise meaningful change in the action, science, or regulations, the Navy will rely on the previous 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS analysis. Where there has been substantive change in the action, science, or regulations, the information and analysis provided in this SEIS/OEIS will supplement the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS to support environmental compliance with applicable environmental statutes for marine birds.

In the alternatives descriptions for this SEIS/OEIS, there have been some modifications to the quantity and type of acoustic stressors under the two action alternatives compared to the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. In addition, the analysis of potential impacts associated with sonar and other transducers has been improved by incorporating additional information regarding marine bird hearing abilities in water. There have been no updates to the assessment of potential impacts on marine birds from other acoustic sources (e.g., vessel noise, airguns, weapons firing noise, and aircraft noise).

The stressors applicable to birds include the new stressor (high-energy laser) and the same stressors considered in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. High-energy laser is detailed in Section 3.0.4.3.2.2 (High-Energy Lasers) and analyzed under the energy stressor category for potential impacts on birds (see Section 3.6.2.3, Energy Stressors).

In general, there have been no substantial changes to the activities analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, which would change the conclusions reached regarding populations of marine birds in the Study Area. Table 2.5.1 and Table 2.5-2 in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) list the proposed training and testing activities and include the number of times each activity would be conducted annually and the locations within the Study Area where the activity would typically occur under each alternative. The tables also present the same information for activities described in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS so that the proposed levels of training and testing under this SEIS/OEIS can be compared. The increased use of FDM for training activities proposed in this SEIS/OEIS necessitates FDM-focused analysis for some stressor categories.

Use of acoustic stressors (sonar and other active acoustic sources) and use of explosives have occurred since the 2015 completion of the MITT Final EIS/OEIS Record of Decision. There have been no known adverse effects to marine birds or population impacts that were not otherwise previously analyzed or accounted for in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2015). The potential stressors associated with the training and testing activities in the Study Area included the following:

- Acoustic stressors (sonar and other transducers, vessel noise, aircraft noise, and weapons noise)

- Explosives (in-air explosions and in-water explosions)
- Energy (in-water and in-air electromagnetic devices, high-energy lasers)
- Physical disturbance and strike stressors (vessels and in-water devices, military expended materials, seafloor devices)
- Ingestion (military expended materials – munitions, military expended materials other than munitions)
- Secondary stressors (impacts on habitat; impacts on prey availability)

During the preparation of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, the Navy assessed the potential for wires and cables, along with decelerators/parachutes, to entangle marine birds. The Navy determined at that time that these materials would not present entanglement risks for marine birds because these items would be expended outside of their range of foraging abilities. During the Navy's literature review, no new information regarding fiber optic cables and guidance wires and decelerators/parachutes was found that would alter this conclusion in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS; therefore, they are not analyzed further in this SEIS/OEIS.

Analysis of Stressors on Farallon de Medinilla

Analysis of Proposed Increases in Number of Events, Munitions, and Net Explosive Weight on Farallon de Medinilla

Under Alternative 1 and Alternative 2, there would be an overall increase in the number of training events and munitions used on FDM, which would increase the number of exposures to explosives noise, weapons firing noise, and aircraft overflights to deliver munitions to the impact zones on FDM. The types of explosive munitions used on FDM include explosive bombs (less than or equal to 2,000 pounds [lb.]), missiles, rockets, explosive grenades and mortars, medium-caliber projectiles, and large-caliber projectiles (see Table 3.0-20). The calculations for the increases in the number of events proposed on FDM are shown on Table 3.6-1. Table 3.6-2 shows the calculations for the proposed increases in the number of explosive and non-explosive munitions expended on FDM. These increases in events and munitions will result in an increase in net explosive weight (NEW) of explosives over the course of a training year. The calculations for NEW expended on NEW resulting from proposed training activities are shown on Table 3.6-3. The NEW for each ordnance type may vary within each class. Based on these NEW ranges within each explosives bin, the Navy calculated the range of total munitions' NEW under each alternative proposed in the SEIS/OEIS by multiplying the number of munitions used by the low and high NEW ranges for each ordnance type. Based on these calculations, the following assumptions are presented as additional analysis for the SEIS/OEIS:

- In terms of the number of events, there would be an increase of less than 2 percent over what was analyzed previously in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. No new activity types are proposed in the SEIS/OEIS from what were previously analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Some activity types, however, would increase in the number of events per year and/or the number of ordnance items expended. Other activities would not change compared to what was analyzed previously in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, and therefore would not contribute to an increase in NEW or the number of munitions expended on FDM. Examples of these training activities include Gunnery Exercise (Air-to-Ground) and Bombing Exercise (Air-to-Ground). Table 3.6-1 shows the

number of events that would occur under each alternative compared to what was analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

- In terms of munitions item numbers, there would be an increase of approximately 9 percent over what was analyzed previously in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS in the total number of munitions used on FDM. Most of these increases are associated with small-caliber rounds, which do not contribute to increases in NEW. Table 3.6-2 shows the number of munitions proposed under each alternative compared to what was analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.
- In terms of NEW, explosives used on FDM would increase by less than 1 percent compared to what was analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (see calculations in Table 3.6-3).

Taken together, the increase in the number of events per year or the amount of ordnance used during events would result in more ordnance use on FDM and an increase in the amount of NEW expended on FDM each year. Although the amount of increased NEW is negligible (less than 1 percent), the number of events per year and the number of ordnance items (most of which are small and medium projectiles) expended increases the potential exposure to stressors associated with ordnance use. Factors that limit the potential for additional adverse impacts, however, include maintaining the same ordnance type and targeting restrictions included as part of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. All ordnance expended on FDM would target existing impact zones, with the same ordnance restrictions imposed on all FDM activities and with the same avoidance and minimization measures in place as with the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (see Section 5.5, Terrestrial Mitigation Measures to be Implemented).

Table 3.6-1: Number of Events by Activity Type on Farallon de Medinilla

Activity	Number of Events			Percent Increase from 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS	
	2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 1	Alternative 2
Marine Air Ground Task Force Exercise (Amphibious) – Battalion	4	4	4	0.0%	0.0%
Naval Surface Fire Support Exercise – Land-based target	10	10	15	0.0%	40.0%
Bombing Exercise (Air-to-Ground)	2,300	2,300	2,300	0.0%	0.0%
Gunnery Exercise (Air-to-Ground)	96	96	96	0.0%	0.0%
Missile Exercise	85	115	115	35.3%	35.3%
Direct Action (Tactical Control Party)	18	18	18	0.0%	0.0%
Total	***2,513***	***2,543***	***2,548***	***1.2%***	***1.4%***

Notes: EIS = Environmental Impact Statement, MITT = Mariana Islands Training and Testing, NEPM = Non-explosive practice munition, OEIS = Overseas EIS

Table 3.6-2: Number of Munitions by Activity Type on Farallon de Medinilla

Activity	Munitions Type	Number of Munitions			Percent Increase from 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS	
		2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 1	Alternative 2
Naval Surface Fire Support Exercise – Land-based target	NEPM Rounds	1,800	–	–	NA	NA
	Explosive large-cal rounds	1,000	2,800	4,200	180.0%	320.0%
Bombing Exercise (Air-to-Ground)	NEPM Rounds	2,670	2,670	2,670	0.0%	0.0%
	Explosive Rounds	6,242	6,242	6,242	0.0%	0.0%
Gunnery Exercise (Air-to-Ground)	Small-cal rounds	24,000	24,000	24,000	0.0%	0.0%
	Med-cal rounds	94,150	94,650	94,650	0.5%	0.5%
	Explosive med-cal rounds	17,350	17,500	17,500	0.9%	0.9%
	Explosive large-cal rounds	200	200	200	0.0%	0.0%
Missile Exercise	Explosive rockets	2,000	2,000	2,000	0.0%	0.0%
	Explosive missiles	85	115	115	35.3%	35.3%
Direct Action (Tactical Control Party)	Small-cal rounds	18,000	30,000	30,000	66.7%	66.7%
	Medium-cal explosives	–	1,000	1,000	NA	NA
	Explosives (grenades/mortars)	600	1,000	1,000	66.7%	66.7%
Total		***168,097***	***182,177***	***183,577***	***8.4%***	***9.2%***

Notes: EIS = Environmental Impact Statement, MITT = Mariana Islands Training and Testing, NEPM = Non-explosive practice munition, OEIS = Overseas EIS

Table 3.6-3: Munitions Use on Farallon de Medinilla, Net Explosive Weight Comparisons

Explosive Munitions used at FDM	NEW Range[1]	NEW			Percent Increase from 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS	
		2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 1	Alternative 2
Explosive Bombs ≤ 2,000 lb.	250–1,740	3,121,000–10,861,080	3,121,000–10,861,080	3,121,000–10,861,080	0.0%	0.0%
Missiles	10–20	850–1,700	1,150–2,300	1,150–2,300	35.3%	35.3%
Large-caliber Projectiles	5–10	6,000–12,000	15,000–30,000	22,000–44,000	150.0%	266.7%
Medium-caliber Projectiles	2.5–5	43,375–86,750	46,250–92,500	46,250–92,500	6.6%	6.6%
Rockets	2.5–5	1,000–2,000	1,000–2,000	1,000–2,000	0.0%	0.0%
Explosive Grenades and Mortars	0.25–0.5	150–300	250–500	250–500	50.0%	50.0%
Total		***3,172,375–10,981,830***	***3,184,650–11,006,380***	***3,191,650–11,020,380***	***0.22–0.39%***	***0.35–0.61%***

[1] NEW (Net Explosive Weight) measured in lb. (pounds)

Notes: EIS = Environmental Impact Statement, FDM = Farallon de Medinilla, lb. = pounds, MITT = Mariana Islands Training and Testing, NEW = Net Explosive Weight (lb.), OEIS = Overseas EIS

Population-Level Impact Analysis

Under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) regulations applicable to military readiness activities (50 Code of Federal Regulation [CFR] part 21), the stressors introduced during training and testing activities would not result in a significant adverse effect on marine birds protected under the MBTA. While this determination is applicable to all marine birds that occur in the Study Area, the Navy carried out a focused analysis for marine birds known to breed within the Study Area, particularly for breeding marine birds on FDM. The Navy identified two birds in particular that have a heightened concern with regards to 50 CFR Part 21—the great frigatebird and the masked booby.

In the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, the Navy assessed the significance of injury and mortality of individual masked boobies and great frigatebirds relative to the viability of these species' populations. The populations of the masked booby and great frigatebird were defined based on (1) the distribution of subspecies *S. d. personata* and *F. m. palmerstoni*, (2) the colony locations within these distributions, and (3) the number of individual birds associated with these colonies. The Navy then compared the number of masked boobies and great frigatebirds that are found within the colonies within the Marianas (particularly FDM) to that of the regional population within the western and central Pacific.

Because the numbers of activities described in this SEIS/OEIS potentially affecting these birds and the amount of NEW used on FDM do not appreciably differ from what was analyzed previously, the conclusions within the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS remain valid. These conclusions are summarized below:

- The great frigatebird may occasionally nest on FDM, which is one of only two small breeding colonies known to exist within the Mariana Islands (the other is located on Maug in the northern portion of the archipelago). FDM does not appear to be a temporally or spatially stable rookery location. Compared to the numbers of great frigatebirds estimated throughout central and western Pacific (10,000 pairs in the Hawaiian Islands, with other colonies on Howland, Baker, Jarvis, Johnston Atoll, and Christmas Island), and the apparent low numbers of great frigatebirds from historic times through the present within the Mariana archipelago, the direct and indirect effects on effects of military activities on FDM would not represent a significant adverse impact on the population of the great frigatebird.
- For the masked booby, FDM is the largest breeding colony in Mariana Islands. The colony numbers recorded by the Navy appear to be stable, and the data do not suggest any significant declines of masked booby numbers. Although the masked booby may be subject to short- and long-term impacts of military use of FDM and individuals likely suffer injury and mortality from some activities, FDM continues to support a relatively stable rookery. In the central and western Pacific, 2,500 pairs are estimated within the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands, Jarvis (up to 1,200 pairs), Barker Island (over 1,500 pairs), and smaller colonies in American Samoa, Palmyra, Johnson Atoll, and northern islands in the Mariana archipelago (Maug, Uracas, Guguan, and FDM). Based on the long-term use and stability of the masked booby breeding population on FDM and the wide geographic range and abundance of the masked booby throughout the Pacific, the effects of military use of FDM would not represent a significant adverse impact on the population of the masked booby.
- Pursuant with the Department of Defense's obligations under 50 CFR Part 21, the Department of Defense will continue to implement training restrictions on FDM (see Section 5.5, Terrestrial Mitigation Measures to be Implemented) and monitoring of bird populations on FDM.

3.6.2.1 Acoustic Stressors

Section 3.6.3.1 (Acoustic Stressors) in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS provided an overview of marine bird hearing, including an explanation of how birds can suffer injury, hearing loss, and physiological stress, as well as various behavioral reactions exhibited by birds when a noise event induces a response. In addition, long-term consequences associated with noise-induced impacts are discussed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS in Section 3.6.3.1 (Acoustic Stressors).

3.6.2.1.1 Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducer Stressors Under Alternative 1

Under Alternative 1, the number of sonar hours used in the Study Area during training and testing activities compared to the number analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (see Table 3.0-2 and Table 3.0-3 in this SEIS/OEIS) would decrease overall. Therefore, the analysis in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS remains valid. Decreases in sonar hours shown for activities proposed under Alternative 1 would have no appreciable change on the impact analysis or conclusions for acoustic stressors presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, based on the analysis below.

Sonar and other transducers emit sound waves into the water to detect objects, safely navigate, and communicate. Use of sonar and other transducers would typically be transient and temporary. General categories of sonar systems are described in Section 3.0.4.1 (Acoustic Stressors).

Information regarding the impacts of sonar on birds is unavailable, and little is known about the ability for birds to hear underwater. The limited information and data from other species suggest the range of best hearing may shift to lower frequencies in water (Dooling & Therrien, 2012; Johansen et al., 2016; Therrien, 2014). Because few birds can hear above 10 kHz in air, it is likely that the only sonar sources they may be able to detect are low- and mid-frequency sources. Other than pursuit diving species, the exposure to birds by these sounds is likely to be negligible because they spend only a very short time underwater (plunge-diving or surface-dipping) or forage only at the water surface. Pursuit divers may remain underwater for minutes, increasing the chance of underwater sound exposure.

In addition to diving behavior, the likelihood of a bird being exposed to underwater sound depends on factors such as duty cycle (defined as the percentage of the time during which a sound is generated over a total operational period), whether the source is moving or stationary, and other activities that might be occurring in the area. When used, continuously active sonars transmit more frequently (greater than 80 percent duty cycle) than traditional sonars, but at a substantially lower source level. However, it should be noted that active sonar is rarely used continuously throughout the listed activities, and many sources are mobile. For moving sources such as hull-mounted sonar, the likelihood of an individual bird being repeatedly exposed to a sound source over a short period of time is low because the training and testing activities are transient, and sonar use and bird diving are intermittent. The potential for birds to be exposed to intense sound associated with stationary sonar sources would likely be limited for some training and testing activities because other activities occurring in conjunction may cause them to leave the immediate area. For example, birds would likely react to helicopter noise during dipping sonar exercises by flushing from the immediate area.

Injury due to acoustic resonance of air space in the lungs due to sonar and other transducers is unlikely in birds. Unlike mammals, birds have compact, rigid lungs with strong pulmonary capillaries that do not change much in diameter when exposed to extreme pressure changes (Baerwald et al., 2008), leading to resonant frequencies lower than the frequencies used for Navy sources.

A physiological impact, such as hearing loss, would likely only occur if a marine bird were close to an intense sound source. Hearing loss is typically quantified in terms of threshold shift—the amount (in dB) that hearing thresholds at one or more specified frequencies are elevated, compared to their pre-exposure values, at some specific time after the noise exposure. The amount of threshold shift measured usually decreases with increasing recovery time—the amount of time that has elapsed since a noise exposure. If the threshold shift eventually returns to zero (i.e., the hearing threshold returns to the pre-exposure value), the threshold shift is called a temporary threshold shift (TTS). If the threshold shift does not completely recover (the threshold remains elevated compared to the pre-exposure value), the remaining threshold shift is called a permanent threshold shift (PTS). By definition, TTS is a function of the recovery time, therefore comparing the severity of noise exposures based on the amount of induced TTS can only be done if the recovery times are also taken into account. For example, a 20 dB TTS measured 24 hours post-exposure indicates a more hazardous exposure than one producing 20 dB of TTS measured only two minutes after exposure; if the TTS is 20 dB after 24 hours, the TTS measured after two minutes would have likely been much higher. Conversely, if 20 dB of TTS was measured after two minutes, the TTS measured after 24 hours would likely have been much smaller.

In general, birds are less susceptible to both TTS and PTS than mammals (Saunders & Dooling, 1974). Diving birds have adaptations to protect the middle ear and tympanum from pressure changes during diving that may affect hearing (Dooling & Therrien, 2012). While some adaptions may exist to aid in underwater hearing, other adaptations to protect in-air hearing may limit aspects of underwater hearing (Hetherington, 2008). Because of these reasons, the likelihood of a diving bird experiencing an underwater exposure to sonar or other transducer that could result in an impact on hearing is considered low.

Because there is no new information since the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS that would change the previous analysis for potential impacts on ESA-listed marine bird species, the conclusions in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS remain valid. The described training and testing activities would present no measurable chance for interaction with ESA-listed marine bird species (e.g., short-tailed albatross, Hawaiian petrel, Newell's shearwater). In the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and during consultation between the Navy and USFWS, the Navy determined that the use of sonar and other transducers would have no effect on ESA-listed marine birds.

Because of the small numbers of birds potentially exposed to stressors associated with sonar and other transducers, and the low potential of any injurious exposure to sonar and other transducers while birds are under water, marine bird population impacts would not occur.

Pursuant to the ESA, acoustic stressors from the use of sonar and other transducers during training and testing activities, as described under Alternative 1, would have no effect on ESA-listed Hawaiian petrels, short-tailed albatrosses, and Newell's shearwaters. This determination is consistent with the previous consultation between the Navy and USFWS for activities described in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

Under the MBTA regulations applicable to military readiness activities (50 CFR Part 21), the impacts from sonar and other transducers during training and testing activities described under Alternative 1 would not result in a significant adverse effect on populations of the great frigatebird, masked booby, or other marine bird populations.

3.6.2.1.2 Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducer Stressors under Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)

As with Alternative 1, the number of sonar hours used under Alternative 2 in the Study Area during training and testing activities compared to the number analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (Table 3.0-2 and Table 3.0-3) would decrease overall. Therefore, the analysis in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS remains valid. Decreases in the number of training and testing activities would potentially decrease the level of acoustic stressors in the Study Area. The conclusions for ESA-listed species presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS is the same as for Alternative 1 in this SEIS/OEIS.

As with Alternative 1, taken together, the small numbers of birds potentially exposed to stressors associated with sonar and other transducers under Alternative 2, and the low potential of any injurious exposure to sonar and other transducers while birds are under water, there would be no impacts on marine bird populations.

Pursuant to the ESA, acoustic stressors from the use of sonar and other transducers during training and testing activities, as described under Alternative 2, would have no effect on ESA-listed Hawaiian petrels, short-tailed albatrosses, and Newell's shearwaters. This determination is consistent with the previous consultation between the Navy and USFWS for activities described in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

Under the MBTA regulations applicable to military readiness activities (50 CFR Part 21), the impacts from sonar and other transducers during training and testing activities described under Alternative 2 would not result in a significant adverse effect on populations of the great frigatebird, masked booby, or other marine bird populations.

3.6.2.1.2.1 Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducer Stressors under the No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, proposed training and testing activities would not occur. Other military activities not associated with this Proposed Action would continue to occur. Acoustic stressors as listed above would not be introduced into the marine environment. Therefore, existing environmental conditions would either remain unchanged or would improve slightly after cessation of ongoing training and testing activities.

Discontinuing the training and testing activities would result in fewer acoustic stressors within the marine environment where Navy activities have historically been conducted. Therefore, discontinuing training and testing activities under the No Action Alternative would lessen the potential for impacts on marine birds from sonar and other transducers, but would not measurably improve the overall distribution or abundance of marine birds.

3.6.2.1.3 Impacts from Aircraft Noise

Section 3.6.3.1.3.1 (Fixed-Wing Aircraft) and Section 3.6.1.3.2 (Helicopters) of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS discuss the different types of aircraft and the noise they generate, along with a summary of potential responses marine birds may exhibit. Since the publication of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, no new information was identified during the Navy's literature review that would substantially alter the assessment of potential impacts on marine birds from aircraft noise. Therefore, the information contained in Section 3.6.3.1.3.3 (Vessels) of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS remains valid.

Birds in areas that may experience repeated exposure often habituate and do not respond behaviorally (Larkin et al., 1996; National Park Service, 1994; Plumpton, 2006). Throughout the Study Area, repeated exposure of individual birds or groups of birds is unlikely based on the dispersed nature of the overflights and the capability of birds to avoid or rapidly vacate an area of disturbance. Therefore, the

general health of individual birds would not be compromised. Occasional startle or alert reactions to aircraft noise are not likely to disrupt major behavior patterns (such as migrating, breeding, feeding, and sheltering) or to result in serious injury to any birds.

Training and testing activities where aircraft are used typically occur further offshore; however, increased use of FDM may increase the potential for aircraft strike of birds. Therefore, for the purposes of this SEIS/OEIS, only the use of aircraft related to FDM training activities are discussed below under the alternatives analysis for birds for this stressor category.

3.6.2.1.3.1 Impacts from Aircraft Noise Stressors Under Alternative 1

Under Alternative 1, the number of proposed activities including aircraft would decrease overall throughout the study area (see Table 3.0-11). In the open ocean, marine birds would be exposed to additional aircraft noise sources, but these activities are spread out throughout the Study Area. Because of the increase in munitions use at FDM, however, aircraft overflights over FDM would increase, depending on the delivery platform. For example, some of the increases are associated with ship to surface, while others may involve helicopters and fixed-wing aircraft. Therefore, the analysis in this section focuses on FDM, where actual aircraft overflights would likely increase.

Increased training activities under Alternative 1 would increase the potential for noise exposures for birds on FDM because the increase in the number of training activities would require more aircraft to fly over the island (potentially at low altitude) and land on the island to deliver and pick up personnel. As shown in Table 2.5-1, activities that would increase aircraft overflights include Missile Exercise and Direct Action (Tactical Air Control Party) activities.

Aircraft overflights are expected to elicit short-term behavioral responses in nesting birds at FDM. Based on studies from other nesting bird areas (Barnas et al., 2018; Bowles, 1995; Larkin et al., 1996), any period away from the nest would last a few seconds to a few minutes, which is likely not long enough for opportunistic predation of a nest (e.g., by rats on FDM). The 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS analyzed other adverse effects, such as damage to eggs and startling of juveniles and adults.

Anecdotally, some birds typically take flight while roosting or nesting during quarterly helicopter-based marine bird surveys over FDM; birds that are stationary and not on the wing are counted (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2013a). Although no studies are available specific to marine bird responses to low-level overflights over FDM, other studies of shorebird responses to military aircraft overflights are helpful. Black (2005), studied the effects of low-altitude (less than 500 ft. [152 m] above ground level) military training flights with sound levels from 55 to 100 A-weighted decibels on wading bird colonies (i.e., great egret, snowy egret, tricolored heron, and little blue heron). The training flights involved three or four aircraft and occurred once or twice per day. This study concluded that the reproductive activity—including nest success, nestling survival, and nestling chronology—was independent of F-16 overflights. Dependent variables were more strongly related to ecological factors, including location and physical characteristics of the colony and climatology. Another study on the effects of circling fixed-wing aircraft and helicopter overflights on wading bird colonies found that at altitudes of 195 ft. (59 m) to 390 ft. (119 m), there was no reaction in nearly 75 percent of the 220 observations. Ninety percent displayed no reaction or merely looked toward the direction of the noise source. Another 6 percent stood up, 3 percent walked from the nest, and 2 percent flushed (but were without active nests) and returned within five minutes (Kushlan, 1978).

These studies, coupled with anecdotal observations on FDM during quarterly marine bird monitoring surveys, suggest that aircraft overflights do not have harmful effects on nesting and roosting marine birds on FDM, and that the behavioral responses are short term (Camp et al., 2016).

Although some degree of disturbance is expected from the increase in aircraft noise over FDM, the island will likely continue to serve as an important rookery for regional species without long-term significant impacts on marine bird populations. As discussed in Section 3.6.1.7 (Rookery Locations and Breeding Activities on FDM), Camp et al. (2016) published results of multi-year population monitoring of three species of boobies on FDM, showing that there is some evidence that masked and red-footed booby populations on FDM have declined, while brown booby populations have increased. However, the general conclusion is that all three species exhibited population fluctuations over time. Combined with the level of variability observed in the count data, this precluded any definite conclusions about long-term population trends (i.e., the data were non-significant) (Camp et al., 2016).

Because of the dispersed nature of overflights in open ocean training areas, birds or groups of birds in pelagic environments would not likely be exposed to repeated overflights. Because any exposures would be infrequent, and these exposures would not cause injury, population impacts would not occur for bird species in the open ocean.

Aircraft activity described in this SEIS/OEIS would present no measurable chance for interaction with ESA-listed marine bird species (e.g., short-tailed albatross, Hawaiian petrel, Newell's shearwater). In the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and during consultation between the Navy and USFWS, the Navy determined that aircraft activity would have no effect on ESA-listed marine birds. Although the amount of training and testing activities using aircraft would increase compared to the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, the potential for geographic and temporal overlap would remain negligible; therefore, the conclusions for ESA-listed species presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS is the same as for Alternative 1 in this SEIS/OEIS.

Pursuant to the ESA, aircraft noise during training activities, as described under Alternative 1, would have no effect on ESA-listed Hawaiian petrels, short-tailed albatrosses, and Newell's shearwaters. This determination is consistent with the previous consultation between the Navy and USFWS for activities described in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

Under the MBTA regulations applicable to military readiness activities (50 CFR Part 21), the impacts from aircraft noise during training activities described under Alternative 1 would not result in a significant adverse effect on populations of the great frigatebird, masked booby, or other marine bird populations.

3.6.2.1.3.2 Impacts from Aircraft Noise Stressors Under Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)

Under Alternative 2, the number of activities including aircraft would decrease compared to levels analyzed under the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, but would be more than proposed under Alternative 1 (see Table 3.0-11).

As with Alternative 1, the dispersed nature of overflights in open ocean training areas under Alternative 2 would not likely expose birds or groups of birds in pelagic environments to repeated overflights. Because any exposures would be infrequent, and these exposures would not cause injury, population impacts would not occur for bird species in the open ocean.

No additional targets would be used, and this activity would be constrained by confining targeting to specific sites within designated impact zones. Because the same locations would be used for targeting activities, the impacts of Alternative 2 are the same as Alternative 1. In the open ocean, marine birds

would be exposed to additional aircraft noise sources, but these activities are spread out throughout the Study Area, and the potential impacts of at-sea training and testing activities would not be discernable from Alternative 1. Therefore, impacts on marine birds under Alternative 2 from aircraft noise would be negligible.

Pursuant to the ESA, aircraft noise during training activities, as described under Alternative 2, would have no effect on ESA-listed Hawaiian petrels, short-tailed albatrosses, and Newell's shearwaters. This determination is consistent with the previous consultation between the Navy and USFWS for activities described in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

Under the MBTA regulations applicable to military readiness activities (50 CFR Part 21), the impacts from aircraft noise during training activities described under Alternative 2 would not result in a significant adverse effect on populations of the great frigatebird, masked booby, or other marine bird populations.

3.6.2.1.3.3 Impacts from Aircraft Noise Stressors Under the No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, proposed training and testing activities would not occur. Other military activities not associated with this Proposed Action would continue to occur. Acoustic stressors as listed above would not be introduced into the marine environment. Therefore, existing environmental conditions would either remain unchanged or would improve slightly after cessation of ongoing training and testing activities.

Discontinuing the training and testing activities would result in fewer acoustic stressors within the marine environment where Navy activities have historically been conducted. Therefore, discontinuing training and testing activities under the No Action Alternative would lessen the potential for impacts on marine birds from aircraft noise, but would not measurably improve the overall distribution or abundance of marine birds.

3.6.2.1.4 Impacts from Weapons Noise

Sounds produced by weapons firing (muzzle blast), launch boosters, and projectile travel are potential stressors to birds and are discussed as impulsive noise under Section 3.6.3.1.2.2 (Explosions on Land and In-Air) in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Since the publication of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, no new information was identified during the Navy's literature review that would substantially alter the assessment of potential impacts on marine birds from weapons noise.

3.6.2.1.4.1 Impacts from Weapons Noise Stressors Under Alternative 1

Under Alternative 1, the number of training and testing activities that would expose marine birds to weapons noise would decrease throughout the Study Area, compared to levels analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (Table 3.0-14 and Table 3.0-16). A bird in the open ocean could be exposed to weapons noise if not already displaced by the visual or noise disturbance of a vessel supporting weapons-firing exercises. The firing of a weapon may have several components of associated noise. Firing of guns could include sound generated in air by firing a gun (muzzle blast) and a crack sound due to a low-amplitude shock wave generated by a supersonic projectile flying through the air. Most in-air sound would be reflected at the air-water interface. Underwater sounds would be strongest just below the surface and directly under the firing point. Any sound that enters the water only does so within a narrow cone below the firing point or path of the projectile. Vibration from the blast propagating through a ship's hull, the sound generated by the impact of an object with the water surface, and the sound generated by launching an object underwater are other sources of impulsive sound in the water.

Supersonic projectiles, which would be similar in size to shells fired from 5-inch/54 guns, would travel at approximately 2,600 ft./second, creating a bow shock wave. Pater and Shea (1981) measured the characteristics of a bow shock wave from a 5-inch projectile and found that the shock wave ranged from 40 to 147 dB re 20 µPa sound pressure level peak taken at the ground surface at 1,100 m from the firing location and 190 m perpendicular from the trajectory (for safety reasons). Shells fired from a kinetic energy weapon are considered hypersonic, and would travel at about 6,500 ft./second, and peak pressures would be expected to be several dB higher than for shell velocities described by (Pater & Shea, 1981). By definition, bow shock waves, regardless of shell velocity, would travel at the speed of sound in air. Marine birds would be exposed to this type of noise for a very brief period of time (a few seconds), and would likely cause brief and temporary behavioral reactions described previously for other in-air noise disturbances.

Sound due to missile and target launches is typically at a maximum at initiation of the booster rocket and rapidly fades as the missile or target travels downrange. Birds foraging or migrating through a training area in the open ocean may respond by avoiding areas where weapons-firing exercises occur. Exposures of most marine birds would be infrequent, based on the brief duration and dispersed nature of the vessels, and the brief duration of the weapons-firing noise. If a bird responds to weapons noise, only short-term behavioral responses such as startle responses, head turning, or avoidance responses would be expected. Weapons noise near rookery locations (only at FDM) may induce startle responses, inducing birds to temporarily leave nests. Because impacts on individual birds, if any, are expected to be minor and limited, no long-term consequences to individuals are expected. Accordingly, there would be no consequences to any bird populations, and weapons noise would not have a significant adverse effect on populations of migratory bird species.

On FDM, however, marine birds would likely be exposed to increased weapons noise because of the increase in the number of explosive and non-explosive munitions (see Table 3.6-1, Table 3.6-2, and Table 3.6-3). Sources of weapons generating noise at the time of weapons firing on or near FDM include small-caliber rounds, rockets, medium-caliber projectiles, and large-caliber projectiles. Other munitions types used on FDM (e.g., non-explosive practice munition and explosive bombs and missiles) are launched far from the target (impact areas on FDM) or released from aircraft.

The potential impacts of explosives noise and weapons firing noise on FDM's wildlife are discussed in Section 3.10.3.1.1 (Impacts from Explosives and Weapons Firing Noise) in Section 3.10 (Terrestrial Species and Habitats) of this SEIS/OEIS, which provides a summary of the different types of sounds, frequency ranges, and intensity of sounds generated from munitions use on FDM. Sources of noise from weapons firing that may be heard by marine birds on FDM include close-in weapons firing from vessels, helicopters, close-combat surface firing from fixed-wing aircraft, and surface firing, with the largest increase in munitions use resulting from small arms, medium-caliber explosives, and mortar and grenade use during Direct Action training activities. As shown in Table 3.6-1, the number of training events for this activity type would stay the same compared to what was previously analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS; however, the number of munitions used would increase during each training event (see Table 3.6-2). These training events would occur within the Northern Special Use Area and fire into the impact areas towards the south; therefore, more birds would be exposed to more weapons firing noise under Alternative 1 because of the increased number of small-caliber rounds, medium-caliber explosives, and grenades and mortars fired into impact areas from the Northern Special Use Area. The weapons-firing noise would likely be masked somewhat by natural sounds on FDM, such as waves and winds. The impulsive sound caused by weapon firings would have limited potential to mask any

important biological sound simply because the duration of the impulse is brief, even when multiple shots are fired in series.

Although some degree of disturbance is expected from the increase in weapons noise on FDM, the island will likely continue to serve as an important rookery for regional species without long-term significant impacts on marine bird populations. As discussed in Section 3.6.1.7 (Rookery Locations and Breeding Activities on FDM), Camp et al. (2016) published results of multi-year population monitoring of three species of boobies on FDM, showing that there is some evidence that masked and red-footed booby populations on FDM have declined, while brown booby populations have increased. However, the general conclusion is that all three species exhibited population fluctuations over time. Combined with the level of variability observed in the count data, this precluded any definite conclusions about long-term population trends (i.e., the data were non-significant) (Camp et al., 2016).

Weapons noise would present no measurable chance for interaction with ESA-listed marine bird species (short-tailed albatross, Hawaiian petrel, Newell's shearwater). As discussed previously, ESA-listed marine bird species do not occur on FDM (or any other island within the Marianas) and have little to no overlap with the Study Area. In the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and during consultation between the Navy and USFWS, the Navy determined that weapons noise would have no effect on ESA-listed marine birds. Although the amount of training and testing activities would increase compared to the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, the potential for geographic and temporal overlap would remain negligible; therefore, the conclusions for ESA-listed species presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS is the same as for Alternative 1 in this SEIS/OEIS.

Pursuant to the ESA, weapons noise during training and testing activities, as described under Alternative 1, would have no effect on ESA-listed Hawaiian petrels, short-tailed albatrosses, and Newell's shearwaters. This determination is consistent with the previous consultation between the Navy and USFWS for activities described in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

Under the MBTA regulations applicable to military readiness activities (50 CFR Part 21), the impacts from weapons noise during training and testing activities described under Alternative 2 would not result in a significant adverse effect on populations of the great frigatebird, masked booby, or other marine bird populations.

3.6.2.1.4.2 Impacts from Weapons Noise Stressors Under Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)

As with Alternative 1, under Alternative 2 the number of training and testing activities that would expose marine birds to weapons noise would decrease throughout the Study Area, compared to levels analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (see Table 3.0-14 and Table 3.0-16). Compared to Alternative 1, there would be small increases in the number of activities using large-caliber and medium-caliber projectiles and missiles under Alternative 2 for at-sea training and testing activities. Therefore, Alternative 2 would introduce fewer weapons firing events than activities analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS for at-sea activities. Because activities would occur within the same locations as with Alternative 1, at-sea weapons firing activities would be widely dispersed, and marine birds would also be widely dispersed, the impacts of Alternative 2 are the same as for Alternative 1.

On FDM, the only training activity that would introduce weapons firing noise is Direct Action (tactical control party). As shown in Table 3.6-1, the number of training events for this activity type would stay the same compared to what was previously analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and compared to Alternative 1; however, the number of munitions used would increase (see Table 3.6-2). These training

events would occur within the Northern Special Use Area and fire into the impact areas towards the south; therefore, more birds would be exposed to more weapons firing noise under Alternative 2 because of the increased number of small-caliber rounds, medium-caliber explosives, and grenades and mortars fired into impact areas from the Northern Special Use Area. The weapons-firing noise would likely be masked somewhat by natural sounds on FDM, such as waves and winds. The impulsive sound caused by weapon firings would have limited potential to mask any important biological sound simply because the duration of the impulse is brief, even when multiple shots are fired in series.

As with Alternative 1, some degree of disturbance is expected from the increase in weapons noise on FDM; however, the island will likely continue to serve as an important rookery for regional species without long-term significant impacts on marine bird populations. As discussed in Section 3.6.1.7 (Rookery Locations and Breeding Activities on FDM), Camp et al. (2016) published results of multi-year population monitoring of three species of boobies on FDM, showing that is some evidence that masked and red-footed booby populations on FDM have declined, while brown booby populations have increased. However, the general conclusion is that all three species exhibited population fluctuations over time. Combined with the level of variability observed in the count data, this precluded any definite conclusions about long-term population trends (i.e., the data were non-significant) (Camp et al., 2016). The same conclusions for Alternative 1 for MBTA-protected marine bird species at sea and on FDM, and ESA-listed marine bird species at sea, are applicable to Alternative 2.

Pursuant to the ESA, weapons noise during training and testing activities, as described under Alternative 1, would have no effect on ESA-listed Hawaiian petrels, short-tailed albatrosses, and Newell's shearwaters. This determination is consistent with the previous consultation between the Navy and USFWS for activities described in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

Under the MBTA regulations applicable to military readiness activities (50 CFR Part 21), the impacts from weapons noise during training and testing activities described under Alternative 2 would not result in a significant adverse effect on populations of the great frigatebird, masked booby, or other marine bird populations.

3.6.2.1.4.3 Impacts from Weapons Noise Stressors Under the No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, proposed training and testing activities would not occur. Other military activities not associated with this Proposed Action would continue to occur. Acoustic stressors would not be introduced into the marine environment. Therefore, existing environmental conditions would either remain unchanged or would improve slightly after cessation of ongoing training and testing activities.

Discontinuing the training and testing activities would result in fewer acoustic stressors within the marine environment where Navy activities have historically been conducted. Therefore, discontinuing training and testing activities under the No Action Alternative would lessen the potential for impacts on marine birds from weapons noise, but would not measurably improve the overall distribution or abundance of marine birds.

3.6.2.2 Explosives Stressors (explosive shock wave and sound, explosive fragments)

Section 3.6.3.1.2 (Impacts from Explosives and Swimmer Defense Airguns) in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS discusses the sources and potential impacts of explosives noise on marine birds (e.g., injury, hearing loss, physiological stress, masking, and long-term consequences of exposures). Explosions in the water, near the water surface, on land (FDM), and in the air can introduce loud, impulsive, broadband

sounds into the marine environment. However, unlike other acoustic stressors, explosives release energy at a high rate, producing a shock wave that can be injurious and even deadly. The information regarding training and testing activities in open ocean training environments that generate explosives noise has not changed since the publication of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Therefore, this section focuses on the potential for increased training activities to impact birds on FDM proposed under the alternatives described in this SEIS/OEIS.

Noise can result from direct munitions impacts (one object striking another), blasts (explosions that result in shock waves), bow shock waves (pressure waves from projectiles flying through the air), and substrate vibrations (combinations of explosion, recoil, or vehicle motion with the ground). Noise may be continuous (i.e., lasting for a long time without interruption) or impulse (i.e., short duration). Continuous impulses (e.g., helicopter rotor noise, bursts from rapid-fire weapons) represent an intermediate type of sound and, when repeated rapidly, may resemble continuous noise. These types of sound are distinguished here as they differ in their effects. Continuous sounds can result in hearing damage, while impulses typically elicit physiological or behavioral responses. Some birds may be killed or injured during these activities, or expend energy stores needed for migration to avoid perturbations generated by explosions.

Because the military will continue to implement mitigation measures designed to avoid or reduce impacts on terrestrial biological resources, all additional ordnance use would still be targeted at existing impact areas.

FDM has three impact areas, a special use area on the northern portion of the island, and a special use area on the land bridge. Since the release of the 2015 Final EIS/OEIS, the Navy has moved gunnery targets into the impact areas from their previous locations near the west-facing cliffs. Targets were relocated in order to minimize impacts on the cliff face. Targeting of areas inside of the special use areas and other areas outside of impact areas are prohibited. In other words, all areas outside of the impact areas are considered “no-fire areas.” Any ordnance that inadvertently lands outside of impact areas, including special use areas and in water, must be reported to Mariana Islands Range Complex Operations, in accordance with Commander, U.S. Naval Forces Marianas Instruction 3500.4A (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2011). The impact areas and special use areas are described below:

- **Northern Special Use Area**. Reserved for direct action (tactical air control party) type exercises and personnel recovery. This area is about 41 acres (ac.) (17 hectares [ha]) and includes a landing zone. Weapons may be fired from the special use area into impact areas, such as small-caliber rounds, grenades, and mortars.
- **Impact Area 1**. This area contains high-fidelity target structures and is comprised of vehicle shells and cargo containers. This area is authorized for inert ordnance only, and operators are required to report any live ordnance inadvertently dropped into Impact Area 1 to Mariana Islands Range Complex Operations. Impact Area 1 contains 10 targets of varying shapes and sizes, including four vehicles and six targets comprised of shipping containers.
- **Impact Area 2**. Impact Area 2 may be used for both live and inert ordnance. Strafing is permitted in this area. Impact Area 2 is about 22 ac. (9 ha).
- **Land Bridge**. The land bridge is designated as a “no target zone.” Operators are required to report ordnance observed impacting the land bridge.

- **Impact Area 3**. This area is south of the land bridge and authorized for inert ordnance, although live ordnance may be used only with prior approval from Joint Region Marianas. Strafing is permitted in this area. Impact Area 3 is about 11 ac. (4.5 ha).

3.6.2.2.1 Impacts from Explosive Stressors Under Alternative 1

Under Alternative 1, there would be an overall decrease throughout the Study Area in the number of explosive munitions used during training and testing activities compared to the number analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (Table 3.0-16).

As shown in Table 3.6-1, there would be an increase in the number of events using FDM as a training location or target, with an increase in the number of munitions items expended on FDM (see Table 3.6-2).

Taken together, the increase in the number of training events per year or the amount of ordnance used during training events would result in an increase in the amount of NEW expended on FDM each year (see Table 3.6-1, Table 3.6-2, and Table 3.6-3). Although the amount of increased NEW is negligible, the potential exposure to stressors associated with ordnance use would increase under Alternative 1 compared to what was analyzed previously in the MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Factors that limit the potential for additional adverse impacts, however, include maintaining the same ordnance type and targeting restrictions included as part of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. All ordnance expended on FDM would target existing impact zones, with the same ordnance restrictions imposed on all FDM activities and with the same avoidance and minimization measures in place (see Section 5.5, Terrestrial Mitigation Measures to be Implemented; and Table 5.5-1). Therefore, the increases in ordnance use on FDM do not appreciably change the impact conclusions presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. The conclusions for ESA-listed marine bird species and other marine bird species protected by the MBTA included in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS remain valid.

Explosives would present no measurable chance for interaction with ESA-listed marine bird species (short-tailed albatross, Hawaiian petrel, Newell's shearwater). In the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and during consultation between the Navy and USFWS, the Navy determined that training and testing activities using explosives would have no effect on ESA-listed marine birds. Despite the continued at-sea use of explosives compared to the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, the potential for geographic and temporal overlap would remain negligible; therefore, the conclusions for ESA-listed species presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS is the same as for Alternative 1 in this SEIS/OEIS.

Pursuant to the ESA, explosives used during training and testing activities, as described under Alternative 1, would have no effect on ESA-listed Hawaiian petrels, short-tailed albatrosses, Newell's shearwaters. This determination is consistent with the previous consultation between the Navy and USFWS for activities described in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

Under the MBTA regulations applicable to military readiness activities (50 CFR Part 21), the impacts from explosives stressors during training and testing activities using explosives described under Alternative 1 would not result in a significant adverse effect on populations of the great frigatebird, masked booby, or other marine bird populations.

3.6.2.2.2 Impacts from Explosive Stressors Under Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)

As with Alternative 1, there would be an overall decrease throughout the Study Area in the number of explosive munitions used during at-sea training and testing activities compared to the number analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. The number of explosive stressors under Alternative 2 would increase

as compared to Alternative 1 (see Table 3.0-16), but the conclusions for at-sea activities remains the same. Under Alternative 2, there would be an increase in the number of training events using FDM as a training location or target (see Table 3.6-1), with an increase in the number of munitions items expended on FDM (see Table 3.6-2) compared to what was analyzed previously in the MITT Final EIS/OEIS and under Alternative 1.

Taken together, the increase in the number of training events per year or the amount of ordnance used during events would result in an increase in the amount of NEW expended on FDM each year (see Table 3.6-3). Although the amount of increased NEW is negligible, the potential exposure to stressors associated with ordnance use would increase under Alternative 2 compared to what was analyzed previously in the MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Under Alternative 2, Naval Surface Firing Exercise events would expend more large-caliber projectiles, thereby increasing the NEW expended under Alternative 2 compared to Alternative 1. Factors that limit the potential for additional adverse impacts, however, include maintaining the same ordnance type and targeting restrictions included as part of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. All ordnance expended on FDM would target existing impact zones, with the same ordnance restrictions imposed on all FDM activities and with the same avoidance and minimization measures in place (see Section 5.5, Terrestrial Mitigation Measures to be Implemented; and Table 5.5-1). Therefore, the increases in ordnance use on FDM shown in Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2 do not appreciably change the impact conclusions presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. The conclusions for ESA-listed marine bird species and other marine bird species protected by the MBTA included in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS remain valid.

Explosives would present no measurable chance for interaction with ESA-listed marine bird species (short-tailed albatross, Hawaiian petrel, Newell's shearwater). In the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and during consultation between the Navy and USFWS, the Navy determined that training and testing activities using explosives would have no effect on ESA-listed marine birds. Although the amount of training and testing activities using explosives would increase compared to the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, the potential for geographic and temporal overlap would remain negligible; therefore, the conclusions for ESA-listed species presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS is the same as for Alternative 1 in this SEIS/OEIS.

Pursuant to the ESA, explosives used during training and testing activities, as described under Alternative 2, would have no effect on ESA-listed Hawaiian petrels, short-tailed albatrosses, Newell's shearwaters. This determination is consistent with the previous consultation between the Navy and USFWS for activities described in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

Under the MBTA regulations applicable to military readiness activities (50 CFR Part 21), the impacts from explosives stressors during training and testing activities using explosives described under Alternative 2 would not result in a significant adverse effect on populations of the great frigatebird, masked booby, or other marine bird populations.

3.6.2.2.3 Impacts from Explosive Stressors Under the No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, proposed training and testing activities would not occur. Other military activities not associated with this Proposed Action would continue to occur. Explosive stressors as listed above would not be introduced into the marine environment. Therefore, existing environmental conditions would either remain unchanged or would improve slightly after cessation of ongoing training and testing activities.

Discontinuing the training and testing activities would result in fewer explosive stressors within the marine environment where Navy activities have historically been conducted. Therefore, discontinuing training and testing activities under the No Action Alternative would lessen the potential for impacts on marine birds from explosive stressors, but would not measurably improve the overall distribution or abundance of marine birds.

3.6.2.3 Energy Stressors

The energy stressors that may impact marine birds include (1) in-air electromagnetic devices and (2) high-energy lasers. However, as discussed in Section 3.0.4.3 (Energy Stressors), in-air electromagnetic energy would be widely dispersed throughout the Study Area, but more concentrated in portions of the Study Area near ports, naval installations, and range complexes. Because these stressors are operated at power levels, altitudes, and distances from people and animals to ensure that energy received is well below levels that could disrupt behavior or cause injury and because most in-air electromagnetic energy is reflected by water, in-air electromagnetic energy would not impact birds and is not analyzed further in this section.

Since the publication of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, additional information has become available that improves understanding of how in-air electromagnetic devices (such as radar) may impact marine birds. This new information is included in this SEIS/OEIS. Studies conducted on in-air electromagnetic sensitivity in birds have typically been associated with land, and little information exists specifically on seabird response to in-air electromagnetic changes at sea. Based on these studies, in-air electromagnetic effects can be categorized as thermal (i.e., capable of causing damage by heating tissue) or non-thermal. Thermal effects are most likely to occur when near high-power systems. Should such effects occur, they would likely cause birds to temporarily avoid the area receiving the electromagnetic radiation until the stressor ceases (Manville, 2016). Currently, questions exist about far-field, non-thermal effects from low-power, in-air electromagnetic devices. Manville (2016) performed a literature review of this topic. Although findings are not always consistent, Manville (2016) reported that several peer-reviewed studies have shown non-thermal effects can include (1) affecting behavior by preventing birds from using their magnetic compass, which may in turn affect migration; (2) fragmenting the DNA of reproductive cells, decreasing the reproductive capacity of living organisms; (3) increasing the permeability of the blood-brain barrier; (4) other behavioral effects; (5) other molecular, cellular, and metabolic changes; and (6) increasing cancer risk.

Many bird species return to the same stopover, wintering, and breeding areas every year and often follow the exact same or very similar migration routes (Akesson & Hedenstrom, 2007). However, ample evidence exists that displaced birds can successfully reorient and find their way when one or more cues are removed. For example, Haftorn et al. (1988) found that after removal from their nests and release into a different area, snow petrels (*Pagodrama nivea*) were able to successfully navigate back to their nests even when their ability to smell was removed. Furthermore, Wiltschko et al. (2011) and Wiltschko and Wiltschko (2005) report that electromagnetic pulses administered to birds during an experimental study on orientation do not deactivate the magnetite-based receptor mechanism in the upper beak altogether but instead cause the receptors to provide altered information, which in turn causes birds to orient in different directions. However, these impacts were temporary, and the ability of the birds to correctly orient themselves eventually returned.

Given (1) the information provided above; (2) the dispersed nature of Navy training and testing activities at sea; (3) the relatively small area around an emitting source that experiences high power

electromagnetic pulses; and (4) the relatively low-level and dispersed use of these systems at sea, the following conclusions are reached:

- The chance that in-air electromagnetic devices would cause thermal damage to an individual marine bird is extremely low.
- It is possible, although unlikely, that some marine bird individuals would be exposed to levels of electromagnetic radiation that would cause discomfort, in which case they would likely avoid the immediate vicinity of testing and training activities.
- The strength of any avoidance response would decrease with increasing distance from the in-air electromagnetic device.
- No long-term or population-level impacts would occur.

There is only one new activity involving an energy stressor (i.e., high-energy lasers) that differs from activities with energy stressors that were previously analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Use of low-energy lasers was covered in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS in Section 3.0.5.2.2.3 (Lasers), but high-energy laser weapons were not part of the proposed action in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. The use of high-energy lasers represents a new substressor used in an existing activity in this SEIS/OEIS. As discussed in this SEIS/OEIS, Section 3.0.4.3.2.2 (High-Energy Lasers), high-energy lasers are designed to disable surface targets, rendering them immobile. The primary concern is the potential for a marine bird to be struck with the laser beam at or near the water's surface, where extended exposure could result in injury or death due to traumatic burns from the beam.

Marine birds could be exposed to a laser only if they flew between the source and the target, or if the beam missed the target and a bird happened to be in the line of fire. Should the laser strike the sea surface, individual sea birds at or near the surface could be exposed. Because laser platforms are typically helicopters and ships, marine birds at sea would likely transit away or submerge in response to other stressors, such as ship or aircraft noise, although some marine birds may not exhibit a response to an oncoming vessel or aircraft, increasing the risk of contact with the laser beam. High-energy laser activities would only occur in open ocean locations (not close to land areas).

3.6.2.3.1 Impacts from High-Energy Lasers Under Alternative 1

Under Alternative 1, the number of proposed activities involving the use of high-energy lasers is shown in Table 3.0-10. High-energy lasers is a new substressor that was not analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. As discussed above, impacts on marine birds from energy stressors should not be expected to occur.

A direct strike of a marine bird at the water's surface or within the beam path is extremely unlikely, and potential impacts on ESA-listed marine bird species are negligible. Therefore, the conclusions for ESA-listed marine bird species and other marine bird species protected by the MBTA included in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS remain valid.

During section 7 ESA consultation between the Navy and USFWS, the Navy determined that the activities described in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS would have no effect on the ESA-listed Hawaiian petrel, short-tailed albatross, or Newell's shearwaters.

Pursuant to the ESA, the use of high-energy lasers during training and testing activities, as described under Alternative 1, would have no effect on ESA-listed Hawaiian petrels, short-tailed albatrosses, Newell's Townsend's shearwaters. This determination is consistent with the previous consultation between the Navy and USFWS for activities described in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

Under the MBTA regulations applicable to military readiness activities (50 CFR Part 21), the impacts from energy stressors during training and testing activities using high-energy lasers described under Alternative 1 would not result in a significant adverse effect on populations of the great frigatebird, masked booby, or other marine bird populations.

3.6.2.3.2 Impacts from High-Energy Lasers Under Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)

Under Alternative 2, the use of high-energy lasers would increase as compared to Alternative 1 (Table 3.0-10), but there would be no change regarding the impact conclusions for energy stressors as summarized above under Alternative 1 and as presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Therefore, impacts on marine birds under Alternative 2 from energy stressors, including high-energy lasers, should not be expected to occur.

Pursuant to the ESA, the use of high energy lasers during training and testing activities, as described under Alternative 2, would have no effect on ESA-listed Hawaiian petrels, short-tailed albatrosses, Newell's shearwaters. This determination is consistent with the previous consultation between the Navy and USFWS for activities described in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

Under the MBTA regulations applicable to military readiness activities (50 CFR Part 21), the impacts from energy stressors during training and testing activities using high-energy lasers described under Alternative 2 would not result in a significant adverse effect on populations of the great frigatebird, masked booby, or other marine bird populations.

3.6.2.3.3 Impacts from High-Energy Lasers Under the No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, proposed training and testing activities would not occur. Other military activities not associated with this Proposed Action would continue to occur. Energy stressors as listed above would not be introduced into the marine environment. Therefore, existing environmental conditions would either remain unchanged or would improve slightly after cessation of ongoing training and testing activities. Discontinuing the training and testing activities would result in fewer energy stressors within the marine environment where Navy activities have historically been conducted. Therefore, discontinuing training and testing activities under the No Action Alternative would lessen the potential for impacts on marine birds from energy stressors, but would not measurably improve the overall distribution or abundance of marine birds.

3.6.2.4 Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors

The physical disturbance and strike stressors that may impact marine birds include (1) aircraft and aerial targets, (2) vessels and in-water devices, (3) military expended materials, and (4) wildfires on FDM. For activities occurring at sea, the use of aircraft and aerial targets, vessels and in-water devices, and military expended materials would decrease under this SEIS/OEIS (Tables 3.0-11 through 3.0-17, and Table 3.0-20), with the exception of increased small caliber munitions use. Small-caliber munitions are inert, are meant to be aimed at targets, and are not long-range weapons. As a result, marine birds are extremely unlikely to be struck by expended small caliber munitions. Military expended materials would increase for training activities occurring on FDM. For the purposes of this SEIS/OEIS, only activities that

occur on or over FDM and activities that would occur in the open ocean environment that have changed since the publication of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS are discussed in this section.

Physical disturbances may elicit short-term behavioral or physiological responses such as alert response, startle response, cessation of feeding, fleeing the immediate area, and a temporary increase in heart rate. These disturbances can also result in abnormal behavioral, growth, or reproductive impacts in nesting birds and can cause foraging and nesting birds to flush from or abandon their habitats or nests. Aircraft strikes often result in bird mortalities or injuries.

Physical disturbance on land may induce erosion, either from loosening of rock and soil from direct impacts (which facilitates transport of material by wind and rain) or from wildfires ignited by explosions (see Section 3.6.3.3.5, Impacts from Wildfires, in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS). Military use of FDM may contribute to ongoing soil disturbance and erosion from natural causes. FDM is comprised of highly weathered limestone overlain by a thin layer of clay soil (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2013b). Ordnance use, particularly within Impact Areas 2 and 3 (where explosive munitions use is permitted), would dislodge sediments that may potentially wash into nearshore waters of FDM. In addition to natural wind and water erosion (including high-energy typhoon events), erosion caused by ordnance use would contribute to increased turbidity and siltation of habitats used by marine bird prey species.

Section 3.6.3.3.1 (Impacts from Aircraft and Aerial Targets) in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS discusses the potential impacts on birds from collisions with fixed-wing aircraft, helicopters, and aerial targets. Aircraft and aerial target strikes could occur during training and testing activities that use aircraft, particularly in nearshore areas, where birds are more concentrated in the Study Area. Training and testing activities where aircraft are used typically occur further offshore; however, increased use of FDM may increase the potential for aircraft strike of birds. Therefore, for the purposes of this SEIS/OEIS, only the use of aircraft related to FDM training activities are discussed below under the alternatives analysis for birds for this stressor category.

3.6.2.4.1 Impacts from Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors Under Alternative 1

Under Alternative 1, physical disturbance and strike stressors associated with training and testing activities would decrease in comparison to the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (Tables 3.0-12 through 3.0-17, 3.0-19), assuming the dismissal of small-caliber munitions use for the reasons noted above. Under Alternative 1, there would be increases in the numbers of large-caliber non-explosive practice munitions (Table 3.0-14) and the number of targets expended at sea (Table 3.0-17), but overall there would be a decrease in the number of combined physical disturbance and strike stressors on marine birds. Consistent with the conclusions provided in the 2015 MITT EIS/OEIS, impacts on marine birds from physical disturbance and strike stressors are not expected to occur.

On FDM, marine birds that nest and roost on the island would be exposed to military expended materials resulting from explosive munitions and non-explosive practice munitions. Explosive munitions increase the potential for a marine bird (or nest) to be struck because of fragments dispersed throughout the blast zone.

As shown in Table 3.6-1, there would be an increase in the number of training events using FDM as a training location or target, with an increase in the number of munitions items expended on FDM (see Table 3.6-2).

Taken together, the increase in the number of training events per year or the amount of ordnance used during events would result in an increase in the amount of NEW expended on FDM each year (see Table

3.6-3). Although the amount of increased NEW is negligible (0.22–0.39 percent, depending on the NEW range of various munition types), the potential exposure to physical disturbance and strike stressors associated with ordnance use would increase under Alternative 1 compared to what was analyzed previously in the MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Factors that limit the potential for additional adverse impacts from physical disturbance and strike, however, include maintaining the same ordnance type and targeting restrictions included as part of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. All ordnance expended on FDM would target existing impact zones, with the same ordnance restrictions imposed on all FDM activities and with the same avoidance and minimization measures in place (see Section 5.5, Terrestrial Mitigation Measures to be Implemented; and Table 5.5-1). Therefore, the increases in ordnance use on FDM shown in Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2 do not appreciably change the impact conclusions presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. The conclusions for ESA-listed marine bird species and other marine bird species protected by the MBTA included in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS remain valid.

During section 7 ESA consultation between the Navy and USFWS, the Navy determined that the activities described in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS would have no effect on the ESA-listed Hawaiian petrel, short-tailed albatross, or Newell's shearwater.

Pursuant to the ESA, training and testing activities that use aircraft and aerial targets, as described under Alternative 1, would have no effect on ESA-listed Hawaiian petrels, short-tailed albatrosses, Newell's shearwaters. This determination is consistent with the previous consultation between the Navy and USFWS for activities described in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

Under the MBTA regulations applicable to military readiness activities (50 CFR Part 21), the impacts from physical disturbance and strike stressors during training and testing activities described under Alternative 1 would not result in a significant adverse effect on populations of the great frigatebird, masked booby, or other marine bird populations.

3.6.2.4.2 Impacts from Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors Under Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)

Under Alternative 2, physical disturbance and strike stressors associated with training and testing activities would decrease in comparison to the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (Tables 3.0-12 through 3.0-17, 3.0-19) assuming the dismissal of small-caliber munitions use for the reasons noted above. Under Alternative 2, there would be increases in the numbers of large-caliber non-explosive practice munitions (Table 3.0-14) and the number of targets expended at sea (Table 3.0-17), but overall there would be a decrease in the number of combined physical disturbance and strike stressors on marine birds. Consistent with the conclusions provided in the 2015 MITT EIS/OEIS, impacts on marine birds from physical disturbance and strike stressors are not expected to occur.

On FDM under Alternative 2, there would be an increase in the number of training events using FDM as a training location or target (see Table 3.6-1), with an increase in the number of munitions items expended on FDM (see Table 3.6-2) compared to what was analyzed previously in the MITT Final EIS/OEIS and under Alternative 1.

Taken together, the increase in the number of training events per year or the amount of ordnance used during events would result in an increase in the amount of NEW expended on FDM each year (see Table 3.6-3). Although the amount of increased NEW is negligible (0.35–0.6 percent, depending on the NEW range of various munition types), the potential exposure to stressors associated with ordnance use would increase under Alternative 2 compared to what was analyzed previously in the MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Under Alternative 2, Naval Surface Firing Exercise events would expend more large-caliber

projectiles, thereby increasing the NEW expended under Alternative 2 compared to Alternative 1. Factors that limit the potential for additional adverse impacts, however, include maintaining the same ordnance type and targeting restrictions included as part of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. All ordnance expended on FDM would target existing impact zones, with the same ordnance restrictions imposed on all FDM activities and with the same avoidance and minimization measures in place (see Section 5.5, Terrestrial Mitigation Measures to be Implemented; and Table 5.5-1). Therefore, the increases in ordnance use on FDM shown in Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2 do not appreciably change the impact conclusions presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. The conclusions for ESA-listed marine bird species and other marine bird species protected by the MBTA included in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS remain valid.

Pursuant to the ESA, training and testing activities that use aircraft and aerial targets, as described under Alternative 2, would have no effect on ESA-listed Hawaiian petrels, short-tailed albatrosses, Newell's shearwaters. This determination is consistent with the previous consultation between the Navy and USFWS for activities described in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

Under the MBTA regulations applicable to military readiness activities (50 CFR Part 21), the impacts from physical disturbance and strike stressors during training and testing activities described under Alternative 2 would not result in a significant adverse effect on populations of the great frigatebird, masked booby, or other marine bird populations.

3.6.2.4.3 Impacts from Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors Under the No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, proposed training and testing activities would not occur. Other military activities not associated with this Proposed Action would continue to occur. Physical disturbance and strike stressors would not be introduced into the marine environment. Therefore, existing environmental conditions would either remain unchanged or would improve slightly after cessation of ongoing training and testing activities.

Discontinuing the training and testing activities would result in fewer physical disturbance and strike stressors within the marine environment where Navy activities have historically been conducted. Therefore, discontinuing training and testing activities under the No Action Alternative would lessen the potential for physical disturbance and strike impacts on marine birds, but would not measurably improve the overall distribution or abundance of marine birds.

3.6.2.5 Ingestion Stressors

As discussed in Section 3.6.3.4 (Ingestion Stressors) of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, a variety of ingestible materials may be released into the marine environment by training and testing activities. Types of materials that could become ingestion stressors (military expended materials – munitions and military expended materials other than munitions) for marine birds during training and testing activities in the Study Area include non-explosive practice munitions (small and medium caliber), fragments from high-explosive munitions, fragments from targets, chaff, plastic end caps from chaff cartridges, the plastic compression pads, end caps from pistons and flares, and small decelerators/parachutes. Ingestion stressors would decrease with the exception of increased small-caliber munitions use (Table 3.0-14, Table 3.0-15, Tables 3.0-25 through 3.0-26). However, small-caliber munitions are inert, small in size, do not resemble prey items, and end up as part of the seafloor where they are unlikely to be encountered by marine birds. The number of munitions and explosive munitions fragments that an individual marine bird could encounter would generally be low, based on the patchy distribution of both the munitions and open water feeding habitats of marine birds. In addition, it is assumed an animal

would not ingest every munition or munition fragment it encountered, and if a munition or munition fragment were ingested, an animal may attempt to reject it when it realizes the item is not food.

3.6.2.5.1 Impacts from Ingestion Stressors Under the Alternative 1

Under Alternative 1, ingestion stressors would decrease, with the exception of increased small-caliber munitions use (Table 3.0-14, Table 3.0-15, Tables 3.0-25 through 3.0-26). For the reasons noted above, the Navy has determined that potential impacts from ingestion stressors would not be substantially different from the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Military expended materials would be only a minute portion of the floating debris that marine birds could encounter and accidently ingest. While military expended materials may be a contributing factor to the harmful effects of manmade debris on some marine birds, an individual military expended material would not negatively impact a marine bird. The overall likelihood that individual birds would be negatively impacted by ingestion of military expended materials in the Study Area under Alternative 1 is considered low, but not discountable. Population-level effects would be very unlikely given the relatively small quantities and limited persistence of military expended materials in habitats where birds are most likely to forage. Because of the extreme low likelihood of geographic or temporal overlap with training and testing activities with ESA-listed marine birds, potential ingestion of expended materials by ESA-listed marine birds is considered negligible. Therefore, the analysis from the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS remains valid.

Pursuant to the ESA, potential ingestion stressors introduced by training and testing activities under Alternative 1 would have no effect on ESA-listed Hawaiian petrels, short-tailed albatrosses, Newell's shearwaters. This determination is consistent with the previous consultation between the Navy and USFWS for activities described in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

Under the MBTA regulations applicable to military readiness activities (50 CFR Part 21), potential ingestion stressors introduced by training and testing activities under Alternative 1 would not result in a significant adverse effect on populations of the great frigatebird, masked booby, or other marine bird populations.

3.6.2.5.2 Impacts from Ingestion Stressors Under Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)

Under Alternative 2, ingestion stressors (military expended materials – munitions and military expended materials other than munitions) would decrease under this SEIS/OEIS in comparison to the ongoing activities, with the exception of increased small-caliber munitions use (Table 3.0-14, Table 3.0-15, and Tables 3.0-25 through 3.0-26). Under Alternative 2, increases as compared to Alternative 1 do not change the impact conclusions for ingestion stressors as summarized above under Alternative 1 and as presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Therefore, impacts on marine birds from ingestion of military expended materials under Alternative 2 would be negligible.

Pursuant to the ESA, potential ingestion stressors introduced by training and testing activities under Alternative 2 would have no effect on ESA-listed Hawaiian petrels, short-tailed albatrosses, Newell's shearwaters. This determination is consistent with the previous consultation between the Navy and USFWS for activities described in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

Under the MBTA regulations applicable to military readiness activities (50 CFR Part 21), potential ingestion stressors introduced by training and testing activities under Alternative 2 would not result in a significant adverse effect on populations of the great frigatebird, masked booby, or other marine bird populations.

3.6.2.5.3 Impacts from Ingestion Stressors Under the No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, proposed training and testing activities would not occur. Other military activities not associated with this Proposed Action would continue to occur. Ingestion stressors would not be introduced into the marine environment. Therefore, existing environmental conditions would either remain unchanged or would improve slightly after cessation of ongoing training and testing activities.

Discontinuing the training and testing activities would result in fewer ingestion stressors within the marine environment where Navy activities have historically been conducted. Therefore, discontinuing training and testing activities under the No Action Alternative would lessen the potential for ingestion impacts on marine birds, but would not measurably improve the overall distribution or abundance of marine birds.

3.6.2.6 Secondary Stressors (impacts on habitat, impacts on prey availability)

The potential for secondary stressors, defined as potential impacts on habitat and prey availability, to impact marine bird species was analyzed in Section 3.6.3.5 (Secondary Stressors) of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Training and testing activities analyzed in this SEIS/OEIS would not introduce additional secondary stressors or change the impacts of secondary stressors on marine bird species from what was analyzed previously in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

3.6.2.7 Endangered Species Act Determinations

Since the publication of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, there have been no updates to the regulatory status, life history information, or species-specific threats that would alter the analysis from the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS for the short-tailed albatross, Hawaiian petrel, or Newell's shearwater. As such, the description regarding these marine bird species presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS remains valid. Because of the limited period of time that ESA-listed marine bird species would be within the Study Area and the extreme unlikelihood that these birds would be subject to stressors generated by training and testing activities within the Study Area, the Navy and the USFWS have not included these species in past at-sea training and testing consultations within the Study Area (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2010, 2015). Similar to these past consultations, the activities proposed in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) of this SEIS/OEIS would have no effect on ESA-listed marine birds.

3.6.3 Migratory Bird Treaty Act

The Navy has conducted an analysis of the potential impacts of increasing the number of events, munitions, and NEW expended on FDM. Taken together with the statistical analysis of bird trends on FDM described above in Section 3.6.2 (Environmental Consequences) and determinations that no significant population impacts would occur, the small increases in events, munitions numbers, and expended NEW on FDM proposed in this SEIS/OEIS would not significantly impact bird populations, as defined in the MBTA regulations applicable to military readiness activities (50 CFR Part 21). While this determination is applicable to all marine birds that occur in the Study Area, the Navy carried out a focused analysis for marine birds known to breed on FDM (see the discussion for population-level analysis in Section 3.6.2, Environmental Consequences). Pursuant with the Department of Defense's obligations under 50 CFR Part 21, the Department of Defense will continue to implement training restrictions on FDM (see Section 5.5, Terrestrial Mitigation Measures to be Implemented) and monitoring of bird populations on FDM.

3.6.4 Public Comments

The public raised a number of issues during the scoping period in regard to marine birds. The issues are summarized in the list below. Comments received from the public during the Draft SEIS/OEIS commenting period related to marine birds are addressed in Appendix K (Public Comment Responses).

- **Public comments regarding potential impacts of marine bird species on FDM –** This SEIS/OEIS includes an analysis of potential impacts from the additional training activities proposed to occur at FDM. For acoustic stressors, Section 3.6.2.1.3 (Impacts from Aircraft Noise) and Section 3.6.2.1.4 (Impacts from Weapons Noise) include an analysis of how these stressor types may impact marine bird rookeries on FDM. For explosives stressors, Section 3.6.2.2 (Explosives Stressors [explosive shock wave and sound, explosive fragments]) includes an analysis of how the proposed increase in munitions for missile exercises and direct action training activities could impact marine birds on the island. Stressor categories within physical disturbance and strike stressors, such as potential strike impacts from aircraft and impacts from wildfires, also include an FDM-focused analysis. While assessing these potential impacts of activities proposed in this SEIS/OEIS, it is important to note that all of the activities would continue under the same targeting constraints as described in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Mitigation measures designed in cooperation with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service personnel provide a level of protection for the northern end of the island (where booby colonies have persisted), while ordnance use is only allowed in designated impact zones (see Section 5.5, Terrestrial Mitigation Measures to be Implemented).
- **Public comments regarding the status of nesting birds on FDM –** This SEIS/OEIS has been updated to include recent published work that provides a statistical review of repeated marine bird surveys on FDM. Camp et al. (2016) analyzed marine bird survey data collected from aerial surveys from 1997 to 2014. As discussed in Section 3.6.1.7 (Rookery Locations and Breeding Activities within the Mariana Islands), there is some evidence that masked and red-footed booby populations on FDM have declined, while brown booby populations have increased, though none of these trends were statistically significant. The general conclusion is that all three species exhibited population fluctuations over time. These fluctuations, combined with the level of variability observed in the count data, precluded any definitive conclusions about long-term population trends (i.e., the data were non-significant) (Camp et al., 2016). This SEIS/OEIS also includes historical observations and more recent surveys, such as Lusk et al. (2000), to provide context for the trend data and statistical analyses of FDM marine bird populations. Aerial surveys are conducted more frequently over FDM than on-the-ground surveys, with the primary focus to monitor marine bird rookeries (namely, brown boobies, masked boobies, and red-footed boobies). These surveys are described in more detail, along with quantitative trend analysis of populations in Section 3.6.2.6.3 (Farallon de Medinilla) of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. All of these studies are summarized and included the Joint Region Marianas Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2019), which is shared with cooperating agencies (e.g., Guam Department of Agriculture Division of Aquatic and Wildlife Resources, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands Department of Land and Natural Resources Division of Fish and Wildlife, and USFWS Pacific Islands Fish and Wildlife Office).

This page intentionally left blank.

REFERENCES

Akesson, S., and A. Hedenstrom. (2007). How migrants get there: Migratory performance and orientation. *BioScience, 57*(2), 123–133.

Baerwald, E. F., G. H. D'Amours, B. J. Klug, and R. M. Barclay. (2008). Barotrauma is a significant cause of bat fatalities at wind turbines. *Current Biology, 18*(16), R695–R696.

Barnas, A., R. Newman, C. J. Felege, M. P. Corcoran, S. D. Hervey, T. J. Stechmann, R. F. Rockwell, and S. N. Ellis-Felege. (2018). Evaluating behavioral responses of nesting lesser snow geese to unmanned aircraft surveys. *Ecology and Evolution, 8*, 1328–1338.

Beason, R. (2004). *What Can Birds Hear?* Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska.

Beuter, K. J., R. Weiss, and B. Frankfurt. (1986). *Properties of the auditory system in birds and the effectiveness of acoustic scaring signals.* Paper presented at the Bird Strike Committee Europe, 18th Meeting Part I, 26–30 May 1986. Copenhagen, Denmark.

Black, A. (2005). Short note: Light induced seabird mortality on vessels operating in the Southern Ocean: Incidents and mitigation measures. *Antarctic Science, 17*(1), 67–68.

Bowles, A. E. (1995). Chapter 8: Responses of Wildlife to Noise. In R. L. Knight & K. J. Gutzwiller (Eds.), *Wildlife and Recreationists: Coexistence Through Management and Research*. Washington, DC: Island Press.

Camp, R., C. Leopold, K. Brinck, and F. Juola. (2016). *Farallon de Medinilla seabird and Tinian moorhen analyses*. Hilo, HI: Hawaii Cooperative Studies Unit, University of Hawaii at Hilo.

Cook, T. R., M. Hamann, L. Pichegru, F. Bonadonna, D. Grémillet, and P. G. Ryan. (2011). GPS and time-depth loggers reveal underwater foraging plasticity in a flying diver, the Cape Cormorant. *Marine Biology, 159*(2), 373–387.

Crowell, S. C. (2016). Measuring in-air and underwater hearing in seabirds. *Advances in Experimental Medicine and Biology, 875*, 1155–1160.

Crowell, S. E., A. M. Wells-Berlin, C. E. Carr, G. H. Olsen, R. E. Therrien, S. E. Ynnuzzi, and D. R. Ketten. (2015). A comparison of auditory brainstem responses across diving bird species. *Journal of Comparative Physiology A, 201*(8), 803–815.

Crowell, S. E., A. M. Wells-Berlin, R. E. Therrien, S. E. Yannuzzi, and C. E. Carr. (2016). In-air hearing of a diving duck: A comparison of psychoacoustic and auditory brainstem response thresholds. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 139*(5), 3001.

Dooling, R. (2002). *Avian Hearing and the Avoidance of Wind Turbines*. College Park, MD: University of Maryland.

Dooling, R. J., and A. N. Popper. (2000). Hearing in birds and reptiles. In R. J. Dooling, R. R. Fay, & A. N. Popper (Eds.), *Comparative Hearing in Birds and Reptiles* (Vol. 13, pp. 308–359). New York, NY: Springer-Verlag.

Dooling, R. J., and S. C. Therrien. (2012). Hearing in birds: What changes from air to water. *Advances in Experimental Medicine and Biology, 730*, 77–82.

Duffy, D. C. (2011). No room in the ark? Climate change and biodiversity in the Pacific Islands of Oceania. *Pacific Conservation Biology, 17*, 192–200.

Frost, M. T., S. Dye, B. Stoker, P. Buckley, and J. Baxter. (2017). *Marine Climate Change Impacts: 10 Years' Experience of Science to Policy Reporting. Summary Report*. London, United Kingdom: Marine Climate Change Impacts Partnership.

Haftorn, S., F. Mehlum, and C. Bech. (1988). Navigation to nest site in the snow petrel (*Pagodroma nivea*). *The Condor, 90*(2), 484–486.

Hansen, K. A., A. Maxwell, U. Siebert, O. N. Larsen, and M. Wahlberg. (2017). Great cormorants (*Phalacrocorax carbo*) can detect auditory cues while diving. *The Science of Nature, 104*(5–6), 45.

Hetherington, T. (2008). Comparative anatomy and function of hearing in aquatic amphibians, reptiles, and birds. In J. G. M. Thewissen & S. Nummela (Eds.), *Sensory Evolution on the Threshold* (pp. 182–209). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Jiménez, S., A. Domingo, M. Abreu, and A. Brazeiro. (2012). Bycatch susceptibility in pelagic longline fisheries: Are albatrosses affected by the diving behaviour of medium-sized petrels? *Aquatic Conservation: Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems, 22*(4), 436–445.

Johansen, S., O. N. Larsen, J. Christensen-Dalsgaard, L. Seidelin, T. Huulvej, K. Jensen, S. G. Lunneryd, M. Bostrom, and M. Wahlberg. (2016). In-air and underwater hearing in the great cormorant (*Phalacrocorax carbo sinensis*). *Advances in Experimental Medicine Biology, 875*, 505–512.

Jongbloed, R. H. (2016). *Flight height of seabirds. A literature study*. Ijmuiden, Netherlands: Institute for Marine Resources & Ecosystem Studies.

Kushlan, J. A. (1978). Non-rigorous foraging by robbing egrets. *Ecology, 59*, 649–653.

Larkin, R. P., L. L. Pater, and D. J. Tazlk. (1996). *Effects of Military Noise on Wildlife: A Literature Review* (USACERL Technical Report 96/21). Champaign, IL: Department of the Army, Construction Engineering Research Lab.

Lincoln, F. C., S. R. Perterson, and J. L. Zimmerman. (1998). *Migration of Birds* (Migration of Birds Circular 16). Manhattan, KS: U.S. Department of the Interior, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service.

Lorrain, A., F. Houlbrèque, F. Benzoni, L. Barjon, L. Tremblay-Boyer, C. Menkes, D. P. Gillikin, C. Payri, H. Jourdan, and G. Boussarie. (2017). Seabirds supply nitrogen to reef-building corals on remote Pacific islets. *Scientific Reports, 7*(1), 3721.

Lusk, M. R., P. Bruner, and C. Kessler. (2000). The Avifauna of Farallon De Medinilla, Mariana Islands. *Journal of Field Ornithology, 71*(1), 22–33.

Manville, A. (2016). *A Briefing Memorandum: What We Know, Can Infer, and Don't Yet Know about Impacts from Thermal and Non-thermal Non-ionizing Radiation to Birds and Other Wildlife—for Public Release*. Washington, DC: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Maxwell, A., K. A. Hansen, S. T. Ortiz, O. N. Larsen, U. Siebert, and M. Wahlberg. (2017). In-air hearing of the great cormorant (*Phalacrocorax carbo*). *Biology Open, 6*(4), 496–502.

National Park Service. (1994). *Report on Effects of Aircraft Overflights on the National Park System* (Report to Congress prepared pursuant to Public Law 100-191, the National Parks Overflights Act of 1987). Washington, DC: National Park Service.

Ostrom, P. H., A. E. Wiley, H. F. James, S. Rossman, W. A. Walker, E. F. Zipkin, and Y. Chikaraishi. (2017). Broad-scale trophic shift in the pelagic North Pacific revealed by an oceanic seabird. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B, 284*(1851), 20162436.

Pater, L. L., and J. W. Shea. (1981). *Techniques for Reducing Gun Blast Noise Levels: An Experimental Study*. Dahlgren, VA: Naval Surface Weapons System.

Plumpton, D. (2006). *Review of Studies Related to Aircraft Noise Disturbance of Waterfowl: A Technical Report in Support of the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for Introduction of F/A-18 E/F (Super Hornet) Aircraft to the East Coast of the United States*. Norfolk, VA: U.S. Department of the Navy.

Poessel, S. A., A. E. Duerr, J. C. Hall, M. A. Braham, and T. E. Katzner. (2018). Improving estimation of flight altitude in wildlife telemetry studies. *Journal of Applied Ecology, 55*(4), 2064–2070.

Ponganis, P. (2015). *Diving Physiology of Marine Mammals and Seabirds*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.

Ramírez, F., I. Afán, L. S. Davis, and A. Chiaradia. (2017). Climate impacts on global hot spots of marine biodiversity. *Science Advances, 3*(2), e1601198.

Rijke, A. M. (1970). Wettability and phylogenetic development of feather structure in water birds. *The Journal of Experimental Biology, 52*(2), 469–479.

Sade, J., Y. Handrich, J. Bernheim, and D. Cohen. (2008). Pressure equilibration in the penguin middle ear. *Acta Oto-Laryngologica, 128*(1), 18–21.

Sanzenbacher, P. M., B. A. Cooper, J. H. Plissner, and J. Bond. (2014). Intra-annual patterns in passage rates and flight altitudes of Marbled Murrelets *Brachyramphus marmoratus* at inland sites in Northern California. *Marine Ornithology, 42*, 169–174.

Saunders, J. C., and R. Dooling. (1974). Noise-induced threshold shift in the parakeet (*Melopsittacus undulatus*). *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 71*(5), 1962–1965.

Sibley, D. (2014). *The Sibley Guide to Birds* (Second ed.). New York, NY: Alfred A. Knopf.

Spiegel, C., A. Berlin, A. Gilbert, C. E. Gray, W. Montevecchi, I. Stenhouse, S. Ford, G. H. Olsen, J. Fiely, and L. Savoy. (2017). *Determining Fine-scale Use and Movement Patterns of Diving Bird Species in Federal Waters of the Mid-Atlantic United States Using Satellite Telemetry*. Sterling, VA: US Department of the Interior, Bureau of Ocean Energy Management.

Stumpf, J. P., N. Denis, T. E. Hamer, G. Johnson, and J. Verschuyl. (2011). Flight height distribution and collision risk of the marbled murrelet *Brachyramphus marmoratus*: Methodology and preliminary results. *Marine Ornithology, 39*, 123–128.

Tarroux, A., H. Weimerskirch, S.-H. Wang, D. H. Bromwich, Y. Cherel, A. Kato, Y. Ropert-Coudert, Ø. Varpe, N. G. Yoccoz, and S. Descamps. (2016). Flexible flight response to challenging wind conditions in a commuting Antarctic seabird: Do you catch the drift? *Animal Behaviour, 113*, 99–112.

Therrien, S. C. (2014). *In-air and underwater hearing of diving birds.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Maryland, College Park, MD. Retrieved from http://hdl.handle.net/1903/2.

Thiessen, G. J. (1958). Threshold of hearing of a ring-billed gull. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 30*(11), 1047.

Trainer, V. L. (2017). *Conditions Promoting Extreme Pseudo-nitzschia Events in the Eastern Pacific but not the Western Pacific* (PICES Scientific Report No. 53, 2017). Sidney, Canada: North Pacific Marine Science Organization Science Board, Marine Environmental Quality Committee.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2007). *Marine Mammal and Sea Turtle Survey and Density Estimates for Guam and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands - Final Report*. Newport Beach, CA: Naval Facilities Engineering Command Pacific and Commander, U.S. Pacific Fleet.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2011). *Marianas Training Manual*. Naval Base Guam, Guam: Commander Joint Region Marianas.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2013a). *Annual Report: Wildlife Surveys on Tinian and FDM*. Naval Base Guam, Guam: Joint Region Marianas.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2013b). *2013 Joint Region Marianas Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan* (Final). Naval Base Guam, Guam: Joint Region Marianas.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2015). *Final Mariana Islands Training and Testing Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement*. Pearl Harbor, HI: Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Pacific.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2019). *Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan for Joint Region Marianas*. Tumon, Guam: Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Marianas.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. (2010). *Biological Opinion for the Mariana Islands Range Complex, Guam and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands 2010–2015*. Honolulu, HI: U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. (2015). *Biological Opinion for the Mariana Islands Training and Testing Program*. Honolulu, HI: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Pacific Islands Fish and Wildlife Office.

Wever, E. G., P. N. Herman, J. A. Simmons, and D. R. Hertzler. (1969). Hearing in the blackfooted penguin (*Spheniscus demersus*), as represented by the cochlear potentials. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 63*, 676–680.

Wiltschko, R., S. Denzau, D. Gehring, P. Thalau, and W. Wiltschko. (2011). Magnetic orientation of migratory robins, *Erithacus rubecula*, under long-wavelength light. *The Journal of Experimental Biology, 214*(18), 3096–3101.

Wiltschko, W., and R. Wiltschko. (2005). Magnetic orientation and magnetoreception in birds and other animals. *Journal of Comparative Physiology A 191*(8), 675–693.

3.7 Marine Vegetation

Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/ Overseas Environmental Impact Statement Mariana Islands Training and Testing

TABLE OF CONTENTS

3.7 Marine Vegetation 3.7-1
3.7.1 Affected Environment 3.7-1
3.7.1.1 General Threats 3.7-1
3.7.1.2 Marine Vegetation Groups 3.7-1
3.7.1.3 Seagrasses 3.7-1
3.7.1.4 Mangroves 3.7-1
3.7.2 Environmental Consequences 3.7-1
3.7.2.1 Explosive Stressors 3.7-2
3.7.2.2 Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors 3.7-3
3.7.2.3 Secondary Stressors 3.7-5
3.7.3 Public Comments 3.7-5

List of Figures

There are no figures in this section.

List of Tables

There are no tables in this section.

This page intentionally left blank.

3.7 Marine Vegetation

3.7.1 Affected Environment

The purpose of this section is to supplement the analysis of impacts on Marine Vegetation presented in the 2015 Mariana Islands Training and Testing (MITT) Final Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (EIS/OEIS) with new information relevant to proposed changes in training and testing activities conducted at sea and on Farallon de Medinilla (FDM). New information made available since the publication of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS is included below to better understand potential stressors and impacts on Marine Vegetation resulting from training and testing activities. Comments received from the public during scoping related to marine vegetation are addressed in Section 3.7.3 (Public Comments). Comments received from the public during the Draft Supplemental EIS (SEIS)/OEIS commenting period related to marine vegetation are addressed in Appendix K (Public Comment Responses).

3.7.1.1 General Threats

There is no new information on threats to marine vegetation in the MITT Study Area that would change the conclusions from the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

3.7.1.2 Marine Vegetation Groups

There is no new information on marine vegetation groups (phylum Cyanobacteria [blue-green algae], phylum Dinophyta [dinoflagellates], phylum Chlorophyta [green algae], phylum Heterokontophyta [brown algae], phylum Rhodophyta [red algae], and phylum Spermatophyta [flowering plants]) that would change the basis of the conclusions from the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

3.7.1.3 Seagrasses

There is no new information on seagrasses that would change the basis of the conclusions from the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

3.7.1.4 Mangroves

There is no new information on mangroves that would change the basis of the conclusions from the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

3.7.2 Environmental Consequences

The 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS considered training and testing activities that currently occur in the Study Area and considered potential stressors related to marine vegetation. With the exception of explosives, stressors analyzed are the same as those analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. In the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, explosives were addressed under acoustic stressors; however, for purposes of this analysis, explosives are analyzed as a separate stressor. The following are stressors analyzed for marine vegetation from the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS:

- Explosive (in-air explosions and in-water explosions)
- Physical disturbance and strike (vessels, in-water devices, military expended materials, and seafloor devices)
- Secondary stressors (impacts associated with sediments and water quality)

This section evaluates how and to what degree potential impacts on marine vegetation from stressors described in Section 3.0 (General Approach to Analysis) may have changed since the analysis presented

in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS was completed. Proposed training and testing activities, the number of times each activity would be conducted annually, and the locations within the Study Area where the activity would typically occur under each alternative are presented in Tables 2.4-1 and 2.4-2 in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives). The tables also present the same information for activities described in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS so that the proposed levels of training and testing under this SEIS/OEIS can be easily compared.

The Navy conducted a review of federal and state regulations and standards relevant to marine vegetation and reviewed literature published since 2015 for new information that could inform the analysis presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. The analysis presented in this section also considers standard operating procedures, which are discussed in Section 2.3.3 (Standard Operating Procedures) of this Final SEIS/OEIS, and mitigation measures that are described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation). The Navy implements these measures to avoid or reduce potential impacts on marine vegetation from stressors associated with training and testing activities.

3.7.2.1 Explosive Stressors

As stated in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, the potential for an explosion to injure or destroy marine vegetation would depend on the amount of vegetation present, the number of munitions used, and their net explosive weight. In areas where marine vegetation and locations for explosions overlap, marine vegetation on the surface of the water, in the water column, or rooted in the seafloor may be impacted. Seafloor macroalgae and single-celled algae may overlap with underwater and sea surface explosion locations. If these vegetation types are near an explosion, only a small number of them are likely to be impacted. Much of the attached macroalgae grows on live hard bottom areas that would be mostly protected in accordance with Navy mitigation measures (see Chapter 5, Mitigation). Also, some seafloor macroalgae are resilient to high levels of wave action (Mach et al., 2007), which may aid in their ability to withstand underwater explosions that occur near them. Underwater explosions also may temporarily increase the turbidity (sediment suspended in the water) in nearby waters, incrementally reducing the amount of light available to marine vegetation. Reducing light availability decreases, albeit temporarily, the photosynthetic ability of marine vegetation.

Seagrasses may potentially be uprooted or damaged by sea surface or underwater explosions. Regrowth of seagrasses after uprooting can take up to 10 years (Dawes et al., 1997). Explosions may also temporarily increase the turbidity (sediment suspended in the water) in nearby waters, but the sediment would settle to pre-explosion conditions within a few hours to days. Sustained high levels of turbidity may reduce the amount of light that reaches vegetation, which it needs to survive. Seagrasses typically grow in waters that are sheltered from wave action, such as estuaries, lagoons, and bays (Phillips & Meñez, 1988), where most activities are not conducted. Detonations are unlikely to occur in areas with mangroves or sea grasses and would continue to occur in disturbed areas over the unvegetated seafloor such as the Agat Bay site, Piti, and Outer Apra Harbor sites.

3.7.2.1.1 Impacts from Explosive Stressors Under Alternative 1

Under Alternative 1, there would be an overall decrease in the number of explosives used in the Study Area during training and testing activities events compared to the number analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (Table 3.0-7). Under Alternative 1, underwater detonations would increase for underwater demolition qualification/certification (Table 2.4-1). However, these activities would continue to occur in the same areas and would have no appreciable change in the impact analysis or

conclusions for explosive stressors as presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Therefore, the analysis in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS remains valid.

As described in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, underwater explosions conducted for training and testing activities may destroy or remove marine vegetation. However, exposure to these detonations would be limited to the vicinity of the explosions. For example, the offshore underwater mine neutralization sites are located in areas with water depths that are unlikely for marine vegetation to occur. Underwater and surface explosions conducted for training and testing activities are not expected to pose a risk to seagrass because (1) the impact area of underwater explosions is very small relative to seagrass distribution and (2) the low number of charges reduces the potential for impacts.

Therefore, the use of explosives is not expected to impact the long-term survival, annual reproductive success, and lifetime reproductive success of marine vegetation.

3.7.2.1.2 Impacts from Explosive Stressors Under Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)

Under Alternative 2, the number of explosives used during training and testing activities would decrease compared to the numbers analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and increase compared to Alternative 1 (Table 3.0-7). Under Alternative 2, increases in the number of underwater explosives would have no appreciable change on the impact conclusions for explosive stressors as summarized above under Alternative 1 and as presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Therefore, explosive impacts on marine vegetation under Alternative 2 would be negligible.

3.7.2.1.3 Impacts from Explosive Stressors Under the No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, proposed training and testing activities would not occur. Other military activities not associated with this Proposed Action would continue to occur. Explosive stressors as listed above would not be introduced into the marine environment. Therefore, existing environmental conditions would either remain unchanged or would improve slightly after cessation of ongoing training and testing activities.

Discontinuing the training and testing activities would result in fewer explosive stressors within the marine environment where training and testing activities have historically been conducted. Therefore, discontinuing training and testing activities under the No Action Alternative would lessen the potential for explosive impacts on marine vegetation, but would not measurably improve the overall distribution or abundance of marine vegetation.

3.7.2.2 Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors

This section analyzes the potential impacts on marine vegetation of the various types of physical disturbance and strike stressors during training and testing activities within the Study Area. Three types of physical disturbance and strike stressors are evaluated for their impacts on marine vegetation, including (1) vessels and in-water devices, (2) military expended materials, and (3) seafloor devices.

The evaluation of the impacts of physical disturbance stressors on marine vegetation focuses on proposed activities that may cause vegetation to be damaged by an object that is moving through the water (e.g., vessels and in-water devices), or dropped to the seafloor (e.g., military expended materials, anchors). Not all activities are proposed throughout the Study Area. Wherever appropriate, specific geographic areas of potential impact are identified.

As described in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, vessel disturbance of marine vegetation would be limited to floating marine algae. Vessel movements may disperse or injure algal mats. Because algal distribution

is patchy and mats may re-form following a disturbance, training and testing activities involving vessel movement would not impact the general health of marine algae.

3.7.2.2.1 Impacts from Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors Under Alternative 1

Under Alternative 1, the number of proposed training and testing events involving vessel movements would increase from those presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (Table 3.0-12). In contrast, the use of towed in-water devices (Table 3.0-13) would decrease. The decrease in the number of in-water devices is unlikely to change the impact conclusion presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. As stated in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, the impact of vessels and in-water devices on marine vegetation would remain inconsequential because of (1) the quick recovery of most vegetation types; (2) the short-term nature of most vessel movements and local disturbances of the surface water, with some temporary increase in suspended sediment in shallow areas; and (3) the deployment of in-water devices at depths where they would not likely come in contact with marine vegetation.

Under Alternative 1, the number of military expended materials used for training and testing activities that has the potential to impact marine vegetation would generally increase (see Tables 3.0-14 through 3.0-17). However, these increases are not expected to pose a risk to marine algae or seagrasses because (1) the relative coverage of marine algae in the Study Area is low, (2) new growth may result from marine algae exposure to military expended materials, (3) the impact area of military expended materials is very small relative to marine algae distribution, and (4) seagrass overlap with areas where the stressor occurs is very limited. In addition, as shown in Table 3.0-18, the total area of the seafloor that could be impacted by the use of military expended materials as proposed in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS would decrease from the amount analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS under Alternative 1. Based on these factors, potential impacts on marine algae and seagrass from military expended materials are not expected to result in detectable changes in their growth, survival, or propagation, and are not expected to result in population-level impacts.

Under Alternative 1, the number of seafloor devices used in shallow-water habitats during training and testing activities would decrease slightly from the number presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (Table 3.0-19). Seafloor devices would pose a negligible risk to marine vegetation for the same reasons described above for military expended materials and no impacts on the long-term survival, reproductive success, and lifetime reproductive success would occur.

Therefore, physical disturbance and strike impacts on marine vegetation under Alternative 1 would be negligible.

3.7.2.2.2 Impacts from Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors Under Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)

Under Alternative 2, the combined number of proposed training and testing events involving vessels and in-water devices (Table 3.0-12 and Table 3.0-13) would decrease slightly from those presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Military expended materials (Table 3.0-14, Table 3.0-15, and Table 3.0-16) combined would increase, and seafloor devices (Table 3.0-19) would decrease slightly from the number in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Increases in some physical disturbance and strike stressors such as military expended materials could increase the impact risk on marine vegetation but does not appreciably change the analysis or impact conclusions presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and those summarized above under Alternative 1.

Therefore, physical disturbance and strike impacts on marine vegetation under Alternative 2 would be negligible.

3.7.2.2.3 Impacts from Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors Under the No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, proposed training and testing activities would not occur. Other military activities not associated with this Proposed Action would continue to occur. Physical disturbance and strike stressors as listed above would not be introduced into the marine environment. Therefore, existing environmental conditions would either remain unchanged or would improve slightly after cessation of ongoing training and testing activities.

Discontinuing the training and testing activities would result in fewer physical disturbance and strike stressors within the marine environment where training and testing activities have historically been conducted. Therefore, discontinuing training and testing activities under the No Action Alternative would lessen the potential for physical disturbance and strike impacts on marine vegetation, but would not measurably improve the overall distribution or abundance of marine vegetation.

3.7.2.3 Secondary Stressors

Stressors from Navy training and testing activities could pose secondary or indirect impacts on marine vegetation via habitat, sediment, or water quality. Potential impacts on marine vegetation exposed to secondary stressors could occur indirectly through sediments and water quality. Components of these stressors that could pose indirect impacts include (1) explosives and byproducts; (2) metals; (3) chemicals; and (4) other materials such as targets, chaff, and plastics.

Section 3.1 (Sediments and Water Quality) considered the impacts on marine sediments and water quality from explosives and explosive byproducts, metals, chemicals other than explosives, and other materials (marine markers, flares, chaff, targets, and miscellaneous components of other materials). As stated in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, one example of a localized impact on marine vegetation associated with water quality impacts could be the increase of cyanobacteria associated with munitions deposits in marine sediments. Cyanobacteria may proliferate when the iron is introduced to the marine environment, and this proliferation can affect surrounding habitats by releasing toxins or stimulating the growth of nuisance species (Schils, 2012). Introducing iron into the marine environment from munitions or infrastructure is not associated with red tide events; rather, these harmful events are more associated with natural causes (e.g., upwellings) and the effects of human activities (e.g., agricultural runoff and other coastal pollution) (Hayes et al., 2007; Whitton & Potts, 2008).

Sediments entering the nearshore environment from FDM as a result of natural processes or explosives associated with strike warfare could cause temporary water quality impacts, some of which may be in foraging areas used by marine organisms. By limiting the location and extent of target areas, along with the types of ordnance allowed within specific impact areas, the military minimizes the potential for soil transport and, thus, water quality impacts. Erosion as a result of training activities at FDM may contribute to deposition of soils into the nearshore areas of FDM, causing increased turbidity. Turbidity can impact vegetation communities by reducing the amount of light that reaches these organisms. The impacts of explosive byproducts on sediment and water quality would be indirect, short term, and local. Explosive ordnance could loosen the soil on FDM and runoff from surface drainage areas containing soil, and explosive byproducts could contaminate sediments and the surrounding ocean water.

3.7.3 Public Comments

The public raised a number of issues during the scoping period in regard to marine vegetation. The issues are summarized in the list below. Comments received from the public during the Draft SEIS/OEIS

commenting period related to marine vegetation are addressed in Appendix K (Public Comment Responses).

- **Direct impacts on seagrass from sedimentation around FDM and military expended materials as marine debris –** Direct impacts on seagrass from sedimentation around FDM occur due to explosive stressors. Explosives may temporarily increase the turbidity (sediment suspended in the water) of nearby waters, but the sediment would settle to pre-explosion conditions within a short amount of time (e.g., a few hours to days). Sustained high levels of turbidity may reduce the amount of light that reaches vegetation, which it needs to survive. This scenario is not likely given the low number of explosions planned in areas with seagrass. Potential impacts on seagrass from military expended materials are not expected to result in detectable changes in their growth, survival, or propagation, and are not expected to result in population-level impacts. See Section 3.7.2.1 (Explosive Stressors) for further analysis of increased turbidity or sedimentation on marine vegetation including seagrasses in the Study Area including FDM. Military expended materials are discussed in Section 3.7.2.2 (Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors) as a cause of physical disturbance and strike to marine vegetation.
- **Request survey of all seagrass beds in the Study Area and monitoring of the seagrass beds –** The analysis of impacts on marine vegetation, including seagrasses, concluded that increased turbidity may be caused by items used in training and testing activities; under the standard operating procedures, the Navy avoids the seafloor to the greatest extent practicable. Additionally, activities that have a greater potential to impact the seafloor, such as amphibious assaults, are conducted at high tide to limit such interactions. Anchorages are also scheduled to occur in specific locations, mainly areas that lack vegetation and that have been previously disturbed. Therefore, serious damage is not anticipated, and survey or mitigation measures are not warranted. In addition, the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS includes maps showing areas of marine vegetation in Section 3.7 (Marine Vegetation).
- **Impact of unexploded ordnance on marine species –** Potential impacts on marine vegetation from unexploded ordnance are not expected to result in detectable changes in their growth, survival, or propagation, and are not expected to result in population-level impacts. The impact of unexploded ordnance to marine species, specifically to marine vegetation, is discussed in Section 3.7.2.2 (Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors) as a cause of physical disturbance and strike to marine vegetation.
- **Impacts on marine species from chemical pollution and destruction of habitat –** The analysis concluded that neither state nor federal standards or guidelines for sediments or water quality would be violated as a result of the implementation of the proposed training and testing activities. Therefore, because these standards and guidelines are structured to protect human health and the environment, and the proposed activities do not violate them, no indirect impacts are anticipated on marine vegetation from the training and testing activities proposed in this SEIS/OEIS. Destruction of habitat is not anticipated to result from the implementation of training and testing activities proposed in this SEIS/OEIS. Impacts on marine species, specifically to marine vegetation from chemical pollution, is discussed in Section 3.7.2.5 (Secondary Stressors).
- **Impacts on marine species from the metals in the water (copper and lead) –** The analysis concluded that neither state nor federal standards or guidelines for sediments or water quality

would be violated as a result of the implementation of the proposed training and testing activities. Therefore, because these standards and guidelines are structured to protect human health and the environment, and the proposed activities do not violate them, no indirect impacts are anticipated on marine vegetation from the training and testing activities proposed in this SEIS/OEIS. Impacts on marine species, specifically on marine vegetation, from metals in the water (such as copper and lead) are discussed in Section 3.7.2.3 (Secondary Stressors).

- **Deposition and resuspension of sediments to Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) from training activities –** Both the 2015 MITT Essential Fish Habitat Assessment (EFHA) and the 2019 MITT Supplemental EFHA concluded that any impacts from explosives or physical disturbance and strike stressors that could cause deposition or resuspension of sediments would be short term and minimal.
- **Erosion and sedimentation impacting EFH –** The 2015 MITT EFHA concluded that any impacts from explosives or physical disturbance and strike stressors that could cause erosion and sedimentation would be short term and minimal.
- **Unexploded ordnance being triggered after use and directly impacting EFH –** Unexploded ordnance that explodes due to being triggered post training and testing would be considered an explosive stressor and the 2015 MITT EFHA concluded that the impacts on attached macroalgae from explosives used during training and testing would be minimal and temporary to short term throughout the Study Area. This analysis remains valid. Given the available information, the impact of explosives used during training and testing on submerged rooted vegetation beds would be minimal.

REFERENCES

Dawes, C. J., J. Andorfer, C. Rose, C. Uranowski, and N. Ehringer. (1997). Regrowth of the seagrass, *Thalassia testudinum,* into propeller scars. *Aquatic Botany, 59*(1–2), 139–155.

Hayes, P. K., N. A. El Semary, and P. Sanchez-Baracaldo. (2007). The taxonomy of cyanobacteria: Molecular insights into a difficult problem. In J. Brodie & J. Lewis (Eds.), *Unravelling the Algae: The Past, Present, and Future of Algal Systematics* (pp. 93–102). Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.

Mach, K. J., B. B. Hale, M. W. Denny, and D. V. Nelson. (2007). Death by small forces: A fracture and fatigue analysis of wave-swept macroalgae. *The Journal of Experimental Biology, 210*(13), 2231–2243.

Phillips, R. C., and E. G. Meñez. (1988). Seagrasses. *Smithsonian Contributions to the Marine Sciences, 34*, 104.

Schils, T. (2012). Episodic eruptions of volcanic ash trigger a reversible cascade of nuisance species outbreaks in pristine coral habitats. *PLoS ONE, 7: e46639*.

Whitton, B. A., and M. Potts. (2008). *The Ecology of Cyanobacteria: Their Diversity in Time and Space*. The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.



Farallon de Medinilla

Saipan

Tinian

Rota

Guam

The Mariana Islands Training and Testing

Volume 2

Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement

United States Department of the Navy

June 2020 | Final

NAVSEA NAVAL SEA SYSTEMS COMMAND

ONR Science & Technology

Doc. No. 35GL-20-1874.*

Mariana Islands Training and Testing Activities Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement

Volume 2

June 2020

MITT SEIS/OEIS Project Manager
Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Pacific/EV21
258 Makalapa Dr., Suite 100
Pearl Harbor, HI 96860-3134

Doc. No. 35GL-20-1874.*

3.8 Marine Invertebrates

Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/ Overseas Environmental Impact Statement Mariana Islands Training and Testing

TABLE OF CONTENTS

3.8 Marine Invertebrates 3.8-1
3.8.1 Affected Environment 3.8-1
3.8.1.1 Sound Sensing and Production 3.8-4
3.8.1.2 General Threats 3.8-4
3.8.1.3 Endangered Species Act-Listed Species 3.8-4
3.8.1.4 Taxonomic Groups 3.8-5
3.8.2 Environmental Consequences 3.8-5
3.8.2.1 Acoustic Stressors 3.8-6
3.8.2.2 Explosive Stressors 3.8-8
3.8.2.3 Energy Stressors 3.8-10
3.8.2.4 Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors 3.8-12
3.8.2.5 Entanglement Stressors 3.8-15
3.8.2.6 Ingestion Stressors 3.8-16
3.8.2.7 Secondary Stressors 3.8-17
3.8.3 Public Comments 3.8-18

List of Figures

Figure 3.8-1: Percent Coral Cover and Habitat Types Around Farallon de Medinilla 3.8-3

List of Tables

Table 3.8-1: Status of Endangered Species Act-Listed Species Within the Study Area 3.8-5

This page intentionally left blank.

3.8 Marine Invertebrates

3.8.1 Affected Environment

The purpose of this section is to supplement the analysis of impacts on marine invertebrates presented in the 2015 Mariana Islands Training and Testing (MITT) Final Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (EIS/OEIS) with new information relevant to proposed changes in training and testing activities conducted at sea and on Farallon De Medinilla (FDM). New information made available since the publication of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS is included below to better understand potential stressors and impacts on marine invertebrates resulting from training and testing activities. Comments received from the public during scoping related to marine invertebrates are addressed in Section 3.8.3 (Public Comments). Comments received from the public during the Draft Supplemental EIS (SEIS)/OEIS commenting period related to marine invertebrates are addressed in Appendix K (Public Comment Responses).

Sensitive habitats in the Study Area include deep sea hydrothermal vents and coral reefs. As discussed in Section 3.3 (Marine Habitats), hydrothermal vents in the Study Area are located in the Mariana Archipelago (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2012). These areas support marine biological communities that are dependent on basalt rock foundations, unlike those throughout the remainder of the Pacific. Hydrothermal vent communities are typically low in species composition, but high in abundance of those few species. Deep-water benthic communities, including hydrothermal vents, include animals that have developed symbiotic relationships with chemosynthetic bacteria, such as tubeworms, shrimp, and mussels, as well as other animals like snails, anemones, and squat lobsters (Glickson et al., 2017) and take extremely long to recover from disturbances (Simon-Lledo et al., 2019).

Coral reefs in the Study Area are threatened by unsustainable fishing practices, climate change, land-based sources of pollution, overuse, and lack of enforcement (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2018a). Coral reefs within the Mariana Islands are moderately impacted, and their overall condition is considered fair. Coral reefs in the northern islands are in good condition, while the southern islands such as Saipan had the most diverse types of coral reefs and associated habitats in the Mariana Islands (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2018a). In contrast, coral reef condition in Tinian and Rota are considered impacted. While these conditions reflect data collected through summer 2017, very recent data suggest coral reef bleaching has resulted in severe impacts, with up to 90 percent loss for some branching coral species occurring around Saipan and Tinian (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2018a). It is unclear what the impact of these bleaching events will be on all reefs of the Mariana Islands, but preliminary information suggests widespread loss across the archipelago.

Smith and Marx (2016) presented results from dive surveys in waters surrounding the live-fire range off FDM that provide qualitative observations of water and sediment quality and noted the condition of the biological resources (see Section 3.1, Sediments and Water Quality). A moderate bleaching event was noted in 2007, and a barnacle infestation was noted in 2012 (Smith et al., 2013). The bleaching event was regional and extended from southern Japan through the Mariana Islands and south through waters surrounding Palau. Subsequent surveys observed soft and fire corals had recovered completely; 75 percent of the stony corals had recovered by 2008 and the coral fauna at FDM were observed to be healthy and robust (Smith & Marx, 2009, 2016). The nearshore physical environment and basic habitat types at FDM have remained unchanged over the 13 years of survey activity. These conclusions are based on (1) a limited amount of physical damage, (2) very low levels of partial mortality and disease

(less than 1 percent of all species observed), (3) absence of excessive mucus production, (4) good coral recruitment, (5) complete recovery by 2012 of the 2007 bleaching event, and (6) a limited number of macrobioeroders and an absence of invasive crown of thorns starfish (*Acanthaster planci*).

A recent coral reef survey by Carilli et al. (2018) at FDM verified Endangered Species Act (ESA)-listed corals, quantified coral reef health, and compiled observations of ordnance impacts. Percent coral cover from these surveys is presented in Figure 3.8-1.

The survey results indicated that ESA-listed corals are present, but rare in waters of <20 meters (m) depth around FDM. Additionally, 77.3 percent of corals observed exhibited some form of bleaching, likely caused by regionally anomalous warm sea surface temperatures. Carilli et al. (2018) found little evidence of adverse impacts on coral from Navy training and testing, including the use of high-explosive bombs, and scleractinian coral growth occurred on a substantial percentage of ordnance items expended.

Guam's coral reefs are moderately impacted, and overall conditions are fair (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2018b). Guam's reefs are struggling against threats such as pollution, overfishing, and climate change. Coral cover on Guam is generally similar to other southern Mariana Islands, but lower than the northern islands (Raymundo et al., 2016). Because coral distribution and coral cover on reefs is naturally patchy and heterogeneous, a single island-wide number is not a representative summary of the coral community. Long-term monitoring surveys conducted by the National Marine Fisheries Service's Pacific Assessment and Monitoring Program found approximately 10−15 percent coral cover overall, but the recent multi-year coral bleaching events have had variable consequences for the reef communities on Guam. For example, Raymundo et al. (2017) estimated a 53 percent decline in staghorn *Acropora* spp. on Guam. Of the 21 sites in the study, 6 are on Joint Region Marianas-administered submerged lands including 4 in Apra Harbor. The estimated mean mortality of staghorn *Acropora* spp. was 80 percent at Big Blue Shoals, 80 percent at Western Shoals, 30 percent at Dogleg, and 90 percent at Gab Gab (Raymundo et al., 2016). In the past several years, corals in Guam have been bleaching regularly each summer and recovery has been limited, leading to significant levels of coral mortality (Harvey, 2016; Raymundo et al., 2017).

Even though the new studies show variability in coral cover at FDM, including decreases in cover of some coral species off Guam, this information does not appreciably change the analysis presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.




Figure 3.8-1: Percent Coral Cover and Habitat Types Around Farallon de Medinilla

3.8.1.1 Sound Sensing and Production

New studies on particle motion detection by Roberts et al. (2016) reinforces the finding that mechanical receptors on some invertebrates are found on various body parts. In addition, these structures are connected to the central nervous system and can detect some movements or vibrations that are transmitted through substrate (Edmonds et al., 2016). However, the addition of this new information does not appreciably change the information or analysis presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

3.8.1.2 General Threats

The health and abundance of marine invertebrates and general threats to coral reef systems are well documented and discussed in detail in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. These threats include stress or damage by coastal development (Risk, 2009), impacts from inland pollution and erosion (Cortes and Risk 1985), overexploitation and destructive fishing practices (Jackson et al., 2001; Pandolfi et al., 2003), disease (Porter et al., 2001), predation, harvesting by the aquarium trade (Caribbean Fishery Management Council, 1994, 2016), anchors (Burke & Maidens, 2004), invasive species (Bryant et al., 1998; Galloway et al., 2009; National Marine Fisheries Service, 2010; Wilkinson, 2002), ship groundings (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2010), oil spills (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2010), marine debris (Lusher et al., 2016), disturbance by recreational activities at beaches, possibly human-made noise (Brainard et al., 2011; Vermeij et al., 2010), and global climate change, which includes impacts such as increases in sea surface temperature (van Hooidonk et al., 2016) and ocean acidification (Anthony, 2016; Hughes et al., 2003). Several studies suggest a direct link between declining water quality from increased runoff and sedimentation and coral reef health and bleaching (Ennis et al., 2016; Gailani et al., 2016; Nelson et al., 2016). Coral bleaching and bleaching of other invertebrates such as anemones, which occurs when symbiotic algae living in their tissues is expelled, is a stress response often tied to atypically high sea temperatures or changes in light availability but also can be attributed to nutrients, toxicants, and pathogens (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2017). For example, toxicants such as oxybenzone and zinc and titanium oxide found in sunscreens and personal beauty products have been shown to induce severe and rapid coral bleaching due to the alteration of the symbiosis between coral and zooxanthellae (Corinaldesi et al., 2018; Downs et al., 2016).

3.8.1.3 Endangered Species Act-Listed Species

In 2014, the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) published the Final Rule (79 Federal Register 53851) protecting 22 coral species under the Endangered Species Act (ESA), including the two corals (elkhorn and staghorn) listed as threatened in 2006. NMFS also determined that the remainder of the proposed species do not warrant listing as endangered or threatened species, and three proposed species (proposed October 2013) were not determinable under the ESA. Only three coral species (*Acropora globicep*s, *A. retusa*, and *Seriatopora aculeata*) are listed under the ESA and occur in the Study Area (Table 3.8-1). New information that supplements existing knowledge on disturbance responses and survivorship of some ESA-listed corals in the genus *Acropora* is detailed in Drury et al. (2017), and reactions of some coral species to thermal stress during a coral restoration project in the Caribbean is documented in (Ladd et al., 2017)). Since the species were listed, there are only a few locations where a federal ESA-listed coral species has been positively identified in the Study Area. Carilli et al. (2018) found ESA-listed corals are present, but rare in waters of <20 m depth around FDM. In April 2015, several colonies of ESA-listed *Acropora globiceps* were encountered during a 40-minute non-systematic survey at Spanish Steps in Outer Apra Harbor (Lybolt, 2015). The colonies were seen in very shallow water less than 3.3 feet (ft.) (1 m) deep. Spanish Steps is just inside the tip of the Orote Peninsula, which is a

dynamic location that is exposed to some effect from the ocean outside the harbor. The area has high coral coverage of commonly seen species from Apra Harbor. A second colony was recorded from the reef crest south of Dadi Beach in September 2016. The single colony was approximately 10–15 inches (25–30 centimeters) across and was observed during a non-systematic survey of the nearshore area at Dadi Beach (Moribe et al., 2016). Even though these observations represent new information on ESA-listed corals, it does not alter the analysis from the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Therefore, all other information presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS on corals that occur in the Study Area remains valid.

In 2017, NMFS determined that seven species of giant clam (*Hippopus, H. porcellanus, Tridacna costata, T. derasa, T. gigas, T. squamosa*, and *T. tevoroa*) were candidates that may warrant listing under the ESA (82 Federal Register 28946). A status review is currently being done for these species. Two species, *H. hippopus* and *T. gigas*, have historically been found in the Study Area, but are believed to have been locally extirpated (Meadows, 2016).

Table 3.8-1: Status of Endangered Species Act-Listed Species Within the Study Area

Species Name and Regulatory Status			Presence in Study Area	
Common Name	**Scientific Name**	**Endangered Species Act Status**	**Open Ocean/ Transit Corridor**	**Coastal Ocean**
Staghorn/Stony coral	*Acropora globiceps*	Threatened	No	Yes
Staghorn/Stony coral	*Acropora retusa*	Threatened	No	Yes
Club finger coral	*Seriatopora aculeata*	Threatened	No	Yes
Giant clam	*Hippopus*	Candidate	No	*
Giant clam	*Tridacna gigas*	Candidate	No	*

* May be locally extirpated

3.8.1.4 Taxonomic Groups

The information presented on invertebrate taxonomic groups in the Study Area, as listed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, has not changed and remains valid.

3.8.2 Environmental Consequences

The 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS considered training and testing activities proposed to occur in the Study Area that may have the potential to impact marine invertebrates. The stressors applicable to marine invertebrates in the Study Area are the same stressors in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and are listed below:

- Acoustic (sonar and other transducers, vessel noise, aircraft noise, weapons noise)
- Explosive (in-air explosions and in-water explosions)
- Energy (in-water electromagnetic devices and high-energy lasers)
- Physical disturbance and strike (vessels and in-water devices, military expended materials, seafloor devices, and personnel disturbance)
- Entanglement (wires and cables, decelerators/parachutes)
- Ingestion (military expended materials – munitions and military expended materials – other than munitions)
- Secondary stressors (impacts on habitat and impacts on prey availability)

This section evaluates how and to what degree potential impacts on marine invertebrates from stressors described in Section 3.0 (General Approach to Analysis) may have changed since the analysis presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS was completed. Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2 in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) list the proposed training and testing activities and include the number of times each activity would be conducted annually and the locations within the Study Area where the activity would typically occur under each alternative. The tables also present the same information for activities described in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS so that the proposed levels of training and testing under this SEIS/OEIS can be easily compared.

The Navy conducted a review of federal and state regulations and standards relevant to marine invertebrates and reviewed scientific literature published since 2015 for new information on marine invertebrates that could inform the analysis presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Since 2006, the Navy, non-Navy scientists, research groups, and universities have conducted scientific monitoring and research in and around ocean areas in the Pacific where the Navy has been and proposes to continue training and testing. The analysis provided in this SEIS/OEIS will be the third time Navy training and testing activities at sea have been comprehensively analyzed in the Study Area. Data collected from the Navy has increased the knowledge of corals in the Study Area. For example, Smith and Marx (2016) conducted a coral reef dive survey on Farallon de Medinilla that used new methods of georeferencing the locations of sighted coral, and documented the existence of a few specimens of two ESA-listed species (*Acropora globiceps* and *Pavona diffluens*), including one species (*Pavona diffluens*) that had not previously been positively identified in the Mariana archipelago. Carilli et al. (2018) found six colonies of possible *Pavona diffluens* (four off the west shoreline, and two off the east shoreline on the northern portion of FDM). The NMFS Final Rule that included the listing of *Pavona diffluens* (79 FR 53851) only included Red Sea/Indian Ocean populations because of taxonomic uncertainty that Pacific populations may be a different species. Because the listing of *Pavona diffluens* only covers colonies outside of the Study Area, this species is not included in the specific analysis of ESA-listed species. Habitat maps were also developed from previous surveys and were refined, confirming that only a small subportion of the nearshore waters were characterized as high-quality coral reef. The analysis presented in this section also considers standard operating procedures, which are discussed in Section 2.3.3 (Standard Operating Procedures) of this Final SEIS/OEIS, and mitigation measures that are described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation). The Navy would implement these measures to avoid or reduce impacts on seafloor resources (including shallow-water coral reefs, live hard bottom, artificial reefs, and shipwrecks) from explosives during applicable activities, as described in Section 5.4.1 (Mitigation Areas for Seafloor Resources).

3.8.2.1 Acoustic Stressors

Little information is available on the potential impacts on marine invertebrates from exposure to sonar and other sound-producing activities. Most studies have focused on a few species (squid or crustaceans) and the consequences of exposures to broadband impulsive air guns typically used for seismic exploration, rather than on sonar or explosions. While the number of training and testing events would change under this SEIS/OEIS, the analysis presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, Section 3.8.3.1 (Acoustic Stressors), remains applicable. The changes in training and testing activities are not substantial and would not result in an overall change to existing environmental conditions or an increase in the level or intensity of acoustic stressors within the Study Area.

As stated in the 2015 analysis, marine invertebrates are generally not sensitive to most sounds that would result from the proposed activities. New information presented on particle motion detection by

Roberts et al. (2016) found mechanical receptors on some invertebrates may be connected to the central nervous system and can detect some movements or vibrations that are transmitted through substrate. Even though some invertebrates may be able to sense or detect particle motion, they would not be impacted by acoustic sources used during training and testing activities, and a recent literature review on assessing impacts of underwater noise on marine fishes and invertebrates (Hawkins & Popper 2017) does not change this conclusion. Therefore, the analysis presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, Section 3.8.3.1 (Acoustic Stressors), remains valid and applicable.

3.8.2.1.1 Impacts from Acoustic Stressors Under Alternative 1

Under Alternative 1, there would be an overall decrease in the number of sonar hours used in the Study Area during training and testing activities compared to the number analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (Table 3.0-2 and Figure 2.4-1). Therefore, the analysis in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS remains valid. Decreases in the number of training and testing events would potentially decrease the level of acoustic stressors in the Study Area. Decreases in sonar hours shown in Table 3.0-2 for activities proposed under Alternative 1 would have no appreciable change on the impact analysis or conclusions for acoustic stressors presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

As described in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, marine invertebrates throughout the Study Area may be exposed to non-impulsive sounds generated by low-, mid-, and high-frequency sonar and other acoustic sources, vessel noise, and aircraft noise during training and testing activities. Acoustic impacts on marine invertebrates under Alternative 1 would be inconsequential because most marine invertebrates would not be close enough to intense sound sources. Any marine invertebrate capable of sensing sound may alter its behavior and become disoriented due to masking of relevant environmental sounds if exposed to non-impulsive sound, although it is unknown if responses to non-impulsive sounds occur. Continuous noise, such as from vessels, may also contribute to masking of relevant environmental sounds. Because the distance over which most marine invertebrates are expected to detect any sounds is limited and vessels would be in transit, any sound exposures with the potential to cause masking or behavioral responses would last only minutes. Furthermore, invertebrate species have their best sensitivity to sound below 1 kilohertz and would not be capable of detecting the majority of sonars and other acoustic sources used in the Study Area. Therefore, non-impulsive sounds associated with Alternative 1 are not expected to impact the majority of marine invertebrates or cause more than a short-term behavioral disturbance (e.g., change in orientation or swim speeds) to those marine invertebrates capable of detecting nearby sound. No population-level impacts on the survival, growth, recruitment, or reproduction of marine invertebrate populations are expected under Alternative 1.

Pursuant to the ESA, the use of sonar and other transducers associated with training and testing activities, as described under Alternative 1, would have no effect on ESA-listed coral species.

3.8.2.1.2 Impacts from Acoustic Stressors Under Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)

Under Alternative 2, the number of sonar hours used during training and testing activities would decrease compared to the numbers analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and increase compared to Alternative 1 of this SEIS/OEIS (Table 3.0-2 and Figure 2.4-1). Under Alternative 2, increases in the number of sonar hours would have no appreciable change on the impact conclusions for acoustic stressors as summarized above under Alternative 1 and as presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Therefore, acoustic impacts on marine invertebrates under Alternative 2 would be negligible.

Pursuant to the ESA, the use of sonar and other transducers associated with training and testing activities, as described under Alternative 2, would have no effect on ESA-listed coral species. The Navy is consulting with NMFS as required by Section 7(a)(2) of the ESA.

3.8.2.1.3 Impacts from Acoustic Stressors Under the No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, proposed training and testing activities would not occur. Other military activities not associated with this Proposed Action would continue to occur. Acoustic stressors as listed above would not be introduced into the marine environment. Therefore, existing environmental conditions would either remain unchanged or would improve slightly after cessation of ongoing training and testing activities.

Discontinuing the training and testing activities would result in fewer acoustic stressors within the marine environment where training and testing activities have historically been conducted. Therefore, discontinuing training and testing activities under the No Action Alternative would lessen the potential for acoustic impacts on individual invertebrates, but would not measurably improve the status of invertebrate populations or subpopulations.

3.8.2.2 Explosive Stressors

Explosives introduce loud, impulse, broadband sounds into the marine environment. Impulse sources are characterized by rapid pressure rise times and high peak pressures. Explosions produce high-pressure shock waves that could cause injury or physical disturbance due to rapid pressure changes. Impulse sounds are usually brief, but the associated rapid pressure changes can injure or startle marine invertebrates. While the number of training and testing events would change under this SEIS/OEIS, the analysis presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, Section 3.8.3.1 (Acoustic Stressors), remains applicable. The changes in training and testing activities are not substantial and would not result in an overall change to existing environmental conditions or an increase in the level or intensity of explosive stressors within the Study Area.

As stated above, in the 2015 analysis, and results reported in Roberts et al. (2016) and Edmonds et al. (2016), marine invertebrates are generally not sensitive to most sounds that would result from the proposed activities, but likely have mechanical receptors that may be connected to the central nervous system that can detect some movements or vibrations that are transmitted through substrate. Given that the activities would also be conducted at similar levels as described in the 2015 analysis, there would be no change to the conclusions. Therefore, the analysis presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, Section 3.8.3.1 (Acoustic Stressors), remains valid.

Although the vast majority of explosions occur at distances greater than 3 nautical miles from shore (where water depths are greater than the depths where shallow-water coral species occur), some explosions may occur close to marine invertebrates that would kill or injure those invertebrates. Explosions near the seafloor and very large explosions in the water column may impact shallow-water corals of any life stage, hard-bottom habitat and associated marine invertebrates, and deep-water corals. Effects could include physical disturbance, fragmentation, or mortality to sessile organisms and pelagic larvae. Energy from an explosion at the surface would dissipate below detectable levels before reaching the seafloor and would not injure or otherwise impact deep-water, benthic marine invertebrates.

3.8.2.2.1 Impacts from Explosive Stressors Under Alternative 1

Under Alternative 1, there would be an overall decrease in the number of explosive ordnance used in the Study Area during training and testing activities compared to the number analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (Table 3.0-7 and Figure 2.4-2). Under Alternative 1, underwater detonations would increase for underwater demolition qualification/certification (Table 2.5-1). However, these activities would continue to occur in the same areas at the Agat Bay site, Piti, and Outer Apra Harbor sites, and would have no appreciable change in the impact analysis or conclusions for explosive stressors as presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Decreases in activities proposed under Alternative 1 would have no appreciable change on the impact analysis or conclusions for explosive stressors presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

Explosions in the water or near the water surface would injure invertebrates at the surface but would not injure benthic marine invertebrates, including those living in hydrothermal vents, because of the great water depth in areas where most explosive will be used. As described above, explosions at or near the surface would likely kill or injure nearby pelagic marine invertebrates. Effects could include physical disturbance, fragmentation, or mortality.

As described above, the vast majority of explosive detonations during training and testing activities would occur in waters greater than 3 nautical miles from shore, which are not known to support ESA-listed coral species. In addition, energy from an explosion at the surface would dissipate below detectable levels before reaching the seafloor and would not injure or otherwise impact deep-water, benthic marine invertebrates. However, various developmental stages such as eggs, sperm, early embryonic stages, and planula larvae of corals, as well as adults, could be impacted in areas overlapping with other training and testing activities using explosives. Consequences of exposure to an explosive shock wave could include breakage, injury, or mortality. Many corals and hard-bottom invertebrates are sessile, fragile, and particularly vulnerable. Because exposures to explosive shock waves are brief, limited in number, and spread over a large area, no long-term impacts are expected. Explosives may impact individual marine invertebrates and groups of marine invertebrates, but they are unlikely to impact populations or subpopulations. Therefore, impacts of explosives on marine invertebrates under Alternative 1 would be negligible.

As discussed in Section 5.4.1 (Mitigation Areas for Seafloor Resources), the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce impacts from explosives on seafloor resources in mitigation areas throughout the Study Area. For example, the Navy will not conduct explosive mine countermeasure and neutralization activities within a specified distance of shallow-water coral reefs, live hard bottom, artificial reefs, and shipwrecks. The mitigation will consequently also help avoid or reduce potential impacts on invertebrates that inhabit these areas. There is also procedural mitigation that affects "jellyfish aggregations," specifically for explosive torpedoes and sinking exercises (see Section 5.3.3, Explosive Stressors). Additionally, the Navy will require Lookouts to observe the water's surface before and during sinking exercises and the use of explosive torpedoes to avoid or reduce jellyfish aggregations.

Pursuant to the ESA, the use of explosives associated with training and testing activities, as described under Alternative 1, may affect ESA-listed coral species.

3.8.2.2.2 Impacts from Explosive Stressors Under Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)

Under Alternative 2, the number of explosives used during training and testing activities would decrease compared to the numbers analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and increase compared to Alternative 1 (Table 3.0-7 and Figure 2.4-2). Under Alternative 2, increases in the number of underwater

explosives would have no appreciable change on the impact conclusions for explosive stressors as summarized above under Alternative 1 and as presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

Therefore, impacts on marine invertebrates under Alternative 2 from explosives would be negligible.

Pursuant to the ESA, the use of explosives associated with training and testing activities, as described under Alternative 2, may affect ESA-listed coral species. The Navy is consulting with NMFS as required by Section 7(a)(2) of the ESA.

3.8.2.2.3 Impacts from Explosive Stressors Under the No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, proposed training and testing activities would not occur. Other military activities not associated with this Proposed Action would continue to occur. Explosive stressors as listed above would not be introduced into the marine environment. Therefore, existing environmental conditions would either remain unchanged or would improve slightly after cessation of ongoing training and testing activities.

Discontinuing the training and testing activities would result in fewer explosive stressors within the marine environment where training and testing activities have historically been conducted. Therefore, discontinuing training and testing activities under the No Action Alternative would lessen the potential for explosive impacts on individual invertebrates, but would not measurably improve the status of invertebrate populations or subpopulations.

3.8.2.3 Energy Stressors

The energy stressors that may impact marine invertebrates include in-water electromagnetic devices and high energy lasers. The in-water electromagnetic devices stressor remains the same as analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS; high-energy lasers is a new stressor analyzed in this SEIS/OEIS. While the number of training and testing events would change under this SEIS/OEIS, the analysis presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS for in-water electromagnetic devices remains valid and an analysis of potential impacts from high-energy laser use is presented below.

As discussed in Section 3.0.5.3.1.2 (High-Energy Lasers), high-energy lasers are designed to disable surface targets, rendering them immobile. The primary concern is the potential for an invertebrate to be struck with the laser beam at or near the water's surface, where extended exposure could result in injury or death.

Little information exists about marine invertebrates' susceptibility to electromagnetic fields. Most corals are thought to use water temperature, day length, lunar cycles, and tidal fluctuations as cues for spawning. Magnetic fields are not known to influence coral spawning or larval settlement. However, existing information suggests sensitivity to electric and magnetic fields in at least three marine invertebrate phyla: Mollusca, Arthropoda, and Echinodermata (Lohmann et al., 1995; Lohmann & Lohmann, 2006; Normandeau et al., 2011).

High-energy lasers were not proposed for use in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Section 3.0.4.3.2.2 (High-Energy Lasers), high-energy laser weapons testing involves the use of directed energy as a weapon against small surface vessels and airborne targets. These weapons systems are deployed from a surface ship to create small but critical failures in potential targets and used at short ranges from the target.

Marine invertebrates could be exposed to a laser only if the beam missed the target. Should the laser strike the sea surface, individual invertebrates at or near the surface, such as jellyfish, floating eggs, and

larvae could potentially be exposed. The potential for exposure to a high-energy laser beam decreases rapidly as water depth increases and varies with time of day, as many zooplankton species migrate away from the surface during the day. Most marine invertebrates, including those that live in hydrothermal vents, are not susceptible to laser exposure because they occur beneath the sea surface.

3.8.2.3.1 Impacts from In-Water Electromagnetic Devices Under Alternative 1

Under Alternative 1, the number of proposed training and testing activities involving the use of in-water electromagnetic devices would decrease in comparison to the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (Table 3.0-9). The activities would occur in the same locations and in a similar manner as were analyzed previously.

Therefore, impacts on marine invertebrates under Alternative 1 from in-water electromagnetic devices would be negligible.

Pursuant to the ESA, the use of in-water electromagnetic devices associated with training and testing activities, as described under Alternative 1, would have no effect on ESA-listed coral species.

3.8.2.3.2 Impacts from In-Water Electromagnetic Devices Under Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)

Under Alternative 2, the number of proposed training and testing activities involving the use of in-water electromagnetic devices would decrease in comparison to the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (Table 3.0-9). The activities would occur in the same locations and in a similar manner as were analyzed previously and above for Alternative 1.

Therefore, impacts on marine invertebrates under Alternative 2 from in-water electromagnetic devices would be negligible.

Pursuant to the ESA, the use of in-water electromagnetic devices associated with training and testing activities, as described under Alternative 2, would have no effect on ESA-listed coral species. The Navy is consulting with NMFS as required by Section 7(a)(2) of the ESA.

3.8.2.3.3 Impacts from In-Water Electromagnetic Devices Under the No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, proposed training and testing activities would not occur. Other military activities not associated with this Proposed Action would continue to occur. Energy stressors as listed above would not be introduced into the marine environment. Therefore, existing environmental conditions would either remain unchanged or would improve slightly after cessation of ongoing training and testing activities.

Discontinuing the training and testing activities would result in fewer in-water electromagnetic stressors within the marine environment where training and testing activities have historically been conducted. Therefore, discontinuing training and testing activities under the No Action Alternative would lessen the potential for energy impacts on individual invertebrates, but would not measurably improve the status of invertebrate populations or subpopulations.

3.8.2.3.4 Impacts from High-Energy Lasers Under Alternative 1

No high-energy lasers are proposed for training activities under Alternative 1. Under Alternative 1, the number of proposed testing events involving the use of high-energy lasers would be 54 (Table 3.0-10); this is a new substressor that was not analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

The primary concern for high-energy weapons testing is the potential for a marine invertebrate to be struck by a high-energy laser beam at or near the water's surface, which could result in injury or death, resulting from traumatic burns from the beam. Invertebrates that do not occur at or near the sea

surface would not be exposed due to the attenuation of laser energy with depth. Surface invertebrates such as squid, jellyfish, and zooplankton (which may include invertebrate larvae) exposed to high-energy lasers could be injured or killed, but the probability is low based on the relatively low number of events, very localized potential impact area of the laser beam, and the temporary duration of potential impact (seconds). Activities involving high-energy lasers are not expected to yield any behavioral changes or lasting effects on the survival, growth, recruitment, or reproduction of invertebrate species at the population level because of the relatively small number of individuals that could be impacted. The impact of high-energy lasers on marine invertebrates, including those that live in hydrothermal vents, would be inconsequential because (1) it is highly unlikely that a high-energy laser would miss its target, (2) it is highly unlikely that the laser would miss in such a way that the laser beam would strike a marine invertebrate, and (3) it is highly unlikely that the marine invertebrate would be at or near the surface, just as two equally unlikely events take place.

Pursuant to the ESA, the use of high-energy lasers associated with testing activities, as described under Alternative 1, would have no effect on ESA-listed coral species.

3.8.2.3.5 Impacts from High-Energy Lasers Under Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)

As shown in Table 3.0-10, 60 testing events involving the use of high-energy lasers are proposed under Alternative 2, which is a slight increase from the number proposed under Alternative 1. Therefore, the impacts would be the same as described under Alternative 1.

Pursuant to the ESA, the use of high-energy lasers associated with testing activities, as described under Alternative 2, would have no effect on ESA-listed coral species. The Navy is consulting with NMFS as required by Section 7(a)(2) of the ESA.

3.8.2.3.6 Impacts from High-Energy Lasers Under the No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, proposed training and testing activities would not occur. Other military activities not associated with this Proposed Action would continue to occur. Energy stressors as listed above would not be introduced into the marine environment. Therefore, existing environmental conditions would either remain unchanged or would improve slightly after cessation of ongoing training and testing activities.

Discontinuing the training and testing activities would result in fewer high-energy laser stressors within the marine environment where training and testing activities have historically been conducted. Therefore, discontinuing training and testing activities under the No Action Alternative would lessen the potential for energy impacts on individual invertebrates, but would not measurably improve the status of invertebrate populations or subpopulations.

3.8.2.4 Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors

The physical disturbance and strike stressors that may impact marine invertebrates include (1) vessels and in-water devices, (2) military expended materials, (3) seafloor devices, and (4) personnel disturbance. While the number of training and testing events would change under this SEIS/OEIS, the analysis presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, Section 3.8.3.3 (Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors) remains valid. The changes in training and testing activities are not substantial and would not result in an overall change to existing environmental conditions or an increase in the level or intensity of physical disturbance and strike stressors within the Study Area.

Most marine invertebrate populations, including those that live in hydrothermal vents, extend across wide areas containing hundreds or thousands of discrete patches of suitable habitat. Sessile (attached to the seafloor or other surface) invertebrate populations may be maintained by complex currents that carry adults and young from place to place. Such widespread populations are difficult to evaluate in terms of Navy training and testing activities that occur intermittently and in relatively small patches in the Study Area. Even invertebrate populations that are somewhat restricted in range, such as coral reefs, cover enormous areas (see Section 3.3, Marine Habitats, for quantitative assessments). In this context, a physical strike or disturbance would impact individual organisms directly or indirectly.

As stated in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, activities involving vessels and in-water devices are not intended to contact the seafloor. This would include amphibious and expeditionary events such as Amphibious Assaults, Amphibious Raids, Personnel Insertion/Extraction, and Underwater Surveys, which are proposed to continue in this SEIS/OEIS. These activities could occur at beaches at Babui, Chulu, and Dankulo on Tinian and could also occur at Dry Dock Island in Apra Harbor at Dadi Beach on Guam. During these activities, combat swimmers and other military personnel may be required to walk through nearshore areas. For example, as the boat approaches a beach, military personnel may be required to exit the boat, stand up, and walk through the shallow water habitats, which could disturb or injure some marine invertebrates. Benthic invertebrates of the reef crest or flat, such as crabs, clams, and polychaete worms, within the disturbed area could be displaced, injured, or killed during amphibious operations. As is current practice, coral and other hard bottom habitats would continue to be avoided to the greatest extent practical under the Proposed Action (see Section 2.3.3, Standard Operating Procedures and Chapter 5, Mitigation). However, combat swimmers and Marines may be required to walk through nearshore areas during these activities. For example, as the boat approaches a beach, Marines may be required to exit the boat, stand up, and walk through the shallow water habitats.

As discussed in Section 5.4.1 (Mitigation Areas for Seafloor Resources), the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce impacts from precision anchoring and military expended materials on seafloor resources in mitigation areas throughout the Study Area. For example, the Navy will not conduct explosive mine countermeasure and neutralization activities within a specified distance of shallow-water coral reefs, live hard bottom, artificial reefs, and shipwrecks (except at designated nearshore training areas, where these resources will be avoided to the maximum extent practicable). The mitigation will consequently also help avoid or reduce potential impacts on invertebrates that inhabit these areas.

3.8.2.4.1 Impacts from Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors Under Alternative 1

Under Alternative 1, the combined number of proposed training and testing activities involving vessels and in-water devices (Table 3.0-12 and Table 3.0-13) would decrease slightly from those presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Military expended materials and munitions (Tables 3.0-14 through 3.0-17) combined would increase, and seafloor devices (Table 3.0-19) would decrease slightly from the number in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, as well as the overall reduction of the footprint of expended materials. Increases in some physical disturbance and strike stressors, such as military expended materials, could increase the level of impact on some marine invertebrates, including those that live in hydrothermal vents. However, these changes do not appreciably change the analysis or impact conclusions presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS because the impact analysis was based on the probability of an impact on a resource.

As stated in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, the impact of physical disturbance and strike stressors on marine invertebrates is likely to cause injury or mortality to individuals, such as corals on nearshore

reefs, but impacts on populations, including those that live in hydrothermal vents, would be negligible because (1) the area exposed to the stressor is extremely small (localized) relative to most marine invertebrates' ranges, and (2) the activities are dispersed such that few individuals could conceivably be exposed to more than one event. Activities involving vessel and in-water devices, military expended material, seafloor devices, and personnel disturbance are not expected to yield any behavioral changes or lasting effects on the survival, growth, recruitment, or reproduction of invertebrate species at the population level. However, the combined consequences of all physical disturbance and strike stressors could degrade habitat quality at some locations. As stated above, combat swimmers and Marines may be required to walk through nearshore areas and reefs during these activities, potentially causing damage to coral species. As stated in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and above, these activities could cause injury or mortality to individuals, but impacts on marine invertebrate populations, including ESA-listed corals, are unlikely.

Therefore, under Alternative 1, impacts on marine invertebrates from the use of vessels and in-water devices, military expended materials, and seafloor devices would be negligible.

Pursuant to the ESA, the use of vessels and in-water devices, military expended materials, and seafloor devices during training and testing activities, as described under Alternative 1, may affect ESA-listed coral species.

3.8.2.4.2 Impacts from Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors Under Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)

Under Alternative 2, the combined number of proposed training and testing activities involving vessels and in-water devices would decrease slightly from those presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (Table 3.0-12 and Table 3.0-13). Military expended materials (Tables 3.0-14 through 3.0-17) combined would increase, and seafloor devices (Table 3.0-19) would decrease slightly from the numbers in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Increases in some physical disturbance and strike stressors such as military expended materials could increase the impact risk on marine invertebrates, but do not appreciably change the analysis or impact conclusions presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Impacts on marine invertebrates would be inconsequential for the same reasons detailed above and there would be no appreciable change in the impact conclusions for physical disturbance and strike stressors, as presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and summarized above under Alternative 1.

Therefore, under Alternative 2, impacts on marine invertebrates from the use of vessels and in-water devices, military expended materials, and seafloor devices would be negligible.

Pursuant to the ESA, the use of vessels and in-water devices, military expended materials, and seafloor devices during training and testing activities, as described under Alternative 2, may affect ESA-listed coral species. The Navy is consulting with NMFS as required by Section 7(a)(2) of the ESA.

3.8.2.4.3 Impacts from Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors Under the No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, proposed training and testing activities would not occur. Other military activities not associated with this Proposed Action would continue to occur. Physical disturbance and strike stressors as listed above would not be introduced into the marine environment. Therefore, existing environmental conditions would either remain unchanged or would improve slightly after cessation of ongoing training and testing activities.

Discontinuing the training and testing activities would result in fewer physical disturbance and strike stressors within the marine environment where Navy activities have historically been conducted. Therefore, discontinuing training and testing activities under the No Action Alternative would lessen the

potential for physical disturbance and strike impacts on individual invertebrates, but would not measurably improve the status of invertebrate populations or subpopulations.

3.8.2.5 Entanglement Stressors

Entanglement stressors that may impact marine invertebrates include (1) fiber optic cables and guidance wires, and (2) decelerators/parachutes. While the number of training and testing events would change under this supplement, the analysis presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, Section 3.8.3.4 (Entanglement Stressors) remains valid.

3.8.2.5.1 Impacts from Entanglement Stressors Under Alternative 1

Under Alternative 1, the number of fiber optic cables (Table 3.0-22), guidance wires (Table 3.0-22), and decelerators/parachutes (Table 3.0-24) that would be expended during training and testing activities would decrease compared to the number of activities proposed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Decreases in the number of training and testing events would potentially decrease the level of entanglement stressors in the Study Area.

As stated in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, the impact of fiber optic cables, guidance wires, and decelerators/parachutes on marine invertebrates, including those that live in hydrothermal vents, is not likely to cause injury or mortality to individuals, and impacts would be negligible because (1) the area exposed to the stressor is extremely small (localized) relative to most marine invertebrates' ranges, (2) the activities are dispersed such that few individuals could conceivably be exposed to more than one activity, and (3) marine invertebrates are not particularly susceptible to entanglement stressors. Activities involving cables, guidance wires, and decelerators/parachutes are not expected to yield any behavioral changes or lasting impacts on the survival, growth, recruitment, or reproduction of invertebrate species at individual or population levels.

Therefore, impacts on marine invertebrates from entanglement stressors such as wires and cables and decelerators/parachutes under Alternative 1 would be negligible.

Pursuant to the ESA, the use of fiber optic cables and guidance wires, and decelerators/parachutes *during training and testing activities, as described under Alternative 1, may affect ESA-listed coral species.*

3.8.2.5.2 Impacts from Entanglement Stressors Under Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)

Under Alternative 2, the number of fiber optic cables (Table 3.0-22) decrease, guidance wires (Table 3.0-22) increase, and decelerators/parachutes (Table 3.0-24) decrease compared to the number of activities proposed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and would increase or stay the same compared to Alternative 1. However, as stated above for Alternative 1, training and testing activities involving fiber optic cables, guidance wires, and decelerators/parachutes are not expected to yield any behavioral changes or lasting impacts on the survival, growth, recruitment, or reproduction of invertebrate species at individual or population levels for the same reasons detailed above for Alternative 1.

Therefore, impacts on marine invertebrates from entanglement stressors such as wires and cables and decelerators/parachutes under Alternative 2 would be negligible.

Pursuant to the ESA, the use of fiber optic cables and guidance wires, and decelerators/parachutes *during training and testing activities, as described under Alternative 2, may affect ESA-listed coral species. The Navy is consulting with NMFS as required by Section 7(a)(2) of the ESA.*

3.8.2.5.3 Impacts from Entanglement Stressors Under the No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, proposed training and testing activities would not occur. Other military activities not associated with this Proposed Action would continue to occur. Entanglement stressors as listed above would not be introduced into the marine environment. Therefore, existing environmental conditions would either remain unchanged or would improve slightly after cessation of ongoing training and testing activities.

Discontinuing the training and testing activities would result in fewer entanglement stressors within the marine environment where training and testing activities have historically been conducted. Therefore, discontinuing training and testing activities under the No Action Alternative would lessen the potential for entanglement impacts on individual invertebrates, but would not measurably improve the status of invertebrate populations or subpopulations.

3.8.2.6 Ingestion Stressors

Types of materials that could become ingestion stressors during training and testing activities in the Study Area include non-explosive practice munitions (small- and medium-caliber), fragments from explosives, fragments from targets, chaff, flare casings (including plastic end caps and pistons), and decelerators/parachutes. While the number of training and testing events would change under this SEIS/OEIS, the analysis presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, Section 3.8.3.5 (Ingestion Stressors) remains valid.

Expended materials could be ingested by marine invertebrates at the surface, in the water column, or on the seafloor, depending on the size and buoyancy of the expended object and the feeding behavior of the animal. Floating material is more likely to be eaten by animals that feed at or near the water surface, while materials that sink to the seafloor present a higher risk to both filter-feeding sessile (i.e., corals) and bottom-feeding animals (seastars and sea cucumbers). Marine invertebrates are universally present in the water and the seafloor, with many individuals being smaller than a few millimeters (e.g., zooplankton, most roundworms, and most arthropods). Most military expended materials and fragments of military expended materials are too large to be ingested by marine invertebrates. The potential for marine invertebrates to encounter fragments of ingestible size increases as the military expended materials degrade into smaller fragments.

3.8.2.6.1 Impacts from Ingestion Stressors Under Alternative 1

Under Alternative 1, the combined number of ingestion stressors would increase compared to the number in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (see Tables 3.0-14 through 3.0-17, Table 3.0-25, and Table 3.0-26). However, increases in the number of ingestion stressors do not appreciably change the impact analysis or conclusions presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

As stated in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, most military expended materials and fragments of military expended materials are too large to be ingested by marine invertebrates, including those that live in hydrothermal vents. The potential for marine invertebrates to encounter fragments of ingestible size increases as the military expended materials degrade into smaller fragments. The increase in military expended materials, primarily from small-caliber projectiles, would not represent an ingestion risk for marine invertebrates. Only a small fraction of military expended materials would be of ingestible size, or become ingestible after degradation; while those may impact individual marine invertebrates, such as ESA-listed corals, they are unlikely to impact populations. Therefore, impacts on marine invertebrates from ingestion of military expended materials under Alternative 1 would be negligible.

Pursuant to the ESA, the use of military expended materials of ingestible size during training and testing activities, as described under Alternative 1, may affect ESA-listed coral species.

3.8.2.6.2 Impacts from Ingestion Stressors Under Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)

Under Alternative 2, the combined number of ingestion stressors would increase compared to the number in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and as compared to Alternative 1 (see Tables 3.0-14 through 3.0-17, Table 3.0-25, and Table 3.0-26). However, these increases do not appreciably change the impact analysis or conclusions presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and those summarized above under Alternative 1.

Therefore, impacts on marine invertebrates from ingestion of military expended materials under Alternative 2 would be negligible.

Pursuant to the ESA, the use of military expended materials of ingestible size during training and testing activities, as described under Alternative 2, may affect ESA-listed coral species. The Navy is consulting with NMFS as required by Section 7(a)(2) of the ESA.

3.8.2.6.3 Impacts from Ingestion Stressors Under the No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, proposed training and testing activities would not occur. Other military activities not associated with this Proposed Action would continue to occur. Ingestion stressors as listed above would not be introduced into the marine environment. Therefore, existing environmental conditions would either remain unchanged or would improve slightly after cessation of ongoing training and testing activities.

Discontinuing the training and testing activities would result in fewer ingestion stressors within the marine environment where training and testing activities have historically been conducted. Therefore, discontinuing training and testing activities under the No Action Alternative would lessen the potential for ingestion impacts on individual invertebrates, but would not measurably improve the status of invertebrate populations or subpopulations.

3.8.2.7 Secondary Stressors

Potential impacts on marine invertebrates exposed to stressors could occur indirectly through sediments and water quality. Stressors from Navy training and testing activities could pose secondary or indirect impacts on marine invertebrates via habitat, sediment, or water quality. Components of these stressors that could pose indirect impacts include (1) explosives and byproducts; (2) metals; (3) chemicals; and (4) other materials such as targets, chaff, and plastics.

While the number of training and testing events would change under this SEIS/OEIS, the analysis presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, Section 3.8.3.6 (Secondary Stressors) remains valid. As stated in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, indirect impacts of explosives and unexploded ordnance on marine invertebrates via water are likely to be negligible and not detectable for two reasons. First, most explosives and explosive degradation products have very low solubility in sea water. This means that dissolution occurs extremely slowly, and harmful concentrations of explosives and degradation are not likely to accumulate except within confined spaces. Second, a low concentration of byproducts, slowly delivered into the water column, is readily diluted to non-harmful concentrations. Filter feeders in the immediate vicinity of degrading explosives may be more susceptible to bioaccumulation of chemical byproducts. While marine invertebrates may be adversely impacted by the indirect effects of degrading explosives via water (Rosen & Lotufo, 2007; 2010), this is extremely unlikely in realistic scenarios.

Impacts on marine invertebrates, including zooplankton, eggs, and larvae, are likely within a very small radius of the ordnance (1–6 ft. [0.3–1.8 m]). These impacts may continue as the ordnance degrades over months to decades. Because most ordnance is deployed as projectiles, multiple unexploded or low-order detonations would accumulate on spatial scales of 1 to 6 ft. (0.3 to 1.8 m.); therefore, potential impacts are likely to remain local and widely separated. Given these conditions, the possibility of population-level impacts on marine invertebrates is negligible. However, if the sites of the depositions are the same over time, this could alter the benthic composition, affect bioaccumulation, and impact local invertebrate communities.

Erosion as a result of training activities at FDM may contribute to deposition of soils into the nearshore areas of FDM, causing increased turbidity. However, cliff face vertical targets used as part of Naval surface fire support training have been moved to reduce erosion and potential impacts on the cliff face, as well as biological resources. Turbidity can impact corals and invertebrate communities on hard-bottom areas by reducing the amount of light that reaches these organisms and by clogging siphons for filter-feeding organisms. Reef-building corals are sensitive to water clarity because they host symbiotic algae that require sunlight to live. Encrusting organisms residing on hard bottom can be impacted by persistent silting from increased turbidity. However, the impacts of explosive byproducts on sediment and water quality would be indirect, short term, local, and negative. Explosive ordnance could loosen soil on FDM, and runoff from surface drainage areas containing soil and explosive byproducts could subsequently enter nearshore waters. Impacts on marine invertebrates from erosion or sedimentation could occur.

As stated in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, concentrations of metals in water are extremely unlikely to be high enough to cause injury or mortality to marine invertebrates; therefore, indirect impacts of metals via water are likely to be negligible and not detectable. Given these conditions, the possibility of population-level impacts on marine invertebrates is likely to be negligible and not detectable. In addition, concentrations of chemicals in sediment and water are not likely to cause injury or mortality to marine invertebrates; therefore, indirect impacts of chemicals via sediment and water are likely to be negligible and not detectable. Population-level impacts on marine invertebrates would be negligible and not detectable.

In addition, as stated in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, plastics could impact marine invertebrates via sediment. Harmful chemicals in plastics interfere with metabolic and endocrine processes in many plants and animals (Derraik, 2002). Potentially harmful chemicals in plastics are not readily adsorbed to marine sediments; instead, marine invertebrates are most at risk via ingestion or bioaccumulation. Because plastics retain many of their chemical properties as they are physically degraded into microplastic particles (Singh & Sharma, 2008), the exposure risks to marine invertebrates are dispersed over time. Marine invertebrates could be indirectly impacted by chemicals from plastics but, absent bioaccumulation, these impacts would be limited to direct contact with the material because relatively few military expended materials contain plastics. Therefore, population-level impacts on marine invertebrates attributable to Navy-expended materials are likely to be negligible and not detectable.

3.8.3 Public Comments

The public raised a number of issues during the scoping period in regard to marine invertebrates. The issues are summarized in the list below. Comments received from the public during the Draft SEIS/OEIS commenting period related to marine invertebrates are addressed in Appendix K (Public Comment Responses).

- **Sonar disrupting larval recruitment –** As described in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, corals throughout the Study Area may be exposed to non-impulse sounds generated by sonar and other transducers, vessels, and aircraft during training and testing activities. However, the vast majority of underwater acoustic sources would not be used in the shallow waters (less than 100 ft. [30 m.]) where the majority of coral species are known to exist. Sound from training and testing activities is intermittent or transient, or both, and would not occur close enough to reefs to interfere with larval perception of reef noise. The Navy also looked at impacts on the individual polyp or medusae from the use of sonar in relation to the overall number, or population, of coral medusae or polyps. In addition, as described above in Section 3.8.1.1 (Sound Sensing and Production), invertebrate species detect sounds through particle motion, which diminishes rapidly from the sound source. Most activities using sonar or other transducers would be conducted in deep-water, offshore areas of the Study Area and would not affect invertebrates. Furthermore, invertebrate species have their best hearing sensitivity below 1 kHz and would not be capable of detecting the majority of sonars and other transducers used in the Study Area.
- **Impacts from precision anchoring activities –** As described in Section 3.7.3.2.3 (Impacts from Seafloor Devices) of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, precision anchoring would typically occur within predetermined shallow water anchorage locations near ports where the seafloor consists of unconsolidated sediments and lacks marine vegetation. These areas do not contain coral reefs. Additional mitigation measures for shallow water coral reefs used to avoid or reduce impacts from precision anchoring are presented in Chapter 5 (Mitigation).
- **Persistence of chemicals in ordnance when debris becomes encased in coral** – As described in Section 3.8.3.3.2.1 (Military Expended Materials that are Ordnance) of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, the physical and chemical properties of the surrounding water from an ordnance strike would be temporarily altered (e.g., slight heating or cooling and increased oxygen concentrations due to turbulent mixing with the atmosphere), but there would be no lasting change resulting in long-term impacts on marine invertebrates. In addition, Section 3.8.3.6 (Secondary Impacts) in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS determined that the impacts on sedentary invertebrate beds and reefs from the use of metal, chemical, and other material byproducts, and secondary physical disturbances during training and testing activities would be minimal and short term within the Study Area.
- **Secondary impacts on ESA species, including coral reefs from training activities on FDM –** The 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS analyzed potential impacts on marine resources, including ESA-listed coral species, using the best available data. Similarly, the Navy conducted an extensive review of recent literature, including government technical documents and reports, and online scientific journal databases to add any new information to this document. This information supports the conclusions from the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS that secondary impacts on coral reefs from explosives and explosive byproducts could occur, while impacts on marine invertebrates from erosion or sedimentation are not anticipated. In addition, indirect impacts from metals and other chemicals in the marine environment are likely to be negligible and not detectable.
- **Direct impacts on coral reefs, coral spawning periods, and other invertebrates from sedimentation/erosion around FDM –** As detailed in Section 3.1 (Sediments and Water Quality), recent multi-year dive studies were conducted by Smith and Marx (2016) at FDM. These surveys found that coral fauna at FDM are healthy and robust and the nearshore physical environment

and basic habitat types at FDM remained unchanged over the 13 years (1999–2012). These conclusions are based on (1) a limited amount of physical damage, (2) very low levels of partial mortality and disease (less than 1 percent of all species observed), (3) absence of excessive mucus production, (4) good coral recruitment, (5) complete recovery by 2012 of the 2007 bleaching event, and (6) a limited number of macrobioeroders and an absence of invasive crown of thorns starfish (*Acanthaster planci*). These factors suggest that sedimentation that may result from military use of FDM is not sufficient as to adversely impact water quality and coral communities. A recent coral reef survey by Carilli et al. (2018) at FDM verified Endangered Species Act (ESA)-listed corals, quantified coral reef health, and compiled observations of ordnance impacts. The survey results indicated that ESA-listed corals are present, but rare in waters of <20 meters depth around FDM. Additionally, 77.3 percent of corals observed exhibited some form of bleaching, likely caused by regionally anomalous warm sea surface temperatures. Carilli et al. (2018) also found little evidence of adverse impacts on coral from Navy training at FDM, including from the use of high-explosive bombs. In addition, they found that scleractinian coral growth occurred on a substantial percentage of ordnance items expended.

- **Direct and cumulative impacts from military expended materials as marine debris –** The 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and this SEIS/OEIS analyzed potential direct and cumulative impacts of military expended materials on marine invertebrates through physical disturbance and strike, entanglement, and ingestion. The majority of these materials are expended in open ocean areas where impacts on biological communities, such as coral reefs, would be minimized.

REFERENCES

Anthony, K. R. N. (2016). Coral Reefs Under Climate Change and Ocean Acidification: Challenges and Opportunities for Management and Policy. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources, 41*, 598–581.

Brainard, R. E., C. Birkeland, C. M. Eakin, P. McElhany, M. W. Miller, M. Patterson, and G. A. Piniak. (2011). *Status Review Report of 82 Candidate Coral Species Petitioned Under the U.S. Endangered Species Act* (NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-PIFSC-27). Honolulu, HI: National Marine Fisheries Service, Pacific Islands Fisheries Science Center.

Bryant, D., L. Burke, J. McManus, and M. Spalding. (1998). *Reefs at Risk: A Map-Based Indicator of Threats to the World's Coral Reefs*. Washington, DC: World Resources Institute.

Burke, L., and J. Maidens. (2004). *Reefs at Risk in the Caribbean*. Washington, DC: World Resources Institute.

Caribbean Fishery Management Council. (1994). *Fishery Management Plan, Regulatory Impact Review and Final Environmental Impact Statement for Corals and Reef Associated Plants and Invertebrates of Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands*. San Juan, PR: Caribbean Fishery Management Council.

Caribbean Fishery Management Council. (2016). *Amendments to the U.S. Caribbean Reef Fish, Spiny Lobster, and Corals and Reef Associated Plants and Invertebrates Fishery Management Plans: Timing of Accountability Measure-Based Closures*. San Juan, PR: Caribbean Fishery Management Council.

Carilli, J., S. H. Smith, D. E. Marx, Jr., L. Bolick, and D. Fenner. (2018). *Farallon de Medinilla 2017 Species Level Coral Reef Survey Report*. Pearl Harbor, HI: U.S. Navy Pacific Fleet.

Corinaldesi, C., F. Marcellini, E. Nepote, E. Damiani, and R. Danovaro. (2018). Impact of inorganic UV filters contained in sunscreen products on tropical stony corals (*Acropora* spp.). *Science of the Total Environment, 2018*, 1279–1285.

Derraik, J. G. B. (2002). The pollution of the marine environment by plastic debris: A review. *Marine Pollution Bulletin, 44*, 842–852.

Downs, C. A., E. Kramarsky-Winter, R. Segal, J. Fauth, S. Knutson, O. Bronstein, F. R. Ciner, R. Jeger, Y. Lichtenfeld, C. M. Woodley, P. Pennington, K. Cadenas, A. Kushmaro, and Y. Loya. (2016). Toxicopathological Effects of the Sunscreen UV Filter, Oxybenzone (Benzophenone-3), on Coral Planulae and Cultured Primary Cells and Its Environmental Contamination in Hawaii and the U.S. Virgin Islands. *Archives of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology, 2016*(70), 265–288.

Drury, C., D. Manzello, and D. Lirman. (2017). Genotype and local environment dynamically influence growth, disturbance response and survivorship in the threatened coral, *Acropora cervicornis*. *PLoS ONE, 12*(3), 21.

Edmonds, N. J., C. J. Firmin, D. Goldsmith, R. C. Faulkner, and D. T. Wood. (2016). A review of crustacean sensitivity to high amplitude underwater noise: Data needs for effective risk assessment in relation to UK commercial species. *Marine Pollution Bulletin, 108*, 5–11.

Ennis, R. S., M. E. Brandt, K. E. W. Grimes, and T. B. Smith. (2016). Coral reef health response to chronic and acute changes in water quality in St. Thomas, United States Virgin Islands. *Marine Pollution Bulletin, 111*(1–2), 418–427.

Gailani, J. Z., T. C. Lackey, D. B. J. King, D. Bryant, S. C. Kim, and D. J. Shafer. (2016). Predicting dredging-associated effects to coral reefs in Apra Harbor, Guam - Part 1: Sediment exposure modeling. *Journal of Environmental Management, 168*, 16–26.

Galloway, S. B., A. W. Bruckner, and C. M. Woodley. (2009). *Coral Health and Disease in the Pacific: Vision for Action*. Silver Spring, MD: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

Glickson, D., D. Amon, L. McKenna, and K. Elliot. (2017). *2016 Deepwater Exploration of the Marianas*. Silver Spring, MD: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Ocean Exploration Program.

Harvey, C. (2016). 'I cried... right into my mask': Scientists say Guam's reefs have bleached four years straight. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/energy-environment/wp/2016/08/03/i-cried-right-into-my-mask-these-coral-reefs-have-seen-a-devastating-four-years-of-bleaching/?noredirect=on&utm_term=.17d2d85b6b40.

Hawkins, A., and A. N. Popper (2017). A sound approach to assessing the impact of underwater noise on marine fishes and invertebrates. *ICES Journal of Marine Science, 74*(3), 635–651.

Hughes, T. P., A. H. Baird, D. R. Bellwood, M. Card, S. R. Connolly, C. Folke, R. Grosberg, O. Hoegh-Guldberg, J. B. C. Jackson, J. Kleypas, J. M. Lough, P. A. Marshall, M. Nystrom, S. R. Palumbi, J. M. Pandolfi, B. Rosen, and J. Roughgarden. (2003). Climate change, human impacts, and the resilience of coral reefs. *Science, 301*(5635), 929–933.

Jackson, J. B. C., M. X. Kirby, W. H. Berger, K. A. Bjorndal, L. W. Botsford, B. J. Bourque, R. H. Bradbury, R. Cooke, J. M. Erlandson, J. A. Estes, T. P. Hughes, S. Kidwell, C. B. Lange, H. S. Lenihan, J. M. Pandolfi, C. H. Peterson, R. S. Steneck, M. J. Tegner, and R. R. Warner. (2001). Historical overfishing and the recent collapse of coastal ecosystems. *Science, 293*, 629–638.

Ladd, M. C., A. A. Shantz, E. Bartels, and D. E. Burkepile. (2017). Thermal stress reveals a genotype-specific tradeoff between growth and tissue loss in restored *Acropora cervicornis*. *Marine Ecology Progess Series, 572*, 129–139.

Lohmann, K. J., N. D. Pentcheff, G. A. Nevitt, G. D. Stetten, R. K. Zimmer-Faust, H. E. Jarrard, and L. C. Boles. (1995). Magnetic orientation of spiny lobsters in the ocean: Experiments with undersea coil systems. *The Journal of Experimental Biology, 198*(10), 2041–2048.

Lohmann, K. J., and C. M. F. Lohmann. (2006). Sea turtles, lobsters, and oceanic magnetic maps. *Marine and Freshwater Behaviour and Physiology, 39*(1), 49–64.

Lusher, A. L., C. O'Donnell, R. Officer, and I. O'Connor. (2016). Microplastic interactions with North Atlantic mesopelagic fish. *ICES Journal of Marine Science, 73*(4), 1214–1225.

Lybolt, M. (2015). *Listed Coral Sighting (Guam)*. Stuart, FL: Tetra Tech, Inc.

Meadows, D. W. (2016). *Petition to List the Tridacninae Giant Clams (Excluding Tridacna rosewateri) as Threatened or Endangered Under the Endangered Species Act*. Ellicott City, MD: Giant Clam Petition.

Moribe, J., S. Hanser, and R. Spaulding (2016). [Personal communication regarding the observation of *Acropora globiceps* near Dadi Beach, Naval Base Guam via email between J. Moribe (National Marine Fisheries Service, Protected Resources Division, Pacific Islands Regional Office), Dr. S. Hanser (Naval Facilities Engineering Command Pacific), and R. Spaulding (Cardno)].

National Marine Fisheries Service. (2010). Marine Invertebrates and Plants. Silver Spring, MD: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Office of Protected Resources.

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. (2010). *Deep-Sea Corals*. Silver Spring, MD: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Ocean Explorer. Retrieved from https://oceanexplorer.noaa.gov/edu/themes/deep-sea-corals/welcome.html.

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. (2017). *Coral Bleaching and Disease*. Retrieved from https://www.pifsc.noaa.gov/cred/coral_bleaching_and_disease.php.

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. (2018a). *Coral reef condition: A status report for the Northern Mariana Islands*. Silver Spring, MD: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Coral Conservation Program.

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. (2018b). *Coral reef condition: A status report for Guam*. Silver Spring, MD: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Coral Conservation Program.

Nelson, D. S., J. McManus, R. H. Richmond, D. B. J. King, J. Z. Gailani, T. C. Lackey, and D. Bryant. (2016). Predicting dredging-associated effects to coral reefs in Apra Harbor, Guam - Part 2: Potential coral effects. *Journal of Environmental Management, 168*, 111–122.

Normandeau, E., T. Tricas, and A. Gill. (2011). *Effects of EMFs from Undersea Power Cables on Elasmobranchs and Other Marine Species*. Camarillo, CA: U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Regulation, and Enforcement, Pacific Outer Continental Shelf Region.

Pandolfi, J. M., R. H. Bradbury, E. Sala, T. P. Hughes, K. A. Bjorndal, R. G. Cooke, D. McArdle, L. McClenachan, M. J. H. Newman, G. Paredes, R. R. Warner, and J. B. C. Jackson. (2003). Global trajectories of the long-term decline of coral reef ecosystems. *Science, 301*, 955–958.

Porter, J. W., P. Dustan, W. C. Jaap, K. L. Patterson, V. Kosmynin, O. W. Meier, M. E. Patterson, and M. Parsons. (2001). Patterns of spread of coral disease in the Florida Keys. *Hydrobiologia, 460*, 1–24.

Raymundo, L. J., M. C. D. Malay, and A. N. Williams. (2016). *Final Report: Research on Stony Coral Health and Community Structure.* Mangilao, GU: University of Guam Marine Laboratory.

Raymundo, L. J., D. Burdick, V. A. Lapacek, R. J. Miller, and V. Brown. (2017). Anomalous temperatures and extreme tides: Guam staghorn *Acropora* succumb to a double threat. *Marine Ecology Progess Series, 564*, 47–55.

Risk, M. (2009). Editorial: The reef crisis and the reef science crisis: Nitrogen isotopic ratios as an objective indicator of stress. *Marine Pollution Bulletin, 58*(6), 787–788.

Roberts, L., S. Cheesman, M. Elliott, and T. Breithaupt. (2016). Sensitivity of *Pagurus bernhardus* (L.) to substrate-borne vibration and anthropogenic noise. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology, 474*, 185–194.

Rosen, G., and G. Lotufo. (2007). Toxicity of explosive compounds to the marine mussel, *Mytilus galloprovincialis*, in aqueous exposures. *Ecotoxicology and Environmental Safety, 68*(2), 228–236.

Rosen, G., and G. R. Lotufo. (2010). Fate and effects of composition B in multispecies marine exposures. *Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry, 29*(6), 1330–1337.

Simon-Lledo, E., B. J. Bett, V. A. Huvenne, K. Koser, T. Schoening, J. Greinert, and D. O. B. Jones. (2019). Biological effects 26 years after simulated deep-sea mining. *Scientific Report, 9*.

Singh, B., and N. Sharma. (2008). Mechanistic implications of plastic degradation. *Polymer Degradation and Stability, 93*(3), 561–584.

Smith, S. H., and D. E. Marx, Jr. (2009). *Assessment of Near Shore Marine Resources at Farallon De Medinilla: 2006, 2007 and 2008*. Capitol Hill, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands: Pacific Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command.

Smith, S. H., J. Marx, D. E., and L. H. Shannon. (2013). *Calendar Year 2012 Assessment of Near Shore Marine Resources at Farallon de Medinilla, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands*. Port Hueneme, CA: U.S. Department of the Navy.

Smith, S. H., and D. E. Marx, Jr. (2016). De-facto marine protection from a Navy bombing range: Farallon de Medinilla, Mariana Archipelago, 1997 to 2012. *Marine Pollution Bulletin, 102*(1), 187–198.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. (2012). *Marianas Trench Marine National Monument*. Washington, DC: U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service.

van Hooidonk, R., J. A. Maynard, J. Tamelander, J. Gove, G. Ahmadia, L. Raymundo, G. Williams, S. F. Heron, and S. Planes. (2016). Local-scale projections of coral reef futures and implications of the Paris Agreement. *Scientific Reports, 6*(39666), 8.

Vermeij, M. J. A., K. L. Marhaver, C. M. Huijbers, I. Nagelkerken, and S. D. Simpson. (2010). Coral larvae move toward reef sounds. *PLoS ONE, 5*(5), e10660.

Wilkinson, C. (2002). Executive Summary. In C. Wilkinson (Ed.), *Status of Coral Reefs of the World: 2002* (pp. 7–31). Townsville, Australia: Global Coral Reef Monitoring Network.

3.9 Fishes

Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/ Overseas Environmental Impact Statement Mariana Islands Training and Testing

TABLE OF CONTENTS

3.9 Fishes 3.9-1
3.9.1 Affected Environment 3.9-1
3.9.1.1 Hearing and Vocalization 3.9-1
3.9.1.2 General Threats 3.9-3
3.9.1.3 Endangered Species Act Species 3.9-3
3.9.1.4 Federally Managed Species 3.9-7
3.9.1.5 Taxonomic Group Descriptions 3.9-11
3.9.2 Environmental Consequences 3.9-11
3.9.2.1 Acoustic Stressors 3.9-12
3.9.2.2 Explosive Stressors 3.9-40
3.9.2.3 Energy Stressors 3.9-53
3.9.2.4 Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors 3.9-55
3.9.2.5 Entanglement Stressors 3.9-57
3.9.2.6 Ingestion Stressors 3.9-59
3.9.2.7 Secondary Stressors 3.9-60
3.9.3 Public Comments 3.9-62

List of Figures

Figure 3.9-1: Fish Hearing Group and Navy Sonar Bin Frequency Ranges 3.9-30

List of Tables

Table 3.9-1: Endangered Species Act Listed and Special Status Fish Species in the Mariana Islands Study Area 3.9-4
Table 3.9-2: Federally Managed Fish Species Within the Mariana Islands Study Area for Each Fishery Management Unit in the FEP 3.9-8
Table 3.9-3: Sound Exposure Criteria for TTS from Sonar 3.9-31
Table 3.9-4: Ranges to Temporary Threshold Shift from Four Representative Sonar Bins 3.9-33

Table 3.9-5: Range to 10 Percent Mortality from In-water Explosions for Fishes with a Swim Bladder 3.9-43
Table 3.9-6: Sound Exposure Criteria for Mortality and Injury from Explosives 3.9-48
Table 3.9-7: Sound Exposure Criteria for Hearing Loss from Explosives 3.9-49
Table 3.9-8: Range to Mortality and Injury for All Fishes from Explosives 3.9-50
Table 3.9-9: Range to TTS for Fishes with a Swim Bladder from Explosives 3.9-51

3.9 Fishes

3.9.1 Affected Environment

The purpose of this section is to supplement the analysis of impacts on fishes presented in the 2015 Mariana Islands Training and Testing (MITT) Final Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (EIS/OEIS) with new information relevant to proposed changes in training and testing activities conducted at sea and on Farallon de Medinilla. New information made available since the publication of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS is included below to better understand potential stressors and impacts on fishes resulting from training and testing activities. Comments received from the public during scoping related to fishes are addressed in Section 3.9.3 (Public Comments). Comments received from the public during the Draft Supplemental EIS (SEIS)/OEIS commenting period related to fishes are addressed in Appendix K (Public Comment Responses).

3.9.1.1 Hearing and Vocalization

A summary of fish hearing and vocalizations is described in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Due to the availability of new literature, including revised sound exposure criteria, the information provided below will supplement the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS for fishes.

All fishes have two sensory systems that can detect sound in the water: the inner ear, which functions similarly to the inner ear in other vertebrates, and the lateral line, which consists of a series of receptors along the body of a fish (Popper, 2008). The lateral line system is sensitive to external particle motion arising from sources within a few body lengths of an animal. The lateral line detects particle motion at low frequencies from below 1 hertz (Hz) up to at least 400 Hz (Coombs & Montgomery, 1999; Hastings & Popper, 2005; Higgs & Radford, 2013; Webb et al., 2008). Generally, the inner ears of fish contain three types of dense otoliths (i.e., small calcareous bodies) that sit atop many delicate mechanoelectric hair cells within the inner ear of fishes, similar to the hair cells found in the mammalian ear. Underwater sound waves pass through the fish's body and vibrate the otoliths. This causes a relative motion between the dense otoliths and the surrounding tissues, causing a deflection of the hair cells, which is sensed by the nervous system.

Although a propagating sound wave contains pressure and particle motion components, particle motion is most significant at low frequencies (up to at least 400 Hz) and is most detectible at high sound pressures or very close to a sound source. The inner ears of fishes are directly sensitive to acoustic particle motion rather than acoustic pressure (acoustic particle motion and acoustic pressure are discussed in Appendix H, Acoustic and Explosive Concepts). Historically, studies that have investigated hearing in, and effects to, fishes have been carried out with sound pressure metrics. Although particle motion may be the more relevant exposure metric for many fish species, there is little data available that actually measures it due to a lack in standard measurement methodology and experience with particle motion detectors (Hawkins et al., 2015; Martin et al., 2016). In these instances, particle motion can be estimated from pressure measurements (Nedelec et al., 2016a).

Some fishes possess additional morphological adaptations or specializations that can enhance their sensitivity to sound pressure, such as a gas-filled swim bladder (Astrup, 1999; Popper & Fay, 2010). The swim bladder can enhance sound detection by converting acoustic pressure into localized particle motion, which may then be detected by the inner ear (Radford et al., 2012). Fishes with a swim bladder generally have greater hearing sensitivity and can detect higher frequencies than fishes without a swim bladder (Popper & Fay, 2010; Popper et al., 2014). In addition, structures such as gas-filled bubbles near

the ear or swim bladder, or even connections between the swim bladder and the inner ear, also increase sensitivity and allow for high-frequency hearing capabilities and better sound pressure detection.

Although many researchers have investigated hearing and vocalizations in fish species (Ladich & Fay, 2013; Popper et al., 2014), hearing capability data only exist for just over 100 of the currently known 34,000 marine and freshwater fish species (Eschmeyer & Fong, 2017). Therefore, fish hearing groups are defined by species that possess a similar continuum of anatomical features, which result in varying degrees of hearing sensitivity (Popper & Fay, 2010). Categories and descriptions of hearing sensitivities are further defined in this document (modified from Popper et al., 2014) as the following:

- Fishes without a swim bladder—hearing capabilities are limited to particle motion detection at frequencies well below 2 kilohertz (kHz).
- Fishes with a swim bladder not involved in hearing—species lack notable anatomical specializations and primarily detect particle motion at frequencies below 2 kHz.
- Fishes with a swim bladder involved in hearing—species can detect frequencies below 2 kHz and possess anatomical specializations to enhance hearing, and are capable of sound pressure detection up to a few kHz.
- Fishes with a swim bladder and high-frequency hearing—species can detect frequencies below 2 kHz and possess anatomical specializations, and are capable of sound pressure detection at frequencies up to 10 kHz to over 100 kHz.

Data suggest that most species of marine fish either lack a swim bladder (e.g., sharks and flatfishes) or have a swim bladder not involved in hearing and can only detect sounds below 1 kHz. Some marine fishes (Clupeiformes) with a swim bladder involved in hearing are able to detect sounds to about 4 kHz (Colleye et al., 2016; Mann et al., 2001; Mann et al., 1997). One subfamily of clupeids (i.e., Alosinae) can detect high- and very high-frequency sounds (i.e., frequencies from 10 to 100 kHz, and frequencies above 100 kHz, respectively), although auditory thresholds at these higher frequencies are elevated and the range of best hearing is still in the low-frequency range (below 1 kHz) similar to other fishes. Mann et al. (1997; 1998) theorize that this subfamily may have evolved the ability to hear relatively high sound levels at these higher frequencies in order to detect echolocations of nearby foraging dolphins. For fishes that have not had their hearing tested, such as deep sea fishes, the suspected hearing capabilities are based on the structure of the ear, the relationship between the ear and the swim bladder, and other potential adaptations such as the presence of highly developed areas of the brain related to inner ear and lateral line functions (Buran et al., 2005; Deng et al., 2011, 2013). It is believed that most fishes have their best hearing sensitivity from 100 to 400 Hz (Popper, 2003).

Endangered Species Act (ESA)-listed species with the potential to occur within the MITT Study Area hammerhead shark (*Sphyrna lewini*), the oceanic whitetip shark (*Carcharhinus longimanus*), and the giant manta ray (*Manta birostris*). As discussed above, most marine fishes investigated to date lack hearing capabilities greater than 1,000 Hz. Rays and sharks are cartilaginous fishes (i.e., elasmobranchs) lacking a swim bladder. Available data suggest these species can detect sounds from 20 to 1,000 Hz, with best sensitivity at lower ranges (Casper et al., 2003; Casper & Mann, 2006; Casper & Mann, 2009; Myrberg, 2001).

Some fishes are known to produce sound. Bony fishes can produce sounds in a number of ways and use them for a number of behavioral functions (Ladich, 2008, 2014). Over 30 families of fishes are known to use vocalizations in aggressive interactions, and over 20 families are known to use vocalizations in mating (Ladich, 2008). Sounds generated by fishes as a means of communication are generally below

500 Hz (Slabbekoorn et al., 2010). The air in the swim bladder is vibrated by the sound producing structures (often muscles that are integral to the swim bladder wall) and radiates sound into the water (Zelick et al., 1999). Sprague and Luczkovich (2004) calculated that silver perch, of the family sciaenidae, can produce drumming sounds ranging from 128 to 135 decibels (dB) referenced to 1 micropascal (dB re 1 µPa). Female midshipman fish apparently detect and locate the "hums" (approximately 90–400 Hz) of vocalizing males during the breeding season (McIver et al., 2014; Sisneros & Bass, 2003). Sciaenids produce a variety of sounds, including calls produced by males on breeding grounds (Ramcharitar et al., 2001), and a "drumming" call produced during chorusing that suggests a seasonal pattern to reproductive-related function (McCauley & Cato, 2000). Other sounds produced by chorusing reef fishes include "popping," "banging," and "trumpet" sounds; altogether, these choruses produce sound levels 35 dB above background levels, at peak frequencies between 250 and 1,200 Hz, and source levels between 144 and 157 dB re 1 µPa (McCauley & Cato, 2000).

Additional research using visual surveys (such as baited underwater video) and passive acoustic monitoring continue to reveal new sounds produced by fishes, both in the marine and freshwater environments, and allow for specific behaviors to be paired with those sounds (Radford et al., 2018; Rountree et al., 2018; Rowell et al., 2018).

3.9.1.2 General Threats

A summary of the major threats to fish species within the Study Area is described in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Overfishing and associated factors, such as bycatch, fisheries-induced evolution, and intrinsic vulnerability to overfishing were described. Pollution, including the effect of oceanic circulation patterns scattering coastal pollution throughout the open ocean, was described. The effects of organic and inorganic pollutants to fishes, including bioaccumulation of pollutants, behavioral and physiological changes, or genetic damage, were described, as well as entanglement in abandoned commercial and recreational fishing gear. Other human-caused stressors on fishes described were the introduction of non-native species, climate change, aquaculture, energy production, vessel movement, and underwater noise. Neither the extent or any other threats have changed since it was last described in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Therefore, the information and analysis presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS remains valid.

3.9.1.3 Endangered Species Act Species

The scalloped hammerhead shark (*Sphyrna lewini*), oceanic whitetip shark (*Carcharhinus longimanus*), and giant manta ray (*Manta birostris*) are the only ESA-listed fish species in the Study Area (Table 3.9-1). Two species of concern, the humphead wrasse (*Cheilinus undulates)* and bumphead parrotfish (*Bolbometopon muricatum*), also occur in the Study Area (Table 3.9-1). The National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) has some concerns regarding status and threats for species of concern, but insufficient information is available to indicate a need to list the species under the ESA. Species of concern status does not carry any procedural or substantive protections under the ESA. All the species listed in Table 3.9-1 are declining because of impacts from fishing (including night spear fishing, bycatch, and illegal fishing activities) and habitat degradation.

Table 3.9-1: Endangered Species Act Listed and Special Status Fish Species in the Mariana Islands Study Area

Species Name and Regulatory Status			Presence in Study Area	
Common Name	**Scientific Name**	**Endangered Species Act Status**	**Open Ocean/ Transit Corridor**	**Coastal Ocean**
Scalloped hammerhead shark (Indo-West Pacific Distinct Population Segment)	*Sphyrna lewini*	Threatened	Yes	Yes
Oceanic whitetip shark	*Carcharhinus longimanus*	Threatened	Yes	Yes
Giant manta ray	*Manta birostris*	Threatened	Yes	Yes
Humphead wrasse	*Cheilinus undulatus*	Species of Concern	No	Yes
Bumphead parrotfish	*Bolbometopon muricatum*	Species of Concern	No	Yes

3.9.1.3.1 Scalloped Hammerhead Shark (*Sphyrna lewini*)

A literature review found that the information on the scalloped hammerhead shark in the Study Area has not substantially changed from what is included in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Therefore, the information presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS remains valid.

3.9.1.3.1.1 Status and Management

In 2013, NMFS determined that two distinct population segments, the Central and Southwest Atlantic and Indo-West Pacific, warrant listing as threatened. The Indo-West Pacific distinct population segment is the only one located within the Study Area. Following a review of recent literature, the status and management of this species has not changed since the publication of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. As such, the information and analysis presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS remains valid. No critical habitat has been designated for this species.

3.9.1.3.1.2 Habitat and Geographic Range

The habitat and geographic range of scalloped hammerhead sharks is described in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Following a review of recent literature, information related to habitat and the geographic range of this species has not changed since the publication of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. As such, the information and analysis presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS remains valid.

3.9.1.3.1.3 Population and Abundance

As indicated in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, information on population and abundance of scalloped hammerhead sharks is limited. Following a review of recent literature, information related to population

and abundance estimates for this species has not changed since the publication of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. As such, the information and analysis presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS remains valid.

3.9.1.3.1.4 Predator and Prey Interactions

A new study by Brown et al. (2016) found that juvenile scalloped hammerhead sharks in the Rewa River estuary on Fiji consumed primarily estuarine and marine prawns, stomatopoda (mantis shrimps), estuarine eels, and various bony fish, with prawns being found in half of the stomachs sampled, which is consistent with other available information. However, this new information does not appreciably change the information and analysis that was presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

3.9.1.3.1.5 Species-Specific Threats

Primary threats to scalloped hammerhead sharks are from direct take, especially by the foreign commercial shark fin fishery (National Marine Fisheries Service, 2011), as described in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Following a review of recent literature, information on threats to this species has not changed since the publication of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. As such, the information and analysis presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS remains valid.

3.9.1.3.2 Oceanic Whitetip Shark (*Carcharhinus longimanus*)

3.9.1.3.2.1 Status and Management

Since the publication of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, NMFS proposed on December 29, 2016 to list the oceanic whitetip shark as a threatened species under the ESA (81 Federal Register [FR] 96304). On January 30, 2018, NMFS published the Final Rule listing this species as threatened and concluded that critical habitat is not determinable because data sufficient to perform the required analyses are lacking (83 FR 4153). Because this species was proposed as threatened, and subsequently listed as threatened under the ESA after the publication of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, the impact analysis included in Section 3.9.2 (Environmental Consequences) is new.

3.9.1.3.2.2 Habitat and Geographic Range

Oceanic whitetip sharks are found worldwide in warm tropical and subtropical waters between 30° North and 35° South latitude near the surface of the water column (Young et al., 2016). Oceanic whitetips occur throughout the Central Pacific. This species has a clear preference for open ocean waters, with abundances decreasing with greater proximity to continental shelves. Preferring warm waters near or over 20°Celsius (68°Fahrenheit), and offshore areas, the oceanic whitetip shark is known to undertake seasonal movements to higher latitudes in the summer (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2016b) and may regularly survey extreme environments (deep depths, low temperatures) as a foraging strategy (Young et al., 2016).

3.9.1.3.2.3 Population and Abundance

Population trend information is not clear or available. Information shows that the population has declined and there is evidence of decreasing average weights of the sharks. Unstandardized nominal catch data from the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission in the eastern Pacific tropical tuna purse seine fisheries show trends of decreasing catch (Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission, 2015). In addition, Rice & Harvey (2012) found catch, catch per unit effort, and size composition data for oceanic whitetip sharks in the western and central Pacific all show consistent declines.

3.9.1.3.2.4 Predator and Prey Interactions

Oceanic whitetip sharks are large, often reaching a maximum length of 345 centimeters (cm) (Ebert et al., 2015), can live up to nine years (Joung et al., 2016), and are one of the major apex predators in the tropical open ocean waters. This species feeds on fishes, stingrays, sea turtles, birds, and cephalopods, and has no known predators.

3.9.1.3.2.5 Species-Specific Threats

Threats include pelagic longline and drift net fisheries bycatch, targeted fisheries (for the shark fin trade), and destruction or modification of its habitat and range (Baum et al., 2015; Defenders of Wildlife, 2015b). Legal and illegal fishing activities have caused significant population declines for the oceanic whitetip shark caught as bycatch in tuna and swordfish longlines throughout its range.

3.9.1.3.3 Giant Manta Ray (*Manta birostris*)

3.9.1.3.3.1 Status and Management

Since the publication of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, NMFS proposed on January 12, 2017 to list the giant manta ray as a threatened species under ESA (82 FR 3694). Based on the best scientific and commercial information available, including the status review report (Miller & Klimovich, 2016), and after taking into account efforts being made to protect these species, NMFS determined that the giant manta ray is likely to become an endangered species within the foreseeable future throughout a significant portion of its range. On January 22, 2018, NMFS published the Final Rule listing this species as threatened and concluded that critical habitat was not determinable because data sufficient to perform the required analyses are lacking (83 FR 2916). Because this species was proposed as threatened and subsequently listed as threatened under the ESA after the publication of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, the impact analysis presented below in Section 3.9.2 (Environmental Consequences) is new.

3.9.1.3.3.2 Habitat and Geographic Range

Giant manta rays are visitors to productive coastlines with regular upwelling, including oceanic island shores, and offshore pinnacles and seamounts. They utilize sandy bottom habitat and seagrass beds, as well as shallow reefs, and the ocean surface both inshore and offshore. The species ranges globally and is distributed in tropical, subtropical, and temperate waters. They migrate seasonally usually more than 1,000 kilometers (km) (621.4 miles), however not likely across ocean basins (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2016a).

3.9.1.3.3.3 Population and Abundance

No stock assessments exist for the giant manta ray. Most estimates of subpopulations are based on anecdotal observations by divers and fishermen, with current populations estimated between 100 and 1,500 individuals (Miller & Klimovich, 2016). In general, giant manta ray populations have declined, except in areas where they are specifically protected, such as the Hawaiian Islands (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2016a). Giant manta rays reach maturity at age 10 and have one pup every two to three years (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2016a).

3.9.1.3.3.4 Predator and Prey Interactions

Manta rays prey exclusively on plankton (Defenders of Wildlife, 2015a). The gill plates of the giant manta ray filters the water as they swim, straining out any plankton that is larger than a grain of sand (Defenders of Wildlife, 2015a).

3.9.1.3.3.5 Species-Specific Threats

Threats to giant manta rays include fisheries and bycatch, destruction or modification of habitat, and disease and predation. The international market highly values the gill plates of the giant manta ray for use in traditional medicines. They also trade their cartilage and skins and consume the manta ray meat or use it for local bait. Bycatch occurs in purse seine, gillnet, and trawl fisheries as well (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2016a). Fisheries exist outside the Study Area in Indonesia, Sri Lanka, India, Peru, Mexico, China, Mozambique, and Ghana (Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, 2013). Other potential threats include degradation of coral reefs, interaction with marine debris, marine pollution, and boat strikes (Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, 2013).

3.9.1.4 Federally Managed Species

The Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA) (see Section 3.0.1.1, Federal Statutes, in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS) established eight fishery management councils that share authority with NMFS to manage and conserve the fisheries in federal waters. Together with NMFS, the councils maintain fishery management plans for species or species groups to regulate commercial and recreational fishing within their geographic regions. The Study Area is under the jurisdiction of the Western Pacific Regional Fishery Management Council. Sections 3.3 (Marine Habitats), 3.7 (Marine Vegetation), and 3.8 (Marine Invertebrates) analyze impacts on habitats within the Study Area.

The Mariana Archipelago Fishery Ecosystem Plan (FEP), which includes fishery management measures for Guam and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, was approved in 2009 and codified in 2010. The Western Pacific Regional Fishery Management Council is currently working on an update to the FEP (Western Pacific Regional Fishery Management Council, 2016). Federally managed fish species listed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and in Table 3.9-2 have not changed since the publication of the EIS/OEIS and the information and analysis presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS remains valid.

The 2015 NMFS stock assessment report for the bottomfish fishery in Guam and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (CNMI) concluded that the fishery was not overfished through 2013, and modeled projections predicted that the fishery was very unlikely to become overfished by 2017 (Yau et al., 2016). However, coral reef fisheries, which support most traditional fishing in the Study Area, have declined over the past 30 years (Weijerman et al., 2016). However, the catch from the non-commercial reef fish fishery in the CNMI, which supports most traditional fishing, has historically been underestimated, yet has clearly been in decline since the late 1970s (Cuetos-Bueno & Houk, 2014). Detailed information on overfished stocks is presented in Section 3.12.1.2 (Commercial and Recreational Fishing).

Table 3.9-2: Federally Managed Fish Species Within the Mariana Islands Study Area for Each Fishery Management Unit in the FEP

Western Pacific Regional Fishery Management Council	
Marianas Bottomfish Management Unit	
Common Name	**Scientific Name**
Amberjack	*Seriola dumerili*
Black trevally/jack	*Caranx lugubris*
Blacktip grouper	*Epinephelus fasciatus*
Blueline snapper	*Lutjanus kasmira*
Giant trevally/jack	*Caranx ignobilis*
Gray snapper	*Aprion virescens*
Lunartail grouper	*Variola louti*
Pink snapper	*Pristipomoides filamentosus*
Pink snapper	*Pristipomoides flavipinnis*
Red snapper/silvermouth	*Aphareus rutilans*
Red snapper/buninas agaga	*Etelis carbunculus*
Red snapper/buninas	*Etelis coruscans*
Redgill emperor	*Lethrinus rubrioperculatus*
Snapper	*Pristipomoides zonatus*
Yelloweye snapper	*Pristipomoides flavipinnis*
Yellowtail snapper	*Pristipomoides auricilla*
Marianas Coral Reef Ecosystem Management Unit	
Banded goatfish	*Parupeneus spp.*
Bantail goatfish	*Upeneus arge*
Barred flag-tail	*Kuhlia mugil*
Barred thicklip	*Hemigymnus fasciatus*
Bigeye	*Priacanthus hamrur*
Bigeye scad	*Selar crumenophthalmus*
Bignose unicornfish	*Naso vlamingii*
Bigscale soldierfish	*Myripristis berndti*
Black tongue unicornfish	*Naso hexacanthus*
Black triggerfish	*Melichthys niger*
Blackeye thicklip	*Hemigymnus melapterus*
Blackstreak surgeonfish	*Acanthurus nigricauda*
Blacktip reef shark	*Carcharhinus melanopterus*
Blotcheye soldierfish	*Myripristis murdjan*

Table 3.9-2: Federally Managed Fish Species Within the Mariana Islands Study Area for Each Fishery Management Unit in the FEP (continued)

Western Pacific Regional Fishery Management Council	
Marianas Coral Reef Ecosystem Management Unit (continued)	
Common Name	**Scientific Name**
Blue-banded surgeonfish	*Acanthurus lineatus*
Blue-lined squirrelfish	*Sargocentron tiere*
Bluespine unicornfish	*Naso unicornus*
Brick soldierfish	*Myripristis amaena*
Bronze soldierfish	*Myripristis adusta*
Cigar wrasse	*Cheilio inermis*
Clown triggerfish	*Balistoides conspicillum*
Convict tang	*Acanthurus triostegus*
Crown squirrelfish	*Sargocentron diadema*
Dash-dot goatfish	*Parupeneus barberinus*
Dogtooth tuna	*Gymnosarda unicolor*
Doublebar goatfish	*Parupeneus bifasciatus*
Engel's mullet	*Moolgarda engeli*
Floral wrasse	*Cheilinus chlorourus*
Forktail rabbitfish	*Siganus aregentus*
Fringelip mullet	*Crenimugil crenilabis*
Galapagos shark	*Carcharhinus galapagensis*
Giant moray eel	*Gymnothorax javanicus*
Glasseye	*Heteropriacanthus cruentatus*
Golden rabbitfish	*Siganus guttatus*
Gold-spot rabbitfish	*Siganus punctatissimus*
Gray unicornfish	*Naso caesius*
Great barracuda	*Sphyraena barracuda*
Grey reef shark	*Carcharhinus amblyrhynchos*
Heller's barracuda	*Sphyraena helleri*
Humphead parrotfish	*Bolbometopon muricatum*
Humpnose unicornfish	*Naso tuberosus*
Longface wrasse	*Hologynmosus doliatus*
Mackerel scad	*Decapterus macarellus*
Mimic surgeonfish	*Acanthurus pyroferus*
Multi-barred goatfish	*Parupeneus multifaciatus*
Napoleon wrasse	*Cheilinus undulates*

Table 3.9-2: Federally Managed Fish Species Within the Mariana Islands Study Area for Each Fishery Management Unit in the FEP (continued)

Western Pacific Regional Fishery Management Council	
Marianas Coral Reef Ecosystem Management Unit (continued)	
Common Name	**Scientific Name**
Orange-spot surgeonfish	*Acanthurus olivaceus*
Orangespine unicornfish	*Naso lituratus*
Orangestriped triggerfish	*Balistapus undulates*
Pacific longnose parrotfish	*Hipposcarus longiceps*
Parrotfish	*Scarus spp.*
Pearly soldierfish	*Myripristis kuntee*
Pinktail triggerfish	*Melichthys vidua*
Razor wrasse	*Xyrichtys pavo*
Red-breasted wrasse	*Cheilinus fasciatus*
Ring-tailed wrasse	*Oxycheilinus unifasciatus*
Ringtail surgeonfish	*Acanthurus blochii*
Rudderfish	*Kyphosus biggibus*
Rudderfish	*Kyphosus cinerascens*
Rudderfish	*Kyphosus vaigienses*
Saber or long jaw squirrelfish	*Sargocentron spiniferum*
Scarlet soldierfish	*Myripristis pralinia*
Scribbled rabbitfish	*Siganus spinus*
Side-spot goatfish	*Parupeneus pleurostigma*
Silvertip shark	*Carcharhinus albimarginatus*
Spotfin squirrelfish	*Neoniphon spp.*
Spotted unicornfish	*Naso brevirostris*
Stareye parrotfish	*Calotomus carolinus*
Striped bristletooth	*Ctenochaetus striatus*
Stripped mullet	*Mugil cephalus*
Surge wrasse	*Thalassoma purpureum*
Tailspot squirrelfish	*Sargocentron caudimaculatum*
Threadfin	*Polydactylus sexfilis*
Three-spot wrasee	*Halicoeres trimaculatus*
Titan triggerfish	*Balistoides viridescens*
Triple-tail wrasee	*Cheilinus trilobatus*
Twospot bristletooth	*Ctenochaetus binotatus*
Undulated moray eel	*Gymnothorax undulatus*
Vermiculate rabbitfish	*Siganus vermiculatus*

Table 3.9-2: Federally Managed Fish Species Within the Mariana Islands Study Area for Each Fishery Management Unit in the FEP (continued)

Western Pacific Regional Fishery Management Council	
Marianas Coral Reef Ecosystem Management Unit (continued)	
Common Name	**Scientific Name**
Violet soldierfish	*Myripristis violacea*
White-lined goatfish	*Parupeneus ciliatus*
White-spotted surgeonfish	*Acanthurus guttatus*
Whitebar surgeonfish	*Acanthurus leucopareius*
Whitecheek surgeonfish	*Acanthurus nigricans*
Whitemargin unicornfish	*Naso annulatus*
Whitepatch wrasse	*Xyrichtys aneitensis*
Whitetip reef shark	*Triaenodon obesus*
Whitetip soldierfish	*Myripristis vittata*
Yellow goatfish	*Mulloidichthys spp.*
Yellow tang	*Zebrasoma flavescens*
Yellowfin goatfish	*Mulloidichthys vanicolensis*
Yellowfin soldierfish	*Myripristis chryseres*
Yellowfin surgeonfish	*Acanthurus xanthopterus*
Yellowmargin moray eel	*Gymnothorax flavimarginatus*
Yellowsaddle goatfish	*Parupeneus cyclostomas*
Yellowstripe goatfish	*Mylloidichthys flaviolineatus*
Guam and Northern Mariana Islands Pelagic Fisheries	
Dogtooth tuna	*Gymnosarda unicolor*
Double-lined mackerel	*Grammatorcynus bilineatus*
Kawakawa	*Euthynnus affinis*
Mahi	*Coryphaena hippurus*
Oilfish	*Ruvettus pretiosus*
Pacific blue marlin	*Makaira mazara*
Rainbow runner	*Elagatis bipinnulatus*
Skipjack tuna	*Katsuwonus pelamis*
Wahoo	*Acanthocybium solandri*
Yellowfin tuna	*Thunnus albacares*

3.9.1.5 Taxonomic Group Descriptions

A literature review found that the information on the taxonomic groups of fishes in the Study Area has not substantially changed from what is included in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Therefore, the information presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS remains valid.

3.9.2 Environmental Consequences

In the Proposed Action for this SEIS/OEIS, there have been some modifications to the quantity and type of acoustic and explosive stressors under the two action alternatives. There are also additional species listed under the ESA that are considered. In addition, within the stressor framework presented in the

2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, high-energy lasers are being analyzed as a new energy stressor, as detailed in Section 3.0.4.3.2.2 (High-Energy Lasers).

The 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS considered training and testing activities that currently occur in the Study Area and considered all potential stressors related to fishes. The potential impacts on fishes in the Study Area from Navy training and testing activities is presented in detail for ESA-listed and federally managed species, as well as generally for taxonomic groups.

The stressors vary in intensity, frequency, duration, and location within the Study Area. The stressors applicable to fishes in the Study Area are the same stressors analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and include:

- **Acoustic** (sonar and other transducers, vessel noise, aircraft noise, and weapon noise)
- **Explosives** (in-air explosions and in-water explosions)
- **Energy** (in-water electromagnetic devices and high-energy lasers)
- **Physical disturbance and strikes** (vessels, in-water devices, military expended materials, and seafloor devices)
- **Entanglement** (wires and cables, decelerators/parachutes)
- **Ingestion** (military expended materials – munitions, military expended materials other than munitions)
- **Secondary** (impacts associated with sediments and water quality)

This section evaluates how and to what degree potential impacts on fishes from stressors described in Section 3.0 (Introduction) may have changed since the analysis presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS was completed. Table 2.5-1 and Table 2.5-2 in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) list the proposed training and testing activities and include the number of times each activity would be conducted annually and the locations within the Study Area where the activity would typically occur under each alternative. The tables also present the same information for activities described in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS so that the proposed levels of training and testing under this SEIS/OEIS can be easily compared.

The Navy conducted a review of federal and state regulations and standards relevant to fishes and reviewed scientific literature published since 2015 for new information on fishes that could update the analysis presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. The analysis presented in this section also considers standard operating procedures, which are discussed in Section 2.3.3 (Standard Operating Procedures) of this SEIS/OEIS, and mitigation measures that are described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation). The Navy would implement these measures to avoid or reduce potential impacts on fishes from stressors associated with the proposed training and testing activities. Mitigation for ESA-listed fishes will be coordinated with NMFS through the ESA consultation process.

3.9.2.1 Acoustic Stressors

The analysis of effects to fishes follows the concepts outlined in Section 3.0.4.7 (Conceptual Framework for Assessing Effects from Acoustic and Explosive Activities). This section begins with a summary of relevant data regarding acoustic impacts on fishes in Section 3.9.2.1.1 (Background). This is followed by an analysis of estimated impacts on fishes due to specific Navy acoustic stressors (sonar and other transducers, vessel noise, aircraft noise, and weapon noise). Additional explanations of the acoustic terms and sound energy concepts used in this section are found in Appendix H (Acoustic and Explosive Concepts).

The Navy will rely on the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS analysis for the analysis of vessel noise and weapon noise, as there has been no substantive or otherwise meaningful change in the action, although new applicable and emergent science in regard to these sub-stressors is presented in the sections that follow. Due to available new literature, adjusted sound exposure criteria, and new acoustic effects modeling, the analysis provided in Section 3.9.2.1.2 (Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers) and Section 3.9.2.1.4 (Impacts from Aircraft Noise) of this SEIS/OEIS supplants the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS for fishes, and changes estimated impacts for some species since the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

3.9.2.1.1 Background

Effects of human-generated sound on fishes have been examined in numerous publications (Hastings & Popper, 2005; Hawkins et al., 2015; Ladich & Popper, 2004; Lindseth & Lobel, 2018; Mann, 2016; Mickle & Higgs, 2018; National Research Council, 1994, 2003; Neenan et al., 2016; Popper et al., 2004; Popper & Hawkins, 2019; Popper, 2003, 2008; Popper & Hastings, 2009b; Popper et al., 2014; Popper et al., 2016; Popper & Hawkins, 2018). The potential impacts from Navy activities are based on the analysis of available literature related to each type of effect. Where applicable, thresholds and relative risk factors presented in the *ANSI Sound Exposure Guideline* technical report (Popper et al., 2014) were used to assist in the analysis of effects on fishes from Navy activities.

There are limited studies of fish responses to aircraft and weapon noise. Based on the general characteristics of these sound types, for stressors where data is lacking (such as aircraft noise), studies of the effects of similar non-impulsive/continuous noise sources (such as sonar or vessel noise) are used to inform the analysis of fish responses. Similarly, studies of the effects from impulsive sources (such as air guns or pile driving) are used to inform fish responses to other impulsive sources (such as weapon noise). Non-impulsive or continuous sources may be presented as a proxy source to better understand potential reactions from fish where data from sonar and vessel noise exposures are limited. Additional information on the acoustic characteristics of these sources can be found in Appendix H (Acoustic and Explosive Concepts).

3.9.2.1.1.1 Injury

Injury refers to the direct effects on the tissues or organs of a fish. Moderate- to low-level noise from vessels, aircraft, and weapons use are described in Section 3.0.4.1 (Acoustic Stressors) and lacks the amplitude and energy to cause any direct injury. Section 3.0.4.7 (Conceptual Framework for Assessing Effects from Acoustic and Explosive Activities) provides additional information on injury and the framework used to analyze this potential impact.

Injury Due to Impulsive Sound Sources

Impulsive sounds, such as those produced by seismic air guns and impact pile driving, may cause injury or mortality in fishes. Although air guns and pile driving would not occur in the Study Area, this information aids in the analysis of other impulsive sources (i.e., weapons noise or in some cases, explosions). Mortality and potential damage to the cells of the lateral line have been observed in fish larvae, fry, and embryos after exposure to single shots from a seismic air gun within close proximity to the sound source (0.1 to 6 meters [m]) (Booman et al., 1996; Cox et al., 2012). However, exposure of adult fish to a single shot from an air gun array (four air guns) within similar ranges (6 m), has not resulted in any signs of mortality within seven days after exposure (Popper et al., 2016). Although injuries occurred in adult fishes, they were similar to injuries seen in control subjects (i.e., fishes that were not exposed to the air gun) so there is little evidence that the air gun exposure solely contributed to the observed effects.

Injuries, such as ruptured swim bladders, hematomas, and hemorrhaging of other gas-filled organs, have been reported in fish exposed to a large number of simulated impact pile driving strikes with cumulative sound exposure levels up to 219 decibels referenced to 1 micropascal squared seconds (dB re 1 μPa^2-s) under highly controlled settings where fish were unable to avoid the source (Casper et al., 2012b; Casper et al., 2013a; Casper et al., 2013b; Halvorsen et al., 2011; Halvorsen et al., 2012a; Halvorsen et al., 2012b). However, it is important to note that these studies exposed fish to 900 or more strikes, as the studies aimed to evaluate the equal energy hypothesis, which suggests that the effects of a large single pulse of energy is equivalent to the effects of energy received from many smaller pulses (as discussed in Smith & Gilley, 2008). Halvorsen et al. (2011) and Casper et al. (2017) found that the equal energy hypothesis does not apply to effects of pile driving; rather, metrics relevant to injury could include, but not be limited to, cumulative sound exposure level, single strike sound exposure level, and number of strikes (Halvorsen et al., 2011). Furthermore, Casper et al. (2017) found the amount of energy in each pile strike and the number of strikes determines the severity of the exposure and the injuries that may be observed. For example, hybrid striped bass (white bass *Morone chrysops* x striped bass *M. saxaltilis*) exposed to fewer strikes with higher single strike sound exposure values resulted in a higher number of, and more severe, injuries than bass exposed to an equivalent cumulative sound exposure level that contained more strikes with lower single strike sound exposure values. This is important to consider when comparing data from pile driving studies to potential effects from an explosion. Although single strike peak sound pressure levels were reported during these experiments (at average levels of 207 dB re 1 µPa), the injuries were only observed during exposures to multiple strikes, therefore, it is anticipated that a peak value much higher than the measured values would be required to lead to injury in fishes exposed to a single strike, or explosion.

These studies included species both with and without swim bladders. The majority of fish that exhibited injuries were those with swim bladders. Lake sturgeon (*Acipenser fulvescens*), a physostomous fish, was found to be less susceptible to injury from impulsive sources than Nile tilapia (*Oreochromis niloticus*) or hybrid striped bass, physoclistous fishes (Casper et al., 2017; Halvorsen et al., 2012a). As reported by Halvorsen et al. (2012a), the difference in results is likely due to the type of swim bladder in each fish. Physostomous fishes have an open duct connecting the swim bladder to their esophagus and may be able to quickly adjust the amount of gas in their body by gulping or releasing air. Physoclistous fishes do not have this duct; instead, gas pressure or glands regulate gas pressure in the swim bladder. There were no mortalities reported during these experiments, and in the studies where recovery was observed, the majority of exposure related injuries healed within a few days in a laboratory setting. In many of these controlled studies, neutral buoyancy was determined in the fishes prior to exposure to the simulated pile driving. However, fishes with similar physiology to those described in these studies that are exposed to actual pile driving activities may show varying levels of injury depending on their state of buoyancy.

By exposing caged juvenile European sea bass (*Dicentrarchus labrax*) to actual pile driving operations, Debusschere et al. (2014) largely confirmed the results discussed in the paragraph above. No differences in mortality were found between control and experimental groups at similar levels tested in the experiments described in the paragraph above (sound exposure levels up to 215–222 dB re 1 μPa^2-s), and many of the same types of injuries occurred (Casper et al., 2012b; Casper et al., 2013a; Casper et al., 2013b; Halvorsen et al., 2011; Halvorsen et al., 2012a; Halvorsen et al., 2012b). Fishes with injuries from impulsive sources such as these may not survive in the wild due to harsher conditions and risk of predation.

Other potential effects from exposure to impulsive sound sources include potential bubble formation and neurotrauma. It is speculated that high sound pressure levels may also cause bubbles to form from micronuclei in the blood stream or other tissues of animals, possibly causing embolism damage (Hastings & Popper, 2005). Fishes have small capillaries where these bubbles could be caught and lead to the rupturing of the capillaries and internal bleeding. It has also been speculated that this phenomena could take place in the eyes of fish due to potentially high gas saturation within the eye tissues (Popper & Hastings, 2009b). Additional research is necessary to verify if these speculations apply to exposures to non-impulsive sources such as sonars. These phenomena have not been well studied in fishes and are difficult to recreate under real-world conditions.

As summarized in the *ANSI Sound Exposure Guideli*ne technical report (Popper et al., 2014), exposure to high intensity and long duration impact pile driving or air gun shots did not cause mortality, and fishes typically recovered from injuries in controlled laboratory settings. Species tested to date can be used as viable surrogates for investigating injury in other species exposed to similar sources (Popper et al., 2014).

Injury due to Sonar and Other Transducers

Non-impulsive sound sources (e.g., sonar, acoustic modems, and sonobuoys) have not been known to cause direct injury or mortality to fish under conditions that would be found in the wild (Halvorsen et al., 2012a; Kane et al., 2010; Popper et al., 2007). Potential direct injuries (e.g., barotrauma, hemorrhage or rupture of organs or tissue) from non-impulsive sound sources, such as sonar, are unlikely because of slow rise times,[1] lack of a strong shock wave such as that associated with an explosive, and relatively low peak pressures. General categories and characteristics of Navy sonar systems are described in Section 3.0.4.1.1 (Sonar and Other Transducers).

The effects of mid-frequency sonar-like signals (1.5−6.5 kHz) on larval and juvenile Atlantic herring (*Clupea harengus*), Atlantic cod (*Gadus morhua*), saithe (*Pollachius virens*), and spotted wolffish (*Anarhichas minor*) were examined by Jørgensen et al. (2005).Researchers investigated potential effects on survival, development, and behavior in this study. Among fish kept in tanks and observed for one to four weeks after sound exposure, no significant differences in mortality or growth-related parameters between exposed and unexposed groups were observed. Examination of organs and tissues from selected herring experiments did not reveal obvious differences between unexposed and exposed groups. However, two (out of 42) of the herring groups exposed to sound pressure levels of 189 dB re 1 µPa and 179 dB re 1 µPa had a post-exposure mortality of 19 and 30 percent, respectively. It is not clear if this increased mortality was due to the received level or to other unknown factors, such as exposure to the resonance frequency of the swim bladder. Jørgensen et al. (2005) estimated a resonant frequency of 1.8 kHz for herring and saithe ranging in size from 6.3 to 7.0 cm, respectively, which lies within the range of frequencies used during sound exposures and therefore may explain some of the noted mortalities.

Individual juvenile fish with a swim bladder resonance in the frequency range of the operational sonars may be more susceptible to injury or mortality. Past research has demonstrated that fish species, size,

[1] Rise time: the amount of time for a signal to change from static pressure (the ambient pressure without the added sound) to high pressure. Rise times for non-impulsive sound typically have relatively gradual increases in pressure, while impulsive sound has near-instantaneous rise to a high peak pressure. For more detail, see Appendix H (Acoustic and Explosive Concepts).

and depth influences resonant frequency (Løvik & Hovem, 1979; McCartney & Stubbs, 1971). At resonance, the swim bladder, which can amplify vibrations that reach the fish's hearing organs, may absorb much of the acoustic energy in the impinging sound wave. It is suspected that the resulting oscillations may cause mortality, harm the auditory organs or the swim bladder (Jørgensen et al., 2005; Kvadsheim & Sevaldsen, 2005b). However, damage to the swim bladder and to tissues surrounding the swim bladder was not observed in fishes exposed to sonar at their presumed swim bladder resonant frequency (Jørgensen et al., 2005). Sonar is expected to physiologically affect adult fish less than juveniles because adult fish are in a more robust stage of development, and their swim bladder resonant frequencies would be lower than that of mid-frequency active sonar. Additionally, adult fish have more ability to move from an unpleasant stimulus (Kvadsheim & Sevaldsen, 2005a). Lower frequencies (i.e., generally below 1 kHz) are expected to produce swim bladder resonance in adult fishes from about 10 to 100 centimeters (McCartney & Stubbs, 1971). Fish, especially larval and small juveniles, are more susceptible to injury from swim bladder resonance when exposed to continuous signals within the resonant frequency range.

Hastings (1991; 1995) tested the limits of acoustic exposure on two freshwater fish species. Hastings found "acoustic stunning" (loss of consciousness) in blue gouramis (*Trichogaster trichopterus*) following an eight-minute continuous exposure in captivity to a 150 Hz pure tone with a sound pressure level of 198 dB re 1 µPa (Hastings, 1995). This species of fish has an air bubble in the mouth cavity directly adjacent to the animal's braincase that may have caused this injury. Hastings (1991; 1995) also found that goldfish (*Carassius auratus*) exposed to a 250 Hz continuous wave sound with peak pressures of 204 dB re 1 µPa for two hours and blue gourami exposed to a 150 Hz continuous wave sound at a sound pressure level of 198 dB re 1 µPa for 0.5 hour did not survive. These studies illustrate the highest-known levels tested on fishes with hearing specializations. These high levels of noise were also projected for relatively long durations of time and in a small tank test environment, therefore direct comparisons to results in natural settings should be treated with caution. Stunning and mortality due to exposure to non-impulsive sound exposure has not been observed in other studies.

Three freshwater species of fish, the rainbow trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*), channel catfish (*Ictalurus punctatus*), and the hybrid sunfish (*Lepomis* sp.), were exposed to both low- and mid-frequency sonar (Kane et al., 2010; Popper et al., 2007). Low-frequency exposures with received sound pressure levels of 193 dB re 1 µPa occurred for either 324 or 648 seconds. Mid-frequency exposures with received sound pressure levels of 210 dB re 1 µPa occurred for 15 seconds. No fish mortality resulted from either experiment, and during necropsy after test exposures, both studies found that none of the subjects showed signs of tissue damage related to exposure (Kane et al., 2010; Popper et al., 2007).

As summarized in the *ANSI Sound Exposure Guideline* technical report (Popper et al., 2014), although fish have been injured and killed due to intense, long-duration, non-impulsive sound exposures, fish exposed under more realistic conditions have shown no signs of injury. Those species tested to date can be used as viable surrogates for estimating injury in other species exposed to similar sources.

3.9.2.1.1.2 Hearing Loss

Researchers have examined the effects on hearing in fishes from sonar-like signals, tones, and different non-impulsive noise sources. Section 3.0.4.7 (Conceptual Framework for Assessing Effects from Acoustic and Explosive Activities) provides additional information on hearing loss and the framework used to analyze this potential impact.

Exposure to high-intensity sound can cause hearing loss, also known as a noise-induced threshold shift, or simply a threshold shift (Miller, 1974). A temporary threshold shift (TTS) is a temporary, recoverable loss of hearing sensitivity. A TTS may last several minutes to several weeks, and the duration may be related to the intensity of the sound source and the duration of the sound (including multiple exposures). A permanent threshold shift (PTS) is non-recoverable, results from the destruction of tissues within the auditory system, permanent loss of hair cells, or damage to auditory nerve fibers (Liberman, 2016), and can occur over a small range of frequencies related to the sound exposure. However, the sensory hair cells of the inner ear in fishes are regularly replaced over time when they are damaged, unlike in mammals where sensory hair cells loss is permanent (Lombarte et al., 1993; Popper et al., 2014; Smith et al., 2006). Consequently, PTS has not been known to occur in fishes, and any hearing loss in fish may be as temporary as the timeframe required to repair or replace the sensory cells that were damaged or destroyed (Popper et al., 2005; Popper et al., 2014; Smith et al., 2006). (Popper et al., 2005; Popper et al., 2014; Smith et al., 2006). As with TTS, the animal does not become deaf but requires a louder sound stimulus, relative to the amount of PTS, to detect a sound within the affected frequencies. Although available data for some terrestrial mammals have shown signs of nerve damage after severe threshold shifts (e.g., Kujawa & Liberman, 2009; Lin et al., 2011), it is not known if damage to auditory nerve fibers could also occur in fishes and, if so, whether fibers would recover during this process. One example that demonstrated a lack of damage to sensory receptors when TTS occurred was in a study on hearing loss in zebrafish (*Danio rerio,* a freshwater species with a swim bladder involved in hearing). This was one of the first studies to look at both auditory threshold shifts and potential physical effects on the inner ear. However, marine species have yet to be tested and future research should evaluate other potential mechanisms of cellular or structural damage if in fact physical damage occurs in fishes with the onset of a threshold shift (Breitzler et al., 2020).

Hearing Loss due to Impulsive Sound Sources

Popper et al. (2005) examined the effects of a seismic air gun array on a fish with a swim bladder that is involved in hearing, the lake chub (*Couesius plumbeus*), and two species that have a swim bladder that is not involved in hearing, the northern pike (*Esox lucius*) and the broad whitefish (*Coregonus nasus*), a salmonid. In this study, the lowest received cumulative sound exposure level at which effects were noted was 186 dB re 1 μPa^2-s (5 shots with a mean sound pressure level of 177 dB re 1 µPa). The results showed temporary hearing loss for both lake chub and northern pike to both 5 and 20 air gun shots, but not for the broad whitefish. Hearing loss was approximately 20 to 25 dB at some frequencies for both species, and full recovery of hearing took place within 18 hours after sound exposure. Examination of the sensory surfaces of the ears after allotted recovery times (one hour for five shot exposures, and up to 18 hours for 20 shot exposures) showed no damage to sensory hair cells in any of the fish from these exposures (Song et al., 2008).

McCauley et al. (2003) and McCauley and Kent (2012) showed loss of a small percent of sensory hair cells in the inner ear of caged fish exposed to a towed air gun array simulating a passing seismic vessel. Pink snapper (*Pagrus auratus*), a species that has a swim bladder that is not involved in hearing, were exposed to multiple air gun shots for up to 1.5 hours (McCauley et al., 2003) where the maximum received sound exposure levels exceeded 180 dB re 1 μPa^2-s. The loss of sensory hair cells continued to increase for up to at least 58 days post exposure to 2.7 percent of the total cells. Gold band snapper (*Pristipomoides multidens*) and sea perch (*Lutjanis kasmira*), both fishes with a swim bladder involved in hearing, were also exposed to a towed air gun array simulating a passing seismic vessel (McCauley & Kent, 2012). Although received levels for these exposures have not been published, hair cell damage

increased as the range of the exposure (i.e., range to the source) decreased. Again, the amount of damage was considered small in each case (McCauley & Kent, 2012). It is not known if this hair cell loss would result in hearing loss since fish have tens or even hundreds of thousands of sensory hair cells in the inner ear and only a small portion were affected by the sound (Lombarte & Popper, 1994; Popper & Hoxter, 1984). A reason McCauley and Kent (2012) found damage to sensory hair cells while Popper et al. (2005) did not may be in their distinct methodologies. Their studies had many differences, including species and the precise sound source characteristics.

Hastings et al. (2008) exposed a fish with a swim bladder that is involved in hearing, the pinecone soldierfish (*Myripristis murdjan*), and three species that have a swim bladder that is not involved in hearing, the blue green damselfish (*Chromis viridis*), the saber squirrelfish (*Sargocentron spiniferum*), and the bluestripe seaperch (*Lutjanus kasmira*), to an air gun array. Fish in cages were exposed to multiple air gun shots with a cumulative sound exposure level of 190 dB re 1 μPa^2-s. The authors found no hearing loss in any fish examined up to 12 hours after the exposures.

In an investigation of another impulsive source, Casper et al. (2013b) found that some fishes may actually be more susceptible to barotrauma (e.g., swim bladder ruptures, herniations, and hematomas) than hearing effects when exposed to simulated impact pile driving. Hybrid striped bass (white bass x striped bass) and Mozambique tilapia (*Oreochromis mossambicus*), two species with a swim bladder not involved in hearing, were exposed to sound exposure levels between 213 and 216 dB re 1 μPa^2-s. The subjects exhibited barotrauma, and although researchers began to observe signs of inner ear hair cell loss, these effects were small compared to the other non-auditory injuries incurred. Researchers speculated that injury might occur prior to signs of hearing loss or TTS. These sound exposure levels may present the lowest threshold at which hearing effects may begin to occur.

Overall, PTS has not been known to occur in fishes tested to date. Any hearing loss in fish may be as temporary as the timeframe required to repair or replace the sensory cells that were damaged or destroyed (Popper et al., 2005; Popper et al., 2014; Smith et al., 2006). The lowest sound exposure level at which TTS has been observed in fishes with a swim bladder involved in hearing is 186 dB re 1 μPa^2-s. As reviewed in the *ANSI Sound Exposure Guideline* technical report (Popper et al., 2014), fishes without a swim bladder, or fishes with a swim bladder that is not involved in hearing, would be less susceptible to hearing loss (i.e., TTS) than fishes with swim bladders involved in hearing, even at higher levels and longer durations.

Hearing Loss due to Sonar and Other Transducers

Several studies have examined the effects of the sound exposures from low-frequency sonar on fish hearing (i.e., Halvorsen et al., 2013; Kane et al., 2010; Popper et al., 2007). Hearing was measured both immediately post exposure and for up to several days thereafter (Halvorsen et al., 2013; Kane et al., 2010; Popper et al., 2007). Maximum received sound pressure levels were 193 dB re 1 µPa for 324 or 648 seconds (a cumulative sound exposure level of 218 or 220 dB re 1 μPa^2-s, respectively) at frequencies ranging from 170 to 320 Hz (Kane et al., 2010; Popper et al., 2007), and 195 dB re 1 µPa for 324 seconds (a cumulative sound exposure level of 215 dB re 1 μPa^2-s) in a follow-on study (Halvorsen et al., 2013). Two species with a swim bladder not involved in hearing, the largemouth bass (*Micropterus salmoides*) and yellow perch (*Perca flavescens*), showed no loss in hearing sensitivity from sound exposure immediately after the test or 24 hours later. Channel catfish, a fish with a swim bladder involved in hearing, and some specimens of rainbow trout, a fish with a swim bladder not involved in hearing, showed a threshold shift (up to 10–20 dB of hearing loss) immediately after exposure to the low-frequency sonar when compared to baseline and control animals. Small thresholds shifts were

detected for up to 24 hours after the experiment in some channel catfish. Although some rainbow trout in one test group showed signs of hearing loss, rainbow trout in another group showed no hearing loss. The different results between rainbow trout test groups are difficult to understand, but may be due to development or genetic differences in the various groups of fish. Catfish hearing returned to, or close to, normal within about 24 hours after exposure to low-frequency sonar. Examination of the inner ears of the fish during necropsy revealed no differences from the control groups in ciliary bundles or other features indicative of hearing loss. The maximum time fish were held post exposure before sacrifice was 96 hours (Kane et al., 2010).

The same investigators examined the potential effects of mid-frequency active sonar on fish hearing and the inner ear (Halvorsen et al., 2012c; Kane et al., 2010). The maximum received sound pressure level was 210 dB re 1 µPa at a frequency of 2.8 to 3.8 kHz for a total duration of 15 seconds (cumulative sound exposure level of 220 dB re 1 μPa^2-s). Out of the species tested (rainbow trout and channel catfish), only one test group of channel catfish showed any hearing loss after exposure to mid-frequency active sonar. The investigators tested catfish during two different seasons and found that the group tested in October experienced TTS, which recovered within 24 hours, but fish tested in December showed no effect. It was speculated that the difference in hearing loss between catfish groups might have been due to the difference in water temperature during the testing period or due to differences between the two stocks of fish (Halvorsen et al., 2012c). Any effects on hearing in channel catfish due to sound exposure appeared to be short-term and non-permanent (Halvorsen et al., 2012c; Kane et al., 2010).

Some studies have suggested that there may be some loss of sensory hair cells due to high-intensity sources, indicating a loss in hearing sensitivity; however, none of those studies concurrently investigated the subjects' actual hearing range after exposure to these sources. Enger (1981) found loss of ciliary bundles of the sensory cells in the inner ears of Atlantic cod following one to five hours of exposure to pure tone sounds between 50 and 400 Hz with a sound pressure level of 180 dB re 1 µPa. Hastings (1995) found auditory hair-cell damage in goldfish, a freshwater species with a swim bladder that is involved in hearing. Goldfish were exposed to 250 Hz and 500 Hz continuous tones with maximum peak sound pressure levels of 204 dB re 1 µPa and 197 dB re 1 µPa, respectively, for about two hours. Similarly, Hastings et al. (1996) demonstrated damage to some sensory hair cells in oscars (*Astronotus ocellatus*) observed one to four days following a one-hour exposure to a pure tone at 300 Hz with a sound pressure level of 180 dB re 1 µPa, but no damage to the lateral line was observed. Both studies found a relatively small percentage of total hair cell loss from hearing organs despite long duration exposures. Effects from long-duration noise exposure studies are generally informative; however, they are not necessarily a direct comparison to intermittent short-duration exposures produced during Navy activities involving sonar and other transducers.

As noted in the *ANSI Sound Exposure Guideline* technical report (Popper et al., 2014), some fish species with a swim bladder that is involved in hearing may be more susceptible to TTS from high-intensity non-impulsive sound sources, such as sonar and other transducers, depending on the duration and frequency content of the exposure. Fishes with a swim bladder involved in hearing and fishes with high-frequency hearing may exhibit TTS from exposure to low- and mid-frequency sonar, specifically at cumulative sound exposure levels above 215 dB re 1 μPa^2-s. However, fishes without a swim bladder and fishes with a swim bladder that is not involved in hearing would be unlikely to detect mid-frequency or other higher-frequency sonars and would likely require a much higher sound exposure level to exhibit the same effect from exposure to low-frequency active sonar.

Hearing Loss due to Vessel Noise

Little data exist on the effects of vessel noise on hearing in fishes. However, TTS has been observed in fishes exposed to elevated background noise and other non-impulsive sources (e.g., white noise). Caged studies on pressure-sensitive fishes (i.e., fishes with a swim bladder involved in hearing and those with high-frequency hearing) show some hearing loss after several days or weeks of exposure to increased background sounds, although the hearing loss seems to recover (e.g., Scholik & Yan, 2002b; Smith et al., 2004b; Smith et al., 2006). Smith et al. (2004b; 2006) exposed goldfish, to noise with a sound pressure level of 170 dB re 1 µPa and found a clear relationship between the amount of hearing loss and the duration of exposure until maximum hearing loss occurred at about 24 hours of exposure. A 10-minute exposure resulted in 5 dB of TTS, whereas a three-week exposure resulted in a 28 dB TTS that took over two weeks to return to pre-exposure baseline levels (Smith et al., 2004b). Recovery times were not measured by investigators for shorter exposure durations. It is important to note that these exposures were continuous and subjects were unable to avoid the sound source for the duration of the experiment.

Scholik and Yan (2001) demonstrated TTS in fathead minnows (*Pimephales promelas*) after a 24-hour continuous exposure to white noise (0.3–2.0 kHz) at 142 dB re 1 µPa that took up to 14 days post-exposure to recover. This is the longest recorded time for a threshold shift to recover in a fish. The same authors also found that the bluegill sunfish (*Lepomis macrochirus*), a species that primarily detects particle motion and lacks specializations for hearing, did not show significant elevations in auditory thresholds when exposed to the same stimulus (Scholik & Yan, 2002a). This demonstrates again that fishes with a swim bladder involved in hearing and those with high-frequency hearing may be more sensitive to hearing loss than fishes without a swim bladder or those with a swim bladder not involved in hearing.

Breitzler et al. (2020) exposed zebrafish (a freshwater fish with a swim bladder involved in hearing) to 24 hours of white noise at various frequencies and sound levels. This is one of the first studies that measured hearing thresholds, physical damage (i.e., loss of hair cells), and recovery post-exposure. Overall, results were similar to those from previous studies. As the noise level increased, the amount of TTS observed in zebrafish also increased and frequencies that were most affected were those within the fishes best hearing sensitivity. Breitzler et al. (2020) also observed an increase in response latency in fish with TTS (i.e., the fish were slower to respond to auditory stimuli during hearing tests). Threshold shifts in fish exposed to 130 dB and 140 dB recovered within three days whereas it took up to 14 days for fish exposed to the highest exposure level (150 dB) to return to pre-exposure levels. Similarly, response latency was time dependent and sometimes took up to 14 days to recover to pre-exposure levels. The highest threshold shifts recorded also resulted in hair cell loss but, similar to the other effects measured in this study, hair cells returned to baseline levels within seven days post-exposure. This further demonstrates the ability for fish to rejuvenate hair cells and for hearing thresholds to recover to baseline levels without any evidence of PTS.

When reviewing results from these three studies, it is important to note that the fish were unable to avoid the sound source (e.g., held stationary in tubs or tanks) and were subject to long, continuous duration exposures (e.g., days to weeks). A direct comparison of these results to fish exposed to continuous sound sources in natural settings should be treated with caution. For example, fishes that are exposed to vessel noise in their natural environment, even in areas with high levels of vessel movement, would only be exposed for periods of short durations (e.g., seconds or minutes) as vessels pass by. Therefore, overall effects would not likely rise to the level of impact demonstrated in laboratory

studies. As summarized in the *ANSI Sound Exposure Guideline* technical report (Popper et al., 2014), some fish species with a swim bladder that is involved in hearing may be more susceptible to TTS from long duration continuous noise, such as broadband[2] white noise, depending on the duration of the exposure (thresholds are proposed based on continuous exposure of 12 hours). However, it is not likely that TTS would occur in fishes with a swim bladder not involved in hearing or in fishes without a swim bladder.

3.9.2.1.1.3 Masking

Masking refers to the presence of a noise that interferes with a fish's ability to hear biologically important sounds, including those produced by prey, predators, or other fishes. Masking occurs in all vertebrate groups and can effectively limit the distance over which an animal can communicate and detect biologically relevant sounds. Human-generated continuous sounds (e.g., some sonar, vessel or aircraft noise, and vibratory pile driving) have the potential to mask sounds that are biologically important to fishes. Researchers have studied masking in fishes using continuous masking noise, but masking due to intermittent, short-duty cycle sounds has not been studied. Section 3.0.4.7 (Conceptual Framework for Assessing Effects from Acoustic and Explosive Activities) provides additional information on masking and the framework used to analyze this potential impact.

Masking is likely to occur in most fishes due to varying levels of ambient or natural noise in the environment such as wave action, precipitation, or other animal vocalizations (Popper et al., 2014). Ambient noise during higher sea states in the ocean has resulted in elevated thresholds in several fish species (Chapman & Hawkins, 1973; Ramcharitar & Popper, 2004). Although the overall intensity or loudness of ambient or human-generated noise may result in masking effects in fishes, masking may be most problematic when human-generated signals or ambient noise levels overlap the frequencies of biologically important signals (Buerkle, 1968, 1969; Popper et al., 2014; Tavolga, 1974).

Wysocki and Ladich (2005) investigated the influence of continuous white noise exposure on the auditory sensitivity of two freshwater fish with notable hearing specializations for sound pressure detection, the goldfish and the lined Raphael catfish (*Platydoras costatus*), and a freshwater fish without notable specializations, the pumpkinseed sunfish (*Lepomis gibbosus*). For the goldfish and catfish, baseline thresholds were lower than masked thresholds. Continuous white noise with a sound pressure level of approximately 130 dB re 1 µPa at 1 m resulted in an elevated threshold of 23–44 dB within the subjects' region of best sensitivity between 500 and 1,000 Hz. There was less evidence of masking in the sunfish during the same exposures, with only a shift of 11 dB. Wysocki and Ladich (2005) suggest that ambient sound regimes may limit acoustic communication and orientation, especially in animals with notable hearing specializations for sound pressure detection.

Masking could lead to potential fitness costs depending on the severity of the reaction and the animal's ability to adapt or compensate during an exposure (de Jong et al., 2020; Radford et al., 2014; Slabbekoorn et al., 2010). For example, masking could result in changes in predator-prey relationships, potentially inhibiting a fish's ability to detect predators and therefore increase its risk of predation (Astrup, 1999; Mann et al., 1998; Simpson et al., 2015; Simpson et al., 2016). Masking may also limit the distance over which fish can communicate or detect important signals (Alves et al., 2016; Codarin et al.,

[2] A sound or signal that contains energy across multiple frequencies.

2009; Ramcharitar et al., 2001; Ramcharitar et al., 2006), including sounds emitted from a reef for navigating larvae (Higgs, 2005; Neenan et al., 2016). If the masking signal is brief (a few seconds or less), biologically important signals may still be detected, resulting in little effect to the individual. If the signal is longer in duration (minutes or hours) or overlaps with important frequencies for a particular species, more severe consequences may occur such as the inability to attract a mate and reproduce. Holt and Johnston (2014) were the first to demonstrate the Lombard effect in one species of fish, a potentially compensatory behavior where an animal increases the source level of its vocalizations in response to elevated noise levels. The Lombard effect is currently understood to be a reflex that may be unnoticeable to the animal or may lead to increased energy expenditure during communication.

The *ANSI Sound Exposure Guideline* technical report (Popper et al., 2014) highlights a lack of data that exists for masking by sonar but suggests that the narrow bandwidth and intermittent nature of most sonar signals would result in only a limited probability of any masking effects. In addition, most sonars (mid-, high-, and very high-frequency) are above the hearing range of most marine fish species, eliminating the possibility of masking for these species. In most cases, the probability of masking would further decrease with increasing distance from the sound source.

In addition, no data are available on masking by impulsive signals (e.g., impact pile driving and air guns) (Popper et al., 2014). Impulsive sounds are typically brief, lasting only fractions of a second, where masking could occur only during that brief duration of sound. Biological sounds can typically be detected between pulses within close distances to the source unless those biological sounds are similar to the masking noise, such as impulsive or drumming vocalizations made by some fishes (e.g., cod or haddock). Masking could also indirectly occur because of repetitive impulsive signals where the repetitive sounds and reverberations over distance may create a more continuous noise exposure.

Although there is evidence of masking because of exposure to vessel noise, the *ANSI Sound Exposure Guideline* technical report (Popper et al., 2014) does not present numeric thresholds for this effect. Instead, relative risk factors are considered, and it is assumed the probability of masking occurring is higher at near to moderate distances from the source (up to hundreds of meters) but decreases with increasing distance (Popper et al., 2014).

3.9.2.1.1.4 Physiological Stress

Section 3.0.4.7 (Conceptual Framework for Assessing Effects from Acoustic and Explosive Activities) provides additional information on physiological stress and the framework used to analyze this potential impact. A fish must first be able to detect a sound above its hearing threshold and above the ambient noise level before a physiological stress reaction can occur. The initial response to a stimulus is a rapid release of stress hormones into the circulatory system, which may cause other responses such as elevated heart rate and blood chemistry changes. Although an increase in background sound has been shown to cause stress in humans and animals, only a limited number of studies have measured biochemical responses by fishes to acoustic stressors (e.g., Goetz et al., 2015; Madaro et al., 2015; Remage-Healey et al., 2006; Smith et al., 2004a; Wysocki et al., 2006; Wysocki et al., 2007), and the results have varied. Stimuli that have been used to study physiological stress responses in fishes include predator vocalizations, non-impulsive or continuous, and impulsive noise exposures.

A stress response that has been observed in fishes is the production of cortisol (a stress hormone) when exposed to sounds such as boat noise, tones, or predator vocalizations. Nichols et al. (2015) found that giant kelpfish (*Heterostichus rostratus*) had increased levels of cortisol with increased sound level and intermittency of boat noise playbacks. Cod exposed to a short-duration upsweep (a tone that sweeps

upward across multiple frequencies) across 100–1,000 Hz had increases in cortisol levels, which returned to normal within one hour post-exposure (Sierra-Flores et al., 2015). Remage-Healey et al. (2006) found elevated cortisol levels in Gulf toadfish (*Opsanus beta*) exposed to low-frequency bottlenose dolphin sounds, but they observed no physiological change when they exposed toadfish to low-frequency "pops" produced by snapping shrimp.

A sudden increase in sound pressure level (i.e., presentation of a sound source) or an increase in overall background noise levels can increase hormone levels and alter other metabolic rates indicative of a stress response, such as increased ventilation and oxygen consumption (Pickering, 1981; Popper & Hastings, 2009a; Radford et al., 2016; Simpson et al., 2015; Simpson et al., 2016; Smith et al., 2004a, 2004b; Spiga et al., 2017). Similarly, reef fish embryos exposed to boat noise have demonstrated changes in morphological development and increases in heart rate, another indication of a physiological stress response, although survival rates were unchanged (Fakan & McCormick, 2019; Jain-Schlaepfer et al., 2018). Although results have varied, it has been shown that chronic or long-term (days or weeks) exposures of continuous man-made sounds can lead to a reduction in embryo viability (Sierra-Flores et al., 2015) and decreased growth rates (Nedelec et al., 2015).

However, not all species tested to date show these reactions. Smith et al. (2004a) found no increase in corticosteroid, a class of stress hormones, in goldfish exposed to a continuous, band-limited noise (0.1–10 kHz) with a sound pressure level of 170 dB re 1 µPa for one month. Wysocki et al. (2007) exposed rainbow trout to continuous band-limited noise with a sound pressure level of about 150 dB re 1 µPa for nine months with no observed stress effects. Growth rates and effects on the trout's immune systems were not significantly different from control animals held at a sound pressure level of 110 dB re 1 µPa.

Fishes may have physiological stress reactions to sounds that they can hear. Generally, stress responses are more likely to occur in the presence of potentially threatening sound sources, such as predator vocalizations, or the sudden onset of impulsive signals rather than from non-impulsive or continuous sources such as vessel noise or sonar. If an exposure is short, the stress responses are typically brief (a few seconds to minutes). In addition, research shows that fishes may habituate (i.e., learn to tolerate) to the noise that is being presented after multiple exposures or longer duration exposures that prove to be non-threatening. However, exposure to chronic noise sources can lead to more severe impacts over time, such as reduced growth rates which can lead to reduced survivability for an individual. It is assumed that any physiological response (e.g., hearing loss or injury) or significant behavioral response is also associated with a stress response.

3.9.2.1.1.5 Behavioral Reactions

Section 3.0.4.7 (Conceptual Framework for Assessing Effects from Acoustic and Explosive Activities) provides additional information on behavioral reactions and the framework used to analyze this potential impact. Behavioral reactions in fishes have been observed due to a number of different types of sound sources. The majority of research has been performed using air guns (including large-scale seismic surveys), sonar, and vessel noise. Fewer observations have been made on behavioral reactions to impact pile driving noise, although fish are likely to show similar behavioral reactions to any impulsive noise within or outside the zone for hearing loss and injury.

As with masking, a fish must first be able to detect a sound above its hearing threshold and above the ambient noise level before a behavioral reaction can occur. Most fishes can only detect low-frequency sounds, with the exception of a few species that can detect some mid and high frequencies (above 1 kHz).

Fish studies have identified the following behavioral reactions to sound: alteration of natural behaviors (e.g., startle or alarm), and avoidance (LGL Ltd Environmental Research Associates et al., 2008; McCauley et al., 2000; Pearson et al., 1992). In the context of this SEIS/OEIS, and to remain consistent with available behavioral reaction literature, the terms "startle," "alarm," "response," and "reaction" will be used synonymously.

In addition, observed behavioral effects to fish could include disruption or alteration of natural activities such as swimming, schooling, feeding, breeding, and migrating. Sudden changes in sound level can cause fish to dive, rise, or change swimming direction. However, some fish may learn to tolerate or habituate to repeated exposures and noise that seems threatening (e.g., Bruintjes et al., 2016; Currie et al., 2020; Nedelec et al., 2016b; Radford et al., 2016).

Research on behavioral reactions can be difficult to understand and interpret. For example, behavioral responses often times vary depending on the type of exposure and sound source present. Changes in sound intensity may be more important to a fishes' behavior than the maximum sound level. Some studies show that sounds that fluctuate in level or have intermittent pulse rates tend to elicit stronger responses from fish than even stronger sounds with a continuous level (Currie et al., 2020; Neo et al., 2014; Schwarz & Greer, 1984). It has also been suggested that unpredictable sounds that last for long durations may have the largest impact on behavioral responses (de Jong et al., 2020). Interpreting behavioral responses can also be difficult due to species-specific behavioral tendencies, motivational state (e.g., feeding or mating), an individual's previous experience, how resilient a species is to changes in their environment, and whether or not the fish are able to avoid the source (e.g., caged versus free-swimming subjects). Results from caged studies may not provide a clear understanding of how free-swimming fishes may react to the same or similar sound exposures (Hawkins et al., 2015).

Behavioral Reactions due to Impulsive Sound Sources

It is assumed that most species would react similarly to impulsive sources such as weapons noise and explosions. However, it is important to note that most data on behavioral reactions to impulsive sources is collected from studies using air guns and impact pile driving, sources that do not occur in the Study Area. Reactions include startle or alarm responses and increased swim speeds at the onset of impulsive sounds (Fewtrell & McCauley, 2012; Pearson et al., 1992; Roberts et al., 2016a; Spiga et al., 2017). Data on fish behavioral reactions exposed to impulsive sound sources is mostly limited to studies using caged fishes and the use of seismic air guns (Løkkeborg et al., 2012). Several species of rockfish (*Sebastes* species) in a caged environment exhibited startle or alarm reactions to seismic air gun pulses between peak-to-peak sound pressure levels of 180 dB re 1 µPa and 205 dB re 1 µPa (Pearson et al., 1992). More subtle behavioral changes were noted at lower sound pressure levels, including decreased swim speeds. At the presentation of the sound, some species of rockfish settled to the bottom of the experimental enclosure and reduced swim speed. Trevally (*Pseudocaranx dentex*) and pink snapper also exhibited alert responses as well as changes in swim depth, speed, and schooling behaviors when exposed to air gun noise (Fewtrell & McCauley, 2012). Both trevally and pink snapper swam faster and closer to the bottom of the cage at the onset of the exposure. However, trevally swam in tightly cohesive groups at the bottom of the test cages while pink snapper exhibited much looser group cohesion. These behavioral responses were seen during sound exposure levels as low as 147 up to 161 dB re 1 μPa^2-s but habituation occurred in all cases, either within a few minutes or within 30 minutes after the final air gun shot (Fewtrell & McCauley, 2012; Pearson et al., 1992).

Some studies have shown a lack of behavioral reactions to air gun noise. Herring exposed to an approaching air gun survey (from 27 to 2 km over six hours), resulting in single pulse sound exposure levels of 125–155 dB re 1 μPa^2-s, did not react by changing direction or swim speed (Pena et al., 2013). Although these levels are similar to those tested in other studies which exhibited responses (Fewtrell & McCauley, 2012), the distance of the exposure to the test enclosure, the slow onset of the sound source, and a strong motivation for feeding may have affected the observed response (Pena et al., 2013). In another study, Wardle et al. (2001) observed marine fish on an inshore reef before, during, and after an air gun survey at varying distances. The air guns were calibrated at a peak level of 210 dB re 1 µPa at 16 m and 195 dB re 1 µPa at 109 m from the source. Other than observed startle responses and small changes in the position of pollack, when the air gun was located within close proximity to the test site (within 10 m), they found no substantial or permanent changes in the behavior of the fish on the reef throughout the course of the study. Behavioral responses to impulsive sources are more likely to occur within near and intermediate (tens to hundreds of meters) distances from the source as opposed to far distances (thousands of meters) (Popper et al., 2014).

Unlike the previous studies, Slotte et al. (2004) used fishing sonar (38 kHz echo sounder) to monitor behavior and depth of blue whiting (*Micromesistius poutassou*) and Norwegian spring herring (*Claupea harengus L.*) spawning schools exposed to air gun signals. They reported that fishes in the area of the air guns appeared to go to greater depths after the air gun exposure compared to their vertical position prior to the air gun usage. Moreover, the abundance of animals 30–50 km away from the air guns increased during seismic activity, suggesting that migrating fish left the zone of seismic activity and did not re-enter the area until the activity ceased. It is unlikely that either species was able to detect the fishing sonar. However, it should be noted that these behavior patterns may have also been influenced by other variables such as motivation for feeding, migration, or other environmental factors (e.g., temperature, salinity, etc.) (Slotte et al., 2004).

Alterations in natural behavior patterns due to exposure to pile driving noise have not been studied as thoroughly, but reactions noted thus far are similar to those seen in response to seismic surveys. These changes in behavior include startle responses, changes in depth (in both caged and free-swimming subjects), increased swim speeds, changes in ventilation rates, changes in attention and anti-predator behaviors, and directional avoidance (e.g., Hawkins et al., 2014; Mueller-Blenkle et al., 2010; Neo et al., 2015; Roberts et al., 2016a; Spiga et al., 2017). The severity of response varied greatly by species and received sound pressure level of the exposure. For example, some minor behavioral reactions such as startle responses were observed during caged studies with a sound pressure level as low as 140 dB re 1 µPa (Neo et al., 2014). However, only some free-swimming fishes avoided pile driving noise at even higher sound pressure levels between 152 and 157 dB re 1 µPa (Iafrate et al., 2016). In addition, Roberts et al. (2016a) observed that although multiple species of free swimming fish responded to simulated pile driving recordings, not all responded consistently. In some cases, only one fish would respond while the others continued feeding from a baited remote underwater video. In other instances, various individual fish would respond to different strikes. The repetition rate of pulses during an exposure may also have an effect on what behaviors were noted and how quickly these behaviors recovered as opposed to the overall sound pressure or exposure level (Neo et al., 2014). Neo et al. (2014) observed slower recovery times in fishes exposed to intermittent sounds (similar to pile driving) compared to continuous exposures.

As summarized in the *ANSI Sound Exposure Guideline* technical report (Popper et al., 2014), species may react differently to the same sound source depending on a number of variables, such as the animal's life

stage or behavioral state (e.g., feeding, mating). Without specific data, it is assumed that fishes react similarly to all impulsive sounds outside the zone for hearing loss and injury. Observations of fish reactions to large-scale air gun surveys are informative, but not necessarily directly applicable to analyzing impacts from the short-term, intermittent use of all impulsive sources. It is assumed that fish have a high probability of reacting to an impulsive sound source within near and intermediate distances (tens to hundreds of meters), and a decreasing probability of reaction at increasing distances (Popper et al., 2014).

Behavioral Reactions due to Sonar and Other Transducers

Behavioral reactions to sonar have been studied both in caged and free-swimming fish, although results can oftentimes be difficult to interpret depending on the species tested and the study environment. Jørgensen et al. (2005) showed that caged cod and spotted wolf fish (*Anarhichas minor*) lacked any response to simulated sonar between 1 and 8 kHz. However, within the same study, reactions were seen in juvenile herring. It is likely that the sonar signals were inaudible to the cod and wolf fish (species that lack notable hearing specializations), but audible to herring (a species that has hearing capabilities in the frequency ranges tested).

Doksæter et al. (2009; 2012) and Sivle et al. (2012; 2014) studied the reactions of both wild and captive Atlantic herring to the Royal Netherlands Navy's experimental mid-frequency active sonar ranging from 1 to 7 kHz. The behavior of the fish was monitored in each study either using upward-looking echosounders (for wild herring) or audio and video monitoring systems (for captive herring). The source levels used within each study varied across all studies and exposures with a maximum received sound pressure level of 181 dB re 1 µPa and maximum cumulative sound exposure level of 184 dB re 1 μPa^2s. No avoidance or escape reactions were observed when herring were exposed to any sonar sources. Instead, significant reactions were noted at lower received sound levels of different non-sonar sound types. For example, dive responses (i.e., escape reactions) were observed when herring were exposed to killer whale feeding sounds at received sound pressure levels of approximately 150 dB re 1 µPa (Sivle et al., 2012). Startle responses were seen when the cages for captive herring were hit with a wooden stick and with the ignition of an outboard boat engine at a distance of one meter from the test pen (Doksaeter et al., 2012). It is possible that the herring were not disturbed by the sonar, were more motivated to continue other behaviors such as feeding, or did not associate the sound as a threatening stimulus. Based on these results (Doksaeter et al., 2009; Doksaeter et al., 2012; Sivle et al., 2012), Sivle et al. (2014) created a model in order to report on the possible population-level effects on Atlantic herring from active naval sonar. The authors concluded that the use of naval sonar poses little risk to populations of herring regardless of season, even when the herring populations are aggregated and directly exposed to sonar.

There is evidence that elasmobranchs (cartilaginous fish including sharks and rays) also respond to human-generated sounds. A number of researchers conducted experiments in which they played back sounds (e.g., pulsed tones below 1 kHz) and attracted a number of different shark species to the sound source (e.g., Casper et al., 2012a; Myrberg et al., 1976; Myrberg et al., 1969; Myrberg et al., 1972; Nelson & Johnson, 1972). The results of these studies showed that sharks were attracted to irregularly pulsed low-frequency sounds (below several hundred Hz), in the same frequency range of sounds that might be produced by struggling prey. However, abrupt and irregularly pulsed human-generated noise (0.2–10 kHz, with most energy below 1 kHz) resulted in withdrawal responses of certain shark species (Chapuis et al., 2019). Sharks are not known to be attracted to continuous signals or higher frequencies that they presumably cannot hear (Casper & Mann, 2006; Casper & Mann, 2009).

Only a few species of fishes can detect sonars above 1 kHz (see Section 3.9.1.1, Hearing and Vocalization), meaning that most fishes would not detect most mid-, high-, or very high-frequency Navy sonars. The few marine species that can detect above 1 kHz and have some hearing specializations may be able to better detect the sound and would therefore be more likely to react. However, researchers have found little reaction by adult fish in the wild to sonars within the animals' hearing range (Doksaeter et al., 2009; Doksaeter et al., 2012; Sivle et al., 2012). The *ANSI Sound Exposure Guideline* technical report (Popper et al., 2014) suggests that fish able to hear sonars would have a low probability of reacting to the source within near or intermediate distances (within tens to hundreds of meters) and a decreasing probability of reacting at increasing distances.

Behavioral Reactions due to Vessel Noise

Vessel traffic also contributes to the amount of noise in the ocean and has the potential to affect fishes. Several studies have demonstrated and reviewed avoidance responses by fishes (e.g., herring and cod) to the low-frequency sounds of vessels (De Robertis & Handegard, 2013; Engås et al., 1995; Handegard et al., 2003). Misund (1997) found that fish that were ahead of a ship and showed avoidance reactions did so at ranges of 50–150 m. When the vessel passed over them, some species of fish responded with sudden escape responses that included lateral avoidance or downward compression of the school.

As mentioned above, behavioral reactions are quite variable and depend on a number of factors such as (but not limited to) the type of fish, its life history stage, behavior, time of day, location, the type of vessel, and the sound propagation characteristics of the water column (Popper et al., 2014; Schwarz & Greer, 1984). Reactions to playbacks of continuous noise or passing vessels generally include basic startle and avoidance responses, as well as evidence of distraction and increased decision-making errors. Other specific examples of observed responses include increased group cohesion, increased distractions or evidence of modified attention, changes in vertical distribution in the water column, changes in swim speeds, distance traveled, as well as changes in feeding efficacy such as reduced foraging attempts and increased mistakes (i.e., lowered discrimination between food and non-food items) (e.g., Bracciali et al., 2012; De Robertis & Handegard, 2013; Handegard et al., 2015; McCormick et al., 2019; Nedelec et al., 2015; Nedelec et al., 2017a; Neo et al., 2015; Payne et al., 2015; Purser & Radford, 2011; Roberts et al., 2016a; Sabet et al., 2016; Simpson et al., 2015; Simpson et al., 2016; Voellmy et al., 2014a; Voellmy et al., 2014b).

Behavioral responses may also be dependent on the type of vessel that fish are exposed to. For example, juvenile damselfish (*Pomacentrus wardi*) exposed to sound from a two-stroke engine resulted in startle responses, reduction in boldness (increased time spent hiding, less time exhibiting exploratory behaviors), and space use (maximum distance ventured from shelter or traveled within the test enclosure), as well as slower and more conservative reactions to visual stimuli analogous to a potential predator. However, damselfish exposed to sound from a four-stroke engine generally displayed similar responses as control fish exposed to ambient noise (e.g., little or no change in boldness) (McCormick et al., 2018; McCormick et al., 2019). Although the two sound sources were very similar, the vessels powered by the four-stroke engine were of lower intensity compared to vessels powered by the two-stroke engine, which may explain the overall reduced response to this engine type.

Vessel noise has also led to changes in anti-predator responses, but these responses vary by species. During exposures to vessel noise, juvenile Ambon damselfish (*Pomacentrus amboinensis*) and European eels showed slower reaction times and lacked startle responses to predatory attacks, and subsequently showed signs of distraction and increased their risk of predation during both simulated and actual predation experiments (Simpson et al., 2015; Simpson et al., 2016). Spiny chromis (*Acanthochromis*

polyacanthus) exposed to chronic boat noise playbacks for up to 12 consecutive days spent less time feeding and interacting with offspring, and increased defensive acts. In addition, offspring survival rates were also lower at nests exposed to chronic boat noise playbacks versus those exposed to ambient playbacks (Nedelec et al., 2017b). This suggests that chronic or long-term exposures could have more severe consequences than brief exposures.

In contrast, larval Atlantic cod showed a stronger anti-predator response and were more difficult to capture during simulated predator attacks (Nedelec et al., 2015). There are also observations of a general lack of response to shipping and pile driving playback noise by grey mullet (*Chelon labrosus*) and the two-spotted goby (*Gobiusculus flavescens*) (Roberts et al., 2016b). Mensinger et al. (2018) found that Australian snapper located in a protected area showed no change in feeding behavior or avoidance during boat passes, whereas snapper in areas where fishing occurs startled and ceased feeding behaviors during boat presence. This supports that location and past experience also have an influence on whether fishes react.

Although behavioral responses such as those listed above were often noted during the onset of most sound presentations, most behaviors did not last long and animals quickly returned to baseline behavior patterns. In fact, in one study, when given the chance to move from a noisy tank (with sound pressure levels reaching 120–140 dB re 1 µPa) to a quieter tank (sound pressure levels of 110 dB re 1 µPa), there was no evidence of avoidance. The fish did not seem to prefer the quieter environment and continued to swim between the two tanks comparable to control sessions (Neo et al., 2015). However, many of these reactions are difficult to extrapolate to real world conditions due to the captive environment in which testing occurred.

Most fish species should be able to detect vessel noise due to its low-frequency content and their hearing capabilities (see Section 3.9.1.1, Hearing and Vocalization). The *ANSI Sound Exposure Guideline* technical report (Popper et al., 2014) suggests that fishes have a moderate to high probability of reacting to nearby vessel noise (i.e., within tens of meters) with decreasing probability of reactions with increasing distance from the source (hundreds or more meters).

3.9.2.1.1.6 Long-Term Consequences

Section 3.0.4.7 (Conceptual Framework for Assessing Effects from Acoustic and Explosive Activities) provides additional information on potential pathways for long-term consequences. Mortality removes an individual fish from the population, while injury reduces the fitness of an individual. Few studies have been conducted on any long-term consequences from repeated hearing loss, stress, or behavioral reactions in fishes due to exposure to loud sounds (Hawkins et al., 2015; Popper & Hastings, 2009a; Popper et al., 2014). Repeated exposures of an individual to multiple sound-producing activities over a season, year, or life stage could cause reactions with costs that can accumulate over time to cause long-term consequences for the individual. These long-term consequences may affect the survivability of the individual, or if impacting enough individuals may have population-level effects, including alteration from migration paths, avoidance of important habitat, or even cessation of foraging or reproductive behavior (Hawkins et al., 2015). Conversely, some animals habituate to or become tolerant of repeated exposures over time, learning to ignore a stimulus that in the past has not accompanied any overt threat. In fact, Sivle et al. (2016) predicted that exposures to sonar at the maximum levels tested would only result in short-term disturbance and would not likely affect the overall population in sensitive fishes such as Atlantic herring (a species which does not occur in the MITT Study Area).

3.9.2.1.2 Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers

The overall use of sonar and other transducers for training and testing would be similar to what is currently conducted (see Table 2.5-1 and Table 3.0-2 for details). Although individual activities may vary some from those previously analyzed, and some new systems using new technologies would be tested under Alternative 1 and 2, the overall determinations presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS remain valid.


Sonar and other transducers proposed for use are transient in most locations because activities that involve sonar and other transducers take place at different locations and many platforms are generally moving throughout the Study Area. A few activities involving sonar and other transducers occur in inshore waters (within bays and estuaries), including at pierside locations where they reoccur. Sonar and other transducers emit sound waves into the water to detect objects, safely navigate, and communicate. General categories and characteristics of these systems and the number of hours these sonars would be operated are described in Section 3.0.4.1.1 (Sonar and Other Transducers). The activities analyzed in this SEIS/OEIS that use sonar and other transducers are described in Appendix A (Training and Testing Activities Descriptions).

As described under Section 3.9.2.1.1.1 (Injury – Injury due to Sonar and Other Transducers), direct injury from sonar and other transducers is highly unlikely because injury has not been documented in fish exposed to sonar (Halvorsen et al., 2012c; Halvorsen et al., 2013; Popper et al., 2007) and therefore is not considered further in this analysis.

Fishes are not equally sensitive to noise at all frequencies. Fishes must first be able to hear a sound in order to be affected by it. As discussed in Section 3.9.1.1 (Hearing and Vocalization), many marine fish species tested to date hear primarily below 1 kHz. For the purposes of this analysis, fish species were grouped into one of four fish hearing groups based on either their known hearing ranges (i.e., audiograms) or physiological features that may be linked to overall hearing capabilities (i.e., swim bladder with connection to, or in close proximity to, the inner ear). Figure 3.9-1 provides a general summary of hearing threshold data from available literature (e.g., Casper & Mann, 2006; Deng et al., 2013; Kéver et al., 2014; Mann et al., 2001; Ramcharitar et al., 2006) to demonstrate the maximum potential range of frequency detection for each hearing group.

Due to data limitations, these estimated hearing ranges may be overly conservative in that they may extend beyond what some species within a given fish hearing group may actually detect. For example, although most sharks are sensitive to lower frequencies, well below 1 kHz, the bull shark has been tested and can detect frequencies up to 1.5 kHz (Kritzler & Wood, 1961; Myrberg, 2001) and therefore represents the uppermost known limit of frequency detection for this hearing group. These upper bounds of each fish hearing groups' frequency range are outside of the range of best sensitivity for the majority of fishes within that group. As a result, fishes within each group would only be able to detect those upper frequencies at close distances to the source, and from sources with relatively high source levels.

Figure 3.9-1 is not intended as a composite audiogram but rather displays the basic overlap in potential frequency content for each hearing group with Navy defined sonar classes (i.e., low-, mid-, high- and very high-frequency) as discussed under Section 3.0.4.1.1 (Sonar and Other Transducers – Classification of Sonar and Other Transducers).



Notes: Thin blue lines represent the estimated minimum and maximum range of frequency detection for each group. All hearing groups are assumed to hear down to 0.01 kHz regardless of available data. Thicker portions of each blue line represent the estimated minimum and maximum range of best sensitivity for that group. Currently, no data are available to estimate the range of best sensitivity for fishes without a swim bladder. Although each sonar class is represented graphically by the horizontal black, grey and brown bars, not all sources within each class would operate at all the displayed frequencies. Example mid-frequency sources are provided to further demonstrate this. kHz = kilohertz, MF1 = 3.5 kHz, MF4 = 4 kHz, MF5 = 8 kHz.

Figure 3.9-1: Fish Hearing Group and Navy Sonar Bin Frequency Ranges

Systems within the low-frequency sonar class present the greatest potential for overlap with fish hearing. Some mid-frequency sonars and other transducers may also overlap some species' hearing ranges, but to a lesser extent than low-frequency sonars. For example, the only hearing groups that have the potential to be able to detect mid-frequency sources within bins MF1, MF4, and MF5 are fishes with a swim bladder involved in hearing and with high-frequency hearing. It is anticipated that most fishes would not hear or be affected by mid-frequency Navy sonars or other transducers with operating frequencies greater than about 1–4 kHz. Only a few fish species (i.e., fish with a swim bladder and high-frequency hearing specializations) can detect and therefore be potentially affected by high- and very high-frequency sonars and other transducers.

The most probable impacts from exposure to sonar and other transducers are TTS (for more detail see Section 3.9.2.1.1.2, Hearing Loss), masking (for more detail see Section 3.9.2.1.1.3, Masking), physiological stress (for more detail see Section 3.9.2.1.1.4, Physiological Stress), and behavioral

reactions (for more detail see Section 3.9.2.1.1.5, Behavioral Reactions). Analysis of these effects are provided below.

3.9.2.1.2.1 Methods for Analyzing Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers

The Navy performed a quantitative analysis to estimate the range to TTS for fishes exposed to sonar and other transducers used during Navy training and testing activities. Inputs to the quantitative analysis included sound propagation modeling in the Navy Acoustic Effects Model to the sound exposure criteria and thresholds presented below to predict ranges to effects. Although ranges to effect are predicted, density data for fish species within the Study Area are not available; therefore, it is not possible to estimate the total number of individuals that may be affected by sound produced by sonar and other transducers.

Criteria and thresholds to estimate impacts from sonar and other transducers are presented below in Table 3.9-3. Thresholds for hearing loss are typically reported in cumulative sound exposure level so as to account for the duration of the exposure. Therefore, thresholds reported in the *ANSI Sound Exposure Guideline* technical report (Popper et al., 2014) that were presented in other metrics were converted to sound exposure level based on the signal duration reported in the original studies (see Halvorsen et al., 2012c; Halvorsen et al., 2013; Kane et al., 2010; Popper et al., 2007). General research findings from these studies can be reviewed in Section 3.9.2.1.1.2 (Hearing Loss).

Table 3.9-3: Sound Exposure Criteria for TTS from Sonar

Fish Hearing Group	*TTS from Low-Frequency Sonar (SEL_{cum})*	*TTS from Mid-Frequency Sonar (SEL_{cum})*
Fishes without a swim bladder	NC	NC
Fishes with a swim bladder not involved in hearing	> 210	NC
Fishes with a swim bladder involved in hearing	210	220
Fishes with a swim bladder and high-frequency hearing	210	220

Notes: TTS = Temporary Threshold Shift, SEL_{cum} = Cumulative sound exposure level (decibel referenced to 1 micropascal squared seconds [dB re 1 μPa^2-s]), NC = effects from exposure to sonar is considered to be unlikely, therefore no criteria are reported, ">" indicates that the given effect would occur above the reported threshold.

For mid-frequency sonars, fishes with a swim bladder involved in hearing have shown signs of hearing loss because of mid-frequency sonar exposure at a maximum received sound pressure level of 210 dB re 1 µPa for a total duration of 15 seconds. To account for the total duration of the exposure, the threshold for TTS is a cumulative sound exposure level of 220 dB re 1 μPa^2-s (Halvorsen et al., 2012c; Kane et al., 2010). The same threshold is used for fishes with a swim bladder and high-frequency hearing as a conservative measure, although fishes in this hearing group have not been tested for the same impact. TTS has not been observed in fishes with a swim bladder that is not involved in hearing exposed to mid-frequency sonar. Fishes within this hearing group do not sense pressure well and typically cannot hear at frequencies above 1 kHz (Halvorsen et al., 2012c; Popper et al., 2014). Therefore, no criteria were proposed for fishes with a swim bladder that is not involved in hearing from exposure to mid-frequency sonars, as it is considered unlikely for TTS to occur. Fishes without a swim bladder are

even less susceptible to noise exposure; therefore, TTS is unlikely to occur, and no criteria are proposed for this group either.

For low-frequency sonar, as described in Section 3.9.2.1.1.2 (Hearing Loss), exposure of fishes with a swim bladder has resulted in TTS (Halvorsen et al., 2013; Kane et al., 2010; Popper et al., 2007). Specifically, fishes with a swim bladder not involved in hearing showed signs of hearing loss after exposure to a maximum received sound pressure level of 193 dB re 1 µPa for 324 and 648 seconds (cumulative sound exposure level of 218 and 220 dB re 1 μPa^2-s, respectively) (Kane et al., 2010; Popper et al., 2007). In addition, exposure of fishes with a swim bladder involved in hearing to low-frequency sonar at a sound pressure level of 195 dB re 1 µPa for 324 seconds (cumulative sound exposure level of 215 dB re 1 μPa^2-s) resulted in TTS (Halvorsen et al., 2013). Although the results were variable, it can be assumed that TTS may occur in fishes within the same hearing groups at similar exposure levels. As a conservative measure, the threshold for TTS from exposure to low-frequency sonar for all fish hearing groups with a swim bladder was rounded down to a cumulative sound exposure level of 210 dB re 1 μPa^2-s.

Criteria for high- and very-high-frequency sonar were not available in the *ANSI Sound Exposure Guideline* technical report (Popper et al., 2014); however, only species with a swim bladder involved in hearing and with high-frequency specializations, such as shad, could potentially be affected. The majority of fish species within the Study Area are unlikely to be able to detect these sounds. There is little data available on hearing loss from exposure of fishes to these high-frequency sonars. Due to the lack of available data, and as a conservative measure, effects to these hearing groups from high-frequency sonars would utilize the lowest threshold available for other hearing groups (a cumulative sound exposure level of 210 dB re 1 μPa^2-s), but effects would largely be analyzed qualitatively.

3.9.2.1.2.2 Impact Ranges for Sonar and Other Transducers

The following section provides ranges to specific effects from sonar and other transducers. Ranges are calculated using criteria from Table 3.9-4 and the Navy Acoustic Effects Model. Only ranges to TTS were predicted based on available data. Sonar durations of 1, 30, 60 and 120 seconds were used to calculate the ranges below. However, despite the variation in exposure duration, ranges were almost identical across these durations and therefore were combined and summarized by bin in the table below. General source levels, durations, and other characteristics of these systems are described in Section 3.0.4.1.1 (Sonar and Other Transducers).

Table 3.9-4: Ranges to Temporary Threshold Shift from Four Representative Sonar Bins

Fish Hearing Group	*Range to Effects (meters)*			
	Sonar Bin LF4 Low-frequency	*Sonar Bin MF1 Hull-mounted surface ship sonars (e.g., AN/SQS-53C and AN/SQS-61)*	*Sonar Bin MF4 Helicopter-deployed dipping sonars (e.g., AN/AQS-22)*	*Sonar Bin MF5 Active acoustic sonobuoys (e.g., DICASS)*
Fishes without a swim bladder	NR	NR	NR	NR
Fishes with a swim bladder not involved in hearing	0	NR	NR	NR
Fishes with a swim bladder involved in hearing	0	7 (5–10)	0	0
Fishes with a swim bladder and high-frequency hearing	0	7 (5–10)	0	0

Notes: Ranges to TTS represent modeled predictions in different areas and seasons within the Study Area. The average range to TTS is provided as well as the minimum to the maximum range to TTS in parenthesis. Where only one number is provided the average, minimum, and maximum ranges to TTS are the same.
LF = low-frequency, MF = mid-frequency, NR = no criteria are available and therefore no range to effects are estimated.

3.9.2.1.2.3 Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers Under Alternative 1

Sonar and other transducers emit sound waves into the water to detect objects, safely navigate, and communicate. Use of sonar and other transducers would typically be transient and temporary. General categories and characteristics of sonar systems and the number of hours these sonars would be operated during training and testing activities under Alternative 1 are described in Section 3.0.4.1.1 (Sonar and Other Transducers). Activities using sonars and other transducers would be conducted as described in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) and Appendix A (Training and Testing Activities Descriptions).

Under Alternative 1, training and testing activities including low-frequency sonars within most marine species hearing range (<2 kHz) would take place throughout the Study Area. Unit-level training and major training exercises would fluctuate each year to account for the natural variation of training cycles and deployment schedules. Some unit-level training would be conducted using synthetic means (e.g., simulators) or would be completed through other training exercises. Low-frequency sources are operated more frequently during testing activities than during training activities. Therefore, although the general impacts from sonar and other transducers during testing would be similar in severity to those described during training, there may be more impacts during testing activities as all marine fishes can detect low-frequency sources.

Only a few species of shad within the Clupeidae family, subfamily Alosinae, are known to be able to detect high-frequency sonar and other transducers (greater than 10 kHz) and are considered a part of the fish hearing group for species with a swim bladder that have high-frequency hearing. However, these species are not present in the MITT Study Area. Other marine fishes would probably not detect

these sounds and therefore would not experience masking, physiological stress, or behavioral disturbance from exposure to high or very high-frequency sonar and other transducers.

Most marine fish species are not expected to detect sounds in the mid-frequency range (above a few kHz) of most operational sonars. The fish species that are known to detect mid-frequencies (i.e., those with swim bladders including some sciaenids [drum], most clupeids [herring, shad], and potentially deep-water fish such as myctophids [lanternfish]) do not have their best sensitivities in the range of the operational sonars (see Figure 3.9-1). Thus, fishes may only detect the most powerful systems, such as hull-mounted sonar, within a few kilometers; and most other, less powerful mid-frequency sonar systems, for a kilometer or less. Fishes with a swim bladder involved in hearing and with high-frequency hearing are more susceptible to hearing loss due to exposure to mid-frequency sonars. However, as shown in Table 3.9-4, the maximum estimated range to TTS for these fish hearing groups is equal to or less than 10 m for only the most powerful sonar bins. Fishes within these hearing groups would have to be very close to the source and the source levels would have to be relatively high in order to experience this effect.

Most mid-frequency active sonars used in the Study Area would not have the potential to substantially mask key environmental sounds or produce sustained physiological stress or behavioral reactions due to the limited time of exposure due to the moving sound sources and variable duty cycles. However, it is important to note that some mid-frequency sonars have a high duty cycle or are operated continuously. This may increase the risk of masking but only for important biological sounds that overlap with the frequency of the sonar being operated. Furthermore, although some species may be able to produce sound at higher frequencies (greater than 1 kHz), vocal marine fishes, such as sciaenids, largely communicate below the range of mid-frequency levels used by most sonars. Any such effects would be temporary and infrequent as a vessel operating mid-frequency sonar transits an area. As such, mid-frequency sonar use is unlikely to impact individuals. Long-term consequences for fish populations due to exposure to mid-frequency sonar and other transducers are not expected.

All marine fish species can likely detect low-frequency sonars and other transducers. However, low-frequency active sonar use is rare and most low-frequency active operations are typically conducted in deeper, offshore areas. The majority of fish species, including those that are the most highly vocal, exist on the continental shelf and within nearshore, estuarine areas. However, some species may still be present in areas where low-frequency sonar and other transducers are used, including some coastal areas. Most low-frequency sonar sources do not have a high enough source level to cause TTS, as shown in Table 3.9-4. Although highly unlikely, if TTS did occur, it may reduce the detection of biologically significant sounds but would likely recover within a few minutes to days.

The majority of fish species exposed to sonar and other transducers within near (tens of meters) to far (thousands of meters) distances of the source would be more likely to experience; mild physiological stress; brief periods of masking; behavioral reactions such as startle or avoidance responses, although risk would be low even close to the source; or no reaction. However, based on the information provided in the *ANSI Sound Exposure Guideline* technical report (Popper et al., 2014), the relative risk of these effects at any distance are expected to be low. Due to the transient nature of most sonar operations, overall effects would be localized and infrequent, only lasting a few seconds or minutes. Based on the low level and short duration of potential exposure to low-frequency sonar and other transducers, long-term consequences for fish populations are not expected.

As discussed previously in Section 3.9.1.1 (Hearing and Vocalization) and as shown in Figure 3.9-1, all ESA-listed fish species that occur in the Study Area are capable of detecting sound produced by low-frequency sonars and other transducers. However, scalloped hammerhead sharks, giant manta rays and oceanic whitetip sharks do not have a swim bladder and cannot detect frequencies above 2 kHz therefore impacts from mid-, high- or very high-frequency sonar and other transducers are not expected for any ESA-listed species. The Indo-West Pacific Distinct Population Segment of scalloped hammerhead could occur in nearshore waters, such as bays and estuaries, but is also known to occur in offshore portions of the Study Area. The giant manta ray and oceanic whitetip shark would most likely be exposed to low-frequency sonar in offshore areas throughout the Study Area.

Impacts on ESA-listed fishes, if they occur, would be similar to impacts on fishes in general. As described above, most low-frequency sonar sources do not have a high enough source level to cause TTS, and TTS would not be anticipated in fishes without a swim bladder. Although some shark species have shown attraction to irregularly pulsed low-frequency sounds (below several hundred Hz), they are not known to be attracted to continuous signals or higher frequencies that they presumably cannot hear (Casper & Mann, 2006; Casper & Mann, 2009; Casper et al., 2012a). Due to the short-term, infrequent, and localized nature of these activities, ESA-listed fishes are unlikely to be exposed multiple times within a short period. In addition, physiological and behavioral reactions would be expected to be brief (e.g., seconds to minutes) and infrequent based on the low probability of co-occurrence between training activities and these species. Although individuals may be impacted, long-term consequences for populations would not be expected.

Pursuant to the ESA, the use of sonar and other transducers during training and testing activities, as described under Alternative 1, may affect ESA-listed Indo-West Pacific Distinct Population Segment scalloped hammerhead sharks, oceanic whitetip sharks and giant manta rays.

3.9.2.1.2.4 Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers Under Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)

Sonar and other transducers emit sound waves into the water to detect objects, safely navigate, and communicate. Use of sonar and other transducers would typically be transient and temporary. General categories and characteristics of sonar systems and the number of hours these sonars would be operated during training and testing activities under Alternative 2 are described in Section 3.0.4.1.1 (Sonar and Other Transducers). Activities using sonars and other transducers would be conducted as described in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) and Appendix A (Training and Testing Activities Descriptions).

Under Alternative 2, training and testing activities could occur throughout the Study Area. Training activities include the same type and tempo of training activities as Alternative 1 but also considers additional Fleet exercises (e.g., Valiant Shield type event) every year. Alternative 2 reflects the maximum number of training events that could occur within a given year, and assumes that the maximum number of Fleet exercises would occur every year. However, the types and tempo of testing activities would be the same as those conducted under Alternative 1.

Compared to training and testing activities that use sonar and other transducers that were previously analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS under Alternative 2, some training and testing activities would increase, decrease, or stay the same from those currently conducted (see Table 2.5-1 and Table 2.5-2 for details).

Impacts on fishes due to sonar and other transducers are expected to be limited to minor behavioral responses, short-term physiological stress, and brief periods of masking (seconds to minutes at most) for individuals; long-term consequences for individuals and therefore populations would not be expected. Predicted impacts on ESA-listed fish species would not be discernible from those described above in Section 3.9.2.1.2.3 (Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers under Alternative 1).

Pursuant to the ESA, the use of sonar and other transducers during training and testing activities, as described under Alternative 2, may affect ESA-listed Indo-West Pacific Distinct Population Segment scalloped hammerhead sharks, oceanic whitetip sharks and giant manta rays. The Navy is consulting with NMFS as required by Section 7(a)(2) of the ESA.

3.9.2.1.2.5 Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers Under the No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, proposed training and testing activities would not occur. Other military activities not associated with this Proposed Action would continue to occur. Acoustic stressors as listed above would not be introduced into the marine environment. Therefore, existing environmental conditions would either remain unchanged or would improve after cessation of ongoing training and testing activities.

Discontinuing the training and testing activities would result in fewer sonar and other transducers within the marine environment where training and testing activities have historically been conducted. Therefore, discontinuing training and testing activities under the No Action Alternative would lessen the potential for acoustic impacts on individual fishes, but would not measurably improve the status of fish populations or subpopulations, including those listed under ESA and those federally managed under the MSA.

3.9.2.1.3 Impacts from Vessel Noise

Fishes may be exposed to noise from vessel movement. A detailed description of the acoustic characteristics and typical sound levels of vessel noise are in Section 3.0.4.1.2 (Vessel Noise). Vessel movements involve transits to and from ports to various locations within the Study Area, including commercial ship traffic as well as recreational vessels in addition to U.S. Navy vessels. Many ongoing and proposed training and testing activities within the Study Area involve maneuvers by various types of surface ships, boats, and submarines (collectively referred to as vessels). Activities may vary from those previously analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, but the overall determinations presented remain valid. Increases and decreases shown in Table 2.5-1 and Table 2.5-2 for proposed activities under Alternative 1 and 2 do not appreciably change the impact conclusions presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

Under the No Action Alternative, proposed training and testing activities would not occur. Other military activities not associated with this Proposed Action would continue to occur. Acoustic stressors, as described above, would not be introduced into the marine environment. Therefore, existing environmental conditions would either remain unchanged or would improve after cessation of ongoing training and testing activities.

Discontinuing the training and testing activities would result in less vessel noise within the marine environment where training and testing activities have historically been conducted. Therefore, discontinuing training and testing activities under the No Action Alternative would lessen the potential for acoustic impacts on individual fishes, but would not measurably improve the status of fish

populations or subpopulations, including those listed under ESA and those federally managed under the MSA.

Pursuant to the ESA, sound produced by vessel movement during training and testing activities, as described under Alternative 1 and Alternative 2, may affect ESA-listed Indo-West Pacific Distinct Population Segment scalloped hammerhead sharks, oceanic whitetip sharks and giant manta rays. The Navy is consulting with NMFS regarding Alternative 2 as required by Section 7(a)(2) of the ESA.

3.9.2.1.4 Impacts from Aircraft Noise

Fishes that occur near or at the water's surface may be exposed to aircraft noise, although this is considered to be unlikely. Fixed, rotary-wing, and tilt-rotor aircraft are used during a variety of training and testing activities throughout the Study Area. Tilt-rotor impacts would be similar to fixed-wing or rotary-wing (i.e., helicopter) impacts depending which mode the aircraft is in. Most of these sounds would be concentrated around airbases and fixed ranges within the range complex. Aircraft noise could also occur in the waters immediately surrounding aircraft carriers at sea during takeoff and landing. Aircraft produce extensive airborne noise from either turbofan or turbojet engines. An infrequent type of aircraft noise is the sonic boom, produced when the aircraft exceeds the speed of sound. Rotary-wing aircraft (helicopters) produce low-frequency sound and vibration (Pepper et al., 2003). A detailed description of aircraft noise as a stressor is in Section 3.0.4.1.3 (Aircraft Noise).

Activities may vary from those previously analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. The analysis of impacts from aircraft noise in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS supplants the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS for fishes, and changes estimated impacts for some species since the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

3.9.2.1.4.1 Methods for Analyzing Impacts from Aircraft Noise

The amount of sound entering the ocean from aircraft would be very limited in duration, sound level, and affected area. Due to the low level of sound that could enter the water from aircraft activities, hearing loss is not further considered as a potential effect. Potential impacts considered are masking of other biologically relevant sounds, physiological stress, and changes in behavior. Reactions by fishes to these specific stressors have not been recorded; however, fishes would be expected to react to aircraft noise as they would react to other transient sounds (e.g., sonar or vessel noise).

For this analysis, the Navy assumes that some fish at or near the water surface may exhibit startle reactions to certain aircraft noise if aircraft altitude is low. This could mean a hovering helicopter, for which the sight of the aircraft and water turbulence could also cause a response, or a low-flying or super-sonic aircraft generating enough noise to be briefly detectable underwater or at the air-water interface. Because any fixed-wing aircraft noise would be brief, the risk of masking any sounds relevant to fishes is very low. The *ANSI Sound Exposure Guidelines* for fishes did not consider this acoustic stressor (Popper et al., 2014).

3.9.2.1.4.2 Impacts from Aircraft Noise Under Alternative 1

Fishes may be exposed to aircraft-generated noise throughout the Study Area. Characteristics of aircraft noise and the number of training and testing events that include aircraft under Alternative 1 are shown in Section 3.0.4.1.3 (Aircraft Noise). Activities with aircraft would be conducted as described in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) and Appendix A (Training and Testing Activities Descriptions). Aircraft training and testing activities would usually occur adjacent to Navy airfields, installations, and in special use airspace within the Study Area and transit corridor.

Under Alternative 1, activities may vary from those previously analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Increases and decreases shown in Table 2.5-1 and Table 2.5-2 for proposed activities under Alternative 1 and 2.

In most cases, exposure of fishes to fixed-wing aircraft presence and noise would be brief as the aircraft quickly passes overhead. Fishes would have to be at or near the surface at the time of an overflight to be exposed to appreciable sound levels. Due to the low sound levels in water, it is unlikely that fishes would respond to most fixed-wing aircraft or transiting helicopters. Because most overflight exposure would be brief and aircraft noise would be at low received levels, only startle reactions, if any, are expected in response to low altitude flights. Similarly, the brief duration of most overflight exposures would limit any potential for masking of relevant sounds.

Daytime and nighttime activities involving helicopters may occur for extended periods of time, up to a couple of hours in some areas. During these activities, helicopters would typically transit throughout an area but could also hover over the water. Longer event durations and periods of time where helicopters hover may increase the potential for behavioral reactions, startle reactions, masking, and physiological stress. Low-altitude flights of helicopters during some activities, which often occur under 100 feet (ft.) altitude, may elicit a stronger startle response due to the proximity of a helicopter to the water; the slower airspeed and longer exposure duration; and the downdraft created by a helicopter's rotor.

If fish were to respond to aircraft noise, only short-term behavioral or physiological reactions (e.g., avoidance and increased heart rate) would be expected. Therefore, long-term consequences for individuals would be unlikely and long-term consequences for populations are not expected.

All ESA-listed species that occur in the Study Area are likely capable of detecting aircraft noise as discussed previously in Section 3.9.1.1 (Hearing and Vocalization) and could be exposed to aircraft noise throughout the Study Area. However, due to the small area within which sound could potentially enter the water and the extremely brief window the sound could be present, exposures of fishes to aircraft noise would be extremely rare, and in the event that they did occur, would be very brief (seconds).

Pursuant to the ESA, sound produced by aircraft movement during training and testing activities, as described under Alternative 1, may affect ESA-listed Indo-West Pacific Distinct Population Segment scalloped hammerhead sharks, oceanic whitetip sharks and giant manta rays.

3.9.2.1.4.3 Impacts from Aircraft Noise Under Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)

Characteristics of aircraft noise and the number of training and testing events that include aircraft under Alternative 2 are shown in Section 3.0.4.1.3 (Aircraft Noise). Activities with aircraft would be conducted as described in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) and Appendix A (Training and Testing Activities Descriptions). Aircraft training and testing activities would usually occur adjacent to Navy airfields, installations, and in special use airspace within the Study Area and transit corridor.

Under Alternative 2, activities may vary from those previously analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Increases and decreases shown in Table 2.5-1 and Table 2.5-2 for proposed activities under Alternative 1 and 2.

Activities under Alternative 2 include a minor increase in the number of events that involve aircraft as compared to Alternative 1; however, the training locations, aircraft, and general types of predicted impacts would not be discernible from those described above in Section 3.9.2.1.4.2 (Impacts from Aircraft Noise Under Alternative 1).

Pursuant to the ESA, sound produced by aircraft movement during training and testing activities, as described under Alternative 2, may affect ESA-listed Indo-West Pacific Distinct Population Segment scalloped hammerhead sharks, oceanic whitetip sharks and giant manta rays. The Navy is consulting with NMFS as required by Section 7(a)(2) of the ESA.

3.9.2.1.4.4 Impacts from Aircraft Noise Under the No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, proposed training and testing activities would not occur. Other military activities not associated with this Proposed Action would continue to occur. Acoustic stressors, as described above, would not be introduced into the marine environment. Therefore, existing environmental conditions would either remain unchanged or would improve after cessation of ongoing training and testing activities.

Discontinuing the training and testing activities would result in less acoustic stressors within the marine environment where training and testing activities have historically been conducted. Therefore, discontinuing training and testing activities under the No Action Alternative would lessen the potential for acoustic impacts on individual fishes, but would not measurably improve the status of fish populations or subpopulations, including those listed under ESA and those federally managed under the MSA.

3.9.2.1.5 Impacts from Weapon Noise

Fishes may be exposed to sounds caused by the firing of weapons, objects in flight, and impact of non-explosive munitions on the water's surface, which are described in Section 3.0.4.1.4 (Weapon Noise). In general, these are impulsive sounds (such as those discussed under Section 3.0.4.2, Explosive Stressors) generated in close vicinity to or at the water surface, with the exception of items that are launched underwater. The firing of a weapon may have several components of associated noise. Firing of guns could include sound generated in air by firing a gun (muzzle blast) and a crack sound due to a low amplitude shock wave generated by a supersonic projectile flying through the air. Most in-air sound would be reflected at the air-water interface. Underwater sounds would be strongest just below the surface and directly under the firing point. Any sound that enters the water only does so within a narrow cone below the firing point or path of the projectile. Vibration from the blast propagating through a ship's hull, the sound generated by the impact of an object with the water surface, and the sound generated by launching an object underwater are other sources of impulsive sound in the water. Sound due to missile and target launches is typically at a maximum at initiation of the booster rocket and rapidly fades as the missile or target travels downrange. Due to the transient nature of most activities that produce weapon noise, overall effects would be localized and infrequent, only lasting a few seconds or minutes. Reactions by fishes to these specific stressors have not been recorded however, fishes would be expected to react to weapon noise as they would react to other transient sounds (e.g., sonar or vessel noise).

Activities may vary from those previously analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, but the overall determinations presented remain valid. Increases and decreases shown in Table 2.5-1 and Table 2.5-2 for activities proposed under Alternative 1 and 2 do not appreciably change the impact conclusions presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

Under the No Action Alternative, proposed training and testing activities would not occur. Other military activities not associated with this Proposed Action would continue to occur. Acoustic stressors, as described above, would not be introduced into the marine environment. Therefore, existing

environmental conditions would either remain unchanged or would improve after cessation of ongoing training and testing activities.

Discontinuing the training and testing activities would result in less acoustic stressors within the marine environment where training and testing activities have historically been conducted. Therefore, discontinuing training and testing activities under the No Action Alternative would lessen the potential for acoustic impacts on individual fishes, but would not measurably improve the status of fish populations or subpopulations, including those listed under ESA and those federally managed under the MSA.

Pursuant to the ESA, sound produced by weapon noise during training and testing activities, as described under Alternative 1 and Alternative 2, may affect ESA-listed Indo-West Pacific Distinct Population Segment scalloped hammerhead sharks, oceanic whitetip sharks and giant manta rays. The Navy is consulting with NMFS regarding Alternative 2 as required by Section 7(a)(2) of the ESA.

3.9.2.2 Explosive Stressors

Explosions in the water or near the water surface can introduce loud, impulsive, broadband sounds into the marine environment. However, unlike other acoustic stressors, explosives release energy at a high rate producing a shock wave that can be injurious and even deadly. Therefore, explosive impacts on fishes are discussed separately from other acoustic stressors, even though the analysis of explosive impacts will rely on data for fish impacts due to impulsive sound exposure where appropriate.

Explosives are usually described by their net explosive weight, which accounts for the weight and type of explosive material. Additional explanation of the acoustic and explosive terms and sound energy concepts used in this section is found in Appendix H (Acoustic and Explosive Concepts).

This section begins with a summary of relevant data regarding explosive impacts on fishes in Section 3.9.2.2.1 (Background). The ways in which an explosive exposure could result in immediate effects or lead to long-term consequences for an animal are explained in Section 3.0.4.7 (Conceptual Framework for Assessing Effects from Acoustic and Explosive Activities), and this section follows that framework.

Although air guns and pile driving are not used during MITT training and testing activities, the analysis of some explosive impacts will in part rely on data from fishes exposed to impulsive sources where appropriate. Impulsive sources are further discussed below when applicable data are available for comparison purposes. In addition, there are limited studies of fish responses to weapon noise. For the purposes of this analysis, studies of the effects from air guns, pile driving, and explosives are used to inform fish responses to other impulsive sources (i.e., weapon noise).

Due to the availability of new literature, adjusted sound exposure criteria, and new acoustic effects modeling, the analysis provided in Section 3.9.2.2.2 (Impacts from Explosives) of this SEIS/OEIS supplants the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS for fishes.

3.9.2.2.1 Background

The effects of explosions on fishes have been studied and reviewed by numerous authors (Keevin & Hempen, 1997; O'Keeffe, 1984; O'Keeffe & Young, 1984; Popper et al., 2014). A summary of the literature related to each type of effect forms the basis for analyzing the potential effects from Navy activities. The sections below include a survey and synthesis of best-available science published in peer-reviewed journals, technical reports, and other scientific sources pertinent to impacts on fishes

potentially resulting from Navy training and testing activities. Fishes could be exposed to a range of impacts depending on the explosive source and context of the exposure. In addition to acoustic impacts including temporary or permanent hearing loss, auditory masking, physiological stress, or changes in behavior, potential impacts from an explosive exposure can include non-lethal injury and mortality.

3.9.2.2.1.1 Injury

Injury refers to the direct effects on the tissues or organs of a fish. The blast wave from an in-water explosion is lethal to fishes at close range, causing massive organ and tissue damage (Keevin & Hempen, 1997). At greater distance from the detonation point, the extent of mortality or injury depends on a number of factors, including fish size, body shape, depth, physical condition of the fish, and perhaps most importantly, the presence of a swim bladder (Keevin & Hempen, 1997; Wright, 1982; Yelverton et al., 1975; Yelverton & Richmond, 1981). At the same distance from the source, larger fishes are generally less susceptible to death or injury, elongated forms that are round in cross-section are less at risk than deep-bodied forms, and fishes oriented sideways to the blast suffer the greatest impact (Edds-Walton & Finneran, 2006; O'Keeffe, 1984; O'Keeffe & Young, 1984; Wiley et al., 1981; Yelverton et al., 1975). Species with a swim bladder are much more susceptible to blast injury from explosives than fishes without them (Gaspin, 1975; Gaspin et al., 1976; Goertner et al., 1994).

If a fish is close to an explosive detonation, the exposure to rapidly changing high pressure levels can cause barotrauma. Barotrauma is injury due to a sudden difference in pressure between an air space inside the body and the surrounding water and tissues. Rapid compression followed by rapid expansion of airspaces, such as the swim bladder, can damage surrounding tissues and result in the rupture of the airspace itself. The swim bladder is the primary site of damage from explosives (Wright, 1982; Yelverton et al., 1975). Gas-filled swim bladders resonate at different frequencies than surrounding tissue and can be torn by rapid oscillation between high- and low-pressure waves (Goertner, 1978). Swim bladders are a characteristic of most bony fishes with the notable exception of flatfishes (e.g., halibut). Sharks and rays are examples of fishes without a swim bladder. Small airspaces, such as micro-bubbles that may be present in gill structures, could also be susceptible to oscillation when exposed to the rapid pressure increases caused by an explosion. This may have caused the bleeding observed on gill structures of some fish exposed to explosions (Goertner et al., 1994). Sudden very high pressures can also cause damage at tissue interfaces due to the way pressure waves travel differently through tissues with different densities. Rapidly oscillating pressure waves might rupture the kidney, liver, spleen, and sinus and cause venous hemorrhaging (Keevin & Hempen, 1997).

Several studies have exposed fish to explosives and examined various metrics in relation to injury susceptibility. Sverdrup (1994) exposed Atlantic salmon (1–1.5 kg [2–3 lb.]) in a laboratory setting to repeated shock pressures of around 2 megapascals (300 pounds per square inch [psi]) without any immediate or delayed mortality after a week. Hubbs and Rechnitzer (1952) showed that fish with swim bladders exposed to explosive shock fronts (the near-instantaneous rise to peak pressure) were more susceptible to injury when several feet below the water surface than near the bottom. When near the surface, the fish began to exhibit injuries around peak pressure exposures of 40 to 70 psi. However, near the bottom (all water depths were less than 100 ft.) fish exposed to pressures over twice as high exhibited no sign of injury. Yelverton et al. (1975) similarly found that peak pressure was not correlated to injury susceptibility; instead, injury susceptibility of swim bladder fish at shallow depths (10 ft. or less) was correlated to the metric of positive impulse (pascal seconds [Pa-s]), which takes into account both the positive peak pressure, the duration of the positive pressure exposure, and the fish mass, with smaller fish being more susceptible.

Gaspin et al. (1976) exposed multiple species of fish with a swim bladder, placed at varying depths, to explosive blasts of varying size and depth. Goertner (1978) and Wiley (1981) developed a swim bladder oscillation model, which showed that the severity of injury observed in those tests could be correlated to the extent of swim bladder expansion and contraction predicted to have been induced by exposure to the explosive blasts. Per this model, the degree of swim bladder oscillation is affected by ambient pressure (i.e., depth of fish), peak pressure of the explosive, duration of the pressure exposure, and exposure to surface rarefaction (negative pressure) waves. The maximum potential for injury is predicted to occur where the surface reflected rarefaction (negative) pressure wave arrives coincident with the moment of maximum compression of the swim bladder caused by exposure to the direct positive blast pressure wave, resulting in a subsequent maximum expansion of the swim bladder. Goertner (1978) and Wiley et al. (1981) found that their swim bladder oscillation model explained the injury data in the Yelverton et al. (1975) exposure study, and their impulse parameter was applicable only to fishes at shallow enough depths to experience less than one swim bladder oscillation before being exposed to the following surface rarefaction wave.

O'Keeffe (1984) provides calculations and contour plots that allow estimation of the range to potential effects of in-water explosions on fish possessing swim bladders using the damage prediction model developed by Goertner (1978). O'Keeffe's (1984) parameters include the charge weight, depth of burst, and the size and depth of the fish, but the estimated ranges do not take into account unique propagation environments that could reduce or increase the range to effect. The 10 percent mortality range shown below in Table 3.9-5 is the maximum horizontal range predicted by O'Keeffe (1984) for 10 percent of fish suffering injuries that are expected to not be survivable (e.g., damaged swim bladder or severe hemorrhaging). Fish at greater depths and near the surface are predicted to be less likely to be injured because geometries of the exposures would limit the amplitude of swim bladder oscillations. In addition, detonations at or near the surface (i.e., similar to most Navy activities that utilize bombs and missiles) would result in energy loss at the water air interface, resulting in lower overall ranges to effect than those predicted here.

In contrast to fish with swim bladders, fishes without swim bladders have been shown to be more resilient to explosives (Gaspin, 1975; Gaspin et al., 1976; Goertner et al., 1994). For example, some small (average 116 mm length; approximately 1 oz.) hogchokers (*Trinectes maculatus*) exposed less than 5 ft. from a 10 lb. pentolite charge immediately survived the exposure with slight to moderate injuries, and only a small number of fish were immediately killed; however, most of the fish at this close range did suffer moderate to severe injuries, typically of the gills or around the otolithic structures (Goertner et al., 1994).

Studies that have documented caged fishes killed during planned underwater explosions indicate that most fish that die do so within one to four hours, and almost all die within a day (Yelverton et al., 1975). Mortality in free-swimming (uncaged) fishes may be higher due to increased susceptibility to predation. Fitch and Young (1948) found that the type of free-swimming fish killed changed when blasting was repeated at the same location within 24 hours of previous blasting. They observed that most fish killed on the second day were scavengers, presumably attracted by the victims of the previous day's blasts.

Table 3.9-5: Range to 10 Percent Mortality from In-water Explosions for Fishes with a Swim Bladder

Weight of Pentolite (lb.) [NEW, lb.][1]	*Depth of Explosion (ft.) [m]*	*10% Mortality Maximum Range (ft.) [m]*		
		1 oz. Fish	*1 lb. Fish*	*30 lb. Fish*
10 [13]	10 [3]	530 [162]	315 [96]	165 [50]
	50 [15]	705 [214]	425 [130]	260 [79]
	200 [61]	905 [276]	505 [154]	290 [88]
100 [130]	10 [3]	985 [300]	600 [183]	330 [101]
	50 [15]	1,235 [376]	865 [264]	590 [180]
	200 [61]	1,340 [408]	1,225 [373]	725 [221]
1,000 [1,300]	10 [3]	1,465 [447]	1,130 [344]	630 [192]
	50 [15]	2,255 [687]	1,655 [504]	1,130 [344]
	200 [61]	2,870 [875]	2,390 [728]	1,555 [474]
10,000 [13,000]	10 [3]	2,490 [759]	1,920 [585]	1,155 [352]
	50 [15]	4,090 [1,247]	2,885 [879]	2,350 [716]
	200 [61]	5,555 [1,693]	4,153 [1,266]	3,090 [942]

[1] Explosive weights of pentolite converted to net explosive weight using the peak pressure parameters in Swisdak (1978).
Notes: ft. = feet, lb. = pounds, m = meters, NEW = net explosive weight, oz. = ounce
Source: Data from O'Keeffe (1984)

Fitch and Young (1948) also investigated whether a significant portion of fish killed would have sunk and not been observed at the surface. Comparisons of the numbers of fish observed dead at the surface and at the bottom in the same affected area after an explosion showed that fish found dead on the bottom comprised less than 10 percent of the total observed mortality. Gitschlag et al. (2000) conducted a more detailed study of both floating fishes and those that were sinking or lying on the bottom after explosive

removal of nine oil platforms in the northern Gulf of Mexico. Results were highly variable. They found that 3–87 percent (46 percent average) of the red snapper killed during a blast might float to the surface. Currents, winds, and predation by seabirds or other fishes may be some of the reasons that the magnitude of fish mortality may not have been accurately captured.

There have been few studies of the impact of underwater explosives on early life stages of fish (eggs, larvae, juveniles). Fitch and Young (1948) reported mortality of larval anchovies exposed to underwater blasts off California. Nix and Chapman (1985) found that anchovy and smelt larvae died following the detonation of buried charges. Similar to adult fishes, the presence of a swim bladder contributes to shock wave-induced internal damage in larval and juvenile fish (Settle et al., 2002). Explosive shock wave injury to internal organs of larval pinfish and spot exposed at shallow depths was documented by Settle et al. (2002) and Govoni et al. (2003; 2008) at impulse levels similar to those predicted by Yelverton et al. (1975) for very small fish. Settle et al. (2002) provide the lowest measured received level that injuries have been observed in larval fish. Researchers (Faulkner et al., 2006; Faulkner et al., 2008; Jensen, 2003) have suggested that egg mortality may be correlated with peak particle velocity exposure (i.e., the localized movement or shaking of water particles, as opposed to the velocity of the blast wave), although sufficient data from direct explosive exposures is not available (2003; 2008).

Rapid pressure changes could cause mechanical damage to sensitive ear structures due to differential movements of the otolithic structures. Bleeding near otolithic structures was the most commonly observed injury in non-swim bladder fish exposed to a close explosive charge (Goertner et al., 1994).

As summarized by the *ANSI Sound Exposure Guideline* technical report (Popper et al., 2014), exposure to explosive energy poses the greatest potential threat for injury and mortality in marine fishes. Fishes with a swim bladder are more susceptible to injury than fishes without a swim bladder. The susceptibility also probably varies with size and depth of both the detonation and the fish. Fish larvae or juvenile fish may be more susceptible to injury from exposure to explosives.

3.9.2.2.1.2 Hearing Loss

There are no direct measurements of hearing loss in fishes due to exposure to explosive sources. The sound resulting from an explosive detonation is considered an impulsive sound and shares important qualities (i.e., short duration and fast rise time) with other impulsive sounds such as those produced by air guns. PTS in fish has not been known to occur in species tested to date and any hearing loss in fish may be as temporary as the timeframe required to repair or replace the sensory cells that were damaged or destroyed (Popper et al., 2005; Popper et al., 2014; Smith et al., 2006).

As reviewed in the *ANSI Sound Exposure Guideline* technical report (Popper et al., 2014), fishes without a swim bladder, or fishes with a swim bladder not involved in hearing, would be less susceptible to hearing loss (i.e., TTS), even at higher level exposures. Fish with a swim bladder involved in hearing may be susceptible to TTS within very close ranges to an explosive. General research findings regarding TTS in fishes as well as findings specific to exposure to other impulsive sound sources are discussed in Section 3.9.2.1.1.2 (Hearing Loss).

3.9.2.2.1.3 Masking

Masking refers to the presence of a noise that interferes with a fish's ability to hear biologically important sounds, including those produced by prey, predators, or other fish in the same species (Myrberg, 1980; Popper et al., 2003). This can take place whenever the noise level heard by a fish exceeds the level of a biologically relevant sound. As discussed in Section 3.0.4.7 (Conceptual

Framework for Assessing Effects from Acoustic and Explosive Activities), masking only occurs in the presence of the masking noise and does not persist after the cessation of the noise. Masking may lead to a change in vocalizations or a change in behavior (e.g., cessation of foraging, leaving an area).

There are no direct observations of masking in fishes due to exposure to explosives. The *ANSI Sound Exposure Guideline* technical report (Popper et al., 2014) highlights a lack of data that exist for masking by explosives but suggests that the intermittent nature of explosions would result in very limited probability of any masking effects, and if masking were to occur it would only occur during the duration of the sound. General research findings regarding masking in fishes due to exposure to sound are discussed in detail in Section 3.9.2.1.1.3 (Masking). Potential masking from explosives is likely to be similar to masking studied for other impulsive sounds such as air guns.

3.9.2.2.1.4 Physiological Stress

Fishes naturally experience stress within their environment and as part of their life histories. The stress response is a suite of physiological changes that are meant to help an organism mitigate the impact of a stressor. However, if the magnitude and duration of the stress response is too great or too long, then it can have negative consequences to the organism (e.g., decreased immune function, decreased reproduction). Section 3.0.4.7 (Conceptual Framework for Assessing Effects from Acoustic and Explosive Activities) provides additional information on physiological stress and the framework used to analyze this potential impact.

Research on physiological stress in fishes due to exposure to explosive sources is limited. Sverdrup et al. (1994) studied levels of stress hormones in Atlantic salmon after exposure to multiple detonations in a laboratory setting. Increases in cortisol and adrenaline were observed following the exposure, with adrenaline values returning to within normal range within 24 hours. General research findings regarding physiological stress in fishes due to exposure to acoustic sources are discussed in detail in Section 3.9.2.1.1.4 (Physiological Stress). Generally, stress responses are more likely to occur in the presence of potentially threatening sound sources such as predator vocalizations or the sudden onset of impulsive signals. Stress responses may be brief (a few seconds to minutes) if the exposure is short or if fishes habituate or learn to tolerate the noise. It is assumed that any physiological response (e.g., hearing loss or injury) or significant behavioral response is also associated with a stress response.

3.9.2.2.1.5 Behavioral Reactions

As discussed in Section 3.0.4.7 (Conceptual Framework for Assessing Effects from Acoustic and Explosive Activities), any stimuli in the environment can cause a behavioral response in fishes, including sound and energy produced by explosions. Behavioral reactions of fishes to explosions have not been recorded. Behavioral reactions from explosive sounds are likely to be similar to reactions studied for other impulsive sounds such as those produced by air guns. Impulsive signals, particularly at close range, have a rapid rise time and higher instantaneous peak pressure than other signal types, making them more likely to cause startle or avoidance responses. General research findings regarding behavioral reactions from fishes due to exposure to impulsive sounds, such as those associated with explosions, are discussed in detail in Section 3.9.2.1.1.5 (Behavioral Reactions).

As summarized by the *ANSI Sound Exposure Guideline* technical report (Popper et al., 2014), species may react differently to the same sound source depending on a number of variables, such as the animal's life stage or behavioral state (e.g., feeding, mating). Without data that are more specific it is assumed that fishes with similar hearing capabilities react similarly to all impulsive sounds outside or within the zone for hearing loss and injury. Observations of fish reactions to large-scale air gun surveys are informative,

but not necessarily directly applicable to analyzing impacts from the short-term, intermittent use of all impulsive sources. Fish have a higher probability of reacting when closer to an impulsive sound source (within tens of meters), and a decreasing probability of reaction at increasing distances (Popper et al., 2014).

3.9.2.2.1.6 Long-Term Consequences

Long-term consequences to a population are determined by examining changes in the population growth rate. For additional information on the determination of long-term consequences, see Section 3.0.4.7 (Conceptual Framework for Assessing Effects from Acoustic and Explosive Activities). Physical effects from explosive sources that could lead to a reduction in the population growth rate include mortality or injury, which could remove animals from the reproductive pool, and temporary hearing impairment or chronic masking, which could affect navigation, foraging, predator avoidance, or communication. The long-term consequences due to individual behavioral reactions, masking, and short-term instances of physiological stress are especially difficult to predict because individual experience over time can create complex contingencies, especially for fish species that live for multiple seasons or years. For example, a lost reproductive opportunity could be a measurable cost to the individual; however, short-term costs may be recouped during the life of an otherwise healthy individual. These factors are taken into consideration when assessing risk of long-term consequences.

3.9.2.2.2 Impacts from Explosives

This section analyzes the impacts on fishes due to in-water and in-air explosives that would be used during Navy training and testing activities, synthesizing the background information presented above.

As discussed above, sound and energy from in-water explosions are capable of causing mortality, injury, temporary hearing loss, masking, physiological stress, or a behavioral response, depending on the level and duration of exposure. The death of an animal would eliminate future reproductive potential, which is considered in the analysis of potential long-term consequences to the population. Exposures that result in non-auditory injuries may limit an animal's ability to find food, communicate with other animals, or interpret the surrounding environment. Impairment of these abilities can decrease an individual's chance of survival or affect its ability to reproduce. Temporary threshold shift can also impair an animal's abilities, although the individual may recover quickly with little significant effect.

The overall use of explosives for training and testing activities would be similar to what is currently conducted and several new testing activities would occur (see Table 2.5-1 and Table 2.5-2 for details). Although individual activities may vary some from those previously analyzed, the overall determinations presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS remain valid, but have been improved upon under this SEIS/OEIS.

3.9.2.2.2.1 Methods for Analyzing Impacts from Explosives

The Navy performed a quantitative analysis to estimate ranges to effect for fishes exposed to underwater explosives during Navy training and testing activities. Inputs to the quantitative analysis included sound propagation modeling in the Navy Acoustic Effects Model to the sound exposure criteria and thresholds presented below. Density data for fish species within the Study Area are not currently available; therefore, it is not possible to estimate the total number of individuals that may be affected by explosive activities.

Criteria and Thresholds used to Estimate Impacts on Fishes from Explosives

Mortality and Injury from Explosives

Criteria and thresholds to estimate impacts from sound and energy produced by explosive activities are presented in Table 3.9-6. In order to estimate the longest range at which a fish may be killed or mortally injured, the Navy based the threshold for mortal injury on the lowest pressure that caused mortalities in the study by Hubbs and Rechnitzer (1952), consistent with the recommendation in the *ANSI Sound Exposure Guideline* technical report (Popper et al., 2014). As described in Section 3.9.2.2.1.1 (Injury), this threshold likely overestimates the potential for mortal injury. The potential for mortal injury has been shown to be correlated to fish size, depth, and geometry of exposure, which are not accounted for by using a peak pressure threshold. However, until fish mortality models are developed that can reasonably consider these factors across multiple environments, use of the peak pressure threshold allows for a conservative estimate of maximum impact ranges.

Due to the lack of detailed data for onset of injury in fishes exposed to explosives, thresholds from impact pile driving exposures (Halvorsen et al., 2011; Halvorsen et al., 2012a; Halvorsen et al., 2012b) were used as a proxy for the analysis in the Atlantic Fleet Training and Testing FEIS/OEIS (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2018). Upon re-evaluation, it was decided that pile driving thresholds are too conservative and not appropriate to use in the analysis of explosive effects on fishes. Therefore, injury criteria have been revised as follows.

Thresholds for the onset of injury from exposure to explosions are not currently available and recommendations in the *ANSI Sound Exposure Guideline* technical report (Popper et al., 2014) only provide qualitative criteria for consideration. Therefore, available data from existing explosive studies were reviewed to provide a conservative estimate for a threshold to the onset of injury (Gaspin, 1975; Gaspin et al., 1976; Hubbs & Rechnitzer, 1952; Settle et al., 2002; Yelverton et al., 1975).

It is important to note that some of the available literature is not peer-reviewed and may have some caveats to consider when reviewing the data (e.g., issues with controls, limited details on injuries observed, etc.) but this information may still provide a better understanding of where injurious effects would begin to occur specific to explosive activities. The lowest threshold at which injuries were observed in each study were recorded and compared for consideration in selecting criteria. As a conservative measure, the absolute lowest peak sound pressure level recorded that resulted in injury, observed in exposures of larval fishes to explosions (Settle et al., 2002), was selected to represent the threshold to injury.

The injury threshold is consistent across all fish regardless of hearing groups due to the lack of rigorous data for multiple species. As discussed throughout Section 3.9.2.2.1.1 (Injury), it is important to note that these thresholds may be overly conservative, as there is evidence that fishes exposed to higher thresholds than those in Table 3.9-6 have shown no signs of injury (depending on variables such as the weight of the fish, size of the explosion, and depth of the cage (Gaspin, 1975; Gaspin et al., 1976; Hubbs & Rechnitzer, 1952; Settle et al., 2002; Yelverton et al., 1975). It is likely that adult fishes and fishes without a swim bladder would be less susceptible to injury than more sensitive hearing groups (i.e., fishes with a swim bladder) and larval fish.

Table 3.9-6: Sound Exposure Criteria for Mortality and Injury from Explosives

Fish Hearing Group	*Onset of Mortality*	*Onset of Injury*
	SPL_{peak}	SPL_{peak}
Fishes without a swim bladder	229	220
Fishes with a swim bladder not involved in hearing	229	220
Fishes with a swim bladder involved in hearing	229	220
Fishes with a swim bladder and high-frequency hearing	229	220

Note: SP_{Lpeak} = Peak sound pressure level.

The number of fish killed by an in-water explosion would depend on the population density near the blast, as well as factors discussed throughout Section 3.9.2.2.1.1 (Injury) such as net explosive weight, depth of the explosion, and fish size. For example, if an explosion occurred in the middle of a dense school of fish, a large number of fish could be killed. However, the probability of this occurring is low, based on the patchy distribution of dense schooling fish. Stunning from pressure waves could also temporarily immobilize fish, making them more susceptible to predation.

Fragments produced by exploding munitions at or near the surface may present a high-speed strike hazard for an animal at or near the surface. In water, however, fragmentation velocities decrease rapidly due to drag (Swisdak & Montanaro, 1992). Because blast waves propagate efficiently through water, the range to injury from the blast wave would likely extend beyond the range of fragmentation risk.

Hearing Loss from Explosives

Criteria and thresholds to estimate TTS from sound produced by explosive activities are presented below in Table 3.9-7. Direct (measured) TTS data from explosives are not available. Criteria used to define TTS from explosives is derived from data on fishes exposed to seismic air gun signals (Popper et al., 2005) as summarized in the *ANSI Sound Exposure Guideline* technical report (Popper et al., 2014). TTS has not been documented in fishes without a swim bladder from exposure to other impulsive sources (pile driving and air guns). Although it is possible that fishes without a swim bladder could receive TTS from exposure to explosives, fishes without a swim bladder are typically less susceptible to hearing impairment than fishes with a swim bladder. If TTS occurs in fishes without a swim bladder, it would likely occur within the range of injury; therefore, no thresholds for TTS are proposed. General research findings regarding hearing loss in fishes as well as findings specific to exposure to other impulsive sound sources are discussed in Section 3.9.2.2.1.2 (Hearing Loss).

As discussed in Section 3.9.2.2.1.2 (Hearing Loss), exposure to sound produced from seismic air guns at a cumulative sound exposure level of 186 dB re 1 μPa^2-s has resulted in TTS in fishes with a swim bladder involved in hearing (Popper et al., 2005). TTS has not occurred in fishes with a swim bladder not involved in hearing and would likely occur above the given threshold in Table 3.9-7.

Table 3.9-7: Sound Exposure Criteria for Hearing Loss from Explosives

Fish Hearing Group	*TTS (SEL_{cum})*
Fishes without a swim bladder	NC
Fishes with a swim bladder not involved in hearing	> 186
Fishes with a swim bladder involved in hearing	186
Fishes with a swim bladder and high-frequency hearing	186

Notes: TTS = Temporary Threshold Shift, SEL_{cum} = Cumulative sound exposure level (decibel referenced to 1 micropascal squared seconds [dB re 1 µPa2-s]), NC = no criteria are reported, ">" indicates that the given effect would occur above the reported threshold.

3.9.2.2.2.2 Impact Ranges for Explosives

The following section provides estimated range to effects for fishes exposed to sound and energy produced by explosives. Ranges are calculated using criteria from Table 3.9-6 and Table 3.9-7 and the Navy Acoustic Effects Model. Fishes within these ranges would be predicted to receive the associated effect. Ranges may vary greatly depending on factors such as the cluster size, location, depth, and season of the event.

Table 3.9-8 provides range to mortality and injury for all fishes. Only one table (Table 3.9-9) is provided for range to TTS for all fishes with a swim bladder. However, ranges to TTS for fishes with a swim bladder not involved in hearing would be shorter than those reported because this effect has not been observed in fishes without a swim bladder exposed to the described TTS threshold.

3.9.2.2.2.3 Impacts from Explosives Under Alternative 1

The following section provides estimated range to effects for fishes exposed to sound and energy produced by explosives. Ranges are calculated using criteria from Table 3.9-6 and Table 3.9-7 and the Navy Acoustic Effects Model. Most detonations conducted during Navy activities would occur at or near the surface. The Navy Acoustic Effects Model cannot account for the highly non-linear effects of cavitation and surface blow off; therefore, some estimated ranges may be overly conservative. Fishes within these ranges would be predicted to receive the associated effect. Ranges may vary greatly depending on factors such as the cluster size (the number of rounds fired [or buoys dropped] within a very short duration), location, depth, and season of the event.

Table 3.9-8: Range to Mortality and Injury for All Fishes from Explosives

Bin[1]	*Range to Effects (meters)*	
	Onset of Mortality	*Onset of Injury*
	SPL_{peak}	SPL_{peak}
E1	50 (45–50)	122 (120–130)
E2	63 (60–65)	156 (110–170)
E3	108 (100–110)	276 (260–280)
E4	141 (140–170)	381 (350–725)
E5	175 (170–250)	433 (410–775)
E6	218 (210–230)	526 (500–625)
E7	330 (330–330)	856 (825–875)
E8	375 (360–410)	920 (850–1,025)
E9	490 (480–500)	1,025 (1,025–1,025)
E10	617 (600–775)	1,388 (1,275–1,775)
E11	785 (700–1,525)	2,111 (1,525–4,775)
E12	770 (750–800)	1,781 (1,775–2,025)

[1]Bin (net explosive weight, lb.): E1 (0.1 – 0.25), E2 (> 0.25 – 0.5), E3 (> 0.5 – 2.5), E4 (> 2.5 – 5), E5 (> 5 – 10), E7 (> 20 – 60), E8 (> 60 – 100), E10 (> 250 – 500), E11 (> 500 – 650)

Notes: SPLpeak = Peak sound pressure level, NEW = net explosive weight, lb. = pound(s). Range to effects represent modeled predictions in different areas and seasons within the Study Area. Each cell contains the estimated average, minimum and maximum range to the specified effect.

Table 3.9-9: Range to TTS for Fishes with a Swim Bladder from Explosives

Bin[1]	*Cluster Size*	*Range to Effects (meters)*
		TTS
		SEL_{cum}
E1	1	< 50 (45–55)
	18	< 196 (160–230)
E2	1	< 58 (55–60)
E3	1	< 127 (95–160)
	19	< 474 (340–600)
E4	1	< 204 (190–300)
E5	1	< 172 (150–450)
	20	< 674 (525–2,775)
E6	1	< 210 (190–390)
E7	1	< 634 (600–725)
E8	1	< 527 (310–775)
E9	1	< 513 (420–1,025)
E10	1	< 685 (525–1,775)
E11	1	< 1,679 (1,525–2,775)
E12	1	< 815 (675–2,025)

[1]Bin (net explosive weight, lb.): E0 (< 0.1), E1 (0.1 – 0.25), E2 (> 0.25 – 0.5), E3 (> 0.5 – 2.5), E4 (> 2.5 – 5), E5 (> 5 – 10), E7 (> 20 – 60), E8 (> 60 – 100), E10 (> 250 – 500), E11 (> 500 – 650)
Notes: SELcum = Cumulative sound exposure level, TTS = Temporary Threshold Shift, NEW = net explosive weight, lb. = pound(s), "<" indicates that the given effect would occur at distances less than the reported range(s). Range to effects represent modeled predictions in different areas and seasons within the Study Area. Each cell contains the estimated average, minimum and maximum range to the specified effect.

Under Alternative 1, there could be fluctuation in the amount of explosions that could occur annually, although potential impacts would be similar from year to year. The number of impulsive sources in this SEIS/OEIS compared with the totals analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS are described in Table 2.5-1 and Table 2.5-2. The number of torpedo testing activities (both explosive and non-explosive) planned under Alternative 1 testing can vary from year to year; however, all other training and testing activities would remain consistent from year to year.

With the exception of mine warfare events which occur at the three established Underwater Detonation ranges, most scheduled training and testing activities involving explosions would occur well offshore (greater than 12 NM), primarily within special use airspace (e.g., W-517). Activities that involve underwater detonations and explosive munitions typically occur more than 3 NM from shore and in the range complexes, rather than in the transit corridor. The Navy will implement mitigation to avoid potential impacts on hammerhead sharks and giant manta rays in the Mariana Islands Range Complex during explosive mine neutralization activities involving Navy divers, as discussed in Section 5.3.3 (Explosive Stressors). In addition to procedural mitigation, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid impacts from explosives on seafloor resources in mitigation areas throughout the Study Area (see Section 5.4.1, Mitigation Areas for Seafloor Resources), which will consequently also help avoid potential impacts on fishes that shelter and feed on shallow-water coral reefs, live hard bottom, artificial reefs, and shipwrecks.

Sound and energy from explosions could result in mortality and injury, on average, for hundreds to even thousands of meters from some of the largest explosions. Exposure to explosions could also result in temporary hearing loss in nearby fishes. The estimated range to each of these effects based on explosive bin size is provided in Table 3.9-8 and Table 3.9-9. Generally, explosives that belong to larger bins (with large net explosive weights) produce longer ranges within each effect category. However, some ranges vary depending upon a number of other factors (e.g., number of explosions in a single event, depth of the charge, etc.). Fishes without a swim bladder, adult fishes, and larger species would generally be less susceptible to injury and mortality from sound and energy associated with explosive activities than small, juvenile or larval fishes. Fishes that experience hearing loss could miss opportunities to detect predators or prey, or show a reduction in interspecific communication.

If an individual fish were repeatedly exposed to sound and energy from in-water explosions that caused alterations in natural behavioral patterns or physiological stress, these impacts could lead to long-term consequences for the individual such as reduced survival, growth, or reproductive capacity. If detonations occurred close together (within a few seconds), there could be the potential for masking to occur but this would likely happen at farther distances from the source where individual detonations might sound more continuous. Training and testing activities involving explosions are generally dispersed in space and time. Consequently, repeated exposure of individual fishes to sound and energy from in-water explosions over the course of a day or multiple days is not likely and most behavioral effects are expected to be short-term (seconds or minutes) and localized. Exposure to multiple detonations over the course of a day would most likely lead to an alteration of natural behavior or the avoidance of that specific area.

As discussed previously in Section 3.9.1.1 (Hearing and Vocalization), all ESA-listed fish species that occur in the Study Area are capable of detecting sound produced by explosives. In addition, all ESA-listed species that occur in the Study Area may be exposed to explosives associated with training and testing activities. The Indo-West Pacific Distinct Population Segment of scalloped hammerhead could occur in nearshore waters, such as bays and estuaries, but is also known to occur in offshore portions of the

Study Area. The giant manta ray and oceanic whitetip shark would most likely be exposed to low-frequency sonar in offshore areas throughout the Study Area. Overall, impacts on ESA-listed species that encounter explosions would be similar to those discussed above for impacts on fishes in general.

Pursuant to the ESA, the use of explosives during training and testing activities, as described under Alternative 1, may affect ESA-listed Indo-West Pacific Distinct Population Segment scalloped hammerhead sharks, oceanic whitetip sharks and giant manta rays.

3.9.2.2.2.4 Impacts from Explosives Under Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)

As described in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives), Section 3.0.4.2 (Explosive Stressors), and Appendix A (Training and Testing Activities Descriptions), the number of activities that use explosives under Alternative 2 are consistent from year-to-year and would increase slightly compared to activities planned under Alternative 1. The differences in the number of events within the range complex across a year is nominal with only minor changes annually; therefore, the locations, tempo, and general types of predicted impacts would not be discernible from those described above in Section 3.9.2.2.2.3 (Impacts from Explosives Under Alternative 1 – Training Activities).

Pursuant to the ESA, the use of explosives during training and testing activities, as described under Alternative 2, may affect ESA-listed Indo-West Pacific Distinct Population Segment scalloped hammerhead sharks, oceanic whitetip sharks and giant manta rays. The Navy is consulting with NMFS as required by Section 7(a)(2) of the ESA.

3.9.2.2.2.5 Impacts from Explosives Under the No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, proposed training and testing activities would not occur. Other military activities not associated with this Proposed Action would continue to occur. Explosive stressors, as described above, would not be introduced into the marine environment. Therefore, existing environmental conditions would either remain unchanged or would improve slightly after cessation of ongoing training and testing activities.

Discontinuing the training and testing activities would result in fewer explosive stressors within the marine environment where training and testing activities have historically been conducted. Therefore, discontinuing training and testing activities under the No Action Alternative would lessen the potential for explosive impacts on individual fishes, but would not measurably improve the status of fish populations or subpopulations, including those listed under ESA and those federally managed under the MSA.

3.9.2.3 Energy Stressors

Energy stressors are discussed in Section 3.0.4.3. Energy stressors that may impact fishes include in-water electromagnetic devices and high-energy lasers. While the number of training and testing events would change under this SEIS/OEIS, the analysis presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, Section 3.9.3.2 (Energy Stressors) remains valid. The changes in training and testing activities are not substantial and would not result in an appreciable change to existing environmental conditions or an increase in the level or intensity of energy stressors within the Study Area. High-energy lasers were not covered in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and represent a new stressor analyzed in this SEIS/OEIS.

As discussed in Section 3.0.4.3.2.2 (High-Energy Lasers), high-energy laser weapons are designed to disable surface targets, rendering them immobile. Fish could be exposed to a laser only if the beam missed the target. Should the laser strike the sea surface, individual fish at or near the surface could be exposed. The potential for exposure to a high-energy laser beam decreases as the water depth

increases. Most fish are unlikely to be exposed to laser activities because they primarily occur more than a few meters below the sea surface.

3.9.2.3.1 Impacts from In-Water Electromagnetic Devices Under Alternative 1

Under Alternative 1, the number of proposed training and testing events involving the use of in-water electromagnetic devices would decrease in comparison to the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (Table 3.0-9). The activities would occur in the same locations and in a similar manner as were analyzed previously.

As stated in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, in-water electromagnetic devices would not cause any potential risk to fishes because (1) the range of impact (i.e., greater than earth's magnetic field) is small (i.e., 13 ft. from the source), (2) the electromagnetic components of these activities are limited to simulating the electromagnetic signature of a vessel as it passes through the water, and (3) the electromagnetic signal is temporally variable and would cover only a small spatial range during each activity in the Study Area.

ESA-listed scalloped hammerhead sharks, oceanic whitetip sharks, and giant manta rays are capable of detecting electromagnetic energy. Therefore, energy stressors such as in-water electromagnetic devices could affect these species by causing temporary disturbances in their normal sensory perception during migratory or foraging movements, or avoidance reactions (Kalmijn, 2000). However, electromagnetic signals are temporally variable and would cover only a small spatial range during each activity in the Study Area. Therefore, impacts on fishes under Alternative 1 from in-water electromagnetic devices would be negligible.

Pursuant to the ESA, the use of in-water electromagnetic devices associated with training and testing activities, as described under Alternative 1, may affect ESA-listed Indo-West Pacific Distinct Population Segment of scalloped hammerhead sharks, oceanic whitetip sharks, and giant manta rays.

3.9.2.3.2 Impacts from In-Water Electromagnetic Devices Under Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)

Under Alternative 2, the number of proposed training and testing events involving the use of in-water electromagnetic devices would decrease in comparison to the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (Table 3.0-9). The activities would occur in the same locations and in a similar manner as were analyzed previously and above for Alternative 1.

Under Alternative 2, impacts on fishes from in-water electromagnetic devices should not be expected to occur and would be negligible.

Pursuant to the ESA, the use of in-water electromagnetic devices associated with training and testing activities, as described under Alternative 2, may affect ESA-listed Indo-West Pacific Distinct Population Segment of scalloped hammerhead sharks, oceanic whitetip sharks, and giant manta rays. The Navy is consulting with NMFS as required by Section 7(a)(2) of the ESA.

3.9.2.3.3 Impacts from In-Water Electromagnetic Devices Under the No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, proposed training and testing activities would not occur. Other military activities not associated with this Proposed Action would continue to occur. Energy stressors as listed above would not be introduced into the marine environment. Therefore, existing environmental conditions would either remain unchanged or would improve slightly after cessation of ongoing training and testing activities.

Discontinuing the training and testing activities would result in fewer energy stressors within the marine environment where training and testing activities have historically been conducted. Therefore, discontinuing training and testing activities under the No Action Alternative would lessen the potential for energy impacts on individual fishes, but would not measurably improve the status of fish populations or subpopulations, including those listed under ESA and those federally managed under the MSA.

3.9.2.3.4 Impacts from High-Energy Lasers Under Alternative 1

Under Alternative 1, the number of proposed events involving the use of high-energy lasers would be 54 (Table 3.0-10); this is a new substressor that was not analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. As discussed above, the potential for fishes to be exposed to high-energy lasers is extremely low, and impacts from high-energy laser activities proposed under Alternative 1 should not be expected to occur. Therefore, impacts on fishes under Alternative 1 from high-energy lasers, would be negligible.

Pursuant to the ESA, the use of high-energy lasers during training and testing activities, as described under Alternative 1, may affect ESA-listed Indo-West Pacific Distinct Population Segment of scalloped hammerhead sharks, oceanic whitetip sharks, and giant manta rays.

3.9.2.3.5 Impacts from High-Energy Lasers Under Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)

Under Alternative 2, the number of proposed events involving the use of high-energy lasers would increase from 54 to 60 compared to Alternative 1 (Table 3.0-10) and the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS; however, as discussed above, impacts on fishes from high-energy lasers should not be expected to occur. Therefore, impacts on fishes under Alternative 2 from energy stressors, including high-energy lasers, would be negligible.

Pursuant to the ESA, the use of high-energy lasers during training and testing activities, as described under Alternative 2, may affect ESA-listed Indo-West Pacific Distinct Population Segment of scalloped hammerhead sharks, oceanic whitetip sharks, and giant manta rays. The Navy is consulting with NMFS as required by Section 7(a)(2) of the ESA.

3.9.2.3.6 Impacts from High-Energy Lasers Under the No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, proposed training and testing activities would not occur. Other military activities not associated with this Proposed Action would continue to occur. Energy stressors, as listed above, would not be introduced into the marine environment. Therefore, existing environmental conditions would either remain unchanged or would improve slightly after cessation of ongoing training and testing activities.

Discontinuing the training and testing activities would result in fewer energy stressors within the marine environment where training and testing activities have historically been conducted. Therefore, discontinuing training and testing activities under the No Action Alternative would lessen the potential for energy impacts on individual fishes, but would not measurably improve the status of fish populations or subpopulations, including those listed under ESA and those federally managed under the MSA.

3.9.2.4 Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors

Physical disturbance and strike stressors are discussed in Section 3.0.4.4. Physical disturbance and strike stressors that may impact fishes include (1) vessels and in-water devices, (2) military expended materials, and (3) seafloor devices. While the number of training and testing events would change under this SEIS/OEIS, the analysis presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, Section 3.9.3.3 (Physical Disturbance and Strike) remains valid. The changes in training and testing activities are not substantial

and would not result in an overall change to existing environmental conditions or an increase in the level or intensity of physical disturbance and strike stressors within the Study Area.

As stated in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, with few exceptions, activities involving vessels and in-water devices are not intended to contact the seafloor. There is minimal potential strike impact other than bottom-crawling unmanned underwater vehicles. Physical disturbance and strike stressors from vessels and in-water devices, military expended materials, and seafloor devices have the potential to affect all marine fish groups found within the Study Area, although some fish groups may be more susceptible to strike potential than others. In addition, the potential responses to physical strikes are varied, but include behavioral changes such as avoidance, altered swimming speed and direction, physiological stress, and physical injury or mortality.

3.9.2.4.1 Impacts from Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors Under Alternative 1

Under Alternative 1, the combined number of proposed training and testing events involving vessels and in-water devices would decrease slightly from those presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (Table 3.0-12 and Table 3.0-13). Military expended materials (Table 3.0-14, Table 3.0-15, and Table 3.0-16) combined would generally increase, and seafloor devices (Table 3.0-19) would decrease slightly from the number in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Increases in physical disturbance and strike stressors, such as military expended materials, could increase the level of impact on some fishes. Analysis by individual category of expended items indicates that those items having the most potential to affect fishes have decreased. Overall, these changes do not appreciably change the analysis or impact conclusions presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS because the impact analysis was based on the probability of an impact on a resource.

The risk of a strike from vessels and in-water devices used in training and testing activities on an individual fish would be extremely low because (1) most fish can detect and avoid vessel and in-water device movements, and (2) the types of fish that are likely to be exposed to vessel and in-water device strike are limited and occur in low concentrations where vessels and in-water devices are used. Potential impacts of exposure to vessels and in-water devices are not expected to result in substantial changes to an individual's behavior, fitness, or species recruitment, and are not expected to result in population-level impacts. Therefore, impacts on fish or fish populations would be negligible.

Similar to most other fish species described above, ESA-listed scalloped hammerhead sharks, oceanic whitetip sharks, and giant manta rays, would be able to sense pressure changes in the water column and swim quickly, and are likely to escape collision with vessels and in-water devices.

Therefore, under Alternative 1, impacts on fishes from the use of vessels and in-water devices, military expended materials, and seafloor devices would be negligible.

Pursuant to the ESA, the use of vessels and in-water devices associated with training and testing activities, as described under Alternative 1, may affect ESA-listed Indo-West Pacific Distinct Population Segment of scalloped hammerhead sharks, oceanic whitetip sharks, and giant manta rays.

3.9.2.4.2 Impacts from Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors Under Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)

Under Alternative 2, the combined number of proposed training and testing events involving vessels and in-water devices would decrease slightly from those presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (Table 3.0-12 and Table 3.0-13). Military expended materials (Table 3.0-14, Table 3.0-15, and Table 3.0-16) combined would generally increase, and seafloor devices (Table 3.0-19) would decrease slightly from the number in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Increases in some physical disturbance and

strike stressors such as military expended materials could increase the impact risk on fishes but does not appreciably change the analysis or impact conclusions presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Impacts on fishes would be inconsequential for the same reasons detailed above and would have no appreciable change on the impact conclusions for physical disturbance and strike stressors, as presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and summarized above under Alternative 1.

Therefore, under Alternative 2, impacts on fishes from physical disturbance and strike would be negligible.

Pursuant to the ESA, the use of vessels and in-water devices associated with training and testing activities, as described under Alternative 2, may affect ESA-listed Indo-West Pacific Distinct Population Segment of scalloped hammerhead sharks, oceanic whitetip sharks, and giant manta rays. The Navy is consulting with NMFS as required by Section 7(a)(2) of the ESA.

3.9.2.4.3 Impacts from Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors Under the No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, proposed training and testing. Other military activities not associated with this Proposed Action would continue to occur. Physical disturbance and strike stressors as listed above would not be introduced into the marine environment. Therefore, existing environmental conditions would either remain unchanged or would improve slightly after cessation of ongoing training and testing activities.

Discontinuing the training and testing activities would result in fewer physical disturbance and strike stressors within the marine environment where training and testing activities have historically been conducted. Therefore, discontinuing training and testing activities under the No Action Alternative would lessen the potential for physical disturbance and strike impacts on individual fishes, but would not measurably improve the status of fish populations or subpopulations, including those listed under ESA and those federally managed under the MSA.

3.9.2.5 Entanglement Stressors

Entanglement stressors are discussed in Section 3.0.4.5. Entanglement stressors considered for fishes include (1) fiber optic cable and guidance wires, and (2) decelerators/parachutes. The annual number of wires and cables and decelerators/parachutes proposed under the alternatives and in comparison to current ongoing activities are presented in Tables 3.0-20, 3.0-21, and 3.0-22. There have been no known instances of any fish being entangled in wires and cables, or decelerators/parachutes associated with Navy training and testing activities prior to or since the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

3.9.2.5.1 Impacts from Entanglement Stressors Under Alternative 1

Under Alternative 1, the combined number of fiber optic cables (Table 3.0-22) decrease, guidance wires (Table 3.0-22) increase, and decelerators/parachutes (Table 3.0-24) decrease compared to the number of events proposed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Decreases in the number of training and testing events would potentially decrease the level of entanglement stressors on fishes in the Study Area.

As stated in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, while individual fish susceptible to entanglement would encounter wires and cables, including guidance wires, fiber optic cables, and sonobuoy wires during training and testing activities, the long-term consequences of entanglement are unlikely for either individuals or populations because (1) the encounter rate for wires and cables is low, (2) the types of fishes that are susceptible to these items is limited, (3) there is restricted overlap with susceptible fishes, and (4) the physical characteristics of the wires and cables reduce entanglement risk to fishes compared

to monofilament used for fishing gear. Potential impacts from exposure to fiber optic cables and guidance wires are not expected to result in substantial changes to an individual's behavior, fitness, or species recruitment, and are not expected to result in population-level impacts.

As described in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, it would be very unlikely that fishes would encounter and become entangled in any decelerators/parachutes or sonobuoy accessories. This is mainly due to the size of the range complexes and the resulting widely scattered decelerators/parachutes. If a few individual fish were to encounter and become entangled in a decelerator/parachute, the growth, survival, annual reproductive success, or lifetime reproductive success of the population as a whole would not be impacted directly or indirectly.

Therefore, impacts on fishes under Alternative 1 from the use of fiber optic cables and guidance wires and decelerators/parachutes would be negligible.

Pursuant to the ESA, the use of fiber optic cables and guidance wires and decelerators/parachutes associated with training and testing activities, as described under Alternative 1, may affect ESA-listed Indo-West Pacific Distinct Population Segment of scalloped hammerhead sharks, oceanic whitetip sharks, and giant manta rays.

3.9.2.5.2 Impacts from Entanglement Stressors Under Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)

Under Alternative 2, the combined number of entanglement stressors decrease (Table 3.0-22 through Table 3.0-24) compared to the number of events proposed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and would increase or stay the same compared to Alternative 1. However, as stated above for Alternative 1, training and testing activities involving fiber optic cables, guidance wires, and decelerators/parachutes are not expected to impact an individual's behavior, fitness, or species recruitment, and are not expected to result in population-level impacts.

Therefore, impacts on fishes from entanglement stressors such as wires and cables and decelerators/parachutes under Alternative 2 would be negligible.

Pursuant to the ESA, the use of fiber optic cables and guidance wires and decelerators/parachutes associated with training and testing activities, as described under Alternative 2, may affect ESA-listed Indo-West Pacific Distinct Population Segment of scalloped hammerhead sharks, oceanic whitetip sharks, and giant manta rays. The Navy is consulting with NMFS as required by Section 7(a)(2) of the ESA.

3.9.2.5.3 Impacts from Entanglement Stressors Under the No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, proposed training and testing activities would not occur. Other military activities not associated with this Proposed Action would continue to occur. Entanglement stressors as listed above would not be introduced into the marine environment. Therefore, existing environmental conditions would either remain unchanged or would improve slightly after cessation of ongoing training and testing activities.

Discontinuing the training and testing activities would result in fewer physical disturbance and strike stressors within the marine environment where training and testing activities have historically been conducted. Therefore, discontinuing training and testing activities under the No Action Alternative would lessen the potential for entanglement impacts on the fishes from entanglement, but would not measurably improve the status of fish populations or subpopulations, including those listed under ESA and those federally managed under the MSA.

3.9.2.6 Ingestion Stressors

Ingestion stressors (military expended materials – munition and military expended materials – other than munition) are discussed in Section 3.0.4.6. Ingestion stressors that may impact fishes include various types of military expended materials such as munitions and expended materials other than munitions used by the Navy during training and testing activities within the Study Area. While the number of training and testing events would change under this SEIS/OEIS, the analysis presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, Section 3.9.3.2 (Ingestion Stressors) remains valid. The changes in training and testing activities are not substantial and would not result in an appreciable change to existing environmental conditions or an increase in the amount of ingestion stressors within the Study Area.

3.9.2.6.1 Impacts from Ingestion Stressors Under Alternative 1

Under Alternative 1, the combined number of ingestion stressors would increase compared to the number in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (see Table 3.0-14, Table 3.0-15, Table 3.0-16, Table 3.0-25, and Table 3.0-26). However, increases in the number of ingestion stressors do not appreciably change the impact analysis or conclusions presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

As presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, open-ocean predators and open-ocean planktivores are most likely to ingest materials in the water column, while coastal bottom-dwelling predators and estuarine bottom-dwelling predators could ingest materials from the seafloor. Open-ocean predators such as tunas and sharks may eat floating or sinking expended materials, while open-ocean planktivores, such as sardines and filter-feeding species such as whale sharks, may ingest floating expended materials incidentally as they feed in the water column. Other fish species such as skates and rays forage on the seafloor and may ingest expended materials on the seafloor. Encounter rates for all of these feeding guilds would be extremely low, but may result in injury or death to individuals; however, population-level effects are not anticipated.

Potential impacts of ingestion on some adult fishes are different than for other life stages (eggs, larvae, and juveniles) because early life stages for some species are too small to ingest any military expended materials except for chaff, which has been shown to have limited effects on fishes in the concentration levels that it is released at (Arfsten et al., 2002; U.S. Department of the Air Force, 1997; U.S. Department of the Navy, 1999). Therefore, with the exception of later stage larvae and juveniles that could ingest microplastics, no ingestion potential impacts on early life stages are expected.

Overall, the potential impacts of ingesting expended military materials such as munitions or other expended materials, such as chaff and flare end caps and pistons, would be limited to individual fish that might suffer a negative response from a given ingestion event. While ingestion of military expended materials could result in sublethal or lethal effects to a small number of individuals, the likelihood of a fish encountering an expended item is dependent on where that species feeds and the amount of material expended. Furthermore, an encounter may not lead to ingestion, as a fish might “taste” an item, then expel it (Felix et al., 1995), in the same manner that a fish would take a lure into its mouth then spit it out.

Therefore, the number of fishes potentially impacted by ingestion of military expended materials such as munitions and other expended materials would be negligible.

Pursuant to the ESA, the use of military expended materials associated with training and testing activities, as described under Alternative 1, may affect ESA-listed Indo-West Pacific Distinct Population Segment of scalloped hammerhead sharks, oceanic whitetip sharks, and giant manta rays.

3.9.2.6.2 Impacts from Ingestion Stressors Under Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)

Under Alternative 2, the combined number of ingestion stressors would increase compared to the number proposed for use in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and above for Alternative 1 (see Table 3.0-14, Table 3.0-15, Table 3.0-16, Table 3.0-25, and Table 3.0-26). However, these increases do not appreciably change the impact analysis or conclusions presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and presented above under Alternative 1.

Therefore, impacts on fishes from ingestion of military expended materials under Alternative 2 would be negligible.

Pursuant to the ESA, the use of military expended materials associated with training and testing activities, as described under Alternative 2, may affect ESA-listed Indo-West Pacific Distinct Population Segment of scalloped hammerhead sharks, oceanic whitetip sharks, and giant manta rays. The Navy is consulting with NMFS as required by Section 7(a)(2) of the ESA.

3.9.2.6.3 Impacts from Ingestion Stressors Under the No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, proposed training and testing activities would not occur. Other military activities not associated with this Proposed Action would continue to occur. Ingestion stressors as listed above would not be introduced into the marine environment. Therefore, existing environmental conditions would either remain unchanged or would improve slightly after cessation of ongoing training and testing activities.

Discontinuing the training and testing activities would result in fewer ingestion stressors within the marine environment where training and testing activities have historically been conducted. Therefore, discontinuing training and testing activities under the No Action Alternative would lessen the potential for ingestion impacts on the fishes from ingestion of military expended material, but would not measurably improve the status of fish populations or subpopulations, including those listed under ESA and those federally-managed under the MSA.

3.9.2.7 Secondary Stressors

Secondary stressors from training and testing activities that could pose secondary or indirect impacts on fishes via habitat, prey, sediment, and water quality include (1) explosives and byproducts; (2) metals; (3) chemicals; (4) other materials such as targets, chaff, and plastics; and (5) impacts on fish habitat. While the number of training and testing events would change under this SEIS/OEIS, the analysis presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, Section 3.9.3.6 (Secondary Stressors) remains valid. The changes in training and testing activities are not substantial and would not result in an appreciable change to existing environmental conditions or an increase in the level or intensity of energy stressors within the Study Area.

As stated in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, indirect impacts of explosives and unexploded ordnance on fishes via water could not only cause physical impacts, but prey might also have behavioral reactions to underwater sound. For example, the sound from underwater explosions might induce startle reactions and temporary dispersal of schooling fishes if they are within close proximity. The abundances of fish and invertebrate prey species near the detonation point could be diminished for a short period of time before being repopulated by animals from adjacent waters. Secondary impacts from underwater explosions would be temporary, and no lasting impact on prey availability or the pelagic food web would be expected. Indirect impacts of underwater detonations and explosive ordnance use under the

Proposed Action would not result in a decrease in the quantity or quality of fish populations or fish habitats in the Study Area.

Indirect impacts of explosives and unexploded ordnance to fishes via sediment is possible in the immediate vicinity of the ordnance. Degradation of explosives proceeds via several pathways discussed in Section 3.1 (Sediments and Water Quality). Degradation products of Royal Demolition Explosive are not toxic to marine organisms at realistic exposure levels (Rosen & Lotufo, 2010). TNT and its degradation products impact developmental processes in fishes and are acutely toxic to adults at concentrations similar to real-world exposures (Halpern et al., 2008; Rosen & Lotufo, 2010). It is likely that various lifestages of fishes could be impacted by the indirect impacts of degrading explosives within a very small radius of the explosive (1–6 ft.), but these impacts are expected to be short term and localized.

Certain metals are harmful to fishes at concentrations above background levels (e.g., cadmium, chromium, lead, mercury, zinc, copper, manganese, and many others) (Wang & Rainbow, 2008). Metals are introduced into seawater and sediments as a result of Navy training and testing activities involving vessel hulks, targets, ordnance, munitions, and other military expended materials. Indirect impacts of metals to fishes via sediment and water involve concentrations that are several orders of magnitude lower than concentrations achieved via bioaccumulation. Fishes may be exposed by contact with the metal, contact with contaminants in the sediment or water, and ingestion of contaminated sediments. Concentrations of metals in sea water are orders of magnitude lower than concentrations in marine sediments. It is extremely unlikely that fishes would be indirectly impacted by toxic metals via the water.

Several training and testing activities introduce potentially harmful chemicals into the marine environment; principally, flares and propellants for rockets, missiles, and torpedoes. The greatest risk to fishes from flares, missile, and rocket propellants is perchlorate, which is highly soluble in water, persistent, and impacts metabolic processes in many plants and animals. Fishes may be exposed by contact with contaminated water or ingestion of contaminated sediments. Since perchlorate is highly soluble, it does not readily absorb to sediments. Therefore, missile and rocket fuel pose no risk of indirect impact on fishes via sediment. In contrast, the principal toxic components of torpedo fuel, propylene glycol dinitrate and nitrodiphenylamine, adsorbs to sediments, has relatively low toxicity, and is readily degraded by biological processes. It is conceivable that various lifestages of fishes could be indirectly impacted by propellants via sediment in the immediate vicinity of the object (e.g., within a few inches), but these potential impacts would diminish rapidly as the propellant degrades.

As described in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, some military expended materials (e.g., decelerators/parachutes) could become remobilized after their initial contact with the sea floor (e.g., by waves or currents) and could be reintroduced as an entanglement or ingestion hazard for fishes. In some bottom types (without strong currents, hard-packed sediments, and low biological productivity), items such as projectiles might remain intact for some time before becoming degraded or broken down by natural processes. While these items remain intact sitting on the bottom, they could potentially remain ingestion hazards. These potential impacts may cease only (1) when the military expended materials is too massive to be mobilized by typical oceanographic processes, (2) if the military expended materials become encrusted by natural processes and incorporated into the seafloor, or (3) when the military expended materials become permanently buried. In this scenario, a parachute could initially sink to the seafloor, but then be transported laterally through the water column or along the seafloor, increasing the opportunity for entanglement. In the unlikely event that a fish would

become entangled, injury or mortality could result. The entanglement stressor would eventually cease to pose an entanglement risk as it becomes encrusted or buried, or degrades.

Secondary stressors can also involve impacts on habitat (sediment or water quality) or prey (i.e., impacting the availability or quality of prey) that have the potential to affect fish species, including ESA-listed scalloped hammerhead sharks, oceanic whitetip sharks, and manta rays. Secondary stressors that may affect ESA-listed species only include those related to the use of explosives. Secondary effects on prey and habitat from the release of metals, chemicals, and other materials into the marine environment during training and testing activities are not anticipated. In addition to directly impacting ESA-listed species, underwater explosives could impact other species in the food web, including those that these species prey upon. The impacts of explosions would differ depending upon the type of prey species in the area of the blast. In addition to physical effects of an underwater blast, prey might have behavioral reactions to underwater sound. For instance, prey species might exhibit a strong startle reaction to explosions that might include swimming to the surface or scattering away from the source. This startle and flight response is the most common secondary defense among animals. The abundances of prey species near the detonation point could be diminished for a short period of time, affecting prey availability for ESA-listed species feeding in the vicinity. Any effects to prey, other than prey located within the impact zone when the explosive detonates, would be temporary. The likelihood of direct impacts on fishes and mobile invertebrates is low, as described in this section. No lasting effects on prey availability or the pelagic food web would be expected.

3.9.3 Public Comments

The public raised a number of issues during the scoping period in regards to fishes. The issues are summarized in the list below. Comments received from the public during the Draft SEIS/OEIS commenting period related to fishes are addressed in Appendix K (Public Comment Responses).

- **Acoustic and explosive disturbance to fish and EFH –** As described in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, and documented in Section 3.9.2.1 (Acoustic Stressors), Navy training and testing activities may affect individual fish by causing some minor behavioral reactions. However, these activities would not cause a population-level impact. For federally managed fish species and habitats under the MSA, those impacts are detailed in Chapter 6. The Navy would also use mitigation measures detailed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) to reduce potential impacts on less than significant levels. For example, during Explosive Mine Neutralization Activities involving Navy divers, divers will notify their supporting small boat or Range Safety Officer of hammerhead shark sightings (of any hammerhead species, due to the difficulty of differentiating species) at the detonation location. The Navy will delay fuse initiations or detonations until the shark is observed exiting the detonation location.
- **Direct and cumulative impacts from military-expended material and debris on marine biology –** As described in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and above, military expended material may affect marine biological resources such as fishes through physical disturbance and strike, entanglement, ingestion, and have a cumulative effect on these resources. However, due to the low potential for interaction between biological resources and entanglement, ingestion, and strike stressors for reasons discussed above and in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, military expended materials are not expected to pose a significant risk to the marine resources, including fishes.

- **Direct and cumulative impacts on fish populations –** As described in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and in most sections above, impacts on fish from acoustic and explosive stressors (Section 3.9.2.1, Acoustic Stressors, and Section 3.9.2.2, Explosive Stressors) may injure or kill a few individuals but are unlikely to have measurable impacts on overall stocks or populations, including ESA-listed scalloped hammerhead sharks, oceanic whitetip sharks, and giant manta rays. As stated in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, if an underwater explosion occurred in an area of high fish density, then more fish would be impacted; however, the probability of this occurring is low based on the patchy distribution of dense schooling fish. In addition, near shore areas used for underwater seafloor detonations are areas that have been previously disturbed and unlikely to support large schools or groups of fish. Cumulative impacts may affect individual fish, but would not have population-level impacts.
- **Impacts on marine species from the metals in the water (copper and lead) (see Section 3.9.2.7, Secondary Stressors) –** As described in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and above, metals would be introduced into seawater and sediments as a result of Navy training and testing activities involving vessel hulks, targets, ordnance, munitions, and other military expended materials. Fishes may be exposed by contact with the metal, contact with contaminants in the sediment or water, and ingestion of contaminated sediments. Concentrations of metals in sea water are orders of magnitude lower than concentrations in marine sediments. It is extremely unlikely that fishes would be indirectly impacted by toxic metals via the water.

REFERENCES

Alves, D., M. C. P. Amorim, and P. J. Fonseca. (2016). Boat noise reduces acoustic active space in the lusitanian toadfish Halobatrachus didactylus. *Proceedings of Meetings on Acoustics*, 010033.

Arfsten, D. P., C. L. Wilson, and B. J. Spargo. (2002). Radio frequency chaff: The effects of its use in training on the environment. *Ecotoxicology and Environmental Safety, 53*, 1–11.

Astrup, J. (1999). Ultrasound detection in fish—A parallel to the sonar-mediated detection of bats by ultrasound-sensitive insects? *Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology, Part A, 124*, 19–27.

Baum, J., E. Medina, J. A. Musick, and M. Smale. (2015). *Carcharhinus longimanus. The International Union for Conservation of Nature Red List of Threatened Species 2015: e.T39374A85699641*. Retrieved from http://www.iucnredlist.org/details/39374/0.

Booman, C., H. Dalen, H. Heivestad, A. Levesen, T. van der Meeren, and K. Toklum. (1996). (Seismic-fish) Effekter av luftkanonskyting pa egg, larver og ynell. *Havforskningsinstituttet, 3*, 1–88.

Bracciali, C., D. Campobello, C. Giacoma, and G. Sara. (2012). Effects of nautical traffic and noise on foraging patterns of Mediterranean damselfish (*Chromis chromis*). *PLoS ONE, 7*(7), e40582.

Breitzler, L., I. H. Lau, P. J. Fonseca, and R. O. Vasconcelos. (2020). Noise-induced hearing loss in zebrafish: Investigating structural and functional inner ear damage and recovery. *Hearing Research*, 107952.

Brown, K. T., J. Seeto, M. M. Lal, and C. E. Miller. (2016). Discovery of an important aggregation area for endangered scalloped hammerhead sharks, *Sphyrna lewini*, in the Rewa River estuary, Fiji Islands. *Pacific Conservation Biology, 22*(3), 242–248.

Bruintjes, R., J. Purser, K. A. Everley, S. Mangan, S. D. Simpson, and A. N. Radford. (2016). Rapid recovery following short–term acoustic disturbance in two fish species. *Royal Society - Open Science, 3*(1), 150686.

Buerkle, U. (1968). Relation of pure tone thresholds to background noise level in the Atlantic cod (*Gadus morhua*). *Journal of the Fisheries Research Board of Canada, 25*, 1155–1160.

Buerkle, U. (1969). Auditory masking and the critical band in Atlantic cod (*Gadus morhua*). *Journal of the Fisheries Research Board of Canada, 26*, 1113–1119.

Buran, B. N., X. Deng, and A. N. Popper. (2005). Structural variation in the inner ears of four deep-sea elopomorph fishes. *Journal of Morphology, 265*, 215–225.

Casper, B., P. Lobel, and H. Yan. (2003). The hearing sensitivity of the little skate, *Raja erinacea*: A comparison of two methods. *Environmental Biology of Fishes, 68*, 371–379.

Casper, B., and D. Mann. (2006). Evoked potential audiograms of the nurse shark (*Ginglymostoma cirratum*) and the yellow stingray (*Urabatis jamaicensis*). *Environmental Biology of Fishes, 76*(1), 101–108.

Casper, B. M., and D. A. Mann. (2009). Field hearing measurements of the Atlantic sharpnose shark, *Rhizoprionodon terraenovae*. *Journal of Fish Biology, 75*(10), 2768–2776.

Casper, B. M., M. B. Halvorsen, and A. N. Popper. (2012a). Are Sharks Even Bothered by a Noisy Environment? In A. N. Popper & A. D. Hawkins (Eds.), *The Effects of Noise on Aquatic Life II* (Vol. 730). New York, NY: Springer.

Casper, B. M., A. N. Popper, F. Matthews, T. J. Carlson, and M. B. Halvorsen. (2012b). Recovery of barotrauma injuries in Chinook salmon, *Oncorhynchus tshawytscha* from exposure to pile driving sound. *PLoS ONE, 7*(6), e39593.

Casper, B. M., M. B. Halvorsen, F. Matthews, T. J. Carlson, and A. N. Popper. (2013a). Recovery of barotrauma injuries resulting from exposure to pile driving sound in two sizes of hybrid striped bass. *PLoS ONE, 8*(9), e73844.

Casper, B. M., M. E. Smith, M. B. Halvorsen, H. Sun, T. J. Carlson, and A. N. Popper. (2013b). Effects of exposure to pile driving sounds on fish inner ear tissues. *Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology, Part A, 166*(2), 352–360.

Casper, B. M., M. B. Halvorsen, T. J. Carlson, and A. N. Popper. (2017). Onset of barotrauma injuries related to number of pile driving strike exposures in hybrid striped bass. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 141*(6), 4380.

Chapman, C. J., and A. D. Hawkins. (1973). Field study of hearing in cod, *Gadus morhua* L. *Journal of Comparative Physiology, 85*(2), 147–167.

Chapuis, L., S. P. Collin, K. E. Yopak, R. D. McCauley, R. M. Kempster, L. A. Ryan, C. Schmidt, C. C. Kerr, E. Gennari, C. A. Egeberg, and N. S. Hart. (2019). The effect of underwater sounds on shark behaviour. *Sci Rep, 9*(1), 6924.

Codarin, A., L. E. Wysocki, F. Ladich, and M. Picciulin. (2009). Effects of ambient and boat noise on hearing and communication in three fish species living in a marine protected area (Miramare, Italy). *Marine Pollution Bulletin, 58*(12), 1880–1887.

Colleye, O., L. Kever, D. Lecchini, L. Berten, and E. Parmentier. (2016). Auditory evoked potential audiograms in post-settlement stage individuals of coral reef fishes. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology, 483*, 1–9.

Coombs, S., and J. C. Montgomery. (1999). The Enigmatic Lateral Line System. In R. R. Fay & A. N. Popper (Eds.), *Comparative Hearing: Fish and Amphibians* (pp. 319–362). New York, NY: Springer-Verlag.

Cox, B. S., A. M. Dux, M. C. Quist, and C. S. Guy. (2012). Use of a seismic air gun to reduce survival of nonnative lake trout embryos: A tool for conservation? *North American Journal of Fisheries Management, 32*(2), 292–298.

Cuetos-Bueno, J., and P. Houk. (2014). Re-estimation and synthesis of coral-reef fishery landings in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands since the 1950s suggests the decline of a common resource. *Reviews in Fish Biology and Fisheries, 25*(1), 179–194.

Currie, H. A. L., P. R. White, T. G. Leighton, and P. S. Kemp. (2020). Group behavior and tolerance of Eurasian minnow (*Phoxinus phoxinus*) in response to tones of differing pulse repetition rate. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 147*(3).

de Jong, K., T. N. Forland, M. C. P. Amorim, G. Rieucau, H. Slabbekoorn, and L. D. Sivle. (2020). Predicting the effects of anthropogenic noise on fish reproduction. *Reviews in Fish Biology and Fisheries*.

De Robertis, A., and N. O. Handegard. (2013). Fish avoidance of research vessels and the efficacy of noise-reduced vessels: A review. *ICES Journal of Marine Science, 70*(1), 34–45.

Debusschere, E., B. De Coensel, A. Bajek, D. Botteldooren, K. Hostens, J. Vanaverbeke, S. Vandendriessche, K. Van Ginderdeuren, M. Vincx, and S. Degraer. (2014). *In situ* mortality experiments with juvenile sea bass (*Dicentrarchus labrax*) in relation to impulsive sound levels caused by pile driving of windmill foundations. *PLoS ONE, 9*(10), e109280.

Defenders of Wildlife. (2015a). *A Petition to List the Giant Manta Ray (Manta birostris), Reef Manta Ray (Manta alfredi), and Caribbean Manta Ray (Manta c.f. birostris) as Endangered, or Alternatively as Threatened, Species Pursuant to the Endangered Species Act and for the Concurrent Designation of Critical Habitat*. Denver, CO: Defenders of Wildlife.

Defenders of Wildlife. (2015b). *A Petition to List the Oceanic Whitetip Shark (Carcharhinus longimanus) as an Endangered, or Alternatively as a Threatened, Species Pursuant to the Endangered Species Act and for the Concurrent Designation of Critical Habitat*. Denver, CO: Defenders of Wildlife.

Deng, X., H. J. Wagner, and A. N. Popper. (2011). The inner ear and its coupling to the swim bladder in the deep-sea fish *Antimora rostrata* (Teleostei: Moridae). *Deep Sea Research Part 1, Oceanographic Research Papers, 58*(1), 27–37.

Deng, X., H. J. Wagner, and A. N. Popper. (2013). Interspecific variations of inner ear structure in the deep-sea fish family Melamphaidae. *The Anatomical Record, 296*(7), 1064–1082.

Doksaeter, L., O. R. Godo, N. O. Handegard, P. H. Kvadsheim, F. P. A. Lam, C. Donovan, and P. J. O. Miller. (2009). Behavioral responses of herring (*Clupea harengus*) to 1–2 and 6–7 kHz sonar signals and killer whale feeding sounds. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 125*(1), 554–564.

Doksaeter, L., N. O. Handegard, O. R. Godo, P. H. Kvadsheim, and N. Nordlund. (2012). Behavior of captive herring exposed to naval sonar transmissions (1.0–1.6 kHz) throughout a yearly cycle. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 131*(2), 1632–1642.

Ebert, D. A., S. Fowler, and M. Dando. (2015). *A Pocket Guide to Sharks of the World*. Princeton, NJ and Oxford, United Kingdom: Princeton University Press.

Edds-Walton, P. L., and J. J. Finneran. (2006). *Evaluation of Evidence for Altered Behavior and Auditory Deficits in Fishes Due to Human-Generated Noise Sources*. (Technical Report 1939). San Diego, CA: SPAWAR Systems Center.

Engås, A., O. A. Misund, A. V. Soldal, B. Horvei, and A. Solstad. (1995). Reactions of penned herring and cod to playback of original, frequency-filtered and time-smoothed vessel sound. *Fisheries Research, 22*(3), 243–254.

Enger, P. S. (1981). *Frequency Discrimination in Teleosts–Central or Peripheral?* New York, NY: Springer-Verlag.

Eschmeyer, W. N., and J. D. Fong. (2017). *Catalog of Fishes*. San Francisco, CA: California Academy of Sciences. Retrieved from http://researcharchive.calacademy.org/research/ichthyology/catalog/SpeciesByFamily.asp.

Fakan, E. P., and M. I. McCormick. (2019). Boat noise affects the early life history of two damselfishes. *Marine Pollution Bulletin, 141*, 493–500.

Faulkner, S. G., W. M. Tonn, M. Welz, and D. R. Schmitt. (2006). Effects of explosives on incubating lake trout eggs in the Canadian Arctic. *North American Journal of Fisheries Management, 26*(4), 833–842.

Faulkner, S. G., M. Welz, W. M. Tonn, and D. R. Schmitt. (2008). Effects of simulated blasting on mortality of rainbow trout eggs. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society, 137*(1), 1–12.

Felix, A., M. E. Stevens, and R. L. Wallace. (1995). Unpalatability of a colonial rotifer, *Sinantherina socialis,* to small zooplanktivorous fishes. *Invertebrate Biology, 114*(2), 139–144.

Fewtrell, J. L., and R. D. McCauley. (2012). Impact of air gun noise on the behaviour of marine fish and squid. *Marine Pollution Bulletin, 64*(5), 984–993.

Fitch, J. E., and P. H. Young. (1948). *Use and Effect of Explosives in California Coastal Waters*. Sacramento, CA: California Division Fish and Game.

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. (2013). *Report of the Fourth FAO Expert Advisory Panel for the Assessment of Proposals to Amend Appendices I and II of CITES Concerning Commercially-Exploited Aquatic Species*. Rome, Italy: Food and Agriculture Organization Fisheries Department, Fishery Resources Division, Marine Resources Service.

Gaspin, J. B. (1975). *Experimental Investigations of the Effects of Underwater Explosions on Swimbladder Fish, I: 1973 Chesapeake Bay Tests*. Silver Spring, MD: Naval Surface Weapons Center, White Oak Laboratory.

Gaspin, J. B., G. B. Peters, and M. L. Wisely. (1976). *Experimental Investigations of the Effects of Underwater Explosions on Swimbladder Fish*. Silver Spring, MD: Naval Ordnance Lab.

Gitschlag, G. R., M. J. Schirripa, and J. E. Powers. (2000). *Estimation of Fisheries Impacts Due to Underwater Explosives Used to Sever and Salvage Oil and Gas Platforms in the U.S. Gulf of Mexico: Final Report*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Interior.

Goertner, J. F. (1978). *Dynamical Model for Explosion Injury to Fish*. Dalgren, VA: U.S. Department of the Navy, Naval Surface Weapons Center.

Goertner, J. F., M. L. Wiley, G. A. Young, and W. W. McDonald. (1994). *Effects of Underwater Explosions on Fish Without Swimbladders*. Silver Spring, MD: Naval Surface Warfare Center.

Goetz, S., M. B. Santos, J. Vingada, D. C. Costas, A. G. Villanueva, and G. J. Pierce. (2015). Do pingers cause stress in fish? An experimental tank study with European sardine, *Sardina pilchardus* (Walbaum, 1792) (Actinopterygii, Clupeidae), exposed to a 70 kHz dolphin pinger. *Hydrobiologia, 749*(1), 83–96.

Govoni, J. J., L. R. Settle, and M. A. West. (2003). Trauma to juvenile pinfish and spot inflicted by submarine detonations. *Journal of Aquatic Animal Health, 15*, 111–119.

Govoni, J. J., M. A. West, L. R. Settle, R. T. Lynch, and M. D. Greene. (2008). Effects of Underwater Explosions on Larval Fish: Implications for a Coastal Engineering Project. *Journal of Coastal Research, 2*, 228–233.

Halpern, B., S. Walbridge, K. A. Selkoe, C. V. Kappel, F. Micheli, C. D'Agrosa, J. F. Bruno, K. S. Casey, C. Ebert, H. E. Fox, R. Fujita, D. Heinemann, H. S. Lenihan, E. M. P. Madin, M. T. Perry, E. R. Selig, M. Spalding, R. S. Steneck, and R. Watson. (2008). A global map of human impact on marine ecosystems. *Science, 319*(5865), 948–952.

Halvorsen, M. B., B. M. Casper, C. M. Woodley, T. J. Carlson, and A. N. Popper. (2011). *Hydroacoustic Impacts on Fish from Pile Installation* (Research Results Digest). Washington, DC: National Cooperative Highway Research Program, Transportation Research Board, National Academy of Sciences.

Halvorsen, M. B., B. M. Casper, F. Matthews, T. J. Carlson, and A. N. Popper. (2012a). Effects of exposure to pile-driving sounds on the lake sturgeon, Nile tilapia and hogchoker. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 279*(1748), 4705–4714.

Halvorsen, M. B., B. M. Casper, C. M. Woodley, T. J. Carlson, and A. N. Popper. (2012b). Threshold for onset of injury in Chinook salmon from exposure to impulsive pile driving sounds. *PLoS ONE, 7*(6), e38968.

Halvorsen, M. B., D. G. Zeddies, W. T. Ellison, D. R. Chicoine, and A. N. Popper. (2012c). Effects of mid-frequency active sonar on hearing in fish. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 131*(1), 599–607.

Halvorsen, M. B., D. G. Zeddies, D. Chicoine, and A. N. Popper. (2013). Effects of low-frequency naval sonar exposure on three species of fish. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 134*(2), EL205–210.

Handegard, N. O., K. Michalsen, and D. Tjøstheim. (2003). Avoidance behaviour in cod (*Gadus morhua*) to a bottom-trawling vessel. *Aquatic Living Resources, 16*(3), 265–270.

Handegard, N. O., A. D. Robertis, G. Rieucau, K. Boswell, G. J. Macaulay, and J. M. Jech. (2015). The reaction of a captive herring school to playbacks of a noise-reduced and a conventional research vessel. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences, 72*(4), 491–499.

Hastings, M., A. Popper, J. Finneran, and P. Lanford. (1996). Effects of low-frequency underwater sound on hair cells of the inner ear and lateral line of the teleost fish *Astronotus ocellatus*. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 99*(3), 1759–1766.

Hastings, M. C. (1991). *Effects of underwater sound on bony fishes*. Paper presented at the 122nd Meeting of the Acoustical Society of America. Houston, TX.

Hastings, M. C. (1995). *Physical effects of noise on fishes.* Paper presented at the 1995 International Congress on Noise Control Engineering. Newport Beach, CA.

Hastings, M. C., and A. N. Popper. (2005). *Effects of Sound on Fish* (Final Report #CA05-0537). Sacramento, CA: California Department of Transportation.

Hawkins, A. D., L. Roberts, and S. Cheesman. (2014). Responses of free-living coastal pelagic fish to impulsive sounds. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 135*(5), 3101–3116.

Hawkins, A. D., A. E. Pembroke, and A. N. Popper. (2015). Information gaps in understanding the effects of noise on fishes and invertebrates. *Reviews in Fish Biology and Fisheries, 25*, 39–64.

Higgs, D. M. (2005). Auditory cues as ecological signals for marine fishes. *Marine Ecology Progress Series, 287*, 278–281.

Higgs, D. M., and C. A. Radford. (2013). The contribution of the lateral line to 'hearing' in fish. *The Journal of Experimental Biology, 216*(Pt 8), 1484–1490.

Holt, D. E., and C. E. Johnston. (2014). Evidence of the Lombard effect in fishes. *Behavioral Ecology, 25*(4), 819–826.

Hubbs, C., and A. Rechnitzer. (1952). Report on experiments designed to determine effects of underwater explosions on fish life. *California Fish and Game, 38*, 333–366.

Iafrate, J. D., S. L. Watwood, E. A. Reyier, D. M. Scheidt, G. A. Dossot, and S. E. Crocker. (2016). Effects of pile driving on the residency and movement of tagged reef fish. *PLoS ONE, 11*(11), e0163638.

Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission. (2015). *Tunas, Billfishes, and Other Species in the Eastern Pacific Ocean in 2014* (Fishery Status Report). La Jolla, CA: Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission.

Jain-Schlaepfer, S., E. Fakan, J. L. Rummer, S. D. Simpson, and M. I. McCormick. (2018). Impact of motorboats on fish embryos depends on engine type. *Conservation Physiology, 6*(1), coy014.

Jensen, J. O. T. (2003). *New Mechanical Shock Sensitivity Units in Support of Criteria for Protection of Salmonid Eggs from Blasting or Seismic Disturbance*. Nanaimo, Canada: Fisheries and Oceans Canada Science Branch Pacific Region, Pacific Biological Station.

Jørgensen, R., K. K. Olsen, I. B. Falk-Petersen, and P. Kanapthippilai. (2005). *Investigations of Potential Effects of Low Frequency Sonar Signals on Survival, Development and Behaviour of Fish Larvae and Juveniles*. Tromsø, Norway: University of Tromsø, The Norwegian College of Fishery Science.

Joung, S. J., N. F. Chen, H. H. Hsu, and K. M. Liu. (2016). Estimates of life history parameters of the oceanic whitetip shark, *Carcharhinus longimanus*, in the Western North Pacific Ocean. *Marine Biology Research, 12*(7), 758–768.

Kalmijn, A. J. (2000). Detection and processing of electromagnetic and near-field acoustic signals in elasmobranch fishes. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London Series B-Biological Sciences, 355*(1401), 1135–1141.

Kane, A. S., J. Song, M. B. Halvorsen, D. L. Miller, J. D. Salierno, L. E. Wysocki, D. Zeddies, and A. N. Popper. (2010). Exposure of fish to high intensity sonar does not induce acute pathology. *Journal of Fish Biology, 76*(7), 1825–1840.

Keevin, T. M., and G. L. Hempen. (1997). *The Environmental Effects of Underwater Explosions with Methods to Mitigate Impacts*. St. Louis, MO: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

Kéver, L., O. Colleye, A. Herrel, P. Romans, and E. Parmentier. (2014). Hearing capacities and otolith size in two ophidiiform species (*Ophidion rochei* and *Carapus acus*). *The Journal of Experimental Biology, 217*(Pt 14), 2517–2525.

Kritzler, H., and L. Wood. (1961). Provisional audiogram for the shark, *Carcharhinus leucas*. *Science, 133*(3463), 1480–1482.

Kujawa, S. G., and M. C. Liberman. (2009). Adding insult to injury: Cochlear nerve degeneration after "temporary" noise-induced hearing loss. *The Journal of Neuroscience, 29*(45), 14077–14085.

Kvadsheim, P. H., and E. M. Sevaldsen. (2005a). *The potential impact of 1-8 kHz active sonar on stocks of juvenile fish during sonar exercises*. Forsvarets Forskningsinstitutt, Norwegian Defence Research Establishment, P.O. Box 25, NO-2027 Kjeller, Norway.

Kvadsheim, P. H., and E. M. Sevaldsen. (2005b). *The Potential Impact of 1-8 kHz Active Sonar on Stocks of Juvenile Fish During Sonar Exercises*. Kjeller, Norway: Norwegian Defence Research Establishment.

Ladich, F., and A. N. Popper. (2004). Parallel Evolution in Fish Hearing Organs. In G. A. Manley, A. N. Popper, & R. R. Fay (Eds.), *Evolution of the Vertebrate Auditory System, Springer Handbook of Auditory Research* (pp. 95–127). New York, NY: Springer-Verlag.

Ladich, F. (2008). Sound communication in fishes and the influence of ambient and anthropogenic noise. *Bioacoustics, 17*, 35–37.

Ladich, F., and R. R. Fay. (2013). Auditory evoked potential audiometry in fish. *Reviews in Fish Biology and Fisheries, 23*(3), 317–364.

Ladich, F. (2014). Fish bioacoustics. *Current Opinion in Neurobiology, 28*, 121–127.

LGL Ltd Environmental Research Associates, Lamont Doherty Earth Observatory, and National Science Foundation. (2008). *Environmental Assessment of a Marine Geophysical Survey by the R/V Melville in the Santa Barbara Channel*. King City, Ontario: La Jolla, CA, Scripps Institution of Oceanography and Arlington, VA, National Science Foundation: Division of Ocean Sciences.

Liberman, M. C. (2016). Noise-induced hearing loss: Permanent versus temporary threshold shifts and the effects of hair cell versus neuronal degeneration. *Advances in Experimental Medicine and Biology, 875*, 1–7.

Lin, H. W., A. C. Furman, S. G. Kujawa, and M. C. Liberman. (2011). Primary neural degeneration in the guinea pig cochlea after reversible noise-induced threshold shift. *Journal of the Association for Research in Otolaryngology, 12*(5), 605–616.

Lindseth, A., and P. Lobel. (2018). Underwater soundscape monitoring and fish bioacoustics: A review. *Fishes, 3*(3), 36.

Løkkeborg, S., E. Ona, A. Vold, and A. Salthaug. (2012). Effects of sounds from seismic air guns on fish behavior and catch rates. In A. N. Popper & A. Hawkins (Eds.), *The Effects of Noise on Aquatic Life* (Vol. 730, pp. 415–419). New York, NY: Springer.

Lombarte, A., H. Y. Yan, A. N. Popper, J. C. Chang, and C. Platt. (1993). Damage and regeneration of hair cell ciliary bundles in a fish ear following treatment with gentamicin. *Hearing Research, 66*, 166–174.

Lombarte, A., and A. N. Popper. (1994). Quantitative analyses of postembryonic hair cell addition in the otolithic endorgans of the inner ear of the European hake, *Merluccius merluccius* (Gadiformes, Teleostei). *The Journal of Comparative Neurology, 345*, 419–428.

Løvik, A., and J. M. Hovem. (1979). An experimental investigation of swimbladder resonance in fishes. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 66*(3), 850–854.

MacDonald, J., and C. Mendez. (2005). *Unexploded ordnance cleanup costs: Implications of alternative protocols*. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.

Madaro, A., R. E. Olsen, T. S. Kristiansen, L. O. Ebbesson, T. O. Nilsen, G. Flik, and M. Gorissen. (2015). Stress in Atlantic salmon: Response to unpredictable chronic stress. *The Journal of Experimental Biology, 218*(16), 2538–2550.

Mann, D., D. Higgs, W. Tavolga, M. Souza, and A. Popper. (2001). Ultrasound detection by clupeiform fishes. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 3048–3054.

Mann, D. A., Z. Lu, and A. N. Popper. (1997). A clupeid fish can detect ultrasound. *Nature, 389*, 341.

Mann, D. A., Z. Lu, M. C. Hastings, and A. N. Popper. (1998). Detection of ultrasonic tones and simulated dolphin echolocation clicks by a teleost fish, the American shad (*Alosa sapidissima*). *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 104*(1), 562–568.

Mann, D. A. (2016). Acoustic Communications in Fishes and Potential Effects of Noise. In A. N. Popper & A. D. Hawkins (Eds.), *The Effects of Noise on Aquatic Life II* (pp. 673–678). New York, NY: Springer.

Martin, B., D. G. Zeddies, B. Gaudet, and J. Richard. (2016). Evaluation of three sensor types for particle motion measurement. *Advances in Experimental Medicine and Biology, 875*, 679–686.

McCartney, B. S., and A. R. Stubbs. (1971). Measurements of the acoustic target strengths of fish in dorsal aspect, including swimbladder resonance. *Journal of Sound and Vibration, 15*(3), 397–420.

McCauley, R. D., and D. H. Cato. (2000). Patterns of fish calling in a nearshore environment in the Great Barrier Reef. *Philosophical Transactions: Biological Sciences, 355*(1401), 1289–1293.

McCauley, R. D., J. Fewtrell, A. J. Duncan, C. Jenner, M.-N. Jenner, J. D. Penrose, R. I. T. Prince, A. Adhitya, J. Murdoch, and K. A. McCabe. (2000). *Marine Seismic Surveys: Analysis and Propagation of Air-gun Signals; and Effects of Air-gun Exposure on Humpback Whales, Sea Turtles, Fishes and Squid*. Bentley, Australia: Centre for Marine Science and Technology.

McCauley, R. D., J. Fewtrell, and A. N. Popper. (2003). High intensity anthropogenic sound damages fish ears. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 113*(1), 638–642.

McCauley, R. D., and C. S. Kent. (2012). A lack of correlation between air gun signal pressure waveforms and fish hearing damage. *Advances in Experimental Medicine and Biology, 730*, 245–250.

McCormick, M. I., B. J. M. Allan, H. Harding, and S. D. Simpson. (2018). Boat noise impacts risk assessment in a coral reef fish but effects depend on engine type. *Scientific Reports, 8*(1), 3847.

McCormick, M. I., E. P. Fakan, S. L. Nedelec, and B. J. M. Allan. (2019). Effects of boat noise on fish fast-start escape response depend on engine type. *Scientific Reports, 9*(1).

McIver, E. L., M. A. Marchaterre, A. N. Rice, and A. H. Bass. (2014). Novel underwater soundscape: Acoustic repertoire of plainfin midshipman fish. *The Journal of Experimental Biology, 217*(Pt 13), 2377–2389.

Mensinger, A. F., R. L. Putland, and C. A. Radford. (2018). The effect of motorboat sound on Australian snapper *Pagrus auratus* inside and outside a marine reserve. *Ecology and Evolution, 8*(13), 6438–6448.

Mickle, M. F., and D. M. Higgs. (2018). Integrating techniques: a review of the effects of anthropogenic noise on freshwater fish. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences, 75*(9), 1534–1541.

Miller, J. D. (1974). Effects of noise on people. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 56*(3), 729–764.

Miller, M. H., and C. Klimovich. (2016). *Endangered Species Act Status Review Report: Giant Manta Ray (Manta birostris) and Reef Manta Ray (Manta alfredi).* Silver Spring, MD: National Marine Fisheries Service, Office of Protected Resources.

Misund, O. A. (1997). Underwater acoustics in marine fisheries and fisheries research. *Reviews in Fish Biology and Fisheries, 7*, 1–34.

Mueller-Blenkle, C., P. K. McGregor, A. B. Gill, M. H. Andersson, J. Metcalfe, V. Bendall, P. Sigray, D. Wood, and F. Thomsen. (2010). *Effects of Pile-Driving Noise on the Behaviour of Marine Fish*. London, United Kingdom: COWRIE Ltd.

Myrberg, A. A., C. R. Gordon, and A. P. Klimley. (1976). Attraction of free ranging sharks by low frequency sound, with comments on its biological significance. In A. Schuijf & A. D. Hawkins (Eds.), *Sound Reception in Fish*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: Elsevier.

Myrberg, A. A. (1980). Ocean noise and the behavior of marine animals: Relationships and implications. In F. P. Diemer, F. J. Vernberg, & D. Z. Mirkes (Eds.), *Advanced Concepts in Ocean Measurements for Marine Biology* (pp. 461–491). Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press.

Myrberg, A. A., Jr., A. Banner, and J. D. Richard. (1969). Shark attraction using a video-acoustic system. *Marine Biology, 2*(3), 264–276.

Myrberg, A. A., Jr., S. J. Ha, S. Walewski, and J. C. Banbury. (1972). Effectiveness of acoustic signals in attracting epipelagic sharks to an underwater sound source. *Bulletin of Marine Science, 22*, 926–949.

Myrberg, A. A., Jr. (2001). The acoustical biology of elasmobranchs. *Environmental Biology of Fishes, 60*, 31–45.

National Marine Fisheries Service. (2011). *Petition to List the Scalloped Hammerhead Shark (Sphyrna lewini) Under the U.S. Endangered Species Act Either Worldwide or as One or More Distinct Population Segments*. Silver Spring, MD: National Marine Fisheries Service.

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. (2016a). *Manta rays (Manta spp.)*. Retrieved from https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/species/giant-manta-ray.

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. (2016b). *Oceanic Whitetip Shark (Carcharhinus longimanus)*. Retrieved from https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/species/oceanic-whitetip-shark.

National Research Council. (1994). *Low-Frequency Sound and Marine Mammals: Current Knowledge and Research Needs*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.

National Research Council. (2003). *Ocean Noise and Marine Mammals*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.

Nedelec, S. L., S. D. Simpson, E. L. Morley, B. Nedelec, and A. N. Radford. (2015). Impacts of regular and random noise on the behaviour, growth and development of larval Atlantic cod (*Gadus morhua*). *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 282*(1817), 1–7.

Nedelec, S. L., J. Campbell, A. N. Radford, S. D. Simpson, and N. D. Merchant. (2016a). Particle motion: The missing link in underwater acoustic ecology. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution, 7*(7), 836–842.

Nedelec, S. L., S. C. Mills, D. Lecchini, B. Nedelec, S. D. Simpson, and A. N. Radford. (2016b). Repeated exposure to noise increases tolerance in a coral reef fish. *Environmental Pollution, 216*, 428–236.

Nedelec, S. L., S. C. Mills, A. N. Radford, R. Beldade, S. D. Simpson, B. Nedelec, and I. M. Cote. (2017a). Motorboat noise disrupts co-operative interspecific interactions. *Scientific Reports, 7*(1), 6987.

Nedelec, S. L., A. N. Radford, L. Pearl, B. Nedelec, M. I. McCormick, M. G. Meekan, and S. D. Simpson. (2017b). Motorboat noise impacts parental behaviour and offspring survival in a reef fish. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences, 284*(1856).

Neenan, S. T. V., R. Piper, P. R. White, P. Kemp, T. G. Leighton, and P. J. Shaw. (2016). Does Masking Matter? Shipping Noise and Fish Vocalizations. In A. N. Popper & A. D. Hawkins (Eds.), *The Effects of Noise on Aquatic Life II* (pp. 747–754). New York, NY: Springer.

Nelson, D. R., and R. H. Johnson. (1972). Acoustic attraction of Pacific reef sharks: Effect of pulse intermittency and variability. *Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology Part A, 42*, 85–95.

Neo, Y. Y., J. Seitz, R. A. Kastelein, H. V. Winter, C. Ten Cate, and H. Slabbekoorn. (2014). Temporal structure of sound affects behavioural recovery from noise impact in European seabass. *Biological Conservation, 178*, 65–73.

Neo, Y. Y., E. Ufkes, R. A. Kastelein, H. V. Winter, C. Ten Cate, and H. Slabbekoorn. (2015). Impulsive sounds change European seabass swimming patterns: Influence of pulse repetition interval. *Marine Pollution Bulletin, 97*(1–2), 111–117.

Nichols, T. A., T. W. Anderson, and A. Širović. (2015). Intermittent noise induces physiological stress in a coastal marine fish. *PLoS ONE, 10*(9), e0139157.

Nix, P., and P. Chapman. (1985). *Monitoring of underwater blasting operations in False Creek, British Columbia.* Paper presented at the Proceedings of the Workshop on Effects of Explosive Use in the Marine Environment. Ottawa, Canada.

O'Keeffe, D. J. (1984). *Guidelines for Predicting the Effects of Underwater Explosions on Swimbladder Fish*. Dahlgren, VA: Naval Surface Weapons Center.

O'Keeffe, D. J., and G. A. Young. (1984). *Handbook on the Environmental Effects of Underwater Explosions*. Silver Spring, MD: U.S. Navy, Naval Surface Weapons Center (Code R14).

Payne, N. L., D. E. van der Meulen, I. M. Suthers, C. A. Gray, and M. D. Taylor. (2015). Foraging intensity of wild mulloway *Argyrosomus japonicus* decreases with increasing anthropogenic disturbance. *Journal of Marine Biology, 162*(3), 539–546.

Pearson, W. H., J. R. Skalski, and C. I. Malme. (1992). Effects of sounds from a geophysical survey device on behavior of captive rockfish (*Sebastes* spp.). *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences, 49*, 1343–1356.

Pena, H., N. O. Handegard, and E. Ona. (2013). Feeding herring schools do not react to seismic air gun surveys. *ICES Journal of Marine Science, 70*(6), 1174–1180.

Pepper, C. B., M. A. Nascarella, and R. J. Kendall. (2003). A review of the effects of aircraft noise on wildlife and humans, current control mechanisms, and the need for further study. *Environmental Management, 32*(4), 418–432.

Pickering, A. D. (1981). *Stress and Fish*. New York, NY: Academic Press.

Popper, A., D. Plachta, D. Mann, and D. Higgs. (2004). Response of clupeid fish to ultrasound: A review. *ICES Journal of Marine Science, 61*(7), 1057–1061.

Popper, A., and A. Hawkins. (2019). An overview of fish bioacoustics and the impacts of anthropogenic sounds on fishes. *Journal of Fish Biology*, 1–22.

Popper, A. N., and B. Hoxter. (1984). Growth of a fish ear: 1. Quantitative analysis of sensory hair cell and ganglion cell proliferation. *Hearing Research, 15*, 133–142.

Popper, A. N. (2003). Effects of anthropogenic sounds on fishes. *Fisheries, 28*(10), 24–31.

Popper, A. N., R. R. Fay, C. Platt, and O. Sand. (2003). Sound detection mechanisms and capabilities of teleost fishes. In S. P. Collin & N. J. Marshall (Eds.), *Sensory Processing in Aquatic Environment*. New York, NY: Springer-Verlag.

Popper, A. N., M. E. Smith, P. A. Cott, B. W. Hanna, A. O. MacGillivray, M. E. Austin, and D. A. Mann. (2005). Effects of exposure to seismic airgun use on hearing of three fish species. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 117*(6), 3958–3971.

Popper, A. N., M. B. Halvorsen, A. Kane, D. L. Miller, M. E. Smith, J. Song, P. Stein, and L. E. Wysocki. (2007). The effects of high-intensity, low-frequency active sonar on rainbow trout. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 122*(1), 623–635.

Popper, A. N. (2008). *Effects of Mid- and High-Frequency Sonars on Fish*. Newport, RI: Naval Undersea Warfare Center Division.

Popper, A. N., and M. C. Hastings. (2009a). The effects of anthropogenic sources of sound on fishes. *Journal of Fish Biology, 75*(3), 455–489.

Popper, A. N., and M. C. Hastings. (2009b). The effects of human-generated sound on fish. *Integrative Zoology, 4*, 43–52.

Popper, A. N., and R. R. Fay. (2010). Rethinking sound detection by fishes. *Hearing Research, 273*(1–2), 25–36.

Popper, A. N., A. D. Hawkins, R. R. Fay, D. A. Mann, S. M. Bartol, T. J. Carlson, S. Coombs, W. T. Ellison, R. L. Gentry, M. B. Halvorsen, S. Løkkeborg, P. H. Rogers, B. L. Southall, D. G. Zeddies, and W. N. Tavolga. (2014). *ASA S3/SC1.4 TR-2014 Sound Exposure Guidelines for Fishes and Sea Turtles: A Technical Report prepared by ANSI-Accredited Standards Committee S3/SC1 and registered with ANSI*. New York, NY and London, United Kingdom: Acoustical Society of America Press and Springer Briefs in Oceanography.

Popper, A. N., J. A. Gross, T. J. Carlson, J. Skalski, J. V. Young, A. D. Hawkins, and D. G. Zeddies. (2016). Effects of exposure to the sound from seismic airguns on pallid sturgeon and paddlefish. *PLoS ONE, 11*(8), e0159486.

Popper, A. N., and A. D. Hawkins. (2018). The importance of particle motion to fishes and invertebrates. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 143*(1), 470.

Purser, J., and A. N. Radford. (2011). Acoustic noise induces attention shifts and reduces foraging performance in three-spined sticklebacks (*Gasterosteus aculeatus*). *PLoS ONE, 6*(2), e17478.

Radford, A. N., E. Kerridge, and S. D. Simpson. (2014). Acoustic communication in a noisy world: Can fish compete with anthropogenic noise? *Behavioral Ecology, 25*(5), 1022–1030.

Radford, A. N., L. Lebre, G. Lecaillon, S. L. Nedelec, and S. D. Simpson. (2016). Repeated exposure reduces the response to impulsive noise in European seabass. *Global Change Biology, 22*(10), 3349–3360.

Radford, C. A., J. C. Montgomery, P. Caiger, and D. M. Higgs. (2012). Pressure and particle motion detection thresholds in fish: A re-examination of salient auditory cues in teleosts. *The Journal of Experimental Biology, 215*(Pt 19), 3429–3435.

Radford, C. A., R. L. Putland, and A. F. Mensinger. (2018). Barking mad: The vocalisation of the John Dory, Zeus faber. *PLoS ONE, 13*(10), e0204647.

Ramcharitar, J., D. M. Higgs, and A. N. Popper. (2001). Sciaenid inner ears: A study in diversity. *Brain, Behavior and Evolution, 58*, 152–162.

Ramcharitar, J., and A. N. Popper. (2004). Masked auditory thresholds in sciaenid fishes: A comparative study. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 116*(3), 1687–1691.

Ramcharitar, J., D. P. Gannon, and A. N. Popper. (2006). Bioacoustics of fishes of the family Sciaenidae (croakers and drums). *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society, 135*, 1409–1431.

Remage-Healey, L., D. P. Nowacek, and A. H. Bass. (2006). Dolphin foraging sounds suppress calling and elevate stress hormone levels in a prey species, the Gulf toadfish. *The Journal of Experimental Biology, 209*(Pt 22), 4444–4451.

Rice, J., and S. Harley. (2012). *Stock Assessment of Oceanic Whitetip Sharks in the Western and Central Pacific Ocean.* Paper presented at the Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission Meeting, Busan, Republic of Korea.

Roberts, L., S. Cheesman, and A. D. Hawkins. (2016a). Effects of Sounds on the Behavior of Wild, Unrestrained Fish Schools. In A. N. Popper & A. D. Hawkins (Eds.), *The Effects of Noise on Aquatic Life II* (pp. 917–924). New York, NY: Springer.

Roberts, L., R. Perez-Dominguez, and M. Elliott. (2016b). Use of baited remote underwater video (BRUV) and motion analysis for studying the impacts of underwater noise upon free ranging fish and implications for marine energy management. *Marine Pollution Bulletin, 112*(1–2), 75–85.

Rosen, G., and G. R. Lotufo. (2010). Fate and effects of composition B in multispecies marine exposures. *Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry, 29*(6), 1330–1337.

Rountree, R. A., F. Juanes, and M. Bolgan. (2018). Air movement sound production by alewife, white sucker, and four salmonid fishes suggests the phenomenon is widespread among freshwater fishes. *PLoS ONE, 13*(9), e0204247.

Rowell, T. J., M. T. Schärer, and R. S. Appeldoorn. (2018). Description of a new sound produced by Nassau grouper at spawning aggregation sites. *Gulf and Caribbean Research, 29*, GCFI22-GCFI26.

Sabet, S. S., K. Wesdorp, J. Campbell, P. Snelderwaard, and H. Slabbekoorn. (2016). Behavioural responses to sound exposure in captivity by two fish species with different hearing ability. *Animal Behaviour, 116*, 1–11.

Scholik, A. R., and H. Y. Yan. (2001). Effects of underwater noise on auditory sensitivity of a cyprinid fish. *Hearing Research, 152*(1–2), 17–24.

Scholik, A. R., and H. Y. Yan. (2002a). The effects of noise on the auditory sensitivity of the bluegill sunfish, *Lepomis macrochirus*. *Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology Part A: Molecular & Integrative Physiology, 133*(1), 43–52.

Scholik, A. R., and H. Y. Yan. (2002b). Effects of boat engine noise on the auditory sensitivity of the fathead minnow, *Pimephales promelas*. *Environmental Biology of Fishes, 63*, 203–209.

Schwarz, A. B., and G. L. Greer. (1984). Responses of Pacific herring, *Clupea harengus pallasi*, to some underwater sounds. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Science, 41*, 1183–1192.

Settle, L. R., J. J. Govoni, M. D. Greene, M. A. West, R. T. Lynch, and G. Revy. (2002). *Investigation of Impacts of Underwater Explosions on Larval and Early Juvenile Fishes*. Beaufort, NC: Center for Coastal Fisheries and Habitat Research.

Shah, A. A., F. Hasan, A. Hameed, and S. Ahmed. (2008). Biological degradation of plastics: A comprehensive review. *Biotechnology Advances, 26*(3), 246–265.

Sierra-Flores, R., T. Atack, H. Migaud, and A. Davie. (2015). Stress response to anthropogenic noise in Atlantic cod *Gadus morhua* L. *Aquacultural Engineering, 67*, 67–76.

Simpson, S. D., J. Purser, and A. N. Radford. (2015). Anthropogenic noise compromises antipredator behaviour in European eels. *Global Change Biology, 21*(2), 586–593.

Simpson, S. D., A. N. Radford, S. L. Nedelec, M. C. Ferrari, D. P. Chivers, M. I. McCormick, and M. G. Meekan. (2016). Anthropogenic noise increases fish mortality by predation. *Nature Communications, 7*, 10544.

Sisneros, J. A., and A. H. Bass. (2003). Seasonal plasticity of peripheral auditory frequency sensitivity. *The Journal of Neuroscience, 23*(3), 1049–1058.

Sivle, L. D., P. H. Kvadsheim, M. A. Ainslie, A. Solow, N. O. Handegard, N. Nordlund, and F. P. A. Lam. (2012). Impact of naval sonar signals on Atlantic herring (*Clupea harengus*) during summer feeding. *ICES Journal of Marine Science, 69*(6), 1078–1085.

Sivle, L. D., P. H. Kvadsheim, and M. A. Ainslie. (2014). Potential for population-level disturbance by active sonar in herring. *ICES Journal of Marine Science, 72*(2), 558–567.

Sivle, L. D., P. H. Kvadsheim, and M. Ainslie. (2016). Potential population consequences of active sonar disturbance in Atlantic herring: Estimating the maximum risk. *Advances in Experimental Medicine and Biology, 875*, 217–222.

Slabbekoorn, H., N. Bouton, I. van Opzeeland, A. Coers, C. ten Cate, and A. N. Popper. (2010). A noisy spring: The impact of globally rising underwater sound levels on fish. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution, 25*(7), 419–427.

Slotte, A., K. Hansen, J. Dalen, and E. Ona. (2004). Acoustic mapping of pelagic fish distribution and abundance in relation to seismic shooting area off the Norwegian west coast. *Fisheries Research, 67*, 143–150.

Smith, M. E., A. S. Kane, and A. N. Popper. (2004a). Noise-induced stress response and hearing loss in goldfish (*Carassius auratus*). *The Journal of Experimental Biology, 207*(3), 427–435.

Smith, M. E., A. S. Kane, and A. N. Popper. (2004b). Acoustical stress and hearing sensitivity in fishes: Does the linear threshold shift hypothesis hold water? *The Journal of Experimental Biology, 207*, 3591–3602.

Smith, M. E., A. B. Coffin, D. L. Miller, and A. N. Popper. (2006). Anatomical and functional recovery of the goldfish (*Carassius auratus*) ear following noise exposure. *The Journal of Experimental Biology, 209*(21), 4193–4202.

Smith, M. E., and R. R. Gilley. (2008). Testing the equal energy hypothesis in noise-exposed fishes. *Bioacoustics, 17*(1–3), 343–345.

Song, J., D. A. Mann, P. A. Cott, B. W. Hanna, and A. N. Popper. (2008). The inner ears of northern Canadian freshwater fishes following exposure to seismic air gun sounds. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 124*(2), 1360–1366.

Spiga, I., N. Aldred, and G. S. Caldwell. (2017). Anthropogenic noise compromises the anti-predator behaviour of the European seabass, Dicentrarchus labrax (L.). *Marine Pollution Bulletin, 122*(1-2), 297-305.

Sprague, M. W., and J. J. Luczkovich. (2004). Measurement of an individual silver perch, *Bairdiella chrysoura,* sound pressure level in a field recording. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 116*(5), 3186–3191.

Sverdrup, A., E. Kjellsby, P. G. Krüger, R. Fløysand, F. R. Knudsen, P. S. Enger, G. Serck-Hanssen, and K. B. Helle. (1994). Effects of experimental seismic shock on vasoactivity of arteries, integrity of the vascular endothelium and on primary stress hormones of the Atlantic salmon. *Journal of Fish Biology, 45*(6), 973–995.

Swisdak, M. M., Jr. (1978). *Explosion Effects and Properties Part II–Explosion Effects in Water*. (NSWC/WOL/TR-76-116). Dahlgren, VA and Silver Spring, MD: Naval Surface Weapons Center.

Swisdak, M. M., Jr., and P. E. Montanaro. (1992). *Airblast and Fragmentation Hazards from Underwater Explosions*. Silver Spring, MD: Naval Surface Warfare Center.

Tavolga, W. N. (1974). Signal/noise ratio and the critical band in fishes. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 55*(6), 1323–1333.

U.S. Department of the Air Force. (1997). *Environmental Effects of Self-Protection Chaff and Flares*. Langley Air Force Base, VA: U.S. Air Force, Headquarters Air Combat Command.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (1999). *Environmental Effects of RF Chaff: A Select Panel Report to the Undersecretary of Defense for Environmental Security*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Navy, Naval Research Laboratory.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2018). *Atlantic Fleet Training and Testing Final Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement*. Norfolk, VA: Naval Facilities Engineering Command Atlantic.

Voellmy, I. K., J. Purser, D. Flynn, P. Kennedy, S. D. Simpson, and A. N. Radford. (2014a). Acoustic noise reduces foraging success in two sympatric fish species via different mechanisms. *Animal Behaviour, 89*, 191–198.

Voellmy, I. K., J. Purser, S. D. Simpson, and A. N. Radford. (2014b). Increased noise levels have different impacts on the anti-predator behaviour of two sympatric fish species. *PLoS ONE, 9*(7), e102946.

Wang, W. X., and P. S. Rainbow. (2008). Comparative approaches to understand metal bioaccumulation in aquatic animals. *Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology, Part C, 148*(4), 315–323.

Wardle, C. S., T. J. Carter, G. G. Urquhart, A. D. F. Johnstone, A. M. Ziolkowski, G. Hampson, and D. Mackie. (2001). Effects of seismic air guns on marine fish. *Continental Shelf Research, 21*, 1005–1027.

Webb, J. F., J. C. Montgomery, and J. Mogdans. (2008). Bioacoustics and the Lateral Line of Fishes. In J. F. Webb, R. R. Fay, & A. N. Popper (Eds.), *Fish Bioacoustics* (pp. 145–182). New York, NY: Springer.

Weijerman, M., I. Williams, J. Gutierrez, S. Grafeld, B. Tibbatts, and G. Davis. (2016). Trends in biomass of coral reef fishes, derived from shore-based creel surveys in Guam. *Fishery Bulletin, 114*(2), 237–256.

Western Pacific Regional Fishery Management Council. (2016). *Fishery Ecosystem Plan for the Pacific Pelagic Fisheries - Working Draft*. Honolulu, HI: Western Pacific Regional Fishery Management Council.

Wiley, M. L., J. B. Gaspin, and J. F. Goertner. (1981). Effects of underwater explosions on fish with a dynamical model to predict fishkill. *Ocean Science and Engineering, 6*(2), 223–284.

Wright, D. G. (1982). *A Discussion Paper on the Effects of Explosives on Fish and Marine Mammals in the Waters of the Northwest Territories* (Canadian Technical Report of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences). Winnipeg, Canada: Western Region Department of Fisheries and Oceans.

Wysocki, L. E., J. P. Dittami, and F. Ladich. (2006). Ship noise and cortisol secretion in European freshwater fishes. *Biological Conservation, 128*, 501–508.

Wysocki, L. E., J. W. Davidson, III, M. E. Smith, A. S. Frankel, W. T. Ellison, P. M. Mazik, A. N. Popper, and J. Bebak. (2007). Effects of aquaculture production noise on hearing, growth, and disease resistance of rainbow trout, *Oncorhynchus mykiss*. *Aquaculture, 272*, 687–697.

Yau, A., M. O. Nadon, B. L. Richards, J. Brodziak, and E. Fletcher. (2016). *Stock Assessment Updates of the Bottomfish Management Unit Species of American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and Guam in 2015 Using Data through 2013*. Honolulu, HI: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Pacific Islands Fisheries Science Center.

Yelverton, J. T., D. R. Richmond, W. Hicks, K. Saunders, and E. R. Fletcher. (1975). *The Relationship between Fish Size and Their Response to Underwater Blast*. Albuquerque, NM: Defense Nuclear Agency.

Yelverton, J. T., and D. R. Richmond. (1981). *Underwater Explosion Damage Risk Criteria for Fish, Birds, and Mammals.* Paper presented at the 102nd Meeting of the Acoustical Society of America. Miami Beach, FL.

Young, C. N., J. Carlson, C. Hutt, D. Kobayashi, C. T. McCandless, and J. Wraith. (2016). *Status review report: Oceanic whitetip shark (Carcharhinius longimanus)* (Final Report to the National Marine Fisheries Service, Office of Protected Resources). Silver Spring, MD: National Marine Fisheries Service & National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

Zelick, R., D. A. Mann, and A. N. Popper. (1999). Acoustic communication in fishes and frogs. In R. R. Fay & A. N. Popper (Eds.), *Comparative Hearing: Fish and Amphibians* (pp. 363–411). New York, NY: Springer-Verlag.

3.10 Terrestrial Species and Habitats

Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/ Overseas Environmental Impact Statement Mariana Islands Training and Testing

TABLE OF CONTENTS

3.10 Terrestrial Species and Habitats 3.10-1
3.10.1 Affected Environment 3.10-1
3.10.1.1 Vegetation Communities on Farallon de Medinilla 3.10-2
3.10.1.2 Wildlife Communities on Farallon de Medinilla 3.10-3
3.10.1.3 Endangered Species Act Listed Species 3.10-3
3.10.1.4 Major Terrestrial Species Taxonomic Group Descriptions 3.10-4
3.10.2 Environmental Consequences 3.10-4
3.10.2.1 Acoustic Stressors 3.10-5
3.10.2.2 Explosives Stressors 3.10-10
3.10.2.3 Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors 3.10-12
3.10.2.4 Secondary Stressors 3.10-15
3.10.3 Public Comments 3.10-16

List of Figures

Figure 3.10-1: Farallon de Medinilla Impact Zones and Micronesian Megapode Occurrences 3.10-8

List of Tables

Table 3.10-1: Endangered Species Act Listed Species on Farallon de Medinilla 3.10-2

This page intentionally left blank.

3.10 Terrestrial Species and Habitats

3.10.1 Affected Environment

The purpose of this section is to supplement the analysis of impacts on terrestrial species and habitats presented in the 2015 *Mariana Islands Training and Testing (MITT) Final Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement* (EIS/OEIS) with new information relevant to proposed changes in training activities conducted at Farallon de Medinilla (FDM). Information presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS that remains valid is noted as such and referenced in the appropriate sections. Any new or updated information describing the affected environment and analysis of impacts on terrestrial species and habitats associated with the Proposed Action is provided in this section. Comments received from the public during scoping related to terrestrial species and habitats are addressed in Section 3.10.3 (Public Comments). Comments received from the public during the Draft Supplemental EIS (SEIS)/OEIS commenting period related to terrestrial species and habitats are addressed in Appendix K (Public Comment Responses).

Section 3.10 in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS analyzed the potential impacts of training activities on three Endangered Species Act (ESA)-listed plant species (*Serianthes nelsonii*, *Osmoxylon mariannense,* and *Nesogenes rotensis*), eight bird species typically found in terrestrial habitats[1] (Mariana swiftlet [*Aerodramus bartschi*], Mariana crow [*Corvus kubaryi*], Mariana common moorhen, [*Gallinula chloropus guami*], Guam Micronesian kingfisher [*Todiramphus cinnamomina*], Micronesian megapode [*Megapodius laperouse*], Guam rail [*Rallus owstoni*], Nightingale reed-warbler [*Acrocephalus luscinia*], and Rota bridled white-eye [*Zosterops rotensis*]), and one mammal species (Mariana fruit bat [*Pteropus mariannus*]). Of these species, only the Micronesian megapode and Mariana fruit bat are found on FDM; therefore, only these ESA-listed species are included in the Navy's SEIS/OEIS (Table 3.10-1). FDM has no critical habitat designations on the island; therefore, critical habitat is not addressed in this SEIS/OEIS.

In addition to the analysis completed for ESA-listed species, the Navy's 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS also considered species that at the time were candidates for ESA listing status. Since the publication of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) has published its Final Rule determining ESA listing status for 23 additional species in the Mariana Islands (80 Federal Register 59423). Because some of these newly listed species were known to occur within the land training areas analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, the Navy and the USFWS reinitiated consultation to include 14 plant species (*Bulbophyllum guamense, Cycas micronesica, Dendrobium guamense, Eugenia bryanii, Heritiera longipetiolata, Maesa walker, Nervilia jacksoniae, Psychotria malaspinae, Solanum guamense, Tabernaemontana rotensis, Tinospora homosepala, Tuberolabium guamense, Hedyotis megalantha*, *Phyllanthus saffordii*) and four terrestrial invertebrates (Mariana eight-spot butterfly [*Hypolimnas octocula marianensis*], Guam tree snail [*Partula radiolata*], fragile tree snail [*Samoana fragilis*], and humped tree snail [*Partula gibba*]). The USFWS concurred with the Navy's determination that the activities originally proposed in the Navy's 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS would not adversely affect these

[1] The 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS analyzed bird species in two different sections. In the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, birds that typically depend on non-marine habitats were analyzed together with other terrestrial plant and animal species (see Section 3.10 of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS). Marine birds were analyzed separately in Section 3.6 (Marine Birds) of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. These species include birds that occur only in pelagic habitats within the Study Area, as well as marine birds that nest within the Study Area. This SEIS/OEIS follows this organization.

newly listed species and that species and habitat protections described in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS would also protect newly listed species (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2016). FDM is not included in the range for any of these species (80 Federal Register 59423) and, based on the structure and composition of the remnant forest on the island, it is extremely unlikely that there is habitat for any of these species on FDM. Therefore, none of these species are included in this SEIS/OEIS. Review of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS confirms the analysis for these species in that document is accurate and represents the best available science.

Table 3.10-1: Endangered Species Act Listed Species on Farallon de Medinilla

Species Name and Regulatory Status			Presence in Study Area[1]	
Common Name	**Scientific Name**	**Endangered Species Act Status**	**Open Ocean**	**Visitor/Breeding on FDM**
Micronesian megapode (Sasangat)	*Megapodius laperouse*	Endangered	Yes	Yes
Mariana fruit bat (Fanihi)	*Pteropus mariannus*	Threatened	Yes	Yes, possible breeding

[1]Study Area = Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area
Note: FDM = Farallon de Medinilla

3.10.1.1 Vegetation Communities on Farallon de Medinilla

The United States (U.S.) military has used the island of FDM as a bombing range since 1971 (U.S. Department of the Navy, 1975), and the agreement between the U.S. Government and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands was formalized in a 50-year lease agreement (United States of America and Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, 1983). FDM's vegetation appears to have undergone significant changes since the island was leased by the Department of Defense and the subsequent bombardment for military training. The most intensive bombardment to date of FDM occurred during the Vietnam era, when as much as 22 tons of ordnance per month were dropped on the island (Lusk et al., 2000). Based on early 20th century descriptions of FDM vegetation and aerial photographs of the island prior to military bombardment activities, island tree height and canopy cover have been greatly reduced (Lusk et al., 2000; Mueller-Dombois & Fosberg, 1998; Mueller-Dombois & Fosberg, 2013).

The island's vegetation may be grouped into the following vegetation communities: coastal vegetation, cliff-line vegetation, upland shrubland and herbaceous vegetation, and bare ground exposed within impact zones. A brief botanical survey of the northern portion of the island carried out in 1996 identified 43 plant species, 32 of which were native (Mueller-Dombois & Fosberg, 1998; Mueller-Dombois & Fosberg, 2013). Periodic helicopter-based surveys have occurred since 1998 (monthly up to 2009, and quarterly thereafter through September 2016) for marine birds on the island. Although the primary goal of these surveys is to count three species of boobies (stationary on the island and not on the wing), observations of other species observed and general observations of vegetation condition are made during the surveys. Because of continued access constraints associated with the unexploded ordnance risk, no formal plant surveys have been completed on FDM since the publication of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Because of a lack of commercial helicopter transit services, surveys have not been conducted since 2016. The most recent surveys have not provided any indications that the vegetation communities have changed since the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

3.10.1.2 Wildlife Communities on Farallon de Medinilla

3.10.1.2.1 Birds

FDM is recognized by regional ornithologists as an important bird area for many species of marine birds and migrant shorebirds, and supports a limited number of terrestrial bird species (Lusk et al., 2000; U.S. Department of the Navy, 2019; U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 1998). Seabird and shorebird species are discussed in Section 3.6 (Marine Birds) of this SEIS/OEIS. No new information is available since the publication of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS regarding FDM's terrestrial avifauna; therefore, the description of the avian portion of FDM's wildlife community in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS remains valid. (Lusk et al., 2000; U.S. Department of the Navy, 2013, 2019).

3.10.1.2.2 Mammals

Incidental observations of fruit bats during bird surveys described in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, along with fishermen reports from the early 1970s, suggest a small number of fruit bats use FDM, possibly as a stopover location while transiting between islands. Fruit bats are discussed in more detail below. The only other mammalian species known to occur on the island are introduced small-sized rats, believed to be *Rattus exulans*. Commonly observed during past natural resource surveys (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2008a, 2013), it is believed that rats negatively impact breeding activities for seabirds, and upland terrestrial birds on the island. There is no new information available that would inform the impact analysis on FDM's mammals since the publication of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS; therefore, the description of the mammalian portion of FDM's wildlife community in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS remains valid.

3.10.1.2.3 Reptiles and Amphibians

Only two species of reptiles are reported on FDM—the Pacific blue-tailed skink (*Emoia caeruleocauda*) and the oceanic snake-eyed skink (*Cryptoblepharus poecilopleurus*) (U.S. Department of the Navy 2008a). No observations of brown treesnakes have been reported on the island. No new information has become available since the publication of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS that expands upon the known list of reptiles on FDM; therefore, the description of FDM's reptiles and amphibians in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS remains valid.

3.10.1.2.4 Invertebrates

Since the publication of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, no new inventories for invertebrate species have been conducted on FDM. Prior to the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, no formal surveys for invertebrates were conducted; accounts of invertebrates have been provided as incidental observations during other natural resource survey efforts. For instance, coconut crabs, including one female with eggs, were observed on FDM in August 2008 (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2013).

3.10.1.3 Endangered Species Act Listed Species

3.10.1.3.1 Micronesian Megapode/Sasangat (*Megapodius laperouse laperouse*)

The Micronesian megapode was first listed as endangered in 1970 (under the Endangered Species Conservation Act, 35 Federal Register 8491–8498). No critical habitat is designated for this species. Threats to this species include habitat loss from typhoons and volcanic activity, damage by feral herbivores, hunting and illegal egg collection, increased tourism, and predation by introduced predators (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 1998). Small remnant populations are known to exist on the southern Mariana Islands of Aguiguan, Saipan, and FDM; larger populations are reported on uninhabited northern islands of Anatahan, Guguan, Sarigan, Alamagan, Pagan, Asuncion, Maug, and possibly Agrihan (Amidon

et al., 2011; U.S. Department of the Navy, 2019). Recent surveys and modeling suggests that islands with low human presence and without ungulates have the highest densities of megapodes (i.e., Maug, Asuncion, Guguan, and Sarigan) (Amidon et al., 2011).

Surveys on FDM in 1996 documented the presence of the Micronesian megapode (Lusk et al., 2000; U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 1998). From this survey, a population of 10 Micronesian megapodes was estimated on FDM (Kessler & Amidon, 2009; Lusk et al., 2000; U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 1998). However, due to an approaching typhoon, biologists were only on the island for about 5.5 hours, so this estimate was based on limited data. FDM was surveyed more thoroughly in December 2007 by Navy biologists, who estimated 21 adult pairs (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2008b, 2008c). The most recent survey for megapodes on FDM was completed in 2013, when Navy biologists detected 11 megapodes while surveying a limited transect in the north part of the island (Impact Areas 1 and 2) (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2013).

Poaching has been identified as a potential threat to megapodes in the northern Mariana Islands (Reichel, 1991; U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 1998). Mitigation measures specified in previous consultations coupled with the restricted access preventing poaching activities may have benefited megapodes on FDM. The mitigation measures included maintaining a no-fire zone on the northern portion of the island and the use of inert ordnance in an area south of the no-fire zone (explosive ordnance is deployed south of this area). These measures were included as non-discretionary terms and conditions in the USFWS's biological opinion for activities consulted on in 2015.

Since the publication of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, there is no new information available to further expand the life history and status of the Micronesian megapodes on FDM. Therefore, the information in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS is valid for analyzing potential impacts on the Micronesian megapode.

3.10.1.3.2 Mariana Fruit Bat/Fanihi (*Pteropus mariannus mariannus*)

The Guam population of the Mariana fruit bat (Mariana flying fox) was federally listed as endangered in 1984 (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2009). However, in 2005, the Mariana fruit bat was listed as threatened throughout the Mariana archipelago and downlisted to threatened on Guam. The recovery plan for the Mariana fruit bat was first finalized in 1990; however, a draft revised recovery plan for the Mariana fruit bat was released in March 2010. Critical habitat is designated on Guam and Rota, but there is no critical habitat designated on FDM.

Since the publication of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, no new information on the Mariana fruit bat life history or status on FDM is available. Therefore, the information in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS is valid for analyzing potential impacts on the Mariana fruit bat.

3.10.1.4 Major Terrestrial Species Taxonomic Group Descriptions

There have been no updates to the status and life history descriptions for the major taxonomic groups that occur within Mariana Island terrestrial environments since the publication of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

3.10.2 Environmental Consequences

The 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS analyzed training and testing activities currently occurring in the MITT Study Area and considered all potential stressors related to terrestrial biological resources. Stressors applicable to terrestrial biological resources on FDM are the same stressors analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. For this supplemental analysis, explosives, which were analyzed under acoustic stressors in 2015, are now analyzed as a separate stressor.

In addition, the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS assessed potential impacts on training locations on Guam, Rota, Tinian, Saipan, and FDM, whereas this SEIS/OEIS only updates the analysis on FDM.

The following stressors are analyzed for terrestrial biological resources; the analyses include stressor description updates from the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS:

- Acoustic (weapons noise)
- Explosives (explosions on land at FDM)
- Physical Disturbance and Strike (aircraft and aerial targets, military expended materials, ground disturbance, and wildfires)
- Secondary stressors (impacts on habitat, impacts on prey availability, introduction of potential invasive species)

This section evaluates how and to what degree potential impacts on terrestrial biological resources from stressors described in Section 3.0 (Introduction) may have changed since the analysis presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS was published. Table 2.5-1 in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) lists the proposed training activities that would occur on FDM and includes the number of times each activity would be conducted annually under each alternative. The tables also present the same information for activities described in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS so that the proposed levels of training and testing under this SEIS/OEIS can be easily compared.

The analysis presented in this section also considers measures that the Navy would implement to avoid or reduce potential impacts on terrestrial biological resources on FDM from stressors associated with the proposed training activities. As with the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, no testing activities would occur on FDM.

3.10.2.1 Acoustic Stressors

The potential impacts of explosives noise and weapons firing noise on FDM's wildlife are discussed in Section 3.10.3.1.1 (Impacts from Explosives and Weapons Firing Noise) in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Impacts from aircraft noise are discussed in Section 3.10.3.1.2 (Impacts from Aircraft Noise) in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. These sections discuss the different types of sounds, frequency ranges, and intensity generated from munitions use on FDM. Noise can result from direct munitions impacts (one object striking another), blasts (explosions that result in shock waves), bow shock waves (pressure waves from projectiles flying through the air), and substrate vibrations (combinations of explosion, recoil, or vehicle motion with the ground). Noise may be continuous, lasting for a long time without interruption, or impulsive, lasting for only a short duration. Continuous impulses (e.g., helicopter rotor noise, bursts from rapid-fire weapons) represent an intermediate type of sound and, when repeated rapidly, may resemble continuous noise. These types of sounds are distinguished here as they differ in their effects. Continuous and impulsive sounds can result in hearing damage, while shorter duration, less frequent, or lower sound levels typically elicit physiological or behavioral responses. Some birds may be killed or injured during these activities, or expend energy stores needed for migration to avoid or reduce perturbations generated by explosions.

FDM has three impact areas, a special use area on the northern portion of the island, and a special use area on the land bridge. Targeting of areas inside of the special use areas and other areas outside of impact areas are prohibited. In other words, all areas outside of the impact areas are considered "no-fire areas." Any ordnance that inadvertently lands outside of impact areas, including special use areas and in water, must be reported to MIRC Operations, in accordance with Commander, U.S. Naval Forces

Marianas Instruction 3500.4A (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2011). The impact areas and special use areas are shown on Figure 3.10-1 and described below:

- **Northern Special Use Area**. Reserved for direct action (tactical air control party) type exercises and personnel recovery. This area is about 41 acres (ac.) (17 hectares [ha]) and includes a landing zone. Weapons may be fired from the special use area into impact areas, such as small-caliber rounds, grenades, and mortars.
- **Impact Area 1**. This area contains high-fidelity target structures and is comprised of vehicle shells and cargo containers. This area is authorized for inert ordnance only, and operators are required to report any live ordnance inadvertently dropped into Impact Area 1 to MIRC Operations. Impact Area 1 contains 10 targets of varying shapes and sizes, including 4 vehicles and 6 targets comprised of shipping containers.
- **Impact Area 2**. Impact Area 2 may be used for both live and inert ordnance. Strafing is permitted in this area. Impact Area 2 is about 22 ac. (9 ha).
- **Land Bridge**. The land bridge is designated as a "no target zone." Operators are required to report ordnance observed impacting the land bridge.
- **Impact Area 3**. This area is south of the land bridge and authorized for inert ordnance, although live ordnance may be used only with prior approval from Joint Region Marianas. Strafing is permitted in this area. Impact Area 3 is about 11 ac. (4.5 ha).

3.10.2.1.1 Impacts from Acoustic Stressors Under Alternative 1

Under Alternative 1, there would be an overall increase in the number of training events and munitions used on the island, which would increase the number of exposures to explosives noise, weapons firing noise, and aircraft overflights to deliver munitions to the impact zones on FDM. The types of explosive munitions used on FDM include explosive bombs (less than or equal to 2,000 pounds [lb.]), missiles, rockets, explosive grenades and mortars, medium-caliber projectiles, and large-caliber projectiles. The calculations for the increases in the number of events proposed on FDM are shown in Table 3.6-1. Table 3.6-2 shows the calculations for the proposed increases in the number of explosive and non-explosive munitions expended on FDM. These increases in events and munitions would result in an increase in net explosive weight (NEW) of explosives over the course of a training year. The calculations for NEW expended on FDM resulting from proposed training activities are shown in Table 3.6-3. The NEW for each ordnance type may vary within each class. Based on these NEW ranges within each explosives bin, the Navy calculated the range of total munitions' NEW under each alternative proposed in this SEIS/OEIS by multiplying the number of munitions used by the low and high NEW ranges for each ordnance type. Based on these calculations, the following assumptions are presented as additional analysis for this SEIS/OEIS:


- In terms of the number of events, there would be an increase of less than 2 percent over what was analyzed previously in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. No new activity types are proposed in this SEIS/OEIS from what were previously analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Some activity types, however, would increase in the number of events per year and/or the number of ordnance items expended. Other activities would not change compared to what was analyzed previously in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, and therefore would not contribute to an increase in NEW or the number of munitions expended on FDM. For example, Bombing Exercise (Air-to-Ground) is the most impactful in terms of explosive power released on FDM and would not increase compared to what was analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Table 3.6-1 shows

the number of events that would occur under each alternative compared to what was analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

- In terms of munitions item numbers, there would be an increase of approximately 9 percent over what was analyzed previously in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS in the total number of munitions used on FDM. Most of these increases are associated with small-caliber rounds, which do not contribute to increases in NEW. Table 3.6-2 shows the number of munitions proposed under each alternative compared to what was analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.
- In terms of NEW, explosives used on FDM would increase by less than 1 percent compared to what was analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (see calculations in Table 3.6-3).

Sources of noise from weapons firing that may be heard by wildlife on FDM (including the ESA-listed Micronesian megapode and Mariana fruit bat, bird species protected under the MBTA, and other native terrestrial wildlife assessed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS) include close-in weapons firing from vessels, helicopters, close-combat surface firing from fixed-wing aircraft, and surface firing, with the largest increase in munitions use resulting from small arms, medium-caliber explosives, and mortar and grenade use during Direct Action training activities. As shown in Table 3.6-1, the number of training events (that involve weapon firing on or proximate to FDM) would stay the same compared to what was previously analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS; however, the number of munitions used would increase during each training event (see Table 3.6-2). These training events would occur within the Northern Special Use Area and fire into the impact areas towards the south; therefore, more megapodes and bats (along with other wildlife species) would be exposed to more weapons firing noise under Alternative 1 because of the increased number of small-caliber rounds, medium-caliber explosives, and grenades and mortars fired into impact areas from the Northern Special Use Area. The weapons-firing noise would likely be masked somewhat by natural sounds on FDM, such as waves and winds. The impulsive sound caused by weapon firings would have limited potential to mask any important biological sound simply because the duration of the impulse is brief, even when multiple shots are fired in series.

Although more ordnance may be used on FDM under Alternative 1 compared to what was analyzed previously in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, all of the ordnance would be targeted at impact zones, with the same mitigation measures in place (discussed above in Section 3.10.2.1, Acoustic Stressors; and Chapter 5, Mitigation), and there would be no changes in how activities are performed compared to the previous analysis in 2015. For FDM's terrestrial biological resources, including ESA-listed species (the Micronesian megapode and Mariana fruit bat), bird species protected under the MBTA, and other native terrestrial plants and wildlife assessed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, the relatively small increase in annual NEW, numbers of ordnance expended, and the number of activities on FDM would not result in an appreciable change in the impact conclusions presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS for the following two reasons: (1) the increase in the amount of NEW (less than 1 percent increase), number of items expended (less than 10 percent increase), and the number of activities (less than 2 percent increase) would be minor when comparing Alternative 1 to NEW amounts analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS); and (2) the Navy would continue to implement the same avoidance and minimization measures in place as with the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (see Section 5.5, Terrestrial Mitigation Measures to be Implemented; and Table 5.5-1).



Note: Target locations in Impact Area 1 may change depending on target maintenance and training requirements.

Figure 3.10-1: Farallon de Medinilla Impact Zones and Micronesian Megapode Occurrences

The USFWS's 2015 Biological Opinion provided the Navy with an incidental take statement for the Mariana fruit bat and the Micronesian megapode (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2015). The Mariana fruit bat would not likely occur in impact zones and, if present on FDM, would likely be confined to the remnant tree cover at the northern end of the island. In the USFWS's 2015 Biological Opinion, one Mariana fruit bat was estimated to be killed over the course of five years as a result of bombing, gunnery, and missile exercises proposed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. The likelihood of increased exposure is negligible because of the small increases in the number of events, munitions, and NEW expended on FDM compared to what was analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and 2015 USFWS Biological Opinion. In addition, the same avoidance and minimization measures in place included in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and 2015 USFWS Biological Opinion would continue under Alternative 1 (see Section 5.5, Terrestrial Mitigation Measures to be Implemented; and Table 5-20).

In the USFWS's 2015 Biological Opinion, four Micronesian megapodes per year were estimated to be killed as a result of bombing, gunnery, and missile exercises proposed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Based on the habitat conditions that persist within the impact zones, it is unlikely that additional megapodes would be exposed to additional ordnance use when used in the same locations previously analyzed. In summary, as the neither the Mariana fruit bat nor the Micronesian megapode will face increased exposure from the proposed additional ordnance to be expended, the incidental take statement provided to the Navy in 2015 as part of the USFWS's Biological Opinion is sufficient to cover potential impacts on ESA-listed species from activities proposed under Alternative 1 of this SEIS/OEIS.

Pursuant to the ESA, acoustic stressors during training activities on FDM, as described under Alternative 1, may affect the Micronesian megapode and the Mariana fruit bat. This determination is consistent with the previous consultation between the Navy and USFWS for activities described in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Because of the small increases in the amount of NEW used on FDM, the number of ordnance items expended, and the number of events that would occur on FDM under Alternative 1 compared to what was analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, the activities proposed under Alternative 1 do not constitute a modification of the original proposed activities that causes new or additional effects on ESA-listed species on FDM; therefore, reinitiation of Section 7 consultation between the USFWS and Navy is not necessary.

Under the MBTA regulations applicable to military readiness activities (50 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] Part 21), acoustic stressors on land during training activities under Alternative 1 would not result in significant adverse effects on terrestrial bird populations.

3.10.2.1.2 Impacts from Acoustic Stressors Under Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)

Under Alternative 2, the number of proposed training activities using explosive munitions would be similar as compared to Alternative 1, with an increase in the number of Direct Action events under Alternative 2 (compared to Alternative 1, see Table 3.6-1). The number of training events for this activity type would stay the same compared to what was previously analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and under Alternative 1; however, the number of munitions used would increase during each training event under Alterative 2 (see Table 3.6-2). As with Alternative 1, these training events would occur within the Northern Special Use Area and fire into the impact areas towards the south; therefore, more megapodes and bats (along with other wildlife species) would be exposed to more weapons firing noise under Alternative 2 because of the increased number of small-caliber rounds, medium-caliber explosives, and grenades and mortars fired into impact areas from the Northern Special Use Area. The weapons-firing noise would likely be masked somewhat by natural sounds on FDM, such as waves and

winds. The impulsive sound caused by weapon firings would have limited potential to mask any important biological sound simply because the duration of the impulse is brief, even when multiple shots are fired in series. In addition, the same avoidance and minimization measures in place included in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS would continue under Alternative 2 (see Section 5.5, Terrestrial Mitigation Measures to be Implemented; and Table 5-20).

Therefore, the same conclusions for Alternative 1 for terrestrial biological resources, including the Micronesian megapode, Mariana fruit bat, and MBTA-protected terrestrial bird species, are applicable to Alternative 2.

Pursuant to the ESA, acoustic stressors during training activities on FDM, as described under Alternative 2, may affect the Micronesian megapode and the Mariana fruit bat. This determination is consistent with the previous consultation between the Navy and USFWS for activities described in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Because of the small increases in the amount of NEW used on FDM, the number of ordnance items expended, and the number of events that would occur on FDM under Alternative 2 compared to what was analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, the activities proposed under Alternative 2 do not constitute a modification of the original proposed activities that causes new or additional effects on ESA-listed species on FDM; therefore, reinitiation of Section 7 consultation between the USFWS and Navy is not necessary.

Under the MBTA regulations applicable to military readiness activities (50 CFR Part 21), acoustic stressors on land during training activities under Alternative 2 would not result in significant adverse effects on terrestrial bird populations.

3.10.2.1.3 Impacts from Acoustic Stressors Under the No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, proposed training and testing activities would not occur. Other military activities not associated with this Proposed Action would continue to occur. For FDM, the lease agreement between the U.S. government and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands would remain in place, and the island would continue to be maintained as a Navy range, although strike warfare would no longer continue on the island.

Acoustic stressors associated with Navy training activities would no longer be introduced to the island, which would minimize adverse noise impacts on FDM, such as disturbance of nesting and roosting birds and bats, sound pressure waves that may induce injury to wildlife, and adverse impacts associated with military noise on wildlife species at various life stages.

3.10.2.2 Explosives Stressors

The training activities that have the greatest impact on vegetation and wildlife communities within the impact areas on FDM are those that result in percussive force from the use of explosive munitions. The potential impacts of activities with these types of disturbances are discussed in Section 3.10.3.1.1 (Impacts from Explosives and Weapons Firing Noise) of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

3.10.2.2.1 Impacts from Explosive Stressors Under Alternative 1

As stated above in Section 3.10.2.1.1 (Impacts from Acoustic Stressors Under Alternative 1), there would be a small increase in the number of explosions on FDM, which would increase the number of exposures to percussive force. The types of explosive munitions used on FDM include explosive bombs (less than or equal to 2,000 lb.), missiles, rockets, explosive grenades and mortars, medium-caliber projectiles, and large-caliber projectiles. The number of explosive bombs (less than or equal to 2,000 lb.) would not

change compared to what was analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, while the increases in NEW would be from the increased number of smaller NEW munitions (see Table 3.6-2). The total change in explosives use on FDM, in terms of NEW, would increase by less than 1 percent under Alternative 1 compared to what was analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Although more ordnance would be used on FDM under Alternative 1, all of the ordnance would target impact zones, with the same avoidance and minimization measures in place (see Section 5.5, Terrestrial Mitigation Measures to be Implemented; and Table 5-20).

As discussed in Section 3.10.2.1.1 (Impacts from Acoustic Stressors Under Alternative 1), the USFWS's 2015 Biological Opinion provided the Navy with an incidental take statement for the Mariana fruit bat and the Micronesian megapode (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2015). The Mariana fruit bat would not likely occur in impact zones and, if present on FDM, would likely be confined to the remnant tree cover at the northern end of the island. In the USFWS's 2015 Biological Opinion, one Mariana fruit bat was estimated to be killed over the course of five years as a result of bombing, gunnery, and missile exercises proposed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. The likelihood of increased exposure is negligible because of the small increases in the number of events, munitions, and NEW expended on FDM compared to what was analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and 2015 USFWS Biological Opinion. In addition, the same avoidance and minimization measures in place included in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and 2015 USFWS Biological Opinion would continue under Alternative 1 (see Section 5.5, Terrestrial Mitigation Measures to be Implemented; and Table 5-20). In the USFWS's 2015 Biological Opinion, four Micronesian megapodes per year were estimated to be killed as a result of bombing, gunnery, and missile exercises proposed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Based on the habitat conditions that persist within the impact zones, it is unlikely that additional megapodes would be exposed to additional ordnance use when used in the same locations previously analyzed. In summary, as neither the Mariana fruit bat, nor the Micronesian megapode would face increased exposure from the proposed use of explosive ordnance, the incidental take statement provided to the Navy in 2015 as part of the USFWS's Biological Opinion is sufficient to cover potential impacts on ESA-listed species from activities proposed under Alternative 1 of this SEIS/OEIS.

Pursuant to the ESA, explosives stressors during training activities on FDM, as described under Alternative 1, may affect the Micronesian megapode and the Mariana fruit bat. This determination is consistent with the previous consultation between the Navy and USFWS for activities described in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Because of the small increases in the amount of NEW used on FDM, the number of ordnance items expended, and the number of events that would occur on FDM under Alternative 1 compared to what was analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, the activities proposed under Alternative 1 do not constitute a modification of the original proposed activities that causes new or additional effects on ESA-listed species on FDM; therefore, reinitiation of Section 7 consultation between the USFWS and Navy is not necessary.

Under the MBTA regulations applicable to military readiness activities (50 CFR Part 21), explosions and weapons firing on land during training activities under Alternative 1 would not result in significant adverse effects on terrestrial bird populations.

3.10.2.2.2 Impacts from Explosive Stressors Under Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)

Under Alternative 2, there would be an increase in the number of events using FDM as a training location or target (see Table 3.6-1), with an increase in the number of munitions items expended on

FDM (see Table 3.6-2) compared to what was analyzed previously in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and under Alternative 1.

Taken together, the increase in the number of events per year or the amount of ordnance used during events would result in an increase in the amount of NEW expended on FDM each year (see Table 3.6-3). Under Alternative 2, Naval Surface Firing Exercise events would expend more large-caliber projectiles, thereby slightly increasing the NEW expended under Alternative 2 compared to Alternative 1. Factors that limit the potential for additional adverse impacts, however, include maintaining the same ordnance type and targeting restrictions included as part of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Total NEW expended annually will continue to be limited by the terms of the 2015 USFWS BO. All ordnance expended on FDM would target existing impact zones, with the same ordnance restrictions imposed on all FDM activities and with the same avoidance and minimization measures in place (see Section 5.5, Terrestrial Mitigation Measures to be Implemented; and Table 5-20). As with Alternative 1, the likelihood of increased exposure under Alternative 2 is negligible because of the small increases in the number of events, munitions, and NEW expended on FDM compared to what was analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and 2015 USFWS Biological Opinion. Therefore, the conclusions for terrestrial biological resources (including ESA-listed species and species protected by the MBTA) included in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS remain valid.

Pursuant to the ESA, explosive stressors during training activities on FDM, as described under Alternative 2, may affect the Micronesian megapode and the Mariana fruit bat. This determination is consistent with the previous consultation between the Navy and USFWS for activities described in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Because of the small increases in the amount of NEW used on FDM, the number of ordnance items expended, and the number of events that would occur on FDM under Alternative 2 compared to what was analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, the activities proposed under Alternative 2 do not constitute a modification of the original proposed activities that causes new or additional effects on ESA-listed species on FDM; therefore, reinitiation of Section 7 consultation between the USFWS and Navy is not necessary.

Under the MBTA regulations applicable to military readiness activities (50 CFR Part 21), explosions and weapons firing on land during training activities under Alternative 2 would not result in significant adverse effects on terrestrial bird populations.

3.10.2.2.3 Impacts from Explosive Stressors Under the No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, proposed training and testing activities would not occur. Other military activities not associated with this Proposed Action would continue to occur. For FDM, the lease agreement between the U.S. government and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands would remain in place, and the island would continue to be maintained as a Navy range, although strike warfare would no longer continue on the island.

Explosions associated with Navy training activities would no longer occur on the island, which would minimize adverse impacts associated with blast effects.

3.10.2.3 Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors

The 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS analyzed the potential for physical disturbance and strike stressors, defined as including (1) direct strike, (2) habitat disturbance, (3) and the potential for wildfires. As discussed in Section 3.10.3.2 (Physical Stressors) in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, the potential for impacts on vegetation communities and wildlife resources, including the Micronesian megapode,

Mariana fruit bats that may occur on the island, and land bird species, associated with direct strike from inert munitions is considerably lower than the potential for blast effects associated with explosive munitions.

Direct Action training activities require helicopter landings on FDM at a landing zone within the "no target area" (see Appendix A, Training and Testing Activities Descriptions, for a description of Direct Action training events). Marines and special warfare personnel would then disembark and conduct Direct Action training activities, where vegetation may be trampled. Because of unexploded ordnance clearance requirements, only marked trails (laid out by explosive ordnance disposal specialists prior to range clearance activities) are used, which reduces the potential for vegetation trampling (as well as nest trampling) in areas away from access trails.

Training activities that involve high explosive detonations on FDM introduce the potential for wildfires on the island. Cluster bombs, live cluster weapons, live scatterable munitions, fuel-air explosives, incendiary devices, and bombs greater than 2,000 lb. are prohibited on FDM. It should be noted that some munitions contain a small amount of phosphorous for spotting charges, and smoke markers are used in some direct action training activities. Phosphorous is not a main constituent to any munitions used on FDM. The live-fire weapons allowed are only targeted at impact areas authorized for live and inert ordnance. The areas for target placement support only low-growing vegetation because of long-term training with explosives. Dense vegetation grows on the northern portion of the island within the special use area, which could create a wildfire if weapons are misfired. Explosions may ignite fires in impact areas, which may spread to higher stature fine fuels outside of impact areas, endangering the remnant forest portions on the northern side of the island. However, the dense vegetation and shaded canopy of trees in the northern portion of the island likely increases the moisture content of vegetation, which should decrease the ability of fires to spread into the special use area.

3.10.2.3.1 Impacts from Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors Under Alternative 1

Under Alternative 1, direct strike of individual birds and bats on FDM is unlikely because the increased activities (missile exercises and direct-action training activities) would occur within the impact zones already established on the island. These areas are highly degraded and do not support sufficient cover and forage resources to be considered high-value habitat on FDM. Therefore, the impact areas are not likely to attract terrestrial wildlife resources, and would attract few (if any) Micronesian megapodes and likely no Mariana fruit bats.

The small increase in explosions under Alternative 1 (see Table 3.6-3) compared to the amount analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, as measured in terms of NEW, would unlikely be additive to wildfire risk on FDM. As described above, munitions use on FDM can ignite wildfires. Wildfire intensity may vary based on the amount and type of munitions, wind speed, levels of humidity, seasonal variation in vegetation thickness and composition, and successional state of vegetation. Micronesian megapodes on FDM would be expected to fly away from smoke, but exposure to smoke inhalation would result in some form of respiratory distress. Direct mortality of megapodes could result from intensive respiratory distress or encirclement of burning vegetation. Megapode eggs, even in burrows, would not likely survive a wildfire overburn on FDM. Likewise, any fledglings within a burn area would be expected to suffer intensive respiratory distress, as they would be unable to flee smoke or burning vegetation. As stated above, fires are unlikely to spread to the northern portion of FDM; the northern portion of the island would continue to serve as refugia for Micronesian megapodes that either reside in this area or for megapodes able to flee smoke and flames from target areas. Therefore, despite more explosions on

FDM, they would occur within the same impact zones, which reduces the potential for overburns in new previously unburned areas.

Pursuant to the ESA, physical disturbance and strike stressors during training activities on FDM, as described under Alternative 1, may affect the Micronesian megapode and the Mariana fruit bat. This determination is consistent with the previous consultation between the Navy and USFWS for activities described in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Because of the small increases in the amount of NEW used on FDM, the number of ordnance items expended, and the number of events that would occur on FDM under Alternative 1 compared to what was analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, the activities proposed under Alternative 1 do not constitute a modification of the original proposed activities that causes new or additional effects on ESA-listed species on FDM; therefore, reinitiation of Section 7 consultation between the USFWS and Navy is not necessary.

Under the MBTA regulations applicable to military readiness activities (50 CFR Part 21), physical disturbance and strike stressors during training activities under Alternative 1 would not result in significant adverse effects on terrestrial bird populations.

3.10.2.3.2 Impacts from Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors Under Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)

Under Alternative 2, there would be an increase in the number of events using FDM as a training location or target (see Table 3.6-1), with an increase in the number of munitions items expended on FDM (see Table 3.6-2) compared to what was analyzed previously in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and under Alternative 1.

Taken together, the increase in the number of events per year or the amount of ordnance used during events would result in an increase in the amount of NEW expended on FDM each year (see Table 3.6-3). Although the amount of increased NEW is negligible, the potential exposure to stressors associated with ordnance use would increase under Alternative 2 compared to what was analyzed previously in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Under Alternative 2, Naval Surface Firing Exercise events would expend more large-caliber projectiles, thereby slightly increasing the NEW expended under Alternative 2 compared to Alternative 1. Factors that limit the potential for additional adverse impacts associated with physical disturbance and strike, however, include maintaining the same ordnance type and targeting restrictions included as part of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. All ordnance expended on FDM would target existing impact zones, with the same ordnance restrictions imposed on all FDM activities and with the same avoidance and minimization measures in place (see Section 5.5, Terrestrial Mitigation Measures to be Implemented; and Table 5-20). Therefore, the increases in ordnance use on FDM shown in Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2 do not appreciably change the impact conclusions presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. The conclusions for terrestrial biological resources (including ESA-listed species and species protected by the MBTA) included in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS remain valid.

Pursuant to the ESA, physical disturbance and strike stressors during training activities on FDM, as described under Alternative 2, may affect the Micronesian megapode and the Mariana fruit bat. This determination is consistent with the previous consultation between the Navy and USFWS for activities described in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Because of the small increases in the amount of NEW used on FDM, the number of ordnance items expended, and the number of activities that would occur on FDM under Alternative 2 compared to what was analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, the activities proposed under Alternative 2 do not constitute a modification of the original proposed activities that causes new or additional effects on ESA-listed species on FDM; therefore, reinitiation of Section 7 consultation between the USFWS and Navy is not necessary.

Under the MBTA regulations applicable to military readiness activities (50 CFR Part 21), physical disturbance and strike stressors during training activities under Alternative 2 would not result in significant adverse effects on terrestrial bird populations.

3.10.2.3.3 Impacts from Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors Under No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, proposed training and testing activities would not occur. Other military activities not associated with this Proposed Action would continue to occur. For FDM, the lease agreement between the U.S. government and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands would remain in place, and the island would continue to be maintained as a Navy range, although strike warfare would no longer continue on the island.

Explosions associated with Navy training activities would no longer occur on the island, which would minimize adverse impacts associated with physical disturbance and strike stressors.

3.10.2.4 Secondary Stressors

The 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS included an analysis of the potential impacts of secondary stressors on terrestrial species and habitats. Specifically, this section addresses the potential introduction of invasive species. Section 3.10.3.3.1 (Impacts from Invasive Species Introductions) in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS discusses potential introduction pathways of invasive species associated with training activities described in this SEIS/OEIS.

The 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS included a conceptual model of invasive species pathways (Figure 3.10-10 in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS) resulting from training activities, and specific invasive species interdiction measures that avoid or minimize risk of specific pathways (see Table 3.10-7 in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS). Of the two training activity types that would increase on FDM under Alternative 1, only Direct Action training activities present potential introduction pathways for invasive species. Introduction pathways that originate on Guam and end on FDM present a potential hazard for brown treesnake dispersal. For activities described in this SEIS/OEIS, potential introduction pathways would be associated with helicopter transports to FDM. The Brown Tree Snake Control and Interdiction Requirements are included in the Commander, U.S. Naval Forces Marianas Instruction 3500.4A (dated October 8, 2013). This document describes roles and responsibilities for exercise planners to interdict and control brown treesnakes and to disseminate information to participants throughout the chain of command. Other policies and instructions associated with military training activities and potential invasive species introductions include Office of the Chief of Naval Operations Instruction 5090.1D (updated in 2013) and Armed Forces Pest Management Board Technical Guide 31 (Armed Forces Pest Management Board, 2012). For instance, any personnel involved in training activities on FDM conduct self inspections to avoid or reduce potential introductions of invasive species from points of origin to FDM. Points of origin include Guam and Saipan, and possibly Tinian. Personnel inspect all gear and

clothing (e.g., boots, bags, weapons, and pants) for soil accumulations, seeds, invertebrates, and possible inconspicuous stowaway brown treesnakes).

The Direct Action training activities, which are proposed to increase, would still be subject to biosecurity measures. The potential introduction of invasive species to FDM from additional transits to FDM during Direct Action training activities is unlikely; therefore, there would be no appreciable increase in risk from activities analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

With the small increase (less than 1 percent) in the amount of NEW used on FDM under Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 compared to what was analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, the activities proposed in this SEIS do not constitute a modification of the original proposed activities that causes new or additional effects from secondary stressors on ESA-listed species on FDM; therefore, reinitiation of Section 7 consultation between the USFWS and Navy is not necessary.

3.10.3 Public Comments

The public raised a number of issues during the scoping period in regard to terrestrial species and habitats. The issues are summarized in the list below. Comments received from the public during the Draft SEIS/OEIS commenting period related to terrestrial species and habitats are addressed in Appendix K (Public Comment Responses).

- **Public comments concerning a lack of studies on FDM** – Some commenters noted a lack of studies documenting the condition of terrestrial biological resources on FDM. Complete natural resource inventories on the island are subject to a number of constraints, such as safety concerns regarding unexploded ordnance and scheduling surveys to avoid both training activities and weather. Surveys are conducted on a periodic basis on FDM. On-the-ground surveys are conducted primarily to monitor Micronesian megapodes on the island. These surveys are described in more detail in Section 3.10.2.3.8.4 (Status within the Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area) in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Aerial surveys are conducted more frequently over FDM, with the primary focus on monitoring seabird rookeries (primarily brown boobies, masked boobies, and red-footed boobies). These surveys are described in more detail, along with quantitative trend analysis of populations, in Section 3.6.2 (Farallon de Medinilla) of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. All of these studies are summarized and included in updates to the Joint Region Marianas Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan for Joint Region Marianas-administered and Leased Lands On Guam, Tinian, and FDM (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2019), which is shared with cooperating agencies (e.g., Guam Department of Agriculture Division of Aquatic and Wildlife Resources, Commonwealth of Northern Mariana Islands Department of Land and Natural Resources Division of Fish and Wildlife, and USFWS Pacific Islands Fish and Wildlife Office).
- **Potential impacts on vegetation communities on FDM –** One comment raised the concern of vegetation loss resulting from bombing activities at FDM. Vegetation loss over the long term is described in Section 3.10.2.1.5 (Farallon de Medinilla) in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Few vegetation surveys have been conducted on FDM. The first published flora record in 1902, described the island as a plateau covered by brush approximately 13 feet (4.0 meters) high (Mueller-Dombois & Fosberg, 1998); however, aerial photographs from 1944 show large canopy trees on FDM (see Figure 3.10-4 in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS). FDM's vegetation appears to have undergone significant changes since the island was leased by the Department of Defense and the subsequent bombardment for military training. The most intensive bombardment to

date of FDM occurred during the Vietnam era, when as much as 22 tons of ordnance per month was dropped on the island (Lusk et al., 2000). Based on early 20th century descriptions of FDM vegetation and aerial photographs of the island prior to military bombardment activities, island tree height and canopy cover have been greatly reduced (Lusk et al., 2000; Mueller-Dombois & Fosberg, 1998). The avoidance and minimization measures currently implemented on FDM, as described in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of this SEIS/OEIS, are designed to protect the area of the island occupied by the Micronesian megapode in the "No Drop Zone." According to Lusk et al. (2000), vegetation in this area has not substantially changed since 1974. The USFWS, in their Biological Opinion signed in 2015 for activities described in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, suggests that the avoidance and minimization measures have protected species and habitats in the northern portion of the island (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2015), while the reductions in vegetation structure and composition have occurred in designated impact zones to the south of the "No Drop Zone." In summary, the Navy concurs that there have been significant losses of vegetation on FDM resulting from military training activities. Mitigation measures that have been designed in cooperation with USFWS personnel provide a level of protection for the northern end of the island, while ordnance use is only allowed in designated impact zones. Increases in ordnance use on FDM would only occur in existing impact zones, causing no new additional vegetation losses on the island.

REFERENCES

Amidon, F. A., A. P. Marshall, and C. C. Kessler. (2011). *Status of the Micronesian megapode in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands*. Honolulu, HI: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Pacific Islands Fish and Wildlife Office.

Armed Forces Pest Management Board. (2012). *Guide for Agricultural and Public Health Preparation of Military Gear and Equipment for Deployment and Redeployment, Technical Guide 31*. Silver Spring, MD: Armed Forces Pest Management Board Information Services Division.

Kessler, C. C., and F. A. Amidon. (2009). *Micronesian Megapode on Tinian and Aguiguan* (Terrestrial Surveys of Tinian and Aguiguan, Mariana Islands, 2008: Working Draft). Honolulu, HI: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Pacific Islands Fish and Wildlife Office.

Lusk, M. R., P. Bruner, and C. Kessler. (2000). The Avifauna of Farallon De Medinilla, Mariana Islands. *Journal of Field Ornithology, 71*(1), 22–33.

Mueller-Dombois, D., and F. R. Fosberg. (1998). *Vegetation of the tropical Pacific islands*. New York, NY: Springer-Verlag.

Mueller-Dombois, D., and F. R. Fosberg. (2013). *Vegetation of the Tropical Pacific Islands* (Vol. 132). New York, NY: Springer Science & Business Media.

Reichel, J. D. (1991). Status and conservation of seabirds in the Mariana Islands. In J. P. Croxall (Ed.), *Seabird Status and Conservation, a Supplement* (pp. 248–262). Cambridge, United Kingdom: International Preservation Technical Publication Number 11.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (1975). *Farallon de Medinilla Bombardment Range: Environmental Impact Statement*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Navy.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2008a). *Micronesian Megapode (Megapodius laperouse laperouse) Surveys on Farallon de Medinilla, Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas Islands (Draft)*. Honolulu, HI: Naval Facilities Engineering Pacific.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2008b). *Final Environmental Assessment for the Homeporting of Six Zumwalt Class Destroyers at East and West Coast Installations (including Hawaii)*. Norfolk, VA: Naval Facilities Engineering Command Atlantic.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2008c). *Fiscal Years 2007 and 2008 Report for 61755NR410 Wildlife Surveys on Military Leased Lands, Tinian CNMI*. Honolulu, HI: Naval Facilities Engineering Pacific.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2011). *Marianas Training Manual*. Naval Base Guam, Guam: Commander Joint Region Marianas.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2013). *Annual Report: Wildlife Surveys on Tinian and FDM*. Naval Base Guam, Guam: Joint Region Marianas.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2019). *Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan for Joint Region Marianas*. Tumon, Guam: Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Marianas.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. (1998). *Recovery Plan for the Micronesian Megapode (Megapodius laperouse laperouse)*. Portland, OR: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Region 1 (Pacific Region Office).

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. (2009). *Draft Revised Recovery Plan for the Mariana Fruit Bat or Fanihi (Pteropus mariannus mariannus)*. Portland, OR: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. (2015). *Biological Opinion for the Mariana Islands Training and Testing Program*. Honolulu, HI: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Pacific Islands Fish and Wildlife Office.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. (2016). *Informal Consultation on Mariana Islands Training and Testing Program Affects to Eighteen Newly-Listed Species, Guam and Tinian*. Honolulu, HI: Fish and Wildlife Service, Pacific Islands Fish and Wildlife Office.

United States of America and Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. (1983). *Lease Agreement Made Pursuant to the Covenant to Establish a Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands in a Political Union with the United States of America*. Washington, DC: United States Code.

This page intentionally left blank.

3.11 Cultural Resources

Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/ Overseas Environmental Impact Statement Mariana Islands Training and Testing

TABLE OF CONTENTS

3.11 Cultural Resources 3.11-1
3.11.1 Affected Environment 3.11-1
3.11.1.1 Guam, Mariana Islands 3.11-1
3.11.1.2 Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands 3.11-1
3.11.1.3 Cultural/Traditional Practices and Beliefs 3.11-3
3.11.1.4 Mariana Islands Training and Testing Transit Corridor 3.11-4
3.11.1.5 Current Requirements, Practices, and Protective Measures 3.11-4
3.11.2 Environmental Consequences 3.11-5
3.11.2.1 Explosive Stressors 3.11-5
3.11.2.2 Physical Disturbance and Strike 3.11-7
3.11.3 Public Comments 3.11-8

List of Figures

Figure 3.11-1: Known Wrecks, Obstructions, or Occurrences Within the United States Territorial Waters 3.11-2

List of Tables

There are no tables in this section.

This page intentionally left blank.

3.11 Cultural Resources

3.11.1 Affected Environment

This section supplements the analysis of impacts on cultural resources presented in the 2015 Mariana Islands Training and Testing (MITT) Final Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (EIS/OEIS). New information made available since the publication of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS is included below to better understand potential stressors and impacts on cultural resources resulting from training and testing activities. Information presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS that remains valid is noted as such and referenced in the appropriate sections. Comments received from the public during scoping related to cultural resources are addressed in Section 3.11.3 (Public Comments). Comments received from the public during the Draft Supplemental EIS (SEIS)/OEIS commenting period related to cultural resources are addressed in Appendix K (Public Comment Responses).

A 10-year programmatic agreement (PA) that addressed potential effects to historic properties in the Mariana Islands Range Complex (MIRC) study area expired in December 2019. The PA provided the Department of Defense with compliance under the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA). This process is separate and distinct from the Navy's responsibilities under the National Environmental Policy Act. However, as the need for a new PA was concurrent with the development of this MITT SEIS/OEIS, the Navy conducted Section 106 consultation in conjunction with the National Environmental Policy Act process. This benefitted both processes as comments received through the consultation process have been incorporated into this SEIS/OEIS, and vice versa.

3.11.1.1 Guam, Mariana Islands

Following a review of recent literature, no additional submerged cultural resources have been identified around Guam. However, geospatial data provided by the National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) documented the presence of several wrecks, obstructions, or occurrences in the waters around Guam (Lord et al., 2003) (**Error! Reference source not found.**). These submerged cultural resources have not been formally evaluated as historic properties eligible for listing in National Register of Historic Places. (see Section 3.11.1.1, Identification, Evaluation, and Treatment of Cultural Resources of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS for an explanation of the procedures associated with cultural resources); however, they will be treated as if they were eligible

3.11.1.2 Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands

3.11.1.2.1 Farallon de Medinilla

Following a literature review, no additional submerged cultural resources, land-based archaeological sites, or isolated non-modern artifacts have been identified around or on Farallon de Medinilla (FDM). A reconnaissance archaeological field survey on FDM was conducted in 1996 (Welch, 1997). No archaeological sites or isolated non-modern artifacts were observed; however, smoke-blackened caves and fragments (i.e., pottery sherds) were observed. Modern debris associated with the military use of the island was also observed. As such, the information presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS is still valid and the most current.




Figure 3.11-1: Known Wrecks, Obstructions, or Occurrences Within the United States Territorial Waters

3.11.1.2.2 Tinian

Following a literature review, additional submerged cultural resources have been identified around Tinian (**Error! Reference source not found.**). In 2017, East Carolina University partnered with the non-profit organization Ships of Exploration and Discovery on a National Parks Service America Battlefield Protection Program grant to conduct an archaeological investigation in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (CNMI). A portion of the 2017 project was dedicated to examining Tinian's World War II invasion beaches Unai Babui and Unai Chulu. The 2017 study was a follow-up study on the original American Battlefield Protection Program grant and a 2010 study of the nearshore areas, which identified potential anomalies in the nearshore areas of Unai Chulu (Burns, 2010). Researchers discovered two previously unidentified cultural resources within the Study Area landing beaches of Tinian: an intact World War II Danforth anchor and a previously unknown, fairly intact Landing Vehicle Tracked-2 in approximately 45 feet (ft.) of water (McKinnon et al., 2017). Researchers also discovered portions of a second Landing Vehicle Tracked, a large stockless U.S. Navy anchor, and a tire that may belong to a DUCKW, a six-wheel-drive amphibious modification of the CCKW trucks (2.5-ton truck) used during World War II in approximately 20 ft. of water in the nearshore area of Unai Babui.

Geospatial data provided by NOAA also documented the presence of several wrecks, obstructions, or occurrences in the waters around Tinian (Lord et al., 2003). The submerged cultural resources have not been formally evaluated for eligibility for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places; however, they will be treated as if they were eligible.

3.11.1.2.3 Saipan

Following a literature review, one additional submerged cultural resource has been identified around Saipan. The results of an underwater archaeological survey conducted in 2011 and published in 2016 describe a mid-to-late 19th-century wooden ship found in Tanapag Lagoon on the western side of Saipan, along with artifacts and an associated debris field. While the study confirmed the shipwreck to be from the colonial period prior to World War II, it was inconclusive as to the positive identity of the ship (McKinnon et al., 2016). In addition, geospatial data provided by NOAA documented the presence of several wrecks, obstructions, or occurrences in the waters around Saipan (Lord et al., 2003) (Figure 3.11-1). These submerged cultural resources have not been formally evaluated as historic properties eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places; however, they will be treated as if they were eligible.

3.11.1.2.4 Rota

Following a literature review, no additional submerged cultural resources have been identified around Rota. As such, the information presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS is still valid and the most current.

3.11.1.3 Cultural/Traditional Practices and Beliefs

Chamorros and Carolinians have a unique cultural history in the Marianas, with which they are closely connected. As far back as 4,000 years ago, the Chamorros migrated from Southeast Asia to the Mariana Islands. Their people and culture experienced centuries of change, from Spanish occupation in the 16th and 17th centuries, to European-introduced diseases and conflict over land in the 18th century, to Japanese occupation during World War II. To present day, Chamorros and Carolinians strive to maintain their ancestral heritage, cultural traditions, and language.

A number of public comments on the Draft SEIS/OEIS refer to the history of displacement and marginalization the Chamorros and Carolinians experienced, suggesting the Proposed Action represents a comparable impact on existing cultural practices. Commenters stated that military training and testing activities within the Mariana Islands are believed to hinder cultural beliefs, access to cultural sites, and the ability to practice cultural traditions. While specific practices were not described in the comments, cultural traditions include (but are not limited to) resource collection for traditional events or ceremonial purposes, seafaring customs, and practices related to traditional and familial roles.

3.11.1.4 Mariana Islands Training and Testing Transit Corridor

The length and variable width of the MITT transit corridor is so vast and deep (sometimes over 18,000 ft. [5,486 meters]), that it precludes systematic survey for submerged cultural resources. In accordance with the NHPA Section 402 regarding international federal activities affecting historic properties, the World Heritage List was reviewed, and no known natural/cultural resources were identified within the MITT transit corridor.

3.11.1.5 Current Requirements, Practices, and Protective Measures

3.11.1.5.1 Avoidance of Obstructions

As stated in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, the military avoids locations of known obstructions, which includes submerged cultural resources such as historic shipwrecks. Known obstructions are avoided to prevent damage to sensitive equipment and vessels, for mission success, and to avoid or reduce potential impacts on cultural resources (Section 2.3.3, Standard Operating Procedures; and Chapter 5, Mitigation).

3.11.1.5.2 Mariana Islands Range Complex Programmatic Agreement

A Programmatic Agreement (PA) was negotiated in 2009 for all military training activities proposed in the MIRC. The PA was based on consultations with the Guam State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), CNMI Historic Preservation Officer (HPO), Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and the National Park Service. The training constraints map identifies Limited Training zones, refined from the previous Military Operations Area constraints map boundaries (U.S. Department of Defense, 2009). Limited Training zones (land-based) are primarily designated as no digging, no vegetation clearing, and no campfire areas. Vehicular access is limited to designated roadways with the use of rubber-tired vehicles. While there are no limits on the quantity of personnel, training in Limited Training zones typically consist of units numbering 20 or fewer. Limited Training and Testing zones (at-sea) are designated for avoidance of historic properties or other environmentally sensitive areas. No Training zones are off limits to training and testing activities.

According to the 2009 PA, training constraint maps shall be reviewed by the Senior Military Official Cultural Resource Manager (CRM) and/or 36th Wing CRM on an annual basis to ensure the maps remain current and take into account any new surveys, studies, or inadvertent and post-review finds. Revisions to the maps shall be consulted upon with the Guam SHPO and CNMI HPO prior to finalization. Each review by the CRM and any resulting revision to the maps shall be reported.

The PA expired in December 2019, and the Navy efforts are ongoing to maintain compliance with the NHPA. Since January 2019, the Navy has been actively engaged in a new NHPA Section 106 consultation with the Guam and CNMI HPOs, consulting parties and members of the interested public. As it has been determined that MITT military readiness training has the potential to affect historic properties in the study area, the Navy is working to develop a MITT PA to maintain NHPA compliance. As we continue to

actively consult and develop a new long-term PA for the MITT undertaking, the Parties have executed interim PAs which incorporate all of the terms and mitigations of the 2009 PA. The interim PAs took effect upon the expiration of the 2009 MITT PA and serve as a continuation of the Department of Defense's compliance under Section 106 of the NHPA for MITT activities. The interim PA with the CNMI HPO expires September 10, 2020, while the interim PA with Guam expires June 30, 2020.

3.11.2 Environmental Consequences

The 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS considered training and testing activities proposed to occur in the Study Area that may have the potential to impact cultural resources. The stressors applicable to cultural resources in the Study Area are the same stressors in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and include:

- explosive (in-water explosions), and
- physical disturbance and strike (ground disturbance, use of towed in-water devices, deposition of military expended materials, and use of seafloor devices).

This section evaluates how and to what degree potential impacts on cultural resources from stressors described in Section 3.0.1 (Overall Approach to Analysis) may have changed since the analysis presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS was completed. Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2 in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) list the proposed training and testing activities and include the number of times each activity would be conducted annually and the locations within the Study Area where the activity would typically occur under each alternative. The tables also present the same information for activities described in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS so that the proposed levels of training and testing under this SEIS/OEIS can be easily compared.

The Navy conducted a review of federal and state regulations and standards relevant to cultural resources and reviewed literature published since 2015 for new information on cultural resources (as presented in Section 3.11.1, Affected Environment) that could inform the analysis presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. The analysis presented in this section also considers standard operating procedures, which are discussed in Section 2.3.3 (Standard Operating Procedures) of this SEIS/OEIS, and mitigation measures that are described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation). The Navy would implement these measures to avoid or reduce potential impacts on cultural resources from stressors associated with the proposed training and testing activities. Protective measures for cultural resources will be coordinated with the Guam SHPO, CNMI HPO Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and the National Park Service as part of the Section 106 consultation process.

3.11.2.1 Explosive Stressors

Explosive stressors that have the potential to impact cultural resources are shock (pressure) waves and vibrations from underwater detonations (such as explosive torpedoes, missiles, bombs, projectiles, airguns, and mines) and cratering created by underwater explosions. While the number of training and testing activities would change under this SEIS/OEIS (refer to Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2), the locations of activities and the analysis presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, Section 3.11.3.1.1 (Impacts from Explosives – Shock [Pressure] Waves from Underwater Explosions) and Section 3.11.3.1.2 (Impacts from Explosives – Cratering) remains valid.

3.11.2.1.1 Impacts from Explosive Stressors Under Alternative 1

Under Alternative 1, the annual number of explosive munitions expended at sea in the Study Area would decrease overall from the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. However, under this alternative, underwater detonation activities would increase for Limpet Mine Neutralization System and Underwater Demolition

Qualification/Certification above the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (Table 2.5-1 and Table 3.0-16). The explosive ordnance would continue to occur in the same areas and would have no appreciable change in the impact analysis or conclusions for explosive stressors as presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

As stated in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS analysis, training and testing activities using explosives would not typically occur within approximately 3 nautical miles from shore, including the nearshore waters surrounding Tinian, Saipan, or Rota. Therefore, no shock (pressure) waves, vibrations, or cratering from explosions would occur in these areas, and no known submerged cultural resources would be affected by explosive stressors. For those training activities at the Agat Bay Floating Mine Neutralization Site, Piti Point Floating Mine Neutralization Site, and Apra Harbor Underwater Demolition Site (located within Outer Apra Harbor), the military avoids locations of known obstructions, which includes submerged cultural resources (Section 2.3.3, Standard Operating Procedures; and Section 5.4.1, Mitigation Areas for Seafloor Resources). Thus, it is unlikely that cultural resources could be disturbed or destroyed from shock waves or cratering created by underwater explosions during mine warfare activities, surface warfare activities, torpedo testing, mine countermeasure mission package activities, or other training activities that use explosives.

In summary, given that the training and testing activities would decrease and be conducted in the same areas as described in the 2015 analysis, the amount of shock (pressure) waves, vibrations, or cratering from explosives would not appreciably change the conclusions. Therefore, the analysis presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, Section 3.11.3.1.1 (Explosive Stressors – Shock (Pressure) Waves from Underwater Explosions) and Section 3.11.3.1.2 (Impacts from Explosives – Cratering) remains valid. Explosive stressors resulting from underwater explosions creating shock (pressure) waves, vibrations, and cratering of the seafloor would not adversely affect submerged cultural resources under Alternative 1 within U.S. territorial waters because measures have been previously implemented to protect these resources and would continue to be implemented according to the mitigation measures and procedures identified and described in the 2009 MIRC PA and the successor MITT PA documents or interim PAs.

3.11.2.1.2 Impacts from Explosive Stressors Under Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)

Under Alternative 2, the annual number of explosive munitions expended at sea in the Study Area would decrease overall from the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. However, under this alternative, underwater detonation activities would increase for Limpet Mine Neutralization System and Underwater Demolition Qualification/Certification above the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (Table 2.5.1 and Table 3.0-16). As noted under Alternative 1, the explosive ordnance would continue to occur in the same areas and would have no appreciable change in the impact analysis or conclusions for explosive stressors as summarized above under Alternative 1 and as presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

3.11.2.1.3 Impacts from Explosive Stressors Under the No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, proposed training and testing activities would not occur. Other military activities not associated with this Proposed Action would continue to occur. Explosive stressors as listed above would not be introduced into the marine environment. Therefore, depending on other activities not related to the MITT undertaking, existing environmental conditions of submerged cultural resources would remain unchanged after cessation of ongoing training and testing activities.

Discontinuing the training and testing activities would result in fewer explosive stressors within the marine environment where training and testing activities have historically been conducted. Therefore, discontinuing training and testing activities under the No Action Alternative would lessen the potential

for explosive impacts on submerged cultural resources, but would not measurably improve the condition of submerged cultural resources in the Study Area.

3.11.2.2 Physical Disturbance and Strike

The physical disturbance and strike stressors that may impact cultural resources include (1) vessels and towed in-water devices, (2) military expended materials, and (3) seafloor devices.

3.11.2.2.1 Impacts from Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors Under Alternative 1

Under Alternative 1, the number of proposed training and testing events would increase for vessels, decrease for towed in-water devices, increase for non-explosive practice munitions, decrease for military expended materials, and decrease for seafloor devices (see Tables 3.0-12, 3.0-13, 3.0-14, 3.0-15, and 3.0-18, respectively) compared to the numbers in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

Proposed increases under Alternative 1 for vessels would have no appreciable change on the impact analysis or conclusions for physical disturbance and strike stressors presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS because the increase in training and testing events including the use of vessels is not substantial (Table 3.0-12). Thus, the analysis presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, Section 3.11.3.2.2 (Impacts from Vessel and In-Water Device Strikes) remains valid.

As stated in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, the impact of physical disturbance and strike stressors on cultural resources would be inconsequential for vessels and in-water devices because (1) the types of activities associated with towed systems are conducted in areas where the sea floor is deeper than the length of the tow lines; (2) prior to deploying a towed device, there is a standard operating procedure to search the intended path of the device for any floating debris (e.g., driftwood) or other potential surface obstructions, since they have the potential to cause damage to the device; and (3) devices are designed and operated within the water column and do not contact the seafloor. Activities involving vessels and in-water devices are not expected to affect submerged cultural resources.

The proposed increase under Alternative 1 in non-explosive practice munitions (Table 3.0-14) is attributed to the increase in small-caliber projectiles. Larger non-explosive practice munitions such as torpedoes, bombs, and missiles would all decrease under Alternative 1. As stated in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, the deposition of non-explosive practice munitions, sonobuoys, and military expended materials other than ordnance may affect submerged cultural resources through possible sudden impact of resources on the seafloor or the simple settling of military expended materials on top of submerged cultural resources. However, the impact of non-explosive practice munitions or military expended materials on cultural resources would be inconsequential because most of the anticipated expended munitions would be small objects and fragments that lose velocity after striking the ocean surface and drift to the seafloor. Larger and heavier objects, such as non-explosive practice munitions, would strike the ocean surface with greater velocity, but their acceleration would slow upon impact with the ocean surface. It is possible these larger and heavier objects could impact a submerged cultural resource site by creating sediment and artifact displacement. A historic resource could be impacted by damaging structural elements; the probability increases in areas where there is a higher density of resources. However, this type of impact is not anticipated because the Navy avoids areas with known submerged obstructions, including submerged objects and sites listed on the National Register of Historic Places. Thus, the increase in non-explosive practice munitions would have no appreciable change on the impact analysis or conclusions for physical disturbance and strike stressors presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

As stated in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, any physical disturbance on the continental shelf and seafloor could inadvertently damage or destroy submerged cultural resources if such resources are located within the Study Area and are not avoided. Under Alternative 1, the impact of seafloor devices on cultural resources would remain inconsequential as presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS because (1) seafloor devices are either stationary or move very slowly along the bottom; and (2) the military avoids locations of known obstructions, which include submerged cultural resources (Section 2.3.3, Standard Operating Procedures; and Section 5.4.1, Mitigation Areas for Seafloor Resources). Thus, activities involving seafloor devices are not expected to affect submerged cultural resources.

3.11.2.2.2 Impacts from Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors Under Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)

Under Alternative 2, the number of proposed training and testing events would increase for vessels, decrease for towed in-water devices, increase for non-explosive practice munitions, decrease for military expended materials, and decrease for seafloor devices (see Tables 3.0-12, 3.0-13, 3.0-14, 3.0-15, and 3.0-18, respectively) compared to the numbers in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Under Alternative 2, increases as compared to Alternative 1 would have no appreciable change on the impact conclusions as summarized above under Alternative 1 and presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

3.11.2.2.3 Impacts from Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors Under the No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, proposed training and testing activities would not occur. Other military activities not associated with this Proposed Action would continue to occur. Physical disturbance and strike stressors as listed above would not be introduced into the marine environment. Therefore, existing environmental conditions of submerged cultural resources would remain unchanged after cessation of ongoing training and testing activities.

Discontinuing the training and testing activities would result in fewer physical disturbance and strike stressors within the marine environment where training and testing activities have historically been conducted. Therefore, discontinuing training and testing activities under the No Action Alternative would lessen the potential for physical disturbance and strike impacts on submerged cultural resources, but would not measurably improve the condition of submerged cultural resources in the Study Area.

3.11.3 Public Comments

The public raised two issues during the scoping period in regard to cultural resources. The issues are summarized in the list below. Comments received from the public during the Draft SEIS/OEIS commenting period related to cultural resources are addressed in Appendix K (Public Comment Responses).

- **U.S. Navy has not consulted with indigenous people for conducting military training –** The 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS summarized in Section 3.11.4.2 (Regulatory Determinations) that the 2009 MIRC PA is in effect and satisfies the requirement for consultation as long as the stipulations in that PA are followed. The 2009 MIRC PA was negotiated for all military training activities for the MIRC EIS/OEIS based on consultations with the Guam SHPO, CNMI HPO, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and the National Park Service (U.S. Department of Defense, 2009).
- **The Navy should conduct a cultural survey of FDM –** The 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS Section 3.11.2.2.1 (Farallon de Medinilla) evaluated the findings of a preliminary archaeological field survey of FDM conducted in 1996 (Welch, 1997). While no archaeological remains were identified during the survey reported by Welch (1997), the reconnaissance effort was

incomplete due to an approaching typhoon and the discovery of "dangerous submunitions" on the island, which prohibited the archaeologists from continuing the work. As part of the PA development, the Navy, in cooperation with the CNMI HPO, is exploring the feasibility of conducting archeological surveys on FDM as well as in the nearshore waters surrounding the Island. Due to the high risk of encountering unexploded ordnance while surveying areas on and around a bombing range, these decisions will require approval from the highest levels of Navy leadership, and no decisions have yet been made.

REFERENCES

Burns, J. (2010). *Underwater Archaeology Remote Sensing Survey of the Proposed AAV and LCAC Landing Beaches on Tinian (Unai Chulu and Unai Dankulo), Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands*. Charlottesville, VA: Southeastern Archaeological Research, Inc.

Lord, C., P. Colin, I. Zelo, and D. Helton. (2003). *Surveys of Abandoned Vessels: Guam and CNMI*. Columbia, SC: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

McKinnon, J., S. Nahabedian, and J. Raupp. (2016). A Colonial Shipwreck in Saipan, Northern Mariana Islands. *International Journal of Nautical Archaeology, 45*(1), 94–104.

McKinnon, J., T. Carrell, J. Raupp, K. Yamafune, V. Richards, J. Carpenter, J. Burns, D. Mullins, W. Hoffman, J. Nunn, A. Ropp, P. Harvey, J. Pruitt, S. Arnold, D. Sprague, and K. Clevenger. (2017). *National Park Service American Battlefield Protection Program Grant Project: East Carolina University*. Retrieved from http://www.themua.org/ECUSaipan/index.php?content=arg6.

U.S. Department of Defense. (2009). *Programmatic Agreement Among the Department of Defense Representative Guam, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, Federated States of Micronesia and Republic of Palau, Joint Region Marianas; Commander, Navy Region Marianas; Commander, 36th Wing, Andersen Air Force Base; the Guam Historic Preservation Officer, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas Islands Historic Preservation Officer Regarding Military Training in the Marianas*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Defense.

Welch, D. J. (1997). *Preliminary Archaeological Reconnaissance and Assessment of Farallon De Medinilla, Mariana Islands*. Honolulu, HI: International Archaeological Research Institute, Inc.

Welch, D. J. (2010). *Archaeological Surveys and Cultural Resources Studies on the Island of Guam in Support of the Joint Guam Build-Up Environmental Impact Statement*. Pearl Harbor, HI: Department of the Navy, Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Pacific.

3.12 Socioeconomic Resources and Environmental Justice

Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/ Overseas Environmental Impact Statement Mariana Islands Training and Testing

TABLE OF CONTENTS

3.12 Socioeconomic Resources and Environmental Justice 3.12-1
3.12.1 Affected Environment 3.12-1
3.12.1.1 Commercial Transportation and Shipping 3.12-4
3.12.1.2 Commercial and Recreational Fishing 3.12-7
3.12.1.3 Tourism 3.12-12
3.12.1.4 Environmental Justice 3.12-14
3.12.2 Environmental Consequences 3.12-17
3.12.2.1 Accessibility (to the Ocean and Airspace) 3.12-17
3.12.2.2 Airborne Acoustics 3.12-25
3.12.2.3 Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors 3.12-28
3.12.2.4 Secondary Stressors 3.12-32
3.12.3 Public Comments 3.12-34

List of Figures

Figure 3.12-1: Commercial Fisheries Landings in Guam from the Years 2013 through 2018 ..... 3.12-9
Figure 3.12-2: Commercial Fisheries Landings in the CNMI from the Years 2013 through 2018 ..... 3.12-11
Figure 3.12-3: Number of NOTMARs Issued for FDM and W-517 for the Years 2010 through 2019 ..... 3.12-19
Figure 3.12-4: Number of Days per Year Affected by Military Activities at FDM and W-517 ..... 3.12-20
Figure 3.12-5: Joint Region Marianas Facebook Post Announcing Military Training Activities at FDM and W-517 ..... 3.12-23

List of Tables

There are no tables in this section.

This page intentionally left blank.

3.12 Socioeconomic Resources and Environmental Justice

The purpose of this section is to supplement the analysis of impacts on socioeconomic resources and environmental justice presented in the 2015 Mariana Islands Training and Testing (MITT) Final Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (EIS/OEIS) with new information relevant to proposed changes in training and testing activities conducted at sea and on Farallon de Medinilla (FDM). Information presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS that remains valid is noted as such and referenced in the appropriate sections. New information made available since the publication of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS is included below to better understand potential stressors and impacts on socioeconomic resources and environmental justice resulting from training and testing activities.

The status and projected trends of socioeconomic resources described in this section represent the affected environment prior to the global coronavirus pandemic and subsequent dramatic declines in economies around the world, including in the United States (U.S.), Guam, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (CNMI). The governments of many countries, including the United States, as well as the governments of Guam and the CNMI, either limited business operations or mandated the closure of certain businesses across multiple economic sectors. The travel and tourism industry, which many people in Guam and the CNMI are dependent on for employment and income, has been particularly hard hit. The analysis in this section shows that training and testing activities would not significantly impact tourism and related recreational activities in Guam and the CNMI. Tourism in both Guam and the CNMI has grown consistently in recent years, adapting to fluctuations in international travel, and in concert with ongoing training and testing activities.

Comments received from the public during scoping related to socioeconomic resources and environmental justice are addressed in Section 3.12.3 (Public Comments). Comments received from the public during the Draft Supplemental EIS (SEIS)/OEIS commenting period related to socioeconomic resources and environmental justice are responded to in Appendix K (Public Comment Responses). Additional or updated information on environmental justice issues, commercial fishing, subsistence fishing, and tourism in the northern Marianas was added to this section.

Section 3.12 (Socioeconomic Resources) in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS analyzed subsistence fishing as a socioeconomic resource but did not identify it as an environmental justice issue. This section supplements the analysis of subsistence fishing by expanding the discussion to include other traditional fishing practices and identifying these practices as an environmental justice issue as well as a socioeconomic resource. For the purposes of this analysis, traditional fishing practices are defined by the motivation for the fishing trip and include subsistence, cultural customs, communal sharing, and non-commercial financial benefit (e.g., selling the catch to cover the costs of the fishing trip). These traditional practices, which are longstanding and defining characteristics for many in the local communities on Guam and in the CNMI, are analyzed separately from recreational and commercial fishing in this section.

3.12.1 Affected Environment

The socioeconomic resources and environmental justice issues (i.e., traditional fishing practices) analyzed in this SEIS/OEIS are the same as the resources identified and analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. The training and testing activities described in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) of this SEIS/OEIS are generally consistent with the training and testing activities analyzed in

the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and are representative of activities that the Department of Defense (DoD) has been conducting in the MITT Study Area for decades.

The concerns over socioeconomic resources and how they may be impacted by the proposed training and testing activities are similar to those as previously described in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. The U.S. Navy's operating procedures to prevent or lessen impacts on local socioeconomic resources, as described in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, remain applicable and will continue to be implemented.

As described in detail in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, the socioeconomic analysis evaluated how elements of the human environment might be affected by ongoing and proposed training and testing activities in the Study Area. The Navy identified four broad socioeconomic elements based on their association with human activities and livelihoods in the Study Area:

- Commercial transportation and shipping
- Commercial and recreational fishing
- Traditional fishing practices
- Tourism

Each of these resources is an aspect of the human environment that involves economics (e.g., employment, income, or revenue) and social conditions (e.g., enjoyment and quality of life) associated with the marine environment in the Study Area. These four elements were chosen as the focus of the analysis in this section because of their importance to the local economy and the way of life on Guam and the CNMI and the potential for these elements to be impacted by the proposed training and testing activities.

Data and information from government technical documents and reports, scientific journals, and the Navy's marine resources database of publications were reviewed to assess any changes in the socioeconomic environment from conditions described in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. The Navy concluded that socioeconomic resources in the marine environment have not changed appreciably since the year 2015.

The growth in Guam's gross domestic product (GDP) has fallen steadily from 2 percent in the year 2012 to -0.3 percent (a decline of 2.3 percent) in the year 2018. For comparison, U.S. GDP growth increased by 2.9 percent in 2018 and by 2.4 percent in 2017 (Hovland et al., 2019a). Increased spending by tourists and spending in the retail sector was offset by decreases in the construction sector following completion of a large hospital and luxury hotel (Hovland et al., 2017a, 2019a). Government spending also decreased with the completion of the Guam Port Authority's improvement plan and fewer DoD construction contracts. However, contracts for construction projects and infrastructure improvements are being awarded to prepare for the relocation of approximately 5,000 Marines and 3,500 dependents from Okinawa, Japan to Guam, which is expected to boost the economy over the next several years (Guam Economic Development Authority, 2018; U.S. Department of the Navy, 2015).

The Guam Economic Development Authority estimates that over 12,800 military personnel and their dependents reside on the island. This includes personnel at Naval Base Guam and Andersen Air Force Base, not just those who support the proposed training and testing activities (Guam Economic Development Authority, 2018). In the 2010 U.S. census, the population of Guam was 159,358 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2018a), and the Central Intelligence Agency World Factbook estimated that the population had grown to 167,358 by the year 2017 (U.S. Central Intelligence Agency, 2018a). Based on these estimates, military personnel and their dependents make up approximately 8 percent of the population of Guam. For comparison, the population on Guam grew by 5 percent from the years 2010

through 2017. In addition to the substantial economic contribution that military personnel and their dependents makes to the Guam economy through spending, taxes (e.g., sales tax), and rental or mortgage payments, the DoD continues to fund infrastructure development projects, and the funding is expected to accelerate with the relocation of the Marines. During the last decade, DoD construction contracts have totaled over $2 billion and have recently averaged nearly $240 million annually. The fiscal year (FY) 2017 National Defense Authorization Act appropriated over $253 million for military construction on Guam (Guam Economic Development Authority, 2018).

The GDP for the CNMI decreased by 19.6 percent in 2018 after increasing by 25.5 percent in 2017 (Hovland et al., 2019b). The decline was driven primarily by decreased visitor spending, including a 50 percent decline in casino gambling. Steady GDP growth from the years 2012 through 2015 preceded large increases in GDP growth in the years 2016 and 2017 and represent a multi-year, positive trend in the economy. It remains to be seen if GDP growth will rebound in the coming years. In the year 2016, the number of tourists visiting the CNMI, particularly from South Korea and China, increased by 10 percent, and private investment increased by over 60 percent, reflecting investment in the gambling industry and construction of the large casino in Garapan as well as smaller hotels on Saipan (Hovland et al., 2017b). However, in 2018, the number of visitors to the CNMI decreased by 19.8 percent, in large part due to the effects of Typhoon Yutu, which devastated the islands of Saipan and Tinian in October 2018. Both private sector spending and government spending are expected to increase in 2019 to support rebuilding and reconstruction efforts (Hovland et al., 2019b).

In the 2010 U.S. census, the population of the CNMI was 53,883 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2018b), and the Central Intelligence Agency World Factbook estimated that the population had declined to 52,263 in the year 2017 (U.S. Central Intelligence Agency, 2018b). Of the 38,679 residents of the CNMI over the age of 16, only 19 reported being in the military in the 2010 U.S. census, indicating that the economic contribution of military personnel and their dependents is not a substantial portion of the CNMI economy (U.S. Census Bureau, 2018c). The Navy has, for the past 5–10 years, had seven vessels assigned to Saipan, which provides substantial funding to the CNMI economy through fuel costs, port fees, and maintenance costs. Five of the vessels are “large, medium speed, roll on/roll off” (or LMSR) vessels and the other two are 2nd Lt. John P. Bobo “BOBO” class vessels. The LMSR vessels transport tracked military vehicles (e.g., tanks) and equipment, and the BOBO class vessels are container and-roll on/roll-off vessels used to transport cargo and ammunition. The annual budget for the five LMSR vessels is approximately $41.5 million, and the annual budget for the two BOBO vessels is approximately $9.5 million. Not every dollar enters directly into the CNMI economy; however, the port fees alone are $900 thousand for each of the seven vessels, totaling $6.3 million annually. Having the seven vessels assigned to Saipan adds millions of dollars into the CNMI economy annually.

Finally, coral reefs are an important element of Guam’s economy, supporting tourism, coastal protection, fisheries, and academic research. At the same time, reefs are also deeply embedded in the island’s culture. For example, the migratory return of traditional fish species are times of special significance, bringing friends and families together to share in the harvest (van Beukering et al., 2007). There are five main uses of coral reefs on Guam, which are integral to the strength of the economy and the health and well-being of many residents: fisheries, recreation and tourism, cultural and traditional uses, education and research, and as shoreline and infrastructure protection (Gorstein et al., 2018; van Beukering et al., 2007).

3.12.1.1 Commercial Transportation and Shipping

The military conducts training and testing activities in operating areas well away from commercially used waterways and inside special use airspace. Refer to Figure 3.12-1 and Figure 3.12-3 of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS for a depiction of commercial waterways and air routes in proximity to military operating areas and special use airspace in the Study Area. Scheduled training and testing activities are published in Notices to Mariners (NOTMARs) issued by the U.S. Coast Guard and Notices to Airmen (NOTAMs) issued by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA). These notices are accessible to the public and intended to limit or prevent conflicts between military and non-military uses of shared sea space and airspace.

Following a review of recent literature, including government technical documents and reports, scientific journals, and the Navy's marine resources database of publications, the information presented on commercial transportation and shipping, as described in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, has not appreciably changed and remains valid.

3.12.1.1.1 Ocean Traffic

Ocean traffic is the transit of commercial, private, or military vessels at sea, including submarines. In most cases, the factors that govern shipping or boating traffic include the following: adequate depth of water, weather conditions (primarily affecting recreational vessels), availability of fish (affecting the location of commercial and recreational fishing vessels), and water temperature. Higher water temperatures are correlated with an increase in recreational boat traffic, jet skis, and scuba diving activities. Most shipping lanes are located close to the coast, but those that are trans-oceanic start and end to the northwest of Guam.

Areas of surface water within the Study Area are designated as danger zones and restricted areas as described in Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Title 33 (Navigation and Navigable Waters), Part 334 (Danger Zone and Restricted Area Regulations) and established by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. A detailed discussion of danger zones and restricted areas located in the Study Area is provided in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives), Figure 2.7-1 and Table 2.7-1, in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. No changes in danger zones and restricted areas in the Study Area have been codified in the Federal Register since the publication of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. The danger zone extending from 3 to 12 NM around FDM and the danger zone at Finegayan Small Arms Range are pending approval by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; a notification will be published in the Federal Register once they are approved. Both danger zones have been analyzed previously in separate documents, including in the 2012 Mariana Islands Range Complex Airspace Final Environmental Assessment/Overseas Environmental Assessment (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2012), the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, and the 2010 Mariana Islands Range Complex Final EIS/OEIS (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2010). Refer to Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS for more information on danger zones in the Study Area.

3.12.1.1.1.1 Guam

Guam has one commercial port, which is located in Apra Harbor. The Port of Guam is the largest U.S. deepwater port in the Western Pacific, handling over 2 million tons of cargo and over 102,000 shipping containers in FY 2016 (Port Authority of Guam, 2017). The average tonnage handled by the port in FY 2015 and FY 2016 was approximately 16 percent greater than the average of the four previous years, and the average number of shipping containers processed by the port in FY 2015 and FY 2016 was 2.6 percent greater than the average of the four previous years (Port Authority of Guam, 2017). Based

on these data, trends in commercial transportation and shipping in Guam appear to be steady and somewhat positive, and the analysis presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS remains valid.

3.12.1.1.1.2 Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands

There are three ports within the CNMI: the Port of Rota, the Port of Tinian, and the Port of Saipan. The Port of Rota, or Rota West Harbor, is located on the southwestern tip of the island of Rota. The port includes a jetty with a pierside water depth of 6–10 feet (ft.), which limits the size of vessels that can access the pier. The Port of Rota is mainly used by ferry boats transporting tourists and residents from Tinian. The Port of Tinian is a small port with three finger piers and a small boat ramp. Pierside water depth ranges from 26 to 30 ft., allowing relatively large vessels to dock. The Port of Saipan is the largest and most advanced of the three CNMI ports, but is nevertheless described as a small seaport by the World Port Source (World Port Source, 2012). The vast majority of cargo transported to the CNMI comes through the Port of Saipan (Commonwealth Ports Authority, 2017). The Port of Saipan has a cargo terminal and an oil terminal with pierside depths up to 25 ft. (World Port Source, 2012). Port facilities are capable of handling loads over 100 tons, and in FY 2016 the port transferred over 560,441 tons of cargo (Commonwealth Ports Authority, 2017). This represents a 36 percent increase over the FY 2015 total and the second straight year of increases (FY 2015 tonnage was 8 percent greater than FY 2014). For all three seaports combined, total tonnage processed in FY 2016 was 581,028 tons, which is a 34 percent increase over the FY 2015 total (Commonwealth Ports Authority, 2017). Based on these data, trends in commercial transportation and shipping in the CNMI have been positive from the years 2014 through 2017, and the analysis presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS remains valid.

3.12.1.1.1.3 Transit Corridor

Major commercial shipping vessels use the shipping lanes for transporting goods between Hawaii, the continental United States, and Asia. However, there are no direct routes between Guam and the United States; stops are made in Asia (usually Japan or South Korea) before continuing on to Hawaii or the continental United States (see Figure 3.12-1 in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS). Vessels using shipping lanes are outside of military training areas and are required to follow U.S. Coast Guard maritime regulations. Based on available information, overseas commercial shipping traffic potentially passing through the transit corridor, as described in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, has not appreciably changed and remains valid.

3.12.1.1.2 Air Traffic

Air traffic refers to movements of aircraft through airspace. Safety and security factors dictate that use of airspace and control of air traffic be closely regulated. Accordingly, regulations applicable to all aircraft are promulgated by the FAA to define permissible uses of designated airspace and to control that use. These regulations are intended to accommodate the various categories of aviation, whether military, commercial, or general aviation.

Special use airspace is a type of airspace used primarily for military operations. Special use airspace has defined dimensions where flight and other activities are confined because of their nature and the need to restrict or prohibit non-participating aircraft for safety reasons. The majority of special use airspace may be used for commercial or general aviation when not reserved for military activities.

One type of special use airspace of particular relevance to the Study Area is a warning area, which is defined in 14 CFR Part 1 as follows:

> "A warning area is airspace of defined dimensions, extending from 3 nautical miles (NM) outward from the coast of the United States that contains activity that may be hazardous to non-participating aircraft. The purpose of such warning areas is to warn non-participating pilots of the potential danger. A warning area may be located over domestic or international waters or both."

On March 13, 2017, the FAA issued a final rule on the modification of the restricted area surrounding FDM (*82 Federal Register 13389*). The modification expands restricted airspace R-7201, which extends 3 NM offshore, by designating a new area surrounding R-7201. The new restricted area airspace, R-7201A, includes the airspace from 3 NM to 12 NM around FDM. Restricted airspace R-7201A became effective on June 22, 2017, and was codified in 14 CFR Part 73. While restricted area airspace R-7201A had not been designated by the FAA prior to completion of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, the Navy had requested the airspace and analyzed potential impacts on socioeconomic resources in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS in anticipation that R-7201A would be approved and designated. For details and figures describing special use airspace in the Study Area, refer to Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives).

No changes to existing special use airspace are proposed in this SEIS/OEIS.

3.12.1.1.2.1 Guam

Guam International Air Terminal is the only civilian air transportation facility on Guam. The airport is FAA certified and operated by Guam International Airport Authority, a public corporation and autonomous agency of the Government of Guam. Guam International Air Terminal contains two runways and facilities that were part of the now-closed Naval Air Station Agana. Eight major airlines operate out of Guam International Air Terminal, making it a hub of air transportation for Micronesia. Military aircraft originating from Guam most often transit to one of the three warning areas located south of Guam (Figure 2.1-2).

From FY 2014 through FY 2016, the number of passengers arriving at Guam International Airport increased from approximately 1.34 million to 1.51 million; nearly half originated from Japan (Guam Visitors Bureau, 2017). This represents an increase of over 12 percent, a trend that is expected to continue.

Based on the available information, air traffic on Guam, as described in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, has not appreciably changed and remains valid.

3.12.1.1.2.2 Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands

Saipan International Airport is the largest commercial airport in the CNMI and the main gateway for commercial air traffic into the CNMI (Commonwealth Ports Authority, 2005). The airport has an 8,700 ft. runway with adjacent taxiways and can accommodate wide-body aircraft. Direct flights are available from major cities in Japan, South Korea, China, and Guam. A commuter terminal services the islands of Tinian and Rota. Star Mariana Air offers 3 outbound and return flights between Rota and Saipan per day, and 12 outbound and return flights between Saipan and Tinian per day (Star Mariana Air, 2018). Since the completion of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, Star Mariana Air opened air service between Rota and Guam, a service made possible by the opening of the light aircraft commuter facility at Guam International Airport (Daleno, 2015).

All commercial flights to Tinian fly into West Tinian Airport. The airport has one runway that is 8,600 ft. by 150 ft. The airport is equipped with a navigational light system for nighttime operations but has no

control tower or additional navigational aids. Rota International Airport has a 6,000 ft. runway capable of handling Boeing 757 or 727 aircraft, but with load restrictions. Tinian and Rota airports primarily support inter-island flights between Tinian, Saipan, Rota, and Guam. All three CNMI airports are FAA certified.

From FY 2014 through FY 2016, the number of passengers departing from CNMI airports increased from 542,744 to 605,952, an increase of over 11 percent (Commonwealth Ports Authority, 2017). The vast majority (over 93 percent) departed from Saipan International Airport. Arrivals increased from 493,851 to 542,126 passengers (nearly 10 percent) over that same timeframe. Airport traffic is forecast to continue to increase with the addition of new airlines providing air service to and from Saipan International Airport (Commonwealth Ports Authority, 2017).

Training and testing activities are conducted at commercial airports, with appropriate planning and coordination with the local port authorities and the FAA. For example, on Tinian, the military conducts aviation training in the military lease area by delivering personnel and cargo to maneuver areas, and providing various support functions to forces already on the ground.

Airspace and sea space may be restricted around FDM. When necessary, the Navy requests that the U.S. Coast Guard issue NOTMARs and that the FAA issues NOTAMs advising the public of potentially hazardous activities occurring in the airspace and sea space surrounding FDM, which may include sea space out to 12 NM from FDM, depending on the nature of the training and testing activities being conducted.

Based on the available information, air traffic and associated activities occurring over islands and sea space in the CNMI, as described in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, has not appreciably changed and remains valid.

3.12.1.1.2.3 Transit Corridor

Commercial air routes controlled by the FAA may overlay a portion of the MITT transit corridor. Commercial aircraft typically fly above 30,000 ft. in this area, and would have no interaction with aircraft conducting training and testing activities, which occur within special use airspace (e.g., warning areas) that have minimal overlap with the transit corridor. Air traffic routes for commercial and general aviation flights departing and arriving at Guam International Air Terminal and Saipan International Airport are established such that overlap with military aircraft activities would be avoided.

3.12.1.2 Commercial and Recreational Fishing

Both the CNMI and Guam are categorized as “fishing communities” by the Western Pacific Regional Fishery Management Council. This designation is based on the portion of the population that is dependent upon fishing for subsistence; the economic importance of fishery resources to the islands; and the geographic, demographic, and cultural attributes of the communities (Western Pacific Regional Fishery Management Council, 2009, 2019).

Fishing is an integral part of the culture and way of life in the CNMI and Guam (Hovland et al., 2019a, 2019b). Most fishers do not fish exclusively for commercial, recreational, or subsistence benefit but rather for some combination of the three (Hospital & Beavers, 2012; Hospital & Beavers, 2014; Tibbats & Flores, 2012; Western Pacific Regional Fishery Management Council, 2019). In a survey conducted in 2016 as part of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration’s Coral Reef Conservation Program, over 30 percent of Guam residents reported participating in fishing or gathering of marine

resources (Hovland et al., 2019a). Even more residents of the CNMI (38 percent) reported engaging in those activities (Hovland et al., 2019b).

Commercial fishing takes place throughout the Study Area from nearshore waters adjacent to Guam and the CNMI, offshore banks, and pelagic waters. Sportfishing peaks in summer (June through August) when popular sport fish, including blue marlin and yellowfin tuna, are most abundant. Skipjack tuna are present year-round, but are most abundant in summer.

3.12.1.2.1 Guam

Commercial and recreational fishing on Guam is typically divided into three types: bottom fishing, coral reef fishing, and pelagic fishing. A 2011 survey of 147 small boat fishers on Guam revealed the traditional and cultural importance of fishing to the people of Guam. Fishers responding to the survey reported having fished from boats for an average of 20 years (Hospital & Beavers, 2012). Although 70 percent of fishers reported selling a portion (on average 24 percent) of their catch, the motivation was not to supplement their income, but mainly to defray some of the costs associated with fishing trips (e.g., fuel costs). In 2018, the average cost of a fishing trip in bottom fish fishery was $57, with 47 percent ($27) spent on fuel. Since 2009, the average cost per fishing trip has ranged from $36 to $72. The cost of fuel has been the primary expense, ranging between 38 and 50 percent of the overall cost. Expenses for ice, fishing gear, and bait make up an approximately equal portion of the remaining cost for a fishing trip. Considering that the price of fuel is heavily influenced by the global oil market, the primary cost associated with fishing is largely beyond the control of fishers (Western Pacific Regional Fishery Management Council, 2019). Even though fishing is no longer the primary source of income for many fishers, it is an important part of the social and cultural history of the people of Guam, and it remains a vital part of local communities (van Beukering et al., 2007). This point is illustrated by the manner in which fishers distribute their catch. Respondents to the survey (Hospital & Beavers, 2012) reported consuming 29 percent of their catch at home, giving away 42 percent of their catch, and selling 24 percent of their catch. The remaining balance was either released or used to barter for other goods. The survey also noted the importance of fish-aggregating devices to small boat fishers. Ninety-six percent of fishers reported having fished at a fish-aggregating device during the previous 12 months and on more than half of all fishing trips (Hospital & Beavers, 2012). The National Coral Reef Monitoring Program report estimated subsistence fishing accounted for 30 percent of coral reef and bottom fish species landed in 2016 (Gorstein et al., 2018).

More information on fishing practices on Guam, including gear types, target species, charter fishing, commonly used harbors and marinas, and popular fishing sites, is presented in Section 3.12 (Socioeconomic Resources) of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

Commercial fisheries landings for all species from the years 2005 through 2009 were presented in Section 3.12 (Socioeconomic Resources) of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (see Table 3.12-2). Total fisheries landings (in pounds of fish) and value (in U.S. dollars) steadily decreased from 2010 through 2015 before leveling off in 2016 (Figure 3.12-1, only the 2013–2018 data are shown). Total commercial landings (pounds and value) increased dramatically in 2017 and then decreased the following year to amounts comparable to 2013 and 2014 totals (Pacific Islands Fisheries Science Center, 2016a, 2019). The average estimated price per pound for commercial landings has also fluctuated, from a recent low of $2.94 per pound in the year 2015 to a high of $3.08 per pound in the year 2014 (Pacific Islands Fisheries Science Center, 2019).




Figure 3.12-1: Commercial Fisheries Landings in Guam from the Years 2013 through 2018

The declining trend in fisheries landings is consistent with the results presented by Weijerman et al. (2016), which documented a decline of over 60 percent in the annual catch of reef fish around Guam between the years 1985 and 2012. The declining catch was consistent with a decline in reef fish biomass around the island. Similar declines in reef fish fisheries have been reported for other regions in Micronesia (Cuetos-Bueno & Houk, 2018). Rather than a single cause, it appears that interconnected economic, social, and environmental factors are combining to exert pressure on remote island fisheries. For example, on the economic front, a growing demand for fresh fish worldwide has driven the development of technology to enable the transportation of fresh fish from more remote areas, including islands in Micronesia, which were not previously commercially viable. Expanding the commercial market to include these remote island fisheries has increased commercial fishing in these remote locations to the point of becoming unsustainable (Cuetos-Bueno & Houk, 2018).

3.12.1.2.2 Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands

Similar to Guam and other Pacific island communities, fishing in the CNMI is performed for commercial and recreational purposes as well as for subsistence and related cultural practices (Western Pacific Regional Fishery Management Council, 2019). Hospital and Beavers (2014) surveyed 112 small boat fishers from Saipan, Tinian, and Rota. Based on the reported information, the researchers were able to characterize fishing practices in the CNMI by analyzing the level of fishing activity, participation in commercial markets, trip costs and other fishing-related expenditures, the social and cultural importance of fishing, fishing as a means of subsistence, and attitudes and perceptions of fishing conditions and fisheries management. The results of the survey are similar to the responses provided by

small boat fishers from Guam and do not appreciably change the conclusions presented in Section 3.12 (Socioeconomic Resources) of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

The results of the survey highlighted the following characteristics of the small boat fishing community. Demographically, small boat fishers are more likely to identify as Chamorro relative to the general population. Approximately 70 percent of boat owners reported that they allowed others to use their boat, indicating that many boats are shared by multiple fishers. As with fishers in Guam, small boat fishers in the CNMI reported that fish-aggregating devices were important, and 70 percent reported using a fish-aggregating device at least once over a 12-month period. Fishers in the CNMI reported consuming approximately 28 percent of their catch at home, giving away 38 percent of their catch, and selling approximately 29 percent. The remaining 5 percent of the catch was either released or exchanged for goods and services (Hospital & Beavers, 2014). However, less than half of fishers in the CNMI were able to sell all of the catch that they wanted to sell, indicating that the market is limited.

Hospital and Beavers (2014) concluded that the CNMI small boat fisheries are a complex mix of subsistence, cultural, recreational, and quasi-commercial fishing practices and validated the socioeconomic importance of fishing to the people of the CNMI.

Small boat fishers were also asked in the survey conducted by Hospital and Beavers (2014) if military activities had affected their fishing trips in the 12 months prior to completing the survey. Approximately one-third of fishers reported trips had been affected by military exercises; however, the survey did not gather information on how trips were affected. While not explicitly clear, the results of the survey imply that waters around FDM were of particular interest to fishers and that activities at FDM were the primary source of impacts on fishing trips. Starmer (2005) noted that many target fish species have become less common in waters around Saipan and Tinian and are more abundant in waters surrounding FDM, which may be an incentive for fishers to attempt to fish near FDM rather than at other unrestricted locations. The Navy has conducted periodic surveys of the waters around FDM and observed that the abundance and size of reef fishes around the island is equal to or greater than at many of the inhabited islands in the Mariana Archipelago where fishing regularly occurs (Smith & Marx, 2016).

A 2016 survey of CNMI fishers reinforced similar themes reported on in previous surveys (Ayers, 2018; Hospital & Beavers, 2014). Survey responses were separated into four broad categories: economic issues; role of government, institutions, and military impacts; fisheries and resource trends; and social and educational issues. Out of 166 individual responses, 70 were related to economic issues, with nearly half of those (33) expressing concerns over a diminishing market for locally caught fish. Impacts from tourism were mixed, with some respondents uneasy about increased pollution while others were hoping more tourists would lead to a greater demand for fish (Ayers, 2018). Thirteen comments were associated with impacts from military activities, with 11 of the comments coming from Tinian fishers. (2 from Saipan and 0 from Rota). Tinian fishers reported being affected by closures of certain favorable shoreline casting areas and preferred trolling areas when military training activities took place (Ayers, 2018). Most of the remaining comments were associated with other topics of interest to fishers (e.g., regulations, illegal fishing, nutrition) but were less relevant to analysis in the SEIS/OEIS.

Commercial fisheries landings in the CNMI for all species from the years 2005 through 2009 were presented in Section 3.12 (Socioeconomic Resources) of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (see Table 3.12-2 in that document). From the years 2010 to 2011, total fisheries landings (in pounds of fish) decreased, but then began a positive trend, reaching a high of nearly 350,000 pounds in the year 2013. In the years

following, landings generally declined to about 200,000 pounds in the year 2018 (Figure 3.12-2) (Pacific Islands Fisheries Science Center, 2016b). The value of commercial landings followed a similar pattern, reaching a high of over $865,000 in the year 2014 but decreasing by 34 percent in the year 2015. Following the trend in pounds, the value of commercial landings in the CNMI decreased steadily between 2016 and 2018 (Pacific Islands Fisheries Science Center, 2019). The average estimated price per pound varied from one year to the next, ranging between $2.97 in the year 2013 and $3.74 in the year 2015.




Figure 3.12-2: Commercial Fisheries Landings in the CNMI from the Years 2013 through 2018

The trend in commercial fisheries landings, pounds and value, from the years 2013 through 2018 has generally declined, particularly over the most recent three years (2016–2018). The historical trend of landings in the coral reef fishery, one of the three major fisheries in the CNMI and Guam and of particular importance to traditional fishers, clearly shows a decline (Cuetos-Bueno & Houk, 2014). Since the 1950s, the researchers estimate that commercial and non-commercial reef fishery landings in the CNMI have declined by 39–73 percent. In addition to greater fishing pressure from commercial, recreational, and traditional fishing, particularly near population centers, a decline in the health and extent of coral reefs in the region has contributed to decreased landings. See Section 3.8 (Marine Invertebrates) for more information on coral reefs in the Study Area. Commercial fishing in the CNMI is not economically viable for most fishers given that the local price per pound for most species has remained relatively fixed for the past 25 years (Ayers, 2018). The rising costs of fishing gear, tackle, boats and associated maintenance, and fuel have made it increasingly difficult for CNMI fishers to make a living as commercial fishers (Ayers, 2018; Hospital & Beavers, 2014). In 2017, the average cost of a

fishing trip in the bottomfish fishery was $38, with 84 percent ($32) spent on fuel. Since 2009, the average cost per fishing trip has ranged from $19 to $65; consistent with the Guam bottomfish fishery, the cost of fuel has been the primary expense, ranging between 78 and 92 percent of the overall cost. Since the price of fuel is heavily dependent on the global oil market, the primary cost associated with fishing is largely beyond the control of fishers (Western Pacific Regional Fishery Management Council, 2019).

The majority of training and testing activities occur offshore in deep waters and not in close proximity to coral reefs, which are located in relatively shallow, nearshore waters. Refer to Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) and Appendix A (Training and Testing Activities Descriptions) for information on where the proposed training and testing activities typically occur. Refer to Section 3.8 (Marine Invertebrates) for information and the locations of coral reefs in the Study Area. Some activities, such as those occurring at FDM, have the potential to affect coral reefs and, by extension, the coral reef fishery. Surveys conducted by Smith and Marx (2016) indicate that the health, abundance, and biomass of reef fish populations in the vicinity of FDM are comparable or superior to populations at other locations in the CNMI, likely due to the de facto protection from fishing that results from restricting access to the area around FDM. The authors conclude that training and testing activities are having little to no negative impact on the reef fish fishery. Having a de facto protected area around FDM may benefit the reef fish fishery in the CNMI, beyond the restricted area around FDM; however, restricting access to nearshore areas (within 3 NM) around FDM where target species occur limits the ability for fishers to gain access to potentially productive fishing sites.

3.12.1.2.3 Transit Corridor

There are no data on commercial or recreational fishing within the transit corridor. Navy vessels using the corridor travel east from Guam directly into ocean waters far from shore. Due to the distance from land and a lack of known fishing areas within the corridor, it is assumed that there is limited to no commercial and recreational fishing activity within the transit corridor.

3.12.1.3 Tourism

Coastal tourism and associated recreational activities that tourists participate in can be defined as the full range of tourism, leisure, and recreationally oriented activities that take place in the coastal zone and offshore coastal waters. From an economic point of view, tourism drives infrastructure development (e.g., hotels, resorts, restaurants, vacation homes), businesses (e.g., retail shops, marinas, fishing tackle stores, dive shops), and services (e.g., guided tours, charter boat cruises, cultural exhibitions arranged for tourists) that create local jobs and tax revenue for the local government. In-water activities that attract tourists to Guam and the CNMI include swimming, snorkeling, scuba diving, wildlife watching (e.g., dolphin cruises), pleasure boating, sailing, and annual events such as the Rota Blue triathlon.

3.12.1.3.1 Guam

Tourism is Guam's largest industry; it generates $1.5 billion annually, makes up 60 percent of business revenue, and supports 33 percent of all employment on the island (Guam Visitors Bureau, 2014, 2017). In 2016, Guam welcomed over million 1.53 million visitors, which is the highest annual total for visitor arrivals on Guam in any calendar year (Guam Visitors Bureau, 2017). Visitors from Japan accounted for half, approximately 752,000 visitors; however, Japanese visitors made up 76 percent of the market in 2010 (Guam Visitors Bureau, 2014, 2017). The decline in the Japanese market share is not entirely due to a reduction in visitors from Japan. It is also attributed to Guam's efforts to broaden its tourism market

to include visitors from other countries, particularly China, which has the fastest-growing visitor market in the world. China contributed just 0.7 percent of visitors to Guam in the year 2012, but 1.8 percent in the year 2016, and the Guam Visitor's Bureau projects that Chinese visitors will make up between 5.7 and 17.5 percent of tourists by the year 2020 (Guam Visitors Bureau, 2014, 2017). The other significant visitor markets in the year 2016 were South Korea (34.8 percent), the United States (5.2 percent), and Taiwan (2.8 percent).

Approximately 23 percent of the value of Guam's GDP in the year 2016 was from spending by the federal government, including defense spending (Hovland et al., 2017a). Revenue from the government has provided Guam with an economic buffer against fluctuations in the tourism industry. Tourism in Guam has continued to increase both in the number of visitors and in its contribution to the economy since completion of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Even though trends in tourism are positive, the existing conditions and the results of the analysis of impacts on tourism presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS remain valid.

3.12.1.3.2 Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands

Tourism is the largest industry in the CNMI and has driven a positive growth in GDP over the past five years (Hovland et al., 2017b; Marianas Visitors Authority, 2016). Visitors from South Korea and China each made up 38 percent of the market in FY 2015, increasing their market share by 39 percent and 15 percent over FY 2014, respectively. The number of visitors from Japan, which has historically been the dominant market, made up just 18 percent of visitors in FY 2015, a 23 percent decrease over FY 2014. The decline is primarily attributed to a poor exchange rate for Japanese travelers and Japan's stagnant economy; however, it has also been a challenge to maintain regular direct flights from Japan to the CNMI (Marianas Visitors Authority, 2016). Visitors from Russia declined by 80 percent in FY 2015 due to the suspension of direct flights to the CNMI, economic sanctions instituted by the European Union and the United States, and a drop in global oil prices. In FY 2016, the total number of visitors from all countries combined increased by 10 percent over FY 2015, exceeding 500,000 for the first time in the past 10 years (Hovland et al., 2017b; Marianas Visitors Authority, 2018). Visitation continued to increase in FY 2017, reaching 653,150 arrivals, due primarily to increases in the number of visitors from South Korea and China and despite declining visitation from Japan (Marianas Visitors Authority, 2018). In FY 2018, the number of visitors declined for the first time since FY 2011, falling to 607,593; although, with the exception of FY 2017, that was the highest total over the past 10 years. However, the trend continued into FY 2019, and as of July 2019, overall visitation was down sharply by more than 32 percent compared to FY 2018, and all major markets (South Korea, China, and Japan) were down between 20 and 73 percent (Marianas Visitors Authority, 2019).

Cruise ships have recently begun visiting the Northern Mariana Islands, fueling a budding tourism industry on Pagan Island and the Maug Islands (Silversea, 2019). Cruises offered by Silversea depart from Guam and visit Saipan before moving north, with a final destination in Japan.

Approximately 2 percent of the value of the CNMI's GDP in the year 2016 was from spending by the federal government and 21 percent was from spending by the territorial government (Hovland et al., 2017b). Government spending buffers the CNMI economy against downturns in tourism; however, the CNMI does not receive the same proportion of federal funds as Guam, leaving the CNMI economy more susceptible to fluctuations in tourism. Even though trends in tourism are positive, the existing conditions, as presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, and the results of the analysis of impacts on tourism remain valid.

3.12.1.3.3 Transit Corridor

It is assumed that there is little to no tourism activity within the transit corridor due to the distance from land and because the majority of tourism activities occur in nearshore waters.

3.12.1.4 Environmental Justice

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency defines environmental justice as the "fair treatment" and "meaningful involvement" of all people regardless of race, color, national origin, or income with respect to the development, implementation, and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations, and policies (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2016). The phrase "fair treatment" means that no group of people should bear a disproportionate share of the negative environmental consequences resulting from industrial, governmental, and commercial operations or policies. The phrase "meaningful involvement" means that

- "people have an opportunity to participate in decisions about activities that may affect their environment or health,
- the public's contribution can influence the regulatory agency's decision,
- their concerns will be considered in the decision-making process, and
- the decision makers seek out and facilitate the involvement of those potentially affected" (Federal Aviation Administration, 2015).

Based on data from the 2010 U.S. Census, the population over the age of 16 in Guam was 113,067, which represents the working population (U.S. Census Bureau, 2018a). Of those people who are of working age, 61.4 percent were employed in the civilian workforce and 4.4 percent were in the armed forces. According to the census data, 2.3 percent of employed people in Guam also participated in a subsistence activity (e.g., fishing), and just 0.6 percent of people who were not in the labor force participated in a subsistence activity. Therefore, less than 3 percent of the working age population reported participating in a subsistence activity in the year 2010, which is likely to be fishing, but does not exclude other activities, such as growing crops. In the CNMI, 38,679 people are of employable age (at least 16 years old), and 64.2 percent are employed in the civilian workforce (U.S. Census Bureau, 2018b). According to the census data, 2.9 percent of employed people in the CNMI also participated in a subsistence activity (e.g., fishing), and just 0.6 percent of people who were not in the labor force participated in a subsistence activity. Therefore, approximately 3 percent of the working age population in the CNMI reported participating in a subsistence activity in the year 2010.

Traditional fishing practices were identified by residents of Guam and the CNMI as having the potential to be impacted by the proposed training and testing activities occurring at sea and on FDM.

3.12.1.4.1 Traditional Fishing Practices

Lower-income communities are more likely to engage in subsistence fishing and may be disproportionately affected by declines in a fishery (Allen & Bartram, 2008; Allen, 2013; Hospital & Beavers, 2014; Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, 1997). An important part of the cultural heritage of local communities practicing traditional fishing is sharing the catch, which lower-income individuals and families in the community may depend on as a source of nutrition whether or not they fish. Most subsistence fishing is expected to occur within 3 NM from shore, because the smaller boats that are typically used by traditional fishers are not equipped for long trips offshore, and traditional fishing sites are generally associated with nearshore reefs.

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency considers subsistence fishers to be people who rely on non-commercial fish as a major source of protein (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2002). Many communities worldwide meet this definition of subsistence fishing, including local communities on Guam and the CNMI. However, many of these communities engage in traditional fishing practices not just for subsistence or financial reasons but as part of their cultural heritage and social customs (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2002). For example, Native Alaskans regard traditional fishing practices as a way of life, not a marginal existence to overcome or to rise above.

> "It's something rich. It's spiritual. It's economic. It's social. It's getting together with your friends and your relatives going out there harvesting, and sharing with elders, sharing with widows, and that's a pride we get." (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2002).

Although this definition is from a native Alaskan fisher, similar input was received from Asian and Pacific Islander groups, more closely linked to fishers from Guam and the CNMI. For example, ethnic Asian and Pacific Islanders residing in the United States, "consider seafood collection and consumption as healthy activities that reflect a homelike lifestyle" (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2002).

Traditional fishers tend to consume non-commercial fish or shellfish at higher rates than other populations who fish, and for a greater percentage of the year, because of cultural customs or economic factors. In the United States, there are no particular criteria or thresholds (such as income level or frequency of fishing) that definitively describe traditional fishers. Allen (2013) reported on the complicated issue of defining traditional fishers in the western Pacific region, including Guam and the CNMI. Many fishers identifying as traditional or subsistence fishers also participate in recreational and commercial fishing. It is not always clear when fishers are engaging in subsistence fishing, fishing for cultural or social reasons, fishing for financial gain or leisure, or some combination, which can occur even on a single fishing trip. Nevertheless, the contribution of non-commercial traditional fishing to the GDP of U.S. Pacific island territories is likely underestimated in fisheries catch data by as much as five times (Cuetos-Bueno & Houk, 2014; Zeller et al., 2014).

The multifaceted nature of traditional fishing practices and their contribution to local communities remains difficult to quantify; however, it is clear that there is both a social and economic benefit to many in those communities even for those who rarely or never actually fish (e.g., someone who doesn't fish may receive fish at low or no cost). Allen (2013) offers a framework to better define traditional fishing practices that is aimed at disentangling traditional fishing from other types of fishing (e.g., recreational or commercial fishing). Discerning specific details on when and to what degree traditional fishing is occurring in the Study Area is beyond the scope of this analysis. However, it is clear that traditional fishing is more than an economic necessity; it is an important part of the cultural and social identity of indigenous peoples and Asian immigrant communities living in Guam and in the CNMI (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2002).

3.12.1.4.1.1 Guam

The 2015 NMFS stock assessment report for the bottomfish fishery in Guam and the CNMI concluded that the fishery was not overfished through the year 2013, and modeled projections predicted that the fishery was very unlikely to become overfished by the year 2017 (Yau et al., 2016). Consistent with those projections, the NMFS fisheries stock status report for the fourth quarter of 2019 reported that the bottomfish fishery in Guam and the CNMI was not overfished (National Marine Fisheries Service, 2020). However, coral reef fisheries, which support most traditional fishing in the Study Area, have declined over the past 30 years (Weijerman et al., 2016). From 1985 through 1990 the average annual catch was

approximately 100 tons, but from the years 2007 through 2012 the average annual catch decreased to 37 tons. The total estimated fishing effort remained relatively stable over the time period (1985–2012), indicating that fishing for reef fishes as an activity, whether for recreation, subsistence, or commercial purposes, on Guam and the CNMI was not responsible for the decline in the catch. Weijerman et al. (2016) also noted that the decline was distributed over most gear types, indicating that a change associated with a particular gear type (e.g., a restriction on usage) was not disproportionately affecting the catch. Furthermore, historical data on the biomass of targeted fish species showed a general decrease in biomass from the years 1985 through 2012 (Weijerman et al., 2016). These results show that the decline in the reef fish fishery has been occurring for decades and is expected to continue.

If the availability of target species in the reef fish fishery continues to decline, the annual catch from traditional fishers will also decline. As noted above, quantifying the total catch from traditional fishing is a complex issue that makes measuring and predicting the impacts of a decline challenging. Even though the catch may continue to decline, traditional fishing practices may not be proportionately impacted, because the social and cultural aspects of the traditional fishing are not necessarily dependent on successfully catching and harvesting fish. As noted in the research by Weijerman et al. (2016), fishing effort (i.e., a measure of how much fishing occurred) remained relatively stable despite recent declines in the catch. While target fish species may be less available, which may have a greater impact on the success of traditional practices like subsistence fishing, overall traditional fishing practices on Guam have not changed appreciably since the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, and the analysis in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS remains valid. Refer to Section 3.12.2.3 (Subsistence Use) of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS for a discussion of subsistence fishing practices on Guam.

3.12.1.4.1.2 Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands

As reported for Guam (see Section 3.12.1.4.1.1, Guam) NMFS stock assessment report predicted that the bottomfish fishery in the CNMI was highly unlikely to become overfished by the year 2017 (Yau et al., 2016). However, the catch from the non-commercial reef fish fishery in the CNMI, which supports most traditional fishing, has historically been underestimated yet has clearly been in decline since the late 1970s based on data from a new reporting system introduced at that time (Cuetos-Bueno & Houk, 2014). Since the 1950s, the catch, which was estimate to have been 450 tons per year, has declined by 39 to 73 percent depending on the scenario used to extrapolate the survey data. More recently the catch is estimate to have declined from 250 tons per year in the year 2005 to 100 tons in the year 2012, a decrease of 60 percent (Cuetos-Bueno & Houk, 2014).

Similar to traditional fishing practices in Guam, if the availability of target species in the reef fish fishery in the CNMI continues to decline, the annual catch from traditional fishers is likely to decline. Traditional fishers that are more dependent on a successful catch (e.g., subsistence fishers) may be impacted to a greater degree than fishers who engage in traditional practices for social and cultural reasons. As noted in recent research by (Weijerman et al., 2016), fishing effort remained relatively stable despite declines in the catch. While target fish species may be less available, traditional fishing practices in the CNMI have not changed appreciably since the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, and the analysis in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS remains valid. Refer to Section 3.12.2.3 (Subsistence Use) of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS for a discussion of subsistence fishing practices in the CNMI.

3.12.1.4.1.3 Transit Corridor

There are no data on traditional fishing practices occurring in the transit corridor. Navy vessels using the corridor travel east from Guam directly into ocean waters far from shore. It is assumed that traditional fishing practices do not typically occur within the transit corridor, because the corridor is a transoceanic route and the majority of traditional fishing occurs in nearshore waters.

3.12.2 Environmental Consequences

The 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS analyzed training and testing activities currently occurring in the Study Area and considered all potential stressors related to socioeconomic resources. Stressors applicable to socioeconomic resources in the Study Area are the same stressors analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS:

- Accessibility (to the ocean and the airspace)
- Airborne acoustics (weapons firing, aircraft, and vessel noise)
- Physical disturbance and strike (aircraft, vessels and in-water devices, military expended materials)
- Secondary stressors (from availability of resources)

This section evaluates how and to what degree potential impacts on socioeconomic resources from stressors described in Section 3.0 (Introduction) may have changed since the analysis presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS was completed. Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2 in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) list the proposed training and testing activities and include the number of times each activity would be conducted annually and the locations within the Study Area where the activity would typically occur under each alternative. The tables also present the same information for activities described in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS so that the proposed levels of training and testing activities under this SEIS/OEIS can be easily compared. The analysis includes consideration of the mitigation that the Navy would implement to avoid or reduce potential impacts on seafloor resources, some of which are important socioeconomic resources.

3.12.2.1 Accessibility (to the Ocean and Airspace)

3.12.2.1.1 Impacts from Limits on Accessibility Under Alternative 1

In some cases, under Alternative 1, the number of proposed training and testing events would change as compared to the number of events proposed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (see Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2 in this SEIS/OEIS for changes in the number of annual events for specific activities). Training and testing activities that would increase under Alternative 1 would potentially increase limits on accessibility to areas of the Study Area that are used by both the military and the public. However, decreases in the number of training and testing events occurring in areas of co-use would potentially decrease the number of times access to those areas is restricted. Only some training and testing activities that either increased or decreased have the potential to impact accessibility and require further analysis to supplement the analysis in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

The activities that changed (i.e., increased or decreased) are identified (highlighted) in Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2 and in Appendix F (Training and Testing Activities Matrices) in this SEIS/OEIS. The two tables and Appendix F were used together to identify which of the activities that either increased or decreased have the potential to impact accessibility in the Study Area. For example, five Gunnery Exercise (GUNEX) (Surface-to-Air–Large Caliber) activities per year were proposed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, and six are proposed under Alternative 1 in this SEIS/OEIS (Table 2.5-1). Referring to Table F-1 (Stressors by

Training Activity) in Appendix F, the activity GUNEX (Surface-to-Air) is identified with a check mark as having the potential to limit accessibility (listed as a socioeconomic stressor) by the public to areas in the Study Area.

As shown in Appendix F (Training and Testing Activities Matrices), the majority of the proposed training and testing activities introduce stressors on accessibility, which supports using the number of annual events proposed under each alternative as a metric to compare impacts. Generally, activities involving the use of aircraft, vessels, or in-water devices may temporarily limit accessibility to areas of the Study Area. Table 3.0-11 in Section 3.0 (Introduction) shows that the number of annual events using aircraft would decrease by about 10 percent under Alternative 1; however, Table 3.0-12 and Table 3.0-13 show that the number of annual events using vessels and in-water devices would increase by about 15 and 4 percent, respectively, under Alternative 1 compared to totals in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

After reviewing the changes in the numbers and types of proposed training and testing activities with the potential to limit accessibility, the Navy determined that potential impacts on accessibility would not be substantially different from the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Therefore, the analysis, supplemented below, from the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS remains valid.

Training and testing activities have the potential to temporarily limit access to areas of the ocean, which has the potential to impact commercial transportation and shipping, commercial recreation and fishing, traditional fishing practices, and tourism in the Study Area. The military requests that the U.S. Coast Guard issue NOTMARs to warn the public of upcoming training and testing activities requiring the exclusive use of sea space and to ensure the safety of the public and military personnel. Data on the number of NOTMARs issued from the years 2013 through 2019 for FDM and W-517 were added to the previous three years of data presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (Figure 3.12-3). The data show that the number of NOTMARs issued for FDM peaked at 56 in the year 2017, and for W-517 the peak was in the year 2016 at 50 NOTMARs. The average number of NOTMARs issued annually from the years 2010 through 2018 was 41 for FDM and 36 for W-517.

Prior to 2017, no NOTMARs were issued for the recently established warning areas W-11, W-12, and W-13. In the year 2017, two NOTMARs were issued for W-12, affecting a total of five days. In the year 2018, six NOTMARs were issued for W-12 (affecting 13 days), and one NOTMAR affecting one day was issued for W-11. For 2019, there were 6 NOTMARs issued for W-11, 3 for W-12, and 15 for W-13. The corresponding number of days affected by activities in the three warning areas was 27, 22, and 37, respectively. As activity in the three newer warning areas has increased, there has been a corresponding decrease in the level of activity in W-517 (Figure 3.12-3 and Figure 3.12-4).




Figure 3.12-3: Number of NOTMARs Issued for FDM and W-517 for the Years 2010 through 2019

The number of days affected by activities occurring at FDM and W-517 has varied over the ten-year period from the years 2010 through 2019 (Figure 3.12-4). The data indicate a slightly increasing trend in the number of affected days for W-517 and potential impacts on accessibility. Overall, the trend appears to be cyclical (increases followed by decreases). However, from the years 2010 through 2014, the average number of days affected was 78, and from 2015 through 2019, the average increased to 103 days, suggesting an upward trend. As noted above, increased use of W-11, W-12, and W-13 may reverse this trend in the coming year.

Access to waters around FDM between 3 and 12 NM was restricted for an average of 159 days per year (peak of 201 in the year 2012), and access to waters under W-517 was restricted for an average of 90 days per year (peak of 136 in the year 2016). Access to waters within 3 NM of FDM is restricted at all times to ensure public safety during military activities using explosive munitions and unexploded ordnance (33 CFR 334, Danger Zone and Restricted Area Regulations). If a restriction or closure is issued for any part of a particular day, then the day was considered to be affected by that closure. When a NOTMAR is issued, it specifies the time of day and the length of time that a particular area is restricted or closed to the public, which can range from a few hours to the entire day.




Figure 3.12-4: Number of Days per Year Affected by Military Activities at FDM and W-517

New information on commercial fisheries and tourism was added to Section 3.12.1.2 (Commercial and Recreational Fishing) and Section 3.12.1.3 (Tourism), respectively. While accessibility to popular fishing sites is a factor potentially affecting fishing and tourism, the data and supporting information for both industries indicate that other economic factors are driving current trends and forecasts in both industries (Cuetos-Bueno & Houk, 2014; Weijerman et al., 2016).

The military also requests that the FAA issue NOTAMs to warn the public of upcoming military activities requiring the exclusive use of airspace. Military operating areas and SUA are identified on nautical and aeronautical charts to inform surface vessels and aircraft that military activities occur in the area. When necessary, airspace used by the military is restricted for short periods of time (typically on the order of hours) to cover the timeframes of training and testing activities. The Navy posts NOTAMs when restrictions are in place prior to initiating a training or testing activity, and the military follows standard operating procedures to visually scan an area to ensure that non-participants (i.e., civilian vessels and aircraft) are not present. If non-participants are present, the military delays, moves, or cancels its activity. Public accessibility is no longer restricted once the activity concludes. Refer to Section 2.3.3 (Standard Operating Procedures) of this SEIS/OEIS for additional information on standard operating procedures.

No commercial or recreational activities occur or are permitted on or near FDM, and aircraft and marine vessels are restricted from entering within 3 NM of FDM. Even when live-fire or other potentially hazardous activities are not occurring at FDM, the threat of unexploded ordnance is always present. As with other activities, the Navy posts NOTMARs and NOTAMS at least 72 hours in advance of potentially hazardous training and testing activities at FDM. NOTMARs and NOTAMs may extend restrictions out to

12 NM as needed for certain training and testing activities to ensure the safety and protection of the public and the military. Detailed information on accessibility to areas in the Study Area is presented in Section 3.12.3.1 (Accessibility [to the Ocean and Airspace]) in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

In addition to issuing NOTMARs and NOTAMs to announce scheduled training and testing events, upcoming events are communicated to stakeholders (e.g., Guam and CNMI local mayors, Guam legislators, resources agencies, and fishers) via e-mail distribution developed by Joint Region Marianas (JRM) with stakeholder input. Notices are also sent to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, local cable channels, and emergency management offices.

Other communication outlets available to the public include the JRM Public Affairs Office, which posts press releases on the JRM website and on the JRM Facebook page (https://www.facebook.com/jrmguam/) (Figure 3.12-5). Interested members of the public can also follow the JRM on Twitter. Posts to the JRM Facebook page activate a Twitter post. Naval Base Guam Public Affairs posts press releases on the Naval Base Guam Facebook page (https://www.facebook.com/USNavalBaseGuam/), and Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Marianas Public Affairs posts press releases on their Facebook page (https://www.facebook.com/navfacmarianas/).

As new communication tools become available, the military will consider their usefulness in communicating important information to the public about training and testing activities. The military will continue to engage the public on issues associated with accessibility to the ocean and airspace within the Study Area.

As presented above, new information relevant to accessibility impacts has become available since publication of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (Figure 3.12-3 and Figure 3.12-4) (Cuetos-Bueno & Houk, 2014; Weijerman et al., 2016). However, this information confirms that there has been no appreciable change to the existing environmental conditions as presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, and the results of the analysis of impacts on accessibility to the ocean and airspace remain valid.

Direct impacts on cruises to the Northern Mariana Islands of Pagan and the island of Maug are not anticipated, because none of the proposed training and testing activities would occur on or near islands north of FDM. The cruise vessel route advertised by the Silversea cruise line (Silversea, 2019), which includes a stop in Saipan, would pass to the west of FDM on the way to Pagan. Considering that the Navy publicizes through multiple outlets when the area around FDM between 3 and 12 NM would be inaccessible, a cruise line, such as Silversea, would be able to plan accordingly to avoid or minimize any potential economic impact.

Upon completion of training and testing activities, restrictions are lifted and commercial and recreational fishers (and other non-military vessels) would be able to return to fish and transit through the area. To help manage competing demands and maintain public access in the Study Area, the military conducts its offshore operations in a manner that reduces restrictions to commercial fisherman. Military ships, fishers, and recreational users operate within the area together, and keep a safe distance between each other. Military participants would relocate as necessary to avoid conflicts with non-participants. The 3 NM area surrounding FDM is the only area designated as a surface danger zone that is permanently inaccessible to the public. The permanent designation is to ensure public safety.

The 2015 MITT EIS/OEIS notes that some training and testing activities may impact commercial and recreational fishing when areas of co-use are made temporarily, or in the case of waters surrounding FDM, permanently inaccessible to ensure the safety of the public. The number of NOTMARs issued from

the years 2010 through 2018 restricting access to waters around FDM peaked in the year 2016, and the number of days affected by activities at FDM was the highest since the year 2012 (Figure 3.12-3, Figure 3.12-4). For W-517, both the number of NOTMARs and the number of days affected peaked in the year 2016. Popular fishing areas in or adjacent to the northern part of W-517 remain accessible when activities are conducted in the southern part of the warning area (Figure 3.12-5). While closure of the entire warning area had been a concern of fishers (Tibbats & Flores, 2012), this accommodation by the military allows areas within W-517 to be open to non-military vessels for fishing and transit to Galvez Bank, Santa Rosa Reef, and White Tuna Banks (see Section 3.12, Socioeconomic Resources, in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS for details). Considering that restrictions on accessing areas of co-use would continue to be periodic, temporary, and short-term, and other fishing sites in the Study Area would be available to the public, significant impacts on access to ocean areas used for commercial and recreational fishing, tourism, and traditional fishing practices are not anticipated. Individual fishers or tourists who are unaware of a temporary closure may need to change plans abruptly, which could substantially impact that particular trip; however, the overall access by the public to ocean and air space in the Study Area would remain consistent with the level of accessibility in the recent past (see Figure 3.12-3 and Figure 3.12-4), and advance notice of pending closures to areas used by the military will help to avoid or reduce impacts.

As stated in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and summarized in this section, the potential impacts on accessibility from the proposed training and testing activities under Alternative 1 would remain consistent with ongoing activities and would not be significant. Traditional fishing practices typically occur in the same general areas as recreational fishing (Allen, 2013), which is close to shore and far from the majority of training and testing activities (with the exception of activities at FDM) that would limit access to an area.

The impacts on traditional fishers would not be disproportionately high in comparison to potential impacts on other fishers, and adverse human health or environmental effects on minority populations and low-income populations would not be disproportionately high in comparison to the general population on Guam and the CNMI. Environmental health risks or safety risks to children would not be disproportionately high compared with the general population.

3.12.2.1.2 Impacts from Limits on Accessibility Under Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)

In some cases, under Alternative 2, the number of proposed training and testing events would change as compared to the number of events proposed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (see Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2 in this SEIS/OEIS for changes in the number of annual events for specific activities). Only some activities that increased under Alternative 2 have the potential to impact accessibility to areas in the Study Area used by both the military and the public. The activities that increased are identified (highlighted) in Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2 and in Appendix F (Training and Testing Activities Matrices) in this SEIS/OEIS. For example, six Gunnery Exercise (Surface-to Air–Large Caliber) activities per year are proposed under Alternative 1, nine are proposed under Alternative 2, and this activity has the potential to limit accessibility.




Figure 3.12-5: Joint Region Marianas Facebook Post Announcing Military Training Activities at FDM and W-517

Under Alternative 2, similar to Alternative 1, activities involving the use of aircraft, vessels, or in-water devices may temporarily limit accessibility to areas of the Study Area. Table 3.0-11 in Section 3.0 (Introduction) shows that the number of annual events using aircraft is approximately the same under Alternative 2 as under Alternative 1, while Table 3.0-12 and Table 3.0-13 show that the number of annual events using vessels and in-water devices is only marginally higher under Alternative 2 compared with Alternative 1.

After reviewing the changes in the numbers and types of training and testing activities with the potential to limit accessibility, the Navy determined that potential impacts on accessibility under Alternative 2 would be the same or similar to impacts identified under Alternative 1. Therefore, increases in the

number of events shown in Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2 under Alternative 2 would have no appreciable change on the conclusions presented under Alternative 1 and in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

As stated in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and summarized in this section, the potential impacts on accessibility from the proposed training and testing activities under Alternative 2 would remain consistent with ongoing activities and activities under Alternative 1 and would not be significant. Traditional fishing practices typically occur in the same general areas as recreational fishing (Allen, 2013), which is close to shore and far from the majority of training and testing activities (with the exception of activities at FDM) that would limit access to an area.

The impacts on traditional fishers would not be disproportionately high in comparison to potential impacts on other fishers, and adverse human health or environmental effects on minority populations and low-income populations would not be disproportionately high in comparison to the general population on Guam and the CNMI. Environmental health risks or safety risks to children would not be disproportionately high compared with the general population.

3.12.2.1.3 Impacts from Limits on Accessibility Under the No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, the proposed training and testing activities would not occur. Other military activities not associated with this Proposed Action would continue to occur. Limits on accessibility to the ocean and airspace as described above would be eliminated or reduced. Therefore, existing environmental conditions would either remain unchanged or would improve slightly after cessation of ongoing training and testing activities.

Discontinuing training and testing activities as described under the No Action Alternative would reduce impacts on accessibility to areas of co-use, but would not measurably improve access to the ocean and airspace in the Study Area.

Certain limitations on accessing danger zones, restricted areas, and warning areas as described in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and in the Code of Federal Regulations would still apply for safety or regulatory reasons (e.g., safety concerns over the presence of unexploded ordnance around FDM). Refer to Code of Federal Regulations, Title 33 (Navigation and Navigable Waters), Part 334 (Danger Zone and Restricted Area Regulations), 33 CFR 165.1401 (Safety Zones), 14 CFR Part 73.1 (Special Use Airspace) for specific regulations regarding these ocean areas and airspace. A more detailed description of danger zones, restricted areas, and special use airspace in the Study Area is provided in Section 3.12.3.1 (Accessibility [to the Ocean and Airspace]) in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

Not conducting the proposed at-sea training and testing activities may have negative impacts on the socioeconomic resources of Guam and the CNMI. The number of jobs and types of jobs available on Guam, and to a lesser extent on the CNMI, may decline. The Navy and Navy personnel are an important and often stabilizing contributor to the local and regional economies. For example, vessels and associated equipment used specifically for training and testing activities would no longer be needed if all training and testing activities ceased. Consequently, the civilian and Navy personnel supporting those activities may be relocated, reassigned, or have to find other employment. The secondary effects from reducing the number of personnel who support at-sea training and testing activities could include a decline in revenue for local businesses frequented by Navy personnel and their families, such as businesses in the food services, retail, and housing sectors.

As described in Section 3.12.1 (Affected Environment), the Navy contributes to the economies of Guam and the CNMI, which includes expenditures associated with at-sea training and testing activities. If a

substantial number of Navy personnel are relocated due to the elimination of training and testing activities, a portion of the 12,800 Navy personnel and their dependents (approximately 8 percent of the population) residing on Guam would potentially be relocated off the island. A reduction in the population and Navy funding for training and testing activities may lessen the ability of military funding to stabilize the economy against fluctuations in the tourism sector. Training activities that use any of the seven vessels assigned to Saipan would no longer be conducted. This may reduce the need for or usage of one or more of the vessels, leading to a reduction in the funding expended to maintain the vessels at Saipan. Based on these two examples, the economies and social communities on Guam and the CNMI would be impacted to some degree if the proposed at-sea training and testing activities were not conducted.

3.12.2.2 Airborne Acoustics

3.12.2.2.1 Impacts from Airborne Acoustic Stressors Under Alternative 1

Training and testing activities that would increase under Alternative 1 and that use vessels, aircraft, or weapons firing would potentially increase airborne acoustics in certain areas of the Study Area that are used by the military (Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2). However, decreases in the number of training and testing events occurring in areas of co-use would potentially decrease airborne acoustics in those areas. Only some training and testing activities that either increased or decreased have the potential to generate airborne acoustics and require further analysis to supplement the analysis in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

The activities that changed (i.e., increased or decreased) are identified (highlighted) in Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2 and in Appendix F (Training and Testing Activities Matrices) in this SEIS/OEIS. The two tables and Appendix F were used together to identify which of the activities that either increased or decreased have the potential to generate airborne acoustics in the Study Area. For example, five GUNEX (Surface-to-Air–Large Caliber) activities per year were proposed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, and six were proposed under Alternative 1 in this SEIS/OEIS (Table 2.5-1 in Chapter 2, Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives). Referring to Table F-1 (Stressors by Training Activity) in Appendix F (Training and Testing Activities Matrices), the activity GUNEX (Surface-to-Air) is identified with a check mark as having the potential to generate airborne acoustics (listed as a socioeconomic stressor) in the Study Area.

As shown in Appendix F (Training and Testing Activities Matrices), the majority of the proposed training and testing activities generate airborne acoustics, which supports using the number of annual events proposed under each alternative as a metric to compare impacts. Generally, activities involving the use of aircraft, vessels, or explosive munitions may generate airborne acoustics detectable by the public in areas of the Study Area where military and civilian activities occur in close proximity. Table 3.0-11 shows that the number of annual events using aircraft would decrease under Alternative 1 compared to totals in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, and Table 3.0-16 shows that the use of nearly all types of explosive munitions would also decrease under Alternative 1.

After reviewing the changes in the numbers and types of proposed training and testing activities with the potential to generate airborne acoustics, the Navy determined that potential impacts from airborne acoustics on socioeconomic resources would not be substantially different from the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Therefore, the analysis, supplemented below, from the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS remains valid.

Loud noises generated from training and testing activities such as weapons firing, in-air explosions, and aircraft transiting have the potential to disrupt recreational activities such as wildlife viewing, boating,

fishing, and scuba diving. In addition to local residents, tourists participate in these activities in the Study Area. Encountering loud noises, particularly those that occur suddenly and nearby, could interfere with the enjoyment of several types of recreational activities. Disturbance from continuous, albeit less intense, noises could also affect the enjoyment of an activity. Airborne noises from military activities would occur on a temporary basis and only when weapons firing and in-air explosions occur and as aircraft transit through an area. Training and testing activities involving weapons firing and in-air explosions would only occur when the military can confirm the area is clear of non-participants (e.g., the public). This would reduce the likelihood that noise from these activities, which are taking place far from non-participants, would disturb residents or tourists engaged in recreational activities on the water. Furthermore, most training and testing activities involving aircraft occur more the 12 NM from shore and those that occur closer to shore are typically at least 3 NM offshore (with the exception of activities at FDM). Noises generated from training and testing activities would occur far offshore and at a great distance from the recreational activities that typically occur closer to shore, reducing the disturbing effect of any perceived noise.

Noise from aircraft overflights would occur most frequently around Guam, the busiest airport in the Study Area, during takeoff and landing. Air Traffic Control Assigned Airspace is used for training and testing activities in the Study Area. The airspace referred to as Air Traffic Control Assigned Airspace-6 overlays Guam, Saipan, Tinian, and Rota and has a lower altitude limit of 39,000 ft. Aircraft at that altitude (or higher) are not likely to generate noise at sea level that would disrupt recreational activities. Revenue from tourism and recreational activities is not expected to be impacted by airborne noise. Refer to Section 3.12.2.1.2 (Air Traffic) of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS for more information on the different types of special use airspace in the Study Area and potential socioeconomic impacts from airborne noise.

There has been no appreciable change to the existing environmental conditions as presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, and the results of the analysis of impacts from airborne noise on recreational activities and tourism remain the same. Therefore, no impacts on tourism would be anticipated because (1) most military training occurs well out to sea, while most tourism and recreational activities occur nearshore; (2) military aircraft generally depart from Andersen Air Force Base and travel north well away from tourist and residential areas; and (3) training and testing activities producing airborne noise are normally short term and temporary. Therefore, airborne noise impacts on tourism would be negligible.

As stated in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and summarized in this section, the potential impacts from airborne acoustics from the proposed training and testing activities under Alternative 1 would remain consistent with ongoing activities and would not be significant. Traditional fishing practices typically occur in the same general areas as recreational fishing (Allen, 2013), which is close to shore and far from the majority of training and testing activities that generate higher levels of airborne acoustics (with the exception of activities at FDM).

The impacts on traditional fishers would not be disproportionately high in comparison to potential impacts on other fishers, and adverse human health or environmental effects on minority populations and low-income populations would not be disproportionately high in comparison to the general population on Guam and the CNMI. Environmental health risks or safety risks to children would not be disproportionately high compared with the general population.

3.12.2.2.2 Impacts from Airborne Acoustic Stressors Under Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)

In some cases, under Alternative 2, the number of proposed training and testing events would change as compared to the number of events proposed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (see Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2 in this SEIS/OEIS for changes in the number of annual events for specific activities).Only some activities that increased under Alternative 2 have the potential to generate airborne acoustics that would be detectable by the public. The activities that increased are identified (highlighted) in Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2 and in Appendix F (Training and Testing Activities Matrices) in this SEIS/OEIS. For example, six GUNEX (Surface-to Air – Large Caliber) activities per year are proposed under Alternative 1, and nine are proposed under Alternative 2, and this activity would generate airborne acoustics that may be detectable by the public.

Under Alternative 2, activities involving the use of aircraft, vessels, or explosive munitions may generate airborne acoustics detectable by the public in areas of the Study Area where military and civilian activities occur in close proximity. Table 3.0-11 shows that the number of annual events using aircraft slightly increases under Alternative 2 compared to Alternative 1, and Table 3.0-12 shows that activities using vessels would increase marginally (<10 percent) under Alternative 2. The numbers of the different types of explosive munitions used under Alternative 2 are either the same or similar to totals under Alternative 1 (Table 3.0-16).

After reviewing the changes in the numbers and types of training and testing activities with the potential to increase airborne acoustics, the Navy determined that potential impacts from airborne acoustics under Alternative 2 would be the same or similar to impacts identified under Alternative 1. Therefore, increases under Alternative 2 would have no appreciable change on the conclusions presented under Alternative 1 and in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

As stated in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and summarized in this section, the potential impacts from airborne acoustics from the proposed training and testing activities under Alternative 2 would remain consistent with ongoing activities and activities under Alternative 1 and would not be significant. Traditional fishing practices typically occur in the same general areas as recreational fishing (Allen, 2013), which is close to shore and far from the majority of training and testing activities that generate higher levels of airborne acoustics (with the exception of activities at FDM).

The impacts on traditional fishers would not be disproportionately high in comparison to potential impacts on other fishers, and adverse human health or environmental effects on minority populations and low-income populations would not be disproportionately high in comparison to the general population on Guam and the CNMI. Environmental health risks or safety risks to children would not be disproportionately high compared with the general population.

3.12.2.2.3 Impacts from Airborne Acoustic Stressors Under the No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, proposed training and testing activities would not occur. Other military activities not associated with this Proposed Action would continue to occur. Disturbances from airborne acoustic stressors as listed above would not be introduced into the marine environment. Therefore, existing environmental conditions would either remain unchanged or would improve slightly after cessation of ongoing training and testing activities.

Discontinuing training and testing activities would result in fewer disturbances from airborne acoustics within the marine environment where training and testing activities have historically been conducted. Therefore, discontinuing training and testing activities under the No Action Alternative would lessen the

potential for disturbances from airborne acoustics, but would not measurably change the frequency or severity of disturbances from airborne acoustics experienced by the public in the Study Area.

Not conducting the proposed at-sea training and testing activities may have negative impacts on the socioeconomic resources of Guam and the CNMI. The number of jobs and types of jobs available on Guam and to a lesser extent on the CNMI may decline. The Navy and Navy personnel are an important and often stabilizing contributor to the local and regional economies. For example, vessels and associated equipment used specifically for training and testing activities would no longer be needed if all at-sea training and testing activities ceased. Consequently, the civilian and Navy personnel supporting those activities may be relocated, reassigned, or have to find other employment. The secondary effects from reducing the number of personnel who support at-sea training and testing activities could include a decline in revenue for local businesses frequented by Navy personnel and their families, such as businesses in the food services, retail, and housing sectors.

As described in Section 3.12.1 (Affected Environment), the Navy contributes to the economies of Guam and the CNMI, which includes expenditures associated with at-sea training and testing activities. If a substantial number of Navy personnel are relocated due to the elimination of training and testing activities, a portion of the 12,800 Navy personnel and their dependents (approximately 8 percent of the population) residing on Guam would potentially be relocated off the island. A reduction in the population and Navy funding for training and testing activities may lessen the ability of military funding to stabilize the economy against fluctuations in the tourism sector. Training activities that use any of the seven vessels assigned to Saipan would no longer be conducted. This may reduce the need for or usage of one or more of the vessels, leading to a reduction in the funding expended to maintain the vessels at Saipan. Based on these two examples, the economies and social communities on Guam and the CNMI would be impacted to some degree if the proposed at-sea training and testing activities were not conducted.

3.12.2.3 Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors

3.12.2.3.1 Impacts from Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors Under Alternative 1

Training and testing activities that would increase under Alternative 1 and that use vessels, aircraft, munitions, and military expended materials would potentially increase the risk of physical disturbance and strike in certain areas of the Study Area that are used by both the military and the public (Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2). However, decreases in the number of training and testing events occurring in areas of co-use would potentially decrease the potential for physical disturbance and strike in those areas. Only some training and testing activities that either increased or decreased have the potential for physical disturbance and strike and require further analysis to supplement the analysis in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

The activities that changed (i.e., increased or decreased) are identified (highlighted) in Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2 and in Appendix F (Training and Testing Activities Matrices) in this SEIS/OEIS. The two tables and Appendix F were used together to identify which of the activities that either increased or decreased have the potential to result in a physical disturbance or strike in the Study Area. For example, five GUNEX (Surface-to-Air – Large Caliber) activities per year were proposed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, and six were proposed under Alternative 1 in this SEIS/OEIS (Table 2.5-1 in Chapter 2, Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives). Referring to Table F-1 (Stressors by Training Activity) in Appendix F (Training and Testing Activities Matrices), the activity GUNEX (Surface-to-Air) is identified

with a check mark as having the potential for physical disturbance and strike (listed as a socioeconomic stressor) in the Study Area.

As shown in Appendix F (Training and Testing Activities Matrices), the majority of the proposed training and testing activities use vessels, in-water devices, aircraft, munitions, or military expended materials and could result in a physical disturbance or strike, which supports using the number of annual events proposed under each alternative as a metric to compare impacts. Table 3.0-11 shows that the number of events using aircraft would decrease by about 10 percent under Alternative 1 compared to totals in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS; however, Table 3.0-12 and Table 3.0-13 show that the number of annual events using vessels and in-water devices would increase by about 15 and 4 percent, respectively, under Alternative 1 compared to totals in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Table 3.0-15 shows that the use of some non-explosive practice munitions would increase over the totals in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, while other non-explosive practice munitions would decrease; Table 3.0-16 shows that the use of nearly all types of explosive munitions would also decrease under Alternative 1. Most types of other military expended materials would decrease under Alternative 1 (Table 3.0-15).

After reviewing the changes in the numbers and types of proposed training and testing activities with the potential for physical disturbance and strike and the numbers of munitions and other military expended materials that would be used, the Navy determined that potential impacts from physical disturbance and strike on socioeconomic resources would not be substantially different from the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Therefore, the analysis, supplemented below, from the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS remains valid.

The evaluation of impacts on socioeconomic resources from physical disturbance and strike stressors focuses on direct physical encounters or collisions with objects moving through the water or air (e.g., vessels, aircraft, unmanned devices, and towed devices), dropped or fired into the water (non-explosive practice munitions, other military expended materials, and ocean bottom deployed devices), or resting on the ocean floor (anchors, mines, targets) that may damage or encounter civilian equipment. Physical encounters that damage equipment and infrastructure could disrupt the collection (e.g., of fisheries resources) and transport of products, which could impact industry revenue or operating costs. Socioeconomic resources potentially impacted by encounters with military vessels, devices, and objects include commercial transportation and shipping, commercial and recreational fishing, traditional fishing practices, and tourism.

The majority of commercial and recreational fishing, traditional fishing practices, and tourism in the Study Area takes place in nearshore waters (less than 3 NM from shore), where, with the exception of training activities at FDM, the military conducts limited training and testing involving munitions or other expended materials. The permanent danger zone extending out to 3 NM from shore around FDM is in place to ensure that the public is not at risk from a physical disturbance or strike while an activity is being conducted and to ensure the public is not at risk from any unexploded ordnance located in nearshore waters around the island. Therefore, most recreational fishing, traditional fishing practices, and tourism activities would occur far away from physical disturbance and strike stressors.

Larger commercial fishing vessels are more likely to go beyond 3 NM and approach areas where the military trains and tests and could be affected by physical disturbances or strikes. The military's standard operating procedures, which are discussed in Section 2.3.3 (Standard Operating Procedures) of this SEIS/OEIS, includes ensuring that an area is clear of all non-participating vessels before training and

testing activities take place, which includes commercial fishing vessels (refer to Section 3.12.3.3, Physical Disturbance and Strike, of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS for detailed analysis).

Commercial shipping vessels transport goods internationally and would be expected to transit through offshore waters en route to domestic and foreign ports. Shipping vessels follow established routes which are avoided by the military during training and testing activities, and both military and civilian vessels in proximity to each other are expected to communicate their positions. In addition, the military provides advance notification of training and testing activities to the public through NOTMARs and other means of communication as described in Section 3.12.2.1 (Accessibility [to the Ocean and Airspace]). For these reasons, a direct strike or collision with a shipping vessel is unlikely.

Additional information and analysis of physical disturbance and strike stressors and the potential for interactions with commercial fishing vessels and gear is described in Section 3.12.3.3 (Physical Disturbance and Strike) of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

New information relevant to physical disturbance and strike impacts has become available since publication of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. There has been no appreciable change to the existing environmental conditions as presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, and the results of the analysis of impacts from physical disturbance and strike on commercial transportation and shipping, commercial and recreational fishing, traditional fishing practices, and tourism remain the same. The advanced public release of NOTMARs and other public notices would inform the public of upcoming activities, and enable them to plan to avoid the area.

The Navy would implement mitigation to avoid or reduce impacts from physical disturbance and strike stressors on seafloor resources in mitigation areas throughout the Study Area (see Section 5.4.1, Mitigation Areas for Seafloor Resources). The mitigation areas will help avoid or reduce potential impacts on shallow-water coral reefs, live hard bottom, artificial reefs, and shipwrecks, which are valuable assets for the snorkeling, diving, and fishing industries. Considering the size of the Navy's Study Area, the wide distribution of military expended materials over this large area, and implementation of standard operating procedures and mitigation, impacts from physical disturbances and strikes on commercial and recreational fishing, traditional fishing practices, and tourism would be negligible under Alternative 1. Refer to Section 2.3.3 (Standard Operating Procedures) of this SEIS/OEIS for additional information on the Navy's standard operating procedures and Chapter 5 (Mitigation) for information on proposed mitigation measures.

As stated in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and summarized in this section, the potential impacts from a potential physical disturbance and strike from the proposed training and testing activities under Alternative 1 would remain consistent with ongoing activities and would not be significant. Traditional fishing practices typically occur in the same general areas as recreational fishing (Allen, 2013), which is close to shore and far from the majority of training and testing activities with the potential to result in a physical disturbance and strike (with the exception of activities at FDM). Therefore, there would be no disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects on any minority populations and low-income populations or disproportionately high environmental health risks or safety risks to children.

3.12.2.3.2 Impacts from Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors Under Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)

In some cases, under Alternative 1, the number of proposed training and testing events would change as compared to the number of events proposed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (see Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2 in this SEIS/OEIS for changes in the number of annual events for specific activities).Only some activities

that increased under Alternative 2 have the potential to increase the risk of physical disturbance and strike in certain areas of the Study Area that are used by both the military and the public. The activities that increased are identified (highlighted) in Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2 and in Appendix F (Training and Testing Activities Matrices). For example, six GUNEX (Surface-to Air–Large Caliber) activities per year are proposed under Alternative 1, nine are proposed under Alternative 2, and this activity has the potential to result in a physical disturbance or strike.

As shown in Appendix F (Training and Testing Activities Matrices), the majority of the proposed training and testing activities use vessels, in-water devices, aircraft, munitions, or military expended materials and could result in a physical disturbance or strike, which supports using the number of annual events proposed under each alternative as a metric to compare impacts. Table 3.0-11 shows that the number of annual events using aircraft is approximately the same under Alternative 2 as under Alternative 1, while Table 3.0-12 and Table 3.0-13 show that the number of events using vessels and in-water devices is only marginally higher under Alternative 2 compared with Alternative 1. Table 3.0-14 shows that the use of some non-explosive practice munitions would increase under Alternative 2 compared to totals under Alternative 1; the numbers of the different types of explosive munitions used under Alternative 2 are either the same or similar to totals under Alternative 1 (Table 3.0-16). Five out of the 10 different types of other military expended materials shown in Table 3.0-15 would also increase under Alternative 2; however, the increases are not substantial.

After reviewing the changes in the numbers and types of training and testing activities with the potential to increase the probability of a physical disturbance and strike, the Navy determined that potential impacts from physical disturbance and strike under Alternative 2 would be the same or similar to impacts identified under Alternative 1. Therefore, increases under Alternative 2 would have no appreciable change on the conclusions presented under Alternative 1 and in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

As stated in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and summarized in this section, the potential impacts from a potential physical disturbance and strike from the proposed training and testing activities under Alternative 2 would remain consistent with ongoing activities and activities under Alternative 1 and would not be significant. Traditional fishing practices typically occur in the same general areas as recreational fishing (Allen, 2013), which is close to shore and far from the majority of training and testing activities with the potential to result in a physical disturbance and strike (with the exception of activities at FDM).

The impacts on traditional fishers would not be disproportionately high in comparison to potential impacts on other fishers, and adverse human health or environmental effects on minority populations and low-income populations would not be disproportionately high in comparison to the general population on Guam and the CNMI. Environmental health risks or safety risks to children would not be disproportionately high compared with the general population.

3.12.2.3.3 Impacts from Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors Under the No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, proposed training and testing activities would not occur. Other military activities not associated with this Proposed Action would continue to occur. Physical disturbance and strike stressors as listed above would not be introduced into the marine environment. Therefore, existing environmental conditions would either remain unchanged or would improve slightly after cessation of ongoing training and testing activities.

Discontinuing training and testing activities would result in fewer physical disturbance and strike stressors within the marine environment where training and testing activities have historically been conducted. Therefore, discontinuing training and testing activities under the No Action Alternative would lessen the potential for physical disturbances and strikes, but would not measurably change the number of times the public is exposed to physical disturbance and strike stressors in the Study Area.

Not conducting the proposed at-sea training and testing activities may have negative impacts on the socioeconomic resources of Guam and the CNMI. The number of jobs and types of jobs available on Guam and to a lesser extent on the CNMI may decline. The Navy and Navy personnel are an important and often stabilizing contributor to the local and regional economies. For example, vessels and associated equipment used specifically for at-sea training and testing activities would no longer be needed if all at-sea training and testing activities ceased. Consequently, the civilian and Navy personnel supporting those activities may be relocated, reassigned, or have to find other employment. The secondary effects from reducing the number of personnel who support at-sea training and testing activities could include a decline in revenue for local businesses frequented by Navy personnel and their families, such as businesses in the food services, retail, and housing sectors.

As described in Section 3.12.1 (Affected Environment), the Navy contributes to the economies of Guam and the CNMI, which includes expenditures associated with at-sea training and testing activities. If a substantial number of Navy personnel are relocated due to the elimination of training and testing activities, a portion of the 12,800 Navy personnel and their dependents (approximately 8 percent of the population) residing on Guam would potentially be relocated off the island. A reduction in the population and Navy funding for training and testing activities may lessen the ability of military funding to stabilize the economy against fluctuations in the tourism sector. Training activities that use any of the seven vessels assigned to Saipan would no longer be conducted. This may reduce the need for or usage of one or more of the vessels, leading to a reduction in the funding expended to maintain the vessels at Saipan. Based on these two examples, the economies and social communities on Guam and the CNMI would be impacted to some degree if the proposed at-sea training and testing activities were not conducted.

3.12.2.4 Secondary Stressors

Secondary stressors resulting in indirect impacts on socioeconomic resources are discussed in Section 3.12.3.4 (Secondary Impacts from Availability of Resources) of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. A secondary stressor, as defined in this section, is a stressor that has the potential to affect a socioeconomic resource as a result of a direct effect on another non-socioeconomic resource. For example, if a training activity has the potential to affect certain fish species, and those same fish are part of an economically important fishery, then the effect of the stressor on those fish species could have an indirect, or secondary, effect on the socioeconomic resource of commercial fishing.

3.12.2.4.1 Secondary Impacts from Availability of Resources Under Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)

The secondary stressor “resource availability” pertains to the potential for loss of fisheries resources, including some invertebrates, within the Study Area, which is relevant to commercial, recreational, and traditional fishing practices as well as tourism. Additionally, impacts on marine mammal populations would have the potential to impact revenue for whale watching businesses if a substantial number of whales were to leave the area or not return to areas where they have been commonly seen. Analysis in Sections 3.4 (Marine Mammals), 3.8 (Marine Invertebrates), and 3.9 (Fishes) determined, however, that

no population-level impacts on marine species are anticipated from the proposed training and testing activities. Those who consume fish and shellfish on a regular basis have also expressed concerns over bioaccumulation of potentially toxic chemicals released from corroding munitions and other expended materials associated with training and testing activities. Analysis presented in Section 3.1 (Sediments and Water Quality) shows that there is no significant toxicity to most marine species from munitions constituents at concentrations on the order of parts per billion, which is typical of sites where munitions have resided for decades, and only in close proximity to a corroding munition (i.e., 1–2 m). At these concentrations, toxicity studies indicate that munitions are unlikely to have an adverse effect on marine species at the population and community level. Specifically for explosives, the constituent chemical compounds that make up the explosive materials are not considered to be the types of compounds to bioaccumulate in the food chain. Scientists who study bioaccumulation, rate the likelihood that a substance would bioaccumulate in a particular food chain by assigning it a bioaccumulation factor. The factor values for constituent compounds of explosives are less than 14 ml/g (for whole organisms), which is more than two orders of magnitude lower than the 5,000 ml/g threshold defined to indicate that a compound has the potential for bioaccumulation (Lotufo, 2018). For these reasons, there would be no secondary impacts on commercial or recreational fishing, traditional fishing practices, or tourism in the Study Area from the use of explosives under Alternative 1 or Alternative 2.

As stated in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and summarized in this section, the secondary impacts from the proposed training and testing activities under Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 would remain consistent with ongoing activities and would not be significant. Traditional fishing practices typically occur in the same general areas as recreational fishing (Allen, 2013), which is close to shore and far from the majority of training and testing activities, with the exception of activities at FDM.

The impacts on traditional fishers would not be disproportionately high in comparison to potential impacts on other fishers, and adverse human health or environmental effects on minority populations and low-income populations would not be disproportionately high in comparison to the general population on Guam and the CNMI. Environmental health risks or safety risks to children would not be disproportionately high compared with the general population.

3.12.2.4.2 Secondary Impacts from Availability of Resources Under the No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, proposed training and testing activities would not occur. Other military activities not associated with this Proposed Action would continue to occur. Secondary stressors impacting resource availability as listed above would not be introduced into the marine environment. Therefore, existing environmental conditions would either remain unchanged or would improve slightly after cessation of ongoing training and testing activities.

Discontinuing training and testing activities would result in fewer secondary stressors from the availability of resources within the marine environment where training and testing activities have historically been conducted. Therefore, discontinuing training and testing activities under the No Action Alternative would lessen the potential for secondary stressors, but would not measurably improve the availability of resources associated with secondary impacts on socioeconomic resources in the Study Area.

Not conducting the proposed at-sea training and testing activities may have negative impacts on the socioeconomic resources of Guam and the CNMI. The number of jobs and types of jobs available on Guam and to a lesser extent on the CNMI may decline. The Navy and Navy personnel are an important and often stabilizing contributor to the local and regional economies. For example, vessels and

associated equipment used specifically for at-sea training and testing activities would no longer be needed if all at-sea training and testing activities ceased. Consequently, the civilian and Navy personnel supporting those activities may be relocated, reassigned, or have to find other employment. The secondary effects from reducing the number of personnel who support at-sea training and testing activities could include a decline in revenue for local businesses frequented by Navy personnel and their families, such as businesses in the food services, retail, and housing sectors.

As described in Section 3.12.1 (Affected Environment), the Navy contributes to the economies of Guam and the CNMI, which includes expenditures associated with at-sea training and testing activities. If a substantial number of Navy personnel are relocated due to the elimination of training and testing activities, a portion of the 12,800 Navy personnel and their dependents (approximately 8 percent of the population) residing on Guam would potentially be relocated off the island. A reduction in the population and Navy funding for training and testing activities may lessen the ability of military funding to stabilize the economy against fluctuations in the tourism sector. Training activities that use any of the seven vessels assigned to Saipan would no longer be conducted. This may reduce the need for or usage of one or more of the vessels, leading to a reduction in the funding expended to maintain the vessels at Saipan. Based on these two examples, the economies and social communities on Guam and the CNMI would be impacted to some degree if the proposed at-sea training and testing activities were not conducted.

3.12.3 Public Comments

The public raised a number of concerns during the scoping period about socioeconomic resources and environmental justice. The issues are summarized in the list below. Comments received from the public during the Draft SEIS/OEIS commenting period on the topics of socioeconomic resources and environmental justice are responded to in Appendix K (Public Comment Responses).

- **Restricting the ability of American citizens to move between islands to fish, recreate, or for general travel –** Access to certain areas of the Study Area is restricted during potentially hazardous training and testing activities to ensure the safety of the public and military personnel. Most areas (with the notable exception of the 3 NM danger zone around FDM) are only restricted on a temporary basis and are accessible to the public when not in use by the military. See Section 3.12.2.1 (Commercial Transportation and Fishing) and 3.12.3.1 (Accessibility [to the Ocean and Airspace]) in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.
- **Concerns regarding negative effects of sonar testing on swimming and diving in the waters off Guam and the CNMI –** The Navy follows established standard operating procedures when conducting training and testing activities with sonar to ensure that swimmers, divers, and any anyone else who might be in the water are safe (see Section 2.3.3, Standard Operating Procedures). The Navy avoids using sonar near popular swimming and diving sites. See Section 3.12.2.1 (Accessibility [to the Ocean and Airspace]) and Section 3.12.2.4 (Tourism) in the in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Also, refer to Section 3.13 (Public Health and Safety) for information on Navy procedures for protecting swimmers and divers.
- **Improve safety for fishermen by issuing NOTMARs in advance of military activities and posting NOTMARs at local marinas for boaters to view and be warned –** The Navy requests that the U.S. Coast Guard issues NOTMARs to make fishers and other members of the public aware of upcoming training and testing activities that would limit public access to areas of the Study Area. The Navy continues to search for new ways to communicate important information to the public

and now posts information about upcoming closures to several Navy Facebook pages. See Section 3.12.2.1 (Commercial Transportation and Shipping) and 3.12.3.1 (Accessibility [to the Ocean and Airspace]) in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Also, refer to Section 3.13 (Public Health and Safety) for information on Navy procedures for protecting mariners.

- **Request additional and more frequent NOTMARs during military training (e.g., broadcast every two hours, posters at boat harbors, Facebook, and direct communication with fishers) –** The Navy requests that the U.S. Coast Guard issues NOTMARs to make fishers and other members of the public aware of upcoming military activities that would limit public access to areas of the Study Area. In addition to posting NOTMARs, emails are sent to Guam and CNMI local mayors, Guam legislators, resources agencies, and fishers. The distribution was developed by JRM and local stakeholders. In addition, notices are sent to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, local cable channels, and emergency management offices. The Navy continues to search for new ways to communicate important information to the public and now posts information about upcoming closures to several Navy Facebook pages. See Section 3.12.2.1 (Commercial Transportation and Shipping) and 3.12.3.1 (Accessibility [to the Ocean and Airspace]) in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.
- **Training and testing activities disturbing pelagic and economically important fish and causing them to leave the Study Area –** The analysis in Section 3.9 (Fishes) concludes that there would be no population level effects on any fish species, including economically important species. See Section 3.12.2.1 (Accessibility [to the Ocean and Airspace]) and Section 3.12.2.4 (Secondary Stressors). Also refer to Sections 3.8 (Marine Invertebrates) and 3.9 (Fishes) in this SEIS/OEIS and in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS for detailed analysis explaining why population level effects are not likely to occur.
- **Direct and cumulative impacts on recreational and commercial fishing and transport between the islands due to the location of restricted areas –** Impacts on commercial and recreational fishing and transportation between islands are not expected to have substantial socioeconomic impacts on recreational and commercial fishing in the region. Upon completion of training and testing activities, restrictions on certain areas (e.g., Apra Harbor small arms firing range) are lifted and fishers would be able to return to fish and transit through the area. To help manage competing demands and maintain public access in the Study Area, the military conducts its offshore operations in a manner that reduces restrictions on commercial fishing. Military vessels, fishers, and recreational users operate within the area together, and keep a safe distance between each other. Military participants would relocate as necessary to avoid conflicts with non-participants. Only specific areas within Study Area have been designated as danger zones or restricted areas. See Section 3.12.2.1 (Commercial Transportation and Shipping) and 3.12.3.1 (Accessibility [to the Ocean and Airspace]) in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Also See Chapter 4 (Cumulative Impacts) for a discussion on potential cumulative impacts from past, present, and future Navy and other military activities in the region occurring simultaneously with civilian activities.
- **Socioeconomic effects on recreational and traditional fishers from limiting access to fishing sites, specifically because of restricted areas –** Access to certain areas of the Study Area is restricted during potentially hazardous training and testing activities to ensure the safety of the public and military personnel. Most areas (with the notable exception of the 3 NM danger zone around FDM) are only restricted on a temporary basis and are accessible to the public when not

in use by the military. The Navy understands that individual fishers may be temporarily impacted by a particular event. The Navy will continue to communicate with the public through multiple means to alert fishers and other members of the public of upcoming activities that may limit access to fishing sites. Monitoring NOTMARs and other announcements for scheduled training and testing activities should avoid any conflicts and reduce socioeconomic impacts on fishers. See Section 3.12.2.1 (Accessibility [to the Ocean and Airspace]). See also Section 3.12.3.1.1.2 (Commercial and Recreational Fishing) and Section 3.12.3.1.1.3 (Subsistence Use) in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

- **Loss of income and revenue from loss of access to prime fishing grounds around FDM with the expansion of the restricted area around FDM –** Access to certain areas of the Study Area is temporarily restricted during potentially hazardous training and testing activities to ensure the safety of the public and military personnel. Areas within in 3 NM of FDM have been permanently restricted to maintain public safety. Even when hazardous activities are not occurring at FDM, the potential occurrence of unexploded ordnance in waters surrounding the island is a constant threat to public safety. Transiting between Guam, Saipan, Tinian, and Rota to islands located north of FDM (e.g., the Islands Unit) would potentially be impacted by designating a 12 NM danger zone around the FDM and limiting access to the area when the range is in use. A study conducted by the Pacific Islands Fisheries Science Center on fishing activity in the Islands Unit of the Marianas Trench Marine National Monument reported that vessels have historically traveled from the southern Mariana Islands to the Islands Unit (defined as the islands of Uracas, Maug, and Asuncion) an average of 3.8 times per year over the 30-year period from the years 1979 through 2009 (Kotowicz & Richmond, 2013). Travel to other islands north of FDM (e.g., Anatahan and Pagan) may be more frequent; however, the study did not address islands located south of the Islands Unit. Considering that trips between the populated island south of FDM and the Islands Unit would be relatively infrequent, the probability of military activities that temporarily limit access to ocean areas within 12 NM of FDM interfering with trips to the Islands Unit would be low. The most direct route between Saipan (the northernmost populated island) and Anatahan (the closest island north of FDM) passes more than 12 NM west of FDM. Furthermore, the military will continue to announce when FDM is not in use in addition to notifying mariners of planned activities via NOTMARs (issued by the U.S. Coast Guard) and NOTAMs (issued by the FAA) at FDM as the Navy has done in the past, which will enable mariners to better plan trips to islands north of FDM, including the Islands Unit. See Section 3.12.3.1.1.2 (Commercial and Recreational Fishing) in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.
- **Increased time and cost to transit around FDM because of the expanded restricted area around FDM –** Transiting between Guam, Saipan, Tinian, and Rota to islands located north of FDM (e.g., the Islands Unit) would potentially be impacted by designating a 12 NM danger zone around the FDM and limiting access to the area when the range is in use. A study conducted by the Pacific Islands Fisheries Science Center on fishing activity in the Islands Unit of the Marianas Trench Marine National Monument reported that vessels have historically traveled from the southern Mariana Islands to the Islands Unit (defined as the islands of Uracas, Maug, and Asuncion) an average of 3.8 times per year over the 30-year period from the years 1979 through 2009 (Kotowicz & Richmond, 2013). Travel to other islands north of FDM (e.g., Anatahan and Pagan) may be more frequent; however, the study did not address islands located south of the Islands Unit. Considering that trips between the populated island south of FDM and the Islands Unit would be relatively infrequent, the probability of military activities that temporarily limit

access to ocean areas within 12 NM of FDM interfering with trips to the Islands Unit would be low. The most direct route between Saipan (the northernmost populated island) and Anatahan (the closest island north of FDM) passes more than 12 NM west of FDM. Furthermore, the military will continue to announce when FDM is not in use in addition to notifying mariners of planned activities via NOTMARs and NOTAMs at FDM as the Navy has done in the past, which will enable mariners to better plan trips to islands north of FDM, including the Islands Unit. See Section 3.12.3.1.1.2 (Commercial and Recreational Fishing) in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

- **Request for direct compensation or development of fishery infrastructure as mitigation for loss of access to fishing grounds –** As presented in Section 3.12 (Socioeconomic Resources) of the MITT Final EIS/OEIS, the military has been conducting training and testing activities within the Study Area for decades, and has taken and will continue to take measures to prevent interruption of commercial and recreational fishing activities. The Navy limits fishing activities in only a small portion of the Study Area and only to the extent necessary to accommodate the training and testing activities. The military does not limit fishing activities from occurring in areas of the Study Area that are not being used for training and testing activities. To mitigate impacts to fishers and minimize potential interactions between military and civilian activities, the Navy will continue to publish scheduled training event times and locations on publicly accessible Navy websites and through U.S. Coast Guard issued Notices to Mariners, up to 6 months in advance of planned events. Press releases have been continuously provided to Guam and CNMI Mayors' offices and interested fishing organizations and fishers. When feasible, the military will use these same means of communication to notify the public of changes to previously published restrictions. Advanced planning on behalf of the military and effective communication of the military's plans attempt to maximize accessibility to desirable fishing locations and minimize the effect on commercial and recreational fishing activities. To the extent practicable, the Navy will continue to limit training and testing activities in and around the location of fish aggravating devices. The Navy will continue to consult with the public and local fishers on issues affecting commercial and recreational fishing in order to limit potential impacts associated with military activities. The issue of compensation to impacted fisheries is beyond the scope of the Navy's analysis in this SEIS/OEIS.
- **Displacement of fishermen from traditional fishing grounds –** Access to certain areas of the Study Area is restricted during potentially hazardous training and testing activities to ensure the safety of the public and military personnel. Most areas (with the notable exception of the 3 NM danger zone around FDM) are only restricted on a temporary basis and are accessible to the public when not in use by the military. See Section 3.12.1.4 (Environmental Justice) and Section 3.12.2.1 (Accessibility [to the Ocean and Airspace]) of this SEIS/OEIS. See also Section 3.12.3.1 (Accessibility [to the Ocean and Airspace]) and Section 3.12.3.1.1.3 (Subsistence Use) in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.
- **Impacts on traditional fishing practices –** Traditional fishers, including subsistence fishers, typically fish from the shore or from small vessels within 3 NM of shore. The majority of training and testing activities occur in offshore waters (beyond 3 NM and in many cases beyond 12 NM) where traditional fishing typically does not occur, reducing any potential overlap with military activities. The Navy understands that individual fishers may be temporarily impacted by a particular event. The Navy will continue to communicate with the public through multiple means to alert traditional fishers of upcoming activities that may limit access to popular fishing

sites. Monitoring NOTMARs and other announcements for scheduled training and testing activities should avoid any conflicts and reduce socioeconomic impacts on traditional fishers. See Section 3.12.1.4 (Environmental Justice) and Section 3.12.2.1 (Accessibility [to the Ocean and Airspace]). See also Section 3.12.3.1 (Accessibility [to the Ocean and Airspace]), Section 3.12.3.1.1.3 (Subsistence Use), and 3.12.3.3.1.1 (Commercial and Recreational Fishing/Subsistence Use) in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

- **Impacts from explosives on fish stocks and traditional fishers who rely on those stocks –** The analysis in Section 3.9 (Fishes) concludes that there would be no population-level effects on any fish species, including economically important species. See Section 3.12.2.4 (Secondary Stressors) and Section 3.12.3.1.1.3 (Subsistence Use) in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.
- **Environmental justice concerns that the people of Guam and the Northern Marianas are disproportionately impacted by military training and testing in relation to other training areas available to the U.S. Navy worldwide –** The military conducts training and testing activities very similar to activities proposed in the MITT SEIS/OEIS in Hawaii, Southern California, the Pacific Northwest, off the Atlantic coast, and in the Gulf of Mexico. The level of activity in most if not all of these locations is greater than in the MITT Study Area, and minority and low-income populations also occur in these areas.

REFERENCES

Allen, S., and P. Bartram. (2008). Guam as a Fishing Community (Vol. 2011, pp. Administrative Report H–08–01). Honolulu, HI: Pacific Islands Fisheries Science Center.

Allen, S. (2013). Carving a niche or cutting a broad swath: Subsistence fishing in the western Pacific. *Pacific Science, 67*(3), 477–488.

Ayers, A. L. (2018). *The Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands Fishing Community Profile: 2017 Update*. Honolulu, HI: National Oceanic Atmospheric Administration Technical Memorandum.

Commonwealth Ports Authority. (2005). *Commonwealth Ports Authority*. Retrieved from http://www.cpa.gov.mp/default.asp.

Commonwealth Ports Authority. (2017). *Report on the Audit of Financial Statements in Accordance with the Uniform Guidance*. Saipan, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands: Deloitte.

Cuetos-Bueno, J., and P. Houk. (2014). Re-estimation and synthesis of coral-reef fishery landings in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands since the 1950s suggests the decline of a common resource. *Reviews in Fish Biology and Fisheries, 25*(1), 179–194.

Cuetos-Bueno, J., and P. Houk. (2018). Disentangling economic, social, and environmental drivers of coral-reef fish trade in Micronesia. *Fisheries Research, 199*, 263–270.

Daleno, G. D. (2015). *Airport opens new interisland terminal*. Retrieved from https://www.guampdn.com/story/news/2015/10/01/airport-opens-new-interisland-terminal/73133388/#.

Federal Aviation Administration. (2015). *1050.1F Desk Reference*. Washington, DC: Office of Environment and Energy.

Gorstein, M., J. Loerzel, P. Edwards, A. Levine, and M. Dillard. (2018). *National Coral Reef Monitoring Program Socioeconomic Monitoring Component: Summary Findings for Guam, 2016* (NOAA Technical Memorandum). Silver Spring, MD: U.S. Department of Commerce.

Guam Economic Development Authority. (2018). *United States Military*. Retrieved from http://www.investguam.com/economic-resources/military/.

Guam Visitors Bureau. (2014). Tourism 2020: Vision 2020. Tumon, GU: Guam Visitors Bureau.

Guam Visitors Bureau. (2017). *The Olympics of Pacific Island Culture*. Tumon, GU: Guam Visitors Bureau.

Hospital, J., and C. Beavers. (2012). *Economic and Social Characteristics of Guam's Small Boat Fisheries* (Administrative Report). Honolulu, HI: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

Hospital, J., and C. Beavers. (2014). *Economic and Social Characteristics of Small Boat Fishing in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands* (Administrative Report H-14-02). Honolulu, HI: Pacific Island Fisheries Science Center.

Hovland, C., J. Aversa, and T. H. Joshua. (2017a). *Gross Domestic Product for Guam increases in 2016: Tourism spending increases for the third year in a row* (News Release BEA 17-44). Washington, DC: Bureau of Economic Analysis.

Hovland, C., J. Aversa, and T. H. Joshua. (2017b). *CNMI GDP increases in 2016: Growth led by gaming industry revenues and investments* (News Release BEA 17-55). Washington, DC: Bureau of Economic Analysis.

Hovland, C., J. Aversa, and T. H. Joshua. (2019a). *Guam GDP Decreases 0.3 Percent in 2018*. www.bea.gov: Bureau of Economic Analysis.

Hovland, C., J. Aversa, and T. H. Joshua. (2019b). *CNMI GDP Decreases in 2018*. www.bea.gov: Bureau of Economic Analysis.

Kotowicz, D., and L. Richmond. (2013). *Traditional Fishing Patterns in the Marianas Trench Marine National Monument* (Administrative Report). Honolulu, HI: Pacific Islands Fisheries Science Center.

Lotufo, G. (2018). Overview of munitions constituents in Water, Sediment and Biota, Toxicity to Aquatic Biota and Derivation of Protection Levels. Presentation to SERDP/ESTCP on May 21.

Marianas Visitors Authority. (2016). *Saipan, Tinian, Rota, Marianas Visitors Authority 2015 Annual Report*. Saipan, MP: Marianas Visitors Authority.

Marianas Visitors Authority. (2018). *FY 2018 Annual Report*. Saipan, Northern Mariana Islands: Marianas Visitors Authority.

Marianas Visitors Authority. (2019). *Visitor Arrival Statistics*. Saipan, Northern Mariana Islands: Marianas Visitors Authority.

National Marine Fisheries Service. (2020). *Summary of Stocks for FSSI Stocks - 4th Quarter Update*. Silver Spring, MD: National Marine Fisheries Service.

Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment. (1997). *Consumption of Fish and Shellfish in California and the United States*. *Chemicals in Fish, Report No. 1, Final Draft Report.* Retrieved from http://oehha.ca.gov/fish/special_reports/fishy.html.

Pacific Islands Fisheries Science Center. (2016a). Commercial Landings in Guam (2010–2015). In M. Zickel (Ed.), *Unpublished Dataset*.

Pacific Islands Fisheries Science Center. (2016b). Commercial Landings in CNMI (2010–2015). In M. Zickel (Ed.), *Unpublished Dataset*.

Pacific Islands Fisheries Science Center. (2019). *Guam CNMI Fisheries Data*. Retrieved from https://apps-pifsc.fisheries.noaa.gov/wpacfin/total-landings.php.

Port Authority of Guam. (2017). *Cargo Statistics and Graphs*. Retrieved from http://www.portofguam.com/about-us/financial-information-and-statistics/cargo-statistics-and-graphs.

Silversea. (2019). *Asia Cruise APRA to KOBE*. Retrieved from https://www.silversea.com/destinations/asia-cruise/apra-to-kobe-e1200527011.html.

Smith, S. H., and D. E. Marx, Jr. (2016). De-facto marine protection from a Navy bombing range: Farallon de Medinilla, Mariana Archipelago, 1997 to 2012. *Marine Pollution Bulletin, 102*(1), 187–198.

Starmer, J. (2005). *The State of Coral Reef Ecosystems of the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands*. Mariana Islands, GU: Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas.

Tibbats, B., and T. Flores. (2012). *Chapter 2: Guam Fishery Ecosystem Report* (Archipelagic Fishery Ecosystem Annual Report). Honolulu, HI: Western Pacific Regional Fishery Management Council.

U.S. Census Bureau. (2018a). *2010 Guam Summary File*. Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau.

U.S. Census Bureau. (2018b). *2010 Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands Summary File*. Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau.

U.S. Census Bureau. (2018c). *2010 Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands Demographic Profile Data*. Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau.

U.S. Central Intelligence Agency. (2018a). *The World Factbook: Guam*. Retrieved from https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/resources/the-world-factbook/geos/gq.html.

U.S. Central Intelligence Agency. (2018b). *The World Factbook: Northern Mariana Islands*. Retrieved from https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/resources/the-world-factbook/geos/cq.html.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2010). *Mariana Islands Range Complex Final Environmental Impact Statement*. Pearl Harbor, HI: Joint Base Pearl Harbor, Hickam.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2012). *Environmental Assessment/Overseas Environmental Assessment Mariana Islands Range Complex Airspace*. Pearl Harbor, HI: Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Pacific.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2015). *Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement Guam and Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands Military Relocation (2012 Roadmap Adjustments)*. Washington, DC: Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Pacific.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. (2002). *Fish Consumption and Environmental Justice*. Seattle, WA: National Environmental Justice Advisory Council.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. (2016). *Promising Practices for EJ Methodologies in NEPA Reviews* (Report of the Federal Interagency Working Group on Environmental Justice & NEPA Committee). Washington, DC: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

van Beukering, P., W. Haider, M. Longland, H. Cesar, J. Sablan, S. Shjegstad, B. Beardmore, Y. Liu, and G. Garces. (2007). The economic value of Guam's coral reefs. In P. van Beukering (Ed.), *University of Guam Marine Laboratory Technical Report No. 116*. Mangilao, Guam: University of Guam, Marine Laboratory.

Weijerman, M., I. Williams, J. Gutierrez, S. Grafeld, B. Tibbatts, and G. Davis. (2016). Trends in biomass of coral reef fishes, derived from shore-based creel surveys in Guam. *Fishery Bulletin, 114*(2), 237–256.

Western Pacific Regional Fishery Management Council. (2009). *Fishery Ecosystem Plan for the Mariana Archipelago*. Honolulu, HI: Western Pacific Regional Fishery Management Council.

Western Pacific Regional Fishery Management Council. (2019). *Annual Stock Assessment and Fishery Evaluation Report for the Mariana Archipelago Fishery Ecosystem Plan 2018*. Honolulu, HI: Western Pacific Regional Fishery Management Council.

World Port Source. (2012). *Port of Saipan Port of Call*. Retrieved from http://www.worldportsource.com/ports/portCall/MNP_Port_of_Saipan_171.php.

Yau, A., M. O. Nadon, B. L. Richards, J. Brodziak, and E. Fletcher. (2016). *Stock Assessment Updates of the Bottomfish Management Unit Species of American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and Guam in 2015 Using Data through 2013*. Honolulu, HI: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Pacific Islands Fisheries Science Center.

Zeller, D., S. Harper, K. Zylich, and D. Pauly. (2014). Synthesis of underreported small-scale fisheries catch in Pacific island waters. *Coral Reefs, 34*(1), 25–39.

This page intentionally left blank.

3.13 Public Health and Safety

Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/ Overseas Environmental Impact Statement Mariana Islands Training and Testing

TABLE OF CONTENTS

3.13 Public Health and Safety 3.13-1
3.13.1 Affected Environment 3.13-1
3.13.1.1 Existing Conditions 3.13-1
3.13.1.2 Airspace 3.13-3
3.13.1.3 Safety and Inspection Procedures 3.13-3
3.13.2 Environmental Consequences 3.13-5
3.13.2.1 Underwater Energy 3.13-6
3.13.2.2 In-Air Energy 3.13-7
3.13.2.3 Physical Interactions 3.13-8
3.13.2.4 Secondary Stressors 3.13-9
3.13.3 Public Comments 3.13-10

List of Figures

There are no figures in this section.

List of Tables

Table 3.13-1: Marine Protected Areas Within the Study Area 3.13-2

This page intentionally left blank.

3.13 Public Health and Safety

3.13.1 Affected Environment

The purpose of this section is to supplement the analysis of impacts on public health and safety presented in the 2015 Mariana Islands Training and Testing (MITT) Final Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (EIS/OEIS) with new information relevant to proposed changes in training and testing activities conducted at sea and on Farallon de Medinilla (FDM). Information presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS that remains valid is noted as such, and referenced in the appropriate sections. Any new or updated information describing the affected environment and analysis of impacts on public health and safety associated with the Proposed Action is provided in this section. Comments received from the public during scoping related to public health and safety are addressed in Section 3.13.3 (Public Comments). Comments received from the public during the Draft Supplemental EIS (SEIS)/OEIS commenting period related to public health and safety are addressed in Appendix K (Public Comment Responses).

3.13.1.1 Existing Conditions

3.13.1.1.1 Sea Space

Sea space accessibility within the MITT Study Area is the same as what is described in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (Section 2.1.1.2, Sea and Undersea Space and Section 3.13.2.1.1, Sea Space). Only select areas have activity restrictions or prohibitions in accordance with Title 33 Code of Federal Regulations Part 334 (Danger Zone and Restricted Area Regulations). These restrictions can be permanent or temporary. The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Association (NOAA) issues nautical charts that delineate these areas. The military conducts training and testing activities in operating areas away from commercially used waterways and inside special use airspace. Scheduled training and testing activities are published by the United States (U.S.) Coast Guard in Notices to Mariners (NOTMARs) to notify the public of upcoming and potentially hazardous activities. NOTMARs are available online,[1] and email notifications can be received by registering online. Data on the number of NOTMARs issued from 2010 through 2015 for FDM and W-517 is presented in Section 3.12 (Socioeconomic Resources and Environmental Justice). As with other activities, the Navy posts NOTMARs at least 72 hours in advance of potentially hazardous training and testing activities at FDM. NOTMARs may extend restrictions out to 12 nautical miles as needed for certain training and testing activities to ensure the safety and protection of the public and the military.

Other communication outlets available to the public include the Joint Region Marianas (JRM) Public Affairs Office, which posts press releases on the JRM website and on the JRM Facebook page.[2] Interested members of the public can also follow the JRM on Twitter. Posts to the JRM Facebook page activate a Twitter post. Naval Base Guam Public Affairs posts press releases on the Naval Base Guam Facebook page,[3] and Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Marianas Public Affairs posts press releases on their Facebook page.[4]

[1] https://www.navcen.uscg.gov/?pageName=lnmDistrict&region=14
[2] https://www.facebook.com/jrmguam/
[3] https://www.facebook.com/USNavalBaseGuam/
[4] https://www.facebook.com/navfacmarianas/

Non-military activities are not permitted on or near FDM, and aircraft and marine vessels are restricted from entering within 3 nautical miles of FDM. Even when live fire or other potentially hazardous activities are not occurring at FDM, the threat of unexploded ordnance is always present. The military prevents civilians from entering FDM when the range is scheduled for use by using visual observers on vessels that scan for non-participants in accordance with standard operating procedures. More details on these procedures are available in Section 5.7.3 (Farallon de Medinilla Access Restrictions) of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

Marine protected areas (MPAs) are marine areas that restrict certain human activities for conservation purposes. The 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS describes five MPAs (Section 3.13.2.1.1, Sea Space); however, Table 3.13-1 lists other MPAs that are located within the Study Area along with their primary conservation focus and fishing restrictions. Although fishing restrictions would decrease boat traffic within the MPAs, they could force fishermen to travel further offshore, which is more dangerous and also has the potential to overlap with other training and testing activities.

Table 3.13-1: Marine Protected Areas Within the Study Area

Marine Protected Area	Primary Conservation Focus	Fishing Restriction	Location
War in the Pacific National Historic Park	Cultural Heritage	Commercial and Recreational	Guam
Tokai Maru	Cultural Heritage	Commercial	Guam
Cormoran	Cultural Heritage	Commercial	Guam
Aratama Maru	Cultural Heritage	Commercial	Guam
Orote Ecological Reserve Area	Natural Heritage	N/A	Guam
Guam National Wildlife Refuge	Natural Heritage	Commercial and Recreational	Guam
Haputo Ecological Reserve Area	Natural Heritage	N/A	Guam
Managaha Marine Conservation Area	Cultural Heritage	Commercial and Recreational	Northern Mariana Islands
Sasanhaya Fish Reserve	Natural Heritage	Commercial and Recreational	Northern Mariana Islands
Lighthouse Reef Trochus Reserve	Natural Heritage	Commercial	Northern Mariana Islands
Laulau Bay Sea Cucumber Reserve	Natural Heritage	Commercial and Recreational	Northern Mariana Islands
Bird Island Marine Sanctuary	Natural Heritage	Commercial and Recreational	Northern Mariana Islands
Bird Island Sea Cucumber Reserve	Natural Heritage	Commercial and Recreational	Northern Mariana Islands
Forbidden Island Marine Sanctuary	Natural Heritage	Commercial and Recreational	Northern Mariana Islands

Table 3.13-1: Marine Protected Areas Within the Study Area (continued)

Marine Protected Area	Primary Conservation Focus	Fishing Restriction	Location
Tank Beach Trochus Reserve	Natural Heritage	Commercial and Recreational	Northern Mariana Islands
Mariana Arc of Fire National Wildlife Refuge	Natural Heritage	N/A	At Sea
Mariana Trench Marine National Monument	Natural Heritage	Commercial and Recreational	At Sea

Source: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (2017)

3.13.1.2 Airspace

General information on airspace within the Study Area can be found in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (Section 3.13.2.1.2, Airspace); however, there have been changes to special use airspace within the Study Area in order to enhance safety. Changes include the addition of one new restricted area and new warning areas (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2015). These changes further separate non-military and military aviation activities, thereby enhancing safety. This SEIS/OEIS does not propose changes to the airspace. The military also requests that the Federal Aviation Administration issue Notices to Airmen to warn the public of upcoming military activities requiring the exclusive use of airspace. Military activity areas and special use airspace are identified on nautical and aeronautical charts to inform surface vessels and aircraft that military activities occur in the area. When necessary, airspace used by the military is restricted for short periods of time (typically on the order of hours) to cover the timeframes of training and testing activities. The Navy posts Notices to Airmen when restrictions are in place prior to initiating a training and testing activity, and the military follows standard operating procedures to visually scan an area to ensure that non-participants (i.e., civilian vessels and aircraft) are not present. More details on these procedures are available in Section 2.3.3 (Standard Operating Procedures) of this SEIS/OEIS. If non-participants are present, the military delays, moves, or cancels its activity. Public accessibility is no longer restricted once the activity concludes.

3.13.1.3 Safety and Inspection Procedures

As stated in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (Section 3.13.2.2, Safety and Inspection Procedures), the Navy adheres to policies that ensure the safety and health of military personnel and the public. This is accomplished by utilizing communication and notification channels provided by the U.S. Coast Guard and Federal Aviation Administration as described above, considering the location when planning activities, and ensuring that training and testing activity areas are clear of non-participants before commencing.

As discussed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (Section 3.13.2.2, Safety and Inspection Procedures), some training and testing activities use ordnance, and the type of ordnance used would be the same as identified in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. As such, the procedures for handling and storing of ordnance remain applicable and valid.

3.13.1.3.1 Aviation Safety

Navy procedures and policies detailing aviation safety are outlined in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (Section 3.13.2.2.1, Aviation Safety). These policies include the Chief of Naval Operations Instruction

3770.2L and Department of Defense Instruction 4540.01, which specify procedures for planning and managing special use airspace, for conducting aircraft maneuvers, and for firing missiles and projectiles over the high seas. Additional measures involve aircrews being responsible for maintaining a lookout for non-participating aircraft while operating in warning areas and other special use airspace, as well as the implementation of the Bird/Animal Aircraft Strike Hazard program, which is discussed in detail in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (Section 3.13.2.2.1, Aviation Safety). These procedures and policies remain applicable and valid.

3.13.1.3.2 Submarine Navigation Safety

Methods for preserving submarine navigation safety are discussed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (Section 3.13.2.2.2, Submarine Navigation Safety). These methods include avoiding collisions while surfaced by using visual scans, radar scans, acoustic depth finders, and satellite navigational systems, as well as avoiding areas with surface vessels while submerged by using inertial navigational charts. These methods remain applicable and valid in this SEIS/OEIS.

3.13.1.3.3 Surface Vessel Navigational Safety

The Navy's methods for ensuring navigational safety for surface vessels are discussed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (Section 3.13.2.2.3, Surface Vessel Navigational Safety) and can involve practicing the fundamentals of safe navigation, posting lookouts to scan for navigational hazards, or utilizing support boats to determine that all safety criteria are met. These safety methods remain applicable and valid.

3.13.1.3.4 Sound Navigation and Sounding (Sonar) Safety

Surface vessel and submarine sonar use is described in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (Section 3.13.2.2.4, Sound Navigation and Sounding [Sonar] Safety). The Navy adheres to Naval Sea Systems Command Instruction 3150.2, Appendix 1A, which provides guidance for protecting divers during active sonar use. Guidance for protecting divers remains applicable and valid.

3.13.1.3.5 Electromagnetic Energy Safety

The electromagnetic spectrum and the applications of electromagnetic radiation are described in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (Section 3.13.2.2.5, Electromagnetic Energy Safety). Military aircraft, ships, and submarines follow standard operating procedures, which prevent people, ordnance, or fuels from receiving levels of electromagnetic energy that exceed hazardous thresholds. The standard operating procedures that are described in Section 2.3.3 (Standard Operating Procedures) of this SEIS/OEIS remain applicable and valid.

3.13.1.3.6 Laser Safety

Lasers produce a coherent beam of light energy. The Navy uses lasers for precision range finding, as target designation/illumination devices for engagement with laser-guided weapons, for mine detection, for mine countermeasures, and for non-lethal deterrent. Testing activities include high-energy laser weapons tests to evaluate the specifications, integration, and performance of a vessel- or aircraft-mounted high-energy laser. Information regarding low-energy lasers can be viewed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (Section 3.13.2.2.6, Laser Safety). High-energy lasers were not analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. The high-energy laser would be used as a weapon to disable small surface vessels. The Office of the Chief of Naval Operations Instruction 5100.27B/Marine Corps Order 5104.1C, *Navy Laser Hazards Control Program*, prescribes Navy and Marine Corps policy and guidance in the identification and control of laser hazards. The Navy observes strict precautions and has written instructions in place for laser users to ensure that non-participants are not exposed to intense light

energy. Laser safety procedures for aircraft require an initial pass over the target before laser activation to ensure that target areas are clear. During actual laser use, aircraft run-in headings are also restricted to avoid or reduce unintentional contact with personnel or non-participants. Personnel participating in laser activities are required to complete a laser safety course (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2008).

3.13.1.3.7 High-Explosive Ordnance Detonation Safety

Safety measures for high explosive detonations, particularly underwater explosions, are discussed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (Section 3.13.2.2.7, High-Explosive Ordnance Detonation Safety) and remain valid. General underwater detonation procedures involve ensuring impact areas are clear before commencing hazardous activities, coordinating with submarine operational authorities, and firing in accordance with current safety instructions.

3.13.1.3.8 Weapons Firing and Ordnance Expenditure Safety

The safety and inspection procedures discussed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS remain applicable and valid to this analysis. Safety continues to be a primary concern for all training and testing activities, and all hazard areas must be clear of all non-participants prior to any use of ordnance. Training and testing activities are delayed, moved, or cancelled if there is any question about public safety.

3.13.2 Environmental Consequences

The 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (Section 3.13.3, Environmental Consequences) analyzed training and testing activities currently occurring in the Study Area and considered all potential stressors related to public health and safety. Stressors applicable to public health and safety in the Study Area are the same stressors analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS with the exception of explosive stressors. In the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, explosives were addressed under acoustic stressors; however, for purposes of this analysis, explosives are analyzed as a separate stressor. The following stressors were analyzed for public health and safety. Following each stressor is a list of substressors that have been updated from the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (Section 3.13.3, Environmental Consequences):

- Underwater Energy (sonar and in-water explosives)
- In-Air Energy (radar, in-air explosives, and lasers)
- Physical Interactions (aircraft, vessels, in-water devices/targets, munitions, seafloor devices)
- Secondary Stressors (impacts on water quality from explosives [in-air explosives and in-water explosives] and explosion byproducts, metals, chemicals other than explosives, and other materials)

This section evaluates how and to what degree potential impacts on public health and safety from stressors described in Section 3.0 (Introduction) may have changed since the analysis presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS was completed. Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2 in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) list the proposed training and testing activities and include the number of times each activity would be conducted annually and the locations within the Study Area where the activity would typically occur under each alternative. The tables also present the same information for activities described in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS so that the proposed levels of training and testing activities under this SEIS/OEIS can be easily compared. The Navy conducted a review of federal and state regulations and standards relevant to public health and safety and reviewed literature published since 2015 for new information that could supplement the analysis presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

The analysis presented in this section also considers standard operating procedures which are discussed in Section 2.3.3 (Standard Operating Procedures) of this SEIS/OEIS. The Navy would implement these measures to avoid or reduce potential impacts on public health and safety from stressors associated with the proposed training and testing activities.

3.13.2.1 Underwater Energy

Sources of underwater energy are the same as those discussed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (Section 3.13.3.1, Underwater Energy) and include active sonar, underwater explosions, air guns, vessel movements, aircraft overflights, mine warfare devices, and unmanned underwater vehicles. Only recreational swimmers and scuba divers who are underwater and within an unsafe distance of training and testing activities would potentially be exposed to the underwater energy produced by these stressors.

The effect of active sonar on humans varies with the sonar frequency. Generally, mid- to low-frequencies have the greatest effect since they fall within the range of human hearing (20 hertz to 20 kilohertz). In addition to acoustic stressors, underwater explosions produce pressure waves that can cause physical injury depending on the size, type, and depth of the explosive charge and the distance between the person and the explosive. Electromagnetic energy sources and their potential impacts on public health and safety are discussed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (Section 3.13.3.1, Underwater Energy) and remain applicable in this discussion. In addition, standard safety buffers that are specified in Department of Defense Instruction 6055.11, *Protecting Personnel from Electromagnetic Fields* (U.S. Department of Defense, 2009), and Military Standard 464A, *Electromagnetic Environmental Effects: Requirements for Systems* (U.S. Department of Defense, 2002), would continue to be implemented to ensure public safety.

3.13.2.1.1 Impacts from Underwater Energy Stressors Under Alternative 1

While the frequency of certain activities would increase under Alternative 1, the analysis of impacts on public health and safety from underwater energy presented in this SEIS/OEIS is not dependent on the number of activities that occur. Instead, the analysis discusses how likely an activity is expected to impact public health and safety regardless of how often it occurs. Therefore, increases shown in Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2 for activities proposed under Alternative 1 would have no appreciable change on the impact analysis or conclusions for underwater energy as presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

Standard operating procedures, which are described in Section 2.3.3 (Standard Operating Procedures) of this SEIS/OEIS, are in place to ensure that military activities do not overlap with non-military activities (e.g., boating, swimming, and fishing). Since the only potential receptors of underwater energy stressors are recreational swimmers and divers, training and testing activities that could affect public health and safety are often held far from popular swimming and dive areas, reducing the potential for exposure. The military's safety procedures would ensure that the potential for training and testing activities to impact public health and safety under Alternative 1 would be unlikely.

3.13.2.1.2 Impacts from Underwater Energy Stressors Under Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)

Similar to Alternative 1, the frequency of certain activities would increase under Alternative 2 (see Table 2.5-1 and Table 2.5-2 to see changes in frequency of specific activities). However, as explained above, this analysis is not dependent on the frequency of activities but instead on how likely an activity is to produce underwater energy that would impact public health and safety. Since the only potential receptors of underwater energy stressors are recreational swimmers and divers, training and testing activities that could affect public health and safety are often held far from popular swim and dive areas,

reducing the potential for exposure. Furthermore, the military has safety procedures to ensure that the potential for training and testing activities to impact public health and safety under Alternative 2 would be unlikely.

3.13.2.1.3 Impacts from Underwater Energy Stressors Under No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, proposed training and testing activities would not occur. Other military activities not associated with this Proposed Action would continue to occur. Underwater energy stressors as listed above would not be introduced into the marine environment. Therefore, existing environmental conditions would either remain unchanged or would improve slightly after cessation of ongoing training and testing activities.

Discontinuing the training and testing activities would result in fewer underwater energy stressors within the marine environment where training and testing activities have historically been conducted. Therefore, discontinuing training and testing activities under the No Action Alternative would lessen the potential for underwater energy impacts on public health and safety, but would not measurably improve public health and safety.

3.13.2.2 In-Air Energy

In-air energy stressors include sources of electromagnetic energy and lasers, such as radar, navigational aids, high-energy lasers, and electronic warfare systems. Current practices for protecting military personnel and the public are described in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (Section 3.13.3.2) and remain applicable to this analysis. In addition, procedures for laser safety are described above in Section 3.13.1.3.6 (Laser Safety) as well as in Section 2.3.3.4 (Pierside Testing Safety). Training and testing activities that involve electromagnetic energy and lasers are described in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and now also includes high-energy laser use.

High-energy lasers are used as weapons to disable surface targets. The Navy would operate high-energy laser equipment in accordance with procedures defined in the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations Instruction 5100.23G, Navy Safety and Occupational Health Program Manual (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2011). These high-energy light sources can cause eye injuries and burns if directly hit with the laser. A comprehensive safety program exists for the use of lasers. Current Navy safety procedures protect individuals from the hazard of injuries caused by laser energy. Laser safety requirements for aircraft and vessels mandate verification that target areas are clear before commencement of an exercise. In the case of aircraft, during actual laser use, the aircraft run-in headings are restricted to preclude inadvertent lasing of areas where the public may be present.

3.13.2.2.1 Impacts from In-Air Energy Stressors Under Alternative 1

The frequency of activities that generate in-air energy would increase under Alternative 1. This increase would result in an increase in ionizing radiation, which can negatively impact public health and safety following chronic exposure and from direct contact. However, repeat exposure would be limited and the impact of each exposure would be minimized due to existing safety procedures. Therefore, increases shown in Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2 for activities proposed under Alternative 1 would have no appreciable change on the impact analysis or conclusions for in-air energy as presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

High-energy lasers would be used during testing activities that were not previously analyzed. It is unlikely that the public would be exposed to high-energy lasers from testing activities because the Navy would not conduct these activities in proximity to the public and they would only occur in designated

areas of the Mariana Islands Range Complex. Explosives would continue to be used at FDM, but the energy produced from these explosives would be contained within their weapon danger zones, which are restricted to the public and would not have the potential to impact public health and safety. Although there would be a general increase to the frequency of in-air energy stressors, standard operating procedures for electromagnetic energy and lasers would prevent personnel and non-participants from being exposed to these stressors. The military's safety procedures would ensure that the potential for training and testing activities to impact public health and safety under Alternative 1 would be unlikely.

3.13.2.2.2 Impacts from In-Air Energy Stressors Under Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)

Under Alternative 2, the number of proposed training and testing activities that would generate in-air energy would increase for high-energy lasers (see Table 3.0-10), increase for explosive munitions (only for torpedoes, missiles, large-caliber projectiles, and medium-caliber projectiles [see Table 3.0-16]), and stay the same for munitions used on FDM (see Table 3.0-20) as compared to Alternative 1. However, as explained in Alternative 1, the increase in ionizing radiation exposure that would occur from increases in training and testing activities would result in only limited exposure due to existing safety procedures. Alternative 2 would also include the introduction of high-energy lasers; however, the standard operating procedures that pertain to the use of high-energy lasers and other in-air energy sources would prevent any energy being generated from impacting public health and safety. Therefore, the implementation of Alternative 2 would have no appreciable change on the impact conclusions presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

3.13.2.2.3 Impacts from In-Air Energy Stressors Under No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, proposed training and testing activities would not occur. Other military activities not associated with this Proposed Action would continue to occur. In-air energy stressors as listed above would not be introduced into the marine environment. Therefore, existing environmental conditions would either remain unchanged or would improve slightly after cessation of ongoing training and testing activities.

Discontinuing the training and testing activities would result in fewer in-air energy stressors within the marine environment where training and testing activities have historically been conducted. Therefore, discontinuing training and testing activities under the No Action Alternative would lessen the potential for in-air energy impacts on public health and safety, but would not measurably improve public health and safety.

3.13.2.3 Physical Interactions

As discussed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (Section 3.13.3.3, Physical Interactions), military aircraft, vessels, targets, munitions, towed devices, seafloor devices, and other expended materials have the potential to directly encounter recreational, commercial, institutional, and governmental aircraft, vessels, and users such as swimmers, divers, and anglers. Methods for providing notice to non-participants of Navy training and testing activities, procedures for minimizing encounters with military expended materials, and a discussion of unexploded ordnance are all outlined in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (Section 3.13.3.3, Physical Interactions) as well as in previous sections 3.13.1.1.1 (Sea Space), 3.13.1.2 (Airspace), and 3.13.1.3 (Safety and Inspection Procedures).

3.13.2.3.1 Impacts from Physical Interaction Stressors Under Alternative 1

Under Alternative 1, there would be a general increase in activities involving vessel movements, as shown in Table 3.0-12. Increases in the frequency of vessel movements would increase vessel traffic and the probability for a physical interaction to occur between naval vessels and non-participating vessels. However, standard operating procedures and safety and inspection procedures would be in place to reduce the potential for non-participants and personnel to be physically impacted by training and testing activities. The military's safety procedures are designed to ensure that the potential for training and testing activities to impact public health and safety under Alternative 1 would be unlikely.

3.13.2.3.2 Impacts from Physical Interaction Stressors Under Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)

Under Alternative 2, the number of training and testing activities involving vessel movement would increase as compared to Alternative 1. However, as described in Alternative 1, the standard operating procedures and safety inspection procedures that are in place would prevent the increase in frequency of vessel movements from impacting public health and safety. Therefore, under Alternative 2, increases shown in Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2 would have no appreciable change on the impact conclusions presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

3.13.2.3.3 Impacts from Physical Interaction Stressors Under No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, proposed training and testing activities would not occur. Other military activities not associated with this Proposed Action would continue to occur. Physical interaction stressors as listed above would not be introduced into the marine environment. Therefore, existing environmental conditions would either remain unchanged or would improve slightly after cessation of ongoing training and testing activities.

Discontinuing the training and testing activities would result in fewer physical interaction stressors within the marine environment where training and testing activities have historically been conducted. Therefore, discontinuing training and testing activities under the No Action Alternative would lessen the potential for physical interactions to impact public health and safety, but would not measurably improve public health and safety.

3.13.2.4 Secondary Stressors

As discussed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (Section 3.13.3.4, Secondary Impacts), public health and safety has the potential to be impacted if sediment or water quality were degraded. Section 3.1 (Sediments and Water Quality) considered the impacts on marine sediments and water quality of explosions and explosive byproducts, metals, chemicals other than explosives, and other materials (marine markers, flares, chaff, targets, and miscellaneous components of other materials). The analysis determined that no Guam, Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas Islands (CNMI), or federal standards or guidelines would be violated under any of the alternatives. Although a general increase in training and testing activities and military expended materials would occur, training and testing activities would not significantly degrade sediment or water quality or contaminate the food supply as discussed in Sections 3.1 (Sediments and Water Quality) and 3.9 (Fishes). In addition, because standards and guidelines are structured to protect human health, and no violations would occur, no secondary impacts on public health and safety would result from training and testing activities. Sections 3.9 (Fishes) and 3.12 (Socioeconomic Resources and Environmental Justice) discuss the impacts that the Proposed Action would have on fish and fisheries in the Study Area.

3.13.3 Public Comments

The public raised a number of issues during the scoping period in regard to public health and safety. The issues are summarized in the list below. Comments received from the public during the Draft SEIS/OEIS commenting period related to public health and safety are addressed in Appendix K (Public Comment Responses).

- **Impacts of sonar testing on human swimmers and divers –** Swimmers and recreational divers are not expected to be near training and testing activity locations where active sonar activities would occur because of the strict procedures for clearance of nonparticipants before conducting activities. As discussed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (Section 3.13.3.1, Underwater Energy), the potential for the public to be exposed to these stressors would be limited to divers within unsafe proximity of an event. SCUBA diving is a popular recreational activity that is typically concentrated around known dive attractions such as reefs and shipwrecks. In general, recreational divers should dive at depths not exceeding 130 feet (40 meters) (Professional Association of Diving Instructors, 2011). This depth limit typically limits this activity's distance from shore. Therefore, training and testing activities closest to shore have the greatest potential to co-occur with the public. In addition, swimmers and recreational SCUBA divers are not expected to be near Navy pierside locations because access to these areas is controlled for safety and security reasons. Locations of popular offshore diving spots are well documented, dive boats are typically well marked, and diver-down flags would be visible from the Navy ships conducting training and testing activities. Therefore, co-occurrence of recreational divers and Navy activities is unlikely.
- **Potential risks from unexploded ordnance –** As discussed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (Section 3.13.3.3, Physical Interactions), munitions have low failure rates and generally function as intended. While fishing activities may encounter undetonated ordnance lying on the ocean floor, such an encounter would be unlikely given the large size of the Study Area and because the density of munitions in the Study Area is low. The Army Corps of Engineers prescribes the following procedures if military munitions are encountered: recognize when you may have encountered a munition, retreat from the area without touching or disturbing the item, and report the item to local law enforcement by calling 911 or the U.S. Coast Guard. More information can be viewed at the following link: http://uxoinfo.com/blogcfc/client/enclosures/uxooverview.pdf.
- **Impacts on water quality from explosives, unexploded ordnance, and military expended materials –** As discussed in Section 3.1.4 (Summary of Potential Impacts [Combined Impact of All Stressors] on Sediments and Water Quality) of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, additive impacts from explosives, explosive byproducts, metals, chemicals other than explosives, and miscellaneous other materials would be measurable but would not exceed applicable standards and guidelines, which indicate the levels where there would be an impact on human health. The impact analysis in Section 3.1 (Sediments and Water Quality) of this SEIS/OEIS addresses impacts on water quality from all sources associated with the Proposed Action and indicates that there would be no appreciable change from the environmental baseline.
- **Chemical exposure to humans from training and testing activities –** As discussed in Section 3.2.4 (Summary of Potential Impacts [Combined Impacts of All Stressors] on Air Quality) of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, emissions associated with Study Area military operations primarily

occur offshore. Fixed-wing aircraft emissions typically occur above the 3,000 feet (914 meters) mixing layer. Even though these stressors can co-occur in time and space, atmospheric dispersion would occur so that the impacts would be short term. Changes in criteria and hazardous air pollutant emissions are not expected to be detectable, so the air quality is expected to fully recover before a subsequent activity. For these reasons, impacts on air quality from combining these resource stressors are expected to be similar to the impacts on air quality for any of these stressors taken individually with no additive, synergistic, or antagonistic interactions.

- **Training and testing activity safety measures to prevent harm to the CNMI economy –** A number of standard operating procedures, which were described in Section 2.3.3 (Standard Operating Procedures) of this SEIS/OEIS as well as the safety and inspection procedures discussed in Section 3.13.1.3 (Safety and Inspection Procedures) above are in place to ensure that military activities do not interfere or pose health risks to the public. There are no known instances of harm to the economy within the Study Area that have been reported due to safety measures associated with current training and testing activities. Standard operating procedures allow fishermen to continue to use the ocean without fear and allow tourists to come to the CNMI without reservations.
- **Fishermen safety –** As discussed above in Section 3.13.1.1.1 (Sea Space), the Navy uses Local NOTMARs, NOTMARs, and Marine Broadcast NOTMARs to advise local mariners of scheduled training and testing activities to avoid encountering fishers and boaters. In addition, the Navy also follows standard operating procedures that prevent military activities from occurring in the presence of non-participants. These standard operating procedures include ensuring impact areas and targets are unpopulated prior to potentially dangerous activities, canceling or delaying activities if public or personnel safety is a concern, and implementing temporary access restrictions to training and testing areas when appropriate to ensure public safety.
- **Spills and accidental releases of fuel or other hazardous materials –** Navy policies and procedures identified in Navy instructions, such as the *Environmental Readiness Program Manual*, include directives regarding waste management, pollution prevention, and recycling. These instructions are mandatory and minimize the likelihood of spills or accidental releases of fuel or other hazardous materials.
- **Health risks from a contaminated food supply –** The Record of Decision for the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS indicated that there would be a negligible impact on water quality and that it would not affect the marine environment. Since there would be no significant change in water quality, and fish would not ingest increased amounts of contaminants as discussed in Section 3.9 (Fishes), the food supply would not be contaminated from proposed activities.

REFERENCES

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. (2017). *The MPA Inventory*. Retrieved from https://marineprotectedareas.noaa.gov/dataanalysis/mpainventory/.

Professional Association of Diving Instructors. (2011). *Scuba Certification Frequently Asked Questions*. Retrieved from http://www.padi.com/scuba/scuba-diving-guide/start-scuba-diving/scuba-certification-faq/default.aspx.

U.S. Department of Defense. (2002). *Electromagnetic Environmental Effects: Requirements for Systems*. (MIL-STD-464A). Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, OH: U.S. Air Force/Aeronautical Systems Center.

U.S. Department of Defense. (2009). *Protecting Personnel from Electromagnetic Fields*. (DoD Instruction 6055.11). Washington, DC: Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2008). *Navy Laser Hazards Control Program OPNAVINST 5100.27B/Marine Corps Order 5104.1C*. Washington, DC: Office of the Chief of Naval Operations and Headquarters United States Marine Corps.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2011). *Navy Safety and Occupational Health Program Manual*. (OPNAVINST 5100.23G CH-1). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Navy.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2015). *Draft Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands Joint Military Training Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement*. Honolulu, HI: Department of Interior, Office of Insular Affairs, Federal Aviation Administration, International Broadcasting Bureau, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service, and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

4 Cumulative Impacts

Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/ Overseas Environmental Impact Statement Mariana Islands Training and Testing

TABLE OF CONTENTS

4 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS 4-1

4.1 Principles of Cumulative Impacts Analysis 4-1

4.1.1 Determination of Significance 4-1

4.1.2 Identifying Region of Influence for Cumulative Impacts Analysis 4-1

4.2 Projects and Other Activities Analyzed for Cumulative Impacts 4-2

4.3 Cumulative Impacts on Environmental Resources 4-22

4.4 Resource-Specific Cumulative Impacts 4-22

4.4.1 Sediments and Water Quality 4-22

4.4.2 Air Quality 4-23

4.4.3 Marine Habitats 4-24

4.4.4 Marine Mammals 4-25

4.4.4.1 Region of Influence 4-25

4.4.4.2 Resource Trends 4-25

4.4.4.3 Impacts of Other Actions 4-26

4.4.4.4 Impacts of the Proposed Action that May Contribute to Cumulative Impacts 4-29

4.4.4.5 Cumulative Impacts on Marine Mammals 4-30

4.4.5 Sea Turtles 4-31

4.4.5.1 Region of Influence 4-31

4.4.5.2 Resource Trends 4-32

4.4.5.3 Impacts of Other Actions 4-32

4.4.5.4 Impacts of the Proposed Action That May Contribute to Cumulative Impacts 4-35

4.4.5.5 Cumulative Impacts on Sea Turtles 4-36

4.4.6 Marine Birds 4-37

4.4.7 Marine Vegetation 4-38

4.4.8 Marine Invertebrates 4-39

4.4.8.1 Region of Influence 4-39

4.4.8.2 Resource Trends 4-39

4.4.8.3 Impacts of Other Actions 4-39
4.4.8.4 Impacts of the Proposed Action That May Contribute to Cumulative Impacts 4-40
4.4.8.5 Cumulative Impacts on Marine Invertebrates 4-41
4.4.9 Marine Fishes 4-42
4.4.10 Terrestrial Species and Habitats 4-43
4.4.11 Cultural Resources 4-43
4.4.12 Socioeconomic Resources 4-44
4.4.12.1 Resource Trends 4-45
4.4.12.2 Onshore and Offshore Fishing for Economic Self-Sustainability 4-45
4.4.12.3 Impacts of Other Actions 4-46
4.4.12.4 Cumulative Impacts on Socioeconomic Resources 4-46
4.4.13 Public Health and Safety 4-46
4.5 Summary of Cumulative Impacts 4-46
4.6 Public Comments 4-47

List of Figures

There are no figures in this chapter.

List of Tables

Table 4.2-1: Past, Present, and Reasonably Foreseeable Actions 4-3

4 Cumulative Impacts

4.1 Principles of Cumulative Impacts Analysis

The approach taken herein to analyze cumulative effects meets the objectives of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations, and CEQ guidance, and has not changed from the approach as described in the 2015 Mariana Islands Training and Testing (MITT) Final Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (EIS/OEIS) (Council on Environmental Quality, 1997; U.S. Department of the Navy, 2015b).

4.1.1 Determination of Significance

Per the CEQ's *Considering Cumulative Effects Under the NEPA* (Council on Environmental Quality, 1997), the "levels of acceptable change used to determine the significance of effects will vary depending on the type of resource being analyzed, the condition of the resource, and the importance of the resource as an issue." Furthermore, "this change is evaluated in terms of both the total threshold beyond which the resource degrades to unacceptable levels and the incremental contribution of the proposed action to reaching that threshold." In practice, "the analyst must determine the realistic potential for the resource to sustain itself in the future and whether the proposed action will affect this potential." In other words, for a proposed action to have a cumulatively significant impact on an environmental resource, two conditions must be met. First, the combined effects of all identified past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, activities, and processes on a resource, including the effects of the proposed action, must be significant. Second, the proposed action must make a measurable or meaningful contribution to that significant cumulative impact.

4.1.2 Identifying Region of Influence for Cumulative Impacts Analysis

The region of influence for analyses of cumulative impacts can vary for different resources and environmental media. CEQ guidance (Council on Environmental Quality, 1997) indicates that the region of influence for cumulative impacts almost always should be expanded beyond those for the project-specific analyses. This guidance continues, indicating that one way to evaluate the region of influence is to consider the distance an effect can travel, and it identifies potential cumulative assessment boundaries accordingly. For air quality, the potentially affected air quality regions are the appropriate boundaries for assessment of cumulative impacts from releases of pollutants into the atmosphere. For water resources and land-based effects, watershed boundaries may be the appropriate regional boundary. For wide-ranging or migratory wildlife, specifically marine mammals, fish, sea turtles, and marine birds, any impacts of the Proposed Action might combine with the impacts of other activities or processes within the range of the population.

The region of influence for evaluating the cumulative impacts of the Proposed Action are defined for each resource in Section 4.4 (Resource-Specific Cumulative Impacts). The basic geographic boundary for the majority of resources analyzed for cumulative impacts in this Supplemental EIS (SEIS)/OEIS is the entire MITT Study Area (Figure 2.1-1). The region of influence for cumulative impacts analysis for some resources are expanded to include activities outside the Study Area that might impact migratory or wide-ranging animals. Other activities potentially originating from outside the Study Area that are considered in this analysis include impacts associated with maritime traffic (e.g., vessel strikes and underwater noise) and commercial fishing (e.g., bycatch and entanglement).

Comments received from the public during scoping related to cumulative impacts are addressed in Section 4.6 (Public Comments). Comments received from the public during the Draft Supplemental EIS

(SEIS)/OEIS commenting period related to cumulative impacts are addressed in Appendix K (Public Comment Responses).

4.2 Projects and Other Activities Analyzed for Cumulative Impacts

The cumulative analysis includes consideration of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions that overlap in time and space with the Proposed Action. Actions and projects that have been added to this cumulative analysis since the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS include the Saipan water system improvements project, the wastewater system for Saipan, the Saipan Resort Hotel, the Plumeria Resort and Casino, aquaculture, and undersea communications cables. For past actions, the cumulative impacts analysis only considers those actions or activities that have had ongoing impacts that may be additive to impacts of the Proposed Action. Likewise, present and reasonably foreseeable future actions selected for inclusion in the analysis are those that may have effects additive to the effects of the Proposed Action as experienced by specific environmental receptors.

The cumulative impacts analysis makes use of the best available data, quantifying impacts where possible and relying on the qualitative description and best professional judgment where detailed measurement is unavailable. Because specific information and data on past projects and actions are typically scarce, the analysis of past effects is often qualitative (Council on Environmental Quality, 1997). Likewise, analysis of ongoing actions is often inconsistent or unavailable. All likely future development or use of the region is considered to the greatest extent possible, even when a foreseeable future action is not planned in sufficient detail to permit complete analysis (Council on Environmental Quality, 1997).

The cumulative impacts analysis is not bound by a specific future timeframe. The Proposed Action includes general types of activities addressed by this SEIS/OEIS that are expected to continue indefinitely, and the associated impacts could occur indefinitely. Likewise, some reasonably foreseeable future actions and other environmental considerations addressed in the cumulative impacts analysis are expected to continue indefinitely (e.g., seismic surveys, maritime traffic, commercial fishing). While Navy training and testing activities requirements change over time in response to world events, it should be recognized that available information, uncertainties, and other practical constraints limit the ability to analyze cumulative impacts for the indefinite future. Navy environmental planning and compliance for training and testing activities is an ongoing process, and the Navy anticipates preparing new or supplemental environmental planning documents covering changes in training and testing activities in the Study Area as necessary. These future environmental planning documents would include a cumulative impacts analysis based on information available at that time.

Table 4.2-1 lists the other actions and other environmental considerations identified for the cumulative impacts analysis, including activities presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS with updated information. Descriptions of each action and environmental consideration carried forward for analysis are provided in the sections that follow. For the perspective of general project locations, please refer to Figures 2.1-1 through 2.1-4, which depict the Study Area, boundaries of individual training and testing activities locations, and large marine ecosystems and open ocean areas within and adjacent to the Study Area.

Table 4.2-1: Past, Present, and Reasonably Foreseeable Actions

Factor/Project	Location	Project Description	Summary of Impact Minimization and Mitigation Measures[1]	Project Timeframe C = Construction O = Operation X = Other		
				Past	Present	Future
Military Mission, Testing, and Training Activities						
Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (CNMI) Joint Military Training (CJMT)	CNMI	The Draft 2015 Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (CNMI) Joint Military Training (CJMT) EIS/OEIS (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2015a) provided a draft evaluation of the potential impacts associated with alternatives for meeting U.S. Indo-Pacific Command Service Components' unfilled unit-level and combined-level training requirements in the Western Pacific. The draft action alternatives proposed the establishment of a series of live-fire and maneuver ranges and training areas; expansion of existing ranges and training areas; and construction of new ranges and training areas within the CNMI, including amphibious operations. The Notice of Intent to complete the EIS/OEIS was published in the *Federal Register* on March 14, 2013. Following an in-depth review of public comments on the proposed construction of military training areas in CNMI, and consultation with CNMI Executive Branch, the Department of Defense (DoD) announced in October 2015 it would issue a Revised Draft EIS for its proposed actions for the CJMT. The proposed revised Draft EIS will evaluate contribution to the cumulative effects of ongoing actions in the CNMI. Specifically, the resources evaluated and the information collected as part of the CJMT project to date will contribute to cumulative impacts, including geology and soils, water resources, air quality, noise, airspace, land and submerged land use, recreation, terrestrial biology, marine biology, cultural resources, visual resources, transportation, utilities, socioeconomics and environmental justice, hazardous materials and waste, and public health and safety.	Resource management measures include avoidance and minimization measures, best management practices, and standard operating procedures.			C/O

Table 4.2-1: Past, Present, and Reasonably Foreseeable Actions (continued)

Factor/Project	Location	Project Description	Summary of Impact Minimization and Mitigation Measures[1]	Project Timeframe C = Construction O = Operation X = Other		
				Past	Present	Future
CNMI Joint Region Marianas Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan (INRMP)	CNMI	In June 2019, the Navy completed the Joint Region Marianas Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan (INRMP). An INRMP is a long-term planning document designed to guide the management of natural resources on military-administered areas, support military missions, and ensure compliance with environmental laws and regulations. The purpose of the 2019 Joint Region Marianas INRMP is to maintain long-term ecosystem health and operational requirements of the DoD's mission while minimizing impacts on natural resources. It is also the intent of the INRMP to provide a conservation benefit to federally protected species (ESA-listed corals, fishes, sea turtles, and marine mammals). In order to meet these purposes, the Joint Region Marianas INRMP establishes a list of management projects for ESA-listed corals, fishes, sea turtles, and marine mammals that either improve the understanding of these species in the wild or are designed to protect species and their habitat without infringing on the DoD's military mission. An INRMP also supports an installation's mission while conserving and rehabilitating installation resources for multiple use, sustainable yield, and biological integrity. National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), as a partner in the development of the Joint Region INRMP, endorsed the Joint Region Marianas INRMP in June 2019. Specific management goals subject to annual funding availability under the June 2019 INRMP include • Coral Habitat Enhancement (surveys, management) [*Naval Base Guam, Andersen Air Force Base, Tinian Military Lease Area*] • Marine Flora Management (survey subtidal areas for algae and seagrasses) [*Naval Base Guam, Tinian Military Lease Area*] • Marine Resources Data Management (Coordination with Pacific Islands Fisheries Science Center for surveys) [*Naval Base Guam,*	Implementation of the Joint Region Marianas INRMP program and the focused strategies and actions of the management projects for marine resources provides a conservation benefit to the marine ecosystem in the nearshore waters of military-owned or leased lands by maintaining and enhancing marine community structure, function, species diversity, and resiliency. Using this regional ecosystem-based approach for managing protected species and their associated ecosystems ensures that the Navy remains in compliance with federal and territorial laws while supporting the	X	X	X

Table 4.2-1: Past, Present, and Reasonably Foreseeable Actions (continued)

Factor/Project	Location	Project Description	Summary of Impact Minimization and Mitigation Measures[1]	Project Timeframe C = Construction O = Operation X = Other		
				Past	Present	Future
		Andersen Air Force Base] • Marine Habitat Mapping (benthic habitat mapping) [*Naval Base Guam, Andersen Air Force Base, Farallon de Medinilla*] • Acoustic Telemetry Network (acoustic tag deployment ESA fish and sea turtles in and adjacent Apra Harbor) [*Naval Base Guam*] • Scalloped Hammerhead Shark Study (eDNA mapping for presence, visual survey, tagging in and adjacent to Apra Harbor) [*Naval Base Guam, Andersen Air Force Base*] • Sea Turtle Population Protection and Enhancement (visual survey and tagging of sea turtles) [*Naval Base Guam, Andersen Air Force Base, Tinian Military Lease Area, Farallon de Medinilla*] • Fish, Coral, and Marine Surveys (visual surveys) [*Farallon de Medinilla*] • Assess ESA-Listed *Scleractinian* Corals (visual surveys and condition assessment for ESA-corals) [*Farallon de Medinilla*] The resources managed under the INRMP that could contribute to cumulative impacts include geology and soils, water resources, air quality, terrestrial biology, and marine biology.	operational functionality of the military installations and ranges in the Action Area.			

Table 4.2-1: Past, Present, and Reasonably Foreseeable Actions (continued)

Factor/Project	Location	Project Description	Summary of Impact Minimization and Mitigation Measures[1]	Project Timeframe C = Construction O = Operation X = Other		
				Past	Present	Future
Divert Activities and Exercises	Saipan and Tinian	The USAF proposed improvements to an existing airfield near the Philippine Sea in support of expanding mission requirements in the western Pacific, along with divert capabilities for current, emerging, and future training activities. A Draft EIS analyzing environmental impacts associated with the divert activities and exercises was published in June 2012 and found adverse effects could occur from the construction phase of the project on cultural resources, as well as adverse impacts to socioeconomic resources and environmental justice, and human health and safety. The USAF published a Revised Draft Divert EIS in 2015 and released a Final EIS and Record of Decision in 2016 (U.S. Department of the Air Force, 2016). The USAF selected the preferred alternative, Alternative 2 - Modified Tinian Alternative and specifically the North Option as the location to implement the proposed action described in the Divert EIS. In spring 2018 the U.S. Air Force published the intention to prepare a Supplemental EIS to assess the potential environmental consequences associated with proposed Tinian Divert Infrastructure Improvements. On May 17, 2019, the USAF published the NOA for the Draft SEIS for the proposed Tinian Divert Infrastructure Improvements. The NOA began the public review period for the Draft SEIS, which ended on July 1, 2019. Substantive comments received during the public review period will be considered during preparation of the Final SEIS. The USAF now proposes to construct a fuel pipeline, and associated infrastructure at the seaport, to transport fuel from the seaport to the airport. Therefore, the USAF also proposes to improve certain existing roads between the seaport and airport that would be used to support Divert-related projects. Additional information about the proposed action is provided on the project website. Therefore, this project may contribute to the cumulative impacts on natural, noise, cultural and socioeconomic resources in the Study Area.	Mitigation measures will be implemented to minimize, avoid, rectify, reduce, or compensate for potential impacts on specific resource areas. There are mitigation measures for noise during construction, air quality, airspace and airfield environment, geology and soils, water resources, terrestrial biological resources, cultural resources, land use, hazardous materials and wastes, infrastructure and utilities, socioeconomic resources and environmental justice, and human health and safety.	C	O	C/O

Table 4.2-1: Past, Present, and Reasonably Foreseeable Actions (continued)

Factor/Project	Location	Project Description	Summary of Impact Minimization and Mitigation Measures[1]	Project Timeframe C = Construction O = Operation X = Other		
				Past	Present	Future
Foreign Navies Training and Testing Activities	Study Area	As the navies of the world increase their "blue water" capabilities, the presence of foreign military within the Study Area will also likely increase. Foreign military vessels currently transit through the Global Commons and international waters within the Study Area while en route to and from Guam, Hawaii, and other locations in and bordering the Pacific. As the extent of naval activities conducted by sovereign vessels and embarked aircraft while in the MITT is not quantified nor quantifiable, it is very likely that routine systems checks as well as opportunistic training and testing occurs. The resources impacted by ongoing and proposed MITT activities would also be exposed to similar stressors (e.g., acoustics from sonar and explosives, vessel strike) introduced by foreign vessels and aircraft conducting activities not related to the MITT Proposed Action.		O	O	O
Guam and Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (CNMI) Military Relocation EIS/Guam CNMI Military Relocation (2012 Roadmap Adjustments) SEIS	Guam	In July 2015, the Final SEIS Guam and Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands Military Relocation (2012 Roadmap Adjustments) was completed (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2015b). The Final SEIS analyzed the potential environmental impacts of five action alternatives for the family housing component of the proposed action and five action alternatives for the live-fire training range complex component, plus a no action alternative. The proposed action was to construct and operate a cantonment area, family housing, and a Live-Fire Training Range Complex on Guam to support the Marine Corps relocation. The Navy selected the preferred alternative as described in the Final 2015 SEIS. The preferred alternative included cantonment and family housing Alternative E with the U.S. Marine Corps cantonment to be located at Navy Computer and Telecommunications Station – Guam (Finegayan), and family housing to be located at Andersen Air Force Base. The Live-Fire Training Range Complex option selected was Alternative 5, to be located at Andersen Air Force Base – Northwest Field. The Live-Fire Training Range Complex also includes a stand-alone hand	Mitigation measures will be implemented to minimize, avoid, rectify, reduce, or compensate for potential impacts on specific resource areas. There are mitigation measures for water resources, terrestrial biological resources, marine biological resources, cultural resources, utilities, socioeconomic resources, and environmental justice	C	C	O

Table 4.2-1: Past, Present, and Reasonably Foreseeable Actions (continued)

Factor/Project	Location	Project Description	Summary of Impact Minimization and Mitigation Measures[1]	Project Timeframe C = Construction O = Operation X = Other		
				Past	Present	Future
		grenade range at Andersen South. The Record of Decision for the SEIS includes cantonment and family housing at the Navy Computer and Telecommunications Station in the Finegayan area of Guam, and family housing to be located at Andersen AFB. The Live Fire Training Range Complex would be located at Andersen AFB, Northwest Field and includes a stand-alone hand grenade range at Andersen South (U.S. Department of the Air Force, 2016). Potential impacts were analyzed for geological and soil resources, water resources, air quality, noise, airspace, land and submerged land use, recreational resources, terrestrial biological resources, marine biological resources, cultural resources, visual resources, ground transportation, marine transportation, utilities, socioeconomic resources and general services, hazardous materials and waste, public health and safety, and environmental justice. Continuing cumulative impacts could occur for water resources, air quality, noise, airspace, recreational resources, terrestrial biological resources, ground transportation, utilities, and socioeconomic resources and general services.	and the protection of children.			
Surveillance Towed Array Sensor System Low Frequency Active Sonar	Pacific Ocean, Atlantic Ocean, Indian Ocean, and the Mediterranean Sea	The Navy utilizes Surveillance Towed Array Sensor System Low Frequency Active Sonar systems onboard several T-AGOS class vessels in the western and central North Pacific Ocean, not including polar waters, and the southwestern Indian Ocean. The Navy is currently conducting covered SURTASS LFA sonar activities under a Letter of Authorization (LOA) published in the Federal Register on August 12, 2019, effective through August 11, 2026. The Navy has updated its relevant environmental planning and compliance documents and published the Final SEIS/OEIS for Surveillance Towed Array Sensor System Low Frequency (SURTASS LFA) Sonar in June 2019 (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2019). National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) published a Proposed Rule on the project in March 2019 in the	The objective of mitigation for the employment of Surveillance Towed Array Sensor System Low Frequency Active Sonar is to reduce or avoid potential exposures of marine mammals, sea turtles, and human divers to	O	O	O

Table 4.2-1: Past, Present, and Reasonably Foreseeable Actions (continued)

Factor/Project	Location	Project Description	Summary of Impact Minimization and Mitigation Measures[1]	Project Timeframe C = Construction O = Operation X = Other		
				Past	Present	Future
		Federal Register, and NMFS issued an ESA Programmatic Biological Opinion/Incidental Take Statement for SURTASS LFA Sonar (effective with 2019 MMPA 7-Year Final Rule from 2019 to 2026) in July 2019 (United States Navy and Permits and Conservation Division et al., 2019). The underwater sound produced by this activity may contribute to the cumulative impacts on marine mammals and sea turtles in the Study Area (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2012), as the SURTASS LFA Study Area overlaps the entire MITT Study Area. The underwater sound produced by this project may contribute to the cumulative impacts on marine mammals and sea turtles in the Study Area.	Surveillance Towed Array Sensor System Low Frequency Active Sonar transmissions.			
Terminal High-Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) Permanent Stationing in Guam	Andersen Air Force Base, Guam	The Environmental Assessment (EA) for this project documents the environmental impacts associated with the expeditionary (temporary) placement and operation of a THAAD ballistic missile defense battery at Andersen Air Force Base in Guam, and from the proposed permanent stationing of the THAAD battery at its current location on Northwest Field (NWF). As a secondary, connected action to the expeditionary deployment and proposed permanent stationing of the THAAD battery in Guam, this EA also analyzes the potential impacts from the expansion of the NWF cargo drop zone training area that was encumbered by THAAD operations (U.S. Army, 2015).		C/O	O	O

Table 4.2-1: Past, Present, and Reasonably Foreseeable Actions (continued)

Factor/Project	Location	Project Description	Summary of Impact Minimization and Mitigation Measures[1]	Project Timeframe C = Construction O = Operation X = Other		
				Past	Present	Future
Other Commercial Industries						
Aquaculture	Oceans worldwide (including the Guam Aquaculture and Development Training Center in Mangilao [Fadian Hatchery])	Aquaculture is the farming of aquatic organisms such as fish, shellfish, and plants. Globally, 29 percent of stocks are fished at biologically unsustainable levels, and aquaculture helps meet demand and offsets stress to wild populations (National Marine Fisheries Service, 2015b). Aquaculture production reached an all-time high of 97 million metric tons in 2013 and is the fastest-growing form of food production, at 6 percent per year globally. Forty-seven percent of aquaculture operations occur in the Pacific Ocean. On Guam, the largest and oldest aquaculture center in the Western Pacific, the Fadian Hatchery, has been operating since the 1970s. A recent bill would expand aquaculture in Guam and improve the facilities at the Fadian Hatchery. The threats of aquaculture operations on wild fish populations include reduced water quality, competition for food, predation by escaped or released farmed fishes, the spread of disease and parasites, and reduced genetic diversity (Kappel, 2005). These threats become apparent when farmed fish escape and enter the natural ecosystem (Hansen & Windsor, 2006; Ormerod, 2003). The Marine Aquaculture Policy provides direction to enable the development of sustainable marine aquaculture (National Marine Fisheries Service, 2015b).		C/O	C/O	C/O

Table 4.2-1: Past, Present, and Reasonably Foreseeable Actions (continued)

Factor/Project	Location	Project Description	Summary of Impact Minimization and Mitigation Measures[1]	Project Timeframe C = Construction O = Operation X = Other		
				Past	Present	Future
Coastal Land Development and Tourism	Coastline	Coastal development intensifies use of coastal resources, resulting in potential impacts on water quality, marine habitat, and air quality. Coastal land development in the Study Area is both intensive and extensive. Development continues to impact coastal resources through point and non-point source pollution, concentrated recreational use, intensive ship traffic using major port facilities, and coastal tourism (e.g., hotels, resorts, restaurants, food industry, vacation homes, second homes) and supporting infrastructure (e.g., retail businesses, marinas, fishing tackle stores, dive shops, fishing piers, recreational boating harbors, beaches, recreational fishing facilities). Coastal development is regulated by states and territories through the Coastal Zone Management Act and associated state and local programs. Chapter 6 (Additional Regulatory Considerations) provides additional information on coastal zone management in the Study Area. Coastal development intensifies use of coastal resources through dune and nearshore habitat loss and disturbance, point and non-point source water pollution, entrainment in outflows and other structures, and air quality degradation. Self-contained underwater breathing apparatus (SCUBA) and snorkeling have the potential to degrade reef systems through disturbance and collecting. Collisions between whale-watching ships and whales are common. Temporary permits could be obtained from the CNMI Homeland Security and Emergency Management Office for various ecotourism activities. It is anticipated these activities would occur in the future (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2015a).	Site-specific mitigation often determined during Coastal Consistency Review by the Guam Coastal Management Program and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands Coastal Zone Management Program	C/O	C/O	C/O

Table 4.2-1: Past, Present, and Reasonably Foreseeable Actions (continued)

Factor/Project	Location	Project Description	Summary of Impact Minimization and Mitigation Measures[1]	Project Timeframe C = Construction O = Operation X = Other		
				Past	Present	Future
Commercial Fishing	Pacific Ocean	Commercial fishing constitutes an important and widespread use of the ocean resources throughout the Study Area, and can adversely affect marine species and habitats. Potential impacts include overfishing of targeted species and bycatch, both of which negatively affect fish stocks and other marine resources. Bycatch is the capture of fish, marine mammals, sea turtles, marine birds, and other non-targeted species that occurs incidental to normal fishing operations. Use of mobile fishing gear, such as bottom trawls, disturbs the seafloor and reduces structural complexity. Indirect impacts of trawls include increased turbidity, alteration of surface sediment, removal of prey (leading to declines in predator abundance), removal of predators, ghost fishing (i.e., lost fishing gear continuing to ensnare fish and other marine animals), and generation of marine debris. Lost gill nets, purse seines, and long lines may foul and disrupt bottom habitats and have the potential to entangle or be ingested by marine mammals. Jackson et al. (2001) analyzed paleoecological records of marine sediments from 125,000 years ago to present, archaeological records from 10,000 years before the present, historical documents, and ecological records from scientific literature sources over the past century. The analysis concluded that ecological extinction caused by overfishing precedes all other pervasive human disturbance of coastal ecosystems, including pollution and anthropogenic climate change. Fisheries bycatch has been identified as a primary driver of population declines in several groups of marine species, including sharks, mammals, marine birds, and sea turtles (Wallace et al., 2010). Therefore, commercial fishing may contribute to cumulative impacts on marine mammals, sea turtles, fish, and marine habitats in the Study Area.	Various bycatch mitigation technologies, quotas, and seasonal restrictions required per the fishery-specific permit process	O	O	O
Grand Mariana Casino and Hotel Resort	Garapan	This project plans for potentially up to 2,000 hotel rooms in stages, beginning with a 250-room hotel and casino (U.S. Department of the Air Force, 2016).				C/O

Table 4.2-1: Past, Present, and Reasonably Foreseeable Actions (continued)

Factor/Project	Location	Project Description	Summary of Impact Minimization and Mitigation Measures[1]	Project Timeframe C = Construction O = Operation X = Other		
				Past	Present	Future
Maritime Traffic	Pacific Ocean	Portions of the Study Area are heavily traveled by commercial, recreational, and government marine vessels, with several commercial ports occurring in or near the Study Area. Section 3.12 (Socioeconomic Resources) provides additional information for marine vessel traffic in the Study Area. Primary concerns for the cumulative impacts analysis include vessels striking marine mammals and sea turtles, the introduction of non-native species through ballast water, and underwater sound from ships and other vessels. Therefore, maritime traffic may contribute to the cumulative impacts on marine mammals and sea turtles in the Study Area. Additionally, air and water quality in busy ports can be diminished due to engine emissions and fuel leaks. Secondary impacts include maintenance of port infrastructure, which often includes dredging requirements to maintain channel depths, and habitat loss and degradation in coastal habitats.	Continued adherence to state and federal marine traffic and operations regulations	O	O	O
Plumeria Resort and Casino	Tinian	Construction is slated to run into 2027. The hotel would include over 6,000 accommodation units and be built in three phases to include villas, a casino, golf course, water park, shops, restaurants, and new roads over 151 hectares of property at Puntan Diablo Cove on Tinian (U.S. Department of the Air Force, 2016). The resources evaluated that could contribute to cumulative impacts include water resources, air quality, cultural resources, geology and soils, terrestrial resources, and socioeconomic resources.			C	C/O
Project ATISA	Undersea between Guam, Saipan, Rota, and Tinian	The DoCoMo Pacific and NEC Corporation built a 175-mile optical fiber cable system that connects Guam and the CNMI and offers new wireless, cable TV, home phone, and broadband services.		C	O	O

Table 4.2-1: Past, Present, and Reasonably Foreseeable Actions (continued)

Factor/Project	Location	Project Description	Summary of Impact Minimization and Mitigation Measures[1]	Project Timeframe C = Construction O = Operation X = Other		
				Past	Present	Future
Recreational and Cultural Fishing	Pacific Ocean	Recreational and cultural fishing includes impacts from vessel traffic (e.g., strike, noise, water pollution, marine debris) and can compound impacts on fish stocks already experiencing exploitation. Recreational and cultural fishing and boat traffic usually occurs nearshore rather than in the deeper open ocean, and recreational/cultural traffic typically frequents popular locations, which can concentrate damage in these areas from anchors or other bottom-disturbing equipment.	Operational regulations, seasonal restrictions, licensing, and quotas used to manage and mitigate negative effects of recreational and cultural fishing, such as geographic limitations (i.e., no fishing in refuges/marine preservation areas)	O	O	O
Saipan Water System Improvements	Saipan (Multiple Sites)	The project will provide focus and direction for meeting a U.S. EPA stipulated order to meet Clean Water Act and the Safe Drinking Water Act requirements in Saipan on existing water quality outputs. Construction of the project began in 2012 and is expected to occur through 2020 (U.S. Department of the Air Force, 2016). The resources evaluated that could contribute to cumulative impacts include public health and safety, socioeconomic resources, and water quality.		C	C	C/O
Wastewater System for Saipan	Saipan (Multiple Sites)	The project is updating the existing water/sewer system due to a U.S. Federal Court order. The rehabilitated water/sewer system will be compliant with U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) requirements. Construction of the project began in 2012 and is expected to occur through 2020 (U.S. Department of the Air Force, 2016). The resources evaluated that could contribute to cumulative impacts include public health and safety, socioeconomic resources, and water quality.		C	C	C/O

Table 4.2-1: Past, Present, and Reasonably Foreseeable Actions (continued)

Factor/Project	Location	Project Description	Summary of Impact Minimization and Mitigation Measures[1]	Project Timeframe C = Construction O = Operation X = Other		
				Past	Present	Future
Seismic Surveys	Waters near the Study Area in the Territory of Guam and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands	Seismic surveys are typically accomplished by towing a sound source, such as an airgun array that emits acoustic energy in timed intervals behind a research vessel. The transmitted acoustic energy is reflected and received by an array of hydrophones. This acoustic information is processed to provide information about geological structure below the seafloor. The oil and gas industry uses seismic surveys to search for new hydrocarbon deposits. Also, academic geologists use them to study plate tectonics and other topics. The underwater sound produced by these surveys could affect marine life, including marine mammals. For example, the potential exists to expose some animals to sound levels exceeding 180 decibels referenced to 1 micropascal root mean square, which would in turn potentially result in temporary or permanent loss of hearing (Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, 2011). All seismic surveys conducted by U.S. vessels are subject to the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA) authorization process administered by NMFS, as well as the NEPA process associated with issuing MMPA authorizations.	Specific mitigations and conditions are designated for implementation during seismic surveys by the NMFS in MMPA authorizations to reduce impacts to marine mammals	O	O	O
Tinian Airport Improvements	Airport on Tinian	The project includes (1) relocation of the Aircraft Rescue and Fire Fighting Facility building, (2) terminal improvements, (3) acquisition of a 1,500-gallon Aircraft Rescue and Fire Fighting Facility vehicle, and (4) a new water line (U.S. Department of the Air Force, 2016).		C	C	O
Undersea Communications Cables	Pacific Ocean/ Connections between Guam and Hawaii and Asia	Submarine cables provide the primary means of voice, data, and Internet connectivity between the mainland U.S. and the rest of the world (Federal Communications Commission, 2017). The Federal Communications Commission grants licenses authorizing cable applicants to install, own, and operate submarine cables and associated landing stations in the United States. Cables are installed by specialized boats across flat ocean surfaces and	Continued adherence to international marine construction and operational regulations	C/O	C/O	C/O

Table 4.2-1: Past, Present, and Reasonably Foreseeable Actions (continued)

Factor/Project	Location	Project Description	Summary of Impact Minimization and Mitigation Measures[1]	Project Timeframe C = Construction O = Operation X = Other		
				Past	Present	Future
		dug into the seabed in shallow areas. Over 550,000 mi. of cables currently exist in the world's oceans. SEA-US trans-Pacific cables will be routed to avoid congested earthquake prone regions and to optimize stable connectivity between the United States and Asia with landing stations in Hawaii and Guam. DoCoMo's ATISA network also is in operation and connects Guam, Saipan, Rota, and Tinian. Other telecom and consortiums continue to discuss the potential submarine cable projects in the region. Cable networks will continue to be updated in the future creating job opportunities and benefits to professions where cables connect users to the internet for less cost (Losinio, 2017). Potential impacts of installation and maintenance activities would include noise and vessel strike from boat traffic and increased seafloor disturbance and sedimentation in localized areas where the cable is installed. Likewise, electromagnetic fields are generated by some cables that may be sensed by and affect the migration behavior of some fish, sharks, rays, and eels (Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, 2016).				
Research and Conservation						
Academic Research	Global	Wide-scale academic research is conducted in the Study Area by federal entities, such as the Navy and National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration/NMFS, as well as state and private entities and other partnerships. Although academic research aims to capture data without disturbing the ambient conditions of the ocean environment, vessels contribute to traffic, noise, and strike hazard; seismic activity contributes noise; and various other collection methods, such as trawling, could be disruptive to the ecosystems under observation. Impacts from academic research operations can be similar to the impacts expected from oil and gas airgun survey activities, when	NMFS and local government programs manage scientific research permits for certain activities	O	O	O

Table 4.2-1: Past, Present, and Reasonably Foreseeable Actions (continued)

Factor/Project	Location	Project Description	Summary of Impact Minimization and Mitigation Measures[1]	Project Timeframe C = Construction O = Operation X = Other		
				Past	Present	Future
		an airgun array that emits acoustic energy in timed intervals behind a research vessel is used.				
Pollution Prevention Grant	CNMI	The CNMI Bureau of Environmental and Coastal Quality provided this grant to support CNMI programs that reduce the environmental impact of local businesses significantly. The impacts of the programs the grant supported were to reduce pollution in air, water, and land during construction and operations by setting requirements and conditions for the Bureau of Environmental and Coastal Quality's permitting process.		O	O	O
Ocean Pollution and Ecosystem Alteration						
Noise	Global	Ambient noise is the collection of ever-present sounds of both natural and human origins. Ambient noise in the ocean is generated by sources that are natural such as physical (e.g., earthquakes, rainfall, waves breaking, and lightning hitting the ocean), biological (e.g., snapping shrimp and the vocalizations of marine mammals), and anthropogenic (human-generated) sources. Anthropogenic sources have substantially increased ocean noise since the 1960s, and include commercial shipping, oil and gas exploration and production activities (including air gun, sonar, drilling, and explosive decommissioning), commercial and recreational fishing (including vessel noise, fish-finding sonar, fathometers, and acoustic deterrent and harassment devices), military (testing, training, and mission activities), shoreline construction projects (including pile driving), recreational boating and whale-watching activities, offshore power generation (including offshore wind farms), and research (including sound from air guns, sonar, and telemetry). The contribution of military and non-military vessel traffic to the underwater noise experienced in the Study Area is discussed in Section 3.0.4.1.2 (Vessel Noise).		O	O	O

Table 4.2-1: Past, Present, and Reasonably Foreseeable Actions (continued)

Factor/Project	Location	Project Description	Summary of Impact Minimization and Mitigation Measures[1]	Project Timeframe C = Construction O = Operation X = Other		
				Past	Present	Future
Marine Debris Section 3.1.1.1.1 (Marine Debris and Water Quality)	Global	Marine debris is any anthropogenic object intentionally or unintentionally discarded, disposed of, or abandoned that enters the marine environment (National Marine Fisheries Service, 2006). Common types of marine debris include various forms of plastic and abandoned fishing gear. Marine debris degrades marine habitat quality and poses ingestion and entanglement risks to marine life and birds (National Marine Fisheries Service, 2006). Plastic debris is a major concern because it degrades slowly and many plastics float. The floating debris is transported by currents throughout the oceans and has been discovered accumulating in oceanic gyres (Law et al., 2010). Additionally, plastic waste in the ocean chemically attracts hydrocarbon pollutants such as polychlorinated biphenyl and dichlorodiphenyltrichloroethane, which accumulate up to one million times more in plastic than in ocean water (Mato et al., 2001). Fish, marine animals, and birds can mistakenly consume these wastes that contain elevated levels of toxins, instead of their prey. In the North Pacific Subtropical Gyre, it is estimated that the fishes in this area are ingesting 12,000–24,000 U.S. tons of plastic debris a year (Davison & Asch, 2011). CNMI has attempted to reduce the occurrence of marine debris under Section 309 of the Coastal Zone Management Act as amended in 1990 and 1996, through the CNMI Department of Coastal Resources Management which implements fines and penalties for violators.		O	O	O

Table 4.2-1: Past, Present, and Reasonably Foreseeable Actions (continued)

Factor/Project	Location	Project Description	Summary of Impact Minimization and Mitigation Measures[1]	Project Timeframe C = Construction O = Operation X = Other		
				Past	Present	Future
Pollution (Section 3.1, Sediments and Water Quality)	Global	Common ocean pollutants are derived from land-based activities and include toxic compounds such as metals, pesticides, and other organic chemicals; excess nutrients from fertilizers and sewage; detergents; oil; plastics; and other solids. Pollutants enter oceans from non-point sources (stormwater runoff from watersheds), point sources (wastewater treatment plant discharges), other land-based sources (windblown debris), spills, dumping, vessels, and atmospheric deposition. Bilgewater is a mix of water, oily fluids, lubricants, grease, cleaning fluids, and other wastes that are pumped out periodically from vessel holding tanks, either to a reception facility onshore or treated with a bilge oil-separator and discharged at sea. Discharging sewage is largely prohibited under the Clean Water Act. The main risk of oil or other petroleum product spills is from ships, whether carrying petroleum to and from ports or in fuel tanks, and from pipelines and onshore facilities that transport and store oil and gas. CNMI has attempted to reduce the occurrence of pollution under Section 309 of the Coastal Zone Management Act as amended in 1990 and 1996, through the CNMI Department of Coastal Resources Management which implements fines and penalties for violators.		O	O	O
Climate Change (Section 3.2, Air Quality)	Global	Predictions of long-term negative environmental impacts, some of which have begun to occur at present, due to climate change include sea level rise; changes in ocean surface temperature, acidity/alkalinity, and salinity; changing weather patterns with increases in the severity of storms and droughts; changes to local and regional ecosystems (including the potential loss of species); shrinking glaciers and sea ice; thawing permafrost; a longer growing season; and shifts in plant and animal ranges, fecundity, and productivity. A special report by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change discussed the long-term warming trend observed since pre-industrial times (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, 2018), and how higher than the global annual average temperatures are being experienced in many		X	X	X

Table 4.2-1: Past, Present, and Reasonably Foreseeable Actions (continued)

Factor/Project	Location	Project Description	Summary of Impact Minimization and Mitigation Measures[1]	Project Timeframe C = Construction O = Operation X = Other		
				Past	Present	Future
		land regions and seasons. An example of the increase in the severity of storms occurred in October 2018. Typhoon Yutu had sustained winds of 180 miles per hour, and was the Earth's 10th Category 5 storm of 2018. It was the biggest storm to hit U.S. soil since 1935, as two people were killed, hundreds were injured, and over 3,000 houses were destroyed. In the aftermath much of Saipan and Tinian went without power for weeks afterwards and had severe water shortages (Wong & Cruz, 2018).Anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions have changed the physical and chemical properties of the oceans, including a 1-degree Celsius temperature rise, increased carbon dioxide absorption, decreased pH, alteration of carbonate chemistry, the decline in dissolved oxygen, and disruption of ocean circulation (Poloczanska et al., 2016). Observations of species responses that have been linked to anthropogenic climate change are widespread, and trends include shifts in species distribution to higher latitudes and deeper locations, earlier onset of spring and later arrival of fall, declines in calcification, and increases in the abundance of warm-water species. Climate change is expected to continue to impact the Study Area negatively and will contribute added stressors to all resources in the Study Area. CNMI has attempted to assess and mitigate the effects of climate change under Section 309 of the Coastal Zone Management Act as amended in 1990 and 1996, through the CNMI Department of Coastal Resources Management, through working groups and research.				

Table 4.2-1: Past, Present, and Reasonably Foreseeable Actions (continued)

Factor/Project	Location	Project Description	Summary of Impact Minimization and Mitigation Measures[1]	Project Timeframe C = Construction O = Operation X = Other		
				Past	Present	Future

[1] Some projects/activities did not list specific impacts minimization measures (such as avoidance techniques, standard operating procedures, or industry-best management practices) or mitigation requirements; either official documentation of project descriptions could not be obtained or did not specify these actions. In most cases, site-specific actions are to be developed as specific projects are developed.

Notes: CNMI = Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, EA = Environmental Assessment, EIS = Environmental Impact Statement, NOA = Notice of Availability, OEIS = Overseas Environmental Impact Statement, SCUBA = Self-Contained Underwater Breathing Apparatus, SEIS = Supplemental EIS, U.S. = United States, USAF = U.S. Air Force

4.3 Cumulative Impacts on Environmental Resources

Since the information available on past, present, and reasonably foreseeable actions varies in quality and level of detail, impacts of these actions were quantified where available data made it possible; otherwise, professional judgment was used to make a qualitative assessment of impacts. Due to the large scale of the area considered (the Study Area and overlapping areas of other actions) and multiple other activities interacting in the ocean environment (Table 4.2-1), the analysis of the incremental contribution to cumulative stress that the Proposed Action may have on a given resource is largely qualitative and speculative. Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) includes a robust discussion of the "general threats," an analysis of aggregate project effects, and a broader level analysis specific to areas where impacts are concentrated (i.e., ranges/operating areas). The Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) analysis is referenced and briefly summarized in each section below to provide context and perspective to the rationale for the conclusions that the Proposed Action would have an insignificant contribution to the cumulative stress experienced by these resources.

Cumulative impacts were analyzed for each resource addressed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) for the Proposed Action in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions. The analysis was not separated by Alternative because the data available for the cumulative effects analysis was mostly qualitative and, from a landscape-level perspective, these qualitative impacts are expected to be similar.

Under Alternative 1 or Alternative 2 of the Proposed Action, the Navy would implement the mitigation detailed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) to avoid or reduce impacts on biological, socioeconomic, and cultural resources in the Study Area.

4.4 Resource-Specific Cumulative Impacts

By CEQ guidance (Council on Environmental Quality, 1997), the following cumulative impacts analysis focuses on impacts that are "truly meaningful." The level of analysis for each resource is commensurate with the intensity of the impacts identified in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) and the level to which impacts from the Proposed Action are expected to mingle with impacts from existing activities. A full analysis of potential cumulative impacts is provided for marine mammals, marine invertebrates, sea turtles, and socioeconomic resources. The rationale is also provided for an abbreviated analysis of the following resources: sediments and water quality, air quality, marine habitats, marine birds, marine vegetation, fishes, cultural resources, terrestrial species and habitats, socioeconomic resources, and public health and safety.

4.4.1 Sediments and Water Quality

In the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, the analysis in Section 3.1 (Sediments and Water Quality) indicated that training and testing activities under each alternative could result in local, short- and long-term changes in sediment and water quality. However, chemical, physical, or biological changes remained within standards, regulations, and guidelines. The short-term impacts arose from explosions and the byproducts of explosions and combusted propellants. The analysis in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS determined that it was unlikely that these short-term impacts would overlap in time and space with other future actions that produce similar constituents. Therefore, the short-term impacts did not contribute to cumulative impacts.

The long-term impacts arose from unexploded ordnance, non-combusted propellant, metals, and other materials. Long-term impacts of each alternative are cumulative with other actions that cause increases in similar constituents. However, the contribution of Alternative 1 or Alternative 2 in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS to long-term cumulative impacts was determined to be negligible because of the following:

- Most training and testing activities are widely dispersed in space and time.
- Where activities are concentrated (i.e., Farallon de Medinilla [FDM]), marine habitat conditions observed over multiple years through dive studies indicate that ecological services that maintain water quality have not been inhibited at FDM.
- Most components of expended materials are inert or corrode slowly.
- Numerically, most of the metals expended are small- and medium-caliber projectiles, metals of concern comprise a small portion of the alloys used in expended materials, and metal corrosion is a slow process that allows for dilution.
- Most of the components are subject to a variety of physical, chemical, and biological processes that render them benign.
- Potential areas of impacts would be limited to small zones immediately adjacent to the explosive, metals, or chemicals.

Under this SEIS/OEIS, the contribution of proposed changes in training and testing activities under Alternative 1 or Alternative 2 would still be negligible based on the reasons presented above. While all of the additional projects since 2015 may be measurable and result in long-term and widespread changes in environmental conditions (e.g., nutrient loading, turbidity, salinity, or pH), any changes in sediment and water quality would be subject to applicable standards and guidelines. Given that impacts on water quality as a result of the proposed training and testing activities would be considered negligible, the incremental contribution to cumulative impacts on water quality would also be negligible.

4.4.2 Air Quality

In the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, the analysis in Section 3.2 (Air Quality) indicated that training and testing activities conducted under each alternative resulted in increased criteria pollutant emissions and hazardous air pollutant emissions throughout the Study Area. Sources of the emissions included vessels and aircraft and, to a lesser extent, munitions. Potential impacts included localized and temporarily elevated pollutant concentrations; however, recovery occurs quickly as emissions disperse. The analysis in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS concluded that the impacts of Alternatives 1 or 2 were cumulative with other actions that involve criteria air pollutant and hazardous air pollutant emissions. However, the incremental contributions, from implementing activities in accordance with the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS Record of Decision (ROD), to cumulative impacts were low for the following reasons:

- Most training and testing activities-related emissions are projected to occur at distances greater than 3 nautical miles (NM) from shore.
- Few stationary offshore air pollutant emission sources exist within the Study Area, and few are expected in the foreseeable future.
- International regulations by the International Maritime Organization required commercial shipping vessels to switch to lower-sulfur fuel near U.S. and international coasts beginning in 2012 (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration 2011).

- The Department of Defense released the *Operational Energy Strategy: Implementation Plan*, which reduced demand, diversified energy sources, and integrated energy consideration into planning (Department of Defense 2012). Since then, the Navy has released the 2016 Operational Energy Strategy, which builds on the successes of the 2012 Operational Energy Strategy (U.S. Department of Defense, 2016).

Under this SEIS/OEIS, the contribution of proposed increases in training and testing activities under Alternative 1 or Alternative 2 would still result in low cumulative impacts based on the reasons presented above. In addition, the International Maritime Organization is set to impose a new 0.5 percent sulfur cap on marine fuel emissions (International Maritime Organization, 2017). Construction-related activities associated with the additional other projects in the area could generate increased air emissions; however, air quality in the region would not be significantly impacted due to the quick dispersive nature of emissions. Based on the analysis presented in Section 3.2 (Air Quality) of this SEIS/OEIS and the reasons summarized above, the incremental contribution of Alternatives 1 or 2 to cumulative impacts on air quality would not be significant.

In addition to the cumulative effects of criteria and hazardous air pollutants, greenhouse gas emissions would increase under the Proposed Action. Greenhouse gases contribute to climate change, which are felt on a global scale, rather than having localized effects. Although the Proposed Action would result in a decrease in greenhouse gas emissions, the Secretary of the Navy has released energy goals that aim to reduce the overall impact that the department has on climate change. Some of those goals involve using alternative energy sources for 50 percent of total consumption needs by 2020, having 50 percent of Navy and Marine Corps installations be net-zero emissions by 2020, and reducing petroleum use in the commercial fleet by 50 percent. These activities would more than offset the greenhouse gas emissions that would result from implementation of Alternative 1 or 2.

4.4.3 Marine Habitats

In the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, the analysis presented in Section 3.3 (Marine Habitats) indicated that marine habitats were affected by explosive stressors (underwater detonations) and physical disturbance or strikes (vessels and in-water devices, military expended materials, or seafloor devices). Impacts included localized disturbance of the seafloor, cratering of soft bottom sediments, and structural damage to hard bottom habitats. Impacts on soft bottom habitats were determined to be short term, and impacts on the hard bottom were determined to be long term. Alterations to marine habitats that occurred under the alternatives in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS were found to be additive to those associated with other actions. The relative incremental contributions, from implementing activities in accordance with the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS ROD, to the overall alterations of marine habitats within the Study Area were low for the following reasons:

- As stated in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, training activities utilizing bottom placed detonations would only occur in the existing underwater detonation areas at Piti, Agat, and Outer Apra Harbor. Cobble, rocky reef, and other hard bottom habitat may be scattered throughout the area, but those areas would be avoided during training to the maximum extent practicable.
- Impacts were confined to a limited area, and recovery of soft bottom habitats occurs quickly.

It can reasonably be assumed that there may be impacts on marine habitats from other actions such as seismic surveys and commercial fishing, but no specific details regarding the impacts or effects can be determined with any specificity or certainty. Seismic surveys and commercial fishing may occur in any open area of the Study Area. Seismic surveys could temporarily disturb soft bottom sediment and would

have no impacts on non-living hard-bottom habitats. Commercial fishing could temporarily disturb soft bottom sediment, and trawling or dragging the bottom of the seafloor could have moderately longer impacts on non-living hard-bottom habitats by movement of sediment; however, impacts would not change the nature of the habitat from non-living hard-bottom. For actions such as the Department of the Navy's Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands Joint Military Training action, direct and indirect impacts could occur on Tinian; however, the Proposed Action is being revised to avoid or reduce direct impacts on marine habitats. Proposed training and testing activities under this SEIS/OEIS would result in minimal impacts on habitat on or around Tinian due to proposed activities such as amphibious assault; raid; noncombatant evacuation operation; humanitarian assistance/disaster relief operations; personnel insertion/extraction; parachute insertion; and intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance. These impacts would be minimal because proposed activities that could impact marine habitats, such as explosives, would not occur in the nearshore region of Tinian. Standard operating procedures, and mitigation measures would avoid or reduce impacts on marine habitat for the activities listed that occur near Tinian under the Proposed Action. Based on the analysis presented in Section 3.3 (Marine Habitats) and the reasons summarized above, the incremental contribution of Alternatives 1 or 2 to cumulative impacts would be negligible. Therefore, further analysis of cumulative impacts on marine habitats is not warranted.

4.4.4 Marine Mammals

4.4.4.1 Region of Influence

The range and habitat for marine mammals extends well beyond the Study Area boundaries and for some species represents only a portion of the full extent of the species' range during their life cycle. Baleen whales (e.g., humpback and blue whales) and some toothed whales (e.g., sperm whales and killer whales) seasonally migrate great distances, including into and out of the Study Area. Many of the smaller toothed whales do not migrate in the strictest sense, but some do undergo seasonal shifts in distribution both within and outside of the Study Area.

Table 3.4-1 lists the current abundance of marine mammal species in the Study Area and the general occurrence locations within the Study Area where they may be encountered. There are 26 marine mammal species known to exist in the Study Area, including 7 mysticetes (baleen whales) and 19 odontocetes (dolphins and toothed whales). Populations are varied; while the average population of certain dolphin and some whale populations include thousands of individuals, other stock populations are unknown or estimated to be in the hundreds. As with other marine resources, distribution is patchy and can be temporarily concentrated in specific areas depending on the species.

4.4.4.2 Resource Trends

Relevant information on the status, distribution, population trends, and ecology is presented for each species and stock in the Study Area in Section 3.4.1 (Affected Environment). The current aggregate impacts of past human activities are significant for some marine mammal species, many of which were in serious decline across the world's oceans. In the Pacific and specifically where the Navy has been intensively training and testing activities for decades, many marine mammal populations seem to be trending towards an increase in abundance.

4.4.4.3 Impacts of Other Actions

4.4.4.3.1 Overview

Section 3.4.1.7 (General Threats) discusses threats within the affected environment that impact marine mammal populations in the Study Area, including water quality degradation (chemical pollution), commercial industries (fisheries bycatch, explosive pest deterrents, and other interactions), noise, hunting, vessel strike, marine debris, disease and parasites, and climate change. Potential impacts of actions that affect marine mammals include mortality, injury, disturbance, and reduced fitness (e.g., reduced reproductive, foraging, and predator avoidance success). The susceptibility of marine mammals to these impacts often depends on proximity, severity, or vulnerability to the stressor, and vulnerability can be increased as multiple stressors compound on an individual.

The activities as described in Table 4.2-1 each potentially create multiple stressors in the Study Area experienced by marine mammals, including vessel traffic, underwater noise, and water pollution. For example, most Navy actions include marine vessel operations, which contribute to underwater noise and the risk of vessel strikes, but Navy vessels are a negligible fraction of the overall vessel presence and, thus, vessel noise in the Study Area. Tens of thousands of cargo vessels annually transit through the Study Area to and from ports in Asia as part of the global network of commercial ship movement (Kaluza et al., 2010). Many human activities also contribute underwater noise from sources other than vessels, including commercial fishing, seismic surveys, construction activities, and other military operations. Bycatch and entanglement, the main threats to marine mammal populations, are chiefly associated with fishing (National Marine Fisheries Service, 2016; Read et al., 2006). While Table 4.2-1 discusses these stressors for individual actions, their aggregate impacts specific to marine mammals are detailed in Section 3.4.1.7 (General Threats) and further described below. Data availability is inconsistent between species and activities, but quantitative estimations are presented where available.

4.4.4.3.2 Commercial Fishing

Several commercial foreign fisheries operate in the Study Area. Potential impacts from these activities include marine mammal injury and mortality due to bycatch and entanglement. Fisheries have also resulted in substantial changes to the structure and function of marine ecosystems that adversely affect marine mammals (National Marine Fisheries Service, 2016). As discussed below, future commercial fishing activities in the Study Area are expected to result in significant impacts on some marine mammal species based on the relatively high injury and mortality rates associated with bycatch and entanglement. This mortality could result in or contribute to population declines for some species. Ecological changes brought about by commercial fishing are also expected to adversely impact marine mammals in the Study Area.

4.4.4.3.2.1 Bycatch

Potential impacts from commercial fishing activities include marine mammal injury and mortality from bycatch, when animals are caught in commercial fishing operations targeting a different species. In 1994, the MMPA was amended to formally require the development of a take reduction plan when U.S. bycatch exceeds a level that is considered unsustainable by the marine mammal population and will lead to marine mammal population decline for U.S. stocks of marine mammals. Although marine mammal bycatch associated with U.S. fisheries has generally declined since the implementation of take reduction measures, and new management practices and consistent regulatory oversight could result in future reductions, this only affects U.S. fisheries; bycatch is expected to remain a leading cause of mortality for

the reasonably foreseeable future (Baker et al., 2006; Lent & Squires, 2017; Read et al., 2006; Song, 2017).

The potential biological removal level is the number of animals that can be removed each year without preventing a stock from reaching or maintaining its optimal sustainable population level. The impacts of bycatch on marine mammal populations vary based on removal rates, population size, and reproductive rates. Small populations with relatively low reproductive rates are most susceptible. At least in part as a result of the MMPA bycatch amendment, estimates of bycatch in the Pacific declined by a total of 96 percent from 1994 to 2006 (Geijer & Read, 2013). Cetacean bycatch declined by 85 percent from 342 in 1994 to 53 in 2006, and pinniped bycatch declined from 1,332 to 53 over the same time period.

Fisheries operations also result in substantial changes to the structure and function of marine ecosystems that adversely affect marine mammals, including loss of prey species and alteration of benthic structure. Overfishing of many fish stocks results in significant changes in trophic structure, species assemblages, and pathways of energy flow in marine ecosystems (Jackson et al., 2001; Myers & Worm, 2003). These ecological changes may have important, and likely adverse, consequences for populations of marine mammals (DeMaster et al., 2001). For instance, depletion of preferred prey could lead to a less-nutritious diet and decreased reproductive success.

4.4.4.3.2.2 Entanglement

As discussed in Section 3.4.1.7 (General Threats), entanglement in fishing gear, such as abandoned or partial nets, fishing line, and the ropes and lines connected to fishing gear, is another threat to marine mammals in the Study Area. The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Marine Debris Program (2014) reports that abandoned, lost, or otherwise discarded fishing gear still constitutes the vast majority of mysticete entanglements.

4.4.4.3.2.3 Hunting

With the enactment of the MMPA, hunting-related mortality has decreased over the last 40 years; however, unregulated harvests and extensive legal and illegal whaling activity still occur in areas outside of U.S. waters. Between 1948 and 1979, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics' whale harvest totaled 195,783 in the North Pacific Ocean. Subsistence harvest of marine mammals by Russian and Alaska Natives occurs in the North Pacific, Chukchi Sea, and Bering Sea, affecting marine mammal stocks that may be present in the Study Area.

4.4.4.3.3 Maritime Traffic and Vessel Strikes

Maritime traffic has increased over the past 50 years, and vessel traffic is expected to continue to increase in the Study Area due to continued economic globalization, widening of the Panama Canal, and increases in offshore energy development and other offshore activities (see for example (Kaluza et al., 2010)). While increased risks come with increased vessel traffic, risks of vessel strikes could be minimized by ongoing and future education and awareness, marine mammal reporting, and maritime traffic planning and management. The most vulnerable marine mammals are thought to be those that spend extended periods at the surface or species whose unresponsiveness to vessel sound makes them more susceptible to vessel collisions (Gerstein, 2002; Laist & Shaw, 2006; Nowacek et al., 2004). Marine mammals such as dolphins and porpoises, which can move quickly throughout the water column, are not as susceptible to vessel strikes.

4.4.4.3.4 Ocean Pollution

As discussed in Table 4.2-1, multiple pollutants from numerous sources are present in, and continue to be released into, the oceans. These releases that affect marine mammals include water pollution as well as the discharge of marine debris and the proliferation of ambient as well as impulsive noise in the underwater ecosystem. Section 3.4.1.7 (General Threats) provides an overview of these potential impacts, which include morbidity and mortality from acute toxicity (although mortality has not yet specifically been shown in marine mammals); disruption of endocrine cycles and developmental processes causing reproductive failures or birth defects; suppression of immune system function; and metabolic disorders resulting in cancer or genetic abnormalities (Reijnders et al., 2009). The effects of exposure to and concentration of persistent organic pollutants in marine mammals, especially from pesticides, includes the accumulation of dichlorodiphenyltrichloroethane (DDT) and polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) in certain species, and high concentrations of organochlorines in tissues appear to have occurred with increasing frequency, based on disease outbreaks involving marine mammals. In addition, experimental and other evidence has shown that persistent contaminants often found in the tissues of marine mammals have deleterious effects on reproduction and the immune system (O'Shea et al., 1999).

4.4.4.3.5 Ocean Noise

Ocean noise as a general stressor in modern oceans is described in Table 4.2-1 and as specific stressors to marine mammals in Section 3.4.1.7 (General Threats). Noise is of particular concern to marine mammals because many species use sound as a primary sense for navigating, finding prey, avoiding predators, and communicating with other individuals. Noise can cause behavioral disturbances; mask other sounds (including their own vocalizations); and may result in injury, including hearing loss in the form of temporary threshold shift or permanent threshold shift (PTS) or, in some cases, death.

Anthropogenic noise is generated from a variety of sources throughout the Study Area, including commercial shipping, oil and gas exploration and production activities (including air gun, drilling, and explosive decommissioning), commercial and recreational fishing (including vessel noise, fish-finding sonar, fathometers, acoustic deterrent, and harassment devices), shoreline construction projects (including pile driving), recreational boating and whale-watching activities, offshore power generation (including offshore windfarms), and research (including sound from air guns, sonar, and telemetry).

The military activities addressed in Table 4.2-1 include various training and testing operations that contribute vessel noise, in-water and in-air explosions, and sonar. While sonar activity can impact individual marine mammals, impacts on populations are not expected. Although various other training and testing activities involve surface or undersea detonations or gunnery exercises, these are generally mitigated through monitored exclusion zones and are infrequent, isolated events. As noted in Table 4.2-1, many activities incorporate best management practices or standard operating procedures to minimize noise generation; in particular, in-water construction at naval piers regularly utilizes dampening and attenuation technologies and other practices that reduce impacts on bottlenose dolphins and other sensitive receptors in the vicinity of pile-driving activities.

4.4.4.3.6 Marine Debris and Ingestion

Interactions between marine mammals and marine debris, including derelict fishing gear (as discussed in Section 4.4.4.3.2.2, Entanglement) and plastics, are significant sources of injury and mortality (Baulch & Perry, 2014), and the percentage of marine mammal species with documented records of entanglement in or ingestion of marine debris has increased from 43 to 66 percent over the past 18 years (Bergmann

et al., 2015). Ingestion of plastic bags and Styrofoam has been identified as a cause of injury or death of minke whales and deep-diving odontocetes, including beaked whales, pygmy sperm whales, pilot whales, and sperm whales.

4.4.4.3.7 Disease and Parasites

Section 3.4.1.7.8 (Disease and Parasites) discusses the effects of disease and parasites in marine mammals. Just like humans, older animals are more likely to be affected by disease and likewise can spread disease through a population, affecting a significant number of otherwise healthy individuals. Mass die-off events can also occur as a result of toxic algal blooms, which may be increasing in frequency due to human nutrient input and climate change, and the spread of certain parasites from the feces of feral cats (toxoplasmosis, hookworms, lungworms, and thorny-headed worms) to marine mammals in storm runoff.

4.4.4.4 Impacts of the Proposed Action that May Contribute to Cumulative Impacts

Impacts of the Proposed Action are detailed in Section 3.4 (Marine Mammals). Impacts that may contribute to cumulative impacts on marine mammals can be generally categorized as mortality, injury (Level A harassment under the MMPA), and behavioral responses and temporary threshold shift (TTS) (Level B harassment under the MMPA). These impacts would be associated with certain acoustic (sonar and other transducers), physical disturbance, and strike stressors. Although behavioral impacts are possible from the remaining stressors (as defined in Section 3.4.2, Environmental Consequences), these stressors are not expected to result in harassment, TTS, PTS, injury, or mortality of marine mammals.

The analysis presented in Section 3.4 (Marine Mammals) concluded that some stressors associated with the Proposed Action could impact individuals of certain marine mammal species, but impacts are not expected to decrease the overall fitness of any marine mammal population. Species most likely to be impacted by training and testing activities are dwarf sperm whales and pygmy sperm whales along with delphinids species (dolphins and small whales), which are the most abundant species in the Study Area. From a cumulative perspective, any potential impacts on species with small populations, especially Endangered Species Act (ESA)-listed species, are of particular concern, and the Navy has consulted with the National Marine Fisheries Service, as required by Section 7(a)(2) of the ESA, in that regard. The Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce impacts from acoustic, explosive, and physical disturbance and strike stressors on marine mammals, as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation).

As determined in Section 3.4 (Marine Mammals), it is not anticipated that the Proposed Action would result in significant impacts on marine mammal populations. The majority of the proposed activities are unit-level training and testing activities, which are conducted in the open ocean. Unit-level events occur over a small spatial scale (one to a few square miles) and with few participants (usually one or two) or short duration (the order of a few hours or less). Additionally, training and testing activities are generally separated in space and time in such a way that it would be unlikely that any individual marine mammal would be exposed to stressors from multiple activities within a short timeframe. Furthermore, research and monitoring efforts have included before, during, and after-event observations and surveys, data collection through conducting long-term studies in areas of Navy activity, occurrence surveys over large geographic areas, biopsy of animals occurring in areas of Navy activity, and tagging studies where animals are exposed to Navy stressors. To date, the findings from the research and monitoring and the regulatory conclusions from previous analyses by the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) (National Marine Fisheries Service, 2015a; National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2013) are that the

majority of impacts from Navy training and testing activities are not expected to have deleterious impacts on the fitness of any individuals or long-term consequences to populations of marine mammals.

Mitigation measures discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) are designed to avoid or reduce potential impacts of explosives, especially higher-order impacts such as injury and mortality to the greatest extent practicable. The acoustic analysis indicates that pressure waves resulting from explosive detonations would not lead to mortality for any of the marine mammals in the Study Area. The effectiveness of procedural mitigation measures is conservatively considered in the Navy's quantitative analysis process.

There are no records of a marine mammal ever being struck by a vessel during training and testing activities in the Study Area, and a vessel strike resulting from the Proposed Action is not anticipated.

4.4.4.5 Cumulative Impacts on Marine Mammals

As discussed above, fishery bycatch, vessel strikes, and entanglement in marine debris are leading causes of direct mortality to marine mammals (Carretta et al., 2017; Helker et al., 2017; Lent & Squires, 2017; National Marine Fisheries Service, 2016; National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Marine Debris Program, 2014; Read et al., 2006). Although Navy activities are mitigated to the greatest extent practicable, the Proposed Action could also result in injury and mortality to individuals of some marine mammal species from in-water explosions and vessel strikes. Implementation of measures discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) would help avoid or reduce, but not absolutely eliminate, the risk for potential impacts, and any incidence of injury and mortality that might occur under the Proposed Action could be additive to injury and mortality associated with other actions in the Study Area. While it is more likely that an individual of an abundant, common stock or species would be affected, there is a chance that a less abundant stock could be affected.

Ocean noise, globally and specifically in the Study Area, is already significantly elevated over historic, natural levels, and acoustic stressors (in-water explosions and sonar, as well as increased Navy vessel noise) associated with the Proposed Action could also result in additive acoustic impacts on marine mammals. However, sonar is not known to make up a significant portion of the overall ocean noise budget (Bassett et al., 2010; Baumann-Pickering et al., 2010; International Council for the Exploration of the Sea, 2005; McDonald et al., 2006). Other current and future actions such as construction, and operation of offshore energy projects; seismic surveys; and construction, operation, and removal of offshore energy facilities could result in underwater sound levels that could cause behavioral harassment, TTS, PTS, or, to a less extent, injury or mortality. Additionally, the constant elevation in ambient noise may produce physiological stress in individuals to which the Proposed Action would contribute.

Sounds from many of these sources travel over long distances, and it is possible that some would overlap in time and space with sounds from in-water explosions or Navy sonar use, in particular commercial shipping noise, which is more widespread and continuous. It is not known whether the co-occurrence of shipping noise and sounds associated with in-water explosions and sonar use would result in harmful additive impacts on marine mammals. However, these training and testing activities are widely dispersed, the sound sources are intermittent, and mitigation measures would be implemented. Furthermore, standard operating procedures would preclude some training and testing activities in the immediate vicinity of other actions, further reducing the likelihood of simultaneous or overlapping exposure. For these reasons, it is unlikely that an individual marine mammal would be simultaneously exposed to sound levels from multiple actions that could cause behavioral harassment, TTS, PTS, or injury.

If the health of an individual marine mammal were compromised, it is possible this condition could alter the animal's expected response to stressors associated with the Proposed Action. The behavioral and physiological responses of any marine mammal to a potential stressor, such as underwater sound, could be influenced by various factors, including disease, dietary stress, body burden of toxic chemicals, energetic stress, percentage body fat, age, reproductive state, and social position. Synergistic impacts are also possible; for example, animals exposed to some chemicals may be more susceptible to noise-induced loss of hearing sensitivity (Fechter & Pouyatos, 2005). While the response of a previously stressed animal might be different from the response of an unstressed animal, no data are available at this time that accurately predict how stress caused by various ocean pollutants would alter a marine mammal's response to stressors associated with the Proposed Action.

In summary, the aggregate impacts of past, present, and other reasonably foreseeable future actions continue to have significant impacts on some marine mammal species in the Study Area. The Proposed Action could contribute incremental stressors to individuals, which would both further compound effects on a given individual already experiencing stress and, in turn, have the potential to further stress populations, some of which may already be in significant decline or in the midst of stabilization and recovery.

Furthermore, the regulatory process administered by NMFS, which includes Stock Assessments for all marine mammals, as well as five-year reviews for all ESA-listed species, provides a backstop that informs decisions on take authorizations and Biological Opinions. Stock Assessments include estimates of Potential Biological Removal that stocks of marine mammals can sustainably absorb. MMPA take authorizations require the minimization of adverse effects and are explicitly limited to small numbers, with no more than a negligible impact on species and stocks of marine mammals. MMPA authorizations are reinforced by monitoring and reporting requirements so that NMFS is kept informed of deviations from what has been approved. Biological Opinions for federal and non-federal actions are similarly grounded in status reviews and conditioned to avoid jeopardy and to allow continued progress toward recovery. These processes help to ensure that, through compliance with these regulatory requirements, the Navy's Proposed Actions would not have a measurable effect on the resource.

4.4.5 Sea Turtles

4.4.5.1 Region of Influence

The general region of influence for sea turtles includes open ocean and coastal water off Guam, Rota, Tinian, Saipan, and FDM. The 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS analyzes amphibious landings on the beaches of Guam, Rota, and Tinian where sea turtles are known to nest. As this SEIS/OEIS only addresses sea-based training and testing activities in the Study Area, the impacts of amphibious landings on sea turtle nesting and other land-based impacts of amphibious landings are not addressed or analyzed in this SEIS/OEIS. The sea turtle species occurring in the Study Area include green sea turtles (*Chelonia mydas*) (Central West Pacific DPS), hawksbill sea turtle (*Eretmochelys imbricata*), loggerhead sea turtle (*Caretta caretta*), olive ridley sea turtle (*Lepidochelys olivacea*), and leatherback sea turtle (*Dermochelys coriacea*). In general, sea turtles spend most of their time at sea, with female turtles returning to land to nest and often migrating long distances between feeding grounds and nesting beaches. As with other marine resources, distribution is patchy and can be concentrated in specific areas depending on the species, season, habitat, activity, and age of the individuals.

4.4.5.2 Resource Trends

All sea turtles in the Study Area have experienced significant decline in population numbers over the past hundred years and are ESA-listed (Table 3.5-1). Because sea turtles are so long-lived, and because reliable data are only available for approximately the past 20 years, it is not possible to determine a reliable trend in abundance for most species. In addition, leatherback sea turtles, loggerhead sea turtles, and olive ridley sea turtles are not expected to occur in nearshore waters of the Study Area, increasing the difficulty of tracking trends of these species in pelagic waters. Recent information, however, shows significant increases of green sea turtles and hawksbill sea turtles in nearshore waters of Guam. Jones and Martin (2016) analyzed five decades of aerial surveys (from 1962 through 2012), calculated a population growth rate of approximately 90 percent over the past five decades for these two species, and estimated that 85 percent of the sea turtles were green sea turtles, and 15 percent were hawksbill sea turtles. The Navy is currently funding in-water tagging of sea turtles to further understand resource trends in waters off of Guam, Tinian, and Saipan. Since November 2015 when tagging began, Falcone et al. (2017) report that the majority of sea turtles observed or captured (65 of 68 total sea turtles observed, or 96 percent) have been green sea turtles.

4.4.5.3 Impacts of Other Actions

4.4.5.3.1 Overview

Section 3.5.1.5 (General Threats) discusses the specific stressors within the affected environment that impact sea turtle populations in the Study Area, which include water quality (marine debris and chemical contaminants), commercial industries (fisheries bycatch and other interactions), hunting/exploitation, vessel strike, oil and gas development, wind energy development, shoreline development and recreation, dredging, military activities, invasive species, disease, habitat destruction (loss of seagrass habitat and nesting beaches), and climate change. Potential impacts of actions that affect sea turtles include mortality, injury, disturbance, and reduced fitness, including reproductive, foraging, and predator avoidance success.

The susceptibility of sea turtles to these outcomes often depends on proximity, severity, or vulnerability to the stressor, and vulnerability can be increased as multiple stressors compound on an individual. The abundance of the species, potential impacts that may affect localized nesting sites, and individual fatalities could have considerable impacts in localized populations.

The activities as described in Table 4.2-1 each potentially contribute multiple stressors in the Study Area experienced by sea turtles, including vessel traffic, underwater noise, and water pollution. For example, most actions include the operation of marine vessels, which contribute to vessel strikes and underwater noise. Bycatch and entanglement, among the main threats to sea turtle populations in the Study Area, are chiefly associated with fishing and are discussed separately. While Table 4.2-1 discusses these stressors for individual actions, their aggregate impacts specific to sea turtles are detailed in Section 3.5.1.5 (General Threats) and further described below.

4.4.5.3.2 Commercial Fishing and Harvest

Past and present commercial fishing activities have had a global effect on the recovery and conservation of marine turtle populations and, despite continued improvements in bycatch avoidance and the implementation of regulatory efforts, fisheries interactions continue to be the primary human-related source of mortality for most sea turtles (National Research Council of the National Academies, 1990; Wallace et al., 2010). Among fisheries that incidentally capture sea turtles, certain types of trawl, gillnet, and longline fisheries generally pose the greatest threat. One comprehensive study estimated that

worldwide, 447,000 turtles are killed each year from bycatch in commercial fisheries (Wallace et al., 2010). In United States' fisheries, bycatch resulted in 71,000 sea turtle deaths per year prior to effective protective sea turtle regulations (enacted in the mid-1990s); but current mortality estimates are 94 percent lower than pre-regulation estimates (Finkbeiner et al., 2011).

Globally, large-scale commercial exploitation also contributes to global decline in marine turtle populations. Currently, 42 countries and territories allow some form of take of turtles and collectively remove in excess of 42,000 turtles per year, the majority of which (more than 80 percent) are green sea turtles (Humber et al., 2014). Illegal fishing for turtles and nest harvesting also continues to be a major cause of sea turtle mortality, both in countries that allow sea turtle take and in countries that outlaw the practice (Lam et al., 2011; Maison et al., 2010). For example, Humber et al. (2014) estimated that 65,000 sea turtles have been illegally harvested in Mexico since 2000. The authors, however, have seen legal and illegal direct take of sea turtles trending downward over the past three decades—citing a more than 40 percent decline in green sea turtle take since the 1980s, a more than 60 percent decline in hawksbill and leatherback take, and a more than 30 percent decline in loggerhead take (Humber et al., 2014).

4.4.5.3.3 Maritime Traffic and Vessel Strikes

Maritime traffic has increased over the past 50 years, and vessel traffic is expected to continue to increase in the Study Area in response to continued economic globalization, increases in energy development, and other offshore activities. Vessel strike has been identified as one of the important mortality factors in several nearshore turtle habitats worldwide. Precise data are lacking for sea turtle mortalities directly caused by ship strikes; however, live and dead turtles are often found with deep cuts and fractures indicative of collision with a boat hull or propeller (Hazel et al., 2007; Lutcavage et al., 1997). Some vessel strikes could cause temporary impacts, such as diverting the turtle from its previous activity or causing minor injury. Major strikes could cause permanent injury or death from bleeding, infection, or inability to feed. Apart from the severity of the physical strike, the likelihood and rate of a turtle's recovery from a strike may be influenced by its age, reproductive state, and general condition. Numerous living sea turtles bear scars that appear to have been caused by propeller cuts or collisions with vessel hulls (Hazel et al., 2007; Lutcavage et al., 1997), suggesting that not all vessel strikes are lethal. While increased risks come with increased vessel traffic, risks of vessel strikes could be minimized by ongoing and future education and awareness, ship-speed reduction measures, and maritime traffic planning and management.

4.4.5.3.4 Coastal Land Development

Although sea turtle nesting sites within the Mariana Islands are not included in the Study Area for this SEIS/OEIS, impacts on sea turtle nesting sites from activities not associated with training and testing activities may impact overall populations of sea turtles within the region of influence for this SEIS/OEIS.

Female sea turtles migrate to their natal beaches to lay eggs, and pervasive coastal development often interferes with successful nesting at these locations. Shared use between turtles and human interests on increasingly populated and utilized beach areas has intensified the tendency for female turtles and their hatchlings to encounter various barriers and hazards accessing, nesting, and leaving these beaches. The following factors prevent beach access and emigration of sea turtles: beachfront construction of homes, hotels, restaurants, roads, seawalls, and shoreline armoring; beach erosion; ports and marinas; beach replenishment; nearshore dredging; and oil and gas activities. Beach-going vehicles and watercraft cause injury and mortality to sea turtles. Abandoned debris and equipment are often insurmountable obstacles for both mother and offspring (SeeTurtles.org, 2017). Populated areas also often have excess

nighttime lighting that confuses hatchlings' instincts to orient toward the moon to arrive at the ocean, and in this journey, they often fall into and can remain trapped within pits and scars left on the beach. Conservation awareness has increased on many popular U.S. beaches and tourist destinations, but nesting success remains imperiled in many others.

4.4.5.3.5 Ocean Pollution

As discussed in Table 4.2-1, multiple pollutants from numerous sources are present in, and continue to be released into, the oceans. Section 3.5.2 (Environmental Consequences) provides an overview of these potential impacts on sea turtles, which include the ingestion of and entanglement in marine debris as well as toxicity from bisphenol-A, phthalates, and heavy metals. Sea turtles often mistake debris for prey; one study found 37 percent of dead leatherback turtles had ingested various types of plastic (Mrosovsky et al., 2009). Other marine debris, including derelict fishing gear and cargo nets, can entangle and drown turtles in all life stages.

4.4.5.3.6 Ocean Noise

Ocean noise as a general stressor in modern oceans is described in Table 4.2-1. Anthropogenic noise is generated from a variety of sources throughout the Study Area, including commercial shipping, oil and gas exploration and production activities (including air gun, drilling, explosive decommissioning), commercial and recreational fishing (including vessel noise, fish-finding sonar, fathometers, acoustic deterrent and harassment devices), shoreline construction projects (including pile driving), recreational boating and whale-watching activities, offshore power generation (including offshore windfarms), and research (including sound from air guns, sonar, telemetry). The military activities addressed in Table 4.2-1 include various training and testing activities that also contribute vessel noise, in-air and in-water explosions, and sonar; however, due to the low risk of encounter and the implementation of required mitigation measures, the Surveillance Towed Array Sensor System Low Frequency Active Sonar training and testing activities are not expected to result in mortality to any sea turtles, and minimal injury or behavioral changes are anticipated.

In general, the potential concerns associated with ocean noise and sea turtles are not as well defined as those for marine mammals. While it is well known that many species of marine mammals use sound as a primary sense for navigating, finding prey, and communicating with other individuals, little is known about how sea turtles use sound in their environment. Based on knowledge of their sensory biology (Bartol & Musick, 2003; Bartol & Ketten, 2006; Ketten & Moein-Bartol, 2006; Levenson et al., 2004), there is evidence that sea turtles may be able to detect objects within the water column (e.g., vessels, prey, predators) via some combination of auditory and visual cues. However, research examining the ability of sea turtles to avoid collisions with vessels shows they may rely more on their vision than auditory cues (Hazel et al., 2007). Similarly, while sea turtles may rely on acoustic cues from breaking waves to identify nesting beaches, they also appear to rely on other non-acoustic cues for navigation, such as magnetic fields (Lohmann & Lohmann, 1992, 1996) and light (Avens, 2003). Additionally, sea turtles are not known to produce sounds underwater for communication. As a result, sound may play a limited role in a sea turtle's environment.

Nonetheless, as discussed in Section 3.5.2.1 (Acoustic Stressors), sea turtles could experience a range of impacts from ocean noise, depending on the sound source. The impacts could include permanent or temporary hearing loss, changes in behavior, physiological stress, and auditory masking. In addition, potential impacts from use of explosives could range from physical discomfort to non-lethal and lethal injuries.

4.4.5.4 Impacts of the Proposed Action That May Contribute to Cumulative Impacts

The cumulative impacts analysis includes green, hawksbill, olive ridley, leatherback, and loggerhead turtles, all of which are ESA-listed species. The analysis presented in Section 3.5 (Sea Turtles) concludes that some stressors associated with the Proposed Action could impact individuals of certain sea turtle species, but impacts are not expected to decrease the overall fitness of any sea turtle population. From a cumulative perspective, potential impacts on listed species are of particular concern, and mitigation measures designed to avoid or reduce the potential impacts are discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation).

Impacts from the Proposed Action that may contribute to cumulative impacts on sea turtles can be generally categorized as behavioral responses, temporary and PTSs, non-auditory injury (modeled as slight lung injury and gastrointestinal tract injury), and mortality. As summarized below, these impacts would be associated with certain acoustic and physical strike stressors. The use of sonar and other transducers may result in behavioral responses, and temporary and PTSs in sea turtles, including ESA-listed sea turtles. Explosives may result in behavioral responses, TTS, PTS, injury, and mortality in sea turtles, including ESA-listed sea turtles. Vessel strikes may cause injury or mortality in sea turtles, including ESA-listed sea turtles.

The remaining acoustic stressors (noise from air guns, weapons firing/launch/impact, aircraft overflight, vessels), energy stressors (electromagnetic, high energy lasers), physical disturbance and strike stressors (in-water devices, military expended materials, seafloor devices), entanglement stressors (cables, wires, decelerators/parachutes), ingestion stressors (military expended materials – munitions and military expended materials – other than munitions), and secondary stressors are not expected to result in temporary or PTSs, injury, or mortality of sea turtles under the Proposed Action, including ESA-listed sea turtles. The Proposed Action would not introduce significant light sources that would disorient nesting turtles or their hatchlings. Because the Navy's training and testing activities covered under this SEIS/OEIS do not co-occur with nesting activities, it is unlikely that stressors presented to sea turtles would contribute to other anthropogenic threats not caused by Navy activities.

Although sea turtles could be exposed to sound and energy from explosive detonations throughout the Study Area, the estimated impacts on individual sea turtles are unlikely to impact populations. Injured sea turtles could suffer reduced fitness and long-term survival. Sea turtles that experience temporary or PTSs may have reduced ability to detect relevant sounds such as predators or prey, although some with temporary threshold shift would recover quickly, possibly in a matter of minutes. It is uncertain whether some permanent hearing loss over a part of a sea turtle's hearing range would have long-term consequences for that individual because the sea turtle hearing range is already limited (Section 3.5.2.1, Acoustic Stressors). Any significant behavioral reactions to acoustic stimuli could lead to a sea turtle expending energy and missing opportunities to secure resources. However, most individuals are not likely to experience long-term consequences from behavioral reactions because exposures would be intermittent and widely spaced, allowing exposed individuals to recover. Since long-term consequences for most individuals are unlikely, long-term consequences for populations are not expected.

In summary and as determined in Section 3.5 (Sea Turtles), it is not anticipated that the Proposed Action would result in significant impacts on sea turtles. Due to the wide dispersion of stressors, speed of the platforms, and general dynamic movement of many training and testing activities, it is very unlikely that a sea turtle would remain in the potential impact range of multiple sources or sequential exercises. Additionally, the majority of the proposed activities are unit-level training and small testing activities, which are conducted in the open ocean. Unit-level exercises occur over a small spatial scale (one to a few square miles) and with few participants (usually one or two) or short duration (the order of a few

hours or less). Likewise, training and testing activities are generally separated in space and time in such a way that it would be unlikely that any individual sea turtle would be exposed to stressors from multiple activities within a short timeframe. Furthermore, research and monitoring efforts have included before, during, and after-event observations and surveys; data collection through conducting long-term studies in areas of Navy activity; occurrence surveys over large geographic areas; biopsy of animals occurring in areas of Navy activity; and tagging studies where animals are exposed to Navy stressors. To date, the findings from the research and monitoring and the regulatory conclusions from previous analyses by NMFS (National Marine Fisheries Service, 2015a; National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2013) are that majority of impacts from Navy training and testing activities are not expected to have deleterious impacts on the fitness of any individuals or long-term consequences to populations of sea turtles.

4.4.5.5 Cumulative Impacts on Sea Turtles

The fact that all five species of sea turtles occurring in the Study Area are ESA-listed provides a clear indication that the current aggregate impacts of past human activities are significant for sea turtles. Bycatch, vessel strikes, coastal land development, and ocean pollution are the leading causes of mortality and population decline for sea turtles, and, although mitigated/avoided to the greatest extent practicable, the Proposed Action could result in stress, injury, and mortality to individuals of some sea turtle species from in-water explosions and vessel strikes. Implementation of observation and delay measures discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) would help avoid or reduce, but not absolutely eliminate, the risk for potential impacts, and any incidence of injury and mortality that might occur under the Proposed Action could be additive to injury and mortality associated with other actions in the Study Area.

According to scientific studies, sea turtles may rely primarily on senses other than hearing for interacting with their environment and appear to recover quickly from noise stressors (Section 3.5.2.1, Acoustic Stressors); thus, the acoustic stressors produced by Navy activities are anticipated to have minimal cumulative impact on sea turtles. The Proposed Action would not affect turtle nesting habitat, and contaminants and debris discharged into the marine environment are expected to be negligible and not persistent (Section 4.4.1, Sediments and Water Quality). Effects from the Proposed Action to sea turtle food sources are avoided or insignificant (Section 4.4.7, Marine Vegetation, and Section 4.4.8, Marine Invertebrates). Likewise, Navy actions generally would not overlap in space and time with other stressors as they occur as dispersed, infrequent, and isolated events that do not last for extended periods.

The potential exists for the impacts of ocean pollution (disease, malnourishment), injury, nesting habitat loss, starvation, and the composite increased underwater noise environment to contribute multiple stressors to an individual, and it is possible that the response of a previously stressed animal to impacts associated with the Proposed Action could be more severe than the response of an unstressed animal, or impacts from the Proposed Action could make an individual more susceptible to other stressors. For example, if a Navy vessel were to strike and injure an otherwise healthy sea turtle, exposure to multiple other stressors in the area may hinder the individual's recovery from any injury sustained in the accident. Likewise, a sea turtle near an in-water explosion or sonar activity may become stressed or disoriented, and the time to recover may be increased if that individual is likewise experiencing disease, malnutrition, or other strike injury that may increase its vulnerability to predation or decrease its ability to forage.

In summary, the aggregate impacts of past, present, and other reasonably foreseeable future actions continue to have significant impacts on all sea turtle species in the Study Area as evident by their scarce populations. The Proposed Action could contribute incremental stressors to individuals, which would both further compound effects on a given individual already experiencing stress and in turn has the potential to further stress populations in significant decline or recovery efforts thereof. Additionally, as with marine mammals, the NMFS regulatory process includes Stock Assessments and five-year reviews for all ESA-listed species, which provides a backstop that informs decisions on take authorizations and Biological Opinions. Biological Opinions for federal and non-federal actions are grounded in status reviews and conditioned to avoid jeopardy and to allow continued progress toward recovery. This process helps to ensure that, through compliance with these regulatory requirements, the Navy's Proposed Action would not have a measurable effect on the resource into the future.

4.4.6 Marine Birds

In the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, the analysis in Section 3.6 (Marine Birds) indicated that birds were impacted by acoustic stressors (sonar and other transducers, in-water explosions, weapons firing noise, aircraft noise, vessel noise), energy stressors (electromagnetic devices), physical disturbance and strikes (aircraft, aerial targets, vessels and in-water devices, military expended materials), and ingestion (military expended materials – munitions and military expended materials – other than munitions). Potential responses included a startle response, which includes short-term behavioral (e.g., movement) and physiological components (e.g., increased heart rate). Recovery from the impacts of most stressor exposures occurs quickly, and impacts are localized. Some stressors, including in-water explosions, physical strikes, and ingestion of plastic military expended materials, result in mortality. However, the number of individual birds affected was expected to be low, and no population-level impacts were expected. The impacts of the alternatives were determined to be cumulative with other actions that caused short-term behavioral and physiological impacts and mortality to birds. However, the incremental contribution of those alternatives to cumulative impacts on birds were determined to be low for the following reasons:

- Most of the proposed activities were widely dispersed in offshore areas, where bird distribution is patchy and concentrations of individuals are often low. Therefore, the potential for interactions between birds and training and testing activities was low.
- As discussed in Section 3.6 (Marine Birds), there have been no statistically significant declines in numbers of indicator species that nest on FDM, despite a long history of military use of FDM.
- It is unlikely that training and testing activities influenced nesting because most activities take place in water and away from nesting habitats on land. Alternatives 1 or 2 did not result in destruction or loss of nesting habitat.
- For most stressors, impacts were short term and localized, and recovery occurs quickly.
- While a limited amount of mortality could occur, no population-level impacts were expected.
- None of the alternatives were likely to adversely affect ESA-listed bird species.

Under this SEIS/OEIS, the contribution of proposed increases in training and testing activities under Alternative 1 or Alternative 2 would still be negligible based on the reasons presented above. While all of the additional projects since 2015 may be measurable and contribute to the cumulative impacts on marine birds, the number of individual marine birds affected is expected to be low, and no population-level impacts are expected. Based on the analysis presented in Section 3.6 (Marine Birds)

and the reasons summarized above, the incremental contribution of Alternatives 1 or 2 to cumulative impacts would be negligible. Further analysis of cumulative impacts on marine birds is not warranted.

4.4.7 Marine Vegetation

In the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, the analysis presented in Section 3.7 (Marine Vegetation) indicated that marine vegetation was affected by explosive stressors (in-water explosions), physical stressors (vessels and in-water devices, military expended materials, or seafloor devices), and secondary stressors (impacts associated with sediments and water quality) and is still valid in this SEIS/OEIS analysis. Potential impacts included localized disturbance and mortality. As discussed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, the analysis indicated that recovery would occur quickly, and population-level impacts were not anticipated. Impacts of the alternatives in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS were considered to be cumulative with other actions that caused disturbance and mortality of marine vegetation.

The current aggregate impacts of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions presented in Table 4.2-1 may affect marine vegetation. Aggregate impacts from vessel movement, increased sedimentation, and other stressors associated with other actions discussed in Table 4.2-1 could result in injury and mortality. Although this SEIS/OEIS does address some of these projects, developments, and actions listed in Table 4.2-1, many of these other actions and their associated cumulative impacts on marine vegetation cannot be determined with any specificity or certainty. However, it can reasonably be assumed that there may be marine vegetation that could be affected by these actions, but no specific details are known regarding the impacts or effects to individuals or populations. Alternatives 1 or 2 could also result in injury and mortality to marine vegetation from in-water explosions and strikes. Injury and mortality that might occur would be additive to injury and mortality associated with other actions. However, the relative contribution of Alternatives 1 or 2 to the overall injury and mortality would be low compared to other actions for the following reasons:

- Most training and testing activities would occur in areas where seagrasses and other attached marine vegetation do not grow.
- Impacts would be localized, recovery would occur quickly, and no population-level impacts would be expected.
- Proposed training and testing activities would not result in impacts that have historically affected marine vegetation. For example, Alternatives 1 or 2 would not increase nutrient loading, which can cause algal blooms, decrease light penetration, and impact photosynthesis of seagrasses.

Under this SEIS/OEIS, the contribution of proposed increases in training and testing activities under Alternative 1 or Alternative 2 would still be low, based on the reasons presented above. Impacts on marine vegetation from projects such as pollution, and climate change could result in long-term or widespread changes in secondary stressors to the environment that would change environmental conditions, such as turbidity, salinity, pH, or water temperature that would impact marine vegetation. However, these impacts are expected to be localized, recovery would occur quickly, and no population-level impacts would be expected. Based on the analysis presented in Section 3.7 (Marine Vegetation) and the reasons summarized above, the incremental contribution of Alternatives 1 or 2 to cumulative impacts on marine vegetation would be negligible. Therefore, further analysis of cumulative impacts on marine vegetation is not warranted.

4.4.8 Marine Invertebrates

4.4.8.1 Region of Influence

The region of influence for invertebrates includes the entire Study Area as invertebrates occur in all habitats and depths, including both the water column and benthic habitat, and many species have pelagic larvae, such as corals, that can drift in the ocean currents until they settle on reefs. Invertebrate groups in the Study Area are listed in Section 3.8 (Marine Invertebrates) and include microscopic zooplankton that drift with currents (e.g., invertebrate larvae, copepods, protozoans), larger invertebrates living in the water column (e.g., jellyfish, shrimp, squid), and benthic invertebrates that live on or in the seafloor (e.g., clams, corals, crabs, worms).

4.4.8.2 Resource Trends

As discussed in Section 3.8.1.2 (General Threats), marine invertebrates are ecologically and economically crucial, performing essential ecosystem services such as coastal protection, nutrient recycling, food for other animals, and habitat, as well as providing income from tourism and commercial fisheries. The health and abundance of marine invertebrates are vital to the marine ecosystem and the sustainability of the world's fisheries. Invertebrates are fished for food (e.g., shrimps, lobsters, and crabs; scallops, clams, and oysters; sea urchins, sea cucumbers, squids, and octopuses); harvested for jewelry, curios, and the aquarium trade; and some are known to secrete medicinal compounds of interest to the health industry.

Corals occur throughout the Study Area and include three species (*Acropora globicep*s, *A. retusa*, and *Seriatopora aculeata*) that are listed under the ESA. Raymundo et al. (2017) reported a catastrophic mass mortality event of more than 50 percent in shallow staghorn (*Acropora*) coral in Guam that was initiated in 2013 by anomalous warm sea surface temperatures.

In 2017, NMFS determined that seven species of giant clam (*Hippopus, H. porcellanus, Tridacna costata, T. derasa, T. gigas, T. squamosa*, and *T. tevoroa*) were candidates that may warrant listing under the ESA (82 Federal Register 28946). A status review is currently being done for these species. Two species, *H. hippopus* and *T. gigas*, have historically been found in the Study Area but are believed to have been locally extirpated (Meadows, 2016).

4.4.8.3 Impacts of Other Actions

Section 3.8.1.2 (General Threats) includes an extensive discussion of the existing stressors to marine invertebrates, including overexploitation and destructive fishing practices, habitat degradation resulting from pollution and coastal development, disease, invasive species, oil spills, noise, global climate change, and ocean acidification. Tourism and recreation also pose threats to marine invertebrates. Beaches such as Chulu Beach, when not used for training, are open to the public, who may disturb or potentially injure marine invertebrates and nearshore hard bottom habitat. Stressors specific to reef-building corals, which are generally located in more shallow zones with adequate sunlight penetration and a mean annual water temperature more than about 64 degrees Fahrenheit, include thermal stress, disease, tropical storms, coastal development and pollution, erosion and sedimentation, tourism/recreation, fishing, trade in coral and live reef species, vessel anchoring or groundings, marine debris, predation, invasive species, and hydrocarbon exploration. Primary threats to deep-water or cold-water corals include bottom fishing, hydrocarbon exploration and extraction, petroleum contamination, cable and pipeline installation, and other various bottom-disturbing activities. Deep corals are susceptible to physical disturbance due to the branching and fragile growth form of some species, slow growth rate (colonies can be hundreds of years old), and low reproduction and recruitment rates. All

activities described in Table 4.2-1 have the potential to impact marine invertebrates due to their ubiquitous presence and relative vulnerability.

4.4.8.3.1 Climate Change

The primary threat to corals is global climate change, which has and is projected to continue to seriously impact coral reefs in the near and known future. The effects of climate change include increased water temperature, ocean acidification, increased frequency or intensity of cyclonic storm events, and sea level rise, which can cause direct damage to these crucial and sensitive ecosystems as well as increase their susceptibility to and decrease their resilience from encounters with all other threats, including disease, pathogens, and genetic disorders.

Increases in ocean temperature can lead to coral stress, bleaching, and mortality. Coral and other marine invertebrate (e.g., anemones, giant clams) bleaching, which occurs when corals expel the symbiotic algae living in their tissues, is a stress response often tied to atypically high sea temperatures or changes in light availability but also can be attributed to nutrients, toxicants, and pathogens (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2017). Bleaching events have increased in frequency in recent decades, and coral bleaching on a global scale has occurred during the summers of 2014, 2015, and 2016. Likewise, ocean acidification has the potential to reduce calcification and growth rates in species with calcium carbonate skeletons, including shellfish, corals, and sponges, and possibly even lobsters and sea cucumbers. In addition to physical effects, increased acidity may result in behavioral changes in some species, such as burrowing behavior and juvenile dispersal patterns of the soft-shell clam and reduction in the loudness and number of snaps in the snapping shrimp.

Although the potential effects that climate change could have on future storm activity are uncertain, numerous researchers suggest that rising temperatures could result in little change to the overall number of storms, but that storm intensity could increase. Increased storm intensity could result in increased physical damage to individual corals and reefs constructed by the corals (which support numerous other invertebrate taxa), overturning of coral colonies, and a decrease in structural complexity (due to disproportionate breakage of branching species). However, large storms such as hurricanes may also have positive impacts on corals, such as lowering the water temperature and removing less resilient macroalgae from reef structures, which can overgrow corals.

Sea level rise could affect invertebrates by modifying or eliminating habitat, particularly estuarine and intertidal habitats bordering steep and artificially hardened shorelines. Likewise, changes in ocean circulation patterns could affect the planktonic food supply of filter- and suspension-feeding invertebrates. Cumulative effects of threats from fishing, pollution, and other human disturbance may reduce the tolerance of corals and other invertebrates to global climate change.

4.4.8.4 Impacts of the Proposed Action That May Contribute to Cumulative Impacts

The analysis presented in Section 3.8 (Marine Invertebrates) indicates that the Proposed Action could impact marine invertebrates through acoustic stressors (sonar and other transducers, air guns, vessel noise, weapons noise), explosives, energy stressors (in-water electromagnetic devices, high-energy lasers), physical disturbance or strikes (vessels and in-water devices, military expended materials, seafloor devices, pile driving), entanglement (wires and cables, decelerators/parachutes), and ingestion of military expended materials. Potential impacts include short-term behavioral and physiological responses (Celi et al., 2015; Edmonds et al., 2016; Roberts et al., 2016). Some stressors could also result in injury or mortality to a relatively small number of individuals. The potential for impacts on ESA-listed corals would be avoided by mitigation designed to avoid locations where they are present, except at

vital designated locations and nearshore training areas where seafloor resources will be avoided to the maximum extent practicable. For example, the Navy will not conduct certain activities within a specified distance of shallow-water coral reefs, live hard bottom, artificial reefs, and shipwrecks (Chapter 5, Mitigation) as much as is practicable. Employment of these measures will help avoid or reduce potential impacts on invertebrates that inhabit these areas.

4.4.8.5 Cumulative Impacts on Marine Invertebrates

Some direct impacts on invertebrates are expected, and the impacts of the Proposed Action could be cumulative with other actions that cause disturbance and mortality of marine invertebrates. However, it is anticipated that the incremental contribution of the proposed alternatives would be insignificant for the following reasons:

- Invertebrates are generally abundant and relatively short-lived; thus, with the exception of sessile species located near areas of repeated Navy activities (e.g., pierside locations), few individuals would likely be affected repeatedly by the same event.
- Invertebrates generally have high reproductive rates, short reproductive cycles, and resilient dispersal mechanisms; thus, local communities are likely to reestablish quickly.
- Most of the proposed activities would occur over dispersed, deep water areas where marine invertebrates are more sparsely distributed but not at the same specific point each time and, therefore, would be unlikely to affect the same individual invertebrates.
- Marine invertebrates are not particularly susceptible to energy, entanglement, or ingestion stressors resulting from Navy activities, and none of the alternatives would result in or interact with impacts that have been historically significant to marine invertebrates, such as overfishing, nutrient loading, disease, or the presence of invasive species.
- None of the alternatives would result in long-term or widespread changes in environmental conditions, such as turbidity, salinity, pH, or water temperature that could impact marine habitats or interact with existing trends affecting these parameters.
- The Navy will not conduct certain activities within a specified distance of shallow coral reefs, live hard bottom, artificial reefs, or submerged cultural resources such as shipwrecks (except designated locations, where these resources will be avoided to the maximum extent practicable). Underwater detonations that would occur in the nearshore areas are only conducted in designated locations and away from known seafloor resources such as shallow coral reefs, live hard bottom, artificial reefs, or submerged cultural resources such as shipwrecks, to the maximum extent practicable. All features that have been identified are included in Chapter 5 (Mitigation).

Although the aggregate impacts of other stressors in the ocean environment continue to have significant impacts on some marine invertebrate species in the Study Area, particularly the effects of global climate change on corals, the Proposed Action is not likely to incrementally contribute to population-level stress and decline of the resource. Due to the effects of global climate change, corals may be less resilient to additional stressors; however, it is not anticipated that the Navy will cause direct effects to coral reef systems. As impacts would be isolated, localized, and not likely to overlap with other relevant stressors, it is anticipated that the incremental contribution of the Proposed Action, when added to the impacts of all other past, present and reasonably foreseeable future actions, would not result in measurable additional impacts on marine invertebrates in the Study Area or beyond.

4.4.9 Marine Fishes

In the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, the analysis presented in Section 3.9 (Fishes) indicated that fishes, including ESA-listed scalloped hammerhead sharks, oceanic whitetip sharks, and giant manta rays could be affected by acoustic stressors (sonar and other transducers, explosives, swimmer defense air guns; weapons firing, launch, and impact noise; aircraft noise; and vessel noise), energy (electromagnetic devices), physical disturbance or strikes (vessels and in-water devices, military expended materials, seafloor devices), entanglement (fiber optic cables and guidance wires, decelerator/parachutes), and ingestion (military expended materials – munitions and military expended materials – other than munitions) and remains valid in this SEIS/OEIS.

Overfishing is discussed as a threat to marine fishes in the Study Area in the socioeconomic resources analysis in this SEIS/OEIS (Section 3.12.1.4.1.1, Guam; and 3.12.1.4.1.2, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands). While target fish species may be less available, which may have a greater impact on the success of traditional practices like subsistence fishing, overall traditional fishing practices on Guam and in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands have not changed appreciably since the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, and the analysis in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS remains valid. Refer to Section 3.12.2.3 (Subsistence Use) of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS for a discussion of subsistence fishing practices on Guam and in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

The current aggregate impacts of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions presented in Section 4.2 (Projects and Other Activities Analyzed for Cumulative Impacts) may potentially affect fishes, including ESA-listed scalloped hammerhead sharks, oceanic whitetip sharks, and giant manta rays. Aggregate impacts associated with the other actions discussed in Section 4.2 (Projects and Other Activities Analyzed for Cumulative Impacts) and Table 4.2-1 could result in injury and mortality. Although this SEIS/OEIS does address some of these other actions listed in Section 4.2 (Projects and Other Activities Analyzed for Cumulative Impacts), many of these actions and their associated cumulative impacts on fish cannot be determined with any specificity or certainty at this time. However, it can reasonably be assumed that there may be fish that could be affected by these other actions, but no specific details are known regarding the impacts or effects to individuals or populations. Alternatives 1 or 2 could also result in injury and mortality to fish from in-water explosions, entanglement, and strikes. Injury and mortality that might occur under Alternatives 1 or 2 would be additive to injury and mortality associated with other actions. However, the relative contribution of Alternatives 1 or 2 to the overall injury and mortality would be low compared to other actions for the following reasons:

- Most potential impacts would be short-term behavioral and physiological responses.
- Any impacts from the Proposed Action resulting in injury or mortality would be to a relatively small number of individuals.
- No population-level impacts are anticipated.

Under this SEIS/OEIS, the contribution of proposed increases in training and testing activities under Alternative 1 or Alternative 2 would still be negligible based on the reasons presented above. Based on the analysis presented in Section 3.9 (Fishes) and the reasons summarized above, the incremental contribution of Alternatives 1 or 2 to cumulative impacts would be negligible. Further analysis of cumulative impacts on fishes is not warranted.

4.4.10 Terrestrial Species and Habitats

The only terrestrial location included in the region of influence for this SEIS/OEIS is FDM. Military use of FDM as a bombing range has occurred for decades, with the lease agreement formalized with the newly formed CNMI in 1983 (United States of America and Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, 1983). Since the late 1990s, the Navy has established restrictions on the types of ordnance used on FDM and where ordnance can be targeted in compliance with past biological opinions and Sikes Act obligations. These measures confine the impacts on discrete impact zones on the island, in contrast to island-wide targeting prior to the establishment of restrictions. By establishing these restrictions, the impacts of decades of military use of the island are reduced (e.g., not targeting a remnant forest patch on the north end of the island and allowing its recovery), and current and future ordnance use on the island are confined to discrete impact zones on the island. The activities that only occur on FDM other than training activities described in this SEIS/OEIS and the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS include: (1) biennial range maintenance activities and periodic ordnance cleanup actions (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2013), and (2) ecological monitoring of natural resources on the island. Both of these activities are interrelated. For example, range clearance activities are required to maintain a suitable training environment on the range (e.g., ordnance cleanup, target maintenance). Surveys are conducted on the island in compliance with biological opinions and Sikes Act obligations associated with military use of the island. All of these activities are authorized and scheduled by the Navy, and entrance rights are conveyed to the Navy through the lease agreement with CNMI. In summary, there are no additional actions that would occur on FDM; therefore, an analysis of cumulative impacts is not warranted.

4.4.11 Cultural Resources

In the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, Alternatives 1 or 2 concluded that physical disturbance and strike stressors including vessel strikes, use of towed in-water devices, use of seafloor devices, and ground disturbance during training and testing activities would not adversely affect historic properties within U.S. territorial waters or on Guam and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands because measures have been previously implemented to protect these resources and would continue to be implemented according to the conservation measures and procedures identified and described in the 2009 Mariana Islands Range Complex Programmatic Agreement.

The contribution of proposed increases in training and testing activities under Alternative 1 or Alternative 2 in this SEIS/OEIS would be negligible because the Navy routinely avoids locations of known obstructions, which includes submerged cultural resources, to prevent damage to sensitive Navy equipment and vessels and to avoid or reduce impacts on known submerged resources. The current aggregate impacts of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions presented in Section 4.2 (Projects and Other Activities Analyzed for Cumulative Impacts) may have an effect on cultural resources. Actions that would contribute to cumulative impacts on cultural resources would involve some form of disturbance to the ocean bottom in areas where cultural resources are present. Actions that would disturb the ocean bottom could impact submerged cultural resources if those resources are not avoided.

Other actions that result in ocean bottom disturbance require federal agencies to take into account the effects of their undertakings on historic properties. If it is determined that there would be an adverse effect to a cultural resource that qualifies for the National Register, the federal agency would work to avoid, minimize, or mitigate the adverse effect. For example, the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management has procedures in place to identify the probability of the presence of submerged historic properties

shoreward from the 148-foot (45-meter) isobaths, informing the Navy to avoid locations of known obstructions, which includes submerged cultural resources. It also has procedures for project redesign or relocation to avoid identified resources (Minerals Management Service, 2007). Nonetheless, inadvertent impacts could occur if submerged cultural resources are present, but are greatly reduced when avoidance measures are put in place.

Effects to submerged historic properties from other actions would typically be avoided or mitigated through compliance with federal regulations. However, impacts could occur if avoidance measures were not implemented or if inadvertent disturbance or destruction of the characteristics or the historic property that qualify it for inclusion on the National Register occurs. Disturbance or destruction of submerged historic properties, including shipwrecks, would diminish the overall record for these properties and decrease the potential for meaningful research. When considered with other actions, Alternatives 1 or 2 would not contribute to cumulative impacts on submerged historic properties because the Navy avoids locations of known obstructions, which includes submerged cultural resources.

4.4.12 Socioeconomic Resources

In Section 3.12 (Socioeconomic Resources) of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, the analysis determined that training and testing activities under Alternatives 1 or 2 would limit public access to certain nearshore areas used for commercial and recreational fishing, certain tourism activities, and subsistence fishing. However, limits on accessibility to these areas were not expected to significantly impact socioeconomic resources, because the majority of restrictions would be temporary, lasting hours, with the exception of the 3 NM danger zone surrounding FDM, which is permanently closed to ensure public safety. Other surface danger zones and temporary exclusion areas would be accessible to the public for fishing, transiting, or other activities when military activities are not occurring. When an area is closed for a training and testing activity, mariners are not permitted to transit directly through a danger zone to a destination outside of the danger zone and are not allowed to anchor or loiter within the danger zone. Military activities utilizing the danger zone or restricted area would be halted until the danger zone or restricted area is cleared of transiting vessels.

Under this SEIS/OEIS, cumulative impacts on fishing may occur from frequent or extended, but also temporary, closures of restricted areas and danger zones in the Study Area. The Navy attempts to mitigate these impacts by using a variety of communication methods (e.g., Notices to Mariners [NOTMARs], e-mails, Facebook posts) to inform the public of upcoming events that may limit access to certain areas. Dates and times of scheduled closures are provided in announcements to allow fishers, tour boat operators, and any other commercial or recreational vessels that may be in the area to plan accordingly.

As a result of previous discussions with fishers, the Navy no longer restricts access to the northern portion of W-517 while military activities are conducted in the southern portion of the warning area, which allows fishers to access popular fishing sites south of Guam. The fishing bank areas (Galvez Bank, Santa Rosa Reef, and White Tuna Banks) are not automatically restricted from public access when W-517 is scheduled for training and testing. Galvez Bank and Santa Rosa Reef are not within W-517, while a portion of White Tuna Banks does exist within W-517. Mariners near Galvez Bank or Santa Rosa Reef may be warned of their proximity or told not to enter W-517 as a precautionary measure. It is vital that units training or testing within W-517 give proper notice to mariners and aviators in the area before they enter W-517, in order to keep members of the public and military safe. On days that W-517 is in use for military training or testing that affects mariners, a Broadcast Notice to Mariners is always sent by

the U.S. Coast Guard to inform the public, in addition to press releases and other communication from Joint Region Marianas. The 120-day average (over a two-year period) that Broadcast Notice to Mariners (NOTMARS) are issued does not constitute 24 hours in the day. Many training or testing events last less than a full day and may hinder access to W-517 for only a short period of time.

The Navy also informs the public of extended periods of time when the restricted area (beyond 3 NM from shore) surrounding FDM will be accessible. The military will continue to collaborate with local communities and stakeholders to develop efficient and effective communication with the public. The goals of these on-going and evolving efforts are (1) to reduce socioeconomic impacts associated with limiting access to areas used by the public, and (2) to ensure the safety of the public and military personnel. Under this SEIS/OEIS, the contribution of proposed increases in training and testing activities under Alternative 1 or Alternative 2 would still be negligible based on the analysis summarized above and described in greater detail in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, Section 3.12 (Socioeconomic Resources and Environmental Justice).

4.4.12.1 Resource Trends

Trends in commercial transportation and shipping are described in Section 3.12.1.1 (Commercial Transportation and Shipping) and indicate that commercial shipping has remained consistent over the past five years. Trends in commercial fishing and tourism are described in Section 3.12.1.2 (Commercial and Recreational Fishing) and Section 3.12.1.3 (Tourism), respectively. Commercial fisheries landing in Guam declined steadily from 2010 through 2015 mainly due to the declining abundance of reef fish around the island, which make up a large percentage of the target species (Weijerman et al., 2016). Trends in commercial fisheries around the CNMI are less clear. Landings from 2010 through 2015 were highest in 2013 and 2014 but declined to their lowest totals in 2015. Tourism trends are mixed for both Guam and the CNMI. The number of visitors from Japan, the largest market, has been declining in recent years, but tourism from other Asian nations, particularly China, has increased and is expected to continue to grow. Trends in recreational fishing are partially driven by trends in tourism. While both recreational fishing and subsistence fishing by residents of Guam and the CNMI remain popular, there are no data that indicate specific trends in either resource.

4.4.12.2 Onshore and Offshore Fishing for Economic Self-Sustainability

NMFS is responsible for the regulation and enforcement of policies for onshore and offshore fishing for economic self-sustainability. Both the CNMI and Guam are categorized as “fishing communities” by the Western Pacific Regional Fishery Management Council. This designation is based on the portion of the population that is dependent upon fishing for subsistence; the economic importance of fishery resources to the islands; and the geographic, demographic, and cultural attributes of the communities (Western Pacific Regional Fishery Management Council, 2009, 2019). Fishing is an integral part of the culture and way of life in the CNMI and Guam. Most fishers do not fish exclusively for commercial, recreational, or subsistence benefit but rather for some combination of the three (Hospital & Beavers, 2012; Hospital & Beavers, 2014; Tibbats & Flores, 2012; Western Pacific Regional Fishery Management Council, 2019). However, the increasing costs of fishing gear, tackle, boats and associated maintenance, and particularly fuel have made it increasingly difficult for fishers in Guam and the CNMI to make a living as commercial fishers. In addition to costs, fishers are concerned about impacts associated with increased tourism (e.g., pollution and damage to reefs) and competition from foreign fishers reducing the market for locally caught fish (Ayers, 2018; Hospital & Beavers, 2014; Western Pacific Regional Fishery Management Council, 2019). Fishing will continue as an integral part of the culture and tradition

of communities on Guam and in the CNMI; however, commercial productivity is likely to vary with changes in the local and global economies.

4.4.12.3 Impacts of Other Actions

The impacts of actions related to coastal development and infrastructure development listed in Table 4.2-1 would generally contribute positively to socioeconomic conditions on Guam and in the CNMI. Water quality and wastewater treatment on Saipan should improve; additional jobs in tourism and retail are likely with further coastal development; and tourism, the largest economic driver, should also be supported by these projects. Other military activities that limit access to popular fishing sites could increase cumulative socioeconomic impacts on commercial, recreational, and subsistence fishers beyond impacts associated with the Proposed Action. Increases in marine debris and pollution (Table 4.2-1) in waters surrounding Guam and the CNMI would potentially impact tourism and fisheries and contribute to cumulative impacts on socioeconomic resources or restrict vessel movement in the Study Area. The effects of climate change on the marine environment could have similar, long-term, cumulative impacts on fisheries and tourism in the region if the marine resources that support these industries are diminished.

4.4.12.4 Cumulative Impacts on Socioeconomic Resources

The current aggregate impacts of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions have the potential to result in significant cumulative impacts on certain socioeconomic resources in the Study Area. The impacts would be considered significant if they resulted in extensive limitations on accessibility by residents, businesses, and tourists to ocean areas needed for commercial, recreational, and subsistence fishing and tourism. If tourism continues to expand, the desire to transit to and access popular ocean areas may also increase. Maintaining efficient and effective communication methods with the public is expected to avoid or reduce conflicts between military and civilian activities in the Study Area.

4.4.13 Public Health and Safety

In the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, the analysis presented in Section 3.13 (Public Health and Safety) indicated that the impacts of Alternatives 1 or 2 on public health and safety would be negligible. Under this SEIS/OEIS, Alternatives 1 or 2 are not expected to contribute incrementally to cumulative health and safety impacts. Therefore, further analysis of cumulative impacts on public health and safety is not warranted.

4.5 Summary of Cumulative Impacts

Marine mammals, marine invertebrates, sea turtles, and socioeconomic resources are the primary resources of concern for cumulative impacts analysis:

- Past human activities have impacted these resources to the extent that several marine mammals, sea turtles, and marine invertebrates occurring in the Study Area are ESA listed. Several marine mammal species and stocks are also classified as strategic stocks under MMPA.
- The use of sonar and other non-impulsive sound sources under Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 has the potential to disturb or injure marine mammals and sea turtles.
- Explosive detonations under Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 have the potential to disturb, injure, or kill marine mammal, and sea turtle species.
- Under Alternative 1 or Alternative 2, proposed danger zones could potentially restrict access to fishing and recreational areas when ranges are in use.

In summary, based on the analysis presented in Sections 3.4 (Marine Mammals), 3.5 (Sea Turtles), 3.8 (Marine Invertebrates), and 3.12 (Socioeconomic Resources and Economic Justice), the current aggregate impacts of past, present, and other reasonably foreseeable future actions are not significantly different than the assessment in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. For marine mammals, sea turtles, and marine invertebrates Alternatives 1 or 2 would contribute to an increase cumulative impacts, but the relative contribution would be low compared to other actions. Cumulative effects on socioeconomic resources may have short-term impacts on accessibility to public services, fishing sites, and tourism resources, but they are not expected to have long-term negative impacts on these resources or the economy of Guam and the CNMI. No new information or circumstances are significant enough to warrant further cumulative impact review.

4.6 Public Comments

The public raised a number of issues during the scoping period in regard to cumulative impacts. The issues are summarized in the list below. Comments received from the public during the Draft Supplemental EIS (SEIS)/OEIS commenting period related to cumulative impacts are addressed in Appendix K (Public Comment Responses).

- **Analyze the cumulative effects of all Department of Defense actions in the Mariana Islands, including CNMI Joint Military Training EIS –** The CNMI Joint Military Training EIS would establish a series of live-fire and maneuver ranges and training areas within the CNMI and include amphibious operations on Tinian. The proposed action for the CNMI Joint Military Training EIS is to expand existing ranges and training areas and construct new ranges and training areas within the CNMI. The resources evaluated that could contribute to cumulative impacts include geology and soils, water resources, air quality, noise, airspace, land and submerged land use, recreation, terrestrial biology, marine biology, cultural resources, visual resources, transportation, utilities, socioeconomic resources and environmental justice, hazardous materials and waste, and public health and safety. The Navy is drafting a revised EIS that would reduce impacts on resources as a result of the proposed action. The analysis of cumulative impacts contained in this chapter addresses cumulative effects of all Department of Defense actions on the Mariana Islands, including the CNMI Joint Military Training EIS.
- **Cumulative impacts from military-expended material and debris on water quality and marine biology –** The analysis of cumulative impacts on water quality from military expended material and debris concluded that although military expended material would occur in the Study Area as a result of training and testing activities, the Navy has defined standard operating procedures and committed to mitigation measures to offset potential impacts from military training and testing to sediment and water quality in the Study Area. The impact analysis conducted on marine biology (e.g., marine mammals, sea turtles, marine birds, marine vegetation, marine invertebrates, and fish) from military expended material and debris concluded that the military expended material and debris would not have a significant impact on water quality or habitat, therefore it would not have a significant impact on marine biology in the Study Area. Further analysis of cumulative impacts on water quality can be found in Section 4.4.1 (Sediments and Water Quality). Further analysis of cumulative impacts on marine biology can be found in Sections 4.4.4 through 4.4.9 (Marine Mammals, Sea Turtles, Marine Birds, Marine Vegetation, Marine Invertebrates, and Marine Fishes).
- **Cumulative impacts on marine mammals from use of explosives and sonar –** The cumulative impact analysis for marine mammals from the use of explosives and sonar concluded that the aggregate impacts of past, present, and other reasonably foreseeable future actions continue to

have significant impacts on some marine mammal species in the Study Area. Proposed training and testing activities could result in additional stressors to individuals, which would both further compound effects on a given individual already experiencing stress and, in turn, have the potential to further stress populations, some of which may already be in significant decline or in the midst of stabilization and recovery. However, implementation of standard operating procedures would reduce the likelihood of overlap in time and space with other stressors, and implementation of mitigation measures would further reduce the likelihood of impact. Therefore, the incremental stressors anticipated from proposed training and testing activities are not anticipated to be significant. Further analysis of cumulative impacts on marine mammals can be found in Section 4.4.4 (Marine Mammals).

- Cumulative impacts on seagrass, coral reef, and other invertebrate from sedimentation around FDM, military expended materials as marine debris, and sonar disrupting larval recruitment – The cumulative impact analysis on seagrass and marine vegetation concludes that sedimentation around FDM and military expended materials as marine debris would have minimal impacts on seagrass and marine vegetation in the Study Area. Based on the analysis presented in Section 3.7 (Marine Vegetation) and the reasons summarized above, the incremental contribution of Alternatives 1 or 2 to cumulative impacts would be negligible. Further cumulative impact analysis on seagrass and marine vegetation can be found in Section 4.4.7 (Marine Vegetation). The cumulative impact analysis on coral reef and other invertebrates from sedimentation around FDM, military expended materials as marine debris, and sonar disrupting larval recruitment concluded that although the aggregate impacts of other stressors in the ocean environment continue to have significant impacts on some marine invertebrate species in the Study Area, particularly the effects of global climate change on corals, proposed training and testing activities are not likely to incrementally contribute to population-level stress and decline of the resource. Further cumulative impact analysis on marine invertebrates can be found in Section 4.4.8 (Marine Invertebrates).
- **Cumulative impacts on sea turtles, fish populations and their habitat –** The cumulative impacts analysis on sea turtles concluded that the aggregate impacts of past, present, and other reasonably foreseeable future actions continue to have significant impacts on all sea turtle species in the Study Area. Proposed training and testing activities could contribute incremental stressors to individuals, which would both further compound effects on a given individual already experiencing stress and in turn has the potential to further stress populations in significant decline or recovery efforts thereof. The cumulative impacts analysis on fish populations concluded that based on the analysis presented in Section 3.9 (Fishes) and the reasons summarized above, the incremental contribution of Alternatives 1 or 2 to cumulative impacts would be negligible. The cumulative impacts analysis on marine habitat concluded that based on the analysis presented in Section 3.3 (Marine Habitats) and the reasons summarized in Section 4.4.3 (Marine Habitats), the incremental contribution of Alternatives 1 or 2 to cumulative impacts would be negligible. Further analysis for cumulative impacts on sea turtles and fish can be found in Section 4.4.5 (Sea Turtles) and 4.4.9 (Marine Fishes) respectively.
- **Cumulative impact on the loss of access to FDM for traditional fishing practices –** The socioeconomic resources section analyzes traditional fishing practices that were identified by residents of Guam and the CNMI as having the potential to be impacted by the proposed training and testing activities occurring at sea and on FDM. Training and testing activities have the potential to temporarily limit access to areas of the ocean, which has the potential to impact traditional fishing practice in the Study Area. The military requests that the U.S. Coast Guard issue NOTMARs to warn the public of upcoming training and testing activities requiring the

exclusive use of sea space and to ensure the safety of the public and military personnel. Data on the number of NOTMARs issued from the years 2013 through 2017 for FDM and W-517 were added to the previous three years of data presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. The number of days affected by activities occurring at FDM and W-517 has varied over the eight-year period from the years 2010 through 2017. The data indicate an increasing trend in affected days and potential impacts on accessibility; however, the peak totals are not substantially different from the previous eight years, and the trend appears to be cyclical (increases followed by decreases). Access to waters around FDM between 3 and 12 NM was restricted for an average of 160 days per year (peak of 201 in the year 2012), and access to waters under W-517 was restricted for an average of 91 days per year (peak of 136 in the year 2016). Access to waters within 3 NM of FDM is restricted at all times to ensure public safety during military activities using explosive munitions (33 Code of Federal Regulations 334, Danger Zone and Restricted Area Regulations).

Traditional fishers in Guam and the CNMI would also be impacted by temporary restrictions limiting access to certain areas where traditional fishing practices take place. As described in Section 3.12.1.4.1 (Traditional Fishing Practices), many fishers identifying as traditional fishers also participate in recreational and commercial fishing, and it is not clear when fishers are engaging in traditional fishing, which has communal and cultural significance, and when they are fishing for financial gain or leisure or some combination of one or more of these motivations, which can occur even on a single fishing trip (Allen, 2013). These data suggest that traditional fishing likely occurs in the same locations as commercial and recreational fishing, and that traditional fishers would not be disproportionately impacted by temporary limits on access to fishing sites. Other fishing sites in the Study Area would be available to traditional fishers, and significant impacts on traditional fishing in the Study Area are not anticipated. Further cumulative analysis for socioeconomic resources can be found in Section 4.4.12 (Socioeconomic Resources).

- Cumulative impact on reduced fishing access, recreational fishing, commercial fishing and transport between the Mariana Islands from the restricted areas – Access to certain areas of the Study Area around islands and in the open ocean is temporarily restricted during potentially hazardous training and testing activities to ensure the safety of the public and military personnel. Danger zones may result from other Department of Defense actions in Guam and the Mariana Islands such as the Guam and Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands Military Relocation and CNMI Joint Military Training. These other actions would occur mainly on land and around Tinian. As a result of the training and testing activities associated with this SEIS/OEIS, areas within 3 NM of FDM are permanently restricted to maintain public safety. Even when hazardous activities are not occurring at FDM, the potential occurrence of unexploded ordnance in waters surrounding the island is a constant threat to public safety. Transiting between Guam, Saipan, Tinian, or other islands located to the south of FDM and the Islands Unit (Northern Mariana Islands) would potentially be impacted by limiting access to the 12 NM danger zone around FDM. Considering that an average of 3.8 trips per year has occurred over the past 30 years (as stated in Section 3.12.3, Public Scoping Comments), the probability of military activities interfering with trips to the Islands Unit is low. Furthermore, the military will announce when FDM is not in use in addition to notifying mariners of planned activities at FDM, which will enable mariners to better plan trips to the Islands Unit. Further analysis can be found for recreational and commercial fishing and transport in Section 4.4.12 (Socioeconomic Resources).

- **Cumulative effects analysis of the ocean as an ecosystem –** The cumulative impacts analysis for water resources concluded that based on the analysis presented in Section 3.1 (Sediments and Water Quality) and the reasons summarized above, the changes in sediment and water quality would be measurable, but would still be below applicable standards and guidelines; therefore, the incremental contribution of Alternatives 1 or 2 to cumulative impacts would be low and further analysis of cumulative impacts is not warranted. Further analysis of the ocean as an ecosystem and cumulative impacts can be found in Section 4.4.1 (Sediments and Water Quality) and Section 4.4.3 (Marine Habitats).
- **Assess cumulative effects to consider a resource response to change and capacity to withstand stress –** Stressors are considered in the cumulative effects analysis for each resource. These resources are analyzed in Sections 4.4.1 through 4.4.13.

  Cumulative effects analysis should reflect the beach landing activity addressed in the 2015 MITT ROD (no Amphibious Assault Vehicle or Landing Craft Air Cushion landing on Tinian beaches) – Beach landing activities would continue as discussed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. This SEIS/OEIS is an update to the in-water activities in the Study Area. Land activities are addressed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and can be found in Section 3.5 (Sea Turtles) of that document.

  Cumulative impacts assessing the length and frequency of each individual training activity and the potential rate of resource recovery – The cumulative impacts assessment takes into account the length and frequency of each training and testing activity and resource recovery as they are analyzed in their individual resource sections (Sections 3.1 through 3.13).
- **Utilize Caltrans/Federal Highways Administration cumulative impacts methodology/eight-step process –** The Caltrans/Federal Highways Administration cumulative impacts eight-step methodology is very similar to the cumulative impacts chapter analysis used in this document. The similarities are as follows: (step 1) The Navy has identified resources to consider; (step 2) defined the region of influence for each resource; (step 3) described the current health and historical context of each resource in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences); (step 4) identified the direct and indirect impacts of the Proposed Action in the Environmental Consequences section of Chapter 3; (step 5) identified current and reasonably foreseeable future actions or projects in Table 4.2-1; (step 6) assessed the potential cumulative impacts in this chapter; (step 7) reported the results of the cumulative impact analysis in this chapter; and (step 8) assessed the need for mitigation and recommendations for actions by other agencies in Chapter 5 (Mitigation).

REFERENCES

Allen, S. (2013). Carving a niche or cutting a broad swath: Subsistence fishing in the western Pacific. *Pacific Science, 67*(3), 477–488.

Avens, L. (2003). Use of multiple orientation cues by juvenile loggerhead sea turtles *Caretta caretta*. *The Journal of Experimental Biology, 206*(23), 4317–4325.

Ayers, A. L. (2018). *The Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands Fishing Community Profile: 2017 Update*. Honolulu, HI: National Oceanic Atmospheric Administration Technical Memorandum.

Baker, C. S., V. Lukoschek, S. Lavery, M. L. Dalebout, M. Yong-un, T. Endo, and N. Funahashi. (2006). Incomplete reporting of whale, dolphin and porpoise 'bycatch' revealed by molecular monitoring of Korean markets. *Animal Conservation, 9*(4), 474–482.

Bartol, S. M., and J. A. Musick. (2003). Sensory Biology of Sea Turtles. In P. L. Lutz, J. A. Musick, & J. Wyneken (Eds.), *The Biology of Sea Turtles* (Vol. 2, pp. 16). Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press Books.

Bartol, S. M., and D. R. Ketten. (2006). *Turtle and Tuna Hearing* (NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-PIFSC-7). Honolulu, HI: Pacific Islands Fisheries Science Center.

Bassett, C., J. Thomson, and B. Polagye. (2010). *Characteristics of Underwater Ambient Noise at a Proposed Tidal Energy Site in Puget Sound*. Seattle, WA: Northwest National Marine Renewable Energy Center.

Baulch, S., and C. Perry. (2014). Evaluating the impacts of marine debris on cetaceans. *Marine Pollution Bulletin, 80*(1–2), 210–221.

Baumann-Pickering, S., L. K. Baldwin, A. E. Simonis, M. A. Roche, M. L. Melcon, J. A. Hildebrand, E. M. Oleson, R. W. Baird, G. S. Schorr, D. L. Webster, and D. J. McSweeney. (2010). *Characterization of Marine Mammal Recordings from the Hawaii Range Complex*. Monterey, CA: Naval Postgraduate School.

Bergmann, M., L. Gutow, and M. Klages. (2015). *Marine Anthropogenic Litter*. New York, NY and London, United Kingdom: Springer.

Bureau of Ocean Energy Management. (2011). *Proposed Outer Continental Shelf Oil & Gas Leasing Program 2012–2017*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Ocean Energy Management.

Bureau of Ocean Energy Management. (2016). *Fact Sheet: Environmental Studies–Electromagnetic Fields*. Sterling, VA: U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Ocean Energy Management. Retrieved from www.boem.gov.

Carretta, J. V., M. M. Muto, J. Greenman, K. Wilkinson, D. Lawson, J. Viezbicke, and J. Jannot. (2017). *Sources of Human-Related Injury and Mortality for U.S. Pacific West Coast Marine Mammal Stock Assessments, 2011–2015* (NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SWFSC-579). La Jolla, CA: Southwest Fisheries Science Center.

Celi, M., F. Filiciotto, M. Vazzana, V. Arizza, V. Maccarrone, M. Ceraulo, S. Mazzola, and G. Buscaino. (2015). Shipping noise affecting immune responses of European spiny lobster (*Palinurus elephas*). *Canadian Journal of Zoology, 93*, 113–121.

Council on Environmental Quality. (1997). *Considering Cumulative Effects Under the National Environmental Policy Act*. Washington, DC: The Council on Environmental Quality.

Davison, P., and R. G. Asch. (2011). Plastic ingestion by mesopelagic fishes in the North Pacific Subtropical Gyre. *Marine Ecological Progress Series, 432*, 173–180.

DeMaster, D. P., C. W. Fowler, S. L. Perry, and M. F. Richlen. (2001). Predation and competition: The impact of fisheries on marine-mammal populations over the next one hundred years. *Journal of Mammalogy, 82*(3), 641–651.

Edmonds, N. J., C. J. Firmin, D. Goldsmith, R. C. Faulkner, and D. T. Wood. (2016). A review of crustacean sensitivity to high amplitude underwater noise: Data needs for effective risk assessment in relation to UK commercial species. *Marine Pollution Bulletin, 108*, 5–11.

Falcone, E. A., G. S. Schorr, S. L. Watwood, S. L. DeRuiter, A. N. Zerbini, R. D. Andrews, R. P. Morrissey, and D. J. Moretti. (2017). Diving behaviour of Cuvier's beaked whales exposed to two types of military sonar. *Royal Society Open Science, 4*(170629), 1–21.

Fechter, L. D., and B. Pouyatos. (2005). Ototoxicity. *Environmental Health Perspectives, 113*(7), 443–444.

Federal Communications Commission. (2017). *Submarine Cables*. Retrieved from https://www.fcc.gov/submarine-cables.

Finkbeiner, E. M., B. P. Wallace, J. E. Moore, R. L. Lewison, L. B. Crowder, and A. J. Read. (2011). Cumulative estimates of sea turtle bycatch and mortality in USA fisheries between 1990 and 2007. *Biological Conservation, 144*(11), 2719–2727.

Geijer, C. K. A., and A. J. Read. (2013). Mitigation of marine mammal bycatch in U.S. fisheries since 1994. *Biological Conservation, 159*, 54–60.

Gerstein, E. R. (2002). Manatees, bioacoustics and boats: Hearing tests, environmental measurements and acoustic phenomena may together explain why boats and animals collide. *American Scientist, 90*(2), 154–163.

Hansen, L. P., and M. L. Windsor. (2006). Interactions between aquaculture and wild stocks of Atlantic salmon and other diadromous fish species: Science and management, challenges and solutions. *ICES Journal of Marine Science, 63*(7), 1159–1161.

Hazel, J., I. R. Lawler, H. Marsh, and S. Robson. (2007). Vessel speed increases collision risk for the green turtle *Chelonia mydas*. *Endangered Species Research, 3*, 105–113.

Helker, V. T., M. M. Muto, K. Savage, S. Teerlink, L. A. Jemison, K. Wilkinson, and J. Jannot. (2017). *Human-Caused Mortality and Injury of NMFS-Managed Alaska Marine Mammal Stocks, 2011–2015* (NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-AFSC-354). Seattle, WA: Alaska Fisheries Science Center.

Hospital, J., and C. Beavers. (2012). *Economic and Social Characteristics of Guam's Small Boat Fisheries* (Administrative Report). Honolulu, HI: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

Hospital, J., and C. Beavers. (2014). *Economic and Social Characteristics of Small Boat Fishing in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands* (Administrative Report H-14-02). Honolulu, HI: Pacific Island Fisheries Science Center.

Humber, F., B. J. Godley, and A. C. Broderick. (2014). So excellent a fishe: A global overview of legal marine turtle fisheries. *Diversity and Distributions, 20*(5), 579–590.

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. (2018). *Global warming of 1.5°C* V. Masson-Delmotte, P. Zhai, H. O. Pörtner, D. Roberts, J. Skea, P. R. Shukla, A. Pirani, W. Moufouma-Okia, C. Péan, R. Pidcock, S. Connors, J. B. R. Matthews, Y. Chen, X. Zhou, M. I. Gomis, E. Lonnoy, T. Maycock, M.

Tignor, & T. Waterfield (Eds.), *An IPCC Special Report on the impacts of global warming of 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels and related global greenhouse gas emission pathways, in the context of strengthening the global response to the threat of climate change, sustainable development, and efforts to eradicate poverty* (pp. 32).

International Council for the Exploration of the Sea. (2005). *Report of the Ad-Hoc Group on the Impact of Sonar on Cetaceans*. Copenhagen, Denmark: Conseil International pour l'Exploration de la Mer.

International Maritime Organization. (2017). *Current Awareness Bulletin*. London, United Kingdom: Maritime Knowledge Centre.

Jackson, J. B. C., M. X. Kirby, W. H. Berger, K. A. Bjorndal, L. W. Botsford, B. J. Bourque, R. H. Bradbury, R. Cooke, J. M. Erlandson, J. A. Estes, T. P. Hughes, S. Kidwell, C. B. Lange, H. S. Lenihan, J. M. Pandolfi, C. H. Peterson, R. S. Steneck, M. J. Tegner, and R. R. Warner. (2001). Historical overfishing and the recent collapse of coastal ecosystems. *Science, 293*, 629–638.

Jones, T. T., and S. L. Martin. (2016). *Sea Turtle Tagging in the Mariana Islands Training and Testing (MITT) Study Area*. Silver Spring, MD: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Fisheries Marine Turtle Biology and Assessment Program Protected Species Division.

Kaluza, P., A. Kölzsch, M. T. Gastner, and B. Blasius. (2010). The complex network of global cargo ship movements. *Proceedings of the Royal Society, 7*(48), 11.

Kappel, C. V. (2005). Losing pieces of the puzzle: Threats to marine, estuarine, and diadromous species. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment, 3*(5), 275–282.

Ketten, D. R., and S. Moein-Bartol. (2006). *Functional Measures of Sea Turtle Hearing*. Woods Hole, MA: Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution.

Laist, D. W., and C. Shaw. (2006). Preliminary evidence that boat speed restrictions reduce deaths of Florida manatees. *Marine Mammal Science, 22*(2), 472–479.

Lam, T., Lingxu, S. Takahashi, and E. A. Burgess. (2011). *Market Forces: An Examination of Marine Turtle Trade in China and Japan*. Hong Kong, China: TRAFFIC East Asia.

Law, K. L., S. Moret-Ferguson, N. A. Maximenko, G. Proskurowski, E. E. Peacock, J. Hafner, and C. M. Reddy. (2010). Plastic accumulation in the North Atlantic Subtropical Gyre. *Sciencexpress, 329*, 1–8.

Lent, R., and D. Squires. (2017). Reducing marine mammal bycatch in global fisheries: An economics approach. *Deep-Sea Research II: Topical Studies in Oceanography, 140*, 268–277.

Levenson, D. H., S. A. Eckert, M. A. Crognale, J. F. Deegan, II, and G. H. Jacobs. (2004). Photopic spectral sensitivity of green and loggerhead sea turtles. *Copeia, 4*, 908–914.

Lohmann, K. J., and C. M. F. Lohmann. (1992). Orientation to oceanic waves by green turtle hatchlings. *The Journal of Experimental Biology, 171*, 1–13.

Lohmann, K. J., and C. M. F. Lohmann. (1996). Orientation and open-sea navigation in sea turtles. *The Journal of Experimental Biology, 199*, 73–81.

Losinio, L. (2017). Cabling the islands into the future. *Pacific Island Times*. Retrieved from http://www.pacificislandtimes.com/single-post/2017/05/03/Cabling-the-islands-into-the-future.

Lutcavage, M. E., P. Plotkin, B. Witherington, and P. L. Lutz. (1997). Human impacts on sea turtle survival. In P. L. Lutz & J. A. Musick (Eds.), *The Biology of Sea Turtles* (pp. 387–409). New York, NY: CRC Press.

Maison, K. A., I. K. Kelly, and K. P. Frutchey. (2010). *Green Turtle Nesting Sites and Sea Turtle Legislation throughout Oceania* (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Technical Memorandum NMFS-F/SPO-110). Silver Spring, MD: Scientific Publications Office.

Mato, Y., T. Isobe, H. Takada, H. Kanehiro, C. Ohtake, and T. Kaminuma. (2001). Plastic resin pellets as a transport medium for toxic chemicals in the marine environment. *Environmental Science Technology, 35*, 318–324.

McDonald, M. A., J. A. Hildebrand, and S. M. Wiggins. (2006). Increases in deep ocean ambient noise in the Northeast Pacific west of San Nicolas Island, California. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 120*(2), 711–718.

Meadows, D. W. (2016). *Petition to List the Tridacninae Giant Clams (Excluding Tridacna rosewateri) as Threatened or Endangered Under the Endangered Species Act*. Ellicott City, MD: Giant Clam Petition.

Minerals Management Service. (2007). *Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for Alternative Energy Development and Production and Alternate Use of Facilities on the Outer Continental Shelf: Final Environmental Impact Statement*. New Orleans, LA: Gulf of Mexico OCS Region.

Mrosovsky, N., G. D. Ryan, and M. C. James. (2009). Leatherback turtles: The menace of plastic. *Marine Pollution Bulletin, 58*(2), 287–289.

Myers, R. A., and B. Worm. (2003). Rapid worldwide depletion of predatory fish communities. *Nature, 423*, 280–283.

National Marine Fisheries Service. (2006). *Marine Debris: Impacts in the Gulf of Mexico*. Lafayette, LA: Southeast Regional Office, Protected Resources Division.

National Marine Fisheries Service. (2015a). *Reinitiated Biological Opinion and Conference Report on U.S. Navy Hawaii-Southern California Training and Testing*. Washington, DC: The United States Navy and National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's National Marine Fisheries Service, Office of Protected Resources' Permits and Conservation Division.

National Marine Fisheries Service. (2015b). *Marine Aquaculture Strategic Plan FY 2016–2020*. Silver Spring, MD: U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service.

National Marine Fisheries Service. (2016). *U.S. National Bycatch Report First Edition Update 2*. Silver Spring, MD: U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service. Retrieved from http://www.st.nmfs.noaa.gov/observer-home/first-edition-update-2.

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. (2013). Takes of Marine Mammals Incidental to Specified Activities; U.S. Navy Training and Testing Activities in the Hawaii-Southern California Training and Testing Study Area; Final Rule. *Federal Register, 78*(247), 78106–78158.

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. (2017). *Coral Bleaching and Disease*. Retrieved from https://www.pifsc.noaa.gov/cred/coral_bleaching_and_disease.php.

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Marine Debris Program. (2014). *Report on the Entanglement of Marine Species in Marine Debris with an Emphasis on Species in the United States*. Silver Spring, MD: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

National Research Council of the National Academies. (1990). *Decline of the Sea Turtles: Causes and Prevention*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.

Nowacek, D., M. Johnson, and P. Tyack. (2004). North Atlantic right whales (*Eubalaena glacialis*) ignore ships but respond to alerting stimuli. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London, 271*(B), 227–231.

O'Shea, T. J., R. R. Reeves, and A. K. Long. (1999). *Marine Mammals and Persistent Ocean Contaminants.* Paper presented at the Marine Mammal Commission Workshop October 12–15 1998. Keystone, CO.

Ormerod, S. J. (2003). Current issues with fish and fisheries: Editor's overview and introduction. *Journal of Applied Ecology, 40*(2), 204–213.

Poloczanska, E. S., M. T. Burrows, C. J. Brown, J. G. Molinos, B. S. Halpern, O. Hoegh-Guldberg, C. V. Kappel, P. J. Moore, A. J. Richardson, D. S. Schoeman, and W. J. Sydeman. (2016). Responses of marine organisms to climate change across oceans. *Frontiers in Marine Science, 3*(62), 1–21.

Raymundo, L. J., D. Burdick, V. A. Lapacek, R. J. Miller, and V. Brown. (2017). Anomalous temperatures and extreme tides: Guam staghorn *Acropora* succumb to a double threat. *Marine Ecology Progess Series, 564*, 47–55.

Read, A., P. Drinker, and S. Northridge. (2006). Bycatch of marine mammals in U.S. and global fisheries. *Conservation Biology, 20*(1), 163–169.

Reijnders, P. J. H., A. Aguilar, and A. Borrell. (2009). Pollution and marine mammals. In W. F. Perrin, B. Wursig, & J. G. M. Thewissen (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Marine Mammals* (2nd ed., pp. 890–898). Cambridge, MA: Academic Press.

Roberts, L., S. Cheesman, M. Elliott, and T. Breithaupt. (2016). Sensitivity of *Pagurus bernhardus* (L.) to substrate-borne vibration and anthropogenic noise. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology, 474*, 185–194.

SeeTurtles.org. (2017). *Coastal Development and Sea Turtles*. Retrieved from http://www.seeturtles.org/coastal-development/.

Song, K.-J. (2017). Bycatch of cetaceans on Korea fisheries in the East Sea. *Fisheries Research, 197*, 7–9.

Tibbats, B., and T. Flores. (2012). *Chapter 2: Guam Fishery Ecosystem Report* (Archipelagic Fishery Ecosystem Annual Report). Honolulu, HI: Western Pacific Regional Fishery Management Council.

U.S. Army. (2015). *Draft Environmental Assessment Terminal High-Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) Permanent Stationing in Guam*. Huntsville, AL: 94th Army Air and Missile Defense Command.

U.S. Department of Defense. (2016). *2016 Operational Energy Strategy*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Defense.

U.S. Department of the Air Force. (2016). *Final Environmental Impact Statement for Divert Activities and Exercises, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands*. Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam, HI: U.S. Air Force.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2012). *Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Supplemental Oversea Environmental Impact Statement for Surveillance Towed Array Sensor System Low Frequency Active (SURTASS LFA) Sonar*. Arlington, VA: Chief of Naval Operations.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2013). *Operational Range Clearance Plan for the Mariana Islands Range Complex/Farallon de Medinilla*. Pearl Harbor, HI: Naval Facilities Engineering Command Pacific.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2015a). *Draft Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands Joint Military Training Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement*. Honolulu, HI: Department of Interior, Office of Insular Affairs, Federal Aviation Administration, International Broadcasting Bureau, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service, and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2015b). *Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement Guam and Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands Military Relocation (2012 Roadmap Adjustments)*. Washington, DC: Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Pacific.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2019). *Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Supplemental Overseas Environmental Impact Statement for Surveillance Towed Array Sensor System Low Frequency (SURTASS LFA) Sonar*. Arlington, VA: U.S. Department of the Navy.

United States Navy and Permits and Conservation Division, Office of Protected Resources, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and U.S. Department of Commerce. (2019). *Biological Opinion on (1) United States Navy's Surveillance Towed Array Sensor System Low Frequency Active Sonar Routine Training and Testing Activities in the Western and Central North Pacific and Eastern Indian Oceans from August 2019 and continuing into the reasonably foreseeable future (2) National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's National Marine Fisheries Service, Office of Protected Resources, Permits and Conservation Division's Promulgation of Regulations and Issuance of a Letter of Authorization for the United States Navy to "Take" Marine Mammals Incidental to Surveillance Towed Array Sensor System Low Frequency Active Sonar routine training and testing activities in the Western and Central North Pacific and Eastern Indian Oceans from August 2019 to August 2026*. Washington, DC: Office of Protected Resources, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce.

United States of America and Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. (1983). *Lease Agreement Made Pursuant to the Covenant to Establish a Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands in a Political Union with the United States of America*. Washington, DC: United States Code.

Wallace, B. P., R. L. Lewison, S. L. McDonald, R. K. McDonald, C. Y. Kot, S. Kelez, R. K. Bjorkland, E. M. Finkbeiner, S. Helmbrecht, and L. B. Crowder. (2010). Global patterns of marine turtle bycatch. *Conservation Letters, 3*(3), 131–142.

Weijerman, M., I. Williams, J. Gutierrez, S. Grafeld, B. Tibbatts, and G. Davis. (2016). Trends in biomass of coral reef fishes, derived from shore-based creel surveys in Guam. *Fishery Bulletin, 114*(2), 237–256.

Western Pacific Regional Fishery Management Council. (2009). *Fishery Ecosystem Plan for the Mariana Archipelago*. Honolulu, HI: Western Pacific Regional Fishery Management Council.

Western Pacific Regional Fishery Management Council. (2019). *Annual Stock Assessment and Fishery Evaluation Report for the Mariana Archipelago Fishery Ecosystem Plan 2018*. Honolulu, HI: Western Pacific Regional Fishery Management Council.

Wong, A., and L. Cruz. (2018). The Media Barely Covered One of the Worst Storms to Hit U.S. Soil. *Science*. Retrieved from https://www.theatlantic.com/science/archive/2018/11/super-typhoon-yutu-mainstream-media-missed-northern-mariana-islands/575692/.

5 Mitigation

Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/ Overseas Environmental Impact Statement Mariana Islands Training and Testing

TABLE OF CONTENTS

5 MITIGATION 5-1

5.1 Introduction 5-1

5.1.1 Benefits of Mitigation 5-2

5.1.2 Compliance Initiatives 5-3

5.1.2.1 Protective Measures Assessment Protocol 5-3

5.1.2.2 Monitoring, Research, and Reporting Initiatives 5-3

5.2 Mitigation Development Process 5-9

5.2.1 At-Sea Procedural Mitigation Development 5-10

5.2.1.1 Lookouts 5-11

5.2.1.2 Mitigation Zones 5-12

5.2.1.3 Procedural Mitigation Implementation 5-12

5.2.2 At-Sea Mitigation Area Development 5-13

5.2.3 Terrestrial Mitigation Measure Development 5-14

5.2.4 Practicality of Implementation 5-14

5.2.4.1 Assessment Criteria 5-14

5.2.4.2 Factors Affecting Practicality 5-17

5.3 At-Sea Procedural Mitigation to be Implemented 5-19

5.3.1 Environmental Awareness and Education 5-19

5.3.2 Acoustic Stressors 5-21

5.3.2.1 Active Sonar 5-21

5.3.2.2 Weapons Firing Noise 5-25

5.3.3 Explosive Stressors 5-26

5.3.3.1 Explosive Sonobuoys 5-26

5.3.3.2 Explosive Torpedoes 5-29

5.3.3.3 Explosive Medium-Caliber and Large-Caliber Projectiles 5-31

5.3.3.4 Explosive Missiles and Rockets 5-35

5.3.3.5 Explosive Bombs 5-38

5.3.3.6 Sinking Exercises 5-40

5.3.3.7 Explosive Mine Countermeasure and Neutralization Activities 5-43
5.3.3.8 Explosive Mine Neutralization Activities Involving Navy Divers 5-45
5.3.3.9 Maritime Security Operations – Anti-Swimmer Grenades 5-49
5.3.4 Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors 5-51
5.3.4.1 Vessel Movement 5-51
5.3.4.2 Towed In-Water Devices 5-54
5.3.4.3 Small-, Medium-, and Large-Caliber Non-Explosive Practice Munitions 5-55
5.3.4.4 Non-Explosive Missiles and Rockets 5-56
5.3.4.5 Non-Explosive Bombs and Mine Shapes 5-57
5.4 At-Sea Mitigation Areas to be Implemented 5-57
5.4.1 Mitigation Areas for Seafloor Resources 5-58
5.4.2 Mitigation Areas for Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles 5-62
5.5 Terrestrial Mitigation Measures to be Implemented 5-65
5.5.1 Farallon De Medinilla 5-65
5.6 Measures Considered but Eliminated 5-66
5.6.1 Active Sonar 5-67
5.6.2 Explosives 5-70
5.6.3 Active and Passive Acoustic Monitoring Devices 5-71
5.6.4 Thermal Detection Systems 5-72
5.6.5 Third-Party Observers 5-75
5.6.6 Foreign Navy Mitigation 5-76
5.6.7 Reporting Requirements 5-76
5.7 Mitigation Summary 5-77

List of Figures

Figure 5.4-1: Seafloor Resource Mitigation Areas off Guam 5-59
Figure 5.4-2: Seafloor Resource Mitigation Areas off Tinian, Saipan, and Farallon de Medinilla 5-60
Figure 5.4-3: Marine Mammal and Sea Turtle Mitigation Areas 5-64

List of Tables

Table 5-1: Environmental Awareness and Education 5-20
Table 5-2: Procedural Mitigation for Active Sonar 5-22
Table 5-3: Procedural Mitigation for Weapons Firing Noise 5-25
Table 5-4: Procedural Mitigation for Explosive Sonobuoys 5-27
Table 5-5: Procedural Mitigation for Explosive Torpedoes 5-29
Table 5-6: Procedural Mitigation for Explosive Medium-Caliber and Large-Caliber Projectiles 5-32

Table 5-7: Procedural Mitigation for Explosive Missiles and Rockets 5-35
Table 5-8: Procedural Mitigation for Explosive Bombs.....5-38
Table 5-9: Procedural Mitigation for Sinking Exercises 5-41
Table 5-10: Procedural Mitigation for Explosive Mine Countermeasure and Neutralization Activities 5-44
Table 5-11: Procedural Mitigation for Explosive Mine Neutralization Activities Involving Navy Divers 5-46
Table 5-12: Procedural Mitigation for Maritime Security Operations – Anti-Swimmer Grenades 5-50
Table 5-13: Procedural Mitigation for Vessel Movement.....5-52
Table 5-14: Procedural Mitigation for Towed In-Water Devices.....5-54
Table 5-15: Procedural Mitigation for Small-, Medium-, and Large-Caliber Non-Explosive Practice Munitions.....5-55
Table 5-16: Procedural Mitigation for Non-Explosive Missiles and Rockets 5-56
Table 5-17: Procedural Mitigation for Non-Explosive Bombs and Mine Shapes.....5-57
Table 5-18: Mitigation Areas for Seafloor Resources 5-58
Table 5-19: Mitigation Areas for Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles.....5-63
Table 5-20: Farallon de Medinilla Mitigation Measures.....5-65
Table 5-21: Summary of At-Sea Procedural Mitigation 5-78
Table 5-22: Summary of At-Sea Mitigation Areas.....5-79
Table 5-23: Summary of Terrestrial Mitigation.....5-80

This page intentionally left blank.

5 Mitigation

5.1 Introduction

This chapter describes the mitigation measures that the United States (U.S.) Department of the Navy (Navy) will implement to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Mariana Islands Training and Testing (MITT) Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS)/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (OEIS) Proposed Action. This chapter has been updated in its entirety since Chapter 5 (Standard Operating Procedures, Mitigation, and Monitoring) of the 2015 MITT Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)/OEIS (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2015). This Final SEIS/OEIS was prepared in coordination with the U.S. Air Force and U.S. Coast Guard, and these Services will implement applicable mitigation measures developed by the Navy for the Proposed Action. Under the Proposed Action, military readiness activities would be conducted at sea or on Farallon de Medinilla (FDM). Therefore, several mitigation measures developed for the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, such as mitigation for invasive species control and training activities conducted on the islands of Guam, Rota, Tinian, and Saipan, are outside the scope of this Final SEIS/OEIS. The Navy will continue implementing these mitigation measures in accordance with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (2015) Biological Opinion. For additional information, see Chapter 5 (Standard Operating Procedures, Mitigation, and Monitoring) of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

The Navy will also implement standard operating procedures specific to training and testing activities conducted under the Proposed Action. In many cases, standard operating procedures provide a benefit to environmental and cultural resources, some of which have high socioeconomic value in the Study Area. Standard operating procedures differ from mitigation measures because standard operating procedures are designed to provide for safety and mission success, whereas mitigation measures are designed specifically to avoid or reduce potential environmental impacts. An example of a standard operating procedure is that ships operated by or for the Navy have personnel assigned to stand watch at all times when underway. Watch personnel monitor their assigned sectors for any indication of danger to the ship and the personnel on board, such as a floating or partially submerged object or piece of debris, periscope, surfaced submarine, wisp of smoke, flash of light, or surface disturbance. The Navy also avoids known navigation hazards that appear on navigational charts, such as submerged wrecks and obstructions. As a standard collision avoidance procedure, watch personnel monitor for marine mammals that have the potential to be in the direct path of the ship. The standard operating procedures to avoid collision hazards are designed for safety of the ship and the personnel on board. This is different from mitigation measures for vessel movement, which require vessels to maneuver to avoid marine mammals by specified distances to avoid or reduce the potential for physical disturbance and strike of marine mammals, as described in Section 5.3.4.1 (Vessel Movement). In this example, the benefit of the mitigation measure for vessel movement is additive to the benefit of the standard operating procedure for vessel safety. Standard operating procedures that apply to the Proposed Action and are generally consistent with those included in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS are described in Chapter 5 (Standard Operating Procedures, Mitigation, and Monitoring) of that document. Standard operating procedures that apply to the Proposed Action and were not included in, or require a clarification from, the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS are discussed in Section 2.3.3 (Standard Operating Procedures) of this Final SEIS/OEIS.

In addition to the mitigation measures and standard operating procedures specific to the Proposed Action, the Navy has existing routine operating instructions (e.g., training manuals), local installation

instructions (e.g., Integrated Natural Resource Management Plans), and Programmatic Agreements that were developed to meet other safety and environmental compliance requirements or initiatives. For example, the Naval Air Training and Operating Procedures Standardization (NATOPS) General Flight and Operating Instructions Manual (CNAF M-3710.7) contains naval air training procedures pertaining to safe operations of aircraft, which includes requirements to minimize the disturbance of wildlife. Aviation units are required to avoid noise-sensitive areas, such as breeding farms, resorts, beaches, national parks, national monuments, and national recreational areas when at altitudes less than 3,000 ft. above ground level except when in compliance with applicable Federal Aviation Administration or U.S. Navy-approved traffic patterns, routes, or special use airspace (e.g., military operations areas). They are also required to avoid disturbing wild fowl in their natural habitats and to avoid firing directly at large fish, whales, or other wildlife.

Additionally, a Programmatic Agreement regarding military training in the Marianas contained procedures pertaining to military readiness activities and other Department of Defense projects (U.S. Department of Defense, 2009). For example, the Navy agreed to avoid certain training exercises within particular areas. Applicable maps have been updated annually and disseminated to military planners who coordinate and execute training exercises. As described in Section 3.11 (Cultural Resources), the 2009 Programmatic Agreement expired in December 2019. The Navy has executed an interim Programmatic Agreement to follow the exact terms of the 2009 agreement while a new agreement is being developed. In accordance with the terms of the Programmatic Agreement, if previously unknown cultural resources are discovered during applicable activities, the Navy will notify the appropriate Cultural Resources Manager and implement reasonable measures to avoid, minimize, or mitigate impacts to those resources. These requirements are in addition to mitigation measures developed for the Proposed Action. The Navy will continue complying with applicable operating instructions, local installation instructions, and Programmatic Agreements within the Study Area, as appropriate.

5.1.1 Benefits of Mitigation

The Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) environmental analyses indicate that certain acoustic, explosive, and physical disturbance and strike stressors have the potential to impact certain biological or cultural resources. The Navy developed mitigation measures for those stressors and would implement the mitigation for either action alternative. The Navy considered the benefits of mitigation in the environmental analyses for both Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 of the Proposed Action in this Final SEIS/OEIS. In addition to analyzing mitigation measures pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the Navy designed its mitigation measures to achieve one or more benefits, such as the following:

- Effect the least practicable adverse impact on marine mammal species or stocks and their habitat, and have a negligible impact on marine mammal species and stocks (as required under the Marine Mammal Protection Act [MMPA]);
- Ensure that the Proposed Action does not jeopardize the continued existence of endangered or threatened species (as required under the Endangered Species Act [ESA]);
- Avoid or minimize adverse effects on essential fish habitat (as required under the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act); and
- Avoid adversely impacting shipwrecks (as required under the Abandoned Shipwreck Act and National Historic Preservation Act).

In addition to the benefits listed above, certain mitigation measures would also benefit other species in the Study Area, such as seabirds listed under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. The Navy coordinated its mitigation with the appropriate regulatory agencies, including the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), through the consultation and permitting processes. The Navy Record of Decision will document all mitigation measures the Navy will implement under the Proposed Action. The NMFS Record of Decision, MMPA Regulations and Letter of Authorization, ESA Biological Opinion, and other applicable consultation documents will include the mitigation measures applicable to the resources for which the Navy has consulted. The suite of mitigation measures included in this Final SEIS/OEIS represents the maximum level of mitigation that is practical for the Navy to implement when balanced against impacts on safety, sustainability, and the ability to continue meeting its mission requirements. Should the Navy require a change in how it implements mitigation based on national security concerns, evolving readiness requirements, or other factors (e.g., significant changes in the best available science), the Navy will engage the appropriate agencies and reevaluate its mitigation through adaptive management or the appropriate consultations. The Navy's adaptive management approach is discussed in Section 5.1.2.2.1.1 (Adaptive Management). This approach was coordinated with NMFS during the consultation and permitting processes and will be included in the MMPA Regulations and Letter of Authorization.

5.1.2 Compliance Initiatives

To disseminate its mitigation requirements to the appropriate personnel and meet other compliance requirements for the MMPA and ESA, the Navy will continue using the Protective Measures Assessment Protocol and its ongoing monitoring and reporting initiatives, as described in the sections below.

5.1.2.1 Protective Measures Assessment Protocol

To disseminate requirements to the personnel who are required to implement mitigation during training and testing activities, the Navy will continue inputting its mitigation measures into the Protective Measures Assessment Protocol and appropriate governing instructions. The Protective Measures Assessment Protocol is a software tool that serves as the Navy's comprehensive data source for at-sea mitigation. The software tool provides personnel with notification of the required mitigation measures and a visual display of the planned training or testing activity location overlaid with relevant environmental data (e.g., mapped locations of shallow-water coral reefs). Navy policy requires applicable personnel to access the Protective Measures Assessment Protocol during the event planning process. This helps ensure that personnel receive mitigation instructions prior to the start of training and testing activities and that mitigation is implemented appropriately.

5.1.2.2 Monitoring, Research, and Reporting Initiatives

Many of the Navy's monitoring programs, research programs, and reporting initiatives have been ongoing for more than a decade and will continue as a compliance requirement for the MMPA or ESA, or both. The Navy and NMFS use the information contained within monitoring, research, activity, and incident reports when evaluating the effectiveness and practicality of mitigation and determining if adaptive adjustments to mitigation may be appropriate. These reports also facilitate better understandings of the biological resources that inhabit the Study Area and the potential impacts of the Proposed Action on those resources.

5.1.2.2.1 Marine Species Research and Monitoring Programs

Through its marine species research and monitoring programs, the Navy is one of the nation's largest sponsors of scientific research on and monitoring of marine species. Detailed information on these programs is provided in Section 3.0.1.1.1 (Marine Species Monitoring and Research Programs). Navy

research programs focus on investments in basic and applied research that increase fundamental knowledge and advance naval technological capabilities. Navy monitoring programs focus on the potential impacts of training and testing activities on biological resources. Monitoring reports are available to the public on the U.S. Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage (https://www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/). The Navy will post future reports online as they become available.

Specific details regarding the content of the reports were coordinated with the appropriate agencies through the consultation and permitting processes. For this Final SEIS/OEIS, the Navy agreed to several additional research and monitoring initiatives designed to help advance the understanding of beaked whales and strandings in the MITT Study Area, including:

- Co-funding the Pacific Marine Assessment Program for Protected Species (PACMAPPS) Mariana Islands survey in spring-summer 2021 to help document beaked whale occurrence, abundance, and distribution in the Mariana Islands. This effort will include deployments of a towed array as well as floating passive acoustic buoys.
- Continuing to fund additional stranding response and necropsy analyses for the Pacific Islands region.
- Funding research on a framework to improve the analysis of single and mass stranding events, including the development of more advanced statistical methods to better characterize uncertainty associated with data parameters.
- Increasing analysis for any future beaked whale strandings in the Mariana Islands, to include detailed Navy reviews of available records of sonar use.
- Sponsoring beaked whale occurrence monitoring within select portions of the MITT Study Area starting in 2022, so as to not duplicate the 2021 PACMAPPS efforts described above.
- Including Cuvier's beaked whales as a priority species for analysis under a 2020-2023 Navy research funded program titled Marine Species Monitoring for Potential Consequences of Disturbance (MSM4PCOD). MSM4PCOD will explore how Navy-funded monitoring priorities can be adjusted to provide the best scientific information to support Population Consequence of Disturbance analysis.
- Funding and co-organizing with NMFS an expert panel to provide recommendations on scientific data gaps and uncertainties for further protective measure consideration to minimize potential impacts of Navy training and testing activities on beaked whales in the Mariana Islands.

Additional information about the U.S. Navy's Marine Species Monitoring Program, including its adaptive management and strategic planning components, is provided in the sections below.

5.1.2.2.1.1 Adaptive Management

Adaptive management is an iterative process of decision-making that accounts for changes in the environment and scientific understanding over time through a system of monitoring and feedback. Within the natural resource management community, adaptive management involves ongoing, real-time learning and knowledge creation, both in a substantive sense and in terms of the adaptive process itself (Williams et al., 2009). Adaptive management focuses on learning and adapting, through partnerships of natural resource managers, scientists, and other stakeholders. Adaptive management helps managers maintain flexibility in their decisions and provides them the latitude to change direction

to improve understanding of ecological systems and achieve management objectives. Taking action to improve progress toward desired outcomes is another function of adaptive management.

The Navy's adaptive management review process and reporting requirements serve as the basis for evaluating performance and compliance. The process involves technical review meetings and ongoing discussions between the Navy, NMFS, the Marine Mammal Commission, and other experts in the scientific community. An example of a revision to the compliance monitoring structure as a result of adaptive management is the development of the Strategic Planning Process, which is a planning tool for the selection and management of monitoring investments (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2013a). Through adaptive management, the Strategic Planning Process has been incorporated into the Integrated Comprehensive Monitoring Program, which is described below.

5.1.2.2.1.2 Integrated Comprehensive Monitoring Program

The Navy developed an Integrated Comprehensive Monitoring Program to serve as the overarching framework for coordinating its marine species monitoring efforts and as a planning tool to focus its monitoring priorities pursuant to ESA and MMPA requirements (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2010). The purpose of the Integrated Comprehensive Monitoring Program is to coordinate monitoring efforts across regions and to allocate the most appropriate level and type of monitoring effort for each range complex based on a set of standardized objectives, regional expertise, and resource availability. The Integrated Comprehensive Monitoring Program does not identify specific field-work or individual projects. It is designed to provide a flexible, scalable, and adaptable framework using adaptive management and the Strategic Planning Process to periodically assess progress and reevaluate objectives.

The Integrated Comprehensive Monitoring Program is evaluated through the adaptive management review process to (1) assess progress, (2) provide a matrix of goals and objectives, and (3) make recommendations for refinement and analysis of monitoring and mitigation techniques. This process includes conducting an annual adaptive management review meeting where the Navy and NMFS jointly consider the prior year's goals, project results, and related scientific advances to determine if monitoring plan modifications are warranted to address program goals more effectively. Modifications to the Integrated Comprehensive Monitoring Program that result from annual adaptive management review discussions are incorporated by an addendum or revision to the Integrated Comprehensive Monitoring Program as needed. The Integrated Comprehensive Monitoring Program will be routinely updated as the program evolves and progresses.

The Strategic Planning Process serves to guide the investment of resources to most efficiently address Integrated Comprehensive Monitoring Program objectives and intermediate scientific objectives. Navy-funded monitoring projects relating to the impact of Navy training and testing activities on protected marine species are designed to accomplish one or more of the following top-level goals, as described in the Integrated Comprehensive Monitoring Program charter:

- Increase the understanding of the likely occurrence of marine mammals and ESA-listed marine species in the vicinity of the action (e.g., presence, abundance, distribution, density).
- Increase the understanding of the nature, scope, or context of the likely exposure of marine mammals and ESA-listed marine species to any of the potential stressors associated with the action (e.g., acoustics, explosives, physical disturbance and strike of military expended materials) through a better understanding of one or more of the following: (1) the nature of the action and its surrounding environment (e.g., sound-source characterization, propagation,

ambient noise levels), (2) the affected species (e.g., life history, dive patterns), (3) the likely co-occurrence of marine mammals and ESA-listed marine species with the action (in whole or part), and (4) the likely biological or behavioral context of exposure to the stressor for the marine mammal and ESA-listed marine species (e.g., age class of exposed animals or known pupping, calving, or feeding areas).

- Increase the understanding of how individual marine mammals or ESA-listed marine species respond behaviorally or physiologically to the specific stressors associated with the action and in what context (e.g., at what distance or received level).
- Increase the understanding of how anticipated individual responses to individual stressors or anticipated combinations of stressors may impact either: (1) the long-term fitness and survival of an individual, or (2) the population, species, or stock (e.g., through impacts on annual rates of recruitment or survival).
- Increase the understanding of the effectiveness of mitigation and monitoring.
- Improve the understanding and record of the manner in which the Navy complies with its Incidental Take Authorizations and Incidental Take Statements.
- Increase the probability of detecting marine mammals through improved technology or methods within mitigation zones to improve mitigation effectiveness and better achieve monitoring goals.

The Navy established a Scientific Advisory Group in 2011 with the initial task of evaluating current Navy monitoring approaches under the Integrated Comprehensive Monitoring Plan and existing MMPA Regulations and Letters of Authorization. The Scientific Advisory Group was also tasked with developing objective scientific recommendations that would form the basis for the Strategic Plan. While recommendations were fairly broad and not specifically prescriptive, the Scientific Advisory Group did provide specific programmatic recommendations that serve as guiding principles for the continued evolution of the Integrated Comprehensive Monitoring Program. Key recommendations included:

- Working within a conceptual framework of knowledge, from basic information on the occurrence of species within each range complex, to more specific matters of exposure, response, and consequences.
- Facilitating collaboration among researchers in each region, with the intent to develop a coherent and synergistic regional monitoring and research effort.
- Striving to move away from effort-based compliance metrics (e.g., completing a pre-determined amount of survey hours or days), with the intent to design and conduct monitoring projects according to scientific objectives rather than effort expended.
- Approaching the monitoring program holistically and selecting projects that offer the best opportunity to advance understanding of the issues, as opposed to establishing range-specific requirements.

5.1.2.2.1.3 Strategic Planning Process

The U.S. Navy's Marine Species Monitoring Program has evolved and improved as a result of adaptive management review and the Strategic Planning Process through changes that include:

- Recognizing the limitations of effort-based compliance metrics;

- Developing a strategic approach to monitoring based on recommendations from the Scientific Advisory Group;
- Shifting focus to projects based on scientific objectives that facilitate generation of statistically meaningful results upon which natural resources management decisions may be based;
- Focusing on priority species or areas of interest as well as best opportunities to address specific monitoring objectives to maximize return on investment; and
- Increasing transparency of the program and management standards, improving collaboration among participating researchers, and improving accessibility to monitoring data and results.

As a result of the changes outlined above due to the implementation of the Strategic Planning Process, the U.S. Navy's Marine Species Monitoring Program has undergone a transition. Intermediate scientific objectives now serve as the basis for developing and executing new monitoring projects across Navy training and testing areas in the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. Implementation of the Strategic Planning Process involves coordination among fleets, system commands, Chief of Naval Operations Energy and Environmental Readiness Division, NMFS, and the Marine Mammal Commission with five primary steps:

- **Identify overarching intermediate scientific objectives.** Through the adaptive management process, the Navy coordinates with NMFS and the Marine Mammal Commission to review and revise the list of intermediate scientific objectives that guide development of individual monitoring projects. Examples include addressing information gaps in species occurrence and density, evaluating behavioral responses of marine mammals to Navy training and testing activities, and developing tools and techniques for passive acoustic monitoring.
- **Develop individual monitoring project concepts.** This step generally takes the form of soliciting input from the scientific community in terms of potential monitoring projects that address one or more of the intermediate scientific objectives. This can be accomplished through a variety of forums, including professional societies, regional scientific advisory groups, and contractor support.
- **Evaluate, prioritize, and select monitoring projects.** Navy technical experts and program managers review and evaluate monitoring project concepts and develop a prioritized ranking. The goal of this step is to establish a suite of monitoring projects that address a cross-section of intermediate scientific objectives spread over a variety of range complexes.
- **Execute and manage selected monitoring projects.** Individual projects are initiated through appropriate funding mechanisms and include clearly defined objectives and deliverables, such as data, reports, or publications.
- **Report and evaluate progress and results.** Progress on individual monitoring projects is updated through the U.S. Navy's Marine Species Monitoring Program webpage as well as annual monitoring reports submitted to NMFS. Both internal review and discussions with NMFS through the adaptive management process are used to evaluate progress toward addressing the primary objectives of the Integrated Comprehensive Monitoring Program and serve to periodically recalibrate the focus of the monitoring program.

These steps serve three primary purposes: (1) to facilitate the Navy in developing specific projects addressing one or more intermediate scientific objectives, (2) to establish a more structured and collaborative framework for developing, evaluating, and selecting monitoring projects across areas where the Navy conducts training and testing activities, and (3) to maximize the opportunity for input

and involvement across the research community, academia, and industry. This process is designed to integrate various elements, including:

- Integrated Comprehensive Monitoring Program top-level goals,
- Scientific Advisory Group recommendations,
- Integration of regional scientific expert input,
- Ongoing adaptive management review dialog between NMFS and the Navy,
- Lessons learned from past and future monitoring of Navy training and testing, and
- Leveraging of research and lessons learned from other Navy-funded science programs.

The Strategic Planning Process will continue to shape the future of the U.S. Navy's Marine Species Monitoring Program and serve as the primary decision-making tool for guiding investments. Information on monitoring projects currently underway in the Atlantic and Pacific oceans, as well as results, reports, and publications, can be accessed through the U.S. Navy's Marine Species Monitoring Program webpage.

5.1.2.2.2 Training and Testing Activity Reports

The Navy developed a classified data repository known as the Sonar Positional Reporting System to maintain an internal record of underwater sound sources (e.g., active sonar) used during training and testing. The Sonar Positional Reporting System facilitates reporting pursuant to the Navy's MMPA Regulations and Letters of Authorization. Using data from the Sonar Positional Reporting System and other relevant sources, the Navy will continue to provide the NMFS Office of Protected Resources with classified or unclassified (depending on the data) annual reports on the training and testing activities that use underwater sound sources. In its annual training and testing activity reports, the Navy will describe the level of training and testing conducted during the reporting period. For major training exercises, the reports will also include information on each individual marine mammal sighting related to mitigation implementation. Unclassified annual training and testing activity reports that have been submitted to NMFS can be found on the NMFS Office of Protected Resources and U.S. Navy's Marine Species Monitoring Program webpages.

5.1.2.2.3 Incident Reports

The Navy's mitigation measures and many of its standard operating procedures are designed to prevent incidents involving biological and cultural resources, such as aircraft strikes, vessel strikes, and impacts on submerged historic properties and seafloor resources. The Navy has been collecting data on such incidents (if they have occurred) for more than a decade and will continue doing so under the Proposed Action. To provide information on incidents involving biological or cultural resources, the Navy will submit reports to the appropriate management authorities as described below:

- **Bird and Bat Aircraft Strikes:** As described in Section 5.1.2 (Aircraft Safety) of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, animal strikes present an aviation safety risk for aircrews and aircraft. The Navy will report all bird and bat strikes per standard operating procedures.
- **Incidents Involving Marine Mammals, Sea Turtles, and ESA-Listed Fish:** The Navy will notify the appropriate regulatory agency (e.g., NMFS) immediately or as soon as operational security considerations allow if it observes the following that is (or may be) attributable to Navy activities: (1) a vessel strike of a marine mammal or sea turtle during training or testing, (2) a stranded, injured, or dead marine mammal or sea turtle during training or testing, or (3) an

injured or dead marine mammal, sea turtle, or ESA-listed fish species during post-explosive event monitoring. The Navy will provide relevant information pertaining to the incident (e.g., vessel speed). Additional details on these incident reporting requirements will be included in the Notification and Reporting Plan, which will be publicly available on the NMFS Office of Protected Resources webpage. The Navy will continue to provide the appropriate personnel with training on marine species incidents and their associated reporting requirements to aid the data collection and reporting processes (see Section 5.3.1, Environmental Awareness and Education). Information on marine mammal strandings is included in the *Marine Mammal Strandings Associated with U.S. Navy Sonar Activities* technical report (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2017a).

- **Corals:** The Navy will submit reports to NMFS regarding surveys of coral reef habitat and ordnance expended at FDM (e.g., observed ricochets and misses that land in waters surrounding FDM occupied by corals, observed in-water effects to corals). Additional details on the Navy's coral reporting requirements are included in the ESA Biological Opinion.
- **Cultural Resources:** In the event the Navy impacts a historic property, it will commence consultation with the appropriate State Historic Preservation Officer in accordance with 36 Code of Federal Regulations section 800.13(b)(3).

5.2 Mitigation Development Process

The Navy, in coordination with the appropriate regulatory agencies, developed its initial suite of mitigation measures for Phase I of environmental planning (2010–2015) and subsequently revised those mitigation measures for the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS in Phase II (2015–2020). For this Final SEIS/OEIS (which represents Phase III of environmental planning), the Navy worked collaboratively with the appropriate regulatory agencies to develop and refine its mitigation, which was finalized through the consultation and permitting processes. The mitigation development process involved reanalyzing existing mitigation measures implemented under the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and analyzing new mitigation recommendations received from Navy and NMFS scientists, other governmental agencies, the public, and non-governmental organizations during NEPA scoping, the Draft SEIS/OEIS public review, and the consultation and permitting processes. The Navy conducted a detailed review and assessment of each potential mitigation measure individually and then all potential mitigation measures collectively to determine if, as a whole, mitigation will effectively avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action and will be practical to implement. The Navy operational community (i.e., leadership from the aviation, surface, subsurface, and special warfare communities; leadership from the research and acquisition community; and training and testing experts), environmental planners, and scientific experts provided input on the effectiveness and practicality of mitigation implementation. Navy Senior Leadership reviewed and approved all mitigation measures included in this Final SEIS/OEIS.

Mitigation measures that the Navy will implement under the Proposed Action are organized into three categories: procedural mitigation measures for at-sea activities, at-sea mitigation areas, and terrestrial mitigation measures for activities on FDM. The sections below provide definitions of mitigation terminology, background information pertinent to the mitigation development process, and information about the mitigation effectiveness and practicality criteria. Section 5.6 (Measures Considered but Eliminated) and Appendix I (Geographic Mitigation Assessment) contain information on measures that did not meet the appropriate balance between being both effective as well as practical to implement, and therefore will not be implemented under the Proposed Action.

5.2.1 At-Sea Procedural Mitigation Development

Procedural mitigation is mitigation that the Navy will implement whenever and wherever training or testing activities involving applicable acoustic, explosive, and physical disturbance and strike stressors take place within the at-sea portion of the Study Area. Procedural mitigation generally involves: (1) the use of one or more trained Lookouts to observe for specific biological resources within a mitigation zone, (2) requirements for Lookouts to immediately communicate sightings of specific biological resources to the appropriate watch station for information dissemination, and (3) requirements for the watch station to implement mitigation until a pre-activity commencement or during-activity recommencement condition has been met.

Procedural mitigation primarily involves Lookouts observing for marine mammals and sea turtles. For some activities, Lookouts may also be required to observe for additional biological resources, such as ESA-listed fish species or jellyfish aggregations that can be an indicator of potential sea turtle presence. While on watch, Lookouts employ visual search techniques, including a combination of naked-eye scanning and the use of hand-held binoculars or high-powered binoculars mounted on a ship deck, depending on the observation platform. After sunset and prior to sunrise, Lookouts and other Navy watch personnel employ night visual search techniques, which could include the use of night vision devices.

To consider the benefits of procedural mitigation to marine mammals and sea turtles within the MMPA and ESA impact estimates, the Navy conservatively factored mitigation effectiveness into its quantitative analysis process, as described in the technical report titled *Quantifying Acoustic Impacts on Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles: Methods and Analytical Approach for Phase III Training and Testing* (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2018a). The Navy's quantitative analysis assumes that Lookouts will not be 100 percent effective at detecting all individual marine mammals and sea turtles within the mitigation zones for each activity. This is due to the inherent limitations of observing marine species and because the likelihood of sighting individual animals is largely dependent on observation conditions (e.g., time of day, sea state, mitigation zone size, observation platform) and animal behavior (e.g., the amount of time an animal spends at the surface of the water). This is particularly true for sea turtles, small marine mammals, and marine mammals that display cryptic behaviors (e.g., surfacing to breathe with only a small portion of their body visible from the surface). Throughout Section 5.3 (At-Sea Procedural Mitigation to be Implemented), discussions about the likelihood that a Lookout would observe a marine mammal or sea turtle pertain specifically to animals that are available to be observed (i.e., on, above, or just below the water's surface). The benefits of procedural mitigation measures for species that were not included in the quantitative analysis process (e.g., fish) are discussed qualitatively.

Data inputs for assessing and developing procedural mitigation included operational data as described in Section 5.2.4 (Practicality of Implementation), the best available science discussed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences), published literature, data on marine mammal and sea turtle impact ranges obtained through acoustic modeling, marine species monitoring and density data, and the most recent guidance from NMFS. Background information on the data that were used to develop the ranges to effect for marine mammals and sea turtles (such as hearing threshold metrics) is provided in Section 3.4 (Marine Mammals) and Section 3.5 (Sea Turtles). Additional activity or stressor-specific details, such as the level of effect to which an at-sea procedural mitigation measure is expected to mitigate and if a measure has been modified from the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS is provided throughout Section 5.3 (At-Sea Procedural Mitigation to be Implemented).

5.2.1.1 Lookouts

Lookouts perform similar duties as the standard watch personnel described in Section 5.1.1 (Vessel Safety) of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, such as personnel on the bridge watch team and personnel stationed for man-overboard precautions. Lookouts are designated the responsibility of helping meet the Navy's mitigation requirements by visually observing mitigation zones. The number of Lookouts designated for each training or testing activity is dependent upon the number of personnel involved in the activity (i.e., manning restrictions) and the number and type of assets available (i.e., equipment and space restrictions).

Depending on the activity, a Lookout may be positioned on a ship (i.e., surface ships and surfaced submarines), on a small boat (e.g., rigid-hull inflatable boat), in an aircraft, or on a pier. Certain platforms, such as aircraft and small boats, have manning or space restrictions; therefore, the Lookout on these platforms is typically an existing member of the aircraft or boat crew who is responsible for other essential tasks (e.g., a pilot or Naval Flight Officer who is responsible for navigation). Some platforms are minimally manned and are therefore either physically unable to accommodate more than one Lookout or divert personnel from mission-essential tasks, including safe and secure operation of propulsion, weapons, and damage control systems that ensure the safety of the ship and the personnel on board. The number of Lookouts specified for each activity in Section 5.3 (At-Sea Procedural Mitigation to be Implemented) represents the maximum number of Lookouts that can be designated for those activities without requiring additional personnel or reassigning duties. The "maximum" number of Lookouts is equivalent to the required number of Lookouts; therefore, the Navy would not use fewer Lookouts than what is specified in each mitigation table. The Navy is unable to position Lookouts on unmanned surface vehicles, unmanned aerial systems, unmanned underwater vehicles, and submerged submarines, or have Lookouts observe during activities that use systems deployed from or towed by unmanned platforms.

When Lookouts are positioned in a fixed-wing aircraft or rotary-wing aircraft (i.e., helicopter), mission requirements determine the flight parameters (altitude, flight path, and speed) for that aircraft. For example, most fixed-wing aircraft sorties occur above 3,000 feet (ft.), while most rotary-wing sorties associated with mine countermeasure activities occur at altitudes as low as 75–100 ft. Similarly, when Lookouts are positioned on a vessel, mission requirements determine the operational parameters (course and speed) for that vessel.

The Navy's passive acoustic devices (e.g., remote acoustic sensors, expendable sonobuoys, passive acoustic sensors on submarines) can complement visual observations for marine mammals when passive acoustic assets are already participating in an activity. The passive acoustic devices can detect vocalizing marine mammals within the frequency bands already being monitored by Navy personnel. Marine mammal detections from passive acoustic devices can alert Lookouts to possible marine mammal presence in the vicinity. Lookouts can use the information from passive acoustic detections to assist their visual observations of the mitigation zone. Based on the number and type of passive acoustic devices that are typically used, passive acoustic detections do not provide range or bearing to a detected animal in order to determine its location or confirm its presence in a mitigation zone. Therefore, it is not practical for the Navy to implement mitigation in response to passive acoustic detections alone (i.e., without a visual sighting of an animal within the mitigation zone). Additional information about passive acoustic devices is provided in Section 5.6.3 (Active and Passive Acoustic Monitoring Devices).

5.2.1.2 Mitigation Zones

Mitigation zones are areas at the surface of the water within which applicable training or testing activities will be ceased, powered down, or modified to protect specific biological resources from an auditory injury (permanent threshold shift [PTS]), non-auditory injury (from impulsive sources), or direct strike (e.g., vessel strike) to the maximum extent practicable. Mitigation zones are measured as the radius from a stressor. Implementation of procedural mitigation is most effective when mitigation zones are appropriately sized to be realistically observed during typical training and testing activity conditions.

The Navy customized its mitigation zone sizes and mitigation requirements for each applicable training and testing activity category or stressor. The Navy developed each mitigation zone to be the largest area that (1) Lookouts can reasonably be expected to observe during typical activity conditions (i.e., most environmentally protective), and (2) the Navy can commit to implementing mitigation without impacting safety, sustainability, or the ability to meet mission requirements. The Navy designed the mitigation zones for most acoustic and explosive stressors according to its source bins. As described in Section 3.0.4.1.1 (Sonar and Other Transducers), sonars and other transducers are grouped into classes that share an attribute, such as frequency range or purpose of use. Classes are further sorted by bins based on the frequency or bandwidth, source level, and when warranted, the application in which the source would be used. As described in Section 3.0.4.2.1.1 (Explosions in Water), explosives detonated in water are binned by net explosive weight. Mitigation does not pertain to stressors that do not have the potential to impact biological resources (e.g., *de minimis* acoustic and explosive sources that do not have the potential to impact marine mammals).

Discussions throughout Section 5.3 (At-Sea Procedural Mitigation to be Implemented) about the level of effect that will likely be mitigated for marine mammals and sea turtles are based on a comparison of the mitigation zone size to the predicted impact ranges for the applicable source bins with the longest average ranges to PTS. These conservative discussions represent the worst-case scenario for each activity category or stressor. The mitigation zones will oftentimes cover all or a larger portion of the predicted average ranges to PTS for other comparatively smaller sources with shorter impact ranges (e.g., sonar sources used at a lower source level, explosives in a smaller bin). The discussions are primarily focused on how the mitigation zone sizes compare to the ranges to PTS; however, depending on the activity category or stressor, the mitigation zones are oftentimes large enough to also mitigate within a portion of the ranges to temporary threshold shift (TTS). TTS is a threshold shift that is recoverable. Background information on PTS, TTS, and marine mammal and sea turtle hearing groups is presented in the U.S. Department of the Navy (2017b) technical report titled *Criteria and Thresholds for U.S. Navy Acoustic and Explosive Effects Analysis (Phase III)*.

5.2.1.3 Procedural Mitigation Implementation

The Navy takes several courses of action in response to a sighting of an applicable biological resource in a mitigation zone. First, a Lookout will communicate the sighting to the appropriate watch station. Next, the watch station will implement the prescribed mitigation, such as delaying the initial start of an activity, powering down sonar, ceasing an explosive detonation, or maneuvering a vessel. For sightings of marine mammals, sea turtles, and other specified biological resources within a mitigation zone prior to the initial start of or during applicable activities, the Navy will continue mitigating until one of the five conditions listed below has been met. The conditions are designed to allow a sighted animal to leave the mitigation zone before the initial start of an activity or before an activity resumes.

- The animal is observed exiting the mitigation zone;

- The animal is thought to have exited the mitigation zone based on a determination of its course, speed, and movement relative to the stressor source;
- The mitigation zone has been clear from any additional sightings for a specific wait period;
- For mobile activities, the stressor source has transited or has been relocated a distance equal to double that of the mitigation zone size beyond the location of the last sighting; or
- For activities using hull-mounted sonar, the ship concludes that dolphins are deliberately closing in on the ship to ride the ship's bow wave and are therefore out of the main transmission axis of the sonar (and there are no other marine mammal sightings within the mitigation zone).

To supplement the implementation of procedural mitigation, the Navy has agreed to undertake reporting initiatives for certain activities or resources based on previous consultations with NMFS, as summarized in Section 5.1.2.2 (Monitoring, Research, and Reporting Initiatives) and detailed where applicable in Section 5.3 (At-Sea Procedural Mitigation to be Implemented).

5.2.2 At-Sea Mitigation Area Development

Mitigation areas are geographic locations within the at-sea portion of the Study Area where the Navy will implement mitigation measures to (1) avoid or reduce potential impacts on biological resources located on the seafloor or submerged cultural resources; (2) in combination with procedural mitigation, to effect the least practicable adverse impact on marine mammal species or stocks and their habitat; or (3) in combination with procedural mitigation, ensure that the Proposed Action does not jeopardize the continued existence of endangered or threatened species.

The Navy completed an extensive assessment of the MITT Study Area to develop mitigation areas for the Proposed Action. The Navy reanalyzed existing mitigation areas implemented under the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and assessed habitats suggested through comments received during NEPA scoping and on the Draft SEIS/OEIS, identified by NMFS during the consultation and permitting processes, and identified internally by the Navy. Biological effectiveness and operational assessments of mitigation areas the Navy developed for marine mammals and sea turtles is provided in Appendix I (Geographic Mitigation Assessment). The appendix includes background information and additional details for each of the areas considered. Details about seafloor resource mitigation areas and summaries of the mitigation areas for marine mammals and sea turtles are presented in Section 5.4 (At-Sea Mitigation Areas to be Implemented).

Mitigation areas are designed to help avoid or reduce potential impacts in key areas of importance. Therefore, mitigation benefits are discussed qualitatively in terms of the context of impact avoidance or reduction. The Navy considers a mitigation area to be effective if it meets the following criteria:

- **The mitigation area is a key area of biological or ecological importance or contains cultural resources:** The best available science suggests that the mitigation area contains submerged cultural resources (e.g., shipwrecks) or is particularly important to one or more species or resources for a biologically important life process (e.g., foraging, migration, reproduction) or ecological function (e.g., shallow-water coral reefs that provide critical ecosystem functions); and
- **The mitigation will result in an avoidance or reduction of impacts:** Implementing the mitigation will likely avoid or reduce potential impacts on: (1) species, stocks, or populations of marine mammals based on data regarding their seasonality, density, and behavior; or (2) other biological or cultural resources based on their distribution and physical properties. Furthermore,

implementing the mitigation will not shift or transfer adverse effects from one species to another (e.g., to a more vulnerable or sensitive species).

The Navy has agreed to undertake additional reporting initiatives for the use of certain sound sources in certain mitigation areas based on consultations with NMFS under the MMPA or ESA, as summarized in Section 5.1.2.2 (Monitoring, Research, and Reporting Initiatives) and detailed where applicable in Section 5.4 (At-Sea Mitigation Areas to be Implemented).

5.2.3 Terrestrial Mitigation Measure Development

Terrestrial mitigation measures are measures that the Navy will implement during applicable military readiness activities that take place on land. FDM is the only terrestrial portion of the Study Area that the Navy plans to use under the Proposed Action. The Navy's mitigation measures on FDM primarily involve access, targeting, and ordnance restrictions, as detailed in Section 5.5 (Terrestrial Mitigation Measures to be Implemented). The terrestrial mitigation measures discussed in this Final SEIS/OEIS were originally developed for past environmental compliance documents in coordination with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Data inputs for assessing and developing terrestrial mitigation included the operational data described in Section 5.2.4 (Practicality of Implementation), the best available science discussed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences), published literature, and guidance from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Terrestrial mitigation measures are designed to avoid or reduce potential impacts on ESA-listed species that inhabit FDM or could occur at the island during migrations. The benefits of terrestrial mitigation measures are discussed qualitatively.

5.2.4 Practicality of Implementation

Mitigation measures are expected to have some degree of impact on the training and testing activities that implement them (e.g., modifying where and when activities occur, ceasing an activity in response to a sighting). The Navy is able to accept a certain level of impact on its military readiness activities because of the benefit that mitigation measures provide for avoiding or reducing potential impacts on environmental and cultural resources. The Navy's focus during mitigation assessment and development is that mitigation measures must meet the appropriate balance between being both effective as well as practical to implement. To evaluate practicality, the Navy operational community conducted an extensive and comprehensive assessment to determine how and to what degree potential mitigation measures would be compatible with planning, scheduling, and conducting training and testing activities under the Proposed Action in order to meet the Navy's Title 10 requirements.

5.2.4.1 Assessment Criteria

The purpose and need of the Proposed Action is to ensure that the Navy meets its mission to maintain, train, and equip combat-ready naval forces capable of winning wars, deterring aggression, and maintaining freedom of the seas. The Navy is statutorily mandated to protect U.S. national security by being ready, at all times, to effectively prosecute war and defend the nation by conducting operations at sea, as outlined in Title 10 section 8062 of the United States Code. The Navy's mission is achieved in part by conducting training and testing within the Study Area in accordance with established military readiness requirements. Training requirements have been developed through many years of iteration and adaptation and are designed to ensure that Sailors achieve the levels of readiness needed to properly respond to the multitude of contingencies they may face during military missions and combat operations. Activities are planned and scheduled in accordance with the Optimized Fleet Response Plan, which details instructions on manning distribution, range scheduling, operational requirements,

maintenance and modernization plans, quality of work and life for personnel, achieving training capabilities, and meeting strategic readiness objectives.

To achieve the highest skill proficiency and most accurate testing results possible, the Navy conducts activities in a variety of realistic tactical oceanographic and environmental conditions. Such conditions include variations in bathymetry, topography, surface fronts, and sea surface temperatures. Training activities must be as realistic as possible to provide the experiences and stressors necessary to successfully execute all required military missions and combat operations. Degraded training would result in units being unqualified to conduct the range of military operations required by operational Commanders. The inability of such Commanders to meet national security objectives would result in not only the increased risk to life, but also the degradation of national security. Testing activities must be as realistic as possible for the Navy to conduct accurate acoustic research to validate acoustic models; conduct accurate engineering tests of acoustic sources, signal processing algorithms, and acoustic interactions; and to effectively test systems and platforms (and components of these systems and platforms) to validate whether they perform as expected and determine whether they are operationally effective, suitable, survivable, and safe for their intended use by the fleet. Testing must be completed before full-scale production or delivery to the fleet to ensure functionality and accuracy in military mission and combat conditions.

As described in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives), the Navy requires access to FDM, sea space, and airspace throughout the Study Area within pierside locations, nearshore areas, and large-scale open ocean areas of the high seas. Each area plays a critical role in the Navy's ability to plan, schedule, and effectively execute military readiness activities. The locations where training and testing occur must be situated in a way that allows the Navy to complete its activities without physical or logistical obstructions. The Navy requires extensive sea space so that individual training and testing activities can occur at sufficient distances so they do not interfere with one another. Some training and testing activities require continuous access to large and unobstructed areas, consisting potentially of tens or thousands of square miles. This provides personnel the ability to develop competence and confidence in their capabilities across multiple types of weapons and sensors, and the ability to train to communicate and operate in a coordinated fashion as required during military missions and combat operations. For example, major exercises using integrated warfare components may require large areas of the littorals, open ocean, and nearshore areas for realistic and safe anti-submarine warfare training. The Navy also requires large areas of sea space because it trains in a manner to avoid observation by potential adversaries. Modern sensing technologies make training on a large scale without observation more difficult. A foreign military's continual observation of U.S. Navy training in predictable geographic areas and timeframes would enable foreign nations to gather intelligence and subsequently develop techniques, tactics, and procedures to potentially and effectively counter U.S. naval operations. Other activities may be conducted on a smaller and more localized scale, with training or testing at discrete locations (e.g., on FDM) that are critical to certain aspects of military readiness.

The locations for training and testing activities are selected to maximize efficiency while supporting specific mission and safety requirements, deconflict sea space and airspace, and minimize the time personnel must spend away from home. Training and testing locations are typically selected based on their proximity to homeports, home bases, associated training ranges, testing facilities, air squadrons, and existing infrastructure (e.g., land ranges) to reduce travel time and associated costs. Activities involving the use of rotary-wing aircraft typically occur in proximity to shore or refueling stations due to fuel restrictions and safety requirements. Testing events are typically located near systems command

support facilities, which provide critical infrastructure support and technical expertise necessary to conduct testing. Logistical support of range testing can only efficiently and effectively occur when the support is co-located with the testing activities. These same principles also apply to pierside and at-sea testing that must occur in proximity to naval harbors. Testing event site locations and associated field activities were originally established to support specific Navy mission testing needs using a selection process that included testing requirements, cost of living, availability of personnel, and low level of crowding from industry and development.

During its assessment to determine how and to what degree the implementation of mitigation would be compatible with meeting the purpose and need of the Proposed Action, the Navy considered mitigation measures to be practical to implement if they met all criteria discussed below:

- **Implementing the mitigation is safe:** Mitigation measures must not increase safety risks to Navy personnel and equipment, or to the public. When assessing whether implementing a mitigation measure would be safe, the Navy factored in the potential for increased pilot fatigue; accelerated fatigue-life of aircraft; typical fuel restrictions of participating aircraft; locations of refueling stations; proximity to aircraft emergency landing fields, critical medical facilities, and search and rescue resources; space restrictions of the observation platforms; the ability to de-conflict platforms and activities to ensure that training and testing activities do not impact each other; and the ability to avoid interaction with non-Navy sea space and airspace uses, such as established commercial air traffic routes, commercial vessel shipping lanes, and areas used for energy exploration or alternative energy development. Other safety considerations included identifying if mitigation measures would reasonably allow Lookouts to safely and effectively maintain situational awareness while observing the mitigation zones during typical activity conditions, or if the mitigation would increase the safety risk for personnel. For example, the safety risk would increase if Lookouts were required to direct their attention away from essential mission requirements.
- **Implementing the mitigation is sustainable:** One of the primary factors that the Navy incorporates into the planning and scheduling of its training and testing activities is the amount and type of available resources, such as funding, personnel, and equipment. Mitigation measures must be sustainable over the life of the Proposed Action, meaning that they will not require the use of resources in excess of what is available. When assessing whether implementing a mitigation measure would be sustainable, the Navy considered if the measure would require excessive time on station or time away from homeport for Navy personnel, require the use of additional personnel (i.e., manpower) or equipment (e.g., adding a small boat to serve as an additional observation platform), or result in additional operational costs (e.g., increased fuel consumption, equipment maintenance, or acquisition of new equipment).
- **Implementing the mitigation allows the Navy to continue meeting its mission requirements:** The Navy considered if each individual measure and the iterative and cumulative impact of all potential measures would be within the Navy's legal authority to implement. The Navy also considered if mitigation would modify training or testing activities in a way that would prevent individual activities from meeting their mission objectives and if mitigation would prevent the Navy from meeting its national security requirements or statutorily mandated Title 10 requirements, such as by:

- Impacting training and testing realism or preventing ready access to ranges, operating areas, facilities, or range support structures (which would reduce realism and present sea space and airspace conflicts).
- Impacting the ability for Sailors to train and become proficient in using sensors and weapon systems as would be required in areas analogous to where the military operates or causing an erosion of capabilities or reduction in perishable skills (which would result in a significant risk to personnel or equipment safety during military missions and combat operations).
- Impacting the ability for units to meet their individual training and certification requirements (which would impact the ability to deploy with the required level of readiness necessary to accomplish any tasking by Combatant Commanders).
- Impacting the ability to certify forces to deploy to meet national security tasking (which would limit the flexibility of Combatant Commanders and warfighters to project power, engage in multi-national operations, and conduct the full range of naval warfighting capabilities in support of national security interests).
- Impacting the ability of researchers, program managers, and weapons system acquisition programs to conduct accurate acoustic research to meet research objectives, effectively test systems and platforms (and components of these systems and platforms) before full-scale production or delivery to the fleet, or complete shipboard maintenance, repairs, or pierside testing prior to at-sea operations (which would not allow the Navy to ensure safety, functionality, and accuracy in military mission and combat conditions per required acquisition milestones or on an as-needed basis to meet operational requirements).
- Requiring the Navy to provide advance notification of specific times and locations of Navy platforms, such as platforms using active sonar (which would present national security concerns).
- Reducing the Navy's ability to be ready, maintain deployment schedules, or respond to national emergencies or emerging national security challenges (which would present national security concerns).

5.2.4.2 Factors Affecting Practicality

Two of the factors that influenced whether procedural mitigation measures met the practicality criteria were the number of times mitigation measures would likely be implemented and the duration over which the activity would likely be ceased due to mitigation implementation. The number of times mitigation would likely be implemented is largely dependent on the size of the mitigation zone. As a mitigation zone size increases, the area of observation increases by an order of magnitude. This is because mitigation zones are measured as the radius (r) from a stressor but apply to circular area (A) around that stressor ($A = \pi * r^2$, where π is a constant that is approximately equal to 3.14). For example, a 100-yard (yd.) mitigation zone is equivalent to an area of 31,416 square yd. A 200 yd. mitigation zone is equivalent to an area of 125,664 square yd. Therefore, increasing a mitigation zone from 100 yd. to 200 yd. (i.e., doubling the mitigation zone radius) would quadruple the mitigation zone area (the area over which mitigation must be implemented). Similarly, increasing a mitigation zone from 1,000 yd. to 4,000 yd. (i.e., quadrupling the mitigation zone radius) would increase the mitigation zone area by a factor of 16. Increasing the area over which mitigation must be implemented consequently increases the number of times mitigation would likely be implemented during that activity.

The duration over which mitigation is implemented can differ considerably depending on the mitigation zone size, number of animal sightings, behavioral state of animals sighted (e.g., travelling at a fast pace on course to exit the mitigation zone, milling slowly in the center of the mitigation zone), and which pre-activity commencement or during-activity recommencement condition is met before the activity can commence or resume after each sighting. The duration of mitigation implementation typically equates to the amount of time the training or testing activity will be extended. The impact that extending the length of an activity has on safety, sustainability, and the Navy's ability to accomplish the activity's intended objectives varies by activity. This is one reason why the Navy tailors its mitigation zone sizes and mitigation requirements by activity category or stressor and the platforms involved.

As described in Section 5.2.1 (At-Sea Procedural Mitigation Development), the Navy will mitigate for each applicable sighting and will continue mitigating until one of five conditions has been met. In some instances, such as if an animal dives underwater after a sighting, it may not be possible for a Lookout to visually verify if the animal has exited the mitigation zone. The Navy cannot delay or cease activities indefinitely for the purpose of mitigation due to impacts on safety, sustainability, and the Navy's ability to continue meeting its mission requirements. To account for this, one of the pre-activity commencement and during-activity recommencement conditions is an established post-sighting wait period of 30 minutes or 10 minutes, based on the platforms involved. Wait periods are designed to allow animals the maximum amount of time practical to resurface (i.e., become available to be observed by a Lookout) before activities resume. When developing the length of its wait periods, the Navy factored in the assumption that mitigation may need to be implemented more than once. For example, an activity may need to be delayed or ceased for more than one 30-minute or 10-minute period.

The Navy assigns a 30-minute wait period to activities conducted from vessels and that involve aircraft that are not typically fuel constrained (e.g., maritime patrol aircraft). A 30-minute period covers the average dive times of most marine mammals and a portion of the dive times of sea turtles and deep-diving marine mammals (i.e., sperm whales, dwarf and pygmy sperm whales [Kogia whales], and beaked whales) (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2017c). The Navy determined that a 30-minute wait period is the maximum wait time that is practical to implement during activities involving vessels and aircraft that are not typically fuel constrained to allow the activities to continue meeting their intended objectives. For example, the typical duration of Maritime Security Operations – Anti-Swimmer Grenades (which involve the use of small boats) is one hour. These activities are scheduled to occur at specific locations within specific timeframes based on range scheduling and for sea space deconfliction. Implementing one wait period would result in the activity being extended by half of the typical activity duration. The Navy determined that, given the benefit of this mitigation, a 30-minute wait period would be practical to implement for this activity; however, implementing a longer wait period (such as extending the wait period to 45 or 60 minutes to cover the average dive times of sea turtles and additional marine mammal species) would be impractical. Increasing the wait period, and consequently, the amount of time the activity would need to be delayed or extended in order to accomplish its intended objective, would impact activity realism or cause sea space conflicts in a way that could impact the Navy's ability to continue meeting its mission requirements. For example, delaying an activity for multiple wait periods could result in personnel not being able to detonate an explosive before the participating platforms are required to depart the range due to range scheduling; therefore, the activity would not accomplish its intended objectives.

The Navy assigns a 10-minute wait period to activities involving aircraft that are typically fuel constrained (e.g., rotary-wing aircraft, fighter aircraft). A 10-minute period covers a portion, but not the

average, dive times of marine mammals and sea turtles (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2017c). The Navy determined that a 10-minute wait period is the maximum wait time that is practical to implement during activities involving aircraft that are typically fuel constrained. Increasing the wait period, and consequently the amount of time the training or testing activity would need to be extended in order to accomplish its intended objective, would require aircraft to depart the activity area to refuel in order to safely complete the event. If the wait period was implemented multiple times, the aircraft would be required to depart the activity area to refuel multiple times. Refueling events would vary in duration, depending on the activity location and proximity to the nearest refueling station. Multiple refueling events would generally be expected to extend the length of the activity by two to five times or more. This would impact activity realism, could cause air space or sea space conflicts in a way that could impact the Navy's ability to continue meeting its mission requirements, would decrease the ability for Lookouts to safely and effectively maintain situational awareness of the activity area, and would increase safety risks due to increased pilot fatigue and accelerated fatigue-life of aircraft. For example, delaying a Torpedo Exercise – Helicopter activity for multiple wait periods could result in personnel not being able to effectively search for, detect, classify, localize, and track a simulated threat submarine before the rotary-wing aircraft is required to depart the range due to range scheduling; therefore, the activity would not accomplish its intended objectives.

Factors that influenced whether a mitigation area measure met the practicality criteria included the historical use and projected future use of geographic locations for training and testing activities under the Proposed Action, and the relative importance of each location. The frequency that an area is used for training or testing does not necessarily equate to that area's level of importance for meeting an individual activity objective, or collectively, the Navy's mission requirements. While frequently used areas can be essential to one or more types of military readiness activities, some infrequently used areas are critical for a particular training exercise, testing mission, or research project.

5.3 At-Sea Procedural Mitigation to be Implemented

The first at-sea procedural mitigation measure (Section 5.3.1, Environmental Awareness and Education) is designed to aid Lookouts and other personnel with observation, environmental compliance, and reporting responsibilities. The remaining procedural mitigation measures are organized by stressor type and training or testing activity category.

5.3.1 Environmental Awareness and Education

The Navy will continue to implement procedural mitigation to provide environmental awareness and education to the appropriate personnel to aid visual observation, environmental compliance, and reporting responsibilities, as outlined in Table 5-1.

Table 5-1: Environmental Awareness and Education

Procedural Mitigation Description
Stressor or Activity • All training and testing activities, as applicable
Resource Protection Focus • Marine mammals • Sea turtles
Mitigation Requirements • Appropriate personnel (including civilian personnel) involved in mitigation and training or testing activity reporting under the Proposed Action will complete one or more modules of the U.S. Navy Afloat Environmental Compliance Training Series, as identified in their career path training plan. Modules include: – **Introduction to the U.S. Navy Afloat Environmental Compliance Training Series.** The introductory module provides information on environmental laws (e.g., ESA, MMPA) and the corresponding responsibilities that are relevant to Navy training and testing activities. The material explains why environmental compliance is important in supporting the Navy's commitment to environmental stewardship. – **Marine Species Awareness Training.** All bridge watch personnel, Commanding Officers, Executive Officers, maritime patrol aircraft aircrews, anti-submarine warfare and mine warfare rotary-wing aircrews, Lookouts, and equivalent civilian personnel must successfully complete the Marine Species Awareness Training prior to standing watch or serving as a Lookout. The Marine Species Awareness Training provides information on sighting cues, visual observation tools and techniques, and sighting notification procedures. Navy biologists developed Marine Species Awareness Training to improve the effectiveness of visual observations for biological resources, focusing on marine mammals and sea turtles, and including jellyfish aggregations and flocks of seabirds. – **U.S. Navy Protective Measures Assessment Protocol.** This module provides the necessary instruction for accessing mitigation requirements during the event planning phase using the Protective Measures Assessment Protocol software tool. – **U.S. Navy Sonar Positional Reporting System and Marine Mammal Incident Reporting.** This module provides instruction on the procedures and activity reporting requirements for the Sonar Positional Reporting System and marine mammal incident reporting.

The Navy requires Lookouts and other personnel to complete their assigned environmental compliance responsibilities (e.g., mitigation, reporting requirements) before, during, and after training and testing activities. Marine Species Awareness Training was first developed in 2007 and has since undergone numerous updates to ensure that the content remains current, with the most recent product approved by NMFS and released by the Navy in 2014. In 2014, the Navy developed a series of educational training modules, known as the Afloat Environmental Compliance Training program, to ensure Navywide compliance with environmental requirements. The Afloat Environmental Compliance Training program, including the updated Marine Species Awareness Training, helps Navy personnel from the most junior Sailors to Commanding Officers gain a better understanding of their personal environmental compliance roles and responsibilities. Additional information on the Protective Measures Assessment Protocol is provided in Section 5.1.2.1 (Protective Measures Assessment Protocol), and additional information on training and testing activity and incident reports is provided in Section 5.1.2.2 (Monitoring, Research, and Reporting Initiatives).

From an operational perspective, the interactive web-based format of the U.S. Navy Afloat Environmental Compliance Training Series is ideal for providing engaging and educational content that is cost effective and convenient to access by personnel who oftentimes face rotating job assignments. The U.S. Navy Afloat Environmental Compliance Training Series has resulted in an improvement in the quality and accuracy of training and testing activity reports, incident reports, and Sonar Positional Reporting System reports submitted by Navy operators. Improved reporting quality indicates that the U.S. Navy Afloat Environmental Compliance Training Series is helping to facilitate Navywide environmental compliance as intended.

Lookouts and members of the operational community have demonstrated enhanced knowledge and understanding of the Navy's environmental compliance responsibilities since the development of the U.S. Navy Afloat Environmental Compliance Training Series. To date, the Navy has had zero vessel strikes of marine mammals in the Study Area. Outside of the Study Area, there has been a decrease in Navy vessel strikes of marine mammals since implementation of the Marine Species Awareness Training in 2007. It is likely that the implementation of the Marine Species Awareness Training starting in 2007, and the additional U.S. Navy Afloat Environmental Compliance Training Series modules starting in 2014, potentially helped contribute to the lack of vessel strikes of marine mammals in the Study Area and decrease in vessel strikes of marine mammals outside of the Study Area. This indicates that the environmental awareness and education program is helping to improve the effectiveness of mitigation implementation. A more detailed analysis of vessel strikes is presented in Section 3.4.2.4 (Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors) of this Final SEIS/OEIS.

5.3.2 Acoustic Stressors

The Navy will implement procedural mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts on biological resources at sea from the acoustic stressors or activities discussed in the sections below.

5.3.2.1 Active Sonar

The Navy will continue to implement procedural mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts on marine mammals and sea turtles from active sonar, as outlined in Table 5-2. In addition to procedural mitigation, the Navy will implement mitigation for active sonar within mitigation areas. Mitigation area requirements for active sonar are detailed in Appendix I (Geographic Mitigation Assessment).

In the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, the Navy's active sonar mitigation zones were based on associated average ranges to PTS. When developing the mitigation for this Final SEIS/OEIS, the Navy analyzed the potential for increasing the sizes of these mitigation zones. The Navy determined that the current mitigation zones for active sonar are the largest areas within which it is practical to implement mitigation; therefore, it will continue implementing these same mitigation zones under the Proposed Action.

The Navy is clarifying in the table that the mitigation zone for low-frequency active sonar sources at or above 200 dB will be the same as the mitigation implemented for hull-mounted mid-frequency active sonar; whereas low-frequency active sonar sources below 200 dB will implement the same mitigation zone as high-frequency active sonar and mid-frequency active sonar sources that are not hull-mounted. The Navy is also clarifying that it will require observation of the mitigation zone prior to the initial start of the activity to ensure the area is clear of applicable biological resources. The Navy has always verified that the mitigation zone is visually clear prior to conducting active sonar activities and is more clearly capturing this current practice in the mitigation measures for this activity. The Navy will follow the incident reporting procedures outlined in Section 5.1.2.2.3 (Incident Reports) if an incident is detected at any time during the event. The mitigation zone sizes and proximity to the observation platforms will result in a high likelihood that Lookouts will be able to detect marine mammals and sea turtles throughout the mitigation zones.

Table 5-2: Procedural Mitigation for Active Sonar

Procedural Mitigation Description
Stressor or Activity • Low-frequency active sonar, mid-frequency active sonar, high-frequency active sonar – For vessel-based active sonar activities, mitigation applies only to sources that are positively controlled and deployed from manned surface vessels (e.g., sonar sources towed from manned surface platforms). – For aircraft-based active sonar activities, mitigation applies only to sources that are positively controlled and deployed from manned aircraft that do not operate at high altitudes (e.g., rotary-wing aircraft). Mitigation does not apply to active sonar sources deployed from unmanned aerial systems or aircraft operating at high altitudes (e.g., maritime patrol aircraft).
Resource Protection Focus • Marine mammals • Sea turtles (only for sources <2 kilohertz [kHz])
Number of Lookouts and Observation Platform • Hull-mounted sources: – 1 Lookout: Platforms with space or manning restrictions while underway (at the forward part of a small boat or ship) and platforms using active sonar while moored or at anchor (including pierside) – 2 Lookouts: Platforms without space or manning restrictions while underway (at the forward part of the ship) • Sources that are not hull-mounted: – 1 Lookout on the ship or aircraft conducting the activity
Mitigation Requirements • Mitigation zones: – 1,000 yd. power down, 500 yd. power down, and 200 yd. shut down for low-frequency active sonar ≥200 decibels (dB) and hull-mounted mid-frequency active sonar – 200 yd. shut down for low-frequency active sonar <200 dB, mid-frequency active sonar sources that are not hull-mounted, and high-frequency active sonar • Prior to the initial start of the activity (e.g., when maneuvering on station): – Observe the mitigation zone for marine mammals and sea turtles; if observed, relocate or delay the start of active sonar transmission. • During the activity: – Low-frequency active sonar ≥200 decibels (dB) and hull-mounted mid-frequency active sonar: Observe the mitigation zone for marine mammals and sea turtles (for sources <2 kHz); power down active sonar transmission by 6 dB if observed within 1,000 yd. of the sonar source; power down an additional 4 dB (10 dB total) within 500 yd.; cease transmission within 200 yd. – Low-frequency active sonar <200 dB, mid-frequency active sonar sources that are not hull-mounted, and high-frequency active sonar: Observe the mitigation zone for marine mammals and sea turtles (for sources <2 kHz); cease active sonar transmission if observed within 200 yd. of the sonar source. • Commencement/recommencement conditions after a marine mammal or sea turtle sighting before or during the activity: – The Navy will allow a sighted marine mammal or sea turtle to leave the mitigation zone prior to the initial start of the activity (by delaying the start) or during the activity (by not recommencing or powering up active sonar transmission) until one of the following conditions has been met: (1) the animal is observed exiting the mitigation zone; (2) the animal is thought to have exited the mitigation zone based on a determination of its course, speed, and movement relative to the sonar source; (3) the mitigation zone has been clear from any additional sightings for 10 minutes for aircraft-deployed sonar sources or 30 minutes for vessel-deployed sonar sources; (4) for mobile activities, the active sonar source has transited a distance equal to double that of the mitigation zone size beyond the location of the last sighting; or (5) for activities using hull-mounted sonar, the ship concludes that dolphins are deliberately closing in on the ship to ride the ship's bow wave, and are therefore out of the main transmission axis of the sonar (and there are no other marine mammal sightings within the mitigation zone).

Section 3.4.2.1.2 (Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducer Stressors) of this Final SEIS/OEIS provides a full analysis of the potential impacts of sonar on marine mammals and includes the impact ranges for various source bins. For low-frequency active sonar at 200 dB or more and hull-mounted mid-frequency active sonar, bin MF1 has the longest predicted ranges to PTS. For low-frequency active sonar below 200 dB, mid-frequency active sonar sources that are not hull-mounted, and high-frequency active sonar, bin HF4 has the longest predicted ranges to PTS. For the highest source levels in bin MF1 and HF4, the mitigation zones extend beyond the respective average ranges to PTS for marine mammals. The

mitigation zones for active sonar will help avoid or reduce the potential for exposure to PTS for marine mammals.

The active sonar mitigation zones also extend into a portion of the average ranges to TTS for marine mammals; therefore, mitigation will help avoid or reduce the potential for some exposure to higher levels of TTS. Active sonar sources that fall within lower source bins or are used at lower source levels have shorter impact ranges than those discussed above; therefore, the mitigation zones will extend further beyond or into the average ranges to PTS and TTS for these sources. The analysis in Section 3.4.2.1.2 (Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers) of this Final SEIS/OEIS indicates that pygmy and dwarf sperm whales (Kogia whales) are the only deep-diving marine mammal species that could potentially experience PTS impacts from active sonar in the Study Area. The 30-minute wait period for vessel-deployed sources will cover the average dive times of marine mammal species that could experience PTS from sonar in the mitigation zone, except for Kogia whales. The 10-minute wait period for aircraft-deployed sources will cover a portion, but not the average, dive times of marine mammals.

Section 3.5.2.1.2 (Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers) provides a full analysis of the potential impacts of sonar on sea turtles. Due to sea turtle hearing capabilities, the mitigation only applies to sea turtles during the use of sources below 2 kilohertz. The range to auditory effects for most active sonar sources in sea turtle hearing range (e.g., LF4) is zero meters. Impact ranges are longer (i.e., up to tens of meters) for active sonars with higher source levels. The mitigation zones for active sonar extend beyond the ranges to PTS and TTS for sea turtles; therefore, mitigation will help avoid or reduce the potential for exposure to these effects for sea turtles.

The Navy currently uses, and will continue to use, computer simulation to augment training and testing whenever possible. As discussed in Section 1.4.1 (Why the Navy Trains), simulators and synthetic training are critical elements that provide early skill repetition and enhance teamwork; however, they cannot replicate the complexity and stresses faced by Sailors during military missions and combat operations to which the Navy trains under the Proposed Action (e.g., anti-submarine warfare training using hull-mounted mid-frequency active sonar). As described previously, the mitigation zones developed for this Final SEIS/OEIS are based on the largest areas within which it is practical for the Navy to implement mitigation during training and testing within the Study Area. Training and testing with active sonar are essential to national security. Active sonar is the only reliable technology for detecting and tracking potential enemy diesel-electric submarines. For example, small diesel-electric submarines operate quietly and may hide in shallow coastal and littoral waters. The ability to effectively operate active sonar is a highly perishable skill that must be repeatedly practiced during realistic training. Naval forces must train in the same mode and manner in which they conduct military missions and combat operations. Anti-submarine warfare training typically involves the periodic use of active sonar to develop the “tactical picture,” or an understanding of the battle space (e.g., area searched or unsearched, identifying false contacts, and understanding the water conditions). This can take from several hours to multiple days and typically occurs over vast areas with varying physical and oceanographic conditions (e.g., bathymetry, topography, surface fronts, and variations in sea surface temperature). Sonar operators train to avoid or reduce interference and sound-reducing clutter from varying ocean floor topographies and environmental conditions, practice coordinating their efforts with other sonar operators in a strike group, develop skill proficiency in detecting and tracking submarines and other threats, and practice the focused endurance vital to effectively working as a team in shifts around the clock until the conclusion of the event.

Increasing the mitigation zone sizes would result in a larger area over which active sonar would need to be powered down or shut down in response to a sighting, and therefore would likely increase the number of times that these mitigation measures would be implemented. This would extend the length of the activity, significantly diminish event realism, and prevent activities from meeting their intended objectives. It would also create fundamental differences between how active sonar would be used in training and how active sonar should be used during military missions and combat operations. For example, additional active sonar power downs or shut downs would prevent sonar operators from developing and maintaining awareness of the tactical picture during training events. Without realistic training in conditions analogous to military missions and combat operations, sonar operators cannot become proficient in effectively operating active sonar. Sonar operators, vessel crews, and aircrews would be expected to operate active sonar during military missions and combat operations in a manner inconsistent with how they were trained.

During integrated training, multiple vessels and aircraft may participate in an exercise using different warfare components simultaneously. Degrading the value of one training element results in a degradation of the training value of the other training elements. Degrading the value of training would cause a reduction in perishable skills and diminished operational capability, which would significantly impact military readiness. Each of these factors would ultimately impact the ability for units to meet their individual training and certification requirements and the Navy's ability to certify forces to safely deploy to meet national security tasking. Diminishing proficiency or eroding active sonar capabilities would present a significant risk to personnel safety during military missions and combat operations and would impact the ability to deploy with the required level of readiness necessary to accomplish any tasking by Combatant Commanders.

Increasing the number of times that the Navy must power down or shut down active sonar transmissions during testing activities would result in similar consequences to activity realism. For example, at-sea sonar testing activities are required in order to calibrate or document the functionality of sonar and torpedo systems while a ship or submarine is in an open ocean environment. Additional powering down or shutting down active sonar transmissions would prevent this activity from meeting its intended objective, such as verifying if the ship meets design acoustic specifications. These types of impacts would impede the ability of researchers, program managers, and weapons system acquisition programs to meet research objectives and testing requirements per required acquisition milestones or on an as-needed basis to meet operational requirements, and would impede shipboard maintenance, repairs, or pierside testing prior to at-sea operations.

For activities that involve aircraft (e.g., activities involving rotary-wing aircraft that use dipping sonar or sonobuoys to locate submarines or submarine targets), extending the length of the activity would require aircraft to depart the area to refuel. If multiple refueling events were required, the length of the activity would be extended by two to five times or more, which would decrease the ability for Lookouts to safely and effectively maintain situational awareness of the activity area and increase safety risks due to increased pilot fatigue and accelerated fatigue-life of aircraft. Extending the length of the activity would also result in additional operational costs due to increased fuel consumption. Increasing the mitigation zone sizes would not result in a substantial reduction of injurious impacts because, as described above, the mitigation zones extend beyond the average ranges to PTS for sea turtles and marine mammals.

In summary, the operational community determined that implementing procedural mitigation for active sonar beyond what is detailed in Table 5-2 would be incompatible with the practicality assessment criteria for safety, sustainability, and mission requirements.

5.3.2.2 Weapons Firing Noise

The Navy will continue to implement procedural mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts on marine mammals and sea turtles from weapons firing noise, as outlined in Table 5-3.

Table 5-3: Procedural Mitigation for Weapons Firing Noise

Procedural Mitigation Description
Stressor or Activity • Weapons firing noise associated with large-caliber gunnery activities
Resource Protection Focus • Marine mammals • Sea turtles
Number of Lookouts and Observation Platform • 1 Lookout positioned on the ship conducting the firing – Depending on the activity, the Lookout could be the same one described in Section 5.3.3.3 (Explosive Medium-Caliber and Large-Caliber Projectiles) or Section 5.3.4.3 (Small-, Medium-, and Large-Caliber Non-Explosive Practice Munitions).
Mitigation Requirements • Mitigation zone: – 30° on either side of the firing line out to 70 yd. from the muzzle of the weapon being fired • Prior to the initial start of the activity: – Observe the mitigation zone for marine mammals and sea turtles; if observed, relocate or delay the start of weapons firing. • During the activity: – Observe the mitigation zone for marine mammals and sea turtles; if observed, cease weapons firing. • Commencement/recommencement conditions after a marine mammal or sea turtle sighting before or during the activity: – The Navy will allow a sighted marine mammal or sea turtle to leave the mitigation zone prior to the initial start of the activity (by delaying the start) or during the activity (by not recommencing weapons firing) until one of the following conditions has been met: (1) the animal is observed exiting the mitigation zone; (2) the animal is thought to have exited the mitigation zone based on a determination of its course, speed, and movement relative to the firing ship; (3) the mitigation zone has been clear from any additional sightings for 30 minutes; or (4) for mobile activities, the firing ship has transited a distance equal to double that of the mitigation zone size beyond the location of the last sighting.

In the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, the weapons firing noise mitigation zone was based on the associated average ranges to PTS. When developing the mitigation for this Final SEIS/OEIS, the Navy analyzed the potential for increasing the size of the mitigation zone. The Navy determined that the current mitigation zone is the largest area within which it is practical to implement mitigation for this activity; therefore, it will continue implementing the same mitigation zone size under the Proposed Action. The Navy is clarifying in the table that it will require observation of the mitigation zone prior to the initial start of the activity to ensure the area is clear of applicable biological resources. The Navy has always verified that the mitigation zone is visually clear prior to conducting weapons firing activities and is more clearly capturing this current practice in the mitigation measures for this activity. The Navy will follow the incident reporting procedures outlined in Section 5.1.2.2.3 (Incident Reports) if an incident is detected at any time during the event.

Section 3.4.4.2.5 (Impacts from Weapons Firing, Launch, and Impact Noise) and Section 3.5.3.1.8 (Impacts from Weapons Firing, Launch, and Impact Noise) of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS provide a full analysis of the potential impacts of weapons noise on marine mammals and sea turtles, respectively. As described in Section 3.0.5.2.1.4 (Weapons Firing, Launch, and Impact Noise) of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, underwater sounds from large-caliber weapons firing activities would be strongest just below

the surface and directly under the firing point. Any sound that enters the water only does so within a narrow cone below the firing point or path of the projectile. The mitigation zone extends beyond the distance to which marine mammals and sea turtles would likely experience PTS or TTS from weapons firing noise; therefore, mitigation will help avoid or reduce the potential for exposure to these impacts. The small mitigation zone size and proximity to the observation platform will result in a high likelihood that Lookouts will be able to detect marine mammals and sea turtles throughout the mitigation zone.

As described previously, the mitigation zone developed for this Final SEIS/OEIS is based on the largest area within which it is practical for the Navy to implement mitigation for this activity. Increasing the mitigation zone would result in a larger area over which weapons firing would need to be ceased in response to a sighting, and therefore would likely increase the number of times weapons firing would be ceased. However, increasing the mitigation zone size would not result in a substantial reduction of injurious impacts because the mitigation zone extends beyond the average ranges to PTS for sea turtles and marine mammals.

Large-caliber gunnery training activities may involve a single ship firing or may be conducted as part of a larger exercise involving multiple ships. Surface ship crews learn to track targets (e.g., with radar), engage targets, practice defensive marksmanship, and coordinate their efforts within the context of larger activities. Increasing the number of times that the Navy must cease weapons firing during training would decrease realism and impact the ability for Navy Sailors to train and become proficient in using large-caliber guns as required during military missions and combat operations. For example, additional ceasing of the activity would reduce the crew's ability to react to changes in the tactical situation or respond to an incoming threat, which could result in a delay to the ship's training schedule. When training is undertaken in the context of a coordinated exercise involving multiple ships, degrading the value of one of the training elements results in a degradation of the training value of the other training elements. These factors would ultimately impact the ability for units to meet their individual training and certification requirements, and the Navy's ability to certify forces to deploy to meet national security tasking.

In summary, the operational community determined that implementing procedural mitigation for weapons firing noise beyond what is detailed in Table 5-3 would be incompatible with the practicality assessment criteria for safety and mission requirements.

5.3.3 Explosive Stressors

The Navy will implement procedural mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts on biological resources at sea from the explosives discussed in the sections below. Section 3.4.2.2 (Explosive Stressors) and Section 3.5.2.2 (Explosive Stressors) provide a full analysis of potential impacts of explosives on marine mammals and sea turtles, respectively, including predicted impact ranges. In addition to procedural mitigation, the Navy will implement mitigation for explosives within mitigation areas. Mitigation area requirements for explosives are detailed in Appendix I (Geographic Mitigation Assessment).

5.3.3.1 Explosive Sonobuoys

The Navy will continue to implement procedural mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts on marine mammals and sea turtles from explosive sonobuoys, as outlined in Table 5-4. In the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, explosive sonobuoys had two mitigation zone sizes based on net explosive weight and the associated average ranges to PTS. When developing mitigation for this Final SEIS/OEIS, the Navy analyzed the potential for increasing the size of these mitigation zones. The Navy identified an

opportunity to increase the mitigation zone size by 250 yd. for sonobuoys using up to 2.5-pound (lb.) net explosive weight so that explosive sonobuoys will implement a 600 yd. mitigation zone, regardless of net explosive weight, to enhance protections to the maximum extent practicable. This increase is reflected in Table 5-4. The mitigation zone for explosive sonobuoys is now based on the largest area within which it is practical to implement mitigation.

Table 5-4: Procedural Mitigation for Explosive Sonobuoys

Procedural Mitigation Description
Stressor or Activity • Explosive sonobuoys
Resource Protection Focus • Marine mammals • Sea turtles
Number of Lookouts and Observation Platform • 1 Lookout positioned in an aircraft or on a small boat • If additional platforms are participating in the activity, personnel positioned in those assets (e.g., safety observers, evaluators) will support observing the mitigation zone for applicable biological resources while performing their regular duties.
Mitigation Requirements • Mitigation zone: – 600 yd. around an explosive sonobuoy • Prior to the initial start of the activity (e.g., during deployment of a sonobuoy pattern, which typically lasts 20–30 minutes): – Conduct passive acoustic monitoring for marine mammals; use information from detections to assist visual observations. – Visually observe the mitigation zone for marine mammals and sea turtles; if observed, relocate or delay the start of sonobuoy or source/receiver pair detonations. • During the activity: – Observe the mitigation zone for marine mammals and sea turtles; if observed, cease sonobuoy or source/receiver pair detonations. • Commencement/recommencement conditions after a marine mammal or sea turtle sighting before or during the activity: – The Navy will allow a sighted marine mammal or sea turtle to leave the mitigation zone prior to the initial start of the activity (by delaying the start) or during the activity (by not recommencing detonations) until one of the following conditions has been met: (1) the animal is observed exiting the mitigation zone; (2) the animal is thought to have exited the mitigation zone based on a determination of its course, speed, and movement relative to the sonobuoy; or (3) the mitigation zone has been clear from any additional sightings for 10 minutes when the activity involves aircraft that have fuel constraints, or 30 minutes when the activity involves aircraft that are not typically fuel constrained. • After completion of the activity (e.g., prior to maneuvering off station): – When practical (e.g., when platforms are not constrained by fuel restrictions or mission-essential follow-on commitments), observe the vicinity of where detonations occurred; if any injured or dead marine mammals or ESA-listed species are observed, follow established incident reporting procedures. – If additional platforms are supporting this activity (e.g., providing range clearance), these assets will assist in the visual observation of the area where detonations occurred.

The Navy is clarifying in the table that it will require observation of the mitigation zone prior to the initial start of the activity to ensure the area is clear of applicable biological resources. The Navy has always verified that the mitigation zone is visually clear prior to conducting explosive activities and is more clearly capturing this current practice in the mitigation measures for this activity. The Navy developed a new mitigation measure requiring the Lookout to observe the mitigation zone after completion of the activity. In accordance with the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS consultation requirements, the Navy currently conducts post-activity observations for some, but not all explosive activities. When developing mitigation for this Final SEIS/OEIS, the Navy determined that it could expand this requirement to other explosive activities for enhanced consistency and to help determine if any resources were injured during explosive events, when practical. The Navy is adding a requirement that additional platforms already participating in the activity will support observing the mitigation zone before, during, and after the

activity while performing their regular duties. There are typically multiple platforms in the vicinity of activities that use explosive sonobuoys (e.g., safety aircraft). When available, having additional personnel support observations of the mitigation zone will help increase the likelihood of detecting biological resources. The Navy will follow the incident reporting procedures outlined in Section 5.1.2.2.3 (Incident Reports) if an incident is detected at any time during the event, including during the post-activity observations.

Some activities that use explosive sonobuoys involve detonations of a single sonobuoy or sonobuoy pair, while other activities involve deployment of multiple sonobuoys that may be dispersed in a pattern over a large distance. Lookouts will have a better likelihood of detecting marine mammals and sea turtles when observing the mitigation zone around a single sonobuoy or sonobuoy pair than when observing multiple sonobuoys dispersed over a large distance. When observing large distances, Lookouts will be more likely to detect large visual cues (e.g., whale blows or large pods of dolphins) than individual marine mammals, cryptic marine mammal species, and sea turtles.

Bin E3 has the longest predicted impact ranges for explosive sonobuoys used in the Study Area (e.g., MK-61 SUS sonobuoys). For the largest explosive in bin E3, the mitigation zone extends beyond the ranges to 50 percent non-auditory injury and 50 percent mortality for sea turtles and marine mammals. The mitigation zone extends beyond the average ranges to PTS for sea turtles and mid-frequency cetaceans, and into a portion of the average ranges to PTS for high-frequency cetaceans and low-frequency cetaceans. The mitigation zone also extends beyond or into a portion of the average ranges to TTS for sea turtles and marine mammals. Therefore, depending on the species, mitigation will help avoid or reduce all or a portion of the potential for exposure to mortality, non-auditory injury, PTS, and higher levels of TTS for the largest explosives in bin E3. Smaller explosives in bin E3 and explosives in smaller source bins (E1) have shorter predicted impact ranges; therefore, the mitigation zone will extend further beyond or cover a greater portion of the impact ranges for these explosives.

As described previously, the mitigation zone developed for this Final SEIS/OEIS is based on the largest area within which it is practical for the Navy to implement mitigation. It is not practical to increase the mitigation zone because observations within the margin of increase would be ineffective unless the Navy allocated additional platforms to observe for biological resources. This is particularly true when observations occur from a small boat or during observations over a large distance. The use of additional personnel and equipment (aircraft or small boats) would be unsustainable due to increased operational costs and an exceedance of the available manpower and resources for this activity. Adding aircraft to observe the mitigation zone could result in airspace conflicts with the event participants. This would either require the aircraft conducting the activity to modify their flight plans (which would reduce activity realism) or force the observing aircraft to position itself a safe distance away from the activity area (which would decrease observation effectiveness). Adding vessels to observe the mitigation zone would increase safety risks due to the presence of observation vessels within the vicinity of an explosive sonobuoy or pattern of explosive sonobuoys.

Increasing the mitigation zone size would result in a larger area over which detonations would need to be ceased in response to a sighting, and therefore would likely increase the number of times detonations would be ceased and would extend the length of the activity. These impacts would significantly diminish event realism in a way that would prevent the activity from meeting its intended objectives. For example, during Anti-Submarine Warfare Tracking Test – Maritime Patrol Aircraft events, additional ceasing of the activity would not allow the Navy to effectively test sensors and systems that are used to detect and track submarines and ensure that systems perform to specifications and meet

operational requirements. Such testing is required to ensure functionality and accuracy in military mission and combat conditions. Extending the length of the activity would require aircraft to depart the area to refuel. If multiple refueling events were required, the activity length would extend by two to five times or more, which would decrease the ability for Lookouts to safely and effectively maintain situational awareness of the activity area and increase safety risks due to increased pilot fatigue and accelerated fatigue-life of aircraft. Extending the length of the activity would also result in additional operational costs due to increased fuel consumption.

In summary, the operational community determined that implementing procedural mitigation for explosive sonobuoys beyond what is detailed in Table 5-4 would be incompatible with the practicality assessment criteria for safety, sustainability, and mission requirements.

5.3.3.2 Explosive Torpedoes

The Navy will continue to implement procedural mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts on marine mammals and sea turtles from explosive torpedoes, as outlined in Table 5-5.

Table 5-5: Procedural Mitigation for Explosive Torpedoes

Procedural Mitigation Description
Stressor or Activity • Explosive torpedoes
Resource Protection Focus • Marine mammals • Sea turtles
Number of Lookouts and Observation Platform • 1 Lookout positioned in an aircraft • If additional platforms are participating in the activity, personnel positioned in those assets (e.g., safety observers, evaluators) will support observing the mitigation zone for applicable biological resources while performing their regular duties.
Mitigation Requirements • Mitigation zone: – 2,100 yd. around the intended impact location • Prior to the initial start of the activity (e.g., during deployment of the target): – Conduct passive acoustic monitoring for marine mammals; use information from detections to assist visual observations. – Visually observe the mitigation zone for marine mammals, sea turtles, and jellyfish aggregations; if observed, relocate or delay the start of firing. • During the activity: – Observe the mitigation zone for marine mammals, sea turtles, and jellyfish aggregations; if observed, cease firing. • Commencement/recommencement conditions after a marine mammal or sea turtle sighting before or during the activity: – The Navy will allow a sighted marine mammal or sea turtle to leave the mitigation zone prior to the initial start of the activity (by delaying the start) or during the activity (by not recommencing firing) until one of the following conditions has been met: (1) the animal is observed exiting the mitigation zone; (2) the animal is thought to have exited the mitigation zone based on a determination of its course, speed, and movement relative to the intended impact location; or (3) the mitigation zone has been clear from any additional sightings for 10 minutes when the activity involves aircraft that have fuel constraints, or 30 minutes when the activity involves aircraft that are not typically fuel constrained. • After completion of the activity (e.g., prior to maneuvering off station): – When practical (e.g., when platforms are not constrained by fuel restrictions or mission-essential follow-on commitments), observe the vicinity of where detonations occurred; if any injured or dead marine mammals or ESA-listed species are observed, follow established incident reporting procedures. – If additional platforms are supporting this activity (e.g., providing range clearance), these assets will assist in the visual observation of the area where detonations occurred.

In the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, the explosive torpedo mitigation zone was based on net explosive weight and the associated average ranges to PTS. When developing the mitigation for this Final SEIS/OEIS, the Navy analyzed the potential for increasing the size of this mitigation zone. The Navy

determined that the current mitigation zone is the largest area within which it is practical to implement mitigation for this activity; therefore, it will continue implementing this same mitigation zone under the Proposed Action.

The post-activity observations for explosive torpedoes are a continuation from the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and will help the Navy determine if any resources were injured during the activity. The Navy will follow the incident reporting procedures outlined in Section 5.1.2.2.3 (Incident Reports) if an incident is detected at any time during the event, including during the post-activity observations. The Navy is clarifying in the table that it will require observation of the mitigation zone prior to the initial start of the activity to ensure the area is clear of applicable biological resources. The Navy has always verified that the mitigation zone is visually clear prior to conducting explosive activities and is more clearly capturing this current practice in the mitigation measures for this activity. The Navy is adding a requirement that additional platforms already participating in the activity will support observing the mitigation zone before, during, and after the activity while performing their regular duties. Typically, when aircraft are firing explosive torpedoes, there are additional observation aircraft, support vessels (e.g., range craft for torpedo retrieval), or other safety aircraft in the vicinity. When available, having additional personnel support observations of the mitigation zone will help increase the likelihood of detecting biological resources.

Explosive torpedo activities involve detonations at a target located down range of the firing platform. Due to the distance between the mitigation zone and the observation platform, Lookouts will have a better likelihood of detecting large visual cues (e.g., whale blows or large pods of dolphins) than individual marine mammals, cryptic marine mammal species, and sea turtles. Some species of sea turtles forage on jellyfish, and some of the locations where explosive torpedo activities could occur support high densities of jellyfish throughout parts of the year. Observing for jellyfish aggregations will further help avoid or reduce potential impacts on sea turtles within the mitigation zone. The post-activity observations for marine mammals and sea turtles will help the Navy determine if any resources were injured during the activity.

Bin E11 has the longest predicted impact ranges for explosive torpedoes used in the Study Area. For the largest explosive in bin E11, the mitigation zone extends beyond the ranges to 50 percent non-auditory injury and 50 percent mortality for sea turtles and marine mammals. The mitigation zone extends beyond the average ranges to PTS for sea turtles, low-frequency cetaceans, and mid-frequency cetaceans, and into a portion of the average ranges to PTS for high-frequency cetaceans. The mitigation zone extends beyond the average range to TTS for sea turtles and mid-frequency cetaceans, and into a portion of the average ranges to TTS for low-frequency cetaceans and high-frequency cetaceans. Therefore, depending on the species, mitigation will help avoid or reduce all or a portion of the potential for exposure to mortality, non-auditory injury, PTS, and higher levels of TTS for the largest explosives in bin E11. Explosive torpedoes in smaller source bins (e.g., E8) have shorter predicted impact ranges; therefore, the mitigation zone will extend further beyond or cover a greater portion of the impact ranges for these explosives.

As described previously, the mitigation zone developed for this Final SEIS/OEIS is based on the largest area within which it is practical for the Navy to implement mitigation. It is not practical to increase this mitigation zone because observations within the margin of increase would be ineffective unless the Navy allocated additional platforms to observe for biological resources. The use of additional personnel and observation platforms would be unsustainable due to increased operational costs and an exceedance of the available manpower and resources for this activity. Adding aircraft to observe the

mitigation zone could result in airspace conflicts with the event participants. This would either require the aircraft participating in the activity to modify their flight plans (which would reduce activity realism) or force the observing aircraft to position itself a safe distance away from the activity area (which would decrease observation effectiveness). Adding vessels to observe the mitigation zone would increase safety risks due to the presence of observation vessels within the vicinity of explosive torpedoes.

Increasing the mitigation zone size would result in a larger area over which detonations would need to be ceased in response to a sighting, and therefore would likely increase the number of times detonations would be ceased and would extend the length of the activity. These impacts would significantly diminish event realism in a way that would prevent the activity from meeting its intended objectives. For example, the Navy conducts Torpedo (Explosive) Testing events to test the functionality of torpedoes and torpedo launch systems. These events often involve aircrews locating, approaching, and firing a torpedo on an artificial target. They require focused situational awareness of the activity area and continuous coordination between the participating platforms as required during military missions and combat operations. Extending the length of the activity would require aircraft to depart the area to refuel. If the firing aircraft departed the activity location to refuel, the aircrew would lose the ability to maintain situational awareness and effectively coordinate with other participating platforms. If multiple refueling events were required, the activity length would extend by two to five times or more, which would increase safety risks due to increased pilot fatigue and accelerated fatigue-life of aircraft. Therefore, an increase in mitigation would impede the Navy's ability to meet testing requirements per required acquisition milestones or on an as-needed basis to meet operational requirements. Extending the length of the activity would also result in additional operational costs due to increased fuel consumption.

In summary, the operational community determined that implementing procedural mitigation for explosive torpedoes beyond what is detailed in Table 5-5 would be incompatible with the practicality assessment criteria for safety, sustainability, and mission requirements.

5.3.3.3 Explosive Medium-Caliber and Large-Caliber Projectiles

The Navy will continue to implement procedural mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts on marine mammals and sea turtles from explosive gunnery activities, as outlined in Table 5-6.

In the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, explosive gunnery activity mitigation zones were based on net explosive weight and the associated average ranges to PTS. When developing mitigation for this Final SEIS/OEIS, the Navy analyzed the potential for increasing the size of these mitigation zones. The Navy identified an opportunity to increase the mitigation zone size by 400 yd. for surface-to-surface activities to enhance protections to the maximum extent practicable. This increase is reflected in Table 5-6. The mitigation zones for explosive medium-caliber and large-caliber projectiles are now based on the largest areas within which it is practical to implement mitigation.

The Navy is clarifying in the table that it will require observation of the mitigation zone prior to the initial start of the activity to ensure the area is clear of applicable biological resources. The Navy has always verified that the mitigation zone is visually clear prior to conducting explosive activities and is more clearly capturing this current practice in the mitigation measures for this activity. The Navy developed a new mitigation measure requiring the Lookout to observe the mitigation zone after completion of the activity. In accordance with the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS consultation requirements, the Navy currently conducts post-activity observations for some, but not all explosive activities. When developing the mitigation for this Final SEIS/OEIS, the Navy determined that it could expand this requirement to other

explosive activities for enhanced consistency and to help determine if any resources were injured during explosive events, when practical.

Table 5-6: Procedural Mitigation for Explosive Medium-Caliber and Large-Caliber Projectiles

Procedural Mitigation Description
Stressor or Activity • Gunnery activities using explosive medium-caliber and large-caliber projectiles – Mitigation applies to activities using a surface target
Resource Protection Focus • Marine mammals • Sea turtles
Number of Lookouts and Observation Platform • 1 Lookout on the vessel or aircraft conducting the activity – For activities using explosive large-caliber projectiles, depending on the activity, the Lookout could be the same as the one described in Section 5.3.2.2 (Weapons Firing Noise) • If additional platforms are participating in the activity, personnel positioned in those assets (e.g., safety observers, evaluators) will support observing the mitigation zone for applicable biological resources while performing their regular duties.
Mitigation Requirements • Mitigation zones: – 200 yd. around the intended impact location for air-to-surface activities using explosive medium-caliber projectiles – 600 yd. around the intended impact location for surface-to-surface activities using explosive medium-caliber projectiles – 1,000 yd. around the intended impact location for surface-to-surface activities using explosive large-caliber projectiles • Prior to the initial start of the activity (e.g., when maneuvering on station): – Observe the mitigation zone for marine mammals and sea turtles; if observed, relocate or delay the start of firing. • During the activity: – Observe the mitigation zone for marine mammals and sea turtles; if observed, cease firing. • Commencement/recommencement conditions after a marine mammal or sea turtle sighting before or during the activity: – The Navy will allow a sighted marine mammal or sea turtle to leave the mitigation zone prior to the initial start of the activity (by delaying the start) or during the activity (by not recommencing firing) until one of the following conditions has been met: (1) the animal is observed exiting the mitigation zone; (2) the animal is thought to have exited the mitigation zone based on a determination of its course, speed, and movement relative to the intended impact location; (3) the mitigation zone has been clear from any additional sightings for 10 minutes for aircraft-based firing or 30 minutes for vessel-based firing; or (4) for activities using mobile targets, the intended impact location has transited a distance equal to double that of the mitigation zone size beyond the location of the last sighting. • After completion of the activity (e.g., prior to maneuvering off station): – When practical (e.g., when platforms are not constrained by fuel restrictions or mission-essential follow-on commitments), observe the vicinity of where detonations occurred; if any injured or dead marine mammals or ESA-listed species are observed, follow established incident reporting procedures. – If additional platforms are supporting this activity (e.g., providing range clearance), these assets will assist in the visual observation of the area where detonations occurred.

The Navy is adding a requirement that additional platforms already participating in the activity will support observing the mitigation zone before, during, and after the activity while performing their regular duties. Typically, when aircraft are firing explosive munitions there are additional observation aircraft, multiple aircraft firing munitions, or other safety aircraft in the vicinity. When available, having additional personnel support observations of the mitigation zone will help increase the likelihood of detecting biological resources. The Navy will follow the incident reporting procedures outlined in Section 5.1.2.2.3 (Incident Reports) if an incident is detected at any time during the event, including during the post-activity observations.

Large-caliber gunnery activities involve vessels firing projectiles at targets located up to 6 nautical miles (NM) down range. Medium-caliber gunnery activities involve vessels or aircraft firing projectiles at targets located up to 4,000 yd. down range, although typically much closer. As described in Section 5.2.1

(At-Sea Procedural Mitigation Development), certain platforms, such as the small boats and aircraft used during explosive medium-caliber gunnery exercises, have manning or space restrictions; therefore, the Lookout for these activities is typically an existing member of the aircraft or boat crew who is responsible for other essential tasks (e.g., navigation). Due to their relatively lower vantage point, Lookouts on vessels (during medium-caliber or large-caliber gunnery exercises) will be more likely to detect large visual cues (e.g., whale blows, breaching whales) than individual marine mammals, cryptic marine mammal species, and sea turtles when observing around targets located at the furthest firing distances. The Navy will implement larger mitigation zones for large-caliber gunnery activities than for medium-caliber gunnery activities due to the nature of how the activities are conducted. For example, large-caliber gunnery activities are conducted from surface combatants, so Lookouts can observe a larger mitigation zone because they typically have access to high-powered binoculars mounted on the ship deck. This will enable observation of the distant mitigation zone in combination with hand-held binoculars and naked-eye scanning. Lookouts in aircraft (during medium-caliber gunnery exercises), have a relatively higher vantage point for observing the mitigation zones but will still be more likely to detect individual marine mammals and sea turtles when observing mitigation zones located close to the firing platform than at the furthest firing distances.

The mitigation applies only to activities using surface targets. Most airborne targets are recoverable aerial drones that are not intended to be hit by ordnance. Given the speed of the projectiles and mobile target, and the long ranges that projectiles typically travel, it is not possible to definitively predict or to effectively observe where the projectile fragments will fall. For gunnery activities using explosive medium-caliber and large-caliber projectiles, the potential military expended material fall zone can only be predicted within thousands of yards, which can be up to 6 NM from the firing location. These areas are too large to be effectively observed for marine mammals and sea turtles with the number of personnel and platforms available for this activity. The potential risk to marine mammals and sea turtles during events using airborne targets is limited to the animal being directly struck by falling military expended materials. There is no potential for direct impact from the explosives because the detonations occur in air. Based on the extremely low potential for projectile fragments to co-occur in space and time with a marine mammal or sea turtle at or near the surface of the water, the potential for a direct strike is negligible; therefore, mitigation for gunnery activities using airborne targets would not be effective at avoiding or reducing potential impacts.

Bin E5 (e.g., 5-inch projectiles) has the longest predicted impact ranges for explosive projectiles that apply to the 1,000 yd. mitigation zone. Bin E2 (e.g., 40-millimeter projectiles) has the longest predicted impact ranges for explosive projectiles that apply to the 600 yd. and 200 yd. mitigation zones. The 1,000 yd., 600 yd., and 200 yd. mitigation zones extend beyond the respective ranges to 50 percent non-auditory injury and 50 percent mortality for sea turtles and marine mammals. The 1,000 yd., 600 yd., and 200 yd. mitigation zones extend beyond the respective average ranges to PTS for sea turtles, mid-frequency cetaceans, and low-frequency cetaceans, and into a portion of the average ranges to PTS for high-frequency cetaceans. The mitigation zones also extend beyond or into a portion of the average ranges to TTS for sea turtles and marine mammals. Therefore, depending on the species, mitigation will help avoid or reduce all or a portion of the potential for exposure to mortality, non-auditory injury, PTS, and higher levels of TTS for the largest explosives in bin E5 and bin E2. Explosives in smaller source bins (e.g., E1) have shorter predicted impact ranges; therefore, the mitigation zones will extend further beyond or cover a greater portion of the impact ranges for these explosives.

As described previously, the mitigation zones developed for this Final SEIS/OEIS are based on the largest areas within which it is practical for the Navy to implement mitigation. It is not practical to increase these mitigation zones because observations within the margin of increase would be unsafe and ineffective. One of the mission-essential safety protocols for explosive gunnery activities is a requirement for event participants (including the Lookout) to maintain focus on the activity area to ensure safety of Navy personnel and equipment, and the public. For example, when air-to-surface medium-caliber gunnery exercises involve fighter aircraft descending on a target, or rotary-wing aircraft flying a racetrack pattern and descending on a target using a forward-tilted firing angle, maintaining attention on the activity area is paramount to aircraft safety. The typical activity areas for medium-caliber and large-caliber gunnery activities coincide with the applicable mitigation zones; therefore, the Lookout can safely and effectively observe the mitigation zones for biological resources while simultaneously maintaining focus on the activity area. However, if the mitigation zone sizes increased, the Lookout would need to redirect attention to observe beyond the activity area. This would not meet the safety criteria since personnel would be required to direct attention away from mission requirements. Alternatively, the Navy would need to add personnel to serve as additional Lookouts on the existing observation platforms or allocate additional platforms to the activity to observe for biological resources. These actions would not be safe or sustainable due to an exceedance of manpower, resource, and space restrictions for these activities. Similarly, positioning platforms closer to the intended impact location would increase safety risks related to proximity to the detonation location and path of the explosive projectile.

Increasing the mitigation zone sizes would result in larger areas over which detonations would need to be ceased in response to a sighting, and therefore would likely increase the number of times firing would be ceased and would extend the length of the activity. These impacts would significantly diminish event realism in a way that would prevent activities from meeting their intended objectives. For example, the Navy must train its gun crews to coordinate with other participating platforms (e.g., small boats launching a target, other firing platforms), locate and engage surface targets (e.g., high speed maneuverable surface targets), and practice precise defensive marksmanship to disable threats.

Depending on the type of target being used, additional stopping of the activity could result in the target needing to be recovered and relaunched, which would cause a significant loss of training time. For activities that involve aircraft, extending the length of the activity would require aircraft to depart the area to refuel. If multiple refueling events were required, the length of the activity would be extended by two to five times or more, which would decrease the ability for Lookouts to safely and effectively maintain situational awareness of the activity area and increase safety risks due to increased pilot fatigue and accelerated fatigue-life of aircraft. These types of impacts would reduce the number of opportunities that gun crews have to fire on the target and cause significant delays to the training schedule. Therefore, an increase in mitigation would impede the ability for gun crews to train and become proficient in using their weapons as required during military missions and combat operations and would prevent units from meeting their individual training and certification requirements (which would prevent them from deploying with the required level of readiness necessary to accomplish their missions). Extending the length of the activity would also result in additional operational costs due to increased fuel consumption.

In summary, the operational community determined that implementing procedural mitigation for explosive medium-caliber and large-caliber projectiles beyond what is detailed in Table 5-6 would be

incompatible with the practicality assessment criteria for safety, sustainability, and mission requirements.

5.3.3.4 Explosive Missiles and Rockets

The Navy will continue to implement procedural mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts on marine mammals and sea turtles from explosive missiles and rockets, as outlined in Table 5-7.

Table 5-7: Procedural Mitigation for Explosive Missiles and Rockets

Procedural Mitigation Description
Stressor or Activity • Aircraft-deployed explosive missiles and rockets – Mitigation applies to activities using a surface target
Resource Protection Focus • Marine mammals • Sea turtles
Number of Lookouts and Observation Platform • 1 Lookout positioned in an aircraft • If additional platforms are participating in the activity, personnel positioned in those assets (e.g., safety observers, evaluators) will support observing the mitigation zone for applicable biological resources while performing their regular duties.
Mitigation Requirements • Mitigation zones: – 900 yd. around the intended impact location for missiles or rockets with 0.6–20 lb. net explosive weight – 2,000 yd. around the intended impact location for missiles with 21–500 lb. net explosive weight • Prior to the initial start of the activity (e.g., during a fly-over of the mitigation zone): – Observe the mitigation zone for marine mammals and sea turtles; if observed, relocate or delay the start of firing. • During the activity: – Observe the mitigation zone for marine mammals and sea turtles; if observed, cease firing. • Commencement/recommencement conditions after a marine mammal or sea turtle sighting before or during the activity: – The Navy will allow a sighted marine mammal or sea turtle to leave the mitigation zone prior to the initial start of the activity (by delaying the start) or during the activity (by not recommencing firing) until one of the following conditions has been met: (1) the animal is observed exiting the mitigation zone; (2) the animal is thought to have exited the mitigation zone based on a determination of its course, speed, and movement relative to the intended impact location; or (3) the mitigation zone has been clear from any additional sightings for 10 minutes when the activity involves aircraft that have fuel constraints, or 30 minutes when the activity involves aircraft that are not typically fuel constrained. • After completion of the activity (e.g., prior to maneuvering off station): – When practical (e.g., when platforms are not constrained by fuel restrictions or mission-essential follow-on commitments), observe the vicinity of where detonations occurred; if any injured or dead marine mammals or ESA-listed species are observed, follow established incident reporting procedures. – If additional platforms are supporting this activity (e.g., providing range clearance), these assets will assist in the visual observation of the area where detonations occurred.

In the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, explosive missile and rocket mitigation zones were based on net explosive weight and the associated average ranges to PTS. When developing the mitigation for this Final SEIS/OEIS, the Navy analyzed the potential for increasing the mitigation zone sizes. The Navy identified an opportunity to increase the mitigation zone by 1,100 yd. for missiles and rockets using 21–250 lb. net explosive weight to enhance protections to the maximum extent practicable. This increase is reflected in Table 5-7. The mitigation zones are now based on the largest areas within which it is practical to implement mitigation.

The Navy is clarifying in the table that it will require observation of the mitigation zone prior to the initial start of the activity to ensure the area is clear of applicable biological resources. The Navy has always verified that the mitigation zone is visually clear prior to conducting explosive activities and is more clearly capturing this current practice in the mitigation measures for this activity. The Navy developed a

new mitigation measure requiring the Lookout to observe the mitigation zone after completion of the activity. In accordance with the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS consultation requirements, the Navy currently conducts post-activity observations for some, but not all explosive activities. When developing the mitigation for this Final SEIS/OEIS, the Navy determined that it could expand this requirement to other explosive activities for enhanced consistency and to help determine if any resources were injured during explosive events, when practical. The Navy is adding a requirement that additional platforms already participating in the activity will support observing the mitigation zone before, during, and after the activity while performing their regular duties. Typically, when aircraft are firing explosive munitions there are additional observation aircraft, multiple aircraft firing munitions, or other safety aircraft in the vicinity. For example, during typical explosive missile exercises, two aircraft circle the activity location. One aircraft clears the intended impact location while the other fires, and vice versa. A third aircraft is typically present for safety or proficiency inspections. When available, having additional personnel support observations of the mitigation zone will help increase the likelihood of detecting biological resources. The Navy will follow the incident reporting procedures outlined in Section 5.1.2.2.3 (Incident Reports) if an incident is detected at any time during the event, including during the post-activity observations.

Missile and rocket exercises involve firing munitions at a target typically located up to 15 NM down range, and infrequently up to 75 NM down range. Due to the distance between the mitigation zone and the observation platform, the Lookout will have a better likelihood of detecting marine mammals and sea turtles during close-range observations and are less likely to detect these resources once positioned at the firing location, particularly individual marine mammals, cryptic marine mammal species, and sea turtles. There is a chance that animals could enter the mitigation zone after the aircraft conducts its close-range mitigation zone observations and before firing begins (once the aircraft has transited to its firing position). The Navy will implement larger mitigation zones for missiles using 21–500 lb. net explosive weight than for missiles and rockets using 0.6–20 lb. net explosive weight due to the nature of how these activities are conducted. During activities using missiles in the larger net explosive weight category, firing aircraft (e.g., maritime patrol aircraft) have the capability of mitigating a larger area due to their larger fuel capacity. During activities using missiles or rockets in the smaller net explosive weight category, firing aircraft (e.g., rotary-wing aircraft) are typically constrained by their fuel capacity.

The mitigation applies to aircraft-deployed missiles and rockets because aircraft can fly over the intended impact area prior to commencing firing. Mitigation would be ineffective for vessel-deployed missiles and rockets because of the inability for a Lookout to detect marine mammals or sea turtles from a vessel from the distant firing position. It would not be effective or practical to have a vessel conduct close-range observations of the mitigation zone prior to firing due to the length of time it would take to complete observations and transit back to the firing position, and the costs associated with increased fuel consumption. The mitigation applies to activities using surface targets. Most airborne targets are recoverable aerial drones that are not intended to be hit by ordnance. For example, telemetry-configured anti-air missiles used in training are designed to detonate or simulate a detonation near a target, but not as a result of a direct strike on a target. Given the speed of missiles and mobile targets, the high altitudes involved, and the long ranges that missiles typically travel, it is not possible to definitively predict or to effectively observe where the missile fragments will fall. The potential expended material fall zone can only be predicted within tens of miles for long range events, which can be 75 NM from the firing location; and thousands of yards for short range events, which can occur 15 NM from the firing location. These areas are too large to be effectively observed for marine mammals and sea turtles with the number of personnel and platforms available for this activity. The

potential risk to marine mammals and sea turtles during events using airborne targets is limited to the animal being directly struck by falling military expended materials. There is no potential for direct impact from explosives because the detonations occur in air. Based on the extremely low potential for military expended materials to co-occur in space and time with a marine mammal or sea turtle at or near the surface of the water, the potential for a direct strike is negligible; therefore, mitigation would not be effective at avoiding or reducing potential impacts.

Bin E10 (e.g., Harpoon missiles) has the longest predicted impact ranges for explosive missiles that apply to the 2,000 yd. mitigation zone. Bin E6 (e.g., Hellfire missiles) has the longest predicted impact ranges for explosive missiles and rockets that apply to the 900 yd. mitigation zone. The 2,000 yd. and 900 yd. mitigation zones extend beyond the respective ranges to 50 percent non-auditory injury and 50 percent mortality for sea turtles and marine mammals. The mitigation zones extend beyond the respective average ranges to PTS for sea turtles, mid-frequency cetaceans, and low-frequency cetaceans, and into a portion of the respective average ranges to PTS for high-frequency cetaceans. The mitigation zones also extend beyond or into a portion of the average ranges to TTS for sea turtles and marine mammals. Therefore, depending on the species, mitigation will help avoid or reduce all or a portion of the potential for exposure to mortality, non-auditory injury, PTS, and higher levels of TTS for the largest explosives in bin E10 and bin E6. Explosives in smaller source bins (e.g., missiles in bin E8, rockets in bin E3) have shorter predicted impact ranges; therefore, the mitigation zones will cover a greater portion of the impact ranges for these explosives.

As described previously, the mitigation zones developed for this Final SEIS/OEIS are based on the largest areas within which it is practical for the Navy to implement mitigation. It is not practical to increase these mitigation zones because observations within the margin of increase would be unsafe and ineffective unless the Navy allocated additional platforms to the activity to observe for biological resources. The use of additional personnel and equipment (e.g., aircraft) would be unsustainable due to increased operational costs and an exceedance of the available manpower and resources for this activity. Adding aircraft to observe the mitigation zone could result in airspace conflicts with the event participants. This would either require the aircraft conducting the activity to modify their flight plans (which would reduce activity realism) or force the observing aircraft to position itself a safe distance away from the activity area (which would decrease observation effectiveness). Similarly, positioning platforms closer to the intended impact location (as would be required if mitigation applied to vessel-deployed missiles and rockets) would increase safety risks related to proximity to the detonation location and path of the explosive missile or rocket.

Increasing the mitigation zone sizes would result in larger areas over which firing would need to be ceased in response to a sighting, and therefore would likely increase the number of times detonations would be ceased and would extend the length of the activity. These impacts would significantly diminish event realism in a way that would prevent the activity from meeting its intended objectives. Explosive missile and rocket events require focused situational awareness of the activity area and continuous coordination between the participating platforms as required during military missions and combat operations. For activities using missiles in the larger net explosive weight category, the flyover distance between the mitigation zone and the firing location can extend upwards of 75 NM; therefore, even aircraft with larger fuel capacities would need to depart the activity area to refuel if the length of the activity was extended. If the firing aircraft departed the activity location to refuel, the aircrew would lose the ability to maintain situational awareness of the activity area and effectively coordinate with other participating platforms. If multiple refueling events were required, the activity length would

extend by two to five times or more, which would increase safety risks due to increased pilot fatigue and accelerated fatigue-life of aircraft. These types of impacts would cause a significant loss of training or testing time, reduce the number of opportunities that aircrews have to fire on the target, and cause a significant delay to the training or testing schedule. Therefore, an increase in mitigation would impede the ability for aircrews to train and become proficient in using their weapons as required during military missions and combat operations, would prevent units from meeting their individual training and certification requirements (which would prevent them from deploying with the required level of readiness necessary to accomplish their missions), and would impede the ability of program managers and weapons system acquisition programs to meet testing requirements per required acquisition milestones or on an as-needed basis to meet operational requirements. Extending the length of the activity would also result in additional operational costs due to increased fuel consumption.

In summary, the operational community determined that implementing procedural mitigation for explosive missiles and rockets beyond what is detailed in Table 5-7 would be incompatible with the practicality assessment criteria for safety, sustainability, and mission requirements.

5.3.3.5 Explosive Bombs

The Navy will continue to implement procedural mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts on marine mammals and sea turtles from explosive bombs, as outlined in Table 5-8.

Table 5-8: Procedural Mitigation for Explosive Bombs

Procedural Mitigation Description
Stressor or Activity • Explosive bombs
Resource Protection Focus • Marine mammals • Sea turtles
Number of Lookouts and Observation Platform • 1 Lookout positioned in the aircraft conducting the activity • If additional platforms are participating in the activity, personnel positioned in those assets (e.g., safety observers, evaluators) will support observing the mitigation zone for applicable biological resources while performing their regular duties.
Mitigation Requirements • Mitigation zone: – 2,500 yd. around the intended target • Prior to the initial start of the activity (e.g., when arriving on station): – Observe the mitigation zone for marine mammals and sea turtles; if observed, relocate or delay the start of bomb deployment. • During the activity (e.g., during target approach): – Observe the mitigation zone for marine mammals and sea turtles; if observed, cease bomb deployment. • Commencement/recommencement conditions after a marine mammal or sea turtle sighting before or during the activity: – The Navy will allow a sighted marine mammal or sea turtle to leave the mitigation zone prior to the initial start of the activity (by delaying the start) or during the activity (by not recommencing bomb deployment) until one of the following conditions has been met: (1) the animal is observed exiting the mitigation zone; (2) the animal is thought to have exited the mitigation zone based on a determination of its course, speed, and movement relative to the intended target; (3) the mitigation zone has been clear from any additional sightings for 10 minutes; or (4) for activities using mobile targets, the intended target has transited a distance equal to double that of the mitigation zone size beyond the location of the last sighting. • After completion of the activity (e.g., prior to maneuvering off station): – When practical (e.g., when platforms are not constrained by fuel restrictions or mission-essential follow-on commitments), observe the vicinity of where detonations occurred; if any injured or dead marine mammals or ESA-listed species are observed, follow established incident reporting procedures. – If additional platforms are supporting this activity (e.g., providing range clearance), these assets will assist in the visual observation of the area where detonations occurred.

In the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, the explosive bombing mitigation zone was based on net explosive weight and the associated average ranges to PTS. When developing the mitigation for this Final SEIS/OEIS, the Navy analyzed the potential for increasing the size of this mitigation zone. The Navy determined that the current mitigation zone for explosive bombs is the largest area within which it is practical to implement mitigation for this activity; therefore, it will continue implementing this same mitigation zone under the Proposed Action.

The Navy is clarifying in the table that it will require observation of the mitigation zone prior to the initial start of the activity to ensure the area is clear of applicable biological resources. The Navy has always verified that the mitigation zone is visually clear prior to conducting explosive activities and is more clearly capturing this current practice in the mitigation measures for this activity. The Navy developed a new mitigation measure requiring the Lookout to observe the mitigation zone after completion of this activity. In accordance with the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS consultation requirements, the Navy currently conducts post-activity observations for some, but not all explosive activities. When developing mitigation for this Final SEIS/OEIS, the Navy determined that it could expand this requirement to other explosive activities for enhanced consistency and to help determine if any resources were injured during explosive events, when practical. The Navy is adding a requirement that additional platforms already participating in the activity will support observing the mitigation zone before, during, and after the activity while performing their regular duties. Typically, when aircraft are firing explosive munitions there are additional observation aircraft, multiple aircraft firing munitions, or other safety aircraft in the vicinity. When available, having additional personnel support observations of the mitigation zone will help increase the likelihood of detecting biological resources. The Navy will follow the incident reporting procedures outlined in Section 5.1.2.2.3 (Incident Reports) if an incident is detected at any time during the event, including during the post-activity observations.

Bombing exercises involve an aircraft deploying munitions at a surface target located beneath the firing platform. During target approach, aircraft maintain a relatively steady altitude of approximately 1,500 ft. Lookouts, by necessity for safety and mission success, primarily focus their attention on the water surface surrounding the intended detonation location (i.e., the mitigation zone). Being positioned in an aircraft gives the Lookout a good vantage point for observing marine mammals and sea turtles throughout the mitigation zone.

Bin E12 (e.g., 2,000 lb. bombs) has the longest predicted impact ranges for explosive bombs used in the Study Area. The 2,500 yd. mitigation zone extends beyond the ranges to 50 percent non-auditory injury and 50 percent mortality for sea turtles and marine mammals. The mitigation zone extends beyond the average ranges to PTS for sea turtles, mid-frequency cetaceans, and low-frequency cetaceans, and into a portion of the average range to PTS for high-frequency cetaceans. The mitigation zone also extends beyond or into a portion of the average ranges to TTS for sea turtles and marine mammals. Therefore, depending on the species, mitigation will help avoid or reduce all or a portion of the potential for exposure to mortality, non-auditory injury, PTS, and higher levels of TTS for the largest bombs in bin E12. Smaller bombs (e.g., 250 lb. bombs, 500 lb. bombs) have shorter predicted impact ranges; therefore, the mitigation zone will extend further beyond or cover a greater portion of the impact ranges for these explosives.

As described previously, the mitigation zone developed for this Final SEIS/OEIS is based on the largest area within which it is practical for the Navy to implement mitigation. It is not practical to increase this mitigation zone because observations within the margin of increase would be unsafe and ineffective unless the Navy allocated additional platforms to the activity to observe for biological resources. The use

of additional personnel and aircraft would be unsustainable due to increased operational costs and an exceedance of the available manpower and resources for this activity. Adding aircraft to observe the mitigation zone could result in airspace conflicts with the event participants. This would either require the aircraft participating in the activity to modify their flight plans (which would reduce activity realism) or force the observing aircraft to position itself a safe distance away from the activity area (which would decrease observation effectiveness). Adding vessels to observe the mitigation zone would increase safety risks due to the presence of observation vessels within the vicinity of the intended explosive bomb detonation location.

Increasing the mitigation zone would result in a larger area over which explosive bomb deployment would need to be ceased in response to a sighting, and therefore would likely increase the number of times explosive bombing activities would be ceased and would extend the length of the activity. These impacts would significantly diminish event realism in a way that would prevent the activity from meeting its intended objectives. For example, critical components of a Bombing Exercise Air-to-Surface training activity are the assembly, loading, delivery, and assessment of an explosive bomb. The activity requires focused situational awareness of the activity area and continuous coordination between multiple training components. The training exercise starts with ground personnel, who must practice the building and loading of explosive munitions. Training includes the safe handling of explosive material, configuring munitions to precise specifications, and loading munitions onto aircraft. Aircrew must then identify a target and safely deliver fused munitions, discern if the bomb was assembled correctly, and determine bomb damage assessments based on how and where the explosive detonated. Extending the length of the activity would require aircraft to depart the area to refuel. If the firing aircraft departed the activity area to refuel, aircrew would lose the ability to maintain situational awareness of the activity area, effectively coordinate with other participating platforms, and complete all training components as required during military missions and combat operations. If multiple refueling events were required, the activity length would be extended by two to five times or more, which would cause a significant loss of training time and would increase safety risks due to increased pilot fatigue and accelerated fatigue-life of aircraft. This would reduce the number of opportunities that aircrews have to approach targets and deploy bombs, which would cause a significant delay to the training schedule. Therefore, an increase in mitigation would impede the ability for aircrews to train and become proficient in using their weapons. This would prevent units from meeting their individual training and certification requirements and deploying with the required level of readiness necessary to accomplish their missions. Extending the length of the activity would also result in additional operational costs due to increased fuel consumption.

In summary, the operational community determined that implementing procedural mitigation for explosive bombs beyond what is detailed in Table 5-8 would be incompatible with the practicality assessment criteria for safety, sustainability, and mission requirements.

5.3.3.6 Sinking Exercises

The Navy will continue to implement procedural mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts on marine mammals and sea turtles from sinking exercises, as outlined in Table 5-9.

Table 5-9: Procedural Mitigation for Sinking Exercises

Procedural Mitigation Description
Stressor or Activity • Sinking exercises
Resource Protection Focus • Marine mammals • Sea turtles
Number of Lookouts and Observation Platform • 2 Lookouts (one positioned in an aircraft and one on a vessel) • If additional platforms are participating in the activity, personnel positioned in those assets (e.g., safety observers, evaluators) will support observing the mitigation zone for applicable biological resources while performing their regular duties.
Mitigation Requirements • Mitigation zone: – 2.5 NM around the target ship hulk • Prior to the initial start of the activity (90 minutes prior to the first firing): – Conduct aerial observations of the mitigation zone for marine mammals, sea turtles, and jellyfish aggregations; if observed, delay the start of firing. • During the activity: – Conduct passive acoustic monitoring for marine mammals; use information from detections to assist visual observations. – Visually observe the mitigation zone for marine mammals and sea turtles from the vessel; if observed, cease firing. – Immediately after any planned or unplanned breaks in weapons firing of longer than 2 hours, observe the mitigation zone for marine mammals and sea turtles from the aircraft and vessel; if observed, delay recommencement of firing. • Commencement/recommencement conditions after a marine mammal or sea turtle sighting before or during the activity: – The Navy will allow a sighted marine mammal or sea turtle to leave the mitigation zone prior to the initial start of the activity (by delaying the start) or during the activity (by not recommencing firing) until one of the following conditions has been met: (1) the animal is observed exiting the mitigation zone; (2) the animal is thought to have exited the mitigation zone based on a determination of its course, speed, and movement relative to the target ship hulk; or (3) the mitigation zone has been clear from any additional sightings for 30 minutes. • After completion of the activity (for 2 hours after sinking the vessel or until sunset, whichever comes first): – Observe the vicinity of where detonations occurred; if any injured or dead marine mammals or ESA-listed species are observed, follow established incident reporting procedures. – If additional platforms are supporting this activity (e.g., providing range clearance), these assets will assist in the visual observation of the area where detonations occurred.

In the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, the mitigation zone was based on net explosive weight and the associated average ranges to PTS. When developing the mitigation for this Final SEIS/OEIS, the Navy analyzed the potential for increasing the size of the mitigation zone. The Navy determined that the current mitigation zone for sinking exercises is the largest area within which it is practical to implement mitigation; therefore, it will continue implementing this same mitigation zone under the Proposed Action. The Navy is clarifying in the table that it will require observation of the mitigation zone prior to the initial start of the activity to ensure the area is clear of applicable biological resources. The Navy has always verified that the mitigation zone is visually clear prior to conducting explosive activities and is more clearly capturing this current practice in the mitigation measures for this activity. The Navy is adding a requirement that additional platforms already participating in the activity will support observing the mitigation zone before, during, and after the activity while performing their regular duties. Sinking exercises typically involved multiple participating platforms. When available, having additional personnel support observations of the mitigation zone will help increase the likelihood of detecting biological resources. The two-hour post-activity observations for sinking exercises are a continuation from the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and will help the Navy determine if any resources were injured during the activity. Sinking exercises are scheduled to ensure they are conducted only in daylight hours. The Navy will be able to complete the full two hours of post-activity observation during typical

activity conditions and it is unlikely that observations will be shortened due to nightfall. The Navy will follow the incident reporting procedures outlined in Section 5.1.2.2.3 (Incident Reports) if an incident is detected at any time during the event, including during the post-activity observations.

There is a chance that animals could enter the mitigation zone after the aircraft conducts its close-range mitigation zone observations and before firing begins (once the aircraft has transited to its distant firing position). The Lookout positioned on the vessel will have a higher likelihood of detecting individual marine mammals and sea turtles that are in the central portion of the mitigation zone near the target ship hulk. Near the perimeter of the mitigation zone, the Lookout will be more likely to detect large visual cues (e.g., whale blows or large pods of dolphins) than individual marine mammals, cryptic marine mammal species, and sea turtles. The Lookout positioned in the aircraft will be able to assist the vessel-based Lookout by observing the entire mitigation zone, including near the perimeter, because the aircraft will be able to transit a larger area more quickly (e.g., during range clearance), and will offer a better vantage point. Some species of sea turtles forage on jellyfish in the region where this activity occurs. Observing for jellyfish aggregations will further help avoid or reduce potential impacts on sea turtles within the mitigation zone.

Bin E12 has the longest predicted impact ranges for the types of explosives used during sinking exercises in the Study Area. For the largest explosive in bin E12, the mitigation zone extends beyond the ranges to 50 percent non-auditory injury and 50 percent mortality for sea turtles and marine mammals. The mitigation zone extends beyond the average ranges to PTS for sea turtles and marine mammals. The mitigation zone also extends beyond or into a portion of the average ranges to TTS for sea turtles and marine mammals. Therefore, depending on the species, mitigation will help avoid or reduce all or a portion of the potential for exposure to mortality, non-auditory injury, PTS, and higher levels of TTS for the largest explosives in bin E12. Smaller explosives in bin E12 and explosives in smaller source bins (e.g., E10, E5) have shorter predicted impact ranges; therefore, the mitigation zone will extend further beyond or cover a greater portion of the impact ranges for these explosives.

As described previously, the mitigation zone developed for this Final SEIS/OEIS is based on the largest area within which it is practical for the Navy to implement mitigation. It is not practical to increase this mitigation zone because observations within the margin of increase would be ineffective unless the Navy allocated additional platforms to the activity to observe for biological resources. The use of additional personnel, aircraft, or vessels would be unsustainable due to increased operational costs and an exceedance of available manpower and resources for this activity. Adding aircraft to observe the mitigation zone could result in airspace conflicts with the event participants. This would either require the aircraft participating in the activity to modify their flight plans (which would reduce activity realism) or force the observing aircraft to position itself a safe distance away from the activity area (which would decrease observation effectiveness). Adding additional platforms to observe the mitigation zone would increase safety risks due to the presence of additional vessels or aircraft within the vicinity of the intended impact location or in the path of explosive projectiles.

Increasing the mitigation zone size would result in a larger area over which firing would need to be ceased in response to a sighting, and therefore would likely increase the number of times that the sinking exercise would be ceased and would extend the length of the activity. These impacts would significantly diminish event realism in a way that would prevent the activity from meeting its intended objectives. Sinking exercises require focused situational awareness of the activity area and continuous coordination of tactics between ship, submarine, and aircraft crews using multiple weapon systems to deliver explosive ordnance to deliberately sink a deactivated vessel. Extending the length of the activity

would require aircraft to depart the area to refuel, which would disrupt the ability for platforms to maintain continuous coordination of tactics. If multiple refueling events were required, the length of the activity would be extended by two to five times or more, which would decrease the ability for Lookouts to safely and effectively maintain situational awareness of the activity area and increase safety risks due to increased pilot fatigue and accelerated fatigue-life of aircraft. These types of impacts would reduce the frequency at which participants would be able to fire on the deactivated vessel. Because the activity ends when the ship sinks, firing at a decreased frequency would ultimately extend the amount of time it takes for the deactivated vessel to sink. Sinking exercises only take place during daylight hours; therefore, the training exercise would likely be delayed into the next day or next several days, which would significantly impact the schedules of the multiple participants. An increase in mitigation would impede the ability for the participants to become proficient in using their weapons as required during military missions and combat operations and would prevent units from meeting their individual training and certification requirements (which would prevent them from deploying with the required level of readiness necessary to accomplish their missions). Extending the length of the activity would also result in additional operational costs due to increased fuel consumption.

In summary, the operational community determined that implementing procedural mitigation for sinking exercises beyond what is detailed in Table 5-9 would be incompatible with the practicality assessment criteria for safety, sustainability, and mission requirements.

5.3.3.7 Explosive Mine Countermeasure and Neutralization Activities

The Navy will continue to implement procedural mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts on marine mammals and sea turtles from explosive mine countermeasure and neutralization activities, as outlined in Table 5-10. The mitigation applies to all explosive mine countermeasure and neutralization activities except those that involve the use of Navy divers, which are discussed in Section 5.3.3.8 (Explosive Mine Neutralization Activities Involving Navy Divers).

The types of charges used in these activities are positively controlled, which means the detonation is controlled by the personnel conducting the activity and is not authorized until the mitigation zone is clear at the time of detonation. In the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, explosive mine countermeasure and neutralization activity mitigation zones were based on net explosive weight and the associated average ranges to PTS. When developing the mitigation for this Final SEIS/OEIS, the Navy analyzed the potential for increasing the size of the mitigation zone. The Navy determined that the current mitigation zone is the largest area within which it is practical to implement mitigation based on the net explosive weights that will be used for this activity under the Proposed Action; therefore, it will continue implementing this same mitigation zone. The post-activity observations are a continuation from the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and will help the Navy determine if any resources were injured during the activity. The Navy will follow the incident reporting procedures outlined in Section 5.1.2.2.3 (Incident Reports) if an incident is detected at any time during the event, including during the post-activity observations.

The Navy is clarifying in the table that it will require observation of the mitigation zone prior to the initial start of the activity to ensure the area is clear of applicable biological resources. The Navy has always verified that the mitigation zone is visually clear prior to conducting explosive activities and is more clearly capturing this current practice in the mitigation measures for this activity. The Navy is adding a requirement that additional platforms already participating in the activity will support observing the mitigation zone before, during, and after the activity while performing their regular duties. When available, having additional personnel support observations of the mitigation zone will help increase the likelihood of detecting biological resources. The small observation area and proximity to the observation

platform will result in a high likelihood that the Lookout will be able to detect marine mammals and sea turtles throughout the mitigation zone (regardless of the type of observation platform used).

Table 5-10: Procedural Mitigation for Explosive Mine Countermeasure and Neutralization Activities

Procedural Mitigation Description
Stressor or Activity • Explosive mine countermeasure and neutralization activities
Resource Protection Focus • Marine mammals • Sea turtles
Number of Lookouts and Observation Platform • 1 Lookout positioned on a vessel or in an aircraft • If additional platforms are participating in the activity, personnel positioned in those assets (e.g., safety observers, evaluators) will support observing the mitigation zone for applicable biological resources while performing their regular duties.
Mitigation Requirements • Mitigation zone: – 600 yd. around the detonation site • Prior to the initial start of the activity (e.g., when maneuvering on station; typically, 10 minutes when the activity involves aircraft that have fuel constraints, or 30 minutes when the activity involves aircraft that are not typically fuel constrained): – Observe the mitigation zone for marine mammals and sea turtles; if observed, relocate or delay the start of detonations. • During the activity: – Observe the mitigation zone for marine mammals and sea turtles; if observed, cease detonations. • Commencement/recommencement conditions after a marine mammal or sea turtle sighting before or during the activity: – The Navy will allow a sighted marine mammal or sea turtle to leave the mitigation zone prior to the initial start of the activity (by delaying the start) or during the activity (by not recommencing detonations) until one of the following conditions has been met: (1) the animal is observed exiting the mitigation zone; (2) the animal is thought to have exited the mitigation zone based on a determination of its course, speed, and movement relative to detonation site; or (3) the mitigation zone has been clear from any additional sightings for 10 minutes when the activity involves aircraft that have fuel constraints, or 30 minutes when the activity involves aircraft that are not typically fuel constrained. • After completion of the activity (typically 10 minutes when the activity involves aircraft that have fuel constraints, or 30 minutes when the activity involves aircraft that are not typically fuel constrained): – Observe the vicinity of where detonations occurred; if any injured or dead marine mammals or ESA-listed species are observed, follow established incident reporting procedures. – If additional platforms are supporting this activity (e.g., providing range clearance), these assets will assist in the visual observation of the area where detonations occurred.

Bin E4 (e.g., 5 lb. net explosive weight charges) has the longest predicted impact ranges for explosives used in the Study Area during mine countermeasures and neutralization activities. The 600 yd. mitigation zone extends beyond the respective ranges to 50 percent non-auditory injury and 50 percent mortality for sea turtles and marine mammals. The mitigation zone extends beyond the respective average ranges to PTS for sea turtles, mid-frequency cetaceans, and low-frequency cetaceans, and into a portion of the average ranges to PTS for high-frequency cetaceans. The mitigation zones also extend beyond or into a portion of the average ranges to TTS for sea turtles and marine mammals. Therefore, depending on the species, mitigation will help avoid or reduce all or a portion of the potential for exposure to mortality, non-auditory injury, PTS, and higher levels of TTS for the largest explosives in bin E4. Smaller explosives within bin E4 have shorter predicted impact ranges; therefore, the mitigation zones will cover a greater portion of the impact ranges for these explosives.

As described previously, the mitigation zone for this activity is based on the largest area within which it is practical for the Navy to implement mitigation. It is not practical to increase the mitigation zone because observations within the margin of increase would be unsafe and ineffective unless the Navy

allocated additional platforms to the activity to observe for biological resources. The use of additional personnel and equipment (e.g., small boats, aircraft) would be unsustainable due to increased operational costs and an exceedance of available manpower and resources for this activity. Adding aircraft to observe the mitigation zone could result in airspace conflicts with the event participants. This would either require the aircraft conducting the activity to modify their flight plans (which would reduce activity realism) or force the observing aircraft to position itself a safe distance away from the activity area (which would decrease observation effectiveness). Adding vessels to observe the mitigation zone would increase safety risks due to the presence observation vessels within the vicinity of detonations.

Increasing the mitigation zone size would result in a larger area over which firing would need to be ceased in response to a sighting, and therefore would likely increase the number of times detonations would be ceased and would extend the length of the activity. These impacts would significantly diminish realism in a way that would prevent the activity from meeting its intended objectives. For example, Mine Neutralization – Remotely Operated Vehicle Sonar training exercises require focused situational awareness of the activity area and continuous coordination of tactics between ship, small boat, and rotary-wing aircraft crews to locate and neutralize mines. During Mine Countermeasure and Neutralization Testing events, personnel evaluate the system's ability to detect and destroy mines from an airborne mine countermeasures-capable rotary-wing aircraft in advance of delivery to the fleet for operational use. Extending the length of these activities would require aircraft to depart the activity area to refuel. If multiple refueling events were required, the length of the activity would be extended by two to five times or more. This would decrease the ability for Lookouts to safely and effectively maintain situational awareness of the activity area and would increase safety risks due to increased pilot fatigue and accelerated fatigue-life of aircraft.

These types of impacts would result in a significant loss of training or testing time (which would reduce the number of opportunities that platforms have to locate and neutralize mines and reduce the Navy's ability to validate whether mine neutralization systems perform as expected) and cause a significant delay to the training or testing schedule. Therefore, an increase in mitigation would impede the ability for the Navy to train and become proficient in using mine neutralization systems as required during military missions and combat operations, would prevent units from meeting their individual training and certification requirements (which would prevent them from deploying with the required level of readiness necessary to accomplish their missions), and would impede the ability of program managers and weapons system acquisition programs to meet testing requirements per required acquisition milestones or on an as-needed basis to meet operational requirements. Extending the length of the activities would also result in additional operational costs due to increased fuel consumption.

In summary, the operational community determined that implementing procedural mitigation for explosive mine countermeasure and neutralization activities beyond what is detailed in Table 5-10 would be incompatible with the practicality assessment criteria for safety, sustainability, and mission requirements.

5.3.3.8 Explosive Mine Neutralization Activities Involving Navy Divers

The Navy will continue to implement procedural mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts on marine mammals and sea turtles from explosive mine neutralization activities involving Navy divers as outlined in Table 5-11.

Table 5-11: Procedural Mitigation for Explosive Mine Neutralization Activities Involving Navy Divers

Procedural Mitigation Description
Stressor or Activity • Explosive mine neutralization activities involving Navy divers
Resource Protection Focus • Marine mammals • Sea turtles • Fish (hammerhead sharks and manta rays of any species due to the difficulty of differentiating species)
Number of Lookouts and Observation Platform • 2 Lookouts (two small boats with one Lookout each, or one Lookout on a small boat and one in a rotary-wing aircraft) when implementing the smaller mitigation zone • 4 Lookouts (two small boats with two Lookouts each), and a pilot or member of an aircrew will serve as an additional Lookout if aircraft are used during the activity, when implementing the larger mitigation zone • All divers placing the charges on mines will support the Lookouts while performing their regular duties and will report applicable sightings to their supporting small boat or Range Safety Officer. • If additional platforms are participating in the activity, personnel positioned in those assets (e.g., safety observers, evaluators) will support observing the mitigation zone for applicable biological resources while performing their regular duties.
Mitigation Requirements • Mitigation zones: – For Lookouts on small boats or aircraft: 500 yd. around the detonation site during activities under positive control – For Lookouts on small boats or aircraft: 1,000 yd. around the detonation site during activities using time-delay fuses – For divers: The underwater detonation location, which is defined as the sea space within the divers' range of visibility but no further than the mitigation zone specified for Lookouts on small boats or aircraft (500 yd. or 1,000 yd. depending on the charge type) • Prior to the initial start of the activity (e.g., when maneuvering on station for activities under positive control; 30 minutes for activities using time-delay firing devices): – Lookouts on small boats or aircraft will observe the mitigation zone for marine mammals, sea turtles, hammerhead sharks, and manta rays; if observed, the Navy will relocate or delay the start of detonations or fuse initiation. • During the activity: – Lookouts on small boats or aircraft will observe the mitigation zone for marine mammals, sea turtles, hammerhead sharks, and manta rays; if observed, the Navy will cease detonations or fuse initiation. – While performing their normal duties, divers will observe the underwater detonation location for marine mammals, sea turtles, hammerhead sharks, and manta rays. Divers will notify their supporting small boat or Range Safety Officer of marine mammal, sea turtle, hammerhead shark, and manta ray sightings at the underwater detonation location; if observed, the Navy will cease detonations or fuse initiation. – To the maximum extent practicable depending on mission requirements, safety, and environmental conditions, boats will position themselves near the mid-point of the mitigation zone radius (but outside of the detonation plume and human safety zone), will position themselves on opposite sides of the detonation location (when two boats are used), and will travel in a circular pattern around the detonation location with one Lookout observing inward toward the detonation site and the other observing outward toward the perimeter of the mitigation zone. – If used, aircraft will travel in a circular pattern around the detonation location to the maximum extent practicable. – The Navy will not set time-delay firing devices to exceed 10 minutes. • Commencement/recommencement conditions after a marine mammal, sea turtle, hammerhead shark, or manta ray sighting before or during the activity: – The Navy will allow a sighted marine mammal, sea turtle, hammerhead shark, or manta ray to leave the underwater detonation location or mitigation zone (as applicable) prior to the initial start of the activity (by delaying the start) or during the activity (by not commencing detonations or fuse initiation) until one of the following conditions has been met: (1) the animal is observed exiting the 500 yd. or 1,000 yd. mitigation zone; (2) the animal is thought to have exited the 500 yd. or 1,000 yd. mitigation zone based on a determination of its course, speed, and movement relative to the detonation site; or (3) the 500 yd. or 1,000 yd. mitigation zones (for Lookouts on small boats or aircraft) and the underwater detonation location (for divers) have been clear from any additional sightings for 10 minutes during activities under positive control with aircraft that have fuel constraints, or 30 minutes during activities under positive control with aircraft that are not typically fuel constrained and during activities using time-delay firing devices.

Table 5-11: Procedural Mitigation for Explosive Mine Neutralization Activities Involving Navy Divers (continued)

Procedural Mitigation Description
• After completion of an activity (for 30 minutes): – Observe the vicinity of where detonations occurred; if any injured or dead marine mammals, sea turtles, hammerhead sharks, or manta rays are observed, follow established incident reporting procedures. – If additional platforms are supporting this activity (e.g., providing range clearance), these assets will assist in the visual observation of the area where detonations occurred.

Navy divers participating in these activities may be explosive ordnance disposal personnel. In the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, the mitigation zones for explosive mine neutralization activities involving Navy divers were based on net explosive weight and the associated average ranges to PTS. When developing the mitigation for this Final SEIS/OEIS, the Navy analyzed the potential for increasing the size of the marine mammal and sea turtle mitigation zones. The Navy identified an opportunity to increase the mitigation zone size for positive control charges in bin E4 or below to enhance protections of marine mammals and sea turtles to the maximum extent practicable and for consistency across activities. The mitigation zones for explosive mine neutralization activities involving the use of Navy divers are now based on the largest areas within which it is practical to implement mitigation. Additionally, during the ESA consultation process, the Navy worked collaboratively with NMFS to enhance mitigation for ESA-listed scalloped hammerhead sharks and to develop new mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts on ESA-listed giant manta rays. The post-activity observations are largely a continuation from the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, with a new requirement to observe for manta rays. These post-activity observations will help the Navy determine if any resources were injured during the activity. The Navy will follow the incident reporting procedures outlined in Section 5.1.2.2.3 (Incident Reports) if an incident is detected at any time during the event, including during the post-activity observations.

The Navy is clarifying in the table that it will require observation of the mitigation zone prior to the initial start of the activity to ensure the area is clear of applicable biological resources. The Navy has always verified that the mitigation zone is visually clear prior to conducting explosive activities and is more clearly capturing this current practice in the mitigation measures for this activity. The Navy is adding a requirement that additional platforms already participating in the activity will support observing the mitigation zone before, during, and after the activity while performing their regular duties. When available, having additional personnel support observations of the mitigation zone will help increase the likelihood of detecting biological resources.

The charges used during explosive mine neutralization activities involving Navy divers are either positively controlled or initiated using a time-delay fuse. Positive control means the detonation is controlled by the personnel conducting the activity and is not authorized until the area is clear at the time of detonation. Time-delay means the detonation is fused with a specified time-delay by the personnel conducting the activity and is not authorized until the area is clear at the time the fuse is initiated but cannot be terminated once the fuse is initiated due to human safety concerns.

For activities using a time-delay fuse (which have a maximum charge size of 20 lb. net explosive weight), there is a remote chance that animals could swim into the mitigation zone after the fuse has been initiated. The Navy established a mitigation measure to set time-delay firing devices not to exceed 10 minutes to limit the potential time that animals have to swim into the mitigation zone after fuse initiation. During activities under positive control, the Navy can cease detonations at any time in

response to a sighting of a marine mammal or sea turtle. For this reason, all activities using a time-delay fuse will implement the 1,000 yd. mitigation zone, while activities that are under positive control will implement the 500 yd. mitigation zone.

For the 500 yd. mitigation zone, the small observation area and proximity to observation platforms will result in a high likelihood that Lookouts will be able to detect marine mammals and sea turtles throughout the mitigation zone. For the 1,000 yd. mitigation zone, the use of two additional Lookouts increases the likelihood that Lookouts will be able to detect marine mammals and sea turtles across the larger observation area. Due to their low vantage point on the water, Lookouts in small boats will be more likely to detect large visual cues (e.g., whale blows or large pods of dolphins) or the splashes of individual marine mammals than cryptic marine mammal species and sea turtles near the perimeter of the 1,000 yd. mitigation zone. When rotary-wing aircraft are used, Lookouts positioned in an aircraft will have a good vantage point for observing out to the perimeter of the 500 yd. and 1,000 yd. mitigation zones. The additional mitigation within the Mariana Islands Range Complex will help the Navy avoid or reduce potential impacts on ESA-listed scalloped hammerhead sharks and giant manta rays.

Bin E6 (e.g., 20 lb. net explosive weight) has the longest predicted impact ranges for the time-delay explosives that apply to the 1,000 yd. mitigation zone. Bin E6 also has the longest predicted impact ranges for the positive control explosives that apply to the 500 yd. mitigation zone. The 1,000 yd. and 500 yd. mitigation zones extend beyond the respective ranges to 50 percent non-auditory injury and 50 percent mortality for sea turtles and marine mammals. For time-delay charges, the 1,000 yd. mitigation zone extends beyond the average ranges to PTS for sea turtles, mid-frequency cetaceans, and low-frequency cetaceans, and into a portion of the average range to PTS for high-frequency cetaceans. For positive control charges, the 500 yd. mitigation zone extends beyond the average ranges to PTS for sea turtles and mid-frequency cetaceans, and into a portion of the average ranges to PTS for high-frequency cetaceans and low-frequency cetaceans. The mitigation zones also extend beyond or into a portion of the average ranges to TTS for sea turtles and marine mammals. Therefore, depending on the species, mitigation will help avoid or reduce all or a portion of the potential for exposure to mortality, non-auditory injury, PTS, and higher levels of TTS for the largest explosives in bin E6. Smaller explosives within bin E6 and explosives in smaller source bins (e.g., E5) have shorter predicted impact ranges; therefore, the mitigation zones will cover a greater portion of the impact ranges for these explosives.

As described previously, the mitigation zones developed for this Final SEIS/OEIS are based on the largest areas within which it is practical for the Navy to implement mitigation. It is not practical to increase these mitigation zones because observations within the margin of increase would be unsafe and ineffective unless the Navy allocated additional platforms to the activity to observe for biological resources. Because mine neutralization activities involve training Navy divers in the safe handling of explosive charges, one of the mission-essential safety protocols required of all event participants, including Lookouts, is to maintain focus on the activity area to ensure safety of personnel and equipment. The typical mine neutralization activity areas coincide with the mitigation zone sizes developed for this Final SEIS/OEIS; therefore, Lookouts can safely and effectively observe the mitigation zones for biological resources while simultaneously maintaining focus on the activity areas. However, if the mitigation zone sizes increased, Lookouts would need to redirect their attention beyond the activity areas. This would not meet the safety criteria since personnel would be required to direct their attention away from mission requirements. Alternatively, the Navy would need to add personnel to serve as additional Lookouts on the existing observation platforms or allocate additional platforms to

the activity to observe for biological resources. These actions would not be safe or sustainable due to an exceedance of manpower, resource, and space restrictions for these activities.

Increasing the mitigation zone sizes would result in larger areas over which detonations would need to be ceased in response to a sighting, and therefore would likely increase the number of times detonations would be ceased. This would extend the length of the activities and cause significant safety risks for Navy divers and loss of training time. Ceasing an activity (e.g., fuse initiation) with divers in the water would have safety implications for diver air consumption and bottom time. It would also impede the ability for Navy divers to complete the training exercise with the focused endurance as required during military missions and combat operations. These impacts would significantly diminish event realism in a way that would prevent activities from meeting their intended objectives. For example, the number of opportunities that divers would have to locate and neutralize mines would be reduced. Divers would then not be able to gain skill proficiency in precise identification and evaluation of a threat mine, safe handling of explosive material during charge placement, and effective charge detonation or fuse initiation. Mine neutralization activities involving the use of Navy divers only take place during daylight hours for safety reasons; therefore, extending the length of the activity could delay the activity into the next day or next several days, which would significantly impact training schedules for all participating platforms. Therefore, an increase in mitigation would impede the ability for Navy divers to train and become proficient in mine neutralization and would prevent units from meeting their individual training and certification requirements (which would prevent them from deploying with the required level of readiness necessary to accomplish their missions).

For activities that involve aircraft, extending the length of the activity would require aircraft to depart the area to refuel. If multiple refueling events were required, the length of the activity would be extended by two to five times or more, which would decrease the ability for Lookouts to safely and effectively maintain situational awareness of the activity area and increase safety risks due to increased pilot fatigue and accelerated fatigue-life of aircraft. Extending the length of the activity would also result in additional operational costs due to increased fuel consumption.

In summary, the operational community determined that implementing procedural mitigation for explosive mine neutralization activities involving Navy divers beyond what is detailed in Table 5-11 would be incompatible with the practicality assessment criteria for safety, sustainability, and mission requirements.

5.3.3.9 Maritime Security Operations – Anti-Swimmer Grenades

The Navy will continue to implement procedural mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts on marine mammals and sea turtles from anti-swimmer grenades during Maritime Security Operations, as outlined in Table 5-12.

In the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, the Maritime Security Operations – Anti-Swimmer Grenade mitigation zone was based on net explosive weight and the associated average ranges to PTS. When developing the mitigation for this Final SEIS/OEIS, the Navy analyzed the potential for increasing the size of the mitigation zone. The Navy determined that the current mitigation zone is the largest area within which it is practical to implement mitigation for this activity; therefore, it will continue implementing this same mitigation zone under the Proposed Action. The Navy is clarifying in the table that it will require observation of the mitigation zone prior to the initial start of the activity to ensure the area is clear of applicable biological resources. The Navy has always verified that the mitigation zone is visually clear

prior to conducting explosive activities and is more clearly capturing this current practice in the mitigation measures for this activity.

Table 5-12: Procedural Mitigation for Maritime Security Operations – Anti-Swimmer Grenades

Procedural Mitigation Description
Stressor or Activity • Maritime Security Operations – Anti-Swimmer Grenades
Resource Protection Focus • Marine mammals • Sea turtles
Number of Lookouts and Observation Platform • 1 Lookout positioned on the small boat conducting the activity • If additional platforms are participating in the activity, personnel positioned in those assets (e.g., safety observers, evaluators) will support observing the mitigation zone for applicable biological resources while performing their regular duties.
Mitigation Requirements • Mitigation zone: – 200 yd. around the intended detonation location • Prior to the initial start of the activity (e.g., when maneuvering on station): – Observe the mitigation zone for marine mammals and sea turtles; if observed, relocate or delay the start of detonations. • During the activity: – Observe the mitigation zone for marine mammals and sea turtles; if observed, cease detonations. • Commencement/recommencement conditions after a marine mammal or sea turtle sighting before or during the activity: – The Navy will allow a sighted marine mammal or sea turtle to leave the mitigation zone prior to the initial start of the activity (by delaying the start) or during the activity (by not recommencing detonations) until one of the following conditions has been met: (1) the animal is observed exiting the mitigation zone; (2) the animal is thought to have exited the mitigation zone based on a determination of its course, speed, and movement relative to the intended detonation location; (3) the mitigation zone has been clear from any additional sightings for 30 minutes; or (4) the intended detonation location has transited a distance equal to double that of the mitigation zone size beyond the location of the last sighting. • After completion of the activity (e.g., prior to maneuvering off station): – When practical (e.g., when platforms are not constrained by fuel restrictions or mission-essential follow-on commitments), observe the vicinity of where detonations occurred; if any injured or dead marine mammals or ESA-listed species are observed, follow established incident reporting procedures. – If additional platforms are supporting this activity (e.g., providing range clearance), these assets will assist in the visual observation of the area where detonations occurred.

The Navy developed a new mitigation measure requiring the Lookout to observe the mitigation zone after completion of the activity. In accordance with the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS consultation requirements, the Navy currently conducts post-activity observations for some, but not all explosive activities. In developing mitigation for this Final SEIS/OEIS, the Navy determined that it could expand this requirement to other explosive activities for enhanced consistency and to help determine if any resources were injured during explosive events, when practical. The Navy is adding a requirement that additional platforms already participating in the activity will support observing the mitigation zone before, during, and after the activity while performing their regular duties. When available, having additional personnel support observations of the mitigation zone will help increase the likelihood of detecting biological resources. The Navy will follow the incident reporting procedures outlined in Section 5.1.2.2.3 (Incident Reports) if an incident is detected at any time during the event, including during the post-activity observations. The small mitigation zone size and proximity to the observation platform result in a high likelihood that Lookouts will be able to detect marine mammals and sea turtles throughout the mitigation zone.

Explosives used during Maritime Security Operations – Anti-Swimmer Grenades exercises are in bin E2 (e.g., 0.5 lb. net explosive weight). The mitigation zone extends beyond the ranges to 50 percent non-auditory injury and 50 percent mortality for sea turtles and marine mammals. The mitigation zone extends beyond the average ranges to PTS for sea turtles, mid-frequency cetaceans, and low-frequency cetaceans, and into a portion of the average range to PTS for high-frequency cetaceans. The mitigation zone also extends beyond or into a portion of the average ranges to TTS for sea turtles and marine mammals. Therefore, mitigation will help avoid or reduce all or a portion of the potential for exposure to mortality, non-auditory injury, PTS, and higher levels of TTS for the largest explosives in bin E2.

As described previously, the mitigation zone developed for this Final SEIS/OEIS is based on the largest area within which it is practical for the Navy to implement mitigation. It is not practical to increase the mitigation zone because observations within the margin of increase would be unsafe and ineffective. Because this activity involves training crews in the safe handling of explosive hand grenades, one of the mission-essential safety protocols required of all event participants, including the Lookout, is to maintain focus on the activity area to ensure safety of personnel and equipment. The typical activity area coincides with the mitigation zone; therefore, the Lookout can safely and effectively observe the mitigation zone for biological resources while simultaneously maintaining focus on the activity area. However, if the mitigation zone size increased, the Lookout would need to redirect attention to observe beyond the activity area. This would not meet the safety criteria since personnel would be required to direct their attention away from mission requirements. Alternatively, the Navy would need to either add personnel to serve as additional Lookouts on the existing observation platform or allocate additional platforms to the activity to observe for biological resources. These actions would not be safe or sustainable due an exceedance of manpower, resource, and space restrictions for this activity.

In summary, the operational community determined that implementing procedural mitigation for Maritime Security Operations – Anti-Swimmer Grenades beyond what is detailed in Table 5-12 would be incompatible with the practicality assessment criteria for safety and sustainability.

5.3.4 Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors

The Navy will implement procedural mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts on biological resources from the physical disturbance and strike stressors or activities discussed in the sections below. Section 3.4.2.4 (Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors) and Section 3.5.2.4 (Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors) provide a full analysis of the potential impacts of physical disturbance and strikes on marine mammals and sea turtles, respectively.

5.3.4.1 Vessel Movement

The Navy will continue to implement procedural mitigation to avoid or reduce the potential for vessel strikes of marine mammals and sea turtles, as outlined in Table 5-13.

Table 5-13: Procedural Mitigation for Vessel Movement

Procedural Mitigation Description
Stressor or Activity • Vessel movement – The mitigation will not be applied if: (1) the vessel's safety is threatened, (2) the vessel is restricted in its ability to maneuver (e.g., during launching and recovery of aircraft or landing craft, during towing activities, when mooring, etc.), (3) the vessel is submerged or operated autonomously, or (4) when impractical based on mission requirements (e.g., during Amphibious Assault and Amphibious Raid exercises).
Resource Protection Focus • Marine mammals • Sea turtles
Number of Lookouts and Observation Platform • 1 Lookout on the vessel that is underway
Mitigation Requirements • Mitigation zones: – 500 yd. around whales – 200 yd. around other marine mammals (except bow-riding dolphins) – Within the vicinity of sea turtles • During the activity: – When underway, observe the mitigation zone for marine mammals and sea turtles; if observed, maneuver to maintain distance. • Additional requirements: – Within the designated vessel traffic lane during Amphibious Assault and Amphibious Raid exercises, while underway, observe for sea turtles; if observed, cease beach approach. To allow a sighted sea turtle to leave the designated vessel traffic lanes, the Navy will not recommence the beach approach until one of the recommencement conditions has been met: (1) the animal is observed exiting the designated vessel traffic lane; (2) the animal is thought to have exited the designated vessel traffic lane based on a determination of its course, speed, and movement relative to the intended impact location; or (3) the designated vessel traffic lane has been clear from any additional sightings for 30 minutes. – If a marine mammal or sea turtle vessel strike occurs, the Navy will follow the established incident reporting procedures.

The procedural mitigation measures for vessel movement are a continuation from the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS based on the largest areas within which it is practical for the Navy to implement mitigation and guidance from NMFS for vessel strike avoidance. Although the Navy is unable to position Lookouts on unmanned vessels, as a standard operating procedure, some vessels that operate autonomously have embedded sensors that aid in avoidance of large objects. The embedded sensors may help those unmanned vessels avoid vessel strikes of marine mammals.

As discussed in Section 5.3.1 (Environmental Awareness and Education), it is likely that the implementation of the Marine Species Awareness Training starting in 2007, and the additional U.S. Navy Afloat Environmental Compliance Training Series modules starting in 2014, potentially helped contribute to the lack of vessel strikes of marine mammals in the Study Area. The Navy is able to detect if a whale is struck due to the diligence of standard watch personnel and Lookouts stationed specifically to observe for marine mammals while a vessel is underway. In the unlikely event that a vessel strike of a marine mammal occurs, the Navy will notify the appropriate regulatory agency immediately or as soon as operational security considerations allow per the established incident reporting procedures described in Section 5.1.2.2.3 (Incident Reports). The Navy's incident reports include relevant information pertaining to the incident, including but not limited to vessel speed.

The small mitigation zone sizes and close proximity to the observation platform will result in a high likelihood that Lookouts will be able to detect marine mammals throughout the mitigation zones while vessels are underway. A mitigation zone size is not specified for sea turtles to allow flexibility based on vessel type and mission requirements (e.g., small boats operating in a narrow harbor). Observation for

sea turtles in the designated vessel traffic lanes during Amphibious Assault and Amphibious Raid exercises will help the Navy avoid striking sea turtles in these nearshore environments.

As described in Section 5.1.1 (Vessel Safety) of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, Navy vessels are required to operate in accordance with applicable navigation rules. Applicable rules include the Inland Navigation Rules (33 Code of Federal Regulations 83) and International Regulations for Preventing Collisions at Sea (72 COLREGS), which were formalized in the Convention on the International Regulations for Preventing Collisions at Sea, 1972. These rules require that vessels proceed at a safe speed so proper and effective action can be taken to avoid collision and so vessels can be stopped within a distance appropriate to the prevailing circumstances and conditions. In addition to complying with navigation requirements, Navy ships transit at speeds that are optimal for fuel conservation, to maintain ship schedules, and to meet mission requirements. Vessel captains use the totality of the circumstances to ensure the vessel is traveling at appropriate speeds in accordance with navigation rules. Depending on the circumstances, this may involve adjusting speeds during periods of reduced visibility or in certain locations.

As discussed in Section 3.0.5.2.3.2 (Vessels) of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, large Navy ships typically operate at average speeds of between 10 and 15 knots, which for reference is slower than large commercial vessels, such as container ships that steam at approximately 24 knots during normal operations (Maloni et al., 2013). Operating vessels at speeds that are not optimal for fuel conservation or mission requirements would be unsustainable due to increased time on station and increased fuel consumption. Each ship has a limited amount of time that it can be underway based on target service requirements and ship schedules. Ship schedules are driven largely by training cycles, scheduled maintenance periods, certification schedules, and deployment requirements. Because of the complex logistical considerations involved with maintaining ship schedules, the Navy does not have the flexibility to extend the amount of time that ships are underway, which would result from vessel speed restriction mitigation.

Navy vessel operators need to train to proficiently operate vessels as they would during military missions and combat operations, including being able to react to changing tactical situations and evaluate system capabilities. For example, during training activities involving flight operations from an aircraft carrier, the vessel must maintain a certain wind speed over the deck to launch or recover aircraft. Depending on wind conditions, the aircraft carrier itself must travel at a certain speed to generate the wind required to launch or recover aircraft. Implementing vessel speed restrictions would increase safety risks for Navy personnel and equipment and the public during the training event and would reduce skill proficiency in a way that would increase safety risks during military missions and combat operations. Furthermore, vessel speed restrictions would not allow the Navy to continue meeting its training requirements due to diminished realism of training exercises.

The Navy needs to test the full range of its vessel and system capabilities to ensure safety and functionality in conditions analogous to military missions and combat operations. For example, during non-explosive torpedo testing activities, the Navy must operate its vessels using speeds typical of military missions and combat operations to accurately test the functionality of its acoustic countermeasures and torpedo systems during firing. Vessel speed restrictions would not allow the Navy to continue meeting its testing program requirements due to diminished realism of testing events. Researchers, program managers, and weapons system acquisition programs would be unable to conduct accurate acoustic research to meet research objectives and effectively test vessels and vessel-deployed systems and platforms before full-scale production or delivery to the fleet. Such testing is required to

ensure functionality and accuracy in military mission and combat conditions per required acquisition milestones or on an as-needed basis to meet operational requirements.

In summary, the operational community determined that implementing procedural mitigation for vessel movements beyond what is detailed in Table 5-13 would be incompatible with the practicality assessment criteria for safety, sustainability, and mission requirements.

5.3.4.2 Towed In-Water Devices

The Navy will continue to implement procedural mitigation to avoid or reduce the potential for strike of marine mammals and sea turtles from towed in-water devices, as outlined in Table 5-14. Vessels involved in towing in-water devices will implement the mitigation described in Section 5.3.4.1 (Vessel Movement), in addition to the mitigation outlined in Table 5-14.

Table 5-14: Procedural Mitigation for Towed In-Water Devices

Procedural Mitigation Description
Stressor or Activity • Towed in-water devices – Mitigation applies to devices that are towed from a manned surface platform or manned aircraft – The mitigation will not be applied if the safety of the towing platform or in-water device is threatened
Resource Protection Focus • Marine mammals • Sea turtles
Number of Lookouts and Observation Platform • 1 Lookout positioned on the manned towing platform
Mitigation Requirements • Mitigation zones: – 250 yd. around marine mammals – Within the vicinity of sea turtles • During the activity (i.e., when towing an in-water device): – Observe the mitigation zone for marine mammals and sea turtles; if observed, maneuver to maintain distance.

The mitigation zones for towed in-water devices are a continuation from the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS based on the largest area within which it is practical for the Navy to implement mitigation. The small mitigation zone size and proximity to the observation platform will result in a high likelihood that Lookouts will be able to detect marine mammals throughout the mitigation zone when manned vessels or manned aircraft are towing in-water devices. A mitigation zone size is not specified for sea turtles to allow flexibility based on towing platform type and mission requirements (e.g., small boats operating in a narrow harbor).

Mission and safety requirements determine the operational parameters (e.g., course, speed) for in-water device towing platforms. Towed in-water devices must be towed at certain speeds and water depths for stability, which are controlled in part by the towing platform's speed and directional movements. Because these devices are towed and not self-propelled, they generally have limited maneuverability and are not able to make immediate course corrections. For example, during a Mine Countermeasure – Towed Mine Neutralization activity using rotary-wing aircraft, towed devices are used to trigger mines and perform various other functions, such as detaching floating moored mines. A high degree of pilot skill is required in deploying devices, safely towing them at relatively low speeds and altitudes, and then recovering devices. The aircraft can safely alter course to shift the route of the towed device in response to a sighted marine mammal or sea turtle up to a certain extent (i.e., up to the size of the mitigation zone) while still maintaining the parameters needed for stable towing. However, the

aircraft would be unable to further alter its course to more drastically course-correct the towed device without decreasing towing stability, which would have implications for safety of personnel and equipment.

In summary, the operational community determined that implementing procedural mitigation for towed in-water devices beyond what is detailed in Table 5-14 would be incompatible with the practicality assessment criteria for safety.

5.3.4.3 Small-, Medium-, and Large-Caliber Non-Explosive Practice Munitions

The Navy will continue to implement procedural mitigation to avoid or reduce the potential for strike of marine mammals and sea turtles from small-, medium-, and large-caliber non-explosive practice munitions, as outlined in Table 5-15.

Table 5-15: Procedural Mitigation for Small-, Medium-, and Large-Caliber Non-Explosive Practice Munitions

Procedural Mitigation Description
Stressor or Activity • Gunnery activities using small-, medium-, and large-caliber non-explosive practice munitions – Mitigation applies to activities using a surface target
Resource Protection Focus • Marine mammals • Sea turtles
Number of Lookouts and Observation Platform • 1 Lookout positioned on the platform conducting the activity – Depending on the activity, the Lookout could be the same as the one described in Section 5.3.2.2 (Weapons Firing Noise)
Mitigation Requirements • Mitigation zone: – 200 yd. around the intended impact location • Prior to the initial start of the activity (e.g., when maneuvering on station): – Observe the mitigation zone for marine mammals and sea turtles; if observed, relocate or delay the start of firing. • During the activity: – Observe the mitigation zone for marine mammals and sea turtles; if observed, cease firing. • Commencement/recommencement conditions after a marine mammal or sea turtle sighting before or during the activity: – The Navy will allow a sighted marine mammal or sea turtle to leave the mitigation zone prior to the initial start of the activity (by delaying the start) or during the activity (by not recommencing firing) until one of the following conditions has been met: (1) the animal is observed exiting the mitigation zone; (2) the animal is thought to have exited the mitigation zone based on a determination of its course, speed, and movement relative to the intended impact location; (3) the mitigation zone has been clear from any additional sightings for 10 minutes for aircraft-based firing or 30 minutes for vessel-based firing; or (4) for activities using a mobile target, the intended impact location has transited a distance equal to double that of the mitigation zone size beyond the location of the last sighting.

The mitigation zone is conservatively designed to be several times larger than the impact footprint for large-caliber non-explosive practice munitions, which are the largest projectiles used for these activities. Small-caliber and medium-caliber non-explosive practice munitions have smaller impact footprints than large-caliber non-explosive practice munitions; therefore, the mitigation zone will extend even further beyond the impact footprints for these smaller projectiles.

Large-caliber gunnery activities involve vessels firing projectiles at a target located up to 6 NM down range. Small- and medium-caliber gunnery activities involve vessels or aircraft firing projectiles at targets located up to 4,000 yd. down range, although typically much closer. Lookouts will have a better likelihood of detecting marine mammals and sea turtles when observing mitigation zones around targets located close to the firing platform. When observing activities that use a target located far from the

firing platform, Lookouts will be more likely to detect large visual cues (e.g., whale blows or large pods of dolphins) than individual marine mammals, cryptic marine mammal species, and sea turtles. Positioning additional observers closer to the targets would increase safety risks because these platforms would be located in the vicinity of an intended impact location or in the path of a projectile.

5.3.4.4 Non-Explosive Missiles and Rockets

The Navy will continue to implement procedural mitigation to avoid or reduce the potential for strike of marine mammals and sea turtles from non-explosive missiles and rockets, as outlined in Table 5-16.

Table 5-16: Procedural Mitigation for Non-Explosive Missiles and Rockets

Procedural Mitigation Description
Stressor or Activity • Aircraft-deployed non-explosive missiles and rockets – Mitigation applies to activities using a surface target
Resource Protection Focus • Marine mammals • Sea turtles
Number of Lookouts and Observation Platform • 1 Lookout positioned in an aircraft
Mitigation Requirements • Mitigation zone: – 900 yd. around the intended impact location • Prior to the initial start of the activity (e.g., during a fly-over of the mitigation zone): – Observe the mitigation zone for marine mammals and sea turtles; if observed, relocate or delay the start of firing. • During the activity: – Observe the mitigation zone for marine mammals and sea turtles; if observed, cease firing. • Commencement/recommencement conditions after a marine mammal or sea turtle sighting prior to or during the activity: – The Navy will allow a sighted marine mammal or sea turtle to leave the mitigation zone prior to the initial start of the activity (by delaying the start) or during the activity (by not recommencing firing) until one of the following conditions has been met: (1) the animal is observed exiting the mitigation zone; (2) the animal is thought to have exited the mitigation zone based on a determination of its course, speed, and movement relative to the intended impact location; or (3) the mitigation zone has been clear from any additional sightings for 10 minutes when the activity involves aircraft that have fuel constraints, or 30 minutes when the activity involves aircraft that are not typically fuel constrained.

The mitigation zone for non-explosive missiles and rockets is conservatively designed to be several times larger than the impact footprint for the largest non-explosive missile used for these activities. Smaller non-explosive missiles and non-explosive rockets have smaller impact footprints than the largest non-explosive missile used for these activities; therefore, the mitigation zone will extend even further beyond the impact footprints for these smaller projectiles.

Mitigation applies to activities using non-explosive missiles or rockets fired from aircraft at targets that are typically located up to 15 NM down range, and infrequently up to 75 NM down range. There is a chance that animals could enter the mitigation zone after the aircraft conducts its close-range mitigation zone observations and before firing begins (once the aircraft has transited to its firing position). Due to the distance between the mitigation zone and the observation platform, Lookouts will have a better likelihood of detecting marine mammals and sea turtles during the close-range observations and are less likely to detect these resources once positioned at the firing location, particularly individual marine mammals, cryptic marine mammal species, and sea turtles. The mitigation only applies to aircraft-deployed missiles and rockets for the reasons discussed in Section 5.3.3.4 (Explosive Missiles and Rockets). Positioning additional observers closer to the targets would increase safety risks because

these platforms would be located in the vicinity of an intended impact location or in the path of a projectile.

5.3.4.5 Non-Explosive Bombs and Mine Shapes

The Navy will continue to implement procedural mitigation to avoid or reduce the potential for strike of marine mammals and sea turtles from non-explosive bombs and mine shapes, as outlined in Table 5-17.

Table 5-17: Procedural Mitigation for Non-Explosive Bombs and Mine Shapes

Procedural Mitigation Description
Stressor or Activity • Non-explosive bombs • Non-explosive mine shapes during mine laying activities
Resource Protection Focus • Marine mammals • Sea turtles
Number of Lookouts and Observation Platform • 1 Lookout positioned in an aircraft
Mitigation Requirements • Mitigation zone: – 1,000 yd. around the intended target • Prior to the initial start of the activity (e.g., when arriving on station): – Observe the mitigation zone for marine mammals and sea turtles; if observed, relocate or delay start of bomb deployment or mine laying. • During the activity (e.g., during approach of the target or intended minefield location): – Observe the mitigation zone for marine mammals and sea turtles; if observed, cease bomb deployment or mine laying. • Commencement/recommencement conditions after a marine mammal or sea turtle sighting prior to or during the activity: – The Navy will allow a sighted marine mammal or sea turtle to leave the mitigation zone prior to the initial start of the activity (by delaying the start) or during the activity (by not recommencing bomb deployment or mine laying) until one of the following conditions has been met: (1) the animal is observed exiting the mitigation zone; (2) the animal is thought to have exited the mitigation zone based on a determination of its course, speed, and movement relative to the intended target or minefield location; (3) the mitigation zone has been clear from any additional sightings for 10 minutes; or (4) for activities using mobile targets, the intended target has transited a distance equal to double that of the mitigation zone size beyond the location of the last sighting.

The mitigation zone for non-explosive bombs and mine shapes is conservatively designed to be several times larger than the impact footprint for the largest non-explosive bomb used for these activities. Smaller non-explosive bombs and mine shapes have smaller impact footprints than the largest non-explosive bomb used for these activities; therefore, the mitigation zone will extend even further beyond the impact footprints for these smaller military expended materials.

Activities involving non-explosive bombing and mine laying involve aircraft deploying munitions or mine shapes from a relatively steady altitude of approximately 1,500 ft. at a surface target or in an intended minefield located beneath the aircraft. Due to the mitigation zone size, proximity to the observation platform, and the good vantage point from an aircraft, Lookouts will be able to observe the entire mitigation zone during approach of the target or intended minefield location.

5.4 At-Sea Mitigation Areas to be Implemented

As a result of the Navy's biological effectiveness and operational assessments, the Navy developed mitigation areas at sea in the MITT Study Area, as summarized in the sections below. Additional details, including the complete biological effectiveness and operational assessments for each area developed for marine mammals and sea turtles, are provided in Appendix I (Geographic Mitigation Assessment).

5.4.1 Mitigation Areas for Seafloor Resources

As outlined in Table 5-18, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from explosives and physical disturbance and strike stressors on submerged cultural resources (i.e., shipwrecks), sensitive seafloor resources, and any biological resources that inhabit, shelter, rest, feed, or occur in the mitigation areas. These mitigation areas are particularly important to one or more resources for a biologically important ecological function (e.g., live hard bottom habitat and artificial reefs that provide critical ecosystem functions).

The seafloor resource mitigation is a continuation from the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Without this mitigation, explosives and physical disturbance and strike stressors could potentially impact shallow-water coral reefs, live hard bottom, artificial reefs, shipwrecks, and their associated ecosystem components during certain training and testing activities in the Study Area. Figure 5.4-1 and Figure 5.4-2 show the relevant seafloor resources and the Navy training or testing locations that overlap them. The Navy developed mitigation areas as either the anchor swing circle diameter or a 350 yd. radius around a seafloor resource, as indicated by the best available georeferenced data.

Table 5-18: Mitigation Areas for Seafloor Resources

Mitigation Area Description
Stressor or Activity • Explosives • Physical disturbance and strikes
Resource Protection Focus • Shallow-water coral reefs • Live hard bottom • Artificial reefs • Shipwrecks
Mitigation Area Requirements • **Within the anchor swing circle of shallow-water coral reefs, live hard bottom, artificial reefs, and shipwrecks:** – The Navy will not conduct precision anchoring (except at designated anchorages and nearshore training areas around Guam and within Apra Harbor, where these resources will be avoided to the maximum extent practicable). • **Within a 350 yd. radius of live hard bottom, artificial reefs, and shipwrecks:** – The Navy will not conduct explosive mine countermeasure and neutralization activities or explosive mine neutralization activities involving Navy divers (except at designated nearshore training areas, where these resources will be avoided to the maximum extent practicable). – The Navy will not place mine shapes, anchors, or mooring devices on the seafloor (except in designated locations, where these resources will be avoided to the maximum extent practicable). • **Within a 350 yd. radius of shallow-water coral reefs:** – The Navy will not conduct explosive or non-explosive small-, medium-, and large-caliber gunnery activities using a surface target; explosive or non-explosive missile and rocket activities using a surface target; explosive or non-explosive bombing and mine-laying activities; explosive or non-explosive mine countermeasure and neutralization activities; and explosive or non-explosive mine neutralization activities involving Navy divers (except at designated nearshore training areas, where these resources will be avoided to the maximum extent practicable). – The Navy will not place mine shapes, anchors, or mooring devices on the seafloor (except in designated locations, where these resources will be avoided to the maximum extent practicable).




Figure 5.4-1: Seafloor Resource Mitigation Areas off Guam




Figure 5.4-2: Seafloor Resource Mitigation Areas off Tinian, Saipan, and Farallon de Medinilla

Mitigation areas apply to georeferenced resources because the Navy requires accurate resource identification and mapping for the mitigation to be both effective as well as practical to implement. To facilitate mitigation implementation, the Navy will include maps of the best available georeferenced data for shallow-water coral reefs, artificial reefs, live hard bottom, and shipwrecks in its Protective Measures Assessment Protocol. The Navy will include data that most accurately represent the natural boundaries of seafloor resources, as described in *Building and Maintaining a Comprehensive Database and Prioritization Scheme for Overlapping Habitat Data* (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2016). Data presented in Section 3.3 (Marine Habitats), Section 3.8 (Marine Invertebrates), and Section 3.11 (Cultural Resources) will serve as the baseline of best available georeferenced data for seafloor resource mitigation areas. The Navy will also include additional seafloor resource data (such as data that the Navy has acquired access to but that is not publicly available), if applicable.

Seafloor resources fulfill important ecosystem functions. Live hard bottom habitats and artificial structures (e.g., artificial reefs, shipwrecks) provide attachment substrate for aquatic vegetation and invertebrates, such as corals, seaweed, seagrass, macroalgae, and sponges. These habitats in turn support a community of organisms, such as fish, shrimp, crabs, barnacles, worms, and sea cucumbers. Shallow-water coral reefs provide substrate, shelter, and food for hundreds of invertebrate species, sea turtles, fishes, and other biological resources. They are one of the most productive and diverse assemblages on Earth. Dive sites occur throughout nearshore areas of the Study Area where there are shipwrecks, artificial reefs, and shallow-water coral reefs, making these resources highly valuable from a socioeconomic standpoint. Similarly, submerged aquatic vegetation attached to live hardbottom or artificial reefs provides important habitat for commercially and recreationally important fish species. Historic shipwrecks are classified as archaeological resources and are an important part of maritime history.

Mitigating within the anchor swing circle will protect seafloor resources during precision anchoring activities when factoring in environmental conditions that could affect anchoring position and swing circle size, such as winds, currents, and water depth. For other activities that will implement the mitigation, a 350 yd. radius around a seafloor resource is a conservatively sized mitigation area that will provide protection well beyond the maximum expected impact footprint (e.g., crater and expelled material radius) of the explosives and non-explosive practice munitions used in the Study Area. The mitigation area size was designed to extend beyond the military expended material with the largest footprint for all Study Areas where this mitigation measure is implemented. The military expended material with the largest footprint (which is used in the Atlantic Fleet Training and Testing Study Area and Hawaii-Southern California Training and Testing Study Area, but not in the MITT Study Area) is an explosive mine with a 650 lb. net explosive weight, which has an estimated impact footprint of approximately 14,800 square ft. and an associated radius of 22.7 yd. (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2018b). The largest explosive applicable to this mitigation in the MITT Study Area has a charge size of 20 lb. net explosive weight, which has an estimated impact footprint of 135 square ft. and an associated radius of 2.19 yd. Therefore, the 350 yd. mitigation area is well beyond the maximum expected direct impact footprint for the activities listed in Table 5-18, and it further mitigates some level of indirect impact from explosive disturbances. As described in Section 3.3 (Marine Habitats), other habitat types, such as soft bottom, are expected to recover relatively quickly from potential disturbances; therefore, there would be a limited benefit of implementing this mitigation for other habitat types.

Input from the operational community indicates that the mitigation detailed in Table 5-18 is practical to implement. Implementing additional mitigation for other activities or types of seafloor resources would

not allow the Navy to continue meeting its mission requirements to successfully accomplish military readiness objectives. Expanding the mitigation to protect additional seafloor features where marine species are known to occur (e.g., soft bottom, which provides habitat for resources such as seagrass, worms, and clams) would essentially result in the Navy not conducting training and testing activities throughout a significant portion of the Study Area. This would prohibit the Navy from accessing its mission-essential activity locations. In many instances, expanding seafloor resource mitigation would also push training and testing activities farther offshore, which would have implications for safety and sustainability. Moving activities farther offshore would increase the distance from aircraft emergency landing fields, critical medical facilities, and search and rescue resources; would require excessive time on station or time away from homeport for Navy personnel; and would result in significant increases to operational costs.

In summary, the operational community determined that implementing mitigation for seafloor resources beyond what is detailed in Table 5-18 would be incompatible with the practicality assessment criteria for safety, sustainability, and mission requirements. For additional information on the biological, cultural, and socioeconomic importance of seafloor resources and their associated ecosystem components, refer to Section 3.3 (Marine Habitats), Section 3.4 (Marine Mammals), Section 3.5 (Sea Turtles), Section 3.6 (Marine Birds), Section 3.7 (Marine Vegetation), Section3.8 (Marine Invertebrates), Section 3.9 (Fish), Section 3.11 (Cultural Resources), and Section 3.12 (Socioeconomic Resources and Environmental Justice).

5.4.2 Mitigation Areas for Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles

As described in Table 5-19 and shown in Figure 5.4-3, the Navy developed mitigation areas in the MITT Study Area to avoid or reduce potential impacts on marine mammals and sea turtles. The Navy developed these mitigation areas to help avoid or reduce potential impacts from mid-frequency active sonar and explosives in areas that the best available science suggests are important to one or more species of marine mammals or sea turtles for foraging, migrating, or other biologically important life processes. As described in Appendix I (Geographic Mitigation Assessment), implementing additional mitigation in the MITT Study Area beyond what is described in Table 5-19 would be impractical due to implications for safety, sustainability, and the Navy's ability to continue meeting its mission requirements. The appendix presents details on how each area was identified and developed. Specifically, the area must be particularly important to one or more species of marine mammals or sea turtles for a biologically important life process such as foraging, migration, or reproduction. In summary, mitigation measures implemented in the following three geographic mitigation areas will help the Navy avoid or reduce potential impacts on marine mammals and sea turtles:

- **Marpi Reef Mitigation Area**. The mitigation will avoid or reduce potential impacts from hull-mounted mid-frequency active sonar and explosives on humpback whales within the mitigation area, which the best available science indicates is seasonally important reproduction habitat.
- **Chalan Kanoa Reef Mitigation Area**. The mitigation will avoid or reduce potential impacts from hull-mounted mid-frequency active sonar and explosives on humpback whales within the mitigation area, which the best available science indicates is seasonally important reproduction habitat. The mitigation will avoid or reduce potential impacts on sea turtles foraging at or near the reef.
- **Agat Bay Nearshore Mitigation Area**. The mitigation will avoid or reduce potential impacts from mid-frequency active sonar and explosives on spinner dolphins and sea turtles within the

mitigation area, which the best available science indicates is seasonally important resting habitat for spinner dolphins and foraging habitat for sea turtles.

Table 5-19: Mitigation Areas for Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles

Mitigation Area Description
Stressor or Activity • Surface Ship Hull-Mounted Mid-frequency Active Sonar (bin MF1) • In-water Explosives
Resource Protection Focus • Marine mammals • Sea turtles
Mitigation Requirements • **Marpi Reef Mitigation Area and Chalan Kanoa Reef Mitigation Area[1]** – The Navy will conduct a maximum combined total of 20 hours of surface ship hull-mounted MF1 mid-frequency active sonar during training and testing from 1 December to 30 April within the Marpi Reef Mitigation Area and Chalan Kanoa Reef Mitigation Area. The Navy will report the total hours of active sonar (all bins, by bin) used in the Marpi Reef Mitigation Area and Chalan Kanoa Reef Mitigation Area from 1 December to 30 April in its annual training and testing activity reports submitted to NMFS. Should national security present a requirement to use surface ship hull-mounted MF1 mid-frequency active sonar between 1 December to 30 April, the Navy will provide NMFS with advance notification of the activity. – The Navy will not use in-water explosives in the Marpi Reef Mitigation Area and Chalan Kanoa Reef Mitigation Area year-round. – The Navy will issue an annual seasonal awareness notification message to alert ships and aircraft operating in the Marpi Reef Mitigation Area and Chalan Kanoa Reef Mitigation Area to the possible presence of increased concentrations of humpback whales from 1 December through 30 April. To maintain safety of navigation and to avoid interactions with large whales during transits, the Navy will instruct vessels to remain vigilant to the presence of humpback whales, that when concentrated seasonally, may become vulnerable to vessel strikes. Platforms will use the information from the awareness notification messages to assist their visual observation of applicable mitigation zones during training and testing activities and to aid in the implementation of procedural mitigation. • **Agat Bay Nearshore Mitigation Area[1,2]** – The Navy will not use surface ship hull-mounted MF1 mid-frequency active sonar in the Agat Bay Nearshore Mitigation Area year-round. – The Navy will not use in-water explosives in the Agat Bay Nearshore Mitigation Area year-round.

[1] Should national security present a requirement to conduct training or testing prohibited by the mitigation requirements specified in this table, naval units will obtain permission from the appropriate designated Command authority prior to commencement of the activity. The Navy will provide NMFS with advance notification and include relevant information (e.g., sonar hours, explosives use) in its annual activity reports submitted to NMFS.

[2] The designated Command authority will base authorization on the unique characteristics of the area from a military readiness perspective, taking into account the importance of the area for spinner dolphins and sea turtles and the need to avoid adverse impacts to the maximum extent practicable. Furthermore, the Command authority conducting the activity will provide specific direction to operational units on required mitigation prior to conducting training or testing using in-water explosives in this area.




Figure 5.4-3: Marine Mammal and Sea Turtle Mitigation Areas

5.5 Terrestrial Mitigation Measures to be Implemented

The Navy will implement mitigation measures for military readiness activities conducted on FDM, which is the only terrestrial portion of the Study Area considered in this Final SEIS/OEIS. Mitigation measures for FDM are described in the section below. Information about mitigation measures the Navy implements at other terrestrial locations that are outside the scope of this Final SEIS/OEIS, such as mitigation for invasive species control and training activities conducted on the islands of Guam, Rota, Tinian, and Saipan, is presented in Chapter 5 (Standard Operating Procedures, Mitigation, and Monitoring) of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

5.5.1 Farallon De Medinilla

As outlined in Table 5-20, the Navy will continue to implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts on birds, bats, and sea turtles that occur on land on FDM.

Table 5-20: Farallon de Medinilla Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Area Description
Stressor or Activity • Explosives • Physical disturbance and strikes
Resource Protection Focus • Birds • Bats • Sea turtles
Mitigation Area Requirements • The Navy will not use explosive cluster weapons, scatterable munitions, fuel air explosives, incendiary munitions, depleted uranium rounds, and bombs greater than 2,000 lb. • The Navy will not target the northern Special Use Area and the narrow land bridge with explosive or non-explosive ordnance. • The Navy will not use explosive ordnance in Impact Area 1. • The Navy will only target Impact Areas 1, 2, and 3 during air-to-ground bombing, missile, and gunnery exercises. • The Navy will only fire from the west during ship-based bombardment. • Navy personnel will not be authorized on FDM without approval from Joint Region Marianas Operations. • During training activities involving aircraft dropping explosive or non-explosive ordnance on a surface target, mitigation will include visual observation immediately before and during the exercise. Firing will cease if a sea turtle is observed (on shore) in the vicinity of the intended impact location. Firing will recommence if the sea turtle is observed exiting the vicinity of the intended impact location, or if the intended impact location has been repositioned to a new location (i.e., to where the sea turtle is no longer within the vicinity of the intended impact location).

As described in Section 3.10 (Terrestrial Species and Habitats) of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, FDM is recognized by regional ornithologists (bird specialists) as an important bird area for many species of marine birds, migrant shorebirds, and a limited number of terrestrial bird species, including the Mariana swiftlet, Mariana crow, Mariana common moorhen, Guam Micronesian kingfisher, ESA-listed Micronesian megapode, Guam rail Nightingale reed-warbler, and Rota bridled white-eye. Habitat for the Micronesian megapode on FDM primarily consists of trees, shrubs, and grasslands. The most recent survey for megapodes on FDM was completed in 2013, when Navy biologists detected 11 megapodes while surveying a limited transect within Impact Areas 1 and 2 (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2013b). FDM may also serve as Mariana fruit bat habitat for a small number of year-round residents and a stopover location for bats transiting between islands. The northern portion of the island may provide habitat for Mariana fruit bat foraging and roosting (U.S. Department of the Navy 2013a). Although the beaches on FDM are unsuitable for sea turtle nesting, green sea turtles have occasionally been observed on shore on FDM.

The Navy will continue to implement mitigation on FDM to help avoid or reduce potential impacts on ESA-listed species. Restricting the locations and type of ordnance used in the northern areas of FDM (including the Special Use Area and Impact Area 1) will help the Navy avoid or reduce potential impacts on ESA-listed Micronesian megapodes and Mariana fruit bats in the areas where they are most likely to occur for roosting and foraging. Only firing from the west during ship-based bombardment will help avoid potential impacts on rookery locations on the eastern cliff of FDM. The mitigation will also help the Navy avoid or reduce potential impacts on Micronesian megapodes and Mariana fruit bats, as well as other bird species that could be migrating or resting on FDM.

The mitigation measures on FDM are a continuation from the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS based on the highest level of mitigation that is practical for the Navy to implement within this land portion of the Study Area. The Navy conducts training on FDM to ensure safety of personnel and skill proficiency in an area analogous to military mission and combat conditions. FDM is the only land training area considered in this Final SEIS/OEIS, and therefore represents the only location where certain activities, such as Naval Surface Fire Support Exercise – Land-based Target, Bombing Exercise (Air-to-Ground), Gunnery Exercise (Air-to-Ground), and Direct Action (Tactical Air Control Party) can occur as part of the Proposed Action.

Because FDM is the only terrestrial area that the Navy plans to use under the Proposed Action, it provides a unique training environment within the Study Area essential to military readiness. Therefore, further mitigation measures with regard to the level, number, type, or timing (seasonal or time of day) of training activities on FDM would be impractical due to implications for safety, sustainability, and mission requirements. For example, during a Direct Action (Tactical Air Control Party) exercise, military personnel train for controlling of combat support aircraft, providing airspace deconfliction, and terminal control for Close Air Support in conjunction with an Air-to-Ground bombing or missile exercise. Personnel may also train to employ small arms, grenades, mortars, and crew served weapons in direct action against targets on the island. This activity provides critical training on coordination of tactics between fixed-wing aircraft, rotary-wing aircraft, and small boats in an environment that cannot be replicated elsewhere in the Study Area. Reducing the number of events or further restricting the type of ordnance used during training would impede the ability for the participants to become proficient in tactical air control and using their weapons as would be required during military missions and combat operations. This would prevent units from meeting their individual training and certification requirements and deploying with the required level of readiness necessary to accomplish their missions. Additional mitigation on FDM would also have significant impacts on personnel safety due to the reduced ability to safely and effectively train personnel for tactical air control and airspace deconfliction.

5.6 Measures Considered but Eliminated

As described in Section 5.2 (Mitigation Development Process), the Navy conducted a detailed review and assessment of each potential mitigation measure individually and then all potential mitigation measures collectively to determine if, as a whole, the mitigation will be effective at avoiding or reducing potential impacts and practical to implement. The assessment included consideration of mitigation recommendations received through scoping and public comments received on the Draft SEIS/OIS for this Proposed Action, during the ESA and MMPA consultation processes, and through public comments and consultations on past environmental compliance documents applicable to the Study Area. The operational community determined that implementing procedural or terrestrial mitigation beyond what is detailed in Section 5.3 (At-Sea Procedural Mitigation to be Implemented), Section 5.4 (At-Sea Mitigation Areas to be Implemented), and Section 5.5 (Terrestrial Mitigation Measures to be Implemented) would be incompatible with the practicality assessment criteria for safety, sustainability,

and mission requirements. Information about why implementing additional mitigation measures for active sonar, explosives, active and passive acoustic monitoring devices, thermal detection systems, third-party observers, foreign navy mitigation, and reporting requirements would be impractical is provided in the sections below and in Appendix I (Geographic Mitigation Assessment).

When analyzing all potential mitigation measures collectively, the operational community determined that adopting certain mitigation measures, such as limiting active sonar to only be conducted in certain water depths, would result in the unacceptable limitation of the Navy's utilization of sea space and airspace required to effectively support training and testing of naval forces in the Study Area. Certain measures would restrict or prohibit Navy training and testing throughout most of the Study Area except in very narrow circumstances. For example, blanket limitations or restrictions on the level, number, or timing (seasonal or time of day) of training and testing activities within discrete or broad-scale areas of water (e.g., embayments and large swaths of the littorals and open ocean), or other areas vital to mission requirements would prevent the Navy from accessing its ranges, operating areas, facilities, or range support structures necessary to meet the purpose and need of the Proposed Action. As described in Section 5.2.4 (Practicality of Implementation), the Navy requires extensive sea space so that individual training and testing activities can occur at sufficient distances such that these activities do not interfere with one another, and so that Navy units can train to communicate and operate in a coordinated fashion over tens or hundreds of square miles, as required during military missions and combat operations. The Navy also needs to maintain access to sea space with the unique, challenging, and diverse environmental and oceanographic features (e.g., bathymetry, topography, surface fronts, and variations in sea surface temperature) analogous to military mission and combat conditions to achieve the highest skill proficiency and most accurate testing results possible.

Threats to national security are constantly evolving. The Navy requires the ability to adapt training and testing to meet these emerging threats. Restricting access to broad-scale areas of water would impact the ability for Navy training and testing to evolve as threats evolve. Eliminating opportunities for the Navy to train and test in a myriad of at-sea conditions would put U.S. forces at a tactical disadvantage during military missions and combat operations. This would also present a risk to national security if potential adversaries were to be alerted to the environmental conditions within which the U.S. Navy is prohibited from training and testing. Restricting large areas of ocean or other smaller areas at sea that are critical to Navy training and testing would make training and concealment much more difficult and would adversely impact the Navy's ability to perform its statutory mission.

5.6.1 Active Sonar

When assessing and developing mitigation, the Navy considered reducing active sonar training and testing hours, modifying active sonar sound sources, implementing time-of-day restrictions and restrictions during surface ducting conditions, replacing active sonar training and testing with synthetic activities (e.g., computer simulated training), and implementing active sonar ramp-up procedures. The Navy determined that it would be practical to implement certain restrictions on the use of active sonar in the Study Area, as detailed in Section 5.3.2.1 (Active Sonar) and Appendix I (Geographic Mitigation Assessment). As discussed in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives), Section 5.2.4 (Practicality of Implementation), Appendix A (Training and Testing Activities Descriptions), and Appendix I (Geographic Mitigation Assessment), training and testing activities are planned and scheduled based on numerous factors and data inputs, such as compliance with the Optimized Fleet Response Plan. Information on why training and testing with active sonar is essential to national security is presented in Section 5.3.2.1 (Active Sonar). The Navy uses active sonar during military readiness

activities only when it is essential to training missions or testing program requirements since active sonar has the potential to alert opposing forces to the operating platform's presence. Passive sonar and other available sensors are used in concert with active sonar to the maximum extent practicable.

The Navy currently uses, and will continue to use, computer simulation to augment training and testing whenever possible. As discussed in Section 1.4.1 (Why the Navy Trains), simulators and synthetic training are critical elements that provide early skill repetition and enhance teamwork; however, they cannot replicate the complexity and stresses faced by Sailors during military missions and combat operations to which the Navy trains under the Proposed Action (e.g., anti-submarine warfare training using hull-mounted mid-frequency active sonar). Just as a pilot would not be ready to fly solo after simulator training, operational Commanders cannot allow military personnel to engage in military missions and combat operations based merely on simulator training. Similarly, in testing a system that is being developed, simulation can be used during the initial stages of development, but ultimately the system must be tested under conditions analogous to those faced during military missions and combat operations. Systems that have undergone maintenance need to be tested, and not simulated, to ensure that the system is operating correctly.

Sonar operators must train to effectively handle bottom bounce and sound passing through changing currents, eddies, and across changes in ocean temperature, pressure, salinity, depth, and in surface ducting conditions. Sonar systems must be tested in conditions analogous to where the Navy trains and operates to ensure functionality and accuracy in military mission and combat conditions. Although the majority of sonar use occurs during the day, the Navy has a nighttime training and testing requirement for some active sonar systems, and a requirement to test in a variety of locations and environmental conditions depending on the testing program objectives. Training and testing in both good visibility (e.g., daylight, favorable weather conditions) and low visibility (e.g., nighttime, inclement weather conditions) is vital because environmental differences between day and night and varying weather conditions affect sound propagation and the detection capabilities of sonar. Temperature layers that move up and down in the water column and ambient noise levels can vary significantly between night and day. This affects sound propagation and could affect how sonar systems function and are operated.

Submarines may hide in the higher ambient noise levels of shallow coastal waters and surface ducts. Surface ducting occurs when water conditions, such as temperature layers and lack of wave action, result in little sound energy penetrating beyond a narrow layer near the surface of the water. Avoiding surface ducting conditions would be impractical because ocean conditions contributing to surface ducting change frequently, and surface ducts can be of varying duration. Surface ducting can also lack uniformity and may or may not extend over a large geographic area, making it difficult to determine where to reduce power and for what periods. Submarines have long been known to take advantage of the phenomena associated with surface ducting to avoid being detected by sonar. When surface ducting occurs, active sonar becomes more useful near the surface but less useful at greater depths. As noted by the U.S. Supreme Court in *Winter v. Natural Resources Defense Council Inc.*, 555 U.S. 7 (2008), because surface ducting conditions occur relatively rarely and are unpredictable, it is especially important for the Navy to be able to train under these conditions when they occur. Training with active sonar in these conditions is a critical component of military readiness because sonar operators need to learn how sonar transmissions are altered due to surface ducting, how submarines may take advantage of them, and how to operate sonar effectively under these conditions. Reducing power, shutting down active sonar based on environmental conditions, or implementing other sonar modification techniques (e.g., sound shielding) as a mitigation would affect a Commander's ability to develop the tactical picture.

It would also prevent sonar operators from training in conditions analogous to those faced during military missions and combat operations, such as during periods of low visibility.

The Navy explicitly designs its active sonar signals to provide optimum performance at detecting underwater objects (e.g., submarines) in a variety of acoustic environments. The Navy assessed the potential for implementing active sonar signal modification as mitigation. At this time, the science on the differences in potential impacts of up or down sweeps of the sonar signal (e.g., different behavioral reactions) is extremely limited and requires further development. For example, Kastelein et al. (2012) researched the behavioral responses of a single captive harbor porpoise to varying sonar signals. Although this very limited data set suggests up or down sweeps of the sonar signal may result in different reactions by harbor porpoises in certain circumstances, this science requires further development (e.g., to determine potential reactions by other individual harbor porpoises and other marine mammal species). If future studies indicate that modifying active sonar signals (i.e., up or down sweeps) could be an effective mitigation approach, then the Navy will investigate if and how the mitigation would affect the sonar's performance. As described throughout this chapter, mitigation must meet the appropriate balance between being effective and practical to implement.

Active sonar equipment power levels are set consistent with mission requirements. Active sonar ramp-up procedures are used during seismic surveys and some foreign navy sonar activities. Ramping up involves slowly increasing sound levels over a certain length of time until the optimal source level is reached. The intent of ramping up a sound source is to alert marine mammals with a low sound level to deter them from the area and avoid higher levels of sound exposure. The best available science does not suggest that ramp-up would be an effective mitigation tool for U.S. Navy active sonar training and testing activities under the Proposed Action. Wensveen et al. (2017) found that active sonar ramp-up was not an effective method for reducing impacts on humpback whales because most whales did not display strong behavioral avoidance to the sonar signals. The study suggested that sonar ramp-up could potentially be more effective for other more behaviorally responsive species but would likely also depend on the context of exposure. For example, ramp-up would be less effective if animals have a strong motivation not to move away from their current location, such as when foraging. Dunlop et al. (2016) and von Benda-Beckmann et al. (2014) found that implementing ramp-up as a mitigation may be effective for some activities in some situations. Additionally, von Benda-Beckmann et al. (2014) found that the main factors limiting ramp-up effectiveness for a typical anti-submarine warfare activity are a high source level, a moving sonar source, and long silences between consecutive sonar transmissions. Based on the source levels, vessel speeds, and sonar transmission intervals that will be used during typical active sonar activities under the Proposed Action, the Navy has determined that ramp-up would be an ineffective mitigation measure for the active sonar activities analyzed in this Final SEIS/OEIS.

Implementing active sonar ramp-up procedures during training or testing under the Proposed Action would not be representative of military mission and combat conditions and would significantly impact training and testing realism. For example, during an anti-submarine warfare exercise using active sonar, ramp-ups have the potential to alert opponents (e.g., target submarines) to the transmitting vessel’s presence. This would defeat the purpose of the training by allowing the target submarine to detect the searching unit and take evasive measures, thereby denying the sonar operator the opportunity to learn how to locate the submarine. Similarly, testing program requirements determine test parameters to accurately determine whether a system is meeting its operational and performance requirements; therefore, implementing ramp-up during testing activities would impede the Navy’s ability to collect essential data for evaluation of a system’s capabilities.

Reducing realism in training impedes the ability for Navy Sailors to train and become proficient in using active sonar, erodes capabilities, and reduces perishable skills. These impacts would result in a significant risk to personnel safety during military missions and combat operations and would prevent units from meeting their individual training and certification requirements. Therefore, implementing additional mitigation that would reduce training realism would ultimately prevent units from deploying with the required level of readiness necessary to accomplish their missions and impede the Navy's ability to certify forces to deploy to meet national security tasking. Reducing realism in testing would impact the ability of researchers, program managers, and weapons system acquisition programs to conduct accurate acoustic research and effectively test systems and platforms (and components of these systems and platforms) before full-scale production or delivery to the fleet. These tests are required to ensure functionality and accuracy in military mission and combat conditions per required acquisition milestones or on an as-needed basis to meet operational requirements.

5.6.2 Explosives

When assessing and developing mitigation, the Navy considered reducing the number and size of explosives and limiting the locations and time of day of explosive training and testing in the Study Area. The Navy determined that it would be practical to implement certain restrictions on the use of explosives in the Study Area, as detailed in Section 5.3.3 (Explosive Stressors) and Appendix I (Geographic Mitigation Assessment). As discussed in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives), Section 5.2.4 (Practicality of Implementation), Appendix I (Geographic Mitigation Assessment), Appendix A (Training and Testing Activities Descriptions), and Appendix I (Geographic Mitigation Assessment), the locations and timing of the training and testing activities that use explosives vary throughout the Study Area based on range scheduling, mission requirements, testing program requirements, and standard operating procedures for safety and mission success.

Activities that involve explosive ordnance are inherently different from those that involve non-explosive practice munitions. For example, critical components of an explosive Bombing Exercise Air-to-Surface include the assembly, loading, delivery, and assessment of the explosive bomb. The explosive bombing training exercise starts with ground personnel, who must practice the building and loading of explosive munitions. Training includes the safe handling of explosive material, configuring munitions to precise specifications, and the loading of munitions onto aircraft. Aircrew must then identify a target and safely deliver fused munitions, discern if the bomb was assembled correctly, and determine bomb damage assessments based on how and where the explosive detonated. An air-to-surface bombing exercise using non-explosive practice munitions can train aircrews on valuable skills to locate and accurately deliver munitions on a target; however, it cannot effectively replicate the critical components of an explosive activity in terms of assembly, loading, delivery, and assessment of an explosive bomb. Reducing the number and size of explosives or diminishing activity realism by implementing time of day or geographic restrictions for additional explosive training activities would impede the ability for Navy Sailors to train and become proficient in using explosive weapons systems (which would result in a significant risk to personnel safety during military missions and combat operations), and would ultimately prevent units from meeting their individual training and certification requirements (which would prevent them from deploying with the required level of readiness necessary to accomplish their missions) and impede the Navy's ability to certify forces to deploy to meet national security tasking.

Similar to training, the Navy is required to test its explosives to quantify the compatibility of weapons with the platform from which they will be launched or released in military missions and combat operations. Such testing requires the use of the actual explosive ordnance that will be used during

training exercises, military missions, and combat operations. Reducing the number and size of explosives or diminishing activity realism by implementing time of day or geographic restrictions for additional explosive testing events would impact the ability of researchers, program managers, and weapons system acquisition programs to effectively test systems and platforms (and components of these systems and platforms). Such testing must be conducted before full-scale production or delivery to the fleet to ensure functionality and accuracy in military mission and combat conditions per required acquisition milestones or on an as-needed basis to meet operational requirements.

5.6.3 Active and Passive Acoustic Monitoring Devices

When assessing and developing mitigation, the Navy considered using active and passive acoustic monitoring devices as procedural mitigation. During Surveillance Towed Array Sensor System low-frequency active sonar (which is not part of the Proposed Action), the Navy uses a specially designed adjunct high-frequency marine mammal monitoring active sonar known as "HF/M3" to mitigate potential impacts. HF/M3 can only be towed at slow speeds and operates like a fish finder used by commercial and recreational fishermen. Installing the HF/M3 adjunct system on the tactical sonar ships used under the Proposed Action would have implications for safety and mission requirements due to impacts on speed and maneuverability. Furthermore, installing the system would significantly increase costs associated with designing, building, installing, maintaining, and manning the equipment. The Navy will not install the HF/M3 system or other adjunct marine mammal monitoring devices as mitigation under the Proposed Action. However, Navy assets with passive acoustic monitoring capabilities that are already participating in an activity will continue to monitor for marine mammals, as described in Section 5.2.1 (At-Sea Procedural Mitigation Development) and Section 5.3 (At-Sea Procedural Mitigation to be Implemented). Significant manpower and logistical constraints make constructing and maintaining additional passive acoustic monitoring systems for each training and testing activity under the Proposed Action impractical. For example, the Navy does not have available manpower or resources to allocate additional aircraft for the purpose of deploying, monitoring, and retrieving passive acoustic monitoring equipment during a bombing exercise. All platforms participating in explosive bombing exercises (e.g., firing aircraft, safety aircraft) must focus on situational awareness of the activity area and continuous coordination between multiple training components for safety and mission success. Therefore, it is impractical for participating platforms to divert their attention to non-mission essential tasks, such as deploying sonobuoys and monitoring for acoustic detections during the event (e.g., setting up a computer station). Diverting platforms with passive acoustic monitoring capabilities to monitor training and testing events would impact their ability to meet their mission requirements and would reduce the service life of those systems.

The Navy is continuing to improve its capabilities to use range instrumentation to aid in the passive acoustic detection of marine mammals. For example, at the Southern California Offshore Range, the Pacific Missile Range Facility off Kauai, Hawaii, and the Atlantic Undersea Test and Evaluation Center in the Bahamas, the Navy can monitor instrumented ranges in real-time or through data recorded by hydrophones. The Navy has sponsored numerous studies that have produced meaningful results on marine mammal occurrence, distribution, and behavior on these ranges through the U.S. Navy's Marine Species Monitoring Program. For information on the U.S. Navy's Marine Species Monitoring Program, see Section 5.1.2.2.1 (Marine Species Research and Monitoring Programs).

Although the Navy's instrumented ranges are helping to facilitate a better understanding of the species that are present in those areas, instrumented ranges were not developed for the purpose of mitigation, and therefore do not have the capabilities to be used effectively for mitigation. To develop an estimated

position for an individual marine mammal, the animal's vocalizations must be detected on at least three hydrophones. The vocalizations must be loud enough to provide the required signal to noise ratio on those hydrophones. The hydrophones must have the required bandwidth and dynamic range to capture that signal. Detection capabilities are generally degraded under noisy conditions (such as high sea state) that affect signal to noise ratio. The ability to detect and develop an estimated position for marine mammals on the Navy's instrumented ranges depends of numerous factors, such as behavioral state (e.g., only vocalizing animals can be detected), species (e.g., species vocalize at varying rates, call types, and source levels), animal location relative to the passive acoustic receivers (hydrophones), and location on the range. The Navy's hydrophones cannot track the real-time locations of individual animals with dispersed and directional vocalizations with the level of precision needed for effective mitigation. Even marine mammals that have been vocalizing for extended periods of time have been known to stop vocalizing for hours at a time, which would prevent the Navy from obtaining or maintaining an accurate estimate of that animal's location. In addition, the Navy does not currently have the capability to perform data processing for large baleen whales in real-time. Determining if an animal is located within a mitigation zone within the timeframes required for mitigation would be prohibited by the amount of time it takes to process the data.

If a vocalizing animal is detected on only one or two hydrophones, estimating its location is not possible, and the location of the animal would be assigned generally within the detection radius around each hydrophone. The detection radius of a hydrophone is typically much larger than the mitigation zone for the activities conducted on instrumented ranges. The Navy does not have a way to verify if that vocalizing animal is located within the mitigation zone or at a location down range. Mitigating for passive acoustic detections based on unknown animal locations would essentially increase the mitigation zone sizes for each activity to that of the hydrophone detection radius. Increasing the mitigation zone sizes beyond what is described for each activity is impractical for the reasons described throughout Section 5.3 (At-Sea Procedural Mitigation to be Implemented).

In summary, although the Navy is continuing to improve its capabilities to use range instrumentation to aid in the passive acoustic detection of marine mammals, at this time it would not be effective or practical for the Navy to monitor instrumented ranges for real-time mitigation or to construct additional instrumented ranges as a tool to aid in the implementation of mitigation.

5.6.4 Thermal Detection Systems

When assessing and developing mitigation, the Navy considered using thermal detection systems and other technologies (e.g., autonomous platforms such as unmanned aerial vehicles, X-band radar) as procedural mitigation. The use of X-band radar instruments for marine mammal monitoring is a new field of study. A preliminary pilot experiment in the Mediterranean Sea indicated that X-band radar instruments, which allow for continuous observation of the sea surface within a certain range from the radar antenna, were able to detect bottlenose dolphins during optimal weather and sea state conditions (Mingozzi et al., 2020). Detections by radar were generally limited by conditions such as waves, which did not allow for the correct identification of small targets; and rain, which masked the radar signal reflection and reduced the ability to detect targets. The pilot experiment used a manual approach to observe for and validate radar detections; however, future technological developments could potentially allow for automated marine mammal observation using X-band radar (Mingozzi et al., 2020).

Thermal detection technology is designed to allow observers to detect the difference in temperature between a surfaced marine mammal (i.e., the body or blow of a whale) and the environment (i.e., the

water and air). Thermal detection systems can be effective at detecting some types of marine mammals in a limited range of marine environmental conditions. Technologies are advancing but continue to be limited by their: (1) reduced performance in certain environmental conditions, (2) ability to detect certain animal characteristics and behaviors, (3) low sensor resolution and narrow fields of view, and (4) high cost and low lifecycle (Boebel, 2017; Zitterbart et al., 2013). Current thermal detection systems have proven more effective at perceiving thermal anomalies as distance to the observer decreases (Zitterbart et al., 2020), and at detecting large whale blows than the bodies of small animals, particularly at a distance (Zitterbart et al., 2013). Zitterbart et al. (2020) found that certain cues, such as those caused by the displacement of relatively large amounts of water (e.g., whale breaches) were less affected by distance than other cues (e.g., whale blows) that showed a linear decay related to the effects of wind on thermal perceptibility. The study also found that the maximum thermal perceptibility distance ranged from <1 to 10 kilometers, depending on factors such as cue type, species, and observation location.

The effectiveness of current technologies has not been demonstrated for small marine mammals. Thermal detection systems exhibit varying degrees of false positive detections (i.e., incorrect notifications) due in part to their low sensor resolution and reduced performance in certain environmental conditions. False positive detections may incorrectly identify other features (e.g., birds, waves, boats) as marine mammals. Zitterbart et al. (2013) reported a false positive rate approaching one incorrect notification per four minutes of observation. Zitterbart et al. (2020) reported maximum false positive rates of greater than 30 or 50 per hour, depending on observation location.

Thermal detection systems are generally thought to be most effective in detecting large, short-diving marine mammals in cold environments where there is a large temperature differential between an animal's temperature and the environment (Verfuss et al., 2018). Two studies that examined the effectiveness of thermal detection systems for marine mammal observations are Zitterbart et al. (2013), which tested a thermal detection system and automatic algorithm in polar waters between 34 and 50 degrees Fahrenheit, and a Navy-funded study in subtropical and tropical waters. Zitterbart et al. (2013) found that current technologies have limitations regarding temperature and survey conditions (e.g., rain, fog, sea state, glare, ambient brightness), for which further effectiveness studies are required. The Office of Naval Research Marine Mammals and Biology program funded a project (2013–2018) to test the thermal limits of infrared-based automatic whale detection technology. That project focused on capturing whale spouts at two different locations featuring subtropical and tropical water temperatures, optimizing detector/classifier performance on the collected data, and testing system performance by comparing system detections with concurrent visual observations. Results indicated that thermal detection systems in subtropical and tropical waters can be a valuable addition to marine mammal surveys within a certain distance from the observation platform (e.g., during seismic surveys, vessel movements), but they have challenges associated with false positive detections of waves and birds (Boebel, 2017).

The Navy has also been investigating the use of thermal detection systems with automated marine mammal detection algorithms for future mitigation during training and testing, including on autonomous platforms. For example, the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency funded six initial studies to test and evaluate infrared-based thermal detection technologies and algorithms to automatically detect marine mammals on an unmanned surface vehicle. Based on the outcome of these initial studies, the Navy is pursuing additional follow-on research efforts.

Thermal detection systems are currently used by some specialized U.S. Air Force aircraft for marine mammal mitigation. These systems are specifically designed for and integrated into Air Force aircraft and cannot be added to Navy aircraft. Only certain Navy aircraft have specialized infrared capabilities, and these capabilities are only for fine-scale targeting within a narrow field of view. The only thermal imagery sensors aboard Navy surface ships are associated with specific weapons systems, and these sensors are not available on all vessels. These sensors are typically used only in select training events, have a limited lifespan before requiring expensive replacement, and are not optimized for marine mammal observations within the Navy's mitigation zones. For example, as described in Section 5.3.3.3 (Explosive Medium-Caliber and Large-Caliber Projectiles), Lookouts are required to observe a 1,000 yd. mitigation zone around the intended impact location during explosive large-caliber gunnery activities. In addition to observing for marine mammals, one of the activity's mission-essential requirements is for event participants, including Lookouts, to maintain focus on the mitigation zone to ensure the safety of Navy personnel and equipment and the public. Lookouts would not be able to observe the 1,000 yd. mitigation zone using the Navy's thermal imagery sensors due to their narrow fields of view and technological design specific to fine-scale targeting. Such observations would be ineffective for marine mammals and would prevent Lookouts from effectively maintaining focus on the activity area and implementing mission-essential safety protocols.

The effectiveness of even the most advanced commercially available thermal detection systems with technological designs specific to marine mammal observations is highly dependent on environmental conditions, animal characteristics, and animal behaviors (Zitterbart et al., 2013). Considering the range of environmental conditions and diversity of marine mammal species found throughout the Study Area, the use of thermal detection systems would be less effective than the traditional techniques currently employed by the Navy, such as naked-eye scanning, hand-held binoculars, and high-powered binoculars mounted on a ship deck. Furthermore, high false positive rates of thermal detection systems could result in the Navy implementing mitigation for features incorrectly identified as marine mammals. Increasing the instances of mitigation implementation based on incorrectly identified features would have significant impacts on the ability for training and testing activities to accomplish their intended objectives, without providing any mitigation benefit to the species. In addition, thermal detection systems are designed to detect marine mammals and do not have the capability to detect other resources for which the Navy is required to implement mitigation. Requiring Lookouts to use thermal detection systems would prevent them from detecting and mitigating for sea turtles and other biological resources (e.g., jellyfish aggregations).

Verfuss et al. (2018) determined that based on the science of current thermal detection system technologies, the combined performance of two or more observation methods would improve detection probability for real-time monitoring of marine mammals. Similarly, during a study conducted offshore Atlantic Canada, Smith et al. (2020) found that overall marine mammal detection rates increased when complementary methods (marine mammal observers, infrared cameras, and passive acoustic monitoring) were used. A combination of techniques balances the benefits and limitations of each method, particularly in conditions such as high sea state and low visibility. As discussed in Section 5.3 (At-Sea Procedural Mitigation to be Implemented), the Navy's procedural mitigation measures include the maximum number of Lookouts the Navy can assign to each activity based on available manpower and resources, combined with the use of passive acoustic monitoring when those assets are already participating in an activity. It would be impractical to add personnel to serve as additional Lookouts for the sole purpose of thermal detection system use under the Proposed Action because the Navy does not

have available manpower to add Lookouts to use thermal detection systems in tandem with existing Lookouts who are using traditional observation techniques.

In summary, thermal detection systems have not been sufficiently studied both in terms of their effectiveness within the environmental conditions found in the Study Area and their compatibility with Navy training and testing. The Navy plans to continue researching thermal detection systems to determine their effectiveness and compatibility with Navy applications. If the technology matures to the state where thermal detection is determined to be an effective mitigation tool during training and testing, the Navy will assess the practicality of using the technology during training and testing events and retrofitting its observation platforms with thermal detection devices. The assessment will include an evaluation of the budget and acquisition process (including costs associated with designing, building, installing, maintaining, and manning equipment that is expensive and has a relatively short lifecycle before key system components need replacing); logistical and physical considerations for device installment, repair, and replacement (e.g., conducting engineering studies to ensure there is no electronic or power interference with existing shipboard systems); manpower and resource considerations for training personnel to effectively operate the equipment; and considerations of potential security and classification issues. New system integration on Navy assets can entail up to 5–10 years of effort to account for acquisition, engineering studies, and development and execution of systems training. The Navy will provide information to NMFS about the status and findings of Navy-funded thermal detection studies and any associated practicality assessments at the annual adaptive management meetings. Information about the Navy's adaptive management program is included in Section 5.1.2.2.1.1 (Adaptive Management).

5.6.5 Third-Party Observers

When assessing and developing mitigation, the Navy considered using third-party observers during training and testing to aid in the implementation of procedural mitigation. The use of third-party observers to conduct pre- or post-activity biological resource observations would be an ineffective mitigation because marine mammals would likely move into or out of the activity area, and mitigation must be implemented at the time the activity is taking place.

There are significant manpower and logistical constraints that make using third-party observers for every training and testing activity under the Proposed Action impractical. Training and testing activities often occur simultaneously and in various regions throughout the Study Area, some of which last for days or weeks at a time. Having third-party observers embark on Navy vessels or aircraft would result in safety and security clearance issues. Training and testing event planning includes careful consideration of capacity limitations when placing personnel on participating aircraft and vessels. The Navy is unable to add third-party observers on a ship or substitute a Navy Lookout with a third-party observer without causing a berthing shortage or exceedance of other space limitations, or impacting the ability for Lookouts to complete their other mission-essential duties. The use of third-party observers also presents national security concerns due to the requirement to provide advance notification of specific times and locations of Navy platform movements and activities (e.g., vessels using active sonar).

Reliance on the availability of third-party personnel for mitigation would be impractical because training and testing activity timetables oftentimes cannot be precisely fixed and are instead based on the free-flow development of tactical situations. Waiting for third-party aircraft or vessels to complete surveys, refuel, or transit on station would extend the length of the activity in a way that would diminish realism and delay training and testing schedules. Hiring third-party civilian vessels or aircraft to observe Navy training and testing activities would also be unsustainable due to the significant associated costs.

Because many training and testing activities take place offshore, the amount of time observers would spend on station would be limited due to aircraft fuel restrictions. Fuel restrictions and distance from shore would increase safety risks should mechanical problems arise. The presence of civilian aircraft or vessels in the vicinity of training and testing activities would present increased safety risks due to airspace conflicts and proximity to explosives.

5.6.6 Foreign Navy Mitigation

When assessing and developing mitigation, the Navy considered adopting the mitigation measures implemented by foreign navies. Mitigation measures are carefully developed for and assessed by each individual navy based on the potential impacts of their activities on the biological resources that live in their Study Areas, and the practicality of mitigation implementation based on their training mission and testing program requirements and the resources available for mitigation. The U.S. Navy's readiness considerations differ from those of foreign navies based on each navy's strategic reach, global mission, country-specific legal requirements, and geographic considerations. Most non-U.S. navies do not possess an integrated strike group and do not have integrated training requirements. The U.S. Navy's training is built around the integrated warfare concept and is based on the U.S. Navy's capabilities, the threats faced, the operating environment, and the overall mission. For this reason, not all measures developed for foreign navies would be effective at reducing impacts of U.S. Navy training or testing, or practical to implement by the U.S. Navy (and vice versa). For example, some navies implement active sonar ramp-up as mitigation for marine mammals; however, as described in Section 5.6.1 (Active Sonar), the U.S. Navy determined that active sonar ramp-up would be an ineffective mitigation measure for training and testing activities under the Proposed Action and would be impractical to implement because it would significantly impact training and testing realism.

The U.S. Navy will implement mitigation measures that have been determined to be effective at avoiding or reducing impacts from the Proposed Action and practical to implement by the U.S. Navy. Many of these measures are the same as, or comparable to, those implemented by foreign navies. For example, most navies implement some form of procedural mitigation to cease certain activities if a marine mammal is observed in a mitigation zone (Dolman et al., 2009). Some navies also implement geographic mitigation to restrict activities within particularly important marine mammal breeding, feeding, or migration habitats. The U.S. Navy will implement several mitigation measures and environmental compliance initiatives that are not implemented by foreign navies. For example, as discussed in Section 5.1.2.2 (Monitoring, Research, and Reporting Initiatives), the U.S. Navy will continue to sponsor scientific monitoring and research and comply with stringent reporting requirements.

5.6.7 Reporting Requirements

When assessing and developing mitigation, the Navy considered increasing its reporting requirements, such as additional reporting of vessel speeds and marine species observations. As discussed in Section 5.1.2.2 (Monitoring, Research, and Reporting Initiatives), the Navy developed its reporting requirements in conjunction with NMFS to be consistent with mission requirements and balance the usefulness of the information to be collected with the practicality of collecting it. The Navy's training and testing activity reports and incident reports are designed to verify implementation of mitigation; comply with current permits, authorizations, and consultation requirements; and improve future environmental analyses. The Navy reports to NMFS if mitigation was implemented during sinking exercises (e.g., number of times explosive detonations were delayed due to marine mammal sightings). For major training exercises, the Navy's annual training and testing activity reports include information on each individual marine

mammal sighting related to mitigation implementation. In the unlikely event that a vessel strike of a marine mammal should occur, the Navy would provide NMFS with relevant information pertaining to the incident, including but not limited to vessel speed.

Additional reporting would be ineffective as mitigation because it would not result in modifications to training or testing activities or further avoidance or reductions of potential impacts. For example, additional reporting of vessel speed data would not result in modifications to vessel speeds (e.g., speed restrictions) or reduce the already low potential for vessel strikes of marine mammals for the reasons described in Section 5.3.4.1 (Vessel Movement). Lookouts are not trained to make species-specific identification and would not be able to provide detailed scientific data if more detailed marine species observation reports were to be required. Furthermore, the Navy does not currently maintain a record management system to collect, archive, analyze, and report every marine species observation or all vessel speed data for every training and testing activity and all vessel movements. For example, the speed of Navy vessels can fluctuate an unlimited number of times during training and testing events. Developing and implementing a record management system of this magnitude would be unduly cost prohibitive and place a significant administrative burden on vessel operators and activity participants. Burdening operational Commanders, vessel operators, and event participations with requirements to complete additional administrative reporting would distract them from preparing a ready force and focusing on mission-essential tasks. Additional reporting requirements would draw event participants' attention away from the complex tactical tasks they are primarily obligated to perform, such as driving a warship or engaging in a gunnery event, which would adversely impact Navy personnel safety, public safety, and the effectiveness of training or testing.

5.7 Mitigation Summary

Table 5-21, Table 5-22, and Table 5-23 summarize the mitigation measures the Navy will implement under Alternative 1 or Alternative 2 of the Proposed Action. For detailed mitigation requirements, see Section 5.3 (At-Sea Procedural Mitigation to be Implemented), Section 5.4 (At-Sea Mitigation Areas to be Implemented), Section 5.5 (Terrestrial Mitigation Measures to be Implemented), and Appendix I (Geographic Mitigation Assessment).

Table 5-21: Summary of At-Sea Procedural Mitigation

Stressor or Activity	*Mitigation Zone Sizes and Other Requirements*	*Protection Focus*
Environmental Awareness and Education	• Afloat Environmental Compliance Training program for applicable personnel	Marine mammals, Sea turtles
Active Sonar	• Depending on sonar source: • 1,000 yards (yd.) power down, 500 yd. power down, and 200 yd. shut down • 200 yd. shut down	Marine mammals, Sea turtles
Weapons Firing Noise	• 30° on either side of the firing line out to 70 yd.	Marine mammals, Sea turtles
Explosive Sonobuoys	• 600 yd.	Marine mammals, Sea turtles
Explosive Torpedoes	• 2,100 yd.	Marine mammals, Sea turtles
Explosive Medium-Caliber and Large-Caliber Projectiles	• 1,000 yd. (large-caliber projectiles) • 600 yd. (medium-caliber projectiles during surface-to-surface activities) • 200 yd. (medium-caliber projectiles during air-to-surface activities)	Marine mammals, Sea turtles
Explosive Missiles and Rockets	• 2,000 yd. (21–500 pounds [lb.] net explosive weight) • 900 yd. (0.6–20 lb. net explosive weight)	Marine mammals, Sea turtles
Explosive Bombs	• 2,500 yd.	Marine mammals, Sea turtles
Sinking Exercises	• 2.5 nautical miles	Marine mammals, Sea turtles
Explosive Mine Countermeasure and Neutralization Activities	• 600 yd.	Marine mammals, Sea turtles
Explosive Mine Neutralization Activities Involving Navy Divers	• 1,000 yd. (charges using time-delay fuses) • 500 yd. (positive control charges) • Underwater detonation location (for divers)	Marine mammals, Sea turtles, Fish (hammerhead sharks, manta rays)
Maritime Security Operations – Anti-Swimmer Grenades	• 200 yd.	Marine mammals, Sea turtles
Vessel Movement	• 500 yd. (whales) • 200 yd. (other marine mammals) • Vicinity (sea turtles) • Cease beach approach during Amphibious Assault and Amphibious Raid exercises (sea turtles)	Marine mammals, Sea turtles
Towed In-Water Devices	• 250 yd. (marine mammals) • Vicinity (sea turtles)	Marine mammals, Sea turtles
Small-, Medium-, and Large-Caliber Non-Explosive Practice Munitions	• 200 yd.	Marine mammals, Sea turtles
Non-Explosive Missiles and Rockets	• 900 yd.	Marine mammals, Sea turtles
Non-Explosive Bombs and Mine Shapes	• 1,000 yd.	Marine mammals, Sea turtles

Table 5-22: Summary of At-Sea Mitigation Areas

Summary of Mitigation Requirements
Mitigation Areas for Seafloor Resources
• **Shallow-water coral reefs:** The Navy will not conduct precision anchoring, explosive mine countermeasure and neutralization activities, explosive mine neutralization activities involving Navy divers, explosive or non-explosive small-, medium-, and large-caliber gunnery activities using a surface target, explosive or non-explosive missile and rocket activities using a surface target, or explosive or non-explosive bombing or mine laying activities. The Navy will not place mine shapes, anchors, or mooring devices on the seafloor. Mitigation applies throughout the Study Area except in designated locations, where these resources will be avoided to the maximum extent practicable. • **Live hard bottom, artificial reefs, and shipwrecks:** The Navy will not conduct precision anchoring, explosive mine countermeasure and neutralization activities, or explosive mine neutralization activities involving Navy divers. The Navy will not place mine shapes, anchors, or mooring devices on the seafloor. Mitigation applies throughout the Study Area except in designated locations, where these resources will be avoided to the maximum extent practicable.
Mitigation Areas for Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles
• **Marpi Reef Mitigation Area and Chalan Kanoa Reef Mitigation Area[1]** – The Navy will conduct a maximum combined total of 20 hours of surface ship hull-mounted MF1 mid-frequency active sonar during training and testing from 1 December to 30 April within the Marpi Reef Mitigation Area and Chalan Kanoa Reef Mitigation Area. The Navy will report the total hours of active sonar (all bins, by bin) used in the Marpi Reef Mitigation Area and Chalan Kanoa Reef Mitigation Area from 1 December to 30 April in its annual training and testing activity reports submitted to NMFS. Should national security present a requirement to use surface ship hull-mounted MF1 mid-frequency active sonar between 1 December to 30 April, the Navy will provide NMFS with advance notification of the activity. – The Navy will not use in-water explosives in the Marpi Reef Mitigation Area and Chalan Kanoa Reef Mitigation Area year-round. – The Navy will issue an annual seasonal awareness notification message to alert ships and aircraft operating in the Marpi Reef Mitigation Area and Chalan Kanoa Reef Mitigation Area to the possible presence of increased concentrations of humpback whales from 1 December through 30 April. To maintain safety of navigation and to avoid interactions with large whales during transits, the Navy will instruct vessels to remain vigilant to the presence of humpback whales, that when concentrated seasonally, may become vulnerable to vessel strikes. Platforms will use the information from the awareness notification messages to assist their visual observation of applicable mitigation zones during training and testing activities and to aid in the implementation of procedural mitigation. • **Agat Bay Nearshore Mitigation Area[1,2]** – The Navy will not use surface ship hull-mounted MF1 mid-frequency active sonar in the Agat Bay Nearshore Mitigation Area year-round. – The Navy will not use in-water explosives in the Agat Bay Nearshore Mitigation Area year-round.

[1] Should national security present a requirement to conduct training or testing prohibited by the mitigation requirements specified in this table, naval units will obtain permission from the appropriate designated Command authority prior to commencement of the activity. The Navy will provide NMFS with advance notification and include relevant information (e.g., sonar hours, explosives use) in its annual activity reports submitted to NMFS.

[2] The designated Command authority will base authorization on the unique characteristics of the area from a military readiness perspective, taking into account the importance of the area for spinner dolphins and sea turtles and the need to avoid adverse impacts to the maximum extent practicable. Furthermore, the Command authority conducting the activity will provide specific direction to operational units on required mitigation prior to conducting training or testing using in-water explosives in this area.

Table 5-23: Summary of Terrestrial Mitigation

Summary of Mitigation Requirements
Terrestrial Mitigation Measures on Farallon de Medinilla for Birds, Bats, and Sea Turtles
• The Navy will not use explosive cluster weapons, scatterable munitions, fuel air explosives, incendiary munitions, depleted uranium rounds, and bombs greater than 2,000 lb. • The Navy will not target the northern Special Use Area and the narrow land bridge with explosive or non-explosive ordnance. • The Navy will not use explosive ordnance in Impact Area 1. • The Navy will only target Impact Areas 1, 2, and 3 during air-to-ground bombing, missile, and gunnery exercises. • The Navy will only fire from the west during ship-based bombardment. • Navy personnel will not be authorized on FDM without approval from Joint Region Marianas Operations. • During training activities involving aircraft dropping explosive or non-explosive ordnance on a surface target, mitigation will include visual observation immediately before and during the exercise. Firing will cease if a sea turtle is observed (on shore) in the vicinity of the intended impact location. Firing will recommence if the sea turtle is observed exiting the vicinity of the intended impact location, or if the intended impact location has been repositioned to a new location (i.e., to where the sea turtle is no longer within the vicinity of the intended impact location).

REFERENCES

Boebel, O. (2017). *Exploring the Thermal Limits of IR-Based Automatic Whale Detection*. Arlington, VA: Office of Naval Research Program.

Dolman, S. J., C. R. Weir, and M. Jasny. (2009). Comparative review of marine mammal guidance implemented during naval exercises. *Marine Pollution Bulletin, 58*, 465–477.

Dunlop, R. A., M. J. Noad, R. D. McCauley, E. Kniest, R. Slade, D. Paton, and D. H. Cato. (2016). Response of humpback whales (*Megaptera novaeangliae*) to ramp-up of a small experimental air gun array. *Marine Pollution Bulletin, 103*(1–2), 72–83.

Kastelein, R. A., N. Steen, R. Gransier, P. J. Wensveen, and C. A. F. de Jong. (2012). Threshold received sound pressure levels of single 1-2 kHz and 6-7 kHz up-sweeps and down-sweeps causing startle responses in a harbor porpoise (*Phocoena phocoena*). *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 131*(3), 2325–2333.

Maloni, M., J. A. Paul, and D. M. Gligor. (2013). Slow steaming impacts on ocean carriers and shippers. *Maritime Economics & Logistics, 15*(2), 151–171.

Mingozzi, M., F. Salvioli, and F. Serafino. (2020). X-band radar for cetacean detection (focus on *Tursiops truncatus*) and preliminary analysis of their behavior. *Remote Sensing, 12*.

Smith, H. R., D. P. Zitterbart, T. F. Norris, M. Flau, E. L. Fergusson, C. G. Jones, O. Boebel, and V. D. Moulton. (2020). A field comparison of marine mammal detection via visual, acoustic, and infrared (IR) imaging methods offshore Atlantic Canada. *Marine Pollution Bulletin, 156*.

U.S. Department of Defense. (2009). *Programmatic Agreement Among the Department of Defense Representative Guam, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, Federated States of Micronesia and Republic of Palau, Joint Region Marianas; Commander, Navy Region Marianas; Commander, 36th Wing, Andersen Air Force Base; the Guam Historic Preservation Officer, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas Islands Historic Preservation Officer Regarding Military Training in the Marianas*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Defense.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2010). *Navy Integrated Comprehensive Monitoring Plan*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Navy.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2013a). *U.S. Navy Strategic Planning Process for Marine Species Monitoring*. Washington, DC: Chief of Naval Operations, Energy & Environmental Readiness Division.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2013b). *Annual Report: Wildlife Surveys on Tinian and FDM*. Naval Base Guam, Guam: Joint Region Marianas.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2015). *Final Mariana Islands Training and Testing Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement*. Pearl Harbor, HI: Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Pacific.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2016). *Building and Maintaining a Comprehensive Database and Prioritization Scheme for Overlapping Habitat Data*.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2017a). *Marine Mammal Strandings Associated with U.S. Navy Sonar Activities*. San Diego, CA: U.S. Navy Marine Mammal Program and SPAWAR Naval Facilities Engineering Command.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2017b). *Criteria and Thresholds for U.S. Navy Acoustic and Explosive Effects Analysis (Phase III)*. San Diego, CA: Space and Naval Warfare Systems Command, Pacific.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2017c). *Dive Distribution and Group Size Parameters for Marine Species Occurring in the U.S. Navy's Atlantic and Hawaii-Southern California Training and Testing Study Areas*. Newport, RI: Naval Undersea Warfare Center Division.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2018a). *Quantifying Acoustic Impacts on Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles: Methods and Analytical Approach for Phase III Training and Testing* (Technical Report prepared by NUWC Division Newport, Space and Naval Warfare Systems Center Pacific, G2 Software Systems, and the National Marine Mammal Foundation). Newport, RI: Naval Undersea Warfare Center.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2018b). *Atlantic Fleet Training and Testing Final Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement*. Norfolk, VA: Naval Facilities Engineering Command Atlantic.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. (2015). *Biological Opinion for the Mariana Islands Training and Testing Program*. Honolulu, HI: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Pacific Islands Fish and Wildlife Office.

Verfuss, U. K., D. Gillespie, J. Gordon, T. A. Marques, B. Miller, R. Plunkett, J. A. Theriault, D. J. Tollit, D. P. Zitterbart, P. Hubert, and L. Thomas. (2018). Comparing methods suitable for monitoring marine mammals in low visibiity conditions during seismic surveys. *Marine Pollution Bulletin, 126*, 1–18.

von Benda-Beckmann, A. M., P. J. Wensveen, P. H. Kvadsheim, F. P. Lam, P. J. Miller, P. L. Tyack, and M. A. Ainslie. (2014). Modeling effectiveness of gradual increases in source level to mitigate effects of sonar on marine mammals. *Conservation Biology, 28*(1), 119–128.

Wensveen, P. J., P. H. Kvadsheim, F.-P. A. Lam, A. M. Von Benda-Beckmann, L. D. Sivle, F. Visser, C. Curé, P. Tyack, and P. J. O. Miller. (2017). Lack of behavioural responses of humpback whales (*Megaptera novaeangliae*) indicate limited effectiveness of sonar mitigation. *The Journal of Experimental Biology, 220*, 1–12.

Williams, B. K., R. C. Szaro, and C. D. Shapiro. (2009). *Adaptive Management: The U.S. Department of the Interior Technical Guide*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Interior.

Zitterbart, D. P., L. Kindermann, E. Burkhardt, and O. Boebel. (2013). Automatic round-the-clock detection of whales for mitigation from underwater noise impacts. *PLoS ONE, 8*(8), e71217.

Zitterbart, D. P., H. R. Smith, M. Flau, S. Richter, E. Burkhardt, J. Beland, A. Cammareri, A. Davis, M. Holst, C. Lanfredi, H. Michel, M. Noad, K. Owen, A. Pacini, and O. Boebel. (2020). *Scaling the laws of thermal imaging-based whale detection*. Woods Hole, MA: Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution.

6 Additional Regulatory Considerations

Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/ Overseas Environmental Impact Statement Mariana Islands Training and Testing

TABLE OF CONTENTS

6 ADDITIONAL REGULATORY CONSIDERATIONS....6-1

6.1 Consistency with Other Applicable Federal, State, and Local Plans, Policies, and Regulations....6-1

6.1.1 Coastal Zone Management Act Compliance....6-7

6.1.1.1 Guam Coastal Management Program....6-7

6.1.1.2 Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands Coastal Zone Management Program....6-7

6.1.2 Marine Protected Areas....6-8

6.1.3 Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act....6-8

6.2 Relationship Between Short-Term Use of the Environment and Maintenance and Enhancement of Long-Term Productivity....6-9

6.3 Irreversible or Irretrievable Commitment of Resources....6-9

6.4 Energy Requirements and Conservation Potential of Alternatives....6-9

List of Figures

There are no figures in this chapter.

List of Tables

Table 6.1-1: Summary of Environmental Compliance for the Proposed Action....6-2

This page intentionally left blank.

6 Additional Regulatory Considerations

In accordance with the Council on Environmental Quality regulations for implementing the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), federal agencies shall, to the fullest extent possible, integrate the requirements of NEPA with other planning and environmental review procedures required by law or by agency practice so that all such procedures run concurrently rather than consecutively. This chapter summarizes environmental compliance for the Proposed Action; consistency with other federal, state, and local plans, policies, and regulations in addition to the ones discussed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences); the relationship between short-term impacts and the maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity in the affected environment; irreversible and irretrievable commitments of resources; and energy conservation.

6.1 Consistency with Other Applicable Federal, State, and Local Plans, Policies, and Regulations

Implementation of the Proposed Action in this Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/ Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS/OEIS) would comply with applicable federal, state, and local laws, regulations, and executive orders. The United States (U.S.) Department of the Navy (Navy) has consulted with regulatory agencies, as appropriate, during the NEPA process and before implementing the Proposed Action.

Table 6.1-1 summarizes environmental compliance requirements that were considered in preparing this SEIS/OEIS (including those that may be secondary considerations in the resource evaluations). Section 3.0.2 (Regulatory Framework) provides brief excerpts of the primary federal statutes, executive orders, international standards, and guidance that form the regulatory framework for the resource evaluations. Section 1.6 (The Environmental Planning Process) provides brief excerpts of the primary federal statutes, executive orders, and guidance that form the regulatory framework for the resource evaluations in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences). Documentation of consultation and coordination with regulatory agencies is provided in Appendix C (Agency Correspondence).

Table 6.1-1: Summary of Environmental Compliance for the Proposed Action

Statutes, Regulations, International Standards, and Guidance	Status of Compliance
Statutes and Regulations	
Abandoned Shipwreck Act (43 United States Code [U.S.C.] sections 2101-2106)	See Section 3.11 (Cultural Resources) for assessment and conclusion that the Proposed Action is consistent with the act.
Act to Prevent Pollution from Ships (33 U.S.C. sections 1901–1915)	The Navy complies with these regulations and operates in a manner that minimizes or eliminates any adverse effects to the marine environment. See Section 3.1 (Sediments and Water Quality) for the assessment.
Clean Air Act (CAA) (42 U.S.C. sections 7401 et seq.) *CAA General Conformity Rule* (40 CFR section 93[B]) State Implementation Plan (SIP)	The Proposed Action would not conflict with attainment and maintenance goals established in the State Implementation Plan. As determined previously, a CAA conformity determination will not be required because emissions attributable to the alternatives including the Proposed Action would be below *de minimis* thresholds. See the Section 3.1 (Air Quality) for discussion of training and testing activities and compliance with the CAA.
Clean Water Act (CWA) (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.)	No permits are required under the CWA Sections 401, 402, or 404 (b) (1) for the Proposed Action.
Coastal Zone Management Act (16 U.S.C. sections 1451-1464)	The Navy will continue compliance with *the Coastal Zone Management Act*. See Section 6.1.1 (Coastal Zone Management Act Compliance).
Endangered Species Act (ESA) (16 U.S.C. sections 1531 et seq.)	This SEIS/OEIS analyzes potential effects to species listed under the ESA and is administered by both the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). In accordance with Section 7 of the ESA (50 CFR section 402), during the preparation of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, the Navy prepared a biological assessment and submitted it to the USFWS. A Biological Opinion (BO) was issued by USFWS and remains valid. The Navy will continue to adhere to any BO terms and conditions listed therein. The Navy prepared a Biological Assessment that was submitted to NMFS as part of formal consultation. A BO may be issued by NMFS, and the Navy will adhere to any BO terms and conditions listed therein.

Table 6.1-1: Summary of Environmental Compliance for the Proposed Action (continued)

Statutes, Regulations, International Standards, and Guidance	Status of Compliance
Statutes and Regulations (continued)	
Historic Sites, Buildings and Antiquities Act, 1935 (54 U.S.C. 320101 et seq.) *Antiquities Act* (54 U.S.C. sections 320301–320303)	Status remains unchanged since the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. See Section 3.11 (Cultural Resources) for the assessment.
Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. sections 1801–1882)	The Proposed Action may have potential impacts on essential fish habitat and managed species. Consultation with NMFS was conducted for affected species and their habitats (see Section 6.1.3, Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act).
Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA) (16 U.S.C. sections 1431 et seq.)	This SEIS/OEIS updates the analysis and was the basis for a request for a new Letter of Authorization (LOA) permit for activities beginning in 2020. The Navy applied for a LOA, which is expected to impose terms and conditions that, when implemented, would make ESA Section 9 prohibitions inapplicable to covered Navy activities.
Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 U.S.C. sections 703–712)	The Proposed Action is not anticipated to result in significant adverse effects on migratory bird populations. The Navy did not need to confer with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service as a result of the Proposed Action.
Military Munitions Rule	As noted in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, military munitions are not considered solid waste based on two conditions stated at 40 CFR section 266.202(a)(1)(i iii). These two conditions are when munitions are used for their intended purpose and when unused munitions or a component of are subject to materials recovery activities. These two conditions cover the uses of munitions included in the Proposed Action; therefore, the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act does not apply. Status remains unchanged since the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.
National Fishery Enhancement Act (33 U.S.C. section 2101 et seq.)	As noted in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, the Proposed Action is consistent with regulations administered by NMFS and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers concerning artificial reefs in the navigable waters of the United States. Status remains unchanged since the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. See Section 3.9 (Fishes) for the assessment.

Table 6.1-1: Summary of Environmental Compliance for the Proposed Action (continued)

Statutes, Regulations, International Standards, and Guidance	Status of Compliance
Statutes and Regulations (continued)	
National Historic Preservation Act (54 U.S.C. section 306108)	Since January 2019, the Navy has been engaged in ongoing consultations under Section 106 of the NHPA in order to replace the now expired 2009 MIRC Programmatic Agreement (PA) (U.S. Department of Defense, 2009). As the Navy continues to actively consult and develop a new PA for the MITT undertaking, the Parties have executed interim PAs which incorporate all of the terms and mitigations of the 2009 PA. The interim PAs took effect after the expiration of the 2009 MIRC PA and serve as a continuation of the DoD's compliance under Section 106 of the NHPA for MITT activities. The interim PA with the CNMI Historic Preservation Officer (HPO) expires September 10, 2020, while the interim PA with the Guam HPO expires June 30, 2020. The Proposed Action is consistent with the national policy for the preservation of historic sites, buildings, and objects of national significance. Furthermore, the Navy will comply, as applicable, with the Section 106 consultation requirements.
National Marine Sanctuaries Act (16 U.S.C. sections 1431–1445c-1)	There are no National Marine Sanctuaries within the MITT Study Area.
Rivers and Harbors Act (33 U.S.C. section 401 et seq.)	No permit is required under the Rivers and Harbors Act because no construction in navigable waterways is proposed.
The Sikes Act of 1960 (16 U.S.C. sections 670a-670o, as amended by the Sikes Act Improvement Act of 1997, Public Law No. 105-85), requires military installations with significant natural resources to prepare and implement Integrated Natural Resource Management Plans (INRMPs).	Status remains unchanged since the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. The Proposed Action and Alternatives will not result in a requirement for an update of INRMPs outside of their normal update schedule of every 5 years.
Submerged Lands Act of 1953 (43 U.S.C. sections 1301–1315)	The Proposed Action is consistent with the Submerged Lands Act regulations.
Sunken Military Craft Act (Public Law 108–375, 10 U.S.C. section 113 Note and 118 Stat. 2094–2098)	The *Sunken Military Craft Act* does not apply to actions taken by, or at the direction of, the United States.

Table 6.1-1: Summary of Environmental Compliance for the Proposed Action (continued)

Statutes, Regulations, International Standards, and Guidance	Status of Compliance
Executive Orders	
Executive Order 11990*, Protection of Wetlands*	Implementation of the Proposed Action would not affect wetlands as defined in Executive Order 11990.
Executive Order 12114, *Environmental Effects Abroad of Major Department of Defense Actions*	The Navy prepared this SEIS/OEIS in accordance with Executive Order 12114 and Navy-implementing regulations found at 32 CFR part 187, *Environmental Effects Abroad of Major Department of Defense Actions*.
Executive Order 12898, *Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations*	As noted in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, the Proposed Action would not result in any disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects on minority or low-income populations. Status remains unchanged since the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. See Section 3.12 (Socioeconomic Resources and Environmental Justice) for the assessment.
Executive Order 12962*, Recreational Fisheries*	Status remains unchanged since the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. See Section 3.12 (Socioeconomic Resources and Environmental Justice) for the assessment.
Executive Order 13045, *Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks*	The Proposed Action would not result in disproportionate environmental health or safety risks to children. See Section 3.0.3 (Resources and Issues Not Carried Forward for More Detailed Discussion).
Executive Order 13089*, Coral Reef Protection*	Status remains unchanged since the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.
Executive Order 13112*, Invasive Species*	As noted in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, the Navy has prepared this SEIS/OEIS in accordance with requirements for the prevention of and eradication of invasive species. Naval vessels are exempt from 33 CFR 151 Subpart D, *Ballast Water Management for Control of Non-indigenous Species in Waters of the United States*. Status remains unchanged since the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.
Executive Order 13158, *Marine Protected Areas*	Status remains unchanged since the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. See Section 6.1.2 (Marine Protected Areas) for more information.
Executive Order 13783, *Promoting Energy Independence and Economic Growth*	The Proposed Action is consistent with the policy and immediate review of all agency actions that potentially burden the safe, efficient development of domestic energy resources. This Executive Order revokes Executive Order 13653, *Preparing the United States for the Impacts of Climate Change*.

Table 6.1-1: Summary of Environmental Compliance for the Proposed Action (continued)

Statutes, Regulations, International Standards, and Guidance	Status of Compliance
Executive Orders (continued)	
Executive Order 13792, *Review of Designations Under the Antiquities Act*	On April 26, 2017, Executive Order 13792 was issued; it directed the Secretary of the Interior to review designations of national monuments made since 1996.
Executive Order 13834, *Efficient Federal Operations*	The Proposed Action is consistent with the federal government's order to prioritize actions that reduce waste, cut costs, enhance the resilience of Federal infrastructure and operations, and enable more effective accomplishment of an agency's mission. This Executive Order revokes Executive Order 13693, *Planning for Federal Sustainability in the Next Decade*.
Executive Order 13840, *Ocean Policy to Advance the Economic, Security, and Environmental Interests of the United States*	The Proposed Action is consistent with the comprehensive national policy for the *Ocean Policy to Advance the Economic, Security, and Environmental Interests of the United States* (which revoked and replaced Executive Order 13547, *Stewardship of the Ocean, Our Coasts, and the Great Lakes*).
International Standards	
International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships	As noted in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, the Proposed Action does not include vessel operation and discharge from ships; however, the Navy vessels operating in the Study Area would comply with the discharge requirements established in this program, minimizing or eliminating potential impacts from discharges from ships. Status remains unchanged since the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

Notes: CFR = Code of Federal Regulations, DoD = Department of Defense, EIS = Environmental Impact Statement, MBTA = Migratory Bird Treaty Act, MIRC = Mariana Islands Range Complex, MITT = Mariana Islands Training and Testing, NHPA = National Historic Preservation Act, OEIS = Overseas Environmental Impact Statement, SEIS = Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement, U.S. = United States, U.S.C. = United States Code.

6.1.1 Coastal Zone Management Act Compliance

The Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (16 United States Code [U.S.C.] section 1451, et seq.) encourages coastal states to be proactive in managing coastal zone uses and resources. The act established a voluntary coastal planning program and required participating states to submit a Coastal Management Plan to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration for approval. Under the act, federal actions that have an effect on a coastal use or resource are required to be consistent, to the maximum extent practicable, with the enforceable policies of federally approved Coastal Management Plans.

The Coastal Zone Management Act defines the coastal zone as extending "to the outer limit of State title and ownership under the Submerged Lands Act" (i.e., 3 nautical miles [NM] or 9 NM from the shoreline, depending on the location). The coastal zone extends inland only to the extent necessary to control the shoreline, but the shoreward extent is not relevant to the Proposed Action.

A consistency determination (CD), a negative determination, or a *de minimis* exemption may be submitted for review of federal agency activities. A federal agency submits a CD when it determines that its activity may have either a direct or an indirect effect on a state coastal use or resource. In accordance with 15 Code of Federal Regulations section 930.39, the CD will include a brief statement indicating whether the proposed activity will be undertaken in a manner consistent to the maximum extent practicable with the enforceable policies of the management program. The CD must be based on evaluation of the relevant enforceable policies of the management program. In accordance with 15 Code of Federal Regulations section 930.35, "if a Federal agency determines that there will not be coastal effects, then the Federal agency shall provide the State agencies with a negative determination for a Federal agency activity: (1) Identified by a State agency on its list, as described in section 930.34(b), or through case-by-case monitoring of unlisted activities; or (2) Which is the same as or is similar to activities for which CDs have been prepared in the past; or (3) For which the Federal agency undertook a thorough consistency assessment and developed initial findings on the coastal effects of the activity." Thus, a negative determination must be submitted to a state if the agency determines no coastal effects and one or more of the triggers above is met. *De minimis* exemptions are activities proposed by the federal agency that have already been reviewed and approved by the state (after allowing for public review and comment), and those that the state has recognized as having insignificant direct or indirect (secondary or cumulative) effects on its coastal resources.

6.1.1.1 Guam Coastal Management Program

The Navy submitted a CD to the Bureau of Statistics and Plans (BSP) in December 2019 addressing proposed military training and testing activities that may affect Guam's coastal use or resource. The CD was prepared in accordance with Guam's Procedures Guide for Achieving Federal Consistency with the Guam Coastal Management Program (Bureau of Statistics and Plans May 2011). BSP's response to the Navy's CD (dated March 6, 2020) can be found in Appendix C (Agency Correspondence). The Navy is in discussions with BSP in order to resolve any differences and reach an agreement regarding the Navy's compliance with Guam's Coastal Management Program to the maximum extent practicable. The outcome of these discussions will be included in the Record of Decision.

6.1.1.2 Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands Coastal Zone Management Program

The Navy submitted a CD to the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (CNMI) Division of Coastal Resources Management (DCRM) in December 2019 addressing proposed military training and testing activities that may affect the CNMI's coastal use or resource. DCRM's response to the Navy's CD

(dated March 9, 2020) can be found in Appendix C (Agency Correspondence). The Navy is in discussions with DCRM in order to resolve any differences and reach an agreement regarding the Navy's compliance with CNMI's Coastal Management Program to the maximum extent practicable. The outcome of these discussions will be included in the Record of Decision.

6.1.2 Marine Protected Areas

The National System of Marine Protected Areas includes marine protected areas managed under six systems: (1) the National Marine Sanctuary System, (2) Marine National Monuments, (3) the National Wildlife Refuge System, (4) State and Local Marine Protected Areas, (5) the National Parks System, and (6) the National Estuarine Research Reserve System. The 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS discussed Marine Protected Areas that overlapped with the Study Area (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2015). There are no National Marine Sanctuary System or National Estuarine Research Reserve System areas in the Study Area. The Mariana Trench Marine National Monument (Proclamation No. 8335, 74 *Federal Register* 1557) is located within the Study Area, but was designated in 2009 with specific language that stated: "The prohibitions required by this proclamation shall not apply to activities and exercises of the Armed Forces (including those carried out by the United States Coast Guard)."

There are three national wildlife refuge areas within the Study Area: the Guam National Wildlife Refuge, the Mariana Arc of Fire National Wildlife Refuge, and the Mariana Trench National Wildlife Refuge. The Guam National Wildlife Refuge is the only one included in the National System of Marine Protected Areas. There are 12 state or local marine protected areas within the Study Area, none of which are included in the National System of Marine Protected Areas. Finally, the War in the Pacific National Historical Park is within the Study Area; however, it is not included in the National System of Marine Protected Areas. Activities proposed and regulations in these areas have not changed substantially since the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS was published. Further analysis and discussion of Marine Protected Areas can be found in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, Chapter 6 (Additional Regulatory Considerations), Table 6.1-2. Executive Order 13792, *Review of Designations Under the Antiquities Act*, authorized a review of certain designated National Monuments under the Antiquities Act by the Secretary of the Interior. No changes have been made currently to the National Monument in the Study Area.

6.1.3 Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act

The Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act of 1976 (16 U.S.C. section 1801–1891[d]), as amended by the 1996 Sustainable Fisheries Act (Public Law 104–297), and the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Reauthorization Act of 2006 (Public Law 109-479), governs marine fisheries management in U.S. waters in order to promote long-term economic and biological sustainability for fisheries up to 200 NM from shore. Its main objectives are to prevent overfishing, rebuild overfished stocks, increase long-term economic and social benefits, and ensure a safe and sustainable supply of seafood (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2017). The Sustainable Fisheries Act of 1996 amended the law to establish procedures that identify, conserve, and enhance Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) for species regulated under a federal fisheries management plan. Consultation with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) on all actions or proposed actions that may adversely affect EFH is required for federal agencies under section 305(b)(2) of the Magnuson-Stevens Act.

The Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act defines an adverse effect as,

> "any impact that reduces quality and/or quantity of Essential Fish Habitat. Adverse effects may include direct or indirect physical, chemical or biological alterations of the waters or substrate and the loss of, or injury to, benthic organisms, prey species and their habitat and other ecosystem components, if such modifications reduce the quality and/or quantity of Essential Fish Habitat. Adverse effects to Essential Fish Habitat may result from actions occurring within Essential Fish Habitat or outside of Essential Fish Habitat and maybe include site-specific or habitat-wide impacts, including individual, cumulative, or synergistic consequences of actions," (50 Code of Federal Regulations 600.810).

The regional Fisheries Management Councils may also designate areas called Habitat Areas of Particular Concern (HAPC). Designated HAPCs are discrete subsets of EFH that provide extremely important ecological functions or are especially vulnerable to degradation.

The Navy completed a previous EFH consultation with NMFS for the MITT Study Area in 2014. From the 2014 consultation, it was determined that certain proposed activities would affect some elements of EFH. NMFS provided conservation recommendations and the Navy agreed to certain measures to avoid, minimize, mitigate, or offset effects. EFH and HAPC designations in the Study Area have not changed and the previous 2014 consultation is still valid for the proposed training and testing activities that have not changed. The Navy conducted a supplemental EFH consultation with the NMFS Pacific Island Regional Office considering activities that are new or that have changed since the 2014 EFH consultation and that have the potential to adversely affect EFH and managed species for this SEIS/OEIS.

6.2 Relationship Between Short-Term Use of the Environment and Maintenance and Enhancement of Long-Term Productivity

In accordance with the Council on Environmental Quality regulations (Part 1502), this SEIS/OEIS analyzes the relationship between the short-term impacts on the environment and the effects those impacts may have on the maintenance and enhancement of the long-term productivity of the affected environment. This analysis has not changed since the analysis conducted in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. See Section 6.2 (Relationship Between Short-Term Use of The Environment and Maintenance and Enhancement of Long-Term Productivity) of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS for more information (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2015).

6.3 Irreversible or Irretrievable Commitment of Resources

NEPA requires that environmental analysis include identification of "any irreversible and irretrievable commitments of resources which would be involved in the Proposed Action should it be implemented" (42 U.S.C. section 4332). This analysis has not changed since it was conducted in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. See Section 6.3 (Irreversible or Irretrievable Commitment of Resources) of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS for more information (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2015).

6.4 Energy Requirements and Conservation Potential of Alternatives

Under the operational strategy report in 2011, the Department of Defense (DoD) published an implementation plan to integrate operational energy considerations and transformation into existing programs, processes, and institutions (U.S. Department of Defense, 2012). In fiscal year (FY) 2015, the Navy reduced its petroleum consumption by 25.1 percent compared to the FY 2005 baseline (U.S. Department of Defense, 2016a). In 2016, the DoD published a new *Operational Energy Strategy*

(U.S. Department of Defense, 2016b) to update the 2011 strategy and transform the way energy is consumed in military operations. The 2011 strategy set the overall direction for operational energy security (U.S. Department of Defense, 2011). The 2016 strategy shifts focus towards three objectives: (1) increasing future warfighting capability by including energy throughout future force development, (2) identifying and reducing logistic and operational risks from operational energy vulnerabilities, and (3) enhancing the force's mission effectiveness through updated equipment and improvements in training, exercises, and operations (U.S. Department of Defense, 2016b). These documents guide the DoD in how to better use energy resources and transform the way we power current and future forces.

This strategy is consistent with energy conservation practices and states that the Navy values energy as a strategic resource, understands how energy security is fundamental to executing our mission afloat and ashore, and is resilient to any potential energy future. The DoD *Fiscal Year 2018 Operational Energy Annual Report* (2019) satisfies the requirements in section 2925(b) of title 10 U.S.C. for FY 2018 and includes information on operational energy demands, progress in implementing the *Operational Energy Strategy* (2016b), alternative fuels investments, and contingency operations support. The DoD consumed approximately 85 million barrels of fuel to power ships, aircraft, combat vehicles, and contingency bases in FY 2018 (Department of Defense, 2019). The Navy consumes approximately 26 percent of the total DoD share (Department of Defense, 2019).

Training and testing activities within the Study Area would increase energy demand over the No Action Alternative. The energy demand would arise from fuel (e.g., gasoline, diesel) consumption, mainly from aircraft and vessels participating in training and testing. Details of fuel consumption by training and testing activities on an annual basis are outlined in the air quality emissions calculation spreadsheets available on the project website. Calculations from the air quality analysis in this SEIS/OEIS found that aircraft fuel consumption is estimated to decrease by approximately 5 percent per year under both Alternative 1 and Alternative 2, when compared to current annual rates of aircraft fuel consumption. Vessel fuel consumption is estimated to increase by approximately 8 percent per year under both Alternative 1 and Alternative 2, when compared to current annual rates of vessel fuel consumption. Conservative assumptions were made in developing the estimates, and therefore the actual amount of fuel consumed during training and testing events may be less than estimated. The alternatives could result in a net cumulative reduction in the global energy (fuel) supply.

Energy requirements would be subject to any established energy conservation practices. The use of energy sources has been minimized wherever possible without compromising safety, training, or testing activities. No additional conservation measures related to direct energy consumption by the proposed activities are identified. The Navy's energy vision given in the *2016 Operational Energy Strategy* report (U.S. Department of Defense, 2016b) is consistent with energy conservation practices and states that the Navy values energy as a strategic resource, understands how energy security is fundamental to executing our mission afloat and ashore and is resilient to any potential energy future.

The Navy is committed to improving energy security and environmental stewardship by reducing its reliance on fossil fuels. The Navy is actively developing and participating in energy, environmental, and climate change initiatives that will help conserve the world's resources for future generations. The Navy Climate Change Roadmap identified actions the Environmental Readiness Division took to implement Executive Order 13653, *Preparing the United States for the Impacts of Climate Change* (which has since been revoked and replaced with Executive Order 13783, *Promoting Energy Independence and Economic Growth*).

The Navy is committed to improving energy security and environmental stewardship by reducing its reliance on fossil fuels (U.S. Department of the Navy, n.d.). The Navy is actively developing and participating in energy, environmental, and climate change initiatives that will increase the use of alternative energy and help conserve the world's resources for future generations. Examples of Navy-wide greenhouse gas reduction projects include energy-efficient construction, thermal and photovoltaic solar systems, geothermal power plants, and the generation of electricity with wind energy. The Navy continues to promote and install new renewable energy projects.

Two Navy programs—the Incentivized Energy Conservation Program and the Naval Sea Systems Command's Fleet Readiness, Research, and Development Program—are helping the Fleet conserve fuel via improved operating procedures and long-term initiatives. The Incentivized Energy Conservation Program encourages the operation of ships in the most efficient manner while conducting their mission and supporting the Secretary of the Navy's efforts to reduce total energy consumption on naval ships. The Naval Sea Systems Command's Fleet Readiness, Research, and Development Program includes the High-Efficiency Heating, Ventilating, and Air Conditioning; and the Hybrid Electric Drive for DDG-51 class ships, which are improvements to existing shipboard technologies that will both help with Fleet readiness and decrease the ships' energy consumption and greenhouse gas emissions. These initiatives are expected to greatly reduce the consumption of fossil fuels.

REFERENCES

Department of Defense. (2019). *Fiscal Year 2018 Operational Energy Annual Report*. Washington, DC: Department of Defense.

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. (2017). *Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act*. Retrieved from https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/resource/document/magnuson-stevens-fishery-conservation-and-management-act.

U.S. Department of Defense. (2009). *Programmatic Agreement Among the Department of Defense Representative Guam, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, Federated States of Micronesia and Republic of Palau, Joint Region Marianas; Commander, Navy Region Marianas; Commander, 36th Wing, Andersen Air Force Base; the Guam Historic Preservation Officer, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas Islands Historic Preservation Officer Regarding Military Training in the Marianas*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Defense.

U.S. Department of Defense. (2011). *Energy for the Warfighter: Operational Energy Strategy*. Washington, DC: Assistant Secretary of Defense for Operational Energy Plans & Programs.

U.S. Department of Defense. (2012). *Operational Energy Strategy: Implementation Plan*. Washington, DC: Assistant Secretary of Defense for Operational Energy Plans & Programs.

U.S. Department of Defense. (2016a). *Department of Defense Annual Energy Management Report Fiscal Year 2015*. Washington, DC: Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Energy, Installations, and Environment).

U.S. Department of Defense. (2016b). *2016 Operational Energy Strategy*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Defense.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2015). *Final Mariana Islands Training and Testing Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement*. Pearl Harbor, HI: Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Pacific.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (n.d.). *Department of the Navy's Energy Program for Security and Independence*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Navy.

7 List of Preparers

Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/

Overseas Environmental Impact Statement

Mariana Islands Training and Testing

TABLE OF CONTENTS

7 LIST OF PREPARERS 7-1

List of Figures

There are no figures in this chapter.

List of Tables

There are no tables in this chapter.

This page intentionally left blank.

7 List of Preparers

U.S. Department of the Navy

Victoria Bowman (Space and Naval Warfare Systems Command)
B.A., Psychology
Years of experience: 10

Andrea Carpenter (Naval Sea Systems Command)
M.E.S.M., Environmental Science & Management
B.A., Environmental Science
Years of experience: 10

Peter Hulton (Naval Undersea Warfare Center, Division Newport)
B.S., Mechanical Engineering
Years of experience: 34

Keith Jenkins (Space & Naval Warfare Systems Command)
M.S., Fisheries Oceanography
B.S., Marine Biology
Years of experience: 19

Chip Johnson (U.S. Navy Pacific Fleet)
M.A., Marine Science
B.S., Biology
Years of experience: 19

Sarah Kotecki (Space & Naval Warfare Systems Command)
B.S., Civil and Environmental Engineering
Years of experience: 19

Jerry Olen (Space & Naval Warfare Systems Command)
M.A., Political Science
B.S., Environmental Engineering
Years of experience: 23

Jennifer Paulk (Naval Air Systems Command)
M.S., Physiology
B.S., Psychology
Years of experience: 24

Barbara Prine (Naval Facilities Engineering Command)
M.S., Environmental-Agricultural Education
B.S., Natural Resources and Environmental Sciences
Years of experience: 14

Coral Rasmussen (Naval Facilities Engineering Command)
M.A., Maritime History
Years of experience: 29

Julie Rivers (U.S. Navy Pacific Fleet)
B.S., Biology
Years of experience: 29

Elizabeth Scheimer (Naval Facilities Engineering Command)
M.S., Earth Systems
B.S., Science, Technology and Society
Years of experience: 12

Cory Scott (U.S. Navy Pacific Fleet)
B.S., Ecosystem Management and Restoration, Natural Resources Planning
Years of experience: 13

John Van Name (U.S. Navy Pacific Fleet)
P.E., Mechanical Engineering
Years of experience: 39

Contractors

Conrad Erkelens (ManTech International)
M.A., Anthropology
B.A., Anthropology
Years of experience: 22

Lucas Griswold (ManTech International)
B.S., Environmental Engineering
Years of experience: 2

Danny Heilprin (ManTech International)
M.S., Marine Science
B.A., Aquatic Biology
Years of experience: 31

Taylor Houston (ManTech International)
M.B.A.
B.S., Natural Resource Management
Years of experience: 19

Meagan Ostrem (ManTech International)
B.S., Environmental Science/Environmental Law and Policy
Years of experience: 15

Sarah Rider (G2 Software Systems)
M.E.M., Coastal Environmental Management
B.S., Marine Science
Years of experience: 14

Marya Samuelson (ManTech International)
M.B.A., Project Management
B.A., Environmental Studies
Years of experience: 8

Claudia Tan (ManTech International)
A.A., Liberal Arts and Science
Years of experience: 18

Michelle Tishler (National Marine Mammal Foundation)
M.S., Marine Biology
B.S., Wildlife Ecology and Conservation, Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences Minor
Years of experience: 14

Allison Turner, Certified Public Participation Practitioner by the International Association of Public Participation (ManTech International)
Master of Environmental Science and Management
B.A., Social Science, emphasis in Environment
Years of experience: 17

Karen Waller (ManTech International)
M.B.A., Environmental Management
B.S., Public Affairs
Years of experience: 27

Mike Zickel (ManTech International)
M.S., Marine Estuarine Environmental Sciences
B.S., Physics
Years of experience: 19

This page intentionally left blank.

8 Public Involvement and Distribution

Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/ Overseas Environmental Impact Statement Mariana Islands Training and Testing

TABLE OF CONTENTS

8 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT AND DISTRIBUTION 8-1

8.1 Project Website 8-1

8.2 Scoping Period 8-1

8.2.1 Public Scoping Notification 8-4

8.2.1.1 Notification Letters 8-4

8.2.1.2 Postcard Mailer 8-11

8.2.1.3 Newspaper Advertisements 8-13

8.2.1.4 Press Release 8-14

8.2.2 Summary of Public Scoping Comments 8-17

8.2.2.1 Description of the Proposed Action and Alternatives 8-17

8.2.2.2 National Environmental Policy Act and Public Involvement 8-17

8.2.2.3 Location of Activities 8-17

8.2.2.4 Indirect and Cumulative Impacts 8-17

8.2.2.5 Sediments and Water Quality Impacts 8-17

8.2.2.6 Socioeconomic Resources 8-18

8.2.2.7 Terrestrial Species and Habitats/Marine Birds 8-18

8.2.2.8 Marine Resources 8-18

8.2.2.9 Marine Mammal Impacts/Sea Turtles 8-18

8.2.2.10 Fish/Marine Habitat 8-18

8.2.2.11 Cultural Resources 8-18

8.2.2.12 Public Health and Safety 8-18

8.2.2.13 Mitigation Measures 8-18

8.2.2.14 Other 8-19

8.3 Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement Public Review and Comment Period 8-19

8.3.1 Notification of Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement Public Review and Comment Period and Public Meetings 8-25

8.3.1.1 Notification Letters 8-25
8.3.1.2 Postcard Mailers 8-33
8.3.1.3 Newspaper Advertisements 8-36
8.3.1.4 Press Releases 8-39
8.3.1.5 Subscriber Email Notifications 8-48
8.3.2 Public Meetings 8-49
8.4 Comments on the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement 8-49
8.5 Distribution of the Draft and Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement 8-49
8.5.1 Federal Agencies 8-50
8.5.2 Information Repositories 8-51

List of Figures

Figure 8.2-1: Notice of Intent for Scoping 8-2
Figure 8.2-2: Stakeholder Scoping Notification Letter 8-8
Figure 8.2-3: Postcard Mailer for Scoping (Front and Back) 8-12
Figure 8.2-4: Newspaper Announcement for Scoping 8-13
Figure 8.2-5: Press Release for Scoping 8-15
Figure 8.3-1: Federal Register Notice of Public Meetings for the Draft SEIS/OEIS 8-20
Figure 8.3-2: Federal Register Notice of Availability for the Draft SEIS/OEIS 8-21
Figure 8.3-3: Federal Register Notice of Rescheduled Public Meetings for the Draft SEIS/OEIS 8-22
Figure 8.3-4: Federal Register Notice of Extension of Public Comment Period for the Draft SEIS/OEIS 8-24
Figure 8.3-5: Stakeholder Letter for the Notification of Availability of the Draft SEIS/OEIS 8-29
Figure 8.3-6: Notice of the Draft SEIS/OEIS Public Meetings Postcard Mailer (Front and Back) 8-34
Figure 8.3-7: Notice of the Draft SEIS/OEIS Rescheduled Public Meetings and Comment Period Extension Postcard Mailer (Front and Back) 8-35
Figure 8.3-8: Newspaper Announcement of the Draft SEIS/OEIS Availability and Public Meetings 8-37
Figure 8.3-9: Newspaper Announcement of the Draft SEIS/OEIS Availability and Rescheduled Public Meetings 8-38
Figure 8.3-10: Newspaper Announcement of the Draft SEIS/OEIS Public Comment Extension Period 8-38
Figure 8.3-11: Press Release of the Notification of Availability of the Draft SEIS/OEIS 8-40
Figure 8.3-12: Press Release of the Public Comment Period Extension and Public Meetings for the Draft SEIS/OEIS 8-43
Figure 8.3-13: Press Release of the Public Comment Period Extension for the Draft SEIS/OEIS 8-46

List of Tables

Table 8.2-1: Federal and Local Entities that Received the Scoping Notification Letter 8-4
Table 8.2-2: Newspaper Publications for Scoping 8-13
Table 8.3-1: Federal and Local Entities that Received the Draft SEIS/OEIS Notification Letter 8-25
Table 8.3-2: Newspaper Publications of Draft SEIS/OEIS and Public Meetings 8-36
Table 8.3-3: Public Meeting Locations 8-49
Table 8.5-1: Information Repositories 8-51

This page intentionally left blank.

8 Public Involvement and Distribution

This chapter includes a summary of the public involvement and stakeholder outreach activities conducted by the United States (U.S.) Navy (Navy) during the scoping period and the public review and comment period for the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS)/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (OEIS) for Mariana Islands Training and Testing (MITT). The scoping period ran from July 28, 2017, through September 15, 2017. The Draft SEIS/OEIS was released for public review and comment February 1, 2019, through April 17, 2019.

The purpose of public involvement during the public scoping period was to (1) notify and inform stakeholders and the public about the Proposed Action; and (2) provide opportunities for the public to comment on the scope of the analysis, including environmental issues and potential viable alternatives. The purpose of public involvement and outreach during the public review and comment period of the Draft SEIS/OEIS was to (1) notify and inform stakeholders and the public about the Proposed Action and the release of the Draft SEIS/OEIS, and (2) provide the opportunity for the public and stakeholders to comment on the Draft SEIS/OEIS.

Public Outreach and involvement efforts were conducted in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act and Navy guidance.

8.1 Project Website

A public website was established to provide the public with project, public meeting, and commenting information, and to accept comments electronically. The project website address is www.mitt-eis.com and has been active since 2014.

The website address was included in the *Federal Register* (FR) notices: Notice of Intent to Prepare an SEIS/OEIS, Notice of Availability of the Draft SEIS/OEIS, Notice of Public Meetings, Notice of Rescheduled Meetings, and Notice of Extension of Public Comment Period. It was also included in newspaper advertisements, agency letters, press releases, and postcard mailers.

Public notifications, fact sheet booklets, maps, technical reports, informational videos, and other public involvement information are available on the project website and will be available throughout the course of the project. The website is periodically updated with project announcements, which are emailed to website subscribers.

8.2 Scoping Period

The public scoping period began with issuance of the Notice of Intent in the *Federal Register* July 28, 2017, originally announcing the scoping period to end September 11, 2017, but was delayed slightly by the publication authority. However, the *Federal Register* notice was published on August 1, 2017 (82 FR 35767), with a September 15, 2017, scoping period end date. Comments on the scope of the analysis were provided by mail and through the project website. The *Federal Register* Notice of Intent for Scoping is shown in Figure 8.2-1.

Federal Register / Vol. 82, No. 146 / Tuesday, August 1, 2017 / Notices 35767

SIDCO/SUBPART C DCO REGULATIONS—RECORDKEEPING COLLECTION—Continued

	Estimated number of recordkeepers per year	Records to be kept annually by each	Total annual responses	Estimated average number of hours per record	Estimated total number of hours of annual burden in fiscal year
Liquidity Resource Due Diligence and Testing	7	4	28	10	280
Financial and Liquidity Resources, Excluding Due Diligence	7	4	28	10	280
Generally	7	28	196	10	1960
Totals		118	662	31	4570

[FR Doc. 2017–16019 Filed 7–31–17; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6351–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Navy

Meeting of the Board of Visitors of Marine Corps University

AGENCY: Department of the Navy, DOD.
ACTION: Notice of open meeting.

SUMMARY: The Board of Visitors of the Marine Corps University (BOV MCU) will meet to review, develop and provide recommendations on all aspects of the academic and administrative policies of the University; examine all aspects of professional military education operations; and provide such oversight and advice, as is necessary, to facilitate high educational standards and cost effective operations. The Board will be focusing primarily on the internal procedures of Marine Corps University. All sessions of the meeting will be open to the public.

DATES: The meeting will be held on Thursday, September 14, 2017, from 9:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. and Friday, September 15, 2017, from 8:00 a.m. to 2:30 p.m. Eastern Time Zone.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will be held at Marine Corps University in Quantico, Virginia. The address is: 2076 South St., Quantico, VA.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. Kim Florich, Director of Faculty Development and Outreach, Marine Corps University Board of Visitors, 2076 South Street, Quantico, Virginia 22134, telephone number 703–432–4682.

Dated: July 24, 2017.

A.M. Nichols,

Lieutenant Commander, Judge Advocate General's Corps, U.S. Navy, Federal Register Liaison Officer.

[FR Doc. 2017–16150 Filed 7–31–17; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 3810–FF–P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Navy

Notice of Intent To Prepare a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement for Mariana Islands Training and Testing

AGENCY: Department of the Navy, DOD.
ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969 and regulations implemented by the Council on Environmental Quality, the Department of the Navy (DoN) announces its intent to prepare a supplement to the 2015 Final Mariana Islands Training and Testing (MITT) Environmental Impact Statement/ Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (EIS/OEIS).

DATES: Public scoping meetings will not be held, but public comments will be accepted during the scoping period from August 1, 2017 to September 15, 2017.

ADDRESSES: The DoN invites scoping comments on the MITT Supplemental EIS/OEIS from all interested parties. Substantive comments may be provided by mail to the address below and through the project Web site at *http://mitt-eis.com/*. Comments must be postmarked or received by September 15, 2017, for consideration during the development of the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Naval Facilities Engineering Command Pacific, Attention: MITT Supplemental EIS/OEIS Project Manager, 258 Makalapa Drive, Suite 100, Pearl Harbor, HI 96860–3134.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Navy will assess the potential environmental impacts associated with ongoing and proposed military readiness activities conducted within the MITT EIS/OEIS Study Area (hereafter known as the "Study Area"). The Supplement to the 2015 Final EIS/OEIS is being prepared to support ongoing and future activities conducted at sea and on Farallon de Medinilla (FDM) within the Study Area beyond 2020. Military readiness activities include training and research, development, testing, and evaluation (hereafter known as "testing"). The Supplemental EIS/OEIS will include an analysis of training and testing activities using new information available after the release of the 2015 Final MITT EIS/OEIS. New information includes an updated acoustic effects model, updated marine mammal density data, and other best available science. Proposed activities are generally consistent with those analyzed in the 2015 Final MITT EIS/OEIS and are representative of training and testing activities the DoN has been conducting in the Study Area for decades.

The Study Area remains unchanged since the 2015 Final MITT EIS/OEIS. The Study Area includes the existing Mariana Islands Range Complex (MIRC); areas on the high seas to the north and west of the MIRC; a transit corridor between the MIRC and the Hawaii Range Complex, starting at the International Date Line; and Apra Harbor and select DoN pierside and harbor locations. The Study Area includes only the in-water components of the range complex and FDM; land components associated with the range complex are not included in the Study Area.

As part of this process the DoN will seek the issuance of regulatory permits and authorizations under the Marine Mammal Protection Act and Endangered Species Act to support training and testing requirements within the Study Area, beyond 2020, thereby ensuring critical Department of Defense requirements are met.

Pursuant to 40 CFR 1501.6, the DoN will invite the National Marine Fisheries Service to be a cooperating agency in preparation of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.

Figure 8.2-1: Notice of Intent for Scoping

The DoN's lead action proponent is Commander, U.S. Pacific Fleet. Additional action proponents include Naval Sea Systems Command, Naval Air Systems Command, and the Office of Naval Research.

The DoN's Proposed Action is to conduct military training and testing activities within the Study Area. Activities include the use of active sonar and explosives while employing appropriate marine species protective mitigation measures. The Proposed Action does not alter the DoN's original purpose and need as presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

The purpose of the Proposed Action is to maintain a ready force, which is needed to ensure the military can accomplish its mission to maintain, train, and equip combat-ready naval forces capable of winning wars, deterring aggression, and maintaining freedom of the seas, consistent with Congressional direction in section 5062 of Title 10 of the U.S. Code. A Supplemental EIS/OEIS is considered the appropriate document, as there is recent scientific information including revised acoustic criteria to consider, in furtherance of NEPA, relevant to the environmental effects of the DoN's Proposed Action, and the analysis will support Marine Mammal Protection Act authorization requests.

Proposed training and testing activities are generally consistent to those analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. The Supplemental EIS/OEIS will propose changes to the tempo and types of training and testing activities, accounting for the introduction of new technologies, the evolving nature of international events, advances in war fighting doctrine and procedures, and changes in the organization of vessels, aircraft, weapon systems, and military personnel. The MITT Supplemental EIS/OEIS will reflect the compilation of training and testing activities required to fulfill the DoN's military readiness requirements beyond 2020, and therefore includes the analysis of newly proposed activities and changes to previously analyzed activities.

In the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the DoN will evaluate the potential environmental impacts of a No Action Alternative and action alternatives. Resources to be evaluated include, but are not limited to, marine mammals, sea turtles, essential fish habitat, and threatened and endangered species.

The scoping process is used to identify public concerns and local issues to be considered during the development of the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Federal agencies, local agencies, the public, and interested persons are encouraged to provide substantive comments to the DoN on environmental resources and issue areas of concern the commenter believes the DoN should consider.

Comments must be postmarked or received online by September 15, 2017, for consideration during the development of the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Comments can be mailed to: Naval Facilities Engineering Command Pacific, Attention: MITT Supplemental EIS/OEIS Project Manager, 258 Makalapa Drive, Suite 100, Pearl Harbor, HI, 96869–3134. Comments can be submitted online via the project Web site at *http://mitt-eis.com/*.

Dated: July 20, 2017.

A.M. Nichols,

Lieutenant Commander, Judge Advocate General's Corps, U.S. Navy, Federal Register Liaison Officer.

[FR Doc. 2017–15939 Filed 7–31–17; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3810–FF–P

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Final Waiver and Extension of the Project Period for the Native American Career and Technical Education Program

[Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) Number: 84.101A]

AGENCY: Office of Career, Technical, and Adult Education, Department of Education.

ACTION: Final waiver and extension of the project period.

SUMMARY: For the 24-month projects originally funded in fiscal year (FY) 2013 and extended for an additional 24-months in FY 2015 under the Native American Career and Technical Education Program (NACTEP), the Secretary: Waives the requirements in Education Department regulations that generally prohibit project extensions involving the obligation of additional Federal funds; and extends the project period for the current 30 NACTEP grantees for an additional 12 months under the existing program authority. This waiver and extension will allow the 30 current NACTEP grantees to seek FY 2017 continuation awards for the project period through FY 2018.

DATES: As of August 1, 2017, the waiver and extension of the project period are finalized.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Gwen Washington by telephone at (202) 245–7790 or by email at *gwen.washington@ed.gov*. You may also contact Linda Mayo by telephone at (202) 245–7792 or by email at *linda.mayo@ed.gov*. If you use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) or a text telephone (TTY), call the Federal Relay Service, toll free, at 1–800–877–8339.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On April 26, 2017, we published a notice in the **Federal Register** (82 FR 19240) proposing to waive the requirements of 34 CFR 75.261(a) and (c)(2) that generally prohibit project period extensions involving the obligation of additional Federal funds. In that notice, the Secretary also proposed to extend the NACTEP project period for up to an additional 12 months. The proposed waiver and extension of project period would enable the Secretary to provide continuation awards to the current NACTEP grantees through FY 2018 under the existing program authority.

That notice contained background information and our reasons for proposing the waiver and extension of the project period. This notice makes the waiver and extension of the project period final. Any activities carried out during the period of a NACTEP continuation award must be consistent with, or a logical extension of, the scope, goals, and objectives of the grantee's application as approved in the FY 2013 NACTEP competition. The requirements applicable to continuation awards for this competition set forth in the 2013 notice inviting applications and the requirements in 34 CFR 75.253 will apply to any continuation awards sought by the current NACTEP grantees.

We will make decisions regarding the continuation awards based on grantee program narratives, budgets and budget narratives, program performance reports, and the requirements in 34 CFR 75.253. We will not announce a new competition or make new awards in FY 2017.

The final waiver and project period extension will not exempt the current NACTEP grantees from the appropriation account closing provisions of 31 U.S.C. 1552(a), nor will it extend the availability of funds previously awarded to current NACTEP grantees. As a result of 31 U.S.C. 1552(a), appropriations available for a limited period may be used for payment of valid obligations for only five years after the expiration of their period of availability for Federal obligation. After that time, the unexpended balance of those funds is canceled and returned to the U.S. Department of the Treasury and is unavailable for restoration for any purpose (31 U.S.C. 1552(b)).

Public Comment: In response to our invitation in the proposed waiver and extension, we received 85 comments.

Figure 8.2-1: Notice of Intent for Scoping (continued)

8.2.1 Public Scoping Notification

The Navy made significant efforts to notify the public to maximize public participation during the scoping process. A summary of these efforts follows.

8.2.1.1 Notification Letters

Notification letters were mailed July 27, 2017, to 291 federal and local elected officials and government agencies. Entities that received the scoping notification letter can be found in Table 8.2-1, and an example of the letter is shown in Figure 8.2-2.

Table 8.2-1: Federal and Local Entities that Received the Scoping Notification Letter

Guam
Federal Elected Officials and Federal Agencies
U.S. Congress
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
National Ocean Service
National Marine Fisheries Service, Habitat Division, Guam Office
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
Guam National Wildlife Refuge
U.S. Department of Agriculture
Natural Resource Conservation Service, West Area Office
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Wildlife Services
National Park Service
War in the Pacific National Historic Park
Western Pacific Regional Fishery Management Council
Guam Education & Outreach
Department of Transportation/Federal Aviation Administration
Local Elected Officials and Local Agencies
Office of the Governor
Office of the Senator
34th Guam Legislature
Mayors' Council of Guam
Office of the Mayor
Village of Agana Heights
Village of Agat
Village of Asan-Maina
Village of Barrigada
Village of Chalan Pago-Ordot
Village of Dededo
Village of Hagåtña
Village of Inarajan
Village of Mangilao
Village of Merizo
Village of Mongmong-Toto-Maite
Village of Piti
Village of Santa Rita
Village of Sinajana
Village of Talofofo
Village of Tamuning-Tumon-Harmon
Village of Umatac
Village of Yigo

Village of Yona
A.B. Won Pat International Airport
Consolidated Utility Services
Department of Labor
Guam Ancestral Lands Commission
Guam Army National Guard
Guam Bureau of Statistics and Plans
Coastal Management Program
Guam Chamorro Land Trust Commission
Guam Consolidated Commission on Utilities
Guam Department of Agriculture
Division of Aquatic and Wildlife Resources
Guam Department of Education
Guam Department of Land Management
Guam Department of Parks and Recreation
Historic Preservation Office
Guam Department of Public Works
Guam Economic Development and Commerce Authority
Guam Environmental Protection Agency
Water Resources Management Program
Guam Homeland Security
Office of Civil Defense
Guam Land Use Commission
Guam Visitors Bureau
Guam Waterworks Authority
Northern Guam Pacific Islands Area Soil and Water Conservation Districts
Port Authority of Guam
U.S. Marshals Service, District of Guam
University of Guam
Water and Environmental Research Institute
Marine Laboratory
Cooperative Extension Service
Saipan
Federal Elected Officials and Federal Agencies
U.S. Congress
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
National Marine Fisheries Service
Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (CNMI) Field Office
U.S. Department of the Interior
Office of Insular Affairs
U.S. Department of Agriculture
Natural Resources Conservation Service
Saipan Service Center
Tinian & Aguiguan Service Center
Western Pacific Regional Fishery Management Council
Local Elected Officials and Local Agencies
Office of the Governor
CNMI Senate
CNMI House of Representatives
CNMI Office of the Mayor
CNMI Public Information and Protocol Office
CNMI Bureau of Environmental and Coastal Quality

Division of Environmental Quality
Division of Coastal Resources Management
Marine Monitoring
CNMI Coastal Resources Management Program
CNMI Department of Commerce
Military Integration Management Committee
CNMI Department of Community and Cultural Affairs
Historic Preservation Office
CNMI Department of Land and Natural Resources
Division of Fish and Wildlife
Division of Agriculture
Division of Parks and Recreation
Soil and Water Conservation District
CNMI Department of Public Lands
CNMI Department of Public Safety
Office of the Commissioner
Tinian Fire Division
CNMI Military and Veteran Affairs
CNMI Northern Marianas College Cooperative, Research, Extension and Education Service
CNMI Zoning Office
Commonwealth Ports Authority
Marianas Visitors Authority
Saipan International Airport
Port of Saipan
Tinian
Federal Elected Officials
U.S. Congress
Local Elected Officials and Local Agencies
Office of the Mayor
Municipality of Tinian and Aguiguan
CNMI Department of Public Lands
CNMI Department of Commerce
CNMI Department of Land and Natural Resources
Rota
Federal Elected Officials
U.S. Congress
Local Elected Officials and Local Agencies
Office of the Mayor
15th Rota Municipal Council
CNMI Department of Lands and Natural Resources
Commonwealth Ports Authority
Department of Lands and Natural Resources
Division of Fish and Wildlife
Department of Public Lands, Rota Office
Rota Gaming Commission
Rota Health Center
Rota Municipal Treasury
Federal Agencies outside of Guam, Saipan, Tinian, and Rota
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
U.S. Department of State
Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

- Region IX
- Pacific Islands Contact Office, Honolulu
- Communities and Ecosystems Division
- Enforcement Division
- Office of Federal Activities
- National Environmental Policy Act Compliance Division

Council on Environmental Quality

Department of the Interior
- Environmental Policy & Compliance
- Office of Insular Affairs

Federal Aviation Administration
- Air Traffic Division, Western Pacific Region (AWP-532)
- Military Program
- Western Pacific Region
- Bureau of Certification and Licensing

Federal Maritime Commission
- Office of the Secretary

Marianas Trench Marine National Monument

Marine Mammal Commission

U.S. Department of Transportation
- Maritime Administration

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
- Office of Law Enforcement, Honolulu District
- National Marine Fisheries Service
  - Headquarters
  - Habitat Division
  - Protected Resources Division
  - Office for Coastal Management
  - Office of Protected Resources
  - Pacific Islands Fisheries Science Center
  - Pacific Islands Regional Office

U.S. Coast Guard Headquarters
- Office of Environmental Management (CG-47)

U.S. Department of the Interior
- Office of Environmental Policy and Compliance
- Office of Insular Affairs

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
- Pacific Islands Office
- Pacific Region

U.S. Geological Survey
- Pacific Coastal and Marine Science Center
- Pacific Islands Water Science Center

U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service
- Pacific Southwest Region 5
- Pacific Southwest Research Station
  - Institute of Pacific Islands Forestry

U.S. Department of Agriculture
- Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service
  - Wildlife Services
- Natural Resources Conservation Service
  - Office of the Chief

Western Pacific Regional Fishery Management Council

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
COMMANDER
UNITED STATES PACIFIC FLEET
250 MAKALAPA DRIVE
PEARL HARBOR, HAWAII 96860-3131

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5090
Ser N465/0822
July 19, 2017

The Honorable Madeleine Z. Bordallo
U.S. Congress
120 Father Dueñas Avenue, Suite 107
Hagåtña, GU 96910

Dear Congresswoman Bordallo:

SUBJECT: NOTICE OF INTENT TO PREPARE A SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT/OVERSEAS ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT FOR MARIANA ISLANDS TRAINING AND TESTING

This letter is to inform you that the Department of the Navy (Navy) is preparing a supplement to the 2015 Final Mariana Islands Training and Testing (MITT) Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (EIS/OEIS) to assess the potential environmental impacts associated with ongoing military readiness activities conducted within the MITT EIS/OEIS Study Area (hereafter referred to as the "Study Area"). Military readiness activities include training and research, development, testing, and evaluation (hereafter referred to as "training and testing"). The Navy is requesting your comments on the scope of the analysis, including potential environmental issues or viable alternatives to be considered during the development of the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS.

The Navy previously completed an EIS/OEIS in May 2015 for training and testing activities occurring within the Study Area. The supplement to the 2015 Final EIS/OEIS is being prepared to support ongoing and future activities conducted at-sea and on Farallon de Medinilla (FDM) within the Study Area beyond 2020. Proposed activities are generally consistent with those analyzed in the 2015 Final EIS/OEIS and are representative of activities the military has conducted in the Study Area for decades.

The supplement to the 2015 Final EIS/OEIS will include an analysis of training and testing activities using new information available after the release of the 2015 Final EIS/OEIS. New information includes an updated acoustic effects model, updated marine mammal density data, and evolving and emergent best available science. As part of this process, the Navy will seek the issuance of federal regulatory permits and authorizations under the Marine Mammal Protection Act and the Endangered Species Act.

The Study Area remains unchanged since the 2015 Final EIS/OEIS (Enclosure 1). The Study Area includes the existing Mariana Islands Range Complex (MIRC); areas on the high seas to the north and west of the MIRC; a transit corridor between the MIRC and the Hawaii

Figure 8.2-2: Stakeholder Scoping Notification Letter

5090
Ser N465/0822
July 19, 2017

Range Complex, starting at the International Date Line; and Apra Harbor and select Navy pierside and harbor locations. The supplement to the 2015 Final EIS/OEIS will only analyze those training and testing activities conducted at sea and on FDM within the Study Area. Other activities and land components associated with the MIRC will not be included in the supplement.

The Proposed Action is to conduct at-sea training and testing activities within the Study Area. Activities include the use of active sonar and explosives while employing marine species protective mitigation measures. The purpose of the Proposed Action is to maintain a ready force, which is needed to ensure the military can accomplish its mission to maintain, train, and equip combat-ready forces, consistent with Congressional direction in Section 5062 of Title 10 of the U.S. Code.

To achieve and maintain military readiness, the Navy proposes to:

- Conduct at-sea training and testing activities at levels required to support military readiness requirements beyond 2020; and
- Accommodate evolving mission requirements, including those resulting from the development, testing, and introduction of new vessels, aircraft, and weapons systems into the fleet.

Public comments will be accepted during the 45-day scoping period beginning July 28, 2017 through September 11, 2017. Comments must be postmarked or received online by **September 11, 2017,** Chamorro Standard Time (ChST), for consideration in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Comments may be submitted online at **www.MITT-EIS.com**, or by mail to:

Naval Facilities Engineering Command Pacific
Attention: MITT Supplemental EIS/OEIS Project Manager
258 Makalapa Drive, Suite 100
Pearl Harbor, HI 96860-3134

If you would like additional information or to receive a project briefing, please contact Mr. John Van Name at 808-471-1714 or john.vanname@navy.mil.

Please help the Navy inform the community about the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS for at-sea training and testing by sharing this information with your staff and interested individuals.

Sincerely,


FOR L. M. FOSTER
By direction

Enclosure: 1. Mariana Islands Training and Testing Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement Study Area

2

Figure 8.2-2: Stakeholder Scoping Notification Letter (continued)

Enclosure: 1. Mariana Islands Training and Testing Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement Study Area




Enclosure (1)

Figure 8.2-2: Stakeholder Scoping Notification Letter (continued)

8.2.1.2 Postcard Mailer

A postcard was mailed first-class to 341 individuals, community groups, and nongovernmental organizations on July 27, 2017. The postcard provided information about the Proposed Action, the website address, and how to submit public comments. An example of the postcard is shown in Figure 8.2-3.






Figure 8.2-3: Postcard Mailer for Scoping (Front and Back)

8.2.1.3 Newspaper Advertisements

Display advertisements were placed in local and regional newspapers to advertise the public's opportunity to comment on the scope of the analysis. The advertisements included a description of the Proposed Action, the address of the project website, the duration of the comment period, and information on how to provide comments. The newspapers and publication dates are indicated in Table 8.2-2. An example of the advertisement is shown in Figure 8.2-4.

Table 8.2-2: Newspaper Publications for Scoping

Newspaper	Newspaper Coverage	Publication Dates
Pacific Daily News	Hagåtña, Guam; and neighboring islands	Friday, July 28, 2017 Saturday, July 29, 2017 Sunday, July 30, 2017
Marianas Variety	Saipan, Tinian, Rota, Federated States of Micronesia	Friday, July 28, 2017 Monday, July 31, 2017 Tuesday, August 1, 2017
Saipan Tribune	Saipan, Tinian, Rota	Friday, July 28, 2017 Monday, July 31, 2017 Tuesday, August 1, 2017



Figure 8.2-4: Newspaper Announcement for Scoping

8.2.1.4 Press Release

A press release to announce the Notice of Intent and request public input was distributed to local and regional media outlets on July 28, 2017. The press release provided information on the Proposed Action, address of the project website, duration of the comment period, and how to submit comments. The press release from the Commander, Joint Region Marianas is shown in Figure 8.2-5.

COMMANDER, JOINT REGION MARIANAS
Public Affairs Office
Main: (671) 349-4055/3209
Fax: (671) 349-1201
E-Mail: CJRMPAO@fe.navy.mil

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
Press Release 17-063

U.S. Navy Seeks Public Input on Training and Testing Supplemental Environmental Impact Analysis

ASAN, Guam (July 28, 2017) –The U.S. Navy is preparing a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (EIS/OEIS) to assess the potential environmental impacts associated with ongoing at-sea military readiness activities conducted within the Mariana Islands Training and Testing (MITT) EIS/OEIS Study Area (hereafter referred to as the "Study Area").

Military readiness activities include training and research, development, testing, and evaluation (hereafter referred to as "training and testing"). The Navy is requesting public comments on the scope of the analysis, including potential environmental issues and viable alternatives to be considered during the development of the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS.

The Navy previously completed an EIS/OEIS in May 2015 for at-sea training and testing activities occurring within the Study Area. The supplement to the 2015 Final EIS/OEIS is being prepared to support ongoing and future activities conducted at sea and on Farallon de Medinilla (FDM) within the Study Area beyond 2020. Proposed training and testing activities are generally consistent with those analyzed in the 2015 Final EIS/OEIS and represent activities the military has conducted in the Study Area for decades.

The Supplemental EIS/OEIS will include an analysis of training and testing activities using new information available after the release of the 2015 Final EIS/OEIS. New information includes an updated acoustic effects model, updated marine mammal density data, and evolving and emergent best available science. As part of this process, the Navy will seek the issuance of federal regulatory permits and authorizations under the Marine Mammal Protection Act and the Endangered Species Act.

Proposed Action:
The Proposed Action is to conduct at-sea training and testing activities within the Study Area. At-sea training and testing activities include the use of active sonar and explosives while employing marine species protective mitigation measures.

-more-

Figure 8.2-5: Press Release for Scoping

The purpose of the Proposed Action is to maintain a ready force, which is needed to ensure the military can accomplish its mission to maintain, train, and equip combat-ready forces, consistent with Congressional direction in Section 5062 of Title 10 of the U.S. Code.

To achieve and maintain military readiness, the Navy proposes to:

- Conduct at-sea training and testing activities at levels required to support military readiness requirements beyond 2020; and
- Accommodate evolving mission requirements, including those resulting from the development, testing, and introduction of new vessels, aircraft, and weapons systems into the fleet.

The Study Area remains unchanged since the 2015 Final EIS/OEIS and includes the existing Mariana Islands Range Complex (MIRC); areas on the high seas to the north and west of the MIRC; a transit corridor between the MIRC and the Hawaii Range Complex, starting at the International Date Line; and Apra Harbor and select Navy pierside and harbor locations. In the supplement to the 2015 Final EIS/OEIS, the Navy will only analyze those training and testing activities conducted at sea and on FDM within the Study Area. Other activities and land components associated with the MIRC are not included in the supplement.

Scoping Comment Period for the Supplemental EIS/OEIS:
The 45-day scoping comment period is July 28-Sept. 11. Comments must be postmarked or received online by **Sept. 11, 2017**, Chamorro Standard Time (ChST), for consideration in the development of the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS. All comments submitted during the 45-day public comment period will become part of the public record. Comments may be submitted online at: **www.MITT-EIS.com**, or by mail to:

Naval Facilities Engineering Command Pacific
Attention: MITT Supplemental EIS/OEIS Project Manager
258 Makalapa Drive, Suite 100
Pearl Harbor, HI 96860-3134

For additional project information, please visit the project website at **www.MITT-EIS.com.**

Please help inform your community by sharing the information in this press release.

-30-

For more information, contact the Joint Region Marianas Public Affairs Office
at (671) 349-4055/3209.

Figure 8.2-5: Press Release for Scoping (continued)

8.2.2 Summary of Public Scoping Comments

Scoping comments were submitted in two ways:

- Written letters (received any time during the public comment period)
- Comments submitted directly on the project website (received any time during the public comment period)

The Navy received a total of 36 written and electronic comments from federal agencies, state agencies, nongovernmental organizations, individuals, and community groups. Thirty website comments were submitted using the electronic comment form on the project website. Six written comments were mailed. A sampling of some of the specific concerns follows.

8.2.2.1 Description of the Proposed Action and Alternatives

Comments stated that the description of the action and proposed activities is vague in the SEIS/OEIS and that it should include an explanation of the differences between the 2015 Record of Decision and the action proposed in this SEIS/OEIS. Comments included a request that a range of alternatives be considered, including time or seasonal restrictions, restrictions in biologically sensitive areas, reduced training and testing tempo, and mitigated alternatives.

8.2.2.2 National Environmental Policy Act and Public Involvement

Comments stated that there is a lack of detail regarding the scope of the Proposed Action presented to the public. It was suggested the website include the updated acoustic effects model, updated marine mammal density data, and the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. The scoping period was thought to be too short and should be extended.

8.2.2.3 Location of Activities

Comments stated that military training should not be conducted in the CNMI.

8.2.2.4 Indirect and Cumulative Impacts

Comments included requests that all Department of Defense actions in the Mariana Islands be analyzed for cumulative effects. Comments also included requests to analyze indirect and cumulative impacts as they relate to seagrass, coral reefs, invertebrates, sea turtles, fish populations, and loss of habitat, as well as the ocean as an ecosystem. Comments also included recommendations that recreational fishing, commercial fishing, and transport be analyzed from a cumulative perspective. Comments in this category expressed concern about the overall impact of military activity in Guam and the overall MITT Study Area.

8.2.2.5 Sediments and Water Quality Impacts

Comments stated that there was a lack of studies regarding impacts on the waters around Farallon de Medinilla (FDM) and documentation of the loss of land at FDM in regard to erosion. Requests were made to provide a detailed analysis of the residence times of constituents, effects of deposition, bioaccumulation of metals and other pollutants, and concentration of explosives and unexploded ordnance in the ocean environment, due to concerns about military expended materials becoming marine debris.

8.2.2.6 Socioeconomic Resources

Comments stated that military training activities are disturbing economically important fishing areas, restricting access to prime fishing grounds, and resulting in contamination in the local food supply. Issues raised in regard to socioeconomic impacts included increased transit times around restricted areas and associated loss of revenue due to transit times and restricted access to fishing areas.

8.2.2.7 Terrestrial Species and Habitats/Marine Birds

Comments included requests for the reevaluation of booby populations and to address impacts on the great frigate bird, red-tailed tropicbird, white-tailed tropicbird, brown noddy, and black noddy on FDM.

8.2.2.8 Marine Resources

Comments stated concerns regarding direct and cumulative impacts from military expended material and debris on the marine environment. Comments included suggestions to analyze sonar, chemical pollutants, and marine debris associated with training activities on all marine species. Monitoring results should be made available and integrated into the analysis. Impacts should also be analyzed in regard to invasive species and marine biosecurity threats. Impacts on coastal resources should be substantively analyzed under a range of alternatives and specific mitigation. Impacts on Habitat Area of Concern for Coral Reef Ecosystem Management Unit Species and Bottomfish Management Units Species should also be analyzed. Commenters stated that there were a lack of studies documenting the amount of ordnance debris and unexploded ordnance in the water and impacts on and around FDM, including coral reefs.

8.2.2.9 Marine Mammal Impacts/Sea Turtles

Comments in this category included concerns regarding the health and safety effects on marine mammals from training activities. Commenters expressed concern regarding impacts on marine mammals from sonar and explosives as well as impacts on humpback whale calving grounds.

8.2.2.10 Fish/Marine Habitat

Comments stated that training activities are disturbing pelagic and economically important fishing areas and causing fish to leave the Study Area. There were also concerns regarding acoustic disturbance to fish.

8.2.2.11 Cultural Resources

Comments stated the U.S. Navy has not consulted with indigenous people for conducting military training in the Mariana Islands. Direct and cumulative impacts need to be identified due to the loss of access to FDM for cultural use.

8.2.2.12 Public Health and Safety

Comments included concerns regarding overall impacts and risks to public health and safety in regard to unexploded ordnance, water contamination, and proper safety measures.

8.2.2.13 Mitigation Measures

Comments included requests to provide details associated with the actions the Navy will take to avoid harming protected marine mammals and coral reefs as well as the effectiveness of past mitigation measures. Comments stated that the public needs a better understanding of how mitigation measures avoid impacts on marine mammals and the effectiveness of those measures.

8.2.2.14 Other

This category includes comments that were considered to be outside the scope of this analysis or not considered applicable to the analysis. For example, there were comments related to the potential dangers posed by North Korea, direct compensation for loss of fishing grounds or the development of fishery infrastructure, the militarization of the Mariana Islands, lack of specific surveys, and third-party assessments of impacts and surveys.

8.3 Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement Public Review and Comment Period

The Draft SEIS/OEIS public review and comment period began with issuance of the Notice of Public Meetings (84 FR 677) January 31, 2019, and the Notice of Availability (84 FR 1119) February 1, 2019, in the *Federal Register*. A Notice of Rescheduled Public Meetings and Extension of Public Comment Period was published in the *Federal Register* (84 FR 8515) March 8, 2019. A Notice of Extension of Public Comment Period was published in the *Federal Register* (84 FR 12239) April 1, 2019. The *Federal Register* notices for the Draft SEIS/OEIS are shown in Figure 8.3-1, Figure 8.3-2, Figure 8.3-3, and Figure 8.3-4.

The *Federal Register* notices included notification of the availability of the Draft SEIS/OEIS and where it can be accessed; an overview of the Proposed Action and its purpose and need; public commenting information; and locations, dates, and times of the public meetings. The purpose of the public meetings was to inform the public about the Proposed Action and to solicit public comments on the environmental issues addressed and analyzed in the Draft SEIS/OEIS. Comments were accepted by mail, through the SEIS/OEIS website at www.mitt-eis.com, and at the public meetings.

Federal Register / Vol. 84, No. 21 / Thursday, January 31, 2019 / Notices 677

Authority: 35 U.S.C. 207, 37 CFR part 404.

Dated: January 28, 2019.

M.S. Werner,

Commander, Judge Advocate General's Corps, U.S. Navy, Federal Register Liaison Officer.

[FR Doc. 2019–00373 Filed 1–30–19; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3810–FF–P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Navy

Notice of Public Meetings for the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement for Mariana Islands Training and Testing

AGENCY: Department of the Navy, DoD.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as implemented by the Council on Environmental Quality, and Presidential Executive Order (E.O.) 12114, the Department of the Navy (DoN) has prepared and filed with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency a Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (EIS/OEIS). In the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the DoN reassesses the potential environmental impacts associated with conducting ongoing and future military readiness activities, which includes training activities and research, development, testing, and evaluation activities (referred to as "testing activities") conducted at sea and on Farallon de Medinilla (FDM) within the Mariana Islands Training and Testing (MITT) Study Area (hereafter referred to as the Study Area) beyond 2020. In the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the DoN evaluates new, relevant information, such as more recent marine mammal density data and new scientific information, and updates the environmental analyses as appropriate. The DoN prepared the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS to support the issuance of federal regulatory permits and authorizations under the Marine Mammal Protection Act and the Endangered Species Act. The National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) is a cooperating agency for this Supplemental EIS/OEIS.

DATES: This notice announces the public comment period and the dates and locations of the public meetings, includes information about how the public can review and comment on the document, and provides supplementary information about the environmental planning effort. All comments must be postmarked or received online by March 18, 2019, Chamorro Standard Time, for consideration in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Federal and local agencies and officials, and interested organizations and individuals, are encouraged to provide substantive comments on the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS during the public review period or in person at one of the scheduled open house public meetings.

ADDRESSES: Public meetings will be held in an open-house format, with DoN representatives available to provide information and answer questions related to the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Open house public meetings will be held on Guam and Saipan. The public may arrive at any time during the open house, as there will not be a presentation or formal oral comment session. Open house public meetings will be held on the following dates and at the following locations:

1. 5:00 to 8:00 p.m. February 26, 2019, at University of Guam, Jesus & Eugenia Leon Guerrero School of Business and Public Administration Building, Anthony Leon Guerrero Multi-Purpose Room 129 and Henry Sy Atrium, Mangilao, Guam 96923.

2. 5:00 to 8:00 p.m. February 27, 2019, at Kanoa Resort Saipan, Seaside Hall, Beach Road in Susupe, Saipan, MP 96950.

Attendees will be able to submit written comments during the open house public meetings. A stenographer will be available for attendees wishing to provide oral comments, one-on-one. Equal weight will be given to oral and written comments. Comments may also be mailed to Naval Facilities Engineering Command Pacific, Attention: MITT Supplemental EIS/OEIS Project Manager, 258 Makalapa Drive, Suite 100, Pearl Harbor, HI 96860–3134, or electronically via the project website at *www.MITT-EIS.com*. All comments, written or oral, submitted during the public comment period will become part of the public record and substantive comments will be addressed in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Naval Facilities Engineering Command Pacific, Attention: MITT Supplemental EIS/OEIS Project Manager, 258 Makalapa Drive, Suite 100, Pearl Harbor, HI 96860–3134.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS was distributed to federal and local agencies with which the DoN consulted. Copies of the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS are available for public review at the following public libraries:

1. Robert F. Kennedy Memorial Library, University of Guam, UOG Station, Mangilao, GU 96923–1871.

2. Nieves M. Flores Memorial Library, 254 Martyr Street, Hagåtña, GU 96910–5141.

3. Tinian Public Library, San Jose Village, Tinian, MP 96952–9997.

4. Antonio C. Atalig Memorial Library (Rota Public Library), Rota, MP 96951–9997.

5. Joeten-Kiyu Public Library, Insatto Street, Saipan, MP 96950–9996.

The MITT Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS is available for electronic viewing or download at *www.MITT-EIS.com*. A compact disc of the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS will be made available upon written request by contacting: Naval Facilities Engineering Command Pacific, Attention: MITT Supplemental EIS/OEIS Project Manager, 258 Makalapa Drive, Suite 100, Pearl Harbor, HI 96860–3134.

Dated: January 25, 2019.

M.S. Werner,

Commander, Judge Advocate General's Corps, U.S. Navy, Federal Register Liaison Officer.

[FR Doc. 2019–00368 Filed 1–30–19; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3810–FF–P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Navy

Notice of Availability of the Record of Decision for the Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for Land-Water Interface and Service Pier Extension at Naval Base Kitsap Bangor, Kitsap County, WA

AGENCY: Department of the Navy, DoD.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The United States Department of the Navy (Navy), announces its decision to construct and operate a Service Pier Extension (SPE) and associated support facilities in Hood Canal on the waterfront of Naval Base (NAVBASE) Kitsap Bangor, Washington (WA). The Navy will implement Alternative 2, short pier configuration, which is the preferred alternative in the October 2018 Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) for the Land-Water Interface (LWI) and SPE, NAVBASE Kitsap Bangor, WA. The Alternative 2 short pier configuration is also the environmentally preferred alternative and will fully meet the Navy's purpose and need for the proposed action.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The existing Service Pier will be extended by 520 feet and will require in-water as well as upland construction of

Figure 8.3-1: Federal Register Notice of Public Meetings for the Draft SEIS/OEIS

Federal Register / Vol. 84, No. 22 / Friday, February 1, 2019 / Notices 1119

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket Nos. IS18–766–000, IS18–767–000]

Notice Rescheduling Technical Conference: Mid-America Pipeline Company, LLC; Seminole Pipeline Company LLC

The technical conference originally scheduled for January 17, 2016, in the above-referenced proceeding, is hereby rescheduled to convene on February 20, 2019, at 9:00 a.m. (Eastern Standard Time). It will occur in Hearing Room 2 at the Commission's Washington DC offices.[1]

Dated: January 15, 2019.

Kimberly D. Bose,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2019–00541 Filed 1–31–19; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[ER–FRL–9043–2]

Environmental Impact Statements; Notice of Availability

Responsible Agency: Office of Federal Activities, General Information 202–564–5632 or *https://www.epa.gov/nepa/.*

Receipt of Environmental Impact Statements
Filed 12/21/2018 Through 01/25/2019
Pursuant to 40 CFR 1506.9.

Notice

Section 309(a) of the Clean Air Act requires that EPA make public its comments on EISs issued by other Federal agencies. EPA's comment letters on EISs are available at: *https://cdxnodengn.epa.gov/cdx-enepa-public/action/eis/search.*

EIS No. 20180325, Final, USFS, WA, Sunrise Vegetation and Fuels Management, *Review Period Ends:* 03/04/2019, *Contact:* Johnny Collin 509–843–4643

EIS No. 20180326, Draft Supplement, BR, CA, Long-Term Water Transfers, *Comment Period Ends:* 03/18/2019, *Contact:* Dan Cordova 916–987–5483

EIS No. 20180327, Final, TxDOT, TX, Oakhill Parkway, *Contact:* Carlos Swonke 512–416–2734

Under 23 U.S.C. 139(n)(2), TxDOT has issued a single document that consists of a supplemental final environmental impact statement and record of decision. Therefore, the 30-day wait/review period under NEPA does not apply to this action.

EIS No. 20180328, Draft, HUD, CT, Resilient Bridgeport, *Comment Period Ends:* 03/18/2019, *Contact:* Rebecca French 860–270–8231

EIS No. 20180329, Draft, USACE, CA, Amoruso Ranch, *Comment Period Ends:* 03/18/2019, *Contact:* Leah M. Fisher 916–557–6639

EIS No. 20180330, Draft, FHWA, LA, Lafayette Regional Xpressway Tier 1, *Comment Period Ends:* 03/18/2019, *Contact:* Todd Jeter 225–757–7612

EIS No. 20180331, Final, FERC, LA, Driftwood LNG Project, *Review Period Ends:* 03/04/2019, *Contact:* Office of External Affairs 866–208–3372

EIS No. 20180332, Final, FERC, CA, Yuba River Development Project, *Review Period Ends:* 03/04/2019, *Contact:* Alan Mitchnick 202–502–6074

EIS No. 20180333, Final, FERC, OR, Swan Lake North Pumped Storage Project, *Review Period Ends:* 03/04/2019, *Contact:* Office of External Affairs 866–208–3372

EIS No. 20180334, Final, FERC, NY, Northeast Supply Enhancement Project, *Review Period Ends:* 03/04/2019, *Contact:* Office of External Affairs 866–208–3372

EIS No. 20180335, Draft Supplement, USN, GU, Mariana Islands Training and Testing Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement, *Comment Period Ends:* 03/18/2019, *Contact:* Nora Macariola-See 808–472–1402

EIS No. 20180336, Draft, FHWA, NY, Van Wyck Expressway Capacity and Access Improvements to JFK Airport, *Comment Period Ends:* 03/18/2019, *Contact:* Hans Anker 518–431–8896

Amended Notices

EIS No. 20180282, Final, USACE, IL, The Great Lakes and Mississippi River Interbasin Study—Brandon Road Integrated Feasibility Study and Environmental Impact Statement—Will County, Illinois, *Review Period Ends:* 02/22/2019, *Contact:* Andrew Leichty 309–794–5399. Revision to FR Notice Published 12/21/2018; Extending the Comment Period from 01/07/2019 to 02/22/2019.

Dated: January 29, 2019.

Robert Tomiak,

Director, Office of Federal Activities.

[FR Doc. 2019–00664 Filed 1–31–19; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

FARM CREDIT SYSTEM INSURANCE CORPORATION

Regular Meeting; Farm Credit System Insurance Corporation Board

AGENCY: Farm Credit System Insurance Corporation.

ACTION: Notice, regular meeting.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given of the regular meeting of the Farm Credit System Insurance Corporation Board (Board).

DATES: The meeting of the Board will be held at the offices of the Farm Credit Administration in McLean, Virginia, on January 17, 2019, from 2:00 p.m. until such time as the Board concludes its business.

ADDRESSES: Farm Credit System Insurance Corporation, 1501 Farm Credit Drive, McLean, Virginia 22102. Submit attendance requests via email to *VisitorRequest@FCA.gov.* See **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** for further information about attendance requests.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dale Aultman, Secretary to the Farm Credit System Insurance Corporation Board, (703) 883–4009, TTY (703) 883–4056, *aultmand@fca.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Parts of this meeting of the Board will be open to the public (limited space available), and parts will be closed to the public. Please send an email to *VisitorRequest@FCA.gov* at least 24 hours before the meeting. In your email include: Name, postal address, entity you are representing (if applicable), and telephone number. You will receive an email confirmation from us. Please be prepared to show a photo identification when you arrive. If you need assistance for accessibility reasons, or if you have any questions, contact Dale Aultman, Secretary to the Farm Credit System Insurance Corporation Board, at (703) 883–4009. The matters to be considered at the meeting are:

Open Session

A. Approval of Minutes

- December 13, 2018

B. New Business

- Review of Insurance Premium Rates

[1] See the *Notice of Technical Conference* issued on December 12, 2018, for additional details regarding this conference.

Figure 8.3-2: Federal Register Notice of Availability for the Draft SEIS/OEIS

Federal Register / Vol. 84, No. 46 / Friday, March 8, 2019 / Notices 8515

EXEMPTIONS PROMULGATED FOR THE SYSTEM:
None.

HISTORY:
February 22, 1993, 58 FR 10227.

[FR Doc. 2019–04191 Filed 3–7–19; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 5001–06–P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Office of the Secretary

[Docket ID: DOD–2018–OS–0104]

Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

AGENCY: Office of the Secretary of Defense, DoD.

ACTION: 30-Day information collection notice.

SUMMARY: The Department of Defense has submitted to OMB for clearance the following proposal for collection of information under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act.

DATES: Consideration will be given to all comments received by April 8, 2019.

ADDRESSES: Comments and recommendations on the proposed information collection should be emailed to Ms. Jasmeet Seehra, DoD Desk Officer, at *oira_submission@omb.eop.gov*. Please identify the proposed information collection by DoD Desk Officer, Docket ID number, and title of the information collection.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Angela James, 571–372–7574, or *whs.mc-alex.esd.mbx.dd-dod-information-collections@mail.mil*.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Title; Associated Form; and OMB Number: Vietnam War Commemoration Program Partner Events; DD Form 2953; DD Form 2954; DD Form 3027; DD Form 3028; DD Form 3029; OMB Control Number 0704–0500.

Type of Request: Extension.

Number of Respondents: 16,020.

Responses per Respondent: 1.8739.

Annual Responses: 30,020.

Average Burden per Response: 15 minutes.

Annual Burden Hours: 7,505.

Needs and Uses: This information collection requirement is necessary to notify the United States of America Vietnam War Commemoration Program of Commemorative Partner's planned events. Information is submitted for inclusion on the program's events calendar and to request event support in the form of materials and/or speakers from the program. The information collection is necessary to obtain, vet, record, process and provide Certificates of Honor to be presented on behalf of a grateful nation by partner organizations. Additionally, this collection is necessary for the partner organizations to communicate to the Commemoration program the results of their events and lessons learned.

Affected Public: Businesses or other for-profits; Not-for-profit institutions; Federal Government; State, local or tribal government, or, by exception, eligible individuals or households.

Frequency: On occasion.

Respondent's Obligation: Voluntary.

OMB Desk Officer: Ms. Jasmeet Seehra.

You may also submit comments and recommendations, identified by Docket ID number and title, by the following method:

- *Federal eRulemaking Portal: http://www.regulations.gov*. Follow the instructions for submitting comments.

Instructions: All submissions received must include the agency name, Docket ID number, and title for this **Federal Register** document. The general policy for comments and other submissions from members of the public is to make these submissions available for public viewing on the internet at *http://www.regulations.gov* as they are received without change, including any personal identifiers or contact information.

DOD Clearance Officer: Ms. Angela James.

Requests for copies of the information collection proposal should be sent to Ms. James at *whs.mc-alex.esd.mbx.dd-dod-information-collections@mail.mil*.

Dated: March 4, 2019.

Aaron T. Siegel,

Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense.

[FR Doc. 2019–04173 Filed 3–7–19; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 5001–06–P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Navy

Notice of Rescheduled Public Meetings and Extension of Public Comment Period for the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/ Overseas Environmental Impact Statement for Mariana Islands Training and Testing

AGENCY: Department of the Navy, DoD.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: A notice of public meetings was published in the **Federal Register** by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency on January 31, 2019 for the Department of the Navy's (DoN) Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (EIS/OEIS) for the Mariana Islands Training and Testing (MITT) Study Area. Due to the effects of Typhoon Wutip, Navy officials postponed public meetings supporting the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS planned for February 26–27, 2019.

DATES: This notice announces the dates and locations of the rescheduled public meetings in March 2019, and a 15-day extension of the public comment period from March 18, 2019, to April 2, 2019.

ADDRESSES: Public meetings will be held in an open-house format with DoN representatives available to provide information and answer questions related to the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The public may arrive at any time during meetings, as there will not be a presentation or public oral comment session. Open house public meetings will be held on the following dates and at the following locations:

1. 1:00 to 3:30 p.m. March 14, 2019, at Tinian Public Library, San Jose Village, Tinian, MP 96952.
2. 1:30 to 4:30 p.m. March 15, 2019, at Mayor's Conference Hall, Songsong Village, Rota, MP 96951.
3. 5:00 to 8:00 p.m. March 18, 2019, at Kanoa Resort Saipan, Seaside Hall, Beach Road in Susupe, Saipan, MP 96950.
4. 5:00 to 8:00 p.m. March 19, 2019, at University of Guam, Jesus & Eugenia Leon Guerrero School of Business and Public Administration Building, Anthony Leon Guerrero Multi-Purpose Room 129 and Henry Sy Atrium, Mangilao, Guam 96923.

Attendees will be able to submit comments during the open house public meetings. Comments may also be mailed to Naval Facilities Engineering Command Pacific, Attention: MITT Supplemental EIS/OEIS Project Manager, 258 Makalapa Drive, Suite 100, Pearl Harbor, HI 96860–3134, or electronically via the project website at *www.MITT-EIS.com*. All comments submitted during the public comment period will become part of the public record and substantive comments will be addressed in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS. All comments must be postmarked or received online by April 2, 2019, Chamorro Standard Time, for consideration in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS.

Naval Facilities Engineering Command Pacific, Attention: MITT Supplemental EIS/OEIS Project Manager, 258 Makalapa Drive, Suite 100, Pearl Harbor, HI 96860–3134.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS is available

Figure 8.3-3: Federal Register Notice of Rescheduled Public Meetings for the Draft SEIS/OEIS

electronically for public viewing at *www.MITT-EIS.com* and at the following public libraries:

1. Robert F. Kennedy Memorial Library, University of Guam, UOG Station, Mangilao, GU 96923–1871.
2. Nieves M. Flores Memorial Library, 254 Martyr St., Hagåtña, GU 96910–5141.
3. Tinian Public Library, San Jose Village, Tinian, MP 96952–9997.
4. Antonio C. Atalig Memorial Library (Rota Public Library), Rota, MP 96951–9997.
5. Joeten-Kiyu Public Library, Beach Road and Insatto St., Saipan, MP 96950–9996.

Dated: March 1, 2019.

M.S. Werner,

Commander, Judge Advocate General's Corps, U.S. Navy, Federal Register Liaison Officer.

[FR Doc. 2019–04019 Filed 3–7–19; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3810–FF–P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Navy

Notice of Intent To Grant Exclusive Patent License; Nanocrine, Inc.

AGENCY: Department of the Navy, DoD.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Department of the Navy hereby gives notice of its intent to grant to Nanocrine, Inc., of Frederick, Maryland an exclusive license in the field of use of products and services for use in cell biology research for cell signaling and phenotyping studies and the field of use of products and services for use in cell biology research for cell protein and chemical secretion, in the United States, to U.S. Patent 9,791,368: Nanoplasmonic Imaging Technique for the Spatio-temporal Mapping of Single Cell Secretions in Real Time, Navy Case No. 102,395.//U.S. Patent Application No. 15/784,433: Nanoplasmonic Imaging Technique for the Spatio-Temporal Mapping of Single Cell Secretion in Real Time, Navy Case No. 102,395.//U.S. Patent No. 9,915,654: Light Microscopy Chips and Data Analysis Methodology for Quantitative Localized Surface Plasmon Resonance (LSPR) Biosensing and Imaging, Navy Case No. 101,529.//U.S. Patent Application No. 15/882,081: Light Microscopy Chips and Data Analysis Methodology for Quantitative Localized Surface Plasmon Resonance (LSPR) Biosensing and Imaging, Navy Case No. 101,529.//U.S Patent Application No. 14/039,326: Calibrating Single Plasmonic Nanostructures for Quantitative Biosensing, Navy Case No. 102,043.//U.S Patent Application No. 15/186,742: Determining Extracellular Protein Concentration with Nanoplasmonic Sensors, Navy Case No. 103,502.//U.S. Patent Application No. 16/196,097: Substrates with Indendently Tunable Topographies and Chemistries for Quantifying Surface-Induced Cell Behavior, Navy Case No. 107,399 and any continuations, divisionals, or re-issues thereof.

DATES: Anyone wishing to object to the grant of this license must file written objections along with supporting evidence, if any, not later than March 25, 2019.

ADDRESSES: Written objections are to be filed with the Naval Research Laboratory, Code 1004, 4555 Overlook Avenue SW, Washington, DC 20375–5320.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Amanda Horansky McKinney, Head, Technology Transfer Office, NRL Code 1004, 4555 Overlook Avenue SW, Washington, DC 20375–5320, telephone 202–767–1644. Due to U.S. Postal delays, please fax 202–404–7920, email: *techtran@.nrl.navy.mil* or use courier delivery to expedite response.

(Authority: 35 U.S.C. 207, 37 CFR part 404.)

M.S. Werner,

Commander, Judge Advocate General's Corps, U.S. Navy, Federal Register Liaison Officer.

[FR Doc. 2019–04220 Filed 3–7–19; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3810–FF–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Energy Conservation Program for Consumer Products: Representative Average Unit Costs of Energy

AGENCY: Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In this notice, the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) is forecasting the representative average unit costs of five residential energy sources for the year 2019 pursuant to the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (Act). The five sources are electricity, natural gas, No. 2 heating oil, propane, and kerosene.

DATES: The representative average unit costs of energy contained in this notice will become effective April 8, 2019 and will remain in effect until further notice.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: John Cymbalsky, U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Forrestal Building, Mail Station EE–5B, 1000 Independence Avenue SW, Washington, DC 20585–0121, (202) 287–1692, *ApplianceStandardsQuestions@ee.doe.gov.*

Francine Pinto, Esq. U.S. Department of Energy, Office of General Counsel Forrestal Building, Mail Station GC–33, 1000 Independence Avenue SW, Washington, DC 20585–0103, (202) 586–7432, *Francine.Pinto@hq.doe.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Section 323 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act requires that DOE prescribe test procedures for the measurement of the estimated annual operating costs or other measures of energy consumption for certain consumer products specified in the Act. (42 U.S.C. 6293(b)(3)) These test procedures are found in Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) part 430, subpart B.

Section 323(b)(3) of the Act requires that the estimated annual operating costs of a covered product be calculated from measurements of energy use in a representative average use cycle or period of use and from representative average unit costs of the energy needed to operate such product during such cycle. (42 U.S.C. 6293(b)(3)) The section further requires that DOE provide information to manufacturers regarding the representative average unit costs of energy. (42 U.S.C. 6293(b)(4)) This cost information should be used by manufacturers to meet their obligations under section 323(c) of the Act. Most notably, these costs are used to comply with Federal Trade Commission (FTC) requirements for labeling. Manufacturers are required to use the revised DOE representative average unit costs when the FTC publishes new ranges of comparability for specific covered products, 16 CFR part 305. Interested parties can also find information covering the FTC labeling requirements at *http://www.ftc.gov/appliances.*

DOE last published representative average unit costs of residential energy in a **Federal Register** notice entitled, "Energy Conservation Program for Consumer Products: Representative Average Unit Costs of Energy", dated April 24, 2018, 83 FR 17811.

On April 8, 2019, the cost figures published in this notice will become effective and supersede those cost figures published on April 24, 2018. The cost figures set forth in this notice will be effective until further notice.

DOE's Energy Information Administration (EIA) has developed the 2019 representative average unit after-tax residential costs found in this notice. These costs for electricity,

Figure 8.3-3: Federal Register Notice of Rescheduled Public Meetings for the Draft SEIS/OEIS (continued)

and Recreation Department, Oregon Department of Environmental Quality, Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development, Oregon Department of State Lands, and Oregon Department of Agriculture.

Alternatives. The EIS will evaluate a no action alternative and action alternatives. The no action alternative is the current management direction for the WVS. Action alternatives will be composed of various measures for continued operations and maintenance of the WVS, as well as measures that will be developed to meet ESA obligations to avoid jeopardizing the continued existence of listed species. Comments received during the scoping comment period will inform the development of action alternatives.

Scoping Process/Public Involvement. The Corps invites all affected federal, state, and local agencies, affected Native American Tribes, other interested parties, and the general public to participate in the NEPA process during development of the EIS. The purpose of the public scoping process is to provide information to the public, narrow the scope of analysis to significant environmental issues, serve as a mechanism to solicit agency and public input on alternatives and issues of concern, and ensure full and open participation in scoping for the Draft EIS. Numerous public scoping meetings will be held during the scoping period. The specific dates, times, and locations of the meetings will be published on the Corps' project website: *https://www.nwp.usace.army.mil/Locations/Willamette-Valley/Evaluation/.*

This is not a notice for the public comment periods for the Cougar Downstream Passage and Detroit Downstream Passage projects; public comment periods for those projects will be noticed separately.

Documents and other important information related to the EIS will be available for review on the Corps' project website.

Aaron L. Dorf,
Colonel, Corps of Engineers, District Commander.

[FR Doc. 2019-06258 Filed 3-29-19; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3720-58-P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Navy

Notice of Availability of Government-Owned Inventions; Available for Licensing

AGENCY: Department of the Navy, DoD.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Department of the Navy (DoN) announces the availability of the inventions listed below, assigned to the United States Government, as represented by the Secretary of the Navy, for domestic and foreign licensing by the Department of the Navy.

ADDRESSES: Requests for copies of the patents cited should be directed to Naval Surface Warfare Center, Crane Div, Code OOL, Bldg 2, 300 Highway 361, Crane, IN 47522–5001.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Christopher Monsey, Naval Surface Warfare Center, Crane Div, Code OOL, Bldg 2, 300 Highway 361, Crane, IN 47522–5001, Email *Christopher.Monsey@navy.mil*, 812–854–2777.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The following patents are available for licensing: Patent No. 10,200,081 (Navy Case No. 200348): SYSTEMS AND METHODS FOR SIGNAL DETECTION AND DIGITAL BANDWIDTH REDUCTION IN DIGITAL PHASED ARRAYS// Patent No. 10,204,875 (Navy Case No. 200421): SYSTEMS AND METHODS FOR INHIBITING BACKEND ACCESS TO INTEGRATED CIRCUITS BY INTEGRATING PHOTON AND ELECTRON SENSING LATCH-UP CIRCUITS// Patent No. 10,209,342 (Navy Case No. 200479): ELECTROMAGNETIC RADIATION SOURCE LOCATING SYSTEM// and Patent No. 10,215,531 (Navy Case No. 200357): TESTING SYSTEM FOR OPTICAL AIMING SYSTEMS WITH LIGHT EMITTER SYSTEMS INCLUDING TESTING SYSTEM FOR THERMAL DRIFT AND RELATED METHODS.

Authority: 35 U.S.C. 207, 37 CFR part 404.

Dated: March 26, 2019.

M.S. Werner,
Commander, Judge Advocate General's Corps, U.S. Navy, Federal Register Liaison Officer.

[FR Doc. 2019-06163 Filed 3-29-19; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3810-FF-P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Navy

Notice of Extension of Public Comment Period for the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement for Mariana Islands Training and Testing

AGENCY: Department of the Navy, DoD.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: A notice of public meetings was published in the **Federal Register** by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency on January 31, 2019 and March 8, 2019 for the Department of the Navy's (DoN) Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (EIS/OEIS) for the Mariana Islands Training and Testing (MITT) Study Area.

DATES: This notice announces a 15-day extension of the public comment period from April 2, 2019, to April 17, 2019.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be mailed to Naval Facilities Engineering Command Pacific, Attention: MITT Supplemental EIS/OEIS Project Manager, 258 Makalapa Drive, Suite 100, Pearl Harbor, HI 96860–3134, or electronically via the project website at *www.MITT-EIS.com*. All comments submitted during the public comment period will become part of the public record and substantive comments will be addressed in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS. All comments must be postmarked or received online by April 17, 2019, Chamorro Standard Time, for consideration in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS.

Naval Facilities Engineering Command Pacific, Attention: MITT Supplemental EIS/OEIS Project Manager, 258 Makalapa Drive, Suite 100, Pearl Harbor, HI 96860–3134.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS is available electronically for public viewing at *www.MITT-EIS.com* and at the following public libraries:

1. Robert F. Kennedy Memorial Library, University of Guam, UOG Station, Mangilao, GU 96923–1871.

2. Nieves M. Flores Memorial Library, 254 Martyr St., Hagåtña, GU 96910–5141.

3. Tinian Public Library, San Jose Village, Tinian, MP 96952–9997.

4. Antonio C. Atalig Memorial Library (Rota Public Library), Rota, MP 96951–9997.

5. Joeten-Kiyu Public Library, Beach Road and Insatto St., Saipan, MP 96950–9996.

Dated: March 25, 2019.

M.S. Werner,
Commander, Judge Advocate General's Corps, U.S. Navy, Federal Register Liaison Officer.

[FR Doc. 2019-06028 Filed 3-29-19; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3810-FF-P

Figure 8.3-4: Federal Register Notice of Extension of Public Comment Period for the Draft SEIS/OEIS

8.3.1 Notification of Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement Public Review and Comment Period and Public Meetings

The Navy made significant efforts to notify the public of the release of the Draft SEIS/OEIS and the dates and locations of the public meetings to maximize participation during the Draft SEIS/OEIS public review and comment period. A summary of these efforts follows.

8.3.1.1 Notification Letters

Stakeholder letters were mailed January 30, 2019, first-class to 218 federal and local elected officials and agency representatives. Entities that received the notification letters are listed in Table 8.3-1, and Figure 8.3-5 provides an example of the notification letter.

Table 8.3-1: Federal and Local Entities that Received the Draft SEIS/OEIS Notification Letter

Guam
Federal Elected Officials and Federal Agencies
U.S. Congress
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
National Ocean Service
National Marine Fisheries Service, Habitat Division, Guam Office
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
Guam National Wildlife Refuge
U.S. Department of Agriculture
Natural Resource Conservation Service, West Area Office
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Wildlife Services
Department of Transportation/Federal Aviation Administration
National Park Service
War in the Pacific National Historic Park
Western Pacific Regional Fishery Management Council
Guam Education & Outreach
Local Elected Officials and Local Agencies
Office of the Governor
Office of the Senator
34th Guam Legislature
Mayors' Council of Guam
Office of the Mayor
Village of Agana Heights
Village of Agat
Village of Asan-Maina
Village of Barrigada
Village of Chalan Pago-Ordot
Village of Dededo
Village of Hagåtña
Village of Inarajan
Village of Mangilao
Village of Merizo
Village of Mongmong-Toto-Maite
Village of Piti
Village of Santa Rita
Village of Sinajana
Village of Talofofo
Village of Tamuning-Tumon-Harmon
Village of Umatac
Village of Yigo

Village of Yona
A.B. Won Pat International Airport
Consolidated Utility Services
Department of Labor
Guam Ancestral Lands Commission
Guam Army National Guard
Guam Bureau of Statistics and Plans
Coastal Management Program
Guam Chamorro Land Trust Commission
Guam Consolidated Commission on Utilities
Guam Department of Agriculture
Division of Aquatic and Wildlife Resources
Guam Department of Education
Guam Department of Land Management
Guam Department of Parks and Recreation
Historic Preservation Office
Guam Department of Public Works
Guam Economic Development and Commerce Authority
Guam Environmental Protection Agency
Water Resources Management Program
Guam Homeland Security
Office of Civil Defense
Guam Land Use Commission
Guam Visitors Bureau
Guam Waterworks Authority
Northern Guam Pacific Islands Area Soil and Water Conservation Districts
Port Authority of Guam
University of Guam
Water and Environmental Research Institute
Marine Laboratory
Cooperative Extension Service
U.S. Marshals Service, District of Guam
Saipan
Federal Elected Officials and Federal Agencies
U.S. Congress
U.S. Department of the Interior
Office of Insular Affairs
U.S. Department of Agriculture
Natural Resources Conservation Service
Saipan Service Center
Tinian & Aguiguan Service Center
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
National Marine Fisheries Service
Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (CNMI) Field Office
Western Pacific Regional Fishery Management Council
Local Elected Officials and Local Agencies
Office of the Governor
CNMI Senate
CNMI House of Representatives
CNMI Office of the Mayor
CNMI Public Information and Protocol Office
CNMI Bureau of Environmental and Coastal Quality
Division of Environmental Quality
Division of Coastal Resources Management
Marine Monitoring

CNMI Coastal Resources Management Program
CNMI Department of Commerce
Military Integration Management Committee
CNMI Department of Community and Cultural Affairs
Historic Preservation Office
CNMI Department of Land and Natural Resources
Division of Fish and Wildlife
Division of Agriculture
Division of Parks and Recreation
Soil and Water Conservation District
CNMI Department of Public Lands
CNMI Department of Public Safety
Office of the Commissioner
Tinian Fire Division
CNMI Military and Veteran Affairs
CNMI Northern Marianas College Cooperative, Research, Extension and Education Service
CNMI Zoning Office
Commonwealth Ports Authority
Marianas Visitors Authority
Port of Saipan
Saipan International Airport
Tinian
Federal Elected Officials
U.S. Congress
Local Elected Officials and Local Agencies
Office of the Mayor
Municipality of Tinian and Aguiguan
CNMI Department of Public Lands
CNMI Department of Commerce
CNMI Department of Land and Natural Resources
Rota
Federal Elected Officials
U.S. Congress
Local Elected Officials and Local Agencies
Office of the Mayor
15th Rota Municipal Council
CNMI Department of Lands and Natural Resources
Commonwealth Ports Authority
Department of Lands and Natural Resources
Division of Fish and Wildlife
Department of Public Lands, Rota Office
Rota Gaming Commission
Rota Health Center
Rota Municipal Treasury
Federal Agencies outside of Guam, Saipan, Tinian, and Rota
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
U.S. Department of State
Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Region IX
Pacific Islands Contact Office, Honolulu
Communities and Ecosystems Division
Enforcement Division
Office of Federal Activities
National Environmental Policy Act Compliance Division

Council on Environmental Quality
Department of the Interior
- Environmental Policy & Compliance
- Office of Insular Affairs

Federal Aviation Administration
- Air Traffic Division, Western Pacific Region (AWP-532)
- Military Program
- Western Pacific Region
- Bureau of Certification and Licensing

Federal Maritime Commission
- Office of the Secretary

Marianas Trench Marine National Monument
Marine Mammal Commission
U.S. Department of Transportation
- Maritime Administration

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
- Office of Law Enforcement, Honolulu District
- National Marine Fisheries Service
  - Headquarters
  - Habitat Division
  - Protected Resources Division
  - Office for Coastal Management
  - Office of Protected Resources
  - Pacific Islands Fisheries Science Center
  - Pacific Islands Regional Office

U.S. Coast Guard Headquarters
- Office of Environmental Management (CG-47)

U.S. Department of the Interior
- Office of Environmental Policy and Compliance
- Office of Insular Affairs


U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
- Pacific Islands Office
- Pacific Region

U.S. Geological Survey
- Pacific Coastal and Marine Science Center
- Pacific Islands Water Science Center

U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service
- Pacific Southwest Region 5
- Pacific Southwest Research Station
  - Institute of Pacific Islands Forestry

U.S. Department of Agriculture
- Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service
  - Wildlife Services
- Natural Resources Conservation Service
  - Office of the Chief

Western Pacific Regional Fishery Management Council



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
COMMANDER
UNITED STATES PACIFIC FLEET
250 MAKALAPA DRIVE
PEARL HARBOR, HAWAII 96860-3131

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5090
Ser N465/0059
January 14, 2019

The Honorable Vinnie V. Sablan
Senator, Saipan
CNMI Senate
P.O. Box 500129
Saipan, MP 96950

Dear Senator Sablan:

SUBJECT: NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY OF THE MARIANA ISLANDS TRAINING AND TESTING DRAFT SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT/OVERSEAS ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

This letter is to inform you that the Department of the Navy (Navy) has prepared a draft supplement to the 2015 Final Mariana Islands Training and Testing (MITT) Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (EIS/OEIS) to assess the potential environmental impacts associated with ongoing at-sea and Farallon de Medinilla (FDM) military readiness activities conducted within the MITT EIS/OEIS Study Area (hereafter referred to as the "Study Area"). Military readiness activities include training and research, development, testing, and evaluation activities (hereafter referred to as "training and testing"). The Navy welcomes your review and comments on the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS.

In May 2015, the Navy completed an EIS/OEIS for training and testing activities occurring within the Study Area from 2015 through 2020. The supplement to the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS supports ongoing and future activities conducted within the Study Area at sea and on FDM. The proposed activities are generally consistent with those analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and are representative of activities the military has conducted in the Study Area for decades.

In the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy evaluates new, relevant information, such as more recent marine mammal density data and new scientific information, and updates the environmental analyses as appropriate. The Navy prepared the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS to support the issuance of federal regulatory permits and authorizations under the Marine Mammal Protection Act and the Endangered Species Act.

The Study Area remains unchanged since the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. The Study Area includes the existing Mariana Islands Range Complex (MIRC), additional areas on the high seas outside of the MIRC, a transit corridor between the MIRC and the Hawaii Range Complex, and

Figure 8.3-5: Stakeholder Letter for the Notification of Availability of the Draft SEIS/OEIS

5090
Ser N465/0059
January 14, 2019

Navy piers located in Apra Harbor (Enclosure 1). Other activities and land components associated with the MIRC (except FDM) are not considered in the supplement.

The Proposed Action is to conduct at-sea training and testing activities within the Study Area. These activities include the use of active sonar and explosives while employing marine species mitigation measures. The purpose of the Proposed Action is to conduct training and testing activities to ensure that the Navy and other U.S. military services meet their respective missions, which, for the Navy is to maintain, train, and equip combat-ready forces capable of winning wars, deterring aggression, and maintaining freedom of the seas, consistent with Congressional direction in Section 5062 of Title 10 of the U.S. Code.

To achieve and maintain military readiness, the Navy proposes to:

- Conduct at-sea training and testing activities at levels required to support military readiness requirements beyond 2020; and
- Accommodate evolving mission requirements, including those resulting from the development, testing, and introduction of new vessels, aircraft, and weapons systems into the fleet.

The Navy will hold two open house public meetings to provide information, answer questions, and give the public an opportunity to comment on the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The public may arrive at any time between 5 to 8 p.m., as there will not be a presentation or formal oral comment session. The meeting will be held at the following locations:

Guam:

Date: **Tuesday, February 26, 2019**
Location: University of Guam
Jesus & Eugenia Leon Guerrero School of Business and Public Administration Building
Anthony Leon Guerrero Multi-Purpose Room 129 and Henry Sy Atrium
Mangilao, Guam 96923

Saipan:

Date: **Wednesday, February 27, 2019**
Location: Kanoa Resort Saipan
Seaside Hall
Beach Road in Susupe
Saipan, MP 96950

To review the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS and for additional information, including details on the key differences between the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and the 2019 Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, please visit the project website at **www.MITT-EIS.com**. The Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS is also available at the following local public libraries:

2

Figure 8.3-5: Stakeholder Letter for the Notification of Availability of the Draft SEIS/OEIS (continued)

5090
Ser N465/0059
January 14, 2019

Robert F. Kennedy Memorial Library
University of Guam
UOG Station
Mangilao, GU 96923

Nieves M. Flores Memorial Library
254 Martyr St.
Hagåtña, GU 96910

Tinian Public Library
San Jose Village
Tinian, MP 96952

Antonio C. Atalig Memorial Library
(Rota Public Library)
Rota, MP 96951

Joeten-Kiyu Public Library
Beach Road and Insatto St.
Saipan, MP 96950

The public comment period begins February 1, 2019, and will close on March 18, 2019. All comments must be postmarked or received online by **March 18, 2019**, Chamorro Standard Time, for consideration in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS. All comments submitted during the public comment period will become part of the public record and substantive comments will be addressed in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS.

Comments may be submitted online at **www.MITT-EIS.com**, at the public meetings, or by mail to:

Naval Facilities Engineering Command Pacific
Attention: MITT Supplemental EIS/OEIS Project Manager
258 Makalapa Drive, Suite 100
Pearl Harbor, HI 96860-3134

If you would like to receive additional information or a project briefing, please contact Mr. John Van Name at 808-471-1714, or john.vanname@navy.mil.

Please help the Navy inform the community about the availability of the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS and public meetings by sharing this information with your staff and interested individuals.

Sincerely,


Timothy C. Liberatore
Captain, Civil Engineer Corps, U.S. Navy
Deputy Fleet Civil Engineer
By direction of the Commander

Enclosure: 1. Mariana Islands Training and Testing Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement Study Area

3

Figure 8.3-5: Stakeholder Letter for the Notification of Availability of the Draft SEIS/OEIS (continued)

Enclosure: 1. Mariana Islands Training and Testing Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement Study Area




Enclosure (1)

Figure 8.3-5: Stakeholder Letter for the Notification of Availability of the Draft SEIS/OEIS (continued)

8.3.1.2 Postcard Mailers

Postcards were mailed January 30, 2019, first-class from Guam to 350 recipients on the project mailing list, including individuals; nongovernmental organizations; community and business groups; fishing, aviation, and recreation groups; and private companies. A second postcard mailer announcing the rescheduled public meeting information and the 15-day extension of the public review and comment period was mailed first-class March 6, 2019, to 568 recipients, including federal and local elected officials and agency representatives, individuals, community and business groups, nongovernmental organizations, and media. The postcards included the dates, locations, and times of the public meetings, as well as the project website address for more information, commenting information, and a brief summary of the Proposed Action. The postcard mailers are shown in Figure 8.3-6 and Figure 8.3-7.






Figure 8.3-6: Notice of the Draft SEIS/OEIS Public Meetings Postcard Mailer (Front and Back)




Figure 8.3-7: Notice of the Draft SEIS/OEIS Rescheduled Public Meetings and Comment Period Extension Postcard Mailer (Front and Back)

8.3.1.3 Newspaper Advertisements

Display advertisements were published in three local and regional newspapers announcing the Notice of Availability/Notice of Public Meetings beginning February 1, 2019, through February 26, 2019. A display advertisement announcing the rescheduled public meetings was published March 7, 2019, through March 18, 2019. An additional display advertisement announcing the public comment extension period was published April 1, 2019, through April 3, 2019. The advertisements included a brief description of the Proposed Action, the project website address, the duration of the comment period, and information on how to provide comments. The newspapers and publication dates are indicated in Table 8.3-2. Examples of the advertisements are shown in Figure 8.3-8, Figure 8.3-9, and Figure 8.3-10.

Table 8.3-2: Newspaper Publications of Draft SEIS/OEIS and Public Meetings


Newspaper	Newspaper Coverage	Publication Dates
Pacific Daily News	Hagåtña, Guam; and neighboring islands	**Notice of Availability/Notice of Public Meetings:** Friday, Feb. 1, 2019 Sunday, Feb. 24, 2019 Monday, Feb. 25, 2019 Tuesday, Feb. 26, 2019 **Meeting Reschedule Notice:** Friday, March 8, 2019 Saturday, March 16, 2019 Sunday, March 17, 2019 Monday, March 18, 2019 **Comment Period Extension Notice:** Monday, April 1, 2019 Tuesday, April 2, 2019 Wednesday, April 3, 2019
Marianas Variety	Saipan, Tinian, Rota, Federated States of Micronesia	**Notice of Availability/Notice of Public Meetings:** Friday, Feb. 1, 2019 Monday, Feb. 25, 2019 **Meeting Reschedule Notice:** Thursday, March 7, 2019 Tuesday, March 12, 2019 Wednesday, March 13, 2019 Thursday, March 14, 2019 **Comment Period Extension Notice:** Monday, April 1, 2019 Tuesday, April 2, 2019 Wednesday, April 3, 2019

Table 8.3-2: Newspaper Publications of Draft SEIS/OEIS and Public Meetings (continued)

Newspaper	Newspaper Coverage	Publication Dates
Saipan Tribune	Saipan, Tinian, Rota	**Notice of Availability/Notice of Public Meetings:** Friday, Feb. 1, 2019 Monday, Feb. 25, 2019 Tuesday, Feb. 26, 2019 **Meeting Reschedule Notice:** Thursday, March 7, 2019 Tuesday, March 12, 2019 Wednesday, March 13, 2019 Thursday, March 14, 2019 **Comment Period Extension Notice:** Monday, April 1, 2019 Tuesday, April 2, 2019 Wednesday, April 3, 2019



Figure 8.3-8: Newspaper Announcement of the Draft SEIS/OEIS Availability and Public Meetings



The U.S. Navy
INVITES YOU TO PARTICIPATE
in the Mariana Islands Training and Testing
Supplemental EIS/OEIS Public Involvement Process

Due to the effects of Typhoon Wutip, Navy officials postponed public meetings planned for Feb. 26-27, 2019. This notice announces the rescheduled public meetings and a 15-day extension of the comment period.

The U.S. Navy has prepared a Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (EIS/OEIS) to assess the potential environmental impacts associated with ongoing military readiness activities conducted within the Mariana Islands Training and Testing (MITT) EIS/OEIS Study Area. The draft supplement to the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS supports ongoing and future activities conducted within the Study Area: at sea and on Farallon de Medinilla (FDM).

Public Involvement

The Navy welcomes your review and comments on the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Comments may be submitted at the public meetings, online at **www.MITT-EIS.com**, or by mail to:

Naval Facilities Engineering Command Pacific
Attention: MITT SEIS/OEIS Project Manager
258 Makalapa Drive, Suite 100
Pearl Harbor, HI 96860-3134

Comments must be postmarked or received online by April 2, 2019, Chamorro Standard Time, for consideration in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS.

Open House Public Meetings

Arrive and submit comments anytime during the open house. No presentation or public oral comment session will be conducted.

TINIAN, Thursday, March 14, 2019
1 to 3:30 p.m.
Tinian Public Library
San Jose Village


ROTA, Friday, March 15, 2019
1:30 to 4:30 p.m.
Mayor's Conference Hall
Songsong Village

SAIPAN, Monday, March 18, 2019
5 to 8 p.m.
Kanoa Resort Saipan
Seaside Hall
Beach Road in Susupe

GUAM, Tuesday, March 19, 2019
5 to 8 p.m.
University of Guam
Jesus and Eugenia Leon Guerrero School of Business and Public Administration Building
Anthony Leon Guerrero Multi-Purpose Room 129
and Henry Sy Atrium

The draft document is available online at **www.MITT-EIS.com** or at the following public libraries: University of Guam Robert F. Kennedy Memorial Library, Nieves M. Flores Memorial Library, Joeten-Kiyu Public Library, Tinian Public Library, and Rota Public Library.

Figure 8.3-9: Newspaper Announcement of the Draft SEIS/OEIS Availability and Rescheduled Public Meetings



Public Comment Period Extended for the Mariana Islands Training and Testing Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS

The U.S. Navy has extended the public comment period by an additional 15 days for the Mariana Islands Training and Testing (MITT) Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (EIS/OEIS). Public comments may now be submitted until **April 17, 2019**, for consideration in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS.

The U.S. Navy has prepared a Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS to assess the potential environmental impacts associated with ongoing military readiness activities conducted within the MITT EIS/OEIS Study Area. The draft supplement to the 2015 Final MITT EIS/OEIS supports ongoing and future activities conducted within the Study Area: at sea and on Farallon de Medinilla (FDM).

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

The Navy welcomes your review and comments on the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS.
Comments will be accepted online at **www.MITT-EIS.com** or by mail to:

Naval Facilities Engineering Command Pacific
Attention: MITT Supplemental EIS/OEIS Project Manager
258 Makalapa Drive, Suite 100
Pearl Harbor, HI 96860-3134

All comments must be postmarked or received online by April 17, 2019, Chamorro Standard Time, for consideration in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS.

The draft document is available online at **www.MITT-EIS.com** or at the following public libraries: University of Guam Robert F. Kennedy Memorial Library, Nieves M. Flores Memorial Library, Joeten-Kiyu Public Library, Tinian Public Library, and Rota Public Library.

Figure 8.3-10: Newspaper Announcement of the Draft SEIS/OEIS Public Comment Extension Period

8.3.1.4 Press Releases

Commander, Joint Region Marianas Public Affairs Office distributed press releases to local and regional media outlets February 4, 2019; March 6, 2019; and March 28, 2019. The press releases provided a description of the Proposed Action; address of the project website; duration of the comment period and commenting methods; location of the information repositories; and location, dates, and times of the public meetings. The press releases provided information on the availability of the Navy to meet with the media in advance of the meetings. The press releases from the Commander, Joint Region Marianas are shown in Figure 8.3-11, Figure 8.3-12, and Figure 8.3-13.

Mariana Islands Training and Testing Supplemental EIS/OEIS

COMMANDER, JOINT REGION MARIANAS
Public Affairs Office
Main: (671) 349-2113/5207
Fax: (671) 349-1201
E-Mail: CJRMPAO@fe.navy.mil

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
Press Release 19-012

Mariana Islands Training and Testing Draft SEIS/OEIS Available for Public Review and Comment

ASAN, Guam (Feb. 4, 2019) – The U.S. Navy has prepared a draft supplement to the 2015 Final Mariana Islands Training and Testing (MITT) Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (EIS/OEIS).

In the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy evaluates the potential environmental impacts associated with conducting ongoing and future military readiness activities within the Study Area at sea and on Farallon de Medinilla.

The Navy requests and welcomes substantive public comments on the MITT Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS.

PROPOSED ACTION:

The Proposed Action is to conduct at-sea training and testing activities within the Study Area. These activities include the use of active sonar and explosives while employing marine species mitigation measures. The purpose of the Proposed Action, which remains the same as the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, is to maintain a ready force to ensure the military can accomplish its mission to maintain, train, and equip combat-ready forces.

The proposed at-sea training and testing activities are generally consistent with those analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and are similar to activities the military has conducted in the Study Area for decades.

The MITT Study Area includes:

- The Mariana Islands Range Complex
- Areas on the high seas to the north and west of the Mariana Islands Range Complex
- A transit corridor between the Mariana Islands Range Complex and the Hawaii Range Complex, starting at the International Date Line
- Apra Harbor and select Navy pierside and harbor locations

The Study Area has not changed since the 2015 Final EIS/OEIS. In the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy analyzes only the training and testing activities conducted at sea and on FDM within the

– more –

Figure 8.3-11: Press Release of the Notification of Availability of the Draft SEIS/OEIS

Mariana Islands Training and Testing Supplemental EIS/OEIS

Study Area. Other activities and land areas are not included and remain covered under the 2015 analysis and associated authorizations.
Please visit the project website at **www.MITT-EIS.com** to download the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS and submit substantive comments online.

AVAILABILITY OF DRAFT SUPPLEMENTAL EIS/OEIS AND PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD:

The Navy is seeking public review and comment on the Proposed Action and alternatives and the accuracy and adequacy of the environmental analysis. The Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS is available for public review online at **www.MITT-EIS.com** and at the following locations:

GUAM
Robert F. Kennedy Memorial Library
University of Guam
UOG Station
Mangilao, GU 96923

Nieves M. Flores Memorial Library
254 Martyr St.
Hagåtña, GU 96910

SAIPAN
Joeten-Kiyu Public Library
Beach Road and Insatto St.
Saipan, MP 96950

TINIAN
Tinian Public Library
San Jose Village
Tinian, MP 96952

ROTA
Antonio C. Atalig Memorial Library
Rota, MP 96951

The Navy will accept comments throughout the public comment period, which ends March 18. All comments must be postmarked or received online by **March 18, 2019**, Chamorro Standard Time, for consideration in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Comments may be submitted online at **www.MITT-EIS.com**, at the public meetings, or by mail to:

Naval Facilities Engineering Command Pacific
Attention: MITT Supplemental EIS/OEIS Project Manager
258 Makalapa Drive, Suite 100
Pearl Harbor, HI 96860-3134

OPEN HOUSE PUBLIC MEETINGS:

The Navy will hold two open house public meetings to provide information, answer questions, and give the public an opportunity to comment on the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The public may arrive at any time between 5-8 p.m., as there will not be a presentation or formal oral comment session. The meetings will be held at the following locations:

GUAM
Date: **Tuesday, Feb. 26**
Location: University of Guam

– more –

Figure 8.3-11: Press Release of the Notification of Availability of the Draft SEIS/OEIS (continued)

Mariana Islands Training and Testing Supplemental EIS/OEIS

Jesus & Eugenia Leon Guerrero School of Business and Public Administration Building
Anthony Leon Guerrero Multi-Purpose Room 129 and Henry Sy Atrium
Mangilao, Guam 96923

SAIPAN
Date: **Wednesday, Feb. 27**
Location: Kanoa Resort Saipan
Seaside Hall
Beach Road in Susupe
Saipan, MP 96950

-30-

Media will have an opportunity to speak with key project personnel before each meeting at 4:30 p.m. Media interested in attending or seeking further information should contact Joint Region Marianas Public Affairs, 1-671-349-2113.

Figure 8.3-11: Press Release of the Notification of Availability of the Draft SEIS/OEIS (continued)

COMMANDER, JOINT REGION MARIANAS
Public Affairs Office
Main: (671) 349-2113
Fax: (671) 349-1201
E-Mail: CJRMPAO@fe.navy.mil

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
Press Release 19-023

MITT Draft SEIS/OEIS Public Comment Period Extended, Public Meetings Announced

SANTA RITA, Guam (March 6, 2019) – The U.S. Navy invites the public to attend open house public meetings for the Mariana Islands Training and Testing Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement.

Due to the effects of Typhoon Wutip, Navy officials postponed public meetings supporting the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS planned for Feb. 26-27. Rescheduled public meeting dates and locations are listed below.

The public comment period has been extended by 15 days from March 18 to **April 2**. The Navy will host separate meetings on Guam and in the CNMI in compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act to specifically focus on effects to historic properties. The purpose of the section 106 meetings are to engage with existing consulting parties.

In the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy evaluates the potential environmental impacts associated with ongoing and future military readiness activities conducted within the Study Area at sea and on Farallon de Medinilla. The Navy requests and welcomes substantive public comments on the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS.

OPEN HOUSE PUBLIC MEETINGS:

The Navy will hold four open house public meetings to provide information, answer questions, and give the public an opportunity to comment on the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The public may arrive at any time during the meetings, as there will not be a presentation or public oral comment session. The meetings will be held at the following locations:

TINIAN
Date: **Thursday, March 14, 1-3:30 p.m.**
Location: Tinian Public Library
San Jose Village
Tinian, MP

Figure 8.3-12: Press Release of the Public Comment Period Extension and Public Meetings for the Draft SEIS/OEIS

ROTA
Date: **Friday, March 15, 1:30-4:30 p.m.**
Location: Mayor's Conference Hall
Songsong Village
Rota, MP

SAIPAN
Date: **Monday, March 18, 5- 8 p.m.**
Location: Kanoa Resort Saipan
Seaside Hall
Beach Road in Susupe
Saipan, MP

GUAM
Date: **Tuesday, March 19, 5-8 p.m.**
Location: University of Guam
Jesus & Eugenia Leon Guerrero School of Business and Public Administration Building
Anthony Leon Guerrero Multi-Purpose Room 129 and Henry Sy Atrium
Mangilao, Guam

AVAILABILITY OF DRAFT SUPPLEMENTAL EIS/OEIS AND PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD:

The Navy is seeking public review and comment on the Proposed Action and alternatives, and the accuracy and adequacy of the environmental analysis. The Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS is available for public review online at **www.MITT-EIS.com** and at the following locations:

GUAM
Robert F. Kennedy Memorial Library
University of Guam
UOG Station
Mangilao, GU 96923

Nieves M. Flores Memorial Library
254 Martyr St.
Hagåtña, GU 96910

SAIPAN
Joeten-Kiyu Public Library
Beach Road and Insatto St.
Saipan, MP 96950

TINIAN
Tinian Public Library
San Jose Village
Tinian, MP 96952

ROTA
Antonio C. Atalig Memorial Library
Rota, MP 96951

The Navy will accept comments throughout the extended public comment period, which ends April 2. All comments must be postmarked or received online by **April 2**, for consideration in the

Figure 8.3-12: Press Release of the Public Comment Period Extension and Public Meetings for the Draft SEIS/OEIS (continued**)**

Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Comments may be submitted online at **www.MITT-EIS.com**, at the public meetings, or by mail to:

Naval Facilities Engineering Command Pacific
Attention: MITT EIS/OEIS Project Manager
258 Makalapa Drive, Suite 100
Pearl Harbor, HI 96860-3134

PROPOSED ACTION:

The Proposed Action is to conduct at-sea training and testing activities within the Study Area. These activities include the use of active sonar and explosives while employing marine species mitigation measures. The purpose of the Proposed Action, which remains the same as the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, is to maintain a ready force to ensure the military can accomplish its mission to maintain, train, and equip combat-ready forces.

The proposed at-sea training and testing activities are generally consistent with those analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and are similar to activities the military has conducted in the Study Area for decades.

Visit the project website at **www.MITT-EIS.com** to download the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS and submit substantive comments online.

-30-

MEDIA AVAILABILITY: Media will have an opportunity to speak with key project personnel 30 minutes before the start of each meeting. Media interested in attending or seeking further information should contact Joint Region Marianas Public Affairs, 1-671-349-2113.

Figure 8.3-12: Press Release of the Public Comment Period Extension and Public Meetings for the Draft SEIS/OEIS (continued)

COMMANDER, JOINT REGION MARIANAS
Public Affairs Office
Main: (671) 349-2113
Fax: (671) 349-1201
E-Mail: CJRMPAO@fe.navy.mil

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
Press Release 19-028

MITT Draft SEIS/OEIS
Public Comment Period Extended

ASAN, Guam (March 28, 2019) – The U.S. Navy extended the public comment period by 15 days from April 2, to April 17, for the Mariana Islands Training and Testing Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement.

In the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy evaluates the potential environmental impacts associated with ongoing and future military readiness activities conducted within the Study Area at sea and on Farallon de Medinilla. The Navy requests and welcomes substantive public comments on the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS.

AVAILABILITY OF DRAFT SUPPLEMENTAL EIS/OEIS AND PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD:
The Navy is seeking public review and comment on the Proposed Action and alternatives, and the accuracy and adequacy of the environmental analysis. The Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS is available for public review online at **www.MITT-EIS.com** and at the following locations:

GUAM
Robert F. Kennedy Memorial Library
University of Guam
UOG Station
Mangilao, GU 96923

Nieves M. Flores Memorial Library
254 Martyr St.
Hagåtña, GU 96910

SAIPAN
Joeten-Kiyu Public Library
Beach Road and Insatto St.
Saipan, MP 96950

TINIAN
Tinian Public Library
San Jose Village
Tinian, MP 96952

ROTA
Antonio C. Atalig Memorial Library
Rota, MP 96951

Figure 8.3-13: Press Release of the Public Comment Period Extension for the Draft SEIS/OEIS

The Navy will accept comments throughout the extended public comment period, which ends April 2. All comments must be postmarked or received online by **April 17**, for consideration in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Comments may be submitted online at **www.MITT-EIS.com**, at the public meetings, or by mail to:

Naval Facilities Engineering Command Pacific
Attention: MITT EIS/OEIS Project Manager
258 Makalapa Drive, Suite 100
Pearl Harbor, HI 96860-3134

PROPOSED ACTION:

The Proposed Action is to conduct at-sea training and testing activities within the Study Area. These activities include the use of active sonar and explosives while employing marine species mitigation measures. The purpose of the Proposed Action, which remains the same as the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, is to maintain a ready force to ensure the military can accomplish its mission to maintain, train, and equip combat-ready forces.

The proposed at-sea training and testing activities are generally consistent with those analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and are similar to activities the military has conducted in the Study Area for decades.

Visit the project website at **www.MITT-EIS.com** to download the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS and submit substantive comments online.

-30-

Media interested in attending or seeking further information should contact Joint Region Marianas Public Affairs, 1-671-349-2113.

Figure 8.3-13: Press Release of the Public Comment Period Extension for the Draft SEIS/OEIS (continued)

8.3.1.5 Subscriber Email Notifications

Project information was also distributed via the project website subscriber's email distribution list. Website subscribers from the scoping phase were carried forward into the Draft SEIS/OEIS phase, beginning with 24 initial website subscribers. An email notification was sent to website subscribers on February 1, 2019, to announce the availability of the Draft SEIS/OEIS for review and comment and public meetings. A second email was sent on March 6, 2019, announcing the rescheduled public meetings and 15-day extended public comment and review period. A third email was sent on March 27, 2019, announcing an additional 15-day public comment period extension. As of September 2019, there are 48 website subscribers.

8.3.2 Public Meetings

The Navy held four public meetings to inform the public about the Proposed Action and to solicit public comments on the Draft SEIS/OEIS. The public meetings included informational poster and video stations staffed by Navy representatives. A stenographer was available to transcribe one-on-one oral comments; written comments were submitted at any time during the meetings. Members of the public could arrive at any time during the public meetings, which were held from 5:00 to 8:00 p.m. In total, 109 people attended the four meetings. The public meeting locations and dates are shown in Table 8.3-3.

Table 8.3-3: Public Meeting Locations

Area Location	Meeting Venue	Date
Tinian	Tinian Public Library	Thursday, March 14, 2019
Rota	Mayor's Conference Hall	Friday, March 15, 2019
Saipan	Kanoa Resort Saipan Seaside Hall	Monday, March 18, 2019
Guam	University of Guam Multipurpose Room	Tuesday, March 19, 2019

8.4 Comments on the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement

Throughout the public comment period, a total of 318 unique comments were received. Public comments on the Draft SEIS/OEIS were submitted in three ways:

- Written letters (received any time during the public comment period) (8 comments).
- Comments submitted at a public meeting (written or oral) (written: 7 comments; oral: 0 comments).
- Comments submitted directly on the project website (received any time during the public comment period) (303 comments).

Appendix K (Public Comment Responses) contains the comments received on the Draft SEIS/OEIS and the Navy's responses.

8.5 Distribution of the Draft and Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement

All parties notified of the availability of the Draft SEIS/OEIS were directed to view the document electronically on the project website (www.mitt-eis.com) or to access hard and CD/DVD copies as available at the information repositories discussed in Section 8.5.2 (Information Repositories).

Due to the widespread outbreak of respiratory illness from the novel coronavirus disease, designated as COVID-19, and federal and territorial guidance on social distancing resulting in the temporary closure of government offices and public facilities, the Navy mailed flash drives containing the Final SEIS/OEIS to all stakeholders and interested parties on the project mailing list. The Final SEIS/OEIS was also available for viewing on the project website and sent to information repositories.

8.5.1 Federal Agencies

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency received a hard copy and electronic version (CD/DVD) of the Draft and Final SEIS/OEIS. Regional offices of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency received electronic versions of the Draft and Final SEIS/OEIS. The National Marine Fisheries Service headquarters office received a hard copy and electronic copy of the Draft and Final SEIS/OEIS.

8.5.2 Information Repositories

The Draft and Final SEIS/OEIS were mailed in hard copy form along with an electronic CD/DVD to the information repository locations shown in Table 8.5-1. For the Final SEIS/OEIS, the public was encouraged to check with the library regarding its hours of operation and the availability of the document, depending on COVID-19 conditions regulating access to public facilities.

Table 8.5-1: Information Repositories

Repository Name	Address
Robert F. Kennedy Memorial Library University of Guam	UOG Station, Mangilao, Guam 96923
Nieves M. Flores Memorial Library	254 Martyr St. Hagåtña, Guam 96910
Tinian Public Library	San Jose Village Tinian, MP 96952
Antonio C. Atalig Memorial Library (Rota Public Library)	Rota, MP 96951
Joeten-Kiyu Public Library	Beach Road and Insatto Street Saipan, MP 96950-1092

This page intentionally left blank.

Appendix A: Training and Testing Activities Descriptions

Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/ Overseas Environmental Impact Statement Mariana Islands Training and Testing

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPENDIX A TRAINING AND TESTING ACTIVITIES DESCRIPTIONS A-1

A.1 Training Activities A-1

A.1.1 Major Training Exercises A-1

A.1.1.1 Joint Expeditionary Exercise A-2

A.1.1.2 Joint Multi-Strike Group Exercise A-4

A.1.2 Air Warfare Training A-6

A.1.2.1 Air Combat Maneuver A-7

A.1.2.2 Air Defense Exercise A-8

A.1.2.3 Air Intercept Control A-10

A.1.2.4 Gunnery Exercise Air-to-Air Medium-Caliber A-11

A.1.2.5 Gunnery Exercise Surface-to-Air Large Caliber A-13

A.1.2.6 Gunnery Exercise Surface-to-Air Medium-Caliber A-15

A.1.2.7 Missile Exercise Air-to-Air A-17

A.1.2.8 Missile Exercise Surface-to-Air A-20

A.1.3 Amphibious Warfare Training A-22

A.1.3.1 Amphibious Rehearsal, No Landing A-22

A.1.3.2 Marine Air Ground Task Force Exercise (Amphibious) – Battalion A-24

A.1.3.3 Amphibious Assault A-26

A.1.3.4 Amphibious Raid A-28

A.1.3.5 Humanitarian Assistance Operations/Disaster Relief Operations A-30

A.1.3.6 Naval Surface Fire Support Exercise – Land-Based Target A-31

A.1.3.7 Noncombatant Evacuation Operation A-32

A.1.3.8 Special Purpose Marine Air Ground Task Force Exercise A-33

A.1.3.9 Unmanned Aerial Vehicle – Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance A-35

A.1.4 Anti-Submarine Warfare Training A-36

A.1.4.1 Torpedo Exercise – Helicopter A-37

A.1.4.2 Torpedo Exercise – Maritime Patrol Aircraft A-39

A.1.4.3 Torpedo Exercise – Submarine A-41

A.1.4.4 Torpedo Exercise – Surface A-43

A.1.4.5 Tracking Exercise – Helicopter A-45

A.1.4.6 Tracking Exercise – Maritime Patrol Aircraft A-47
A.1.4.7 Tracking Exercise – Submarine A-49
A.1.4.8 Tracking Exercise – Surface A-51
A.1.4.9 Surface Warfare Advanced Tactical Training A-53
A.1.4.10 Small Joint Coordinated ASW Exercise (Multi-Sail/GUAMEX) A-55
A.1.5 Electronic Warfare A-57
A.1.5.1 Counter Targeting Chaff Exercise – Aircraft A-57
A.1.5.2 Counter Targeting Chaff Exercise – Ship A-59
A.1.5.3 Counter Targeting Flare Exercise – Aircraft A-61
A.1.5.4 Electronic Warfare Operations A-63
A.1.6 Expeditionary Warfare A-65
A.1.6.1 Parachute Insertion A-65
A.1.6.2 Personnel Insertion/Extraction A-66
A.1.7 Mine Warfare A-68
A.1.7.1 Civilian Port Defense A-68
A.1.7.2 Limpet Mine Neutralization System A-70
A.1.7.3 Mine Neutralization – Remotely Operated Vehicle Sonar A-71
A.1.7.4 Mine Countermeasure Exercise – Surface Ship Sonar A-73
A.1.7.5 Mine Countermeasure – Towed Mine Neutralization A-74
A.1.7.6 Mine Countermeasure – Towed Mine Detection A-76
A.1.7.7 Mine Countermeasure Exercise – Towed Sonar A-78
A.1.7.8 Mine Laying A-80
A.1.7.9 Mine Neutralization – Explosive Ordnance Disposal A-81
A.1.7.10 Submarine Mine Exercise A-83
A.1.7.11 Surface Ship Object Detection A-85
A.1.7.12 Underwater Demolition Qualification and Certification A-87
A.1.8 Strike Warfare A-89
A.1.8.1 Bombing Exercise (Air-to-Ground) A-89
A.1.8.2 Gunnery Exercise (Air-to-Ground) A-90
A.1.8.3 Missile Exercise A-91
A.1.9 Surface Warfare Training A-92
A.1.9.1 Bombing Exercise Air-to-Surface A-93
A.1.9.2 Gunnery Exercise Air-to-Surface Medium-Caliber A-95
A.1.9.3 Gunnery Exercise Air-to-Surface Small-Caliber A-97
A.1.9.4 Gunnery Exercise Surface-to-Surface Boat Medium-Caliber A-99
A.1.9.5 Gunnery Exercise Surface-to-Surface Boat Small-Caliber A-101
A.1.9.6 Gunnery Exercise Surface-to-Surface Ship Large-Caliber A-103

A.1.9.7 Gunnery Exercise Surface-to-Surface Ship Small- and Medium-Caliber A-105
A.1.9.8 Laser Targeting – At-Sea A-107
A.1.9.9 Maritime Security Operations A-109
A.1.9.10 Missile Exercise Air-to-Surface A-111
A.1.9.11 Missile Exercise Air-to-Surface – Rocket A-113
A.1.9.12 Missile Exercise Surface-to-Surface A-115
A.1.9.13 Sinking Exercise A-117
A.1.10 Other Training Exercises A-119
A.1.10.1 Direct Action (Tactical Air Control Party) A-119
A.1.10.2 Intelligence, Surveillance, Reconnaissance A-120
A.1.10.3 Precision Anchoring A-121
A.1.10.4 Search and Rescue At Sea A-122
A.1.10.5 Small Boat Attack A-123
A.1.10.6 Submarine Navigation A-125
A.1.10.7 Submarine Sonar Maintenance A-126
A.1.10.8 Surface Ship Sonar Maintenance A-127
A.1.10.9 Underwater Survey A-128
A.1.10.10 Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Training and Certification A-129
A.1.10.11 Unmanned Underwater Vehicle Training A-131
A.2 Testing Activities A-133
A.2.1 Naval Air Systems Command Testing Activities A-133
A.2.1.1 Anti-Submarine Warfare A-134
A.2.1.2 Electronic Warfare A-138
A.2.1.3 Surface Warfare A-139
A.2.2 Naval Sea Systems Command Testing Activities A-142
A.2.2.1 Anti-Submarine Warfare A-142
A.2.2.2 Electronic Warfare A-150
A.2.2.3 Mine Warfare A-152
A.2.2.4 Surface Warfare Testing A-154
A.2.2.5 Vessel Evaluation A-156
A.2.2.6 Other Testing A-158
A.2.3 Office of Naval Research Testing Activities A-160
A.2.3.1 Acoustic and Oceanographic Research A-160

List of Figures

Figure A-1: BQM-74 (Aerial Target) A-18
Figure A-2: LUU-2B/B Illuminating Flare (Aerial Target) A-18
Figure A-3: Tactical Air-Launched Decoy (Aerial Target) A-19

List of Tables

There are no tables in this appendix.

APPENDIX A TRAINING AND TESTING ACTIVITIES DESCRIPTIONS

A.1 TRAINING ACTIVITIES

The Navy's training activities are organized generally into eight primary mission areas and a miscellaneous category (Other Training) that includes those activities that do not fall within a primary mission area, but are an essential part of Navy training. In addition, because the Navy conducts a number of activities within larger training exercises, descriptions of those larger exercises are also included here. It is important to note that these larger exercises are comprised entirely of individual activities described in the primary mission areas.

A.1.1 MAJOR TRAINING EXERCISES

A major training exercise is comprised of several "unit level" range exercises conducted by several units operating together while commanded and controlled by a single commander. These exercises typically employ an exercise scenario developed to train and evaluate the strike group in naval tactical tasks. In a major training exercise, most of the operations and activities being directed and coordinated by the strike group commander are identical in nature to the operations conducted during individual, crew, and smaller-unit training events. In a major training exercise, however, these disparate training tasks are conducted in concert, rather than in isolation.

Major training exercises are listed below.

A.1.1.1 Joint Expeditionary Exercise

<table>
<tr><th colspan="4">Major Training Exercises – Medium Integrated Anti-Submarine Warfare</th></tr>
<tr><th colspan="4">Joint Expeditionary Exercise</th></tr>
<tr><td>Short Description</td><td colspan="2">Typically a 10-day exercise that could include a Carrier Strike Group and Expeditionary Strike Group, Marine Expeditionary Units, Army Infantry Units, and Air Force aircraft together in a joint environment that includes planning and execution efforts as well as military training activities at sea, in the air, and ashore.</td><td>Typical Duration
10 days</td></tr>
<tr><td>Long Description</td><td colspan="3">Advanced joint level battle group and expeditionary amphibious warfare exercise designed to create a cohesive Carrier and Expeditionary Strike Group. Typically 15 surface ships, amphibious assault craft, helicopters, maritime patrol aircraft, strike fighter aircraft, two submarines, and various unmanned vehicles.
More than 8,000 personnel may participate and could include the combined assets of a Carrier Strike Group and Expeditionary Strike Group, Marine Expeditionary Units, Army Infantry Units, and Air Force aircraft.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Typical Components</td><td colspan="3">Platforms: Aircraft carrier, amphibious warfare ship, fixed-wing aircraft, rotary-wing aircraft, support craft, surface combatant
Targets: Submarines
Systems being Trained/Tested: Mid-frequency sonar systems, sonobuoys</td></tr>
<tr><td>Standard Operating Procedures (Section 2.3.3)</td><td>Aircraft safety
Towed in-water device safety
Vessel safety</td><td colspan="2">Typical Locations
Range Complexes/Testing Ranges:
Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area
Mariana Islands Range Complex
Bays/Estuaries/Pierside:
Apra Harbor</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Biological Resources</td><td colspan="3">Acoustic:
Sonar and other transducers
Aircraft noise
Weapons noise
Vessel noise
Explosive:
In-air explosions
In-water explosions
Physical Disturbance and Strike:
Aircraft and aerial targets
Vessel and in-water devices
Military expended materials
Ingestion:
Military expended materials – munitions
Military expended materials – other than munitions
Energy:
In-air electromagnetic devices
In-water electromagnetic devices
Entanglement:
Decelerator/Parachutes
Wires and cables</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Physical Resources</td><td colspan="3">Air Quality:
Criteria air pollutants
Sediments and Water Quality:
Metals
Explosives
Other materials
Chemicals</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Human Resources</td><td colspan="3">Cultural Resources:
Physical disturbance and strike
Explosives
Socioeconomic Resources:
Accessibility
Physical disturbance and strike
Airborne acoustics
Public Health and Safety:
In-water energy
In-air energy
Physical interactions</td></tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr><th colspan="4">Major Training Exercises – Medium Integrated Anti-Submarine Warfare</th></tr>
<tr><th colspan="4">Joint Expeditionary Exercise</th></tr>
<tr><td>Military Expended Material</td><td colspan="2">Ingestible Material:
Decelerators/parachutes - small

Non-Ingestible Material:
Expended bathythermograph, expended bathythermograph wire, sonobuoy (non-explosive), sonobuoy wires</td><td>Military Recoverable Material</td><td>None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Sonar and Other Transducer Bins</td><td colspan="4">Mid-Frequency:
MF1 MF4
MF5 MF12

Anti-Submarine Warfare:
ASW2 ASW3</td></tr>
<tr><td>Explosive Bins</td><td colspan="4">None. Presented in appropriate worksheets for unit-level activities that could be conducted during this exercise.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Procedural Mitigation Measures</td><td colspan="4">Acoustic Stressors: (Section 5.3.2)
Active sonar

Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors:
(Section 5.3.4)
Vessel movement
Towed in-water devices</td></tr>
<tr><td>Assumptions Used for Analysis</td><td colspan="4">All military expended materials, ordnance, and explosives use is included in individual events. Additional activities utilizing sources not listed in the Sonar and Other Transducer Bins section above may occur during this exercise. All acoustic sources which may be used during training and testing activities have been accounted for in the modeling and analysis presented in this SEIS/OEIS.</td></tr>
</table>

A.1.1.2 Joint Multi-Strike Group Exercise

<table>
<tr><th colspan="6">Major Training Exercises</th></tr>
<tr><th colspan="6">Joint Multi-Strike Group Exercise – Large Integrated Anti-Submarine Warfare</th></tr>
<tr><td>Short Description</td><td colspan="3">Typically a 10-day Joint exercise, in which up to three carrier strike groups would conduct training exercises simultaneously.</td><td>Typical Duration
10 days</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Long Description</td><td colspan="5">The Joint Multi-Strike Group Exercise demonstrates the Navy's ability to operate a large naval force of up to three Carrier Strike Groups in coordination with other Services. In addition to this joint warfare demonstration, it also fulfills the Navy's requirement to maintain, train, and equip combat-ready naval forces capable of winning wars, deterring aggression, and maintaining freedom of the seas. The exercise would involve Joint assets engaging in a "free play" battle scenario, with U.S. forces pitted against a replicated opposition force. The exercise provides realistic in-theater training.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Typical Components</td><td colspan="5">Platforms: Aircraft carrier, fixed-wing aircraft, rotary-wing aircraft, submarines, surface combatant
Targets: Sub-surface targets
Systems being Trained/Tested: High and mid-frequency sonar systems, sonobuoys</td></tr>
<tr><td>Standard Operating Procedures (Section 2.3.3)</td><td colspan="2">Aircraft safety
Towed in-water device safety
Vessel safety</td><td colspan="3">Typical Locations
Range Complexes/Testing Ranges:
Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area
Mariana Islands Range Complex
Bays/Estuaries/Pierside:
Apra Harbor</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Biological Resources</td><td colspan="2">Acoustic:
Sonar and other transducers
Aircraft noise
Vessel noise
Weapons noise
Explosive:
In-air explosions
In-water explosions</td><td colspan="2">Physical Disturbance and Strike:
Aircraft and aerial targets
Vessel and in-water devices
Military expended materials
Ingestion:
Military expended materials – other than munitions</td><td>Energy:
In-air electromagnetic devices
In-water electromagnetic devices
Entanglement:
Decelerator/Parachutes
Wires and cables</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Physical Resources</td><td colspan="2">Air Quality:
Criteria air pollutants</td><td colspan="3">Sediments and Water Quality:
Metals
Explosives
Other materials
Chemicals</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Human Resources</td><td>Cultural Resources:
Physical disturbance and strike
Explosives</td><td colspan="2">Socioeconomic Resources:
Accessibility
Physical disturbance and strike
Airborne acoustics</td><td colspan="2">Public Health and Safety:
In-water energy
In-air energy
Physical interactions</td></tr>
<tr><td>Military Expended Material</td><td colspan="2">Ingestible Material:
Decelerators/parachutes - small
Non-Ingestible Material:
Acoustic countermeasures, expended bathythermograph, expended bathythermograph wire, sonobuoy (non-explosive), sonobuoy wires</td><td>Military Recoverable Material</td><td colspan="2">None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Sonar and Other Transducer Bin</td><td>Mid-Frequency:
MF1 MF3
MF4 MF5
MF11 MF12</td><td colspan="2">Anti-Submarine Warfare:
ASW2 ASW3
ASW4</td><td colspan="2">High-Frequency:
HF1</td></tr>
</table>

Major Training Exercises		
Joint Multi-Strike Group Exercise – Large Integrated Anti-Submarine Warfare		
Explosive Bins	None. Presented in appropriate worksheets for unit-level activities that could be conducted during this exercise.	
Procedural Mitigation Measures	**Acoustic Stressors:** *(Section 5.3.2)* Active sonar	**Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors:** *(Section 5.3.4)* Vessel movement Towed in-water devices
Assumptions Used for Analysis	All military expended materials, ordnance, and explosive use is included in individual events. Additional activities utilizing sources not listed in the Sonar and Other Transducer Bins section above could be used during this exercise, and details can be found in the worksheets for those explosive events. All acoustic sources which may be used during training and testing activities have been accounted for in the modeling and analysis presented in this SEIS/OEIS.	

A.1.2 AIR WARFARE TRAINING

Air warfare is the primary mission area that addresses combat operations by air and surface forces against hostile aircraft. Navy ships contain an array of modern anti-aircraft weapon systems, including naval guns linked to radar-directed fire-control systems, surface-to-air missile systems, and radar-controlled guns for close-in point defense. Strike/fighter aircraft carry anti-aircraft weapons, including air-to-air missiles and aircraft guns. Air warfare training encompasses events and exercises to train ship and aircraft crews in employment of these weapons systems against simulated threat aircraft or targets. Air warfare training includes surface-to-air gunnery, surface-to-air and air-to-air missile exercises, and aircraft force-on-force combat maneuvers.

A.1.2.1 Air Combat Maneuver

Air Warfare			
Air Combat Maneuver (ACM)			
Short Description	Aircrews engage in flight maneuvers designed to gain a tactical advantage during combat.	**Typical Duration**	1–2 hours
Long Description	Basic flight maneuvers in which fixed-wing aircrew engage in offensive and defensive maneuvering against each other. During air combat maneuver engagements, no ordnance is fired, however, countermeasures such as chaff and flares may be used. These maneuvers typically involve two aircraft; however, based upon the training requirement, air combat maneuver exercises may involve over a dozen aircraft.		
Typical Components	**Platforms:** Fixed-wing aircraft **Targets:** Aircraft targets **Systems being Trained/Tested:** None		
Standard Operating Procedures *(Section 2.3.3)*	Aircraft safety	**Typical Locations**	
		Range Complexes/Testing Ranges: Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area, Primary areas: Special Use Airspace	**Bays/Estuaries/Pierside:** None
Stressors to Biological Resources	**Acoustic:** Aircraft noise **Explosive:** None	**Physical Disturbance and Strike:** Aircraft and aerial targets **Ingestion:** None	**Energy:** In-air electromagnetic devices **Entanglement:** None
Stressors to Physical Resources	**Air Quality:** Criteria air pollutants	**Sediments and Water Quality:** Metals	
Stressors to Human Resources	**Cultural Resources:** None	**Socioeconomic Resources:** Airborne acoustics Physical disturbance and strike	**Public Health and Safety:** None
Military Expended Material	**Ingestible Material:** None **Non-Ingestible Material:** None	**Military Recoverable Material**	None
Sonar and Other Transducer Bins	None		
Explosive Bins	None		
Procedural Mitigation Measures	None		
Assumptions Used for Analysis	No munitions fired. Flare and chaff may be used. All flare and chaff accounted for in flare exercise and chaff exercise events. This activity occurs greater than 12 NM from land (FDM excepted).		

A.1.2.2 Air Defense Exercise

<table>
<tr><th colspan="6">Air Warfare</th></tr>
<tr><th colspan="6">Air Defense Exercise (ADEX)</th></tr>
<tr><td>Short Description</td><td colspan="3">Aircrew and ship crews conduct defensive measures against threat aircraft or simulated missiles.</td><td colspan="2">Typical Duration
1–4 hours</td></tr>
<tr><td>Long Description</td><td colspan="5">Aircrew and ship personnel perform measures designed to defend against attacking threat aircraft or missiles or reduce the effectiveness of such attack. This exercise involves full detection through engagement sequence. Aircraft operate at varying altitudes and speeds. This exercise may include Air Intercept Control exercises that involve aircraft controllers on vessels, in fixed-wing aircraft, or at land-based locations use search radars to track and direct friendly aircraft to intercept the threat aircraft, and Detect to engage exercises in which personnel on vessels use search radars in the process of detecting, classifying, and tracking enemy aircraft or missiles up to the point of engagement.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Typical Components</td><td colspan="5">Platforms: Surface vessels, fixed-wing aircraft
Targets: Aircraft targets
Systems being Trained/Tested: None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Standard Operating Procedures
(Section 2.3.3)</td><td colspan="2">Vessel safety
Aircraft safety</td><td colspan="3">Typical Locations
Range Complexes/Testing Ranges:
Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area, Primary areas: Special Use Airspace
Bays/Estuaries/Pierside:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Biological Resources</td><td colspan="2">Acoustic:
Aircraft noise
Vessel noise

Explosive:
None</td><td colspan="2">Physical Disturbance and Strike:
Aircraft and aerial targets
Vessels and in-water devices

Ingestion:
None</td><td>Energy:
In-air electromagnetic devices

Entanglement:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Physical Resources</td><td colspan="2">Air Quality:
Criteria air pollutants</td><td colspan="3">Sediments and Water Quality:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Human Resources</td><td>Cultural Resources:
Physical disturbance and strike</td><td colspan="2">Socioeconomic Resources:
Airborne acoustics
Physical disturbance and strike</td><td>Public Health and Safety:
Physical interactions</td></tr>
<tr><td>Military Expended Material</td><td colspan="2">Ingestible Material:
None

Non-Ingestible Material:
None</td><td>Military Recoverable Material</td><td colspan="2">None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Sonar and Other Transducer Bins</td><td colspan="5">None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Explosive Bins</td><td colspan="5">None</td></tr>
</table>

Air Warfare	
Air Defense Exercise (ADEX)	
Procedural Mitigation Measures	**Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors:** *(Section 5.3.4)* Vessel movement
Assumptions Used for Analysis	No munitions are fired.

A.1.2.3 Air Intercept Control

Air Warfare				
Air Intercept Control (AIC)				
Short Description	Aircrew and air controllers conduct aircraft intercepts of other aircraft.		**Typical Duration**	1–2 hours
Long Description	Fighter jet aircrews maneuver to defend against threat aircraft. An event involves two or more fighter aircraft.			
Typical Components	**Platforms:** Fixed-wing aircraft **Targets:** Aircraft Targets **Systems being Trained/Tested:** None			
Standard Operating Procedures *(Section 2.3.3)*	Aircraft safety	**Typical Locations**		
		Range Complexes/Testing Ranges: Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area, Primary areas: Special Use Airspace	**Bays/Estuaries/Pierside:** None	
Stressors to Biological Resources	**Acoustic:** Aircraft noise	**Physical Disturbance and Strike:** Aircraft and aerial targets	**Energy:** None	
	Explosive: None	**Ingestion:** None	**Entanglement:** None	
Stressors to Physical Resources	**Air Quality:** Criteria air pollutants	**Sediments and Water Quality:** None		
Stressors to Human Resources	**Cultural Resources:** None	**Socioeconomic Resources:** Airborne acoustics Physical Disturbance and Strike	**Public Health and Safety:** None	
Military Expended Material	**Ingestible Material:** None **Non-Ingestible Material:** None	**Military Recoverable Material**	None	
Sonar and Other Transducer Bins	None			
Explosive Bins	None			
Procedural Mitigation Measures	None			
Assumptions Used for Analysis	No munitions are fired. This activity would occur greater than 12 NM from land (FDM excepted).			

A.1.2.4 Gunnery Exercise Air-to-Air Medium-Caliber

Air Warfare				
Gunnery Exercise Air-to-Air Medium-Caliber (GUNEX A-A)				
Short Description	Fixed-wing aircrews fire medium-caliber guns at air targets.	**Typical Duration**	1–2 hours	
Long Description	Fixed-wing aircrews maneuver aircraft in a gunnery pattern to achieve a weapons firing solution with integrated medium-caliber guns. Typically involves two or more fixed-wing aircraft and a target banner towed by a contract aircraft (e.g., Lear jet). The target banner is recovered after the event.			
Typical Components	**Platforms:** Fixed-wing aircraft **Targets:** Air targets **Systems being Trained/Tested:** None			
Standard Operating Procedures *(Section 2.3.3)*	Aircraft safety Weapons firing safety Target deployment and retrieval safety	**Typical Locations**		
		Range Complexes/Testing Ranges: Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area, Primary areas: Special Use Airspace	**Bays/Estuaries/Pierside:** None	
Stressors to Biological Resources	**Acoustic:** Aircraft noise Weapons noise	**Physical Disturbance and Strike:** Aircraft and aerial targets Military expended materials	**Energy:** In-air electromagnetic devices	
	Explosive: None	**Ingestion:** Military expended materials – munitions	**Entanglement:** None	
Stressors to Physical Resources	**Air Quality:** Criteria air pollutants	**Sediments and Water Quality:** Metals		
Stressors to Human Resources	**Cultural Resources:** Physical disturbance and strike	**Socioeconomic Resources:** Accessibility Airborne acoustics Physical disturbance and strike	**Public Health and Safety:** Physical interactions	
Military Expended Material	**Ingestible Material:** Medium-caliber projectiles (non-explosive), medium-caliber casings **Non-Ingestible Material:** None	**Military Recoverable Material**	Air target (towed target)	
Sonar and Other Transducer Bins	None			
Explosive Bins	None			
Procedural Mitigation Measures	None			

Air Warfare	
Gunnery Exercise Air-to-Air Medium-Caliber (GUNEX A-A)	
Assumptions Used for Analysis	This activity is conducted at an altitude of 15,000 feet and above, during the daytime, and beyond 12 nautical miles from shore (FDM excepted). A towed air target is a banner target and will be recovered. Only non-explosive munitions used.

A.1.2.5 Gunnery Exercise Surface-to-Air Large Caliber

<table>
<tr><th colspan="6">Air Warfare</th></tr>
<tr><th colspan="6">Gunnery Exercise Surface-to-Air Large-Caliber (GUNEX S-A)</th></tr>
<tr><td>Short Description</td><td colspan="3">Surface ship crews fire large-caliber guns at air targets.</td><td>Typical Duration
Up to 3 hours</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Long Description</td><td colspan="5">Surface ship crews defend against threat aircraft or missiles with large-caliber guns to disable or destroy the threat.

An event involves one ship and a simulated threat aircraft or missile that is detected by the ship's radar. Large-caliber guns fire explosive and non-explosive projectiles at the threat before it reaches the ship. The target is towed by a contract air services jet.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Typical Components</td><td colspan="5">Platforms: Surface combatant
Targets: Air targets
Systems being Trained/Tested: None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Standard Operating Procedures (Section 2.3.3)</td><td colspan="2">Aircraft safety
Weapons firing safety
Vessel safety
Target deployment and retrieval safety</td><td colspan="3">Typical Locations
Range Complexes/Testing Ranges:
Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area, Primary areas: Special Use Airspace
Bays/Estuaries/Pierside:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Biological Resources</td><td colspan="5">Acoustic:
Aircraft noise
Weapons noise
Vessel noise

Explosive:
In-air explosions

Physical Disturbance and Strike:
Aircraft and aerial targets
Vessels and in-water devices
Military expended materials

Ingestion:
Military expended materials – munitions

Energy:
In-air electromagnetic devices

Entanglement:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Physical Resources</td><td colspan="5">Air Quality:
Criteria air pollutants

Sediments and Water Quality:
Metals Other materials
Explosives</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Human Resources</td><td colspan="5">Cultural Resources:
Physical disturbance and strike

Socioeconomic Resources:
Accessibility
Airborne acoustics
Physical disturbance and strike

Public Health and Safety:
Physical interactions
In-air energy</td></tr>
<tr><td>Military Expended Material</td><td colspan="2">Ingestible Material:
Large-caliber projectile (explosive) fragments

Non-Ingestible Material:
Large-caliber casings, Large-caliber projectile (non-explosive)</td><td>Military Recoverable Material</td><td colspan="2">Air targets (towed target)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Sonar and Other Transducer Bins</td><td colspan="5">None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Explosive Bins</td><td colspan="5">None. Only in-air detonations.</td></tr>
</table>

Air Warfare		
Gunnery Exercise Surface-to-Air Large-Caliber (GUNEX S-A)		
Procedural Mitigation Measures	**Acoustic Stressors** *(Section 5.3.2)* Weapons firing noise	**Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors:** *(Section 5.3.4)* Vessel movement
Assumptions Used for Analysis	The target is a fiberglass-finned target that is towed approximately 3 nautical miles behind the towing aircraft. All projectiles are assumed to be non-explosive or explode in-air well above the water's surface. This activity would occur greater than 12 NM from land (FDM excepted).	

A.1.2.6 Gunnery Exercise Surface-to-Air Medium-Caliber

<table>
<tr><th colspan="5">Air Warfare</th></tr>
<tr><th colspan="5">Gunnery Exercise Surface-to-Air Medium-Caliber (GUNEX S-A)</th></tr>
<tr><td>Short Description</td><td colspan="2">Surface ship crews fire medium-caliber guns at air targets.</td><td>Typical Duration</td><td>1–2 hours</td></tr>
<tr><td>Long Description</td><td colspan="4">Surface ship crews defend against threat aircraft or missiles with medium-caliber guns to disable or destroy the threat.

An event involves one ship and a simulated threat aircraft or anti-ship missile that is detected by the ship's radar. Medium-caliber guns fire non-explosive projectiles to disable or destroy the threat before it reaches the ship. The target is towed by a contract air services jet.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Typical Components</td><td colspan="4">Platforms: Aircraft carrier, amphibious warfare ship, surface combatant
Targets: Air targets
Systems being Trained/Tested: None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Standard Operating Procedures (Section 2.3.3)</td><td colspan="2">Aircraft safety
Weapons firing safety
Vessel safety
Target deployment and retrieval safety</td><td colspan="2">Typical Locations
Range Complexes/Testing Ranges:
Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area, Primary areas: Special Use Airspace
Bays/Estuaries/Pierside:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Biological Resources</td><td colspan="4">Acoustic:
Aircraft noise
Vessel noise
Weapons noise

Explosive:
None

Physical Disturbance and Strike:
Aircraft and aerial targets
Vessels and in-water devices
Military expended materials

Ingestion:
Military expended materials – munitions

Energy:
In-air electromagnetic devices

Entanglement:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Physical Resources</td><td colspan="4">Air Quality:
Criteria air pollutants

Sediments and Water Quality:
Metals</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Human Resources</td><td colspan="4">Cultural Resources:
Physical disturbance and strike

Socioeconomic Resources:
Accessibility
Airborne acoustics
Physical disturbance and strike

Public Health and Safety:
Physical interactions</td></tr>
<tr><td>Military Expended Material</td><td colspan="2">Ingestible Material:
Medium-caliber projectiles (non-explosive), medium-caliber casings

Non-Ingestible Material:
None</td><td>Military Recoverable Material</td><td>Air targets (towed target)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Sonar and Other Transducer Bins</td><td colspan="4">None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Explosive Bins</td><td colspan="4">None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Procedural Mitigation Measures</td><td colspan="4">None</td></tr>
</table>

Air Warfare	
Gunnery Exercise Surface-to-Air Medium-Caliber (GUNEX S-A)	
Assumptions Used for Analysis	The target is a fiberglass finned target that is towed approximately 3 nautical miles behind the towing aircraft. The target is typically recovered but may be damaged, resulting in target fragments or loss of target. This activity would occur greater than 12 NM from land (FDM excepted).

A.1.2.7 Missile Exercise Air-to-Air

<table>
<tr><th colspan="6">Air Warfare</th></tr>
<tr><th colspan="6">Missile Exercise Air-to-Air (MISSILEX A-A)</th></tr>
<tr><td>Short Description</td><td colspan="3">Fixed-wing aircrews fire air-to-air missiles at air targets.</td><td>Typical Duration</td><td>1–2 hours</td></tr>
<tr><td>Long Description</td><td colspan="5">An event involves two or more fixed-wing aircraft and a target. Missiles are either high-explosive warheads or non-explosive practice munitions. The target is an unmanned aerial target drone, a tactical air-launched decoy, or a parachute suspended illumination flare. Target drones deploy parachutes and are recovered by small boat or rotary-wing aircraft. Missiles may also be employed when training against threat missiles. These events typically occur at high altitudes.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Typical Components</td><td colspan="5">Platforms: Fixed-wing aircraft, support craft
Targets: Air targets
Systems being Trained/Tested: None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Standard Operating Procedures (Section 2.3.3)</td><td colspan="2">Aircraft safety
Weapons firing safety
Vessel safety
Target Deployment and Retrieval Safety</td><td colspan="3">Typical Locations
Range Complexes/Testing Ranges:
Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area, Primary areas: Special Use Airspace
Bays/Estuaries/Pierside:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Biological Resources</td><td colspan="2">Acoustic:
Aircraft noise
Vessel noise
Weapons noise
Explosive:
In-air explosions</td><td colspan="2">Physical Disturbance and Strike:
Aircraft and aerial targets
Vessels and in-water devices
Military expended materials
Ingestion:
Military expended materials – munitions
Military expended materials – other than munitions</td><td>Energy:
In-air electromagnetic devices
Entanglement:
Decelerators/parachutes</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Physical Resources</td><td colspan="3">Air Quality:
Criteria air pollutants</td><td colspan="2">Sediments and Water Quality:
Explosives Chemicals
Metals</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Human Resources</td><td colspan="2">Cultural Resources:
Physical disturbance and strike</td><td colspan="2">Socioeconomic Resources:
Accessibility
Airborne acoustics
Physical disturbance and strike</td><td>Public Health and Safety:
Physical interactions</td></tr>
<tr><td>Military Expended Material</td><td colspan="2">Ingestible Material:
Missile (explosive) fragments

Non-Ingestible Material:
Air target (decoy), illumination flares, decelerators/parachutes – medium and large, end caps, o-ring, air-launched decoy, or illumination flare, (see Figure A-1 and Figure A-2)</td><td>Military Recoverable Material</td><td colspan="2">Air targets (drones, see Figure A-3)</td></tr>
</table>

Air Warfare	
Missile Exercise Air-to-Air (MISSILEX A-A)	
Sonar and Other Transducer Bins	None
Explosive Bins	None. Only in-air detonations.
Procedural Mitigation Measures	None
Assumptions Used for Analysis	Assumes that all missiles are explosive, although non-explosive practice munitions may be used. All missiles explode at high altitude. All propellant and explosives are consumed. Tactical air-launched decoys and illumination flares are expended and not recovered. This activity would occur greater than 12 NM from land (FDM excepted).



Figure A-1: BQM-74 (Aerial Target)




Figure A-2: LUU-2B/B Illuminating Flare (Aerial Target)



Figure A-3: Tactical Air-Launched Decoy (Aerial Target)

A.1.2.8 Missile Exercise Surface-to-Air

<table>
<tr><th colspan="5">Air Warfare</th></tr>
<tr><th colspan="5">Missile Exercise Surface-to-Air (MISSILEX S-A)</th></tr>
<tr><td>Short Description</td><td colspan="2">Surface ship crews fire surface-to-air missiles at air targets.</td><td>Typical Duration</td><td>1–2 hours</td></tr>
<tr><td>Long Description</td><td colspan="4">Surface ship crews defend against threat missiles and aircraft with ship-launched surface-to-air missiles.

The event involves a simulated threat aircraft or anti-ship missile which is detected by the ship's radar. Ship-launched surface-to-air missiles are fired (high-explosive) to disable or destroy the threat. The target typically is a remote-controlled drone. Surface-to-air missiles may also be used to train against land attack missiles.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Typical Components</td><td colspan="4">Platforms: Aircraft carrier, amphibious warfare ship, rotary-wing aircraft, surface combatant
Targets: Air targets
Systems being Trained/Tested: None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Standard Operating Procedures (Section 2.3.3)</td><td colspan="2">Aircraft safety
Weapons firing safety
Vessel safety
Target deployment and retrieval safety</td><td colspan="2">Typical Locations
Range Complexes/Testing Ranges:
Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area, Primary areas: Special Use Airspace
Bays/Estuaries/Pierside:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Biological Resources</td><td colspan="2">Acoustic:
Aircraft noise
Vessel noise
Weapons noise

Explosive:
In-air explosions</td><td colspan="2">Physical Disturbance and Strike:
Aircraft and aerial targets
Vessels and in-water devices
Military expended materials

Ingestion:
Military expended materials – munitions
Military expended materials – other than munitions

Energy:
In-air electromagnetic devices

Entanglement:
Decelerators/parachutes</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Physical Resources</td><td colspan="2">Air Quality:
Criteria air pollutants</td><td colspan="2">Sediments and Water Quality:
Explosives Chemicals
Metals</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Human Resources</td><td>Cultural Resources:
Physical disturbance and strike</td><td colspan="2">Socioeconomic Resources:
Accessibility
Airborne acoustics
Physical disturbance and strike</td><td>Public Health and Safety:
Physical interactions</td></tr>
<tr><td>Military Expended Material</td><td colspan="2">Ingestible Material:
Missile (explosive) fragments

Non-Ingestible Material:
Decelerators/parachutes – medium and large</td><td>Military Recoverable Material</td><td>Air targets (decoy or drone)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Sonar and Other Transducer Bins</td><td colspan="4">None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Explosive Bins</td><td colspan="4">None. Only in-air detonations.</td></tr>
</table>

Air Warfare	
Missile Exercise Surface-to-Air (MISSILEX S-A)	
Procedural Mitigation Measures	**Acoustic Stressors** *(Section 5.3.2)* Weapons firing noise **Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors:** *(Section 5.3.4)* Vessel movement
Assumptions Used for Analysis	Assumes that all surface-to-air missiles are high-explosive. Missile explodes well above surface. All explosive and propellant are consumed. Target typically not destroyed, unmanned drones are recovered when possible. This activity would occur greater than 12 NM from land (FDM excepted).

A.1.3 AMPHIBIOUS WARFARE TRAINING

Amphibious warfare is a type of naval warfare involving the utilization of naval firepower, logistics, and Marine Corps landing forces to project military power ashore. Amphibious warfare encompasses a broad spectrum of activities involving maneuver from the sea to objectives ashore, ranging from reconnaissance or raid missions involving a small unit, to large-scale amphibious operations involving over one thousand Marines and Sailors, and multiple ships and aircraft embarked in a strike group.

Amphibious warfare training includes tasks at increasing levels of complexity, from individual, crew, and small unit events to large task force exercises. Individual and crew training include the operation of amphibious vehicles and naval gunfire support training. Small-unit training activities include shore assaults, boat raids, airfield or port seizures, and reconnaissance. Larger-scale amphibious exercises involve ship-to-shore maneuver, shore bombardment and other naval fire support, and air strike and close air support training.

A.1.3.1 Amphibious Rehearsal, No Landing

<table>
<tr><th colspan="6">Amphibious Warfare</th></tr>
<tr><th colspan="6">Amphibious Rehearsal, No Landing</th></tr>
<tr><td>Short Description</td><td colspan="3">Amphibious shipping, landing craft, and aviation elements of the Marine Air Ground Task Force rehearse amphibious landing operations without conducting an actual landing on shore.</td><td>Typical Duration
1–2 days</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Long Description</td><td colspan="5">Amphibious vessels maneuver to position, flood well decks, and launch and recover landing craft including hovercraft, combat rubber raiding craft, armored amphibious craft, landing craft ship, and task force aircraft in assault landing rehearsals. Assault craft form landing waves and approach shore without landing.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Typical Components</td><td colspan="5">Platforms: Amphibious warfare ship, fleet support ship, small boat
Targets: None
Systems being Trained/Tested: None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Standard Operating Procedures (Section 2.3.3)</td><td>Vessel safety</td><td colspan="4">Typical Locations
Range Complexes/Testing Ranges:
Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area and Nearshore
Bays/Estuaries/Pierside:
Apra Harbor</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Biological Resources</td><td>Acoustic:
Vessel noise
Explosive:
None</td><td colspan="2">Physical Disturbance and Strike:
Vessel and in-water devices
Ingestion:
None</td><td colspan="2">Energy:
None
Entanglement:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Physical Resources</td><td colspan="2">Air Quality:
Criteria air pollutants</td><td colspan="3">Sediments and Water Quality:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Human Resources</td><td>Cultural Resources:
Physical disturbance and strike</td><td colspan="2">Socioeconomic Resources:
Accessibility
Physical disturbance and strike</td><td colspan="2">Public Health and Safety:
Physical interactions</td></tr>
<tr><td>Military Expended Material</td><td colspan="2">Ingestible Material:
None
Non-Ingestible Material:
None</td><td>Military Recoverable Material</td><td colspan="2">None</td></tr>
</table>

Amphibious Warfare	
Amphibious Rehearsal, No Landing	
Sonar and Other Transducer Bins	None
Explosive Bins	None
Procedural Mitigation Measures	**Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors:** *(Section 5.3.4)* Vessel movement
Assumptions Used for Analysis	Amphibious vehicles train to launch from, and return to, amphibious ships. Amphibious vehicles approach surf zone but turn away before entering surf zone or landing zone. Typical participants: amphibious vessels (e.g., LHA or LHD, LPD, LSD), landing craft (Landing Craft, Air Cushioned; Landing Craft, Utility), and amphibious assault vehicles.

A.1.3.2 Marine Air Ground Task Force Exercise (Amphibious) – Battalion

<table>
<tr><th colspan="5">Major Training Exercises</th></tr>
<tr><th colspan="5">Marine Air Ground Task Force Exercise (Amphibious) – Battalion</th></tr>
<tr><td>Short Description</td><td colspan="3">Typically a 10-day exercise that conducts over-the-horizon, ship-to-objective maneuver for the elements of the Expeditionary Strike Group and the Amphibious Marine Air Ground Task Force. The exercise utilizes all elements of the Marine Air Ground Task Force (Amphibious), conducting training activities ashore with logistic support of the Expeditionary Strike Group and conducting amphibious landings.</td><td>Typical Duration
10 days</td></tr>
<tr><td>Long Description</td><td colspan="4">This exercise conducts over-the-horizon, ship-to-objective maneuver of the elements of the Expeditionary Strike Group and the Amphibious Marine Air Ground Task Force. The exercise utilizes all elements of the task force to secure the battlespace (air, land, and sea), maneuver to and seize the objective, and conduct self-sustaining operations ashore with continual logistic support. Tinian is the primary training area for this exercise; however, elements of the exercise may be rehearsed nearshore and on Guam. The landing force is supported by all of the battalions assigned to a Marine Expeditionary Unit.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Typical Components</td><td colspan="4">Platforms: Amphibious warfare ship, rotary-wing aircraft, surface combatant
Targets: None
Systems being Trained/Tested: Sonar systems</td></tr>
<tr><td>Standard Operating Procedures (Section 2.3.3)</td><td colspan="2">Aircraft safety
Towed in-water device safety
Vessel safety</td><td colspan="2">Typical Locations
Range Complexes/Testing Ranges:
Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area to nearshore Mariana Islands Range Complex
Tinian; Guam; Rota; Saipan; Farallon de Medinilla
Bays/Estuaries/Pierside:
Apra Harbor; Tinian; Guam</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Biological Resources</td><td>Acoustic:
Sonar and other transducers
Aircraft noise
Vessel noise
Weapons noise

Explosive:
In-Air Explosions
In-Water Explosions</td><td colspan="2">Physical Disturbance and Strike:
Aircraft and aerial targets
Vessel and in-water devices
Military expended materials

Ingestion:

Military expended materials – other than munitions</td><td>Energy:
In-air electromagnetic Devices
In-water electromagnetic devices

Entanglement:
Decelerators/parachutes
Wires and cables</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Physical Resources</td><td colspan="2">Air Quality:
Criteria air pollutants</td><td colspan="2">Sediments and Water Quality:
Metals Other materials
Explosives Chemicals</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Human Resources</td><td>Cultural Resources:
Explosives
Physical disturbance and strike</td><td>Socioeconomic Resources:
Accessibility
Physical disturbance and strike
Airborne acoustics</td><td colspan="2">Public Health and Safety:
In-water energy
In-air energy
Physical interactions</td></tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr><th colspan="4">Major Training Exercises</th></tr>
<tr><th colspan="4">Marine Air Ground Task Force Exercise (Amphibious) – Battalion</th></tr>
<tr><td>Military Expended Material</td><td colspan="2">Ingestible Material:
None

Non-Ingestible Material:
Expended bathythermograph, expended bathythermograph wire</td><td>Military Recoverable Material</td><td>None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Sonar and Other Transducer Bins</td><td colspan="4">Mid-Frequency:
MF1 MF4
MF12

Anti-Submarine Warfare:
ASW3</td></tr>
<tr><td>Explosive Bins</td><td colspan="4">None. Presented in appropriate worksheets for unit-level activities that could be conducted during this exercise.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Procedural Mitigation Measures</td><td colspan="2">Acoustic Stressors: (Section 5.3.2)
Active sonar</td><td colspan="2">Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors: (Section 5.3.4)
Vessel movement
Towed in-water devices</td></tr>
<tr><td>Assumptions Used for Analysis</td><td colspan="4">All military expended materials, ordnance, and explosive use is included in individual events. Additional activities utilizing sources not listed in the Sonar and Other Transducer Bins section above may occur during this exercise. All acoustic sources that may be used during training and testing activities have been accounted for in the modeling and analysis presented in this SEIS/OEIS.</td></tr>
</table>

A.1.3.3 Amphibious Assault

<table>
<tr><th colspan="6">Amphibious Warfare</th></tr>
<tr><th colspan="6">Amphibious Assault</th></tr>
<tr><td>Short Description</td><td colspan="3">Large unit forces move ashore from amphibious ships at sea for the immediate execution of inland objectives.</td><td colspan="2">Typical Duration
Up to 2 weeks</td></tr>
<tr><td>Long Description</td><td colspan="5">Landing forces embarked in vessels, craft, or tilt-rotor and helicopters launch an attack from the sea onto a hostile shore. Amphibious assault is conducted for the purposes of prosecuting further combat operations, obtaining a site for an advanced naval or airbase, or denying the enemy use of an area.

Unit-Level Training exercises involve one or more amphibious ships, and their associated watercraft and aircraft, to move personnel and equipment from ship to shore without the command and control and supporting elements involved in a full-scale event. The goal is to practice loading, unloading, and movement, and to develop the timing required for a full-scale exercise.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Typical Components</td><td colspan="5">Platforms: Amphibious warfare ship, fixed-wing aircraft, rotary-wing aircraft, tilt-rotor aircraft, small boat
Targets: None
Systems being Trained/Tested: None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Standard Operating Procedures (Section 2.3.3)</td><td colspan="2">Vessel safety
Aircraft safety
Amphibious assault and amphibious raid procedures</td><td colspan="3">Typical Locations
Range Complexes/Testing Ranges:
Mariana Islands Range Complex
Tinian; Guam
Bays/Estuaries/Pierside:
Tinian; Guam</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Biological Resources</td><td colspan="2">Acoustic:
Aircraft noise
Vessel noise
Explosive:
None</td><td colspan="2">Physical Disturbance and Strike:
Aircraft and aerial targets
Vessels and in-water devices
Personnel disturbance
Ingestion:
None</td><td>Energy:
None
Entanglement:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Physical Resources</td><td colspan="2">Air Quality:
Criteria air pollutants</td><td colspan="3">Sediments and Water Quality:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Human Resources</td><td colspan="2">Cultural Resources:
Physical disturbance and strike</td><td colspan="2">Socioeconomic Resources:
Accessibility
Physical disturbance and strike</td><td>Public Health and Safety:
Physical interactions</td></tr>
<tr><td>Military Expended Material</td><td colspan="2">Ingestible Material:
None
Non-Ingestible Material:
None</td><td>Military Recoverable Material</td><td colspan="2">None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Sonar and Other Transducer Bins</td><td colspan="5">None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Explosive Bins</td><td colspan="5">None</td></tr>
</table>

Amphibious Warfare	
Amphibious Assault	
Procedural Mitigation Measures	**Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors:** *(Section 5.3.4)* Vessel movement
Assumptions Used for Analysis	Typical event: 1–3 amphibious ships (e.g., LHA or LHD, LPD, LSD); 2-8 landing craft (landing craft, air cushioned; landing craft, utility); 4–14 amphibious assault vehicles; up to 22 aircraft (e.g., MH-53, H-46/MV-22, AH-1, UH-1, AV-8); a Marine Expeditionary Unit (2,200 Marines).

A.1.3.4 Amphibious Raid

<table>
<tr><th colspan="6">Amphibious Warfare</th></tr>
<tr><th colspan="6">Amphibious Raid</th></tr>
<tr><td>Short Description</td><td colspan="3">Small unit forces move from amphibious ships at sea for a specific short-term mission. These are quick operations with as few personnel as possible.</td><td>Typical Duration
4–8 hours</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Long Description</td><td colspan="5">Small unit forces swiftly move from amphibious vessels at sea into hostile territory for a specific mission, including a planned withdrawal. Raids are conducted to inflict loss or damage, secure information, create a diversion, confuse the enemy, or capture or evacuate individuals or material. Amphibious raid forces are kept as small as possible to maximize stealth and speed of the operation.

An event may employ assault amphibian vehicle units, small boats, combat swimmers, or small unit non-live-fire operations, including the use of blanks and simunitions. Surveillance or reconnaissance unmanned surface and aerial vehicles may be used during this event.

Events are also conducted to train in the delivery of humanitarian assistance to remote locations or areas requiring assistance after natural disasters.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Typical Components</td><td colspan="5">Platforms: Amphibious warfare ship, small boat, unmanned aerial system-fixed wing
Targets: Land Targets
Systems being Trained/Tested: None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Standard Operating Procedures (Section 2.3.3)</td><td colspan="2">Vessel safety
Aircraft safety

Amphibious assault and amphibious raid procedures</td><td colspan="3">Typical Locations
Range Complexes/Testing Ranges:
Mariana Islands Range Complex
Tinian; Guam; Rota

Bays/Estuaries/Pierside:
Tinian; Guam</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Biological Resources</td><td colspan="2">Acoustic:
Aircraft noise
Vessel noise

Explosive:
None</td><td colspan="2">Physical Disturbance and Strike:
Aircraft and aerial target
Vessels and in-water devices
Personnel disturbance

Ingestion:
None</td><td>Energy:
None

Entanglement:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Physical Resources</td><td colspan="2">Air Quality:
Criteria air pollutants</td><td colspan="3">Sediments and Water Quality:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Human Resources</td><td colspan="2">Cultural Resources:
Physical disturbance and strike</td><td colspan="2">Socioeconomic Resources:
Accessibility
Physical disturbance and strike</td><td>Public Health and Safety:
Physical interactions</td></tr>
<tr><td>Military Expended Material</td><td colspan="2">Ingestible Material:
Small-caliber casings

Non-Ingestible Material:
None</td><td>Military Recoverable Material</td><td colspan="2">None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Sonar and Other Transducer Bins</td><td colspan="5">None</td></tr>
</table>

Amphibious Warfare	
Amphibious Raid	
Explosive Bins	None
Procedural Mitigation Measures	**Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors:** *(Section 5.3.4)* Vessel movement
Assumptions Used for Analysis	Weapons firing (if conducted) during this event is discussed in appropriate activity descriptions (e.g., surface-to-surface and air-to-surface small-caliber gunnery exercises). During the conduct of amphibious raids personnel may exit the watercraft in the surf zone and divers and combat swimmers will stand in the surf zone and walk onto the beach.

A.1.3.5 Humanitarian Assistance Operations/Disaster Relief Operations

<table>
<tr><th colspan="6">Amphibious Warfare</th></tr>
<tr><th colspan="6">Humanitarian Assistance Operations/Disaster Relief Operations</th></tr>
<tr><td>Short Description</td><td colspan="3">Military units provide humanitarian assistance in times of disaster.</td><td>Typical Duration</td><td>Up to 2 weeks</td></tr>
<tr><td>Long Description</td><td colspan="5">Military units provide humanitarian assistance and disaster relief in times of natural disaster. Ships, aircraft, and amphibious landing crafts could be expected to participate in this operation during day or night. The rapid movement of relief supplies and logistics from ships and a logistic “hub” during extreme conditions is practiced during this event.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Typical Components</td><td colspan="5">Platforms: Amphibious warfare ship, fixed-wing aircraft, rotary-wing aircraft, tilt-rotor aircraft, and small boat
Targets: None
Systems being Trained/Tested: None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Standard Operating Procedures (Section 2.3.3)</td><td colspan="2">Aircraft safety
Vessel safety</td><td colspan="3">Typical Locations
Range Complexes/Testing Ranges:
Mariana Islands Range Complex; Guam; Tinian; Rota; Saipan
Bays/Estuaries/Pierside:
Guam; Tinian; Rota; Saipan</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Biological Resources</td><td colspan="2">Acoustic:
Aircraft noise
Vessel noise

Explosive:
None</td><td colspan="2">Physical Disturbance and Strike:
Aircraft and aerial targets
Vessels and in-water devices

Ingestion:
None</td><td>Energy:
In-air electromagnetic devices

Entanglement:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Physical Resources</td><td colspan="3">Air Quality:
Criteria air pollutants</td><td colspan="2">Sediments and Water Quality:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Human Resources</td><td colspan="2">Cultural Resources:
Physical disturbance and strike</td><td colspan="2">Socioeconomic Resources:
Accessibility
Physical disturbance and strike</td><td>Public Health and Safety:
Physical interactions</td></tr>
<tr><td>Military Expended Material</td><td colspan="3">Ingestible Material:
None

Non-Ingestible Material:
None</td><td>Military Recoverable Material</td><td>None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Sonar and Other Transducer Bins</td><td colspan="5">None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Explosive Bins</td><td colspan="5">None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Procedural Mitigation Measures</td><td colspan="5">Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors: (Section 5.3.4)
Vessel movement</td></tr>
<tr><td>Assumptions Used for Analysis</td><td colspan="5">Sea-, land-, and air-based activity. Logistics and aid distributed across island region via “hub” location.</td></tr>
</table>

A.1.3.6 Naval Surface Fire Support Exercise – Land-Based Target

<table>
<tr><th colspan="6">Amphibious Warfare</th></tr>
<tr><th colspan="6">Naval Surface Fire Support Exercise – Land-Based Target</th></tr>
<tr><td>Short Description</td><td colspan="3">Surface ship crews fire large-caliber guns at land-based targets in support of forces ashore.</td><td>Typical Duration
4–6 hours</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Long Description</td><td colspan="5">Surface ship crews use large-caliber guns to support forces ashore.
One or more ships position themselves offshore the target area and a land-based spotter relays type and exact location of the target. After observing the fall of the shot, the spotter relays any adjustments needed to reach the target. Once the rounds are on target, the spotter requests a sufficient number to effectively destroy the target.
This exercise occurs on land ranges where high-explosive and non-explosive practice ordnance is authorized and may be supported by target shapes on the ground.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Typical Components</td><td colspan="5">Platforms: Surface combatant
Targets: Land targets
Systems being Trained/Tested: None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Standard Operating Procedures (Section 2.3.3)</td><td colspan="2">Vessel safety
Weapons firing safety
Farallon de Medinilla Access Restrictions</td><td colspan="3">Typical Locations
Range Complexes/Testing Ranges:
R-7201 and Farallon de Medinilla
Bays/Estuaries/Pierside:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Biological Resources</td><td colspan="2">Acoustic:
Vessel noise
Weapons noise
Explosive:
In-air explosions</td><td colspan="2">Physical Disturbance and Strike:
Vessels and in-water devices
Ingestion:
None</td><td>Energy:
In-water electromagnetic devices
Entanglement:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Physical Resources</td><td colspan="2">Air Quality:
Criteria air pollutants</td><td colspan="3">Sediments and Water Quality:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Human Resources</td><td colspan="2">Cultural Resources:
None</td><td colspan="2">Socioeconomic Resources:
Accessibility
Airborne acoustics</td><td>Public Health and Safety:
Physical interactions</td></tr>
<tr><td>Military Expended Material</td><td colspan="2">Ingestible Material:
None
Non-Ingestible Material:
Large-caliber casings</td><td>Military Recoverable Material</td><td colspan="2">None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Sonar and Other Transducer Bins</td><td colspan="5">None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Explosive Bins</td><td colspan="5">None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Procedural Mitigation Measures</td><td colspan="2">Acoustic Stressors: (Section 5.3.2)
Weapons firing noise</td><td colspan="3">Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors: (Section 5.3.4)
Vessel movement</td></tr>
<tr><td>Assumptions Used for Analysis</td><td colspan="5">Projectile impact is on land; however, potential nearshore in-water impacts are considered.</td></tr>
</table>

A.1.3.7 Noncombatant Evacuation Operation

<table>
<tr><th colspan="6">Amphibious Warfare</th></tr>
<tr><th colspan="6">Noncombatant Evacuation Operation</th></tr>
<tr><td>Short Description</td><td colspan="3">Military units evacuate noncombatants from hostile or unsafe areas</td><td>Typical Duration</td><td>5 days</td></tr>
<tr><td>Long Description</td><td colspan="5">Military units evacuate noncombatants from hostile or unsafe areas to safe havens. Non-Combatant Evacuation Operation is conducted by military units, usually operating in conjunction with Navy ships and aircraft. Noncombatants are evacuated when their lives are endangered by war, civil unrest, or natural disaster. Expeditionary units train for evacuations in hostile environments that may require the use of force. Helicopters, landing crafts, and combat swimmers could be expected to participate in this operation during day or night.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Typical Components</td><td colspan="5">Platforms: Amphibious warfare ship, surface vessels, fixed-wing aircraft, rotary-wing aircraft, tilt rotor aircraft, unmanned aerial vehicles
Targets: None
Systems Being Trained/Tested: None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Standard Operating Procedures (Section 2.3.3)</td><td colspan="2">Aircraft safety
Vessel safety
Unmanned aerial and underwater vehicle procedures</td><td colspan="3">Typical Locations
Range Complexes/Testing Ranges:
Mariana Islands Range Complex
Guam; Tinian; Rota
Bays/Estuaries/Pierside:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Biological Resources</td><td colspan="2">Acoustic:
Aircraft noise
Vessel noise
Explosives:
None</td><td colspan="2">Physical Disturbance and Strike:
Aircraft and aerial targets
Vessels and in-water devices
Ingestion:
None</td><td>Energy:
In-air electromagnetic devices
Entanglement:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Physical Resources</td><td colspan="2">Air Quality:
Criteria air pollutants</td><td colspan="3">Sediments and Water Quality:
Metals
Chemicals
Other materials</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Human Resources</td><td colspan="2">Cultural Resources:
Physical disturbance and strike</td><td colspan="2">Socioeconomic Resources:
Accessibility
Physical disturbance and strike</td><td>Public Health and Safety:
Physical interactions</td></tr>
<tr><td>Military Expended Material</td><td colspan="2">Ingestible Material:
None
Non-Ingestible Material:
None</td><td>Military Recoverable Material</td><td colspan="2">None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Sonar and Other Transducer Bins</td><td colspan="5">None</td></tr>
<tr><td>In-Water Explosive Bins</td><td colspan="5">None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Procedural Mitigation Measures</td><td colspan="5">Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors: (Section 5.3.4)
Vessel movement</td></tr>
<tr><td>Assumptions Used for Analysis</td><td colspan="5">Sea-, land-, and air-based activity</td></tr>
</table>

A.1.3.8 Special Purpose Marine Air Ground Task Force Exercise

<table>
<tr><th colspan="5">Amphibious Warfare</th></tr>
<tr><th colspan="5">Special Purpose Marine Air-Ground Task Force Exercise</th></tr>
<tr><td>Short Description</td><td colspan="2">Typically a 10-day exercise similar to Marine Air Ground Task Force (Amphibious) – Battalion, but task organized to conduct a specific mission (e.g., Humanitarian Assistance, Disaster Relief, Noncombatant Evacuation Operations).</td><td colspan="2">Typical Duration
10 days</td></tr>
<tr><td>Long Description</td><td colspan="4">Special Purpose Marine Air Ground Task Force, operating in conjunction with Navy ships and aircraft, typically conduct humanitarian and disaster relief, or evacuation of noncombatants from foreign countries to safe havens or back to the United States when their lives are endangered by war, civil unrest, or natural disaster. Normally, there is no opposition from the host country; however, Marine Corps Special Purpose Marine Air Ground Task Force or Marine Expeditionary Unit (Special Operations Capable) normally trains for evacuation under a circumstance that requires the use of force in a hostile environment. Much like a raid, the event involves the rapid introduction of forces, the evacuation of noncombatants, and a planned withdrawal. The activity is conducted during day or night.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Typical Components</td><td colspan="4">Platforms: Amphibious warfare ship, fixed-wing aircraft, rotary-wing aircraft, tilt-rotor aircraft, small boat
Targets: None
Systems being Trained/Tested: None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Standard Operating Procedures (Section 2.3.3)</td><td>Aircraft safety
Vessel safety</td><td colspan="3">Typical Locations
Range Complexes/Testing Ranges:
Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area to nearshore; Mariana Islands Range Complex; Tinian; Guam; Rota; Saipan
Bays/Estuaries/Pierside:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Biological Resources</td><td>Acoustic:
Aircraft noise
Vessel noise
Weapons noise
Explosive:
In-air explosions
In-water explosions</td><td>Physical Disturbance and Strike:
Aircraft and aerial targets
Vessel and in-water devices
Military expended materials
Ingestion:
Military expended materials – munitions
Military expended materials – other than munitions</td><td colspan="2">Energy:
None
Entanglement:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Physical Resources</td><td colspan="2">Air Quality:
Criteria air pollutants</td><td colspan="2">Sediments and Water Quality:
Explosives
Metals
Chemicals</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Human Resources</td><td>Cultural Resources:
Physical disturbance and strike
Explosives</td><td>Socioeconomic Resources:
Accessibility
Physical disturbance and strike
Airborne acoustics</td><td colspan="2">Public Health and Safety:
Physical interactions
In-water energy
In-Air Energy</td></tr>
<tr><td>Military Expended Material</td><td colspan="2">Ingestible Material:
Shell casings
Non-Ingestible Material:
None</td><td>Military Recoverable Material</td><td>None</td></tr>
</table>

Amphibious Warfare	
Special Purpose Marine Air-Ground Task Force Exercise	
Sonar and Other Transducer Bins	None
Explosive Bins	None
Procedural Mitigation Measures	**Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors:** *(Section 5.3.4)* Vessel movement
Assumptions Used for Analysis	Impacts from land-based targeting are not analyzed. Only the at-sea components of this activity are analyzed in this document. Weapons firing (if conducted) during this event is discussed in appropriate activity descriptions (e.g., surface-to-surface and air-to-surface small-caliber gunnery exercises) Additional activities utilizing sources not listed in the Sonar and Other Transducer Bins section above may occur during this exercise. All acoustic sources that may be used during training and testing activities have been accounted for in the modeling and analysis presented in this EIS/OEIS.

A.1.3.9 Unmanned Aerial Vehicle – Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance

<table>
<tr><th colspan="6">Amphibious Warfare</th></tr>
<tr><th colspan="6">Unmanned Aerial Vehicle – Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance</th></tr>
<tr><td>Short Description</td><td colspan="3">Military units employ unmanned aerial vehicles to launch, operate, and gather intelligence for specified amphibious missions.</td><td>Typical Duration
Varies</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Long Description</td><td colspan="5">Unmanned aerial vehicles may be launched from ships, boats, submarines, or ground and are used to gather tactical or theater-level intelligence.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Typical Components</td><td colspan="5">Platforms: Fixed-wing aircraft, unmanned aerial system – fixed wing, unmanned aerial system – rotary wing
Targets: None
Systems being Trained/Tested: None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Standard Operating Procedures
(Section 2.3.3)</td><td colspan="2">Aircraft safety
Unmanned aerial and underwater vehicle procedures</td><td colspan="3">Typical Locations
Range Complexes/Testing Ranges:
Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area
Bays/Estuaries/Pierside:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Biological Resources</td><td colspan="2">Acoustic:
Aircraft noise
Explosives:
None</td><td colspan="2">Physical Disturbance and Strike:
Aircraft and aerial targets
Ingestion:
None</td><td>Energy:
None
Entanglement:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Physical Resources</td><td colspan="2">Air Quality:
Criteria air pollutants</td><td colspan="3">Sediments and Water Quality:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Human Resources</td><td colspan="2">Cultural Resources:
Physical disturbance and strike</td><td colspan="2">Socioeconomic Resources:
Accessibility
Physical disturbance and strike
Airborne acoustics</td><td>Public Health and Safety:
Physical interactions</td></tr>
<tr><td>Military Expended Material</td><td colspan="2">Ingestible Material:
None
Non-Ingestible Material:
None</td><td>Military Recoverable Material</td><td colspan="2">None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Sonar and Other Transducer Bins</td><td colspan="5">None</td></tr>
<tr><td>In-Water Explosive Bins</td><td colspan="5">None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Procedural Mitigation Measures</td><td colspan="5">None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Assumptions Used for Analysis</td><td colspan="5">Sea-, land-, and air-based activity. Unmanned Aerial vehicles are typically recovered; however, units may be damaged and lost. Small expendable units may also be used.</td></tr>
</table>

A.1.4 ANTI-SUBMARINE WARFARE TRAINING

Anti-submarine warfare involves helicopter and maritime patrol aircraft, ships, and submarines. These units operate alone or in combination to locate, track, and neutralize submarines. Controlling the undersea battlespace is a unique naval capability and a vital aspect of sea control. Undersea battlespace dominance requires proficiency in anti-submarine warfare. Every deploying strike group and individual surface combatant must possess this capability.

Various types of active and passive sonar are used by the Navy to determine water depth, and identify, track, and target submarines. Passive sonar "listens" for sound waves by using underwater microphones, called hydrophones, which receive, amplify, and process underwater sounds. No sound is introduced into the water when using passive sonar. Passive sonar can indicate the presence, character, and movement of submarines. However, passive sonar provides only a bearing (direction) to a sound-emitting source; it does not provide an accurate range (distance) to the source. Active sonar is needed to locate objects because active sonar provides both bearing and range to the detected contact (such as an enemy submarine).

The Navy's anti-submarine warfare training plan, including the use of active sonar in at-sea training scenarios, includes multiple levels of training. Individual-level anti-submarine warfare training addresses basic skills such as detection and classification of contacts, distinguishing discrete acoustic signatures including those of ships, submarines, and marine life, and identifying the characteristics, functions, and effects of controlled jamming and evasion devices.

More advanced, integrated anti-submarine warfare training exercises involving active sonar are conducted in coordinated, at-sea operations during training events involving submarines, ships, aircraft, and helicopters. This training integrates the full anti-submarine warfare continuum from detecting and tracking a submarine to attacking a target using either exercise torpedoes or simulated weapons. Training events include detection and tracking exercises against "enemy" submarine contacts; torpedo employment exercises against the target; and exercising command and control tasks in a multi-dimensional battlespace.

A.1.4.1 Torpedo Exercise – Helicopter

Anti-Submarine Warfare			
Anti-Submarine Warfare Torpedo Exercise – Helicopter (TORPEX)			
Short Description	Helicopter crews search for, track, and detect submarines. Recoverable air launched torpedoes are employed against submarine targets.	**Typical Duration**	2–5 hours
Long Description	Helicopters using sonobuoys and dipping sonar search for, detect, classify, localize, and track a simulated threat submarine with the goal of determining a firing solution that could be used to launch a torpedo and destroy the submarine. The exercise may be conducted on a portable underwater tracking range. Sonobuoys (both passive and active) are typically employed by a helicopter operating at altitudes below 3,000 feet (ft.). Dipping sonar (both passive and active) is employed from an altitude of about 50 ft. after the search area has been narrowed based on the sonobuoy search. The anti-submarine warfare target used for this exercise may be a MK-39 Expendable Mobile Anti-submarine Warfare Training Target, a MK-30 target, or a live submarine. This exercise may involve a single aircraft, or occur during a coordinated larger exercise involving multiple aircraft and ships, including a major range event. Unmanned aerial systems, such as the MQ-8 Fire Scout, may also be used. The exercise torpedo is recovered by a special recovery helicopter or small craft. The preferred range for this exercise is an instrumented underwater range, but it may be conducted anywhere within the Study Area depending on training requirements and available assets.		
Typical Components	**Platforms:** Rotary-wing aircraft, unmanned aerial system - rotary wing, surface vessels, small boats **Targets:** Sub-surface targets **Systems being Trained/Tested:** Mid-frequency sonar, torpedoes		
Standard Operating Procedures *(Section 2.3.3)*	Vessel safety Aircraft safety Unmanned aerial and underwater vehicle procedures Target deployment and retrieval safety	**Typical Locations** **Range Complexes/Testing Ranges:** Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area	**Bays/Estuaries/Pierside:** None
Stressors to Biological Resources	**Acoustic:** Sonar and other transducers Aircraft noise Vessel noise **Explosive:** None	**Physical Disturbance and Strike:** Aircraft and aerial target Vessels and in-water devices Military expended materials **Ingestion:** Military expended materials – munitions Military expended materials – other than munitions	**Energy:** In-air electromagnetic devices **Entanglement:** Decelerators/parachutes Wires and cables
Stressors to Physical Resources	**Air Quality:** Criteria air pollutants	**Sediments and Water Quality:** Chemicals Metals Other materials	
Stressors to Human Resources	**Cultural Resources:** Physical disturbance and strike	**Socioeconomic Resources:** Accessibility Airborne acoustics Physical disturbance and strike	**Public Health and Safety:** In-water energy Physical interactions

<table>
<tr><th colspan="4">Anti-Submarine Warfare</th></tr>
<tr><th colspan="4">Anti-Submarine Warfare Torpedo Exercise – Helicopter (TORPEX)</th></tr>
<tr><td>Military Expended Material</td><td colspan="2">Ingestible Material:
Decelerators/parachutes - small

Non-Ingestible Material:
Expended bathythermograph, expended bathythermograph wire, expendable transponder anchors, lightweight torpedo accessories, sonobuoy (non-explosive), sonobuoy wires, sub-surface target (mobile), ASW targets</td><td>Military Recoverable Material
Lightweight torpedo (non-explosive), sub-surface target (mobile)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Sonar and Other Transducer Bins</td><td colspan="3">Mid-Frequency:
MF4 MF5

Torpedoes:
TORP1</td></tr>
<tr><td>Explosive Bins</td><td colspan="3">None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Procedural Mitigation Measures</td><td colspan="2">Acoustic Stressors: (Section 5.3.2)
Active sonar</td><td>Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors:
(Section 5.3.4)
Vessel movement</td></tr>
<tr><td>Assumptions Used for Analysis</td><td colspan="3">This activity occurs greater than 3 NM from land.
Submarine may provide service as the target.</td></tr>
</table>

A.1.4.2 Torpedo Exercise – Maritime Patrol Aircraft

Anti-Submarine Warfare			
Anti-Submarine Warfare Torpedo Exercise – Maritime Patrol Aircraft (TORPEX)			
Short Description	Maritime patrol aircraft crews search for, track, and detect submarines. Recoverable air launched torpedoes are employed against submarine targets.	**Typical Duration**	2–8 hours
Long Description	Fixed-wing maritime patrol aircraft employ sonobuoys to search for, detect, classify, localize, and track a simulated threat submarine with the goal of determining a firing solution that could be used to launch a torpedo and destroy the submarine. The exercise may be conducted on a portable underwater tracking range. Sonobuoys (both passive and active) are typically employed by a maritime patrol aircraft operating at altitudes below 3,000 feet. However, sonobuoys may be released at higher altitudes. Sonobuoys are deployed in specific patterns based on the expected threat submarine and specific water conditions. Depending on these two factors, these patterns will cover many different size areas. For certain sonobuoys, tactical parameters of use may be classified. The anti-submarine warfare target used for this exercise may be a MK-39 Expendable Mobile Anti-Submarine Warfare Training Target, a MK-30 target, or a live submarine. This exercise may involve a single aircraft, or be undertaken in the context of a coordinated larger exercise involving multiple aircraft and vessels, including a major range event. The exercise torpedo is recovered by helicopter or small craft. The preferred range for this exercise is an instrumented underwater range, but it may be conducted anywhere within the Study Area depending on training requirements and available assets.		
Typical Components	**Platforms:** Fixed-wing aircraft, range support craft **Targets:** Sub-surface targets **Systems being Trained/Tested:** Mid-frequency sonar, torpedoes		
Standard Operating Procedures *(Section 2.3.3)*	Aircraft safety Target deployment and retrieval safety	**Typical Locations**	
		Range Complexes/Testing Ranges: Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area	**Bays/Estuaries/Pierside:** None
Stressors to Biological Resources	**Acoustic:** Sonar and other transducers Aircraft noise **Explosive:** None	**Physical Disturbance and Strike:** Aircraft and aerial targets Military expended materials Vessels and in-water devices **Ingestion:** Military expended materials – munitions Military expended materials – other than munitions	**Energy:** In-air electromagnetic devices **Entanglement:** Decelerators/parachutes Wires and cables
Stressors to Physical Resources	**Air Quality:** Criteria air pollutants	**Sediments and Water Quality:** Chemicals Metals Other materials	
Stressors to Human Resources	**Cultural Resources:** Physical disturbance and strike	**Socioeconomic Resources:** Accessibility Airborne acoustics Physical disturbance and strike	**Public Health and Safety:** In-water energy Physical interactions

Anti-Submarine Warfare			
Anti-Submarine Warfare Torpedo Exercise – Maritime Patrol Aircraft (TORPEX)			
Military Expended Material	**Ingestible Material:** Decelerators/parachutes - small **Non-Ingestible Material:** Expended bathythermograph, expended bathythermograph wire, lightweight torpedo accessories, sonobuoy (non-explosive), sonobuoy wires, sub-surface target (mobile), ASW targets	**Military Recoverable Material**	Lightweight torpedo (non-explosive), sub-surface target (mobile)
Sonar and Other Transducer Bins	Mid-Frequency: MF5		Torpedoes: TORP1
Explosive Bins	None		
Procedural Mitigation Measures	**Acoustic Stressors:** *(Section 5.3.2)* Active sonar		
Assumptions Used for Analysis	Submarine may provide service as the target. If target is air-dropped, one parachute per target. This activity occurs greater than 3 NM from land.		

A.1.4.3 Torpedo Exercise – Submarine

<table>
<tr><th colspan="5">Anti-Submarine Warfare</th></tr>
<tr><th colspan="5">Anti-Submarine Warfare Torpedo Exercise – Submarine (TORPEX)</th></tr>
<tr><td>Short Description</td><td colspan="3">Submarine crews search for, track, and detect submarines. Exercise torpedoes are used during this event.</td><td>Typical Duration
8 hours</td></tr>
<tr><td>Long Description</td><td colspan="4">Submarine crews search for, detect and track a threat submarine to develop firing position to launch a torpedo. A single submerged submarine operates at slow speeds and various depths while using its hull mounted or towed array sonar to track a threat submarine. While passive sonar is most typically used for this training event, some active sonar may be used on occasion. Non-explosive exercise torpedoes may also be fired during training.

This exercise may involve a single submarine, or be undertaken in the context of a coordinated larger exercise involving multiple aircraft, ships, and submarines, including a major range event. The exercise torpedo is recovered by helicopter or small craft. The preferred range for this exercise is an instrumented underwater range, but it may be conducted anywhere within the Study Area depending on training requirements and available assets.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Typical Components</td><td colspan="4">Platforms: Submarines, support boat, support aircraft
Targets: Sub-surface targets
Systems being Trained/Tested: Mid-frequency and high-frequency sonar, torpedoes</td></tr>
<tr><td>Standard Operating Procedures (Section 2.3.3)</td><td colspan="2">Vessel safety
Aircraft safety
Target deployment and retrieval safety</td><td colspan="2">Typical Locations
Range Complexes/Testing Ranges:
Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area
Bays/Estuaries/Pierside:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Biological Resources</td><td>Acoustic:
Sonar and other transducers
Vessel noise
Explosive:
None</td><td colspan="2">Physical Disturbance and Strike:
Vessels and in-water devices
Military expended materials
Ingestion:
Military expended materials – other than munitions</td><td>Energy:
None
Entanglement:
Wires and cables</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Physical Resources</td><td colspan="2">Air Quality:
None</td><td colspan="2">Sediments and Water Quality:
Metals</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Human Resources</td><td>Cultural Resources:
Physical disturbance and strike</td><td colspan="2">Socioeconomic Resources:
Physical disturbance and strike</td><td>Public Health and Safety:
In-water energy
Physical interactions</td></tr>
<tr><td>Military Expended Material</td><td colspan="2">Ingestible Material:
None
Non-Ingestible Material:
Acoustic countermeasures, expended bathythermograph, expended bathythermograph wire, guidance wire, heavyweight torpedo accessories, ASW targets</td><td>Military Recoverable Material</td><td>Heavyweight (non-explosive) torpedo, sub-surface target (mobile)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Sonar and Other Transducer Bins</td><td>Anti-Submarine Warfare:
ASW4
Torpedoes:
TORP2</td><td colspan="2">High Frequency:
HF1</td><td>Mid-Frequency:
MF3</td></tr>
</table>

Anti-Submarine Warfare		
Anti-Submarine Warfare Torpedo Exercise – Submarine (TORPEX)		
Explosive Bins	None	
Procedural Mitigation Measures	**Acoustic Stressors:** *(Section 5.3.2)* Active sonar	**Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors:** *(Section 5.3.4)* Vessel movement
Assumptions Used for Analysis	Torpedoes are recovered. Guidance wire has a low breaking strength and breaks easily. Weights and flex tubing sink rapidly. This activity occurs greater than 3 NM from land.	

A.1.4.4 Torpedo Exercise – Surface

<table>
<tr><th colspan="5">Anti-Submarine Warfare</th></tr>
<tr><th colspan="5">Anti-Submarine Warfare Torpedo Exercise – Surface (TORPEX)</th></tr>
<tr><td>Short Description</td><td colspan="2">Surface ship crews search for, track, and detect submarines. Exercise torpedoes are used during this event.</td><td colspan="2">Typical Duration
2–5 hours</td></tr>
<tr><td>Long Description</td><td colspan="4">Surface ships search for, detect, and track threat submarines to determine a firing position to launch a torpedo and attack the submarine. The exercise may be conducted on a portable underwater tracking range. A surface ship operates at slow speeds while employing hull mounted or towed array sonar. Passive or active sonar is employed depending on the type of threat submarine, the tactical situation, and environmental conditions. The anti-submarine warfare target used for this exercise is a MK-39 Expendable Mobile Anti-Submarine Warfare (ASW) Training Target, MK-30 Target, or live submarine. This exercise may involve a single ship, or be undertaken in the context of a coordinated larger exercise involving multiple aircraft, ships, and submarines, including a major range event.

The exercise torpedo is recovered by helicopter or small craft. The preferred area for this exercise is an instrumented underwater range, but it may be conducted anywhere within the Study Area depending on training requirements and available assets.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Typical Components</td><td colspan="4">Platforms: Surface combatant
Targets: Sub-surface targets
Systems being Trained/Tested: Mid-frequency sonar, torpedoes</td></tr>
<tr><td>Standard Operating Procedures (Section 2.3.3)</td><td colspan="2">Towed in-water device safety
Vessel safety
Target deployment and retrieval safety</td><td colspan="2">Typical Locations
Range Complexes/Testing Ranges:
Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area
Bays/Estuaries/Pierside:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Biological Resources</td><td>Acoustic:
Sonar and other transducers
Vessel noise

Explosive:
None</td><td>Physical Disturbance and Strike:
Vessels and in-water devices
Military expended materials

Ingestion:
Military expended materials – other than munitions</td><td colspan="2">Energy:
In-air electromagnetic devices

Entanglement:
Decelerator/parachutes
Wires and cables</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Physical Resources</td><td colspan="2">Air Quality:
Criteria air pollutants</td><td colspan="2">Sediments and Water Quality:
Metals</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Human Resources</td><td>Cultural Resources:
Physical disturbance and strike</td><td colspan="2">Socioeconomic Resources:
Accessibility
Airborne acoustics
Physical disturbance and strike</td><td>Public Health and Safety:
In-water energy
Physical interactions</td></tr>
<tr><td>Military Expended Material</td><td colspan="2">Ingestible Material:
Decelerators/parachutes - small

Non-Ingestible Material:
Expended bathythermograph, expended bathythermograph wire, lightweight torpedo accessories, sonobuoy (non-explosive), sonobuoy wires, ASW targets</td><td>Military Recoverable Material</td><td>Lightweight torpedo (non-explosive), sub-surface target (mobile)</td></tr>
</table>

Anti-Submarine Warfare				
Anti-Submarine Warfare Torpedo Exercise – Surface (TORPEX)				
Sonar and Other Transducer Bins	**Anti-Submarine Warfare:** ASW3	**Mid-Frequency:** MF1	MF5	**Torpedoes:** TORP1
Explosive Bins	None			
Procedural Mitigation Measures	**Acoustic Stressors:** *(Section 5.3.2)* Active sonar			**Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors:** *(Section 5.3.4)* Vessel movement Towed In-water devices
Assumptions Used for Analysis	Submarines may provide service as the target. Torpedoes are recovered. This activity occurs greater than 3 NM from land.			

A.1.4.5 Tracking Exercise – Helicopter

<table>
<tr><th colspan="4">Anti-Submarine Warfare</th></tr>
<tr><th colspan="4">Anti-Submarine Warfare Tracking Exercise – Helicopter (TRACKEX)</th></tr>
<tr><td>Short Description</td><td colspan="2">Helicopter crews search for, track, and detect submarines.</td><td>Typical Duration
2–4 hours</td></tr>
<tr><td>Long Description</td><td colspan="3">Helicopters using sonobuoys and dipping sonar search for, detect, classify, localize, and track a simulated threat submarine with the goal of determining a firing solution that could be used to launch a torpedo and destroy the submarine.

Sonobuoys (both passive and active) are typically employed by a helicopter operating at altitudes below 3,000 ft. Dipping sonar (both passive and active) is employed from an altitude of about 50 ft. after the search area has been narrowed based on the sonobuoy search.

The anti-submarine warfare target used for this exercise may be a MK-39 Expendable Mobile Anti-submarine Warfare Training Target, a MK-30 target, or a live submarine. This exercise may involve a single aircraft, or occur during a coordinated larger exercise involving multiple aircraft and ships, including a major range event. Unmanned aerial systems, such as the MQ-8 Fire Scout, may also be used. The preferred range for this exercise is an instrumented range, but it may be conducted anywhere within the Study Area depending on training requirements and available assets.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Typical Components</td><td colspan="3">Platforms: Rotary-wing aircraft
Targets: Sub-surface targets
Systems being Trained/Tested: Mid Frequency Sonar (sonobuoys, dipping sonar)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Standard Operating Procedures (Section 2.3.3)</td><td>Aircraft safety</td><td colspan="2">Typical Locations
Range Complexes/Testing Ranges:
Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area
Transit Corridor
Bays/Estuaries/Pierside:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Biological Resources</td><td>Acoustic:
Sonar and other transducers
Aircraft noise

Explosive:
None</td><td>Physical Disturbance and Strike:
Aircraft and aerial target
Vessels and in-water devices
Military expended materials

Ingestion:
Military expended materials – other than munitions</td><td>Energy:
In-air electromagnetic devices

Entanglement:
Decelerators/parachutes
Wires and cables</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Physical Resources</td><td>Air Quality:
Criteria air pollutants</td><td colspan="2">Sediments and Water Quality:
Chemicals
Metals
Other materials</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Human Resources</td><td>Cultural Resources:
Physical disturbance and strike</td><td>Socioeconomic Resources:
Accessibility
Airborne acoustics
Physical disturbance and strike</td><td>Public Health and Safety:
In-water energy
Physical interactions</td></tr>
</table>

Anti-Submarine Warfare			
Anti-Submarine Warfare Tracking Exercise – Helicopter (TRACKEX)			
Military Expended Material	**Ingestible Material:** Decelerators/parachutes - small **Non-Ingestible Material:** Expended bathythermograph, expended bathythermograph wire, sonobuoy (non-explosive), sonobuoy wires, sub-surface target (mobile), ASW targets	**Military Recoverable Material**	None
Sonar and Other Transducer Bins	**Mid-Frequency:** MF4 MF5		
Explosive Bins	None		
Procedural Mitigation Measures	**Acoustic Stressors:** *(Section 5.3.2)* Active sonar		
Assumptions Used for Analysis	Submarines may provide service as the target. This activity occurs greater than 3 NM from land.		

A.1.4.6 Tracking Exercise – Maritime Patrol Aircraft

<table>
<tr><th colspan="5">Anti-Submarine Warfare</th></tr>
<tr><th colspan="5">Anti-Submarine Warfare Tracking Exercise – Maritime Patrol Aircraft (TRACKEX)</th></tr>
<tr><td>Short Description</td><td colspan="2">Maritime patrol aircraft crews search for, track, and detect submarines.</td><td>Typical Duration</td><td>2–8 hours</td></tr>
<tr><td>Long Description</td><td colspan="4">Fixed-wing maritime patrol aircraft employ sonobuoys to search for, detect, classify, localize, and track a simulated threat submarine with the goal of determining a firing solution that could be used to launch a torpedo and destroy the submarine.

Sonobuoys (both passive and active) are typically employed by a maritime patrol aircraft operating at altitudes below 3,000 feet. However, sonobuoys may be released at higher altitudes. Sonobuoys are deployed in specific patterns based on the expected threat submarine and specific water conditions. Depending on these two factors, these patterns will cover many different size areas. For certain sonobuoys, tactical parameters of use may be classified. The anti-submarine warfare target used for this exercise may be a MK-39 Expendable Mobile Anti-Submarine Warfare (ASW) Training Target, a MK-30 target, or a live submarine. This exercise may involve a single aircraft, or be undertaken in the context of a coordinated larger exercise involving multiple aircraft and vessels, including a major range event.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Typical Components</td><td colspan="4">Platforms: Fixed-wing aircraft
Targets: Sub-surface targets
Systems being Trained/Tested: Mid-frequency sonar</td></tr>
<tr><td>Standard Operating Procedures (Section 2.3.3)</td><td colspan="2">Aircraft safety
Target Deployment and Retrieval Safety</td><td colspan="2">Typical Locations
Range Complexes/Testing Ranges:
Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area
Bays/Estuaries/Pierside:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Biological Resources</td><td>Acoustic:
Sonar and other transducers
Aircraft noise

Explosive:
None</td><td colspan="2">Physical Disturbance and Strike:
Aircraft and aerial target
Vessels and in-water devices
Military expended materials

Ingestion:

Military expended materials – other than munitions</td><td>Energy:
In-air electromagnetic devices

Entanglement:
Decelerators/parachutes
Wires and cables</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Physical Resources</td><td colspan="2">Air Quality:
Criteria air pollutants</td><td colspan="2">Sediments and Water Quality:
Chemicals
Metals
Other materials</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Human Resources</td><td>Cultural Resources:
Physical disturbance and strike</td><td colspan="2">Socioeconomic Resources:
Accessibility
Airborne acoustics
Physical disturbance and strike</td><td>Public Health and Safety:
In-water energy
Physical interactions</td></tr>
<tr><td>Military Expended Material</td><td colspan="2">Ingestible Material:
Decelerators/parachutes - small

Non-Ingestible Material:
Expended bathythermograph, expended bathythermograph wire, sonobuoy (non-explosive), sonobuoy wires, ASW targets</td><td>Military Recoverable Material</td><td>Sub-surface target (mobile)</td></tr>
</table>

Anti-Submarine Warfare	
Anti-Submarine Warfare Tracking Exercise – Maritime Patrol Aircraft (TRACKEX)	
Sonar and Other Transducer Bins	**Mid-Frequency:** MF5
Explosive Bins	None
Procedural Mitigation Measures	**Acoustic Stressors:** *(Section 5.3.2)* Active sonar
Assumptions Used for Analysis	Submarine may provide service as the target. If target is air-dropped, one parachute per target. This activity occurs greater than 3 NM from land.

A.1.4.7 Tracking Exercise – Submarine

<table>
<tr><th colspan="6">Anti-Submarine Warfare</th></tr>
<tr><th colspan="6">Anti-Submarine Warfare Tracking Exercise – Submarine (TRACKEX)</th></tr>
<tr><td>Short Description</td><td colspan="3">Submarine crews search for, track, and detect submarines.</td><td>Typical Duration
8 hours</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Long Description</td><td colspan="5">Submarine crews search for, detect and track a threat submarine to develop firing position to launch a torpedo.

A single submerged submarine operates at slow speeds and various depths while using its hull mounted or towed array sonar to track a threat submarine. Passive sonar is used almost exclusively. The target for this exercise is either an MK 39 expendable mobile anti-submarine warfare training target, MK 30 recoverable training target, or live submarine.

This exercise could occur anywhere throughout the MITT Study Area. This exercise may involve a single submarine, or be undertaken in the context of a coordinated larger exercise involving multiple aircraft, ships, and submarines, including a major range event.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Typical Components</td><td colspan="5">Platforms: Submarines
Targets: Sub-surface targets
Systems being Trained/Tested: Mid-frequency and high-frequency sonar</td></tr>
<tr><td>Standard Operating Procedures (Section 2.3.3)</td><td colspan="2">Vessel safety
Target Deployment and Retrieval Safety</td><td colspan="3">Typical Locations
Range Complexes/Testing Ranges:
Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area
Transit Corridor

Bays/Estuaries/Pierside:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Biological Resources</td><td colspan="2">Acoustic:
Sonar and other transducers
Vessel noise

Explosive:
None</td><td colspan="2">Physical Disturbance and Strike:
Vessel and in-water devices
Military expended materials

Ingestion:
None</td><td>Energy:
None

Entanglement:
Wires and cables</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Physical Resources</td><td colspan="2">Air Quality:
None</td><td colspan="3">Sediments and Water Quality:
Metals</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Human Resources</td><td>Cultural Resources:
Physical disturbance and strike</td><td colspan="2">Socioeconomic Resources:
Physical disturbance and strike</td><td colspan="2">Public Health and Safety:
In-water energy
Physical interactions</td></tr>
<tr><td>Military Expended Material</td><td colspan="2">Ingestible Material:
None

Non-Ingestible Material:
Acoustic countermeasures, expended bathythermograph, expended bathythermograph wire, ASW targets</td><td>Military Recoverable Material</td><td colspan="2">Sub-surface target (mobile)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Sonar and Other Transducer Bins</td><td colspan="2">Anti-Submarine Warfare:
ASW4</td><td colspan="2">High-Frequency:
HF1 HF3</td><td>Mid-Frequency:
MF3</td></tr>
<tr><td>Explosive Bins</td><td colspan="5">None</td></tr>
</table>

Anti-Submarine Warfare	
Anti-Submarine Warfare Tracking Exercise – Submarine (TRACKEX)	
Procedural Mitigation Measures	**Acoustic Stressors:** *(Section 5.3.2)* Active sonar
Assumptions Used for Analysis	This activity occurs greater than 3 NM from land.

A.1.4.8 Tracking Exercise – Surface

<table>
<tr><th colspan="6">Anti-Submarine Warfare</th></tr>
<tr><th colspan="6">Anti-Submarine Warfare Tracking Exercise – Surface (TRACKEX)</th></tr>
<tr><td>Short Description</td><td colspan="3">Surface ship crews search for, track, and detect submarines.</td><td>Typical Duration</td><td>2–4 hours</td></tr>
<tr><td>Long Description</td><td colspan="5">Surface ships search for, detect, and track threat submarines to determine a firing position to launch a torpedo and attack the submarine.

A surface ship operates at slow speeds while employing sonobuoys, hull mounted sonar, or towed array sonar. Passive or active sonar is employed depending on the type of threat submarine, the tactical situation, and environmental conditions. The target for this exercise is either a MK-39 Expendable Mobile Anti-Submarine Warfare Training Target, MK-30 Recoverable Training Target, or live submarine.

Anti-Submarine Warfare (ASW) Tracking exercise – Ship could occur anywhere throughout the MITT Study Area. This exercise may involve a single ship, or be undertaken in the context of a coordinated larger exercise involving multiple aircraft, ships, and submarines, including a major range event.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Typical Components</td><td colspan="5">Platforms: Surface combatant
Targets: Sub-surface targets
Systems being Trained/Tested: Mid-frequency sonar</td></tr>
<tr><td>Standard Operating Procedures (Section 2.3.3)</td><td colspan="2">Vessel safety
Towed in-water device safety
Target deployment and retrieval safety</td><td colspan="3">Typical Locations
Range Complexes/Testing Ranges:
Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area
Transit Corridor
Bays/Estuaries/Pierside:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Biological Resources</td><td colspan="2">Acoustic:
Sonar and other transducers
Vessel noise
Explosive:
None</td><td colspan="2">Physical Disturbance and Strike:
Vessels and in-water devices
Military Expended Materials
Ingestion:
None</td><td>Energy:
In-air electromagnetic devices
In-water electromagnetic devices
Entanglement:
Wires and cables</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Physical Resources</td><td colspan="2">Air Quality:
Criteria air pollutants</td><td colspan="3">Sediments and Water Quality:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Human Resources</td><td>Cultural Resources:
Physical disturbance and strike</td><td colspan="2">Socioeconomic Resources:
Accessibility
Airborne acoustics
Physical disturbance and strike</td><td colspan="2">Public Health and Safety:
In-water energy
Physical interactions</td></tr>
<tr><td>Military Expended Material</td><td colspan="2">Ingestible Material:
None
Non-Ingestible Material:
Buoy (non-explosive), expended bathythermograph, expended bathythermograph wire, sub-surface target (mobile), ASW targets</td><td>Military Recoverable Material</td><td colspan="2">Sub-surface target (mobile)</td></tr>
</table>

Anti-Submarine Warfare				
Anti-Submarine Warfare Tracking Exercise – Surface (TRACKEX)				
Sonar and Other Transducer Bins	**Anti-Submarine Warfare:** ASW1 ASW3		**Mid-Frequency:** MF1 MF11 MF12	
Explosive Bins	None			
Procedural Mitigation Measures	**Acoustic Stressors:** *(Section 5.3.2)* Active sonar		**Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors:** *(Section 5.3.4)* Vessel movement Towed in-water devices	
Assumptions Used for Analysis	A submarine may provide service as the target. This activity occurs greater than 3 NM from land.			

A.1.4.9 Surface Warfare Advanced Tactical Training

<table>
<tr><th colspan="4">Small Integrated Anti-Submarine Warfare Training</th></tr>
<tr><th colspan="4">Surface Warfare Advanced Tactical Training</th></tr>
<tr><td>Short Description</td><td colspan="2">Multiple ships and aircraft coordinate the use of sensors, including sonobuoys, to search, detect, and track a threat submarine. Surface Warfare Advanced Tactical Training exercises are not dedicated Anti-Submarine Warfare events and involve multiple warfare areas.</td><td>Typical Duration

Up to 15 days</td></tr>
<tr><td>Long Description</td><td colspan="3">Surface Warfare Advanced Tactical Training (SWATT) is an intermediate training exercise designed primarily to increase operator proficiency and exercise combined force responses to surface warfare, anti-submarine warfare, air warfare and electromagnetic spectrum operations.

Surface Warfare Advanced Tactical Training is conducted after a carrier strike group's first Group Sail, and before Composite Training Unit Exercise, and consists of multiple surface warfare, anti-submarine, and air warfare live-fire events. Multiple ships and aircraft search for, locate, and track one submarine. Occurs once per carrier strike group training cycle.

All other warfare area training conducted during SWATT was analyzed as unit-level training (gunnery, missile exercise, etc.).</td></tr>
<tr><td>Typical Components</td><td colspan="3">Platforms: Multiple Surface Combatants, fixed-wing aircraft, helicopters, unmanned vehicles, and submarines
Targets: All surface, air and anti-submarine warfare targets (e.g., MK-30s, MK-39 Expendable Mobile Training Targets, recoverable or expendable floating targets)
Systems being Trained/Tested: Mid-frequency sonar, high-frequency sonar, lightweight torpedoes, high-frequency acoustic modems</td></tr>
<tr><td>Standard Operating Procedures (Section 2.3.3)</td><td>Vessel safety
Aircraft safety
Weapons firing safety
Towed in-water device safety</td><td colspan="2">Typical Locations

Range Complexes/Testing Ranges:
Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area

Bays/Estuaries/Pierside:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Biological Resources</td><td colspan="3">Acoustic:
Sonar and other transducers
Aircraft noise
Vessel noise
Weapons noise

Explosive:
In-air explosions

Physical Disturbance and Strike:
Aircraft and aerial targets
Vessels and in-water devices
Military expended materials

Ingestion:
Military expended materials – munitions
Military expended materials – other than munitions

Energy:
In-air electromagnetic devices

Entanglement:
Wires and cables
Decelerators/parachutes</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Physical Resources</td><td colspan="3">Air Quality:
Criteria air pollutants
Habitats:
Physical disturbance and strike – military expended material

Sediments and Water Quality:
Explosives
Metals
Chemicals</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Human Resources</td><td>Cultural Resources:
Physical disturbance and strike</td><td>Socioeconomic Resources:
Accessibility
Airborne acoustics
Physical disturbance and strike</td><td>Public Health and Safety:
Physical interactions</td></tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr><th colspan="4">Small Integrated Anti-Submarine Warfare Training</th></tr>
<tr><th colspan="4">Surface Warfare Advanced Tactical Training</th></tr>
<tr><td>Military Expended Material</td><td colspan="2">Ingestible Material:
Target fragments, small-caliber projectiles, small decelerators/parachutes
Non-Ingestible Material:
Sonobuoys, large and medium-caliber projectiles, acoustic countermeasures, ASW targets</td><td>Military Recoverable Material</td><td>Air warfare targets
Surface warfare targets</td></tr>
<tr><td>Sonar and Other Transducer Bins</td><td colspan="4">Mid-Frequency:
MF1
MF1K
MF3
MF4
MF5
MF6
MF12

High-Frequency:
HF1

Anti-Submarine Warfare:
ASW2
ASW3
ASW4
Torpedoes:
TORP1 TORP2

Acoustic Modems:
Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>Explosive Bins</td><td colspan="4">None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Procedural Mitigation Measures</td><td colspan="2">Acoustic Stressors: (Section 5.3.2)
Active sonar</td><td colspan="2">Physical Disturbance and Strike: (Section 5.3.4)
Vessel movement
Towed in-water devices</td></tr>
<tr><td>Assumptions Used for Analysis</td><td colspan="4">All other warfare area training conducted during SWATT was analyzed as unit-level training (gunnery, missile exercise, etc.). All military expended materials, munitions, explosives and sonar use is included in individual unit-level events.
Additional activities utilizing sources not listed in the Sonar and Other Transducer Bins section above may occur during this exercise. All acoustic sources which may be used during training and testing activities have been accounted for in the modeling and analysis presented in this EIS/OEIS. A submarine may provide service as a target for non-firing events.</td></tr>
</table>

A.1.4.10 Small Joint Coordinated ASW Exercise (Multi-Sail/GUAMEX)

<table>
<tr><th colspan="5">Anti-Submarine Warfare</th></tr>
<tr><th colspan="5">Small Joint Coordinated ASW Exercise (Multi-Sail/GUAMEX)</th></tr>
<tr><td>Short Description</td><td colspan="2">Typically a 5-day exercise with multiple ships, aircraft and submarines integrating the use of their sensors, including sonobuoys, to search, detect, and track threat submarines.</td><td colspan="2">Typical Duration
5 days</td></tr>
<tr><td>Long Description</td><td colspan="4">This is an Anti-Submarine Warfare (ASW) exercise conducted by the forward deployed Navy Strike Groups to sustain and assess their ASW proficiency while located in the Seventh Fleet area of operations. The exercise is designed to assess the Strike Groups' ability to conduct ASW in the most realistic environment, against the level of threat expected, in order to effect changes to both training and capabilities (e.g., equipment, tactics, and changes to size and composition) of U.S. Navy Strike Groups. The Strike Group receives significant sustainment training value in ASW and other warfare areas, as training is inherent in all at-sea exercises. Additional unit-level activities, such as MISSILEX may be conducted during these events.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Typical Components</td><td colspan="4">Platforms: Fixed-wing aircraft, rotary-wing aircraft, submarines, surface combatant
Targets: Surface targets, sub-surface targets
Systems being Trained/Tested: Mid-frequency Sonar</td></tr>
<tr><td>Standard Operating Procedures (Section 2.3.3)</td><td>Aircraft safety
Towed in-water device safety
Vessel safety</td><td colspan="3">Typical Locations
Range Complexes/Testing Ranges:
Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area
Bays/Estuaries/Pierside:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Biological Resources</td><td colspan="4">Acoustic:
Sonar and other transducers
Aircraft noise
Vessel noise
Explosive:
None
Physical Disturbance and Strike:
Aircraft and aerial targets
Vessel and in-water devices
Military expended materials
Ingestion:
Military expended materials – munitions
Military expended material – other than munitions
Energy:
In-air electromagnetic devices
Entanglement:
Decelerator/Parachutes
Wires and cables</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Physical Resources</td><td colspan="4">Air Quality:
Criteria air pollutants
Sediments and Water Quality:
Metals Other materials
Chemicals</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Human Resources</td><td colspan="4">Cultural Resources:
Physical disturbance and strike
Socioeconomic Resources:
Accessibility
Physical disturbance and strike
Airborne acoustics
Public Health and Safety:
In-water energy
In-air energy
Physical interactions</td></tr>
<tr><td>Military Expended Material</td><td colspan="2">Ingestible Material:
Decelerators/parachutes - small
Non-Ingestible Material:
Acoustic countermeasures, aircraft stores and ballast, expended bathythermograph, expended bathythermograph wire, sonobuoy (non-explosive), sonobuoy wires, sub-surface target (mobile), ASW targets</td><td>Military Recoverable Material</td><td>None</td></tr>
</table>

Anti-Submarine Warfare					
Small Joint Coordinated ASW Exercise (Multi-Sail/GUAMEX)					
Sonar and Other Transducer Bins	**Anti-Submarine Warfare:**		**High-Frequency:**	**Mid-Frequency:**	
	ASW2	ASW3	HF1	MF1	MF3
	ASW4			MF4	MF5
				MF11	MF12
Explosive Bins	None. Presented in appropriate worksheets for unit-level activities that could be conducted during this exercise.				
Procedural Mitigation Measures	**Acoustic Stressors:** *(Section 5.3.2)* Active sonar		**Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors:** *(Section 5.3.4)* Vessel movement Towed in-water devices		
Assumptions Used for Analysis	This activity occurs at least 3 NM from land (FDM excepted). Additional activities utilizing sources not listed in the Sonar and Other Transducer Bins section above may occur during this exercise. All acoustic sources which may be used during training and testing activities have been accounted for in the modeling and analysis presented in this EIS.				

A.1.5 ELECTRONIC WARFARE

Electronic warfare is the mission area of naval warfare that aims to control use of the electromagnetic spectrum and to deny its use by an adversary. Typical electronic warfare activities include threat avoidance training, signals analysis for intelligence purposes, and use of airborne and surface electronic jamming devices to defeat tracking systems.

A.1.5.1 Counter Targeting Chaff Exercise – Aircraft

<table>
<tr><th colspan="6">Electronic Warfare</th></tr>
<tr><th colspan="6">Counter Targeting Chaff Exercise – Aircraft</th></tr>
<tr><td>Short Description</td><td colspan="3">Fixed-wing aircraft and helicopter aircrews deploy chaff to disrupt threat targeting and missile guidance radars.</td><td>Typical Duration</td><td>1–2 hours</td></tr>
<tr><td>Long Description</td><td colspan="5">Fixed-wing aircraft and helicopter aircrews deploy chaff to disrupt threat targeting and missile guidance radars.

Fixed-wing aircraft and helicopter aircrews detect electronic targeting signals from threat radars or missiles, dispense chaff, and immediately maneuver to defeat the threat. The chaff cloud deceives the inbound missile and the aircraft clears away from the threat.

Chaff is a radar reflector material made of thin, narrow, metallic strips cut in various lengths to elicit frequency responses, which deceive enemy radars. Chaff is employed to create a target that will lure enemy radar and weapons system away from the actual friendly platform.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Typical Components</td><td colspan="5">Platforms: Fixed-wing aircraft, rotary-wing aircraft
Targets: None
Systems being Trained/Tested: None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Standard Operating Procedures (Section 2.3.3)</td><td colspan="2">Aircraft safety</td><td colspan="3">Typical Locations
Range Complexes/Testing Ranges:
Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area

Bays/Estuaries/Pierside:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Biological Resources</td><td colspan="2">Acoustic:
Aircraft noise

Explosive:
None</td><td colspan="2">Physical Disturbance and Strike:
Aircraft and aerial targets
Military expended materials

Ingestion:

Military expended materials – other than munitions</td><td>Energy:
In-air electromagnetic devices

Entanglement:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Physical Resources</td><td colspan="2">Air Quality:
Criteria air pollutants</td><td colspan="3">Sediments and Water Quality:
Other materials</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Human Resources</td><td>Cultural Resources:
None</td><td colspan="2">Socioeconomic Resources:
Airborne acoustics</td><td colspan="2">Public Health and Safety:
Physical interactions</td></tr>
<tr><td>Military Expended Material</td><td colspan="2">Ingestible Material:
Per chaff: one chaff-air cartridge, one plastic endcap, chaff fibers

Non-Ingestible Material:
None</td><td>Military Recoverable Material</td><td colspan="2">None</td></tr>
</table>

Electronic Warfare	
Counter Targeting Chaff Exercise – Aircraft	
Sonar and Other Transducer Bins	None
Explosive Bins	None
Procedural Mitigation Measures	None
Assumptions Used for Analysis	Chaff is usually expended while conducting other training activities, such as air combat maneuvering. Potential effects are analyzed under this activity. This activity occurs greater than 12 NM from land.

A.1.5.2 Counter Targeting Chaff Exercise – Ship

<table>
<tr><th colspan="6">Electronic Warfare</th></tr>
<tr><th colspan="6">Counter Targeting Chaff Exercise – Ship</th></tr>
<tr><td>Short Description</td><td colspan="3">Surface ship crews deploy chaff to disrupt threat targeting and missile guidance radars.</td><td>Typical Duration
1–2 hours</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Long Description</td><td colspan="5">Surface ship crews deploy chaff to disrupt threat targeting and missile guidance radars to defend against an attack.

Surface ship crews detect electronic targeting signals from threat radars or missiles, dispense chaff, and immediately maneuver to defeat the threat. The chaff cloud deceives the inbound missile and the vessel clears away from the threat. The typical event duration is approximately one and one-half hours.

Chaff is a radar reflector material made of thin, narrow, metallic strips cut in various lengths to elicit frequency responses, which deceive enemy radars. Chaff is employed to create a target that will lure enemy radar and weapons system away from the actual friendly platform. Ships may also train with advanced countermeasure systems, such as the MK 53 Decoy Launching System (Nulka).</td></tr>
<tr><td>Typical Components</td><td colspan="5">Platforms: Navy Ships
Targets: None
Systems being Trained/Tested: None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Standard Operating Procedures (Section 2.3.3)</td><td colspan="2">Vessel safety</td><td colspan="3">Typical Locations
Range Complexes/Testing Ranges:
Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area

Bays/Estuaries/Pierside:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Biological Resources</td><td colspan="2">Acoustic:
Vessel noise

Explosive:
None</td><td colspan="2">Physical Disturbance and Strike:
Vessels and in-water devices
Military expended materials

Ingestion:
Military expended materials – other than munitions</td><td>Energy:
In-air electromagnetic devices

Entanglement:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Physical Resources</td><td colspan="2">Air Quality:
Criteria air pollutants</td><td colspan="3">Sediments and Water Quality:
Other materials</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Human Resources</td><td colspan="2">Cultural Resources:
None</td><td colspan="2">Socioeconomic Resources:
Accessibility</td><td>Public Health and Safety:
Physical interactions</td></tr>
<tr><td>Military Expended Material</td><td colspan="2">Ingestible Material:
Chaff-ship fibers

Non-Ingestible Material:
Chaff-ship cartridge</td><td>Military Recoverable Material</td><td colspan="2">None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Sonar and Other Transducer Bins</td><td colspan="5">None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Explosive Bins</td><td colspan="5">None</td></tr>
</table>

Electronic Warfare	
Counter Targeting Chaff Exercise – Ship	
Procedural Mitigation Measures	**Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors:** *(Section 5.3.4)* Vessel movement
Assumptions Used for Analysis	This activity occurs greater than 12 NM from land.

A.1.5.3 Counter Targeting Flare Exercise – Aircraft

<table>
<tr><th colspan="6">Electronic Warfare</th></tr>
<tr><th colspan="6">Counter Targeting Flare Exercise - Aircraft</th></tr>
<tr><td>Short Description</td><td colspan="3">Fixed-wing aircraft and helicopter aircrews deploy flares to disrupt threat infrared missile guidance systems.</td><td>Typical Duration</td><td>1–2 hours</td></tr>
<tr><td>Long Description</td><td colspan="5">Fixed-wing aircraft and helicopter aircrews deploy flares to disrupt threat infrared missile guidance systems. Range personnel acting as opposition forces may use pyrotechnics to simulate missile launch.

Aircraft detect electronic targeting signals from threat radars or missiles, or a threat missile plume, when launched and dispense flares and immediately maneuver to defeat the threat. This exercise trains aircraft personnel in the use of defensive flares designed to confuse infrared sensors or infrared homing missiles, thereby causing the sensor or missile to lock onto the flares instead of the real aircraft. Typically an aircraft will expend five flares in an exercise while operating above 3,000 feet. Flare exercises are often conducted with chaff exercises, rather than as a stand-alone exercise.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Typical Components</td><td colspan="5">Platforms: Fixed-wing aircraft, rotary-wing aircraft
Targets: None
Systems being Trained/Tested: None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Standard Operating Procedures (Section 2.3.3)</td><td colspan="2">Aircraft safety</td><td colspan="3">Typical Locations
Range Complexes/Testing Ranges:
Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area
Bays/Estuaries/Pierside:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Biological Resources</td><td colspan="2">Acoustic:
Aircraft noise
Explosive:
None</td><td colspan="2">Physical Disturbance and Strike:
Aircraft and aerial targets
Military expended materials
Ingestion:
Military expended materials – other than munitions</td><td>Energy:
In-air electromagnetic devices
Entanglement:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Physical Resources</td><td colspan="5">Air Quality:
Criteria air pollutants
Sediments and Water Quality:
Metals Other materials</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Human Resources</td><td colspan="2">Cultural Resources:
None</td><td colspan="2">Socioeconomic Resources:
Airborne acoustics</td><td>Public Health and Safety:
Physical interactions</td></tr>
<tr><td>Military Expended Material</td><td colspan="3">Ingestible Material:
Per flare: one casing, one compression pad or one plastic piston, one plastic endcap, one O-ring
Non-Ingestible Material:
None</td><td>Military Recoverable Material</td><td>None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Sonar and Other Transducer Bins</td><td colspan="5">None</td></tr>
</table>

Electronic Warfare	
Counter Targeting Flare Exercise - Aircraft	
Explosive Bins	None
Procedural Mitigation Measures	None
Assumptions Used for Analysis	Approximately five flares per aircraft. This activity typically occurs greater than 12 NM from land. However, rotary-wing events may occur closer to land (up to 3 NM when crew-served EW threat emitters [MANPADS] are employed).

A.1.5.4 Electronic Warfare Operations

<table>
<tr><th colspan="6">Electronic Warfare</th></tr>
<tr><th colspan="6">Electronic Warfare Operations</th></tr>
<tr><td>Short Description</td><td colspan="3">Aircraft and surface ship crews control portions of the electromagnetic spectrum used by enemy systems to degrade or deny the enemy’s ability to take defensive actions.</td><td>Typical Duration</td><td>1–2 hours</td></tr>
<tr><td>Long Description</td><td colspan="5">Aircraft and surface ship crews control the electromagnetic spectrum used by enemy systems to degrade or deny the enemy’s ability to take defensive actions. Electronic Warfare Operations can be active or passive, offensive or defensive. Fixed-wing aircraft employ active jamming and deception against enemy search radars to mask the friendly inbound strike aircraft mission. Surface ships detect and evaluate enemy electronic signals from enemy aircraft or missile radars, evaluate courses of action concerning the use of passive or active countermeasures, then use ship maneuvers and either chaff, flares, active electronic countermeasures, or a combination of them to defeat the threat.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Typical Components</td><td colspan="5">Platforms: Fixed-wing aircraft, rotary-wing aircraft, surface combatant
Targets: Aircraft targets; electronic warfare targets
Systems being Trained/Tested: None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Standard Operating Procedures (Section 2.3.3)</td><td colspan="2">Aircraft safety
Vessel safety</td><td colspan="3">Typical Locations
Range Complexes/Testing Ranges:
Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area
Bays/Estuaries/Pierside:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Biological Resources</td><td colspan="2">Acoustic:
Aircraft noise
Vessel noise
Explosive:
None</td><td colspan="2">Physical Disturbance and Strike:
Aircraft and aerial targets
Vessels and in-water devices
Ingestion:
None</td><td>Energy:
In-air electromagnetic devices
Entanglement:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Physical Resources</td><td colspan="5">Air Quality:
Criteria air pollutants
Sediments and Water Quality:
Metals Other materials</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Human Resources</td><td>Cultural Resources:
None</td><td colspan="2">Socioeconomic Resources:
Accessibility
Airborne acoustics
Physical disturbance and strike</td><td colspan="2">Public Health and Safety:
Physical interactions</td></tr>
<tr><td>Military Expended Material</td><td colspan="2">Ingestible Material:
None
Non-Ingestible Material:
Expendable decoys</td><td>Military Recoverable Material</td><td colspan="2">None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Sonar and Other Transducer Bins</td><td colspan="5">None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Explosive Bins</td><td colspan="5">None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Procedural Mitigation Measures</td><td colspan="5">Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors: (Section 5.3.4)
Vessel movement</td></tr>
</table>

Electronic Warfare	
Electronic Warfare Operations	
Assumptions Used for Analysis	All chaff and flares involved in this event are covered under chaff exercise and flare exercises, respectively.

A.1.6 EXPEDITIONARY WARFARE

A.1.6.1 Parachute Insertion

<table>
<tr><th colspan="6">Expeditionary Warfare</th></tr>
<tr><th colspan="6">Parachute Insertion</th></tr>
<tr><td>Short Description</td><td colspan="3">Military personnel train for covert insertion into target areas using parachutes.</td><td>Typical Duration
2–8 hours</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Long Description</td><td colspan="5">These operations will vary in length depending on the transportation method and systems being used. Target areas are parachute drop zones that may be at sea or on land.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Typical Components</td><td colspan="5">Platforms: Fixed-wing aircraft, rotary-wing aircraft, tilt-rotor aircraft, small boat
Targets: None
Systems being Trained/Tested: None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Standard Operating Procedures (Section 2.3.3)</td><td colspan="2">Aircraft safety
Vessel safety</td><td colspan="3">Typical Locations
Range Complexes/Testing Ranges:
Mariana Islands Range Complex parachute drop zones; Guam; Tinian; Rota
Bays/Estuaries/Pierside:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Biological Resources</td><td colspan="2">Acoustic:
Aircraft noise
Vessel noise
Explosive:
None</td><td colspan="2">Physical Disturbance and Strike:
Aircraft and aerial targets
Vessel and in-water devices
Personnel disturbance
Ingestion:
None</td><td>Energy:
None
Entanglement:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Physical Resources</td><td colspan="2">Air Quality:
Criteria air pollutants</td><td colspan="3">Sediments and Water Quality:
Other materials</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Human Resources</td><td colspan="2">Cultural Resources:
Physical disturbance and strike</td><td colspan="2">Socioeconomic Resources:
Accessibility
Physical disturbance and strike
Airborne acoustics</td><td>Public Health and Safety:
Physical interactions</td></tr>
<tr><td>Military Expended Material</td><td colspan="2">Ingestible Material:
None
Non-Ingestible Material:
None</td><td>Military Recoverable Material</td><td colspan="2">Decelerators/parachutes</td></tr>
<tr><td>Sonar and Other Transducer Bins</td><td colspan="5">None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Explosive Bins</td><td colspan="5">None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Procedural Mitigation Measures</td><td colspan="5">Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors: (Section 5.3.4)
Vessel movement</td></tr>
<tr><td>Assumptions Used for Analysis</td><td colspan="5">Combat swimmers inserted at sea may transit through surf zone onto beach.</td></tr>
</table>

A.1.6.2 Personnel Insertion/Extraction

<table>
<tr><th colspan="6">Expeditionary Warfare</th></tr>
<tr><th colspan="6">Personnel Insertion/Extraction</th></tr>
<tr><td>Short Description</td><td colspan="3">Military personnel train for covert insertion and extraction into target areas using helicopters, fixed-wing (insertion only), small boats, and submersibles.</td><td>Typical Duration</td><td>2–8 hours</td></tr>
<tr><td>Long Description</td><td colspan="5">Personnel train to approach or depart an objective area using various transportation methods and tactics. These operations train forces to insert and extract personnel and equipment day or night. Tactics and techniques employed include insertion from aircraft by parachute, by rope, or from low, slow-flying helicopters from which personnel jump into the water. Parachute training is required to be conducted on surveyed drop zones to enhance safety. Insertion and extraction methods also employ small inflatable boats.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Typical Components</td><td colspan="5">Platforms: Fixed-wing aircraft, rotary-wing aircraft, tilt-rotor aircraft, small craft, submersibles
Targets: None
Systems being Trained/Tested: None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Standard Operating Procedures (Section 2.3.3)</td><td colspan="2">Aircraft safety
Vessel safety</td><td colspan="3">Typical Locations
Range Complexes/Testing Ranges:
Mariana Islands Range Complex; Guam; Tinian; Rota; Saipan
Bays/Estuaries/Pierside:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Biological Resources</td><td colspan="2">Acoustic:
Aircraft noise
Vessel noise
Explosive:
None</td><td colspan="2">Physical Disturbance and Strike:
Aircraft and aerial targets
Vessel and in-water devices
Personnel disturbance
Ingestion:
None</td><td>Energy:
None
Entanglement:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Physical Resources</td><td colspan="2">Air Quality:
Criteria air pollutants</td><td colspan="3">Sediments and Water Quality:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Human Resources</td><td colspan="2">Cultural Resources:
Physical disturbance and strike</td><td colspan="2">Socioeconomic Resources:
Accessibility
Physical disturbance and strike</td><td>Public Health and Safety:
Physical interactions</td></tr>
<tr><td>Military Expended Material</td><td colspan="2">Ingestible Material:
None
Non-Ingestible Material:
None</td><td>Military Recoverable Material</td><td colspan="2">Decelerators/parachutes</td></tr>
<tr><td>Sonar and Other Transducer Bins</td><td colspan="5">None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Explosive Bins</td><td colspan="5">None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Procedural Mitigation Measures</td><td colspan="5">Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors: (Section 5.3.4)
Vessel movement</td></tr>
</table>

Expeditionary Warfare	
Personnel Insertion/Extraction	
Assumptions Used for Analysis	During the conduct of insertion/extraction activities personnel may exit the watercraft in the surf zone and divers and combat swimmers will stand in the surf zone and walk onto the beach.

A.1.7 MINE WARFARE

Mine warfare is the naval warfare area involving the detection, avoidance, and neutralization of mines to protect Navy ships and submarines, and offensive mine laying in naval operations. A naval mine is a self-contained explosive device placed in water to destroy ships or submarines. Naval mines are deposited and left in place until triggered by the approach of an enemy ship, or are destroyed or removed. Naval mines can be laid by purpose-built minelayers, other ships, submarines, or airplanes. Mine warfare training includes mine countermeasure exercises, mine laying, and recovery exercises. Recovery of mine shapes and targets can include raising and towing the training aides to shore.

A.1.7.1 Civilian Port Defense

<table>
<tr><th colspan="4">Mine Warfare</th></tr>
<tr><th colspan="4">Civilian Port Defense</th></tr>
<tr><td>Short Description</td><td colspan="2">Maritime security personnel train to protect civilian ports and harbors against enemy efforts to interfere with access to those ports.</td><td>Typical Duration
Multiple days</td></tr>
<tr><td>Long Description</td><td colspan="3">Naval forces provide Mine Warfare capabilities to support Department of Homeland Security sponsored events. The three pillars of mine warfare, airborne (helicopter), surface (surface ships), and undersea (divers, marine mammals, and unmanned vehicles) mine countermeasures will be brought to bear in order to ensure strategic U.S. ports remain free of mine threats. Various mine warfare sensors, which utilize active acoustics, will be employed in the detection, classification, and neutralization of mines. Along with traditional mine warfare techniques, such as helicopter towed mine countermeasures, new technologies (unmanned vehicles) will be utilized.

Event locations and scenarios will vary according to Department of Homeland Security strategic goals and evolving world events.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Typical Components</td><td colspan="3">Platforms: Mine warfare ship, rotary-wing aircraft, small boat, unmanned underwater vehicle
Targets: Mine shapes
Systems being Trained/Tested: Mine detection systems, towed mine neutralization systems, airborne mine neutralization system</td></tr>
<tr><td>Standard Operating Procedures (Section 2.3.3)</td><td>Vessel safety
Aircraft safety
Unmanned aerial and underwater vehicle procedures
Towed in-water device safety
Laser Procedures
Target deployment and retrieval safety
Pierside testing safety</td><td colspan="2">Typical Locations
Range Complexes/Testing Ranges:
Mariana Islands Range Complex

Bays/Estuaries/Pierside:
Mariana littorals
Inner and Outer Apra Harbor</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Biological Resources</td><td>Acoustic:
Sonar and other transducers
Aircraft noise
Vessel noise

Explosive:
In-air explosions
In-water explosions</td><td>Physical Disturbance and Strike:
Aircraft and aerial targets
Vessels and in-water devices
Seafloor devices
Military expended materials

Ingestion:
Military expended materials – munitions
Military expended materials – other than munitions</td><td>Energy:
In-water electromagnetic devices
In-air electromagnetic devices
Entanglement:
Wires and cables
Decelerators/Parachutes</td></tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr><th colspan="5">Mine Warfare</th></tr>
<tr><th colspan="5">Civilian Port Defense</th></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Physical Resources</td><td colspan="4">Air Quality:
Criteria air pollutants

Sediments and Water Quality:
Explosives
Metals
Chemicals
Other materials</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Human Resources</td><td>Cultural Resources:
Explosives
Physical disturbance and strike</td><td colspan="2">Socioeconomic Resources:
Accessibility
Airborne acoustics
Physical disturbance and strike</td><td>Public Health and Safety:
In-air energy
In-water energy
Physical interactions</td></tr>
<tr><td>Military Expended Material</td><td colspan="2">Ingestible Material:
None

Non-Ingestible Material:
None</td><td>Military Recoverable Material</td><td>Mine shapes (non-explosive)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Sonar and Other Transducer Bins</td><td colspan="4">High-Frequency:
HF4

Synthetic Aperture Sonar:
SAS2</td></tr>
<tr><td>Explosive Bins</td><td colspan="4">None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Procedural Mitigation Measures</td><td colspan="2">Acoustic Stressors: (Section 5.3.2)
Active sonar</td><td colspan="2">Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors:
(Section 5.3.4)
Vessel movement
Towed in-water devices</td></tr>
<tr><td>Assumptions Used for Analysis</td><td colspan="4">Non-permanent mine shapes will be laid in various places on the bottom and will be retrieved Shapes are varied, from about 1 m circular to about 2.5 meters long by 1 meter wide. They will be recovered using normal assets, with diver involvement.</td></tr>
</table>

A.1.7.2 Limpet Mine Neutralization System

Mine Warfare			
Limpet Mine Neutralization System			
Short Description	Navy Explosive Ordnance Disposal divers place a small charge on a simulated underwater mine.	**Typical Duration**	2 hours
Long Description	A metal sheet containing a non-explosive limpet mine is lowered into the water, sometimes from the side of a small vessel, such as an LCM- 8 craft. Navy Explosive Ordnance Divers place a single shock wave generator of Limpet Mine Neutralizing Systems on the mine that is located mid-water column, within water depths of 10 to 20 feet. A bag is placed over the mine to catch falling debris.		
Typical Components	**Platforms:** Support craft **Targets:** Mine Shapes **Systems being Trained/Tested:** None		
Standard Operating Procedures *(Section 2.3.3)*	Vessel safety Target deployment and retrieval safety	**Typical Locations** **Range Complexes/Testing Ranges:** Mariana littorals	**Bays/Estuaries/Pierside:** Mariana littorals Inner and Outer Apra Harbor
Stressors to Biological Resources	**Acoustic:** Vessel noise **Explosive:** In-water explosions (*de minimis*)	**Physical Disturbance and Strike:** Vessels and in-water devices **Ingestion:** None	**Energy:** None **Entanglement:** None
Stressors to Physical Resources	**Air Quality:** Criteria air pollutants	**Sediments and Water Quality:** Explosives Chemicals Metals	
Stressors to Human Resources	**Cultural Resources:** Physical disturbance and strike	**Socioeconomic Resources:** Accessibility Physical disturbance and strike Airborne acoustics	**Public Health and Safety:** Physical interactions In-water energy
Military Expended Material	**Ingestible Material:** None **Non-Ingestible Material:** None	**Military Recoverable Material**	Sub-surface target (stationary)
Sonar and Other Transducer Bins	None		
Explosive Bins	None		
Procedural Mitigation Measures	**Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors:** *(Section 5.3.4)* Vessel movement		
Assumptions Used for Analysis	*De minimis* small explosive charges would be used during this activity and not quantitatively analyzed and therefore are not included under munitions.		

A.1.7.3 Mine Neutralization – Remotely Operated Vehicle Sonar

<table>
<tr><th colspan="6">Mine Warfare</th></tr>
<tr><th colspan="6">Mine Neutralization – Remotely Operated Vehicle Sonar</th></tr>
<tr><td>Short Description</td><td colspan="3">Ship, small boat, and helicopter crews locate and disable mines using remotely operated underwater vehicles.</td><td>Typical Duration</td><td>1–4 hours</td></tr>
<tr><td>Long Description</td><td colspan="5">Ship, small boat, and helicopter crews utilize remotely operated vehicles to neutralize potential mines. Remotely operated vehicles will use sonar and optical systems to locate and target mine shapes. Explosive mine neutralizers may be used during live-fire events.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Typical Components</td><td colspan="5">Platforms: Rotary-wing aircraft, surface combatants, small boat
Targets: Mine shapes
Systems being Trained/Tested: Towed sonar systems, underwater explosives</td></tr>
<tr><td>Standard Operating Procedures (Section 2.3.3)</td><td colspan="2">Aircraft safety
Towed in-water device safety
Vessel safety
Target deployment and retrieval safety</td><td colspan="3">Typical Locations
Range Complexes/Testing Ranges:
Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area
Bays/Estuaries/Pierside:
Mariana littorals and Outer Apra Harbor</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Biological Resources</td><td colspan="2">Acoustic:
Sonar and other transducers
Aircraft noise
Vessel noise
Explosive:
In-water explosions</td><td colspan="2">Physical Disturbance and Strike:
Aircraft and aerial targets
Vessels and in-water devices
Military expended materials
Seafloor devices
Ingestion:
Military expended materials – munitions
Military expended materials – other than munitions</td><td>Energy:
In-air electromagnetic devices
In-water electromagnetic devices
Entanglement:
Wires and cables</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Physical Resources</td><td colspan="2">Air Quality:
Criteria air pollutants</td><td colspan="3">Sediments and Water Quality:
Explosives
Metals</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Human Resources</td><td>Cultural Resources:
Explosives
Physical disturbance and strike</td><td>Socioeconomic Resources:
Accessibility
Airborne acoustics
Physical disturbance and strike</td><td colspan="3">Public Health and Safety:
In-water energy
Physical interactions</td></tr>
<tr><td>Military Expended Material</td><td colspan="2">Ingestible Material:
Neutralizer fragments
Non-Ingestible Material:
Fiber optic cable, fiber optic can</td><td>Military Recoverable Material</td><td colspan="2">Mine shapes (non-explosive)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Sonar and Other Transducer Bins</td><td colspan="5">None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Explosive Bins</td><td colspan="5">E4</td></tr>
<tr><td>Procedural Mitigation Measures</td><td colspan="3">Explosive Stressors: (Section 5.3.3)
Explosive Mine Countermeasure and Neutralization Activities</td><td colspan="2">Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors: (Section 5.3.4)
Vessel movement
Towed in-water devices</td></tr>
</table>

Mine Warfare	
Mine Neutralization – Remotely Operated Vehicle Sonar	
Assumptions Used for Analysis	Fiber optic cable is only expended during use of explosive mine neutralizers.

A.1.7.4 Mine Countermeasure Exercise – Surface Ship Sonar

<table>
<tr><th colspan="6">Mine Warfare</th></tr>
<tr><th colspan="6">Mine Countermeasure Exercise – Surface Sonar</th></tr>
<tr><td>Short Description</td><td colspan="3">Ship crews detect, locate, identify, and avoid mines while navigating restricted areas or channels, such as while entering or leaving port.</td><td>Typical Duration
Up to 15 hours</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Long Description</td><td colspan="5">This event trains ship crews to detect mines for future neutralization or to alert other ships. Training utilizes simulated minefields constructed of moored or bottom mines, or instrumented mines that can record effectiveness of mine detection efforts.
Ships will use active sonar to search the area ahead of the ship for moored mines or other hazards of navigation.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Typical Components</td><td colspan="5">Platforms: Mine sweeper, Surface combatant
Targets: Mine shapes
Systems being Trained/Tested: High-frequency sonar, mid-frequency sonar</td></tr>
<tr><td>Standard Operating Procedures (Section 2.3.3)</td><td colspan="2">Vessel safety
Target deployment and retrieval safety</td><td colspan="3">Typical Locations
Range Complexes/Testing Ranges:
Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area
Bays/Estuaries/Pierside:
Apra Harbor</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Biological Resources</td><td colspan="2">Acoustic:
Sonar and other transducers
Vessel noise
Explosive:
None</td><td colspan="2">Physical Disturbance and Strike:
Vessels and in-water devices
Seafloor devices
Ingestion:
None</td><td>Energy:
In-air electromagnetic devices
Entanglement:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Physical Resources</td><td colspan="2">Air Quality:
Criteria air pollutants</td><td colspan="3">Sediments and Water Quality:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Human Resources</td><td colspan="2">Cultural Resources:
None</td><td colspan="2">Socioeconomic Resources:
Accessibility</td><td>Public Health and Safety:
In-water energy
Physical interactions</td></tr>
<tr><td>Military Expended Material</td><td colspan="2">Ingestible Material:
None
Non-Ingestible Material:
None</td><td>Military Recoverable Material</td><td colspan="2">Mine shapes (non-explosive)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Sonar and Other Transducer Bins</td><td colspan="2">High-Frequency Sonar
HF4</td><td colspan="3">Mid-Frequency Sonar
MF1K</td></tr>
<tr><td>Explosive Bins</td><td colspan="5">None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Procedural Mitigation Measures</td><td colspan="2">Acoustic Stressors: (Section 5.3.2)
Active sonar</td><td colspan="3">Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors: (Section 5.3.4)
Vessel movement</td></tr>
<tr><td>Assumptions Used for Analysis</td><td colspan="5">Existing placed mine shapes or targets of opportunity (buoys) to be used. There is potential for temporarily placed mine shapes to be used.</td></tr>
</table>

A.1.7.5 Mine Countermeasure – Towed Mine Neutralization

Mine Warfare			
Mine Countermeasures – Towed Mine Neutralization			
Short Description	Helicopter aircrews, manned and unmanned vehicles tow systems through the water which are designed to disable or trigger mines.	**Typical Duration**	Up to 12 hours
Long Description	Helicopter, vehicle operators and unmanned vehicles use towed devices to trigger mines that are designed to detonate when they detect ships/submarines by engine/propeller sounds or magnetic (steel construction) signature. Towed devices can also employ cable cutters to detach floating moored mines. Training will be conducted either with non-explosive training mine shapes or without any mine shapes. A high degree of pilot skill is required in deploying devices, safely towing them at relatively low speeds and altitudes, and then recovering devices. Devices used may include the following: Organic Airborne and Surface Influence Sweep (OASIS). The Organic Airborne and Surface Influence Sweep is a towed device that imitates the magnetic and acoustic signatures of naval ships and submarines. MK 105 sled: the MK 105 sled, similar to the Organic Airborne and Surface Influence Sweep, creates a magnetic field used to trigger mines. The MK 105 sled can also be used in conjunction with the MK 103 cable cutter system and the MK 104 acoustic countermeasure. AN/SPU-1/W "Magnetic Orange Pipe": As the name implies, the AN/SPU-1/W is a magnetic pipe that is used to trigger magnetically influenced mines.		
Typical Components	**Platforms:** Mine warfare ship, rotary-wing aircraft, unmanned surface vehicle **Targets:** Mine Shapes **Systems being Trained/Tested:** Electromagnetic devices		
Standard Operating Procedures *(Section 2.3.3)*	Aircraft safety Towed in-water device safety Vessel safety Unmanned surface vehicle safety Pierside testing safety Target deployment and retrieval safety	**Typical Locations**	
		Range Complexes/Testing Ranges: Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area	**Bays/Estuaries/Pierside:** Apra Harbor
Stressors to Biological Resources	**Acoustic:** Aircraft noise Vessel noise **Explosive:** None	**Physical Disturbance and Strike:** Aircraft and aerial target Vessels and in-water devices Seafloor devices **Ingestion:** None	**Energy:** In-water electromagnetic devices In-air electromagnetic devices **Entanglement:** None
Stressors to Physical Resources	**Air Quality:** Criteria air pollutants	**Sediments and Water Quality:** None	
Stressors to Human Resources	**Cultural Resources:** Physical disturbance and strike	**Socioeconomic Resources:** Accessibility Airborne acoustics Physical disturbance and strike	**Public Health and Safety:** In-water energy In-air energy Physical interactions

Mine Warfare			
Mine Countermeasures – Towed Mine Neutralization			
Military Expended Material	**Ingestible Material:** None **Non-Ingestible Material:** None	**Military Recoverable Material**	Mine shape (non-explosive)
Sonar and Other Transducer Bins	None		
Explosive Bins	None		
Procedural Mitigation Measures	**Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors:** *(Section 5.3.4)* Vessel movement Towed in-water devices		
Assumptions Used for Analysis	Mechanical sweeping (cable cutting), acoustic and magnetic influence sweeping devices are towed from helicopters, surface vessels, and unmanned vehicles. Cable cutters utilize an insignificant charge (similar to a shotgun shell). Acoustic sweeps generate ship type noise via a mechanical system. Towing systems though minefields (or without mines, to train to deploy, tow, and recover) may involve instrumented mines. Mine shapes would be recovered.		

A.1.7.6 Mine Countermeasure – Towed Mine Detection

<table>
<tr><th colspan="6">Mine Warfare</th></tr>
<tr><th colspan="6">Mine Countermeasures – Towed Mine Detection</th></tr>
<tr><td>Short Description</td><td colspan="3">Helicopter aircrews, manned and unmanned vehicles detect mines using towed or laser mine detection systems.</td><td>Typical Duration</td><td>Typically 1.5 hours up to 4 hours</td></tr>
<tr><td>Long Description</td><td colspan="5">Helicopter aircrews, manned and unmanned vehicles use towed and airborne devices to detect, locate, and classify potential mines. Towed devices employ active acoustic sources, such as high-frequency and side scanning sonar. These devices are similar in function to systems used to map the seafloor or locate submerged structures/items. Airborne devices utilize laser systems to locate mines located below the surface.

Devices used include the ANAQS-20/A, towed mine-hunting sonar used to detect and classify bottom and floating/moored mines in deep and shallow water, and the Airborne Laser Mine Detection System, developed to detect and classify floating and near-surface, moored mines.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Typical Components</td><td colspan="5">Platforms: Mine warfare ship, rotary-wing aircraft, unmanned surface vehicles
Targets: Mine shapes
Systems being Trained/Tested: Mine detection systems</td></tr>
<tr><td>Standard Operating Procedures (Section 2.3.3)</td><td colspan="2">Aircraft safety
Vessel safety
Unmanned surface vehicle safety
Laser Procedures
Target deployment and retrieval safety</td><td colspan="3">Typical Locations
Range Complexes/Testing Ranges:
Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area
Bays/Estuaries/Pierside:
Apra Harbor</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Biological Resources</td><td colspan="2">Acoustic:
Aircraft noise
Vessel noise
Explosive:
None</td><td colspan="2">Physical Disturbance and Strike:
Aircraft and aerial target
Vessels and in-water devices
Seafloor devices
Ingestion:
None</td><td>Energy:
None
Entanglement:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Physical Resources</td><td colspan="2">Air Quality:
Criteria air pollutants</td><td colspan="3">Sediments and Water Quality:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Human Resources</td><td colspan="2">Cultural Resources:
Physical disturbance and strike</td><td colspan="2">Socioeconomic Resources:
Accessibility
Airborne acoustics
Physical disturbance and strike</td><td>Public Health and Safety:
In-water energy
In-air energy
Physical interactions</td></tr>
<tr><td>Military Expended Material</td><td colspan="2">Ingestible Material:
None
Non-Ingestible Material:
None</td><td>Military Recoverable Material</td><td colspan="2">Mine shapes (non-explosive)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Sonar and Other Transducer Bins</td><td colspan="5">None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Explosive Bins</td><td colspan="5">None</td></tr>
</table>

Mine Warfare	
Mine Countermeasures – Towed Mine Detection	
Procedural Mitigation Measures	**Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors:** *(Section 5.3.4)* Towed in-water devices Vessel movement
Assumptions Used for Analysis	Sonar mine detection systems towed from helicopters and surface vessels. Airborne laser systems used to detect mine shapes. Laser systems are similar to commercial Light Detection And Ranging systems. The in-air low energy laser stressor was used in analysis of potential impacts on human resources. Mine shapes may be deployed via ship and will be recovered.

A.1.7.7 Mine Countermeasure Exercise – Towed Sonar

Mine Warfare				
Mine Countermeasure Exercise – Towed Sonar				
Short Description	Surface ship crews detect and avoid mines while navigating restricted areas or channels using towed active sonar systems.	**Typical Duration**	1–4 hours	
Long Description	Surface vessel crews detect and avoid mines or other underwater hazardous objects while navigating restricted areas or channels using active sonar. Littoral Combat Ship utilizes unmanned surface vehicles and remotely operated vehicles to tow mine detection (hunting) equipment. Systems will operate from shallow zone greater than 40 feet to deep water. Events could be embedded in major training exercises.			
Typical Components	**Platforms:** Surface combatant, unmanned aerial vehicles, unmanned surface vehicles **Targets:** Mine shapes **Systems being Trained/Tested:** High frequency sonar			
Standard Operating Procedures *(Section 2.3.3)*	Unmanned aerial, surface, and subsurface vehicle safety Vessel safety Laser Procedures Target deployment and retrieval safety	**Typical Locations**		
		Range Complexes/Testing Ranges: Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area	**Bays/Estuaries/Pierside:** Apra Harbor	
Stressors to Biological Resources	**Acoustic:** Sonar and other transducers Vessel noise **Explosive:** None	**Physical Disturbance and Strike:** Aircraft and aerial targets Vessel and in-water devices Seafloor devices **Ingestion:** None	**Energy:** In-air electromagnetic devices In-water electromagnetic devices **Entanglement:** None	
Stressors to Physical Resources	**Air Quality:** Criteria air pollutants	**Sediments and Water Quality:** Explosives		
Stressors to Human Resources	**Cultural Resources:** Physical disturbance and strike	**Socioeconomic Resources:** Accessibility Airborne acoustics Physical disturbance and strike	**Public Health and Safety:** In-water energy Physical interactions	
Military Expended Material	**Ingestible Material:** None **Non-Ingestible Material:** None	**Military Recoverable Material**	Mine shapes (non-explosive)	
Sonar and Other Transducer Bins	**High Frequency:** HF4			
Explosive Bins	None			
Procedural Mitigation Measures	**Acoustic Stressors:** *(Section 5.3.2)* Active sonar	**Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors:** *(Section 5.3.4)* Vessel movement Towed-in water devices		

Mine Warfare	
Mine Countermeasure Exercise – Towed Sonar	
Assumptions Used for Analysis	No explosives used. Constraints: Assume system will be operated in areas free of obstructions, and will be towed well above the seafloor. Towed system will be operated in a manner to avoid entanglement and damage. Events will take place in water depths 40 feet and greater. Existing placed mine shapes to be used. Potential for temporary placement of mine shapes.

A.1.7.8 Mine Laying

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6">Mine Warfare</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="6">Mine Laying</td></tr>
<tr><td>Short Description</td><td colspan="3">Fixed-wing aircraft drop non-explosive mine shapes.</td><td>Typical Duration
1 hour</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Long Description</td><td colspan="5">Fixed-wing aircraft lay offensive or defensive mines for a tactical advantage for friendly forces. Fixed-wing aircraft lay a precise minefield pattern for specific tactical situations. The aircrew typically makes multiple passes in the same flight pattern, and drop one or more training shapes per pass (four shapes total). Training shapes are non-explosive and are recovered when possible.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Typical Components</td><td colspan="5">Platforms: Fixed-wing aircraft, support vessels
Targets: Mine shapes
Systems being Trained/Tested: None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Standard Operating Procedures (Section 2.3.3)</td><td>Aircraft safety
Target deployment and retrieval safety</td><td colspan="4">Typical Locations
Range Complexes/Testing Ranges:
Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area, Primary areas: Special Use Airspace, nearshore FDM.
Bays/Estuaries/Pierside:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Biological Resources</td><td colspan="5">Acoustic:
Aircraft noise
Vessel noise
Explosive:
None
Physical Disturbance and Strike:
Aircraft and aerial targets
Military expended materials
Seafloor devices
Ingestion:
None
Energy:
None
Entanglement:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Physical Resources</td><td colspan="5">Air Quality:
Criteria air pollutants
Sediments and Water Quality:
Metals</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Human Resources</td><td colspan="5">Cultural Resources:
Physical disturbance and strike
Socioeconomic Resources:
Accessibility
Airborne acoustics
Physical disturbance and strike
Public Health and Safety:
Physical interactions</td></tr>
<tr><td>Military Expended Material</td><td colspan="2">Ingestible Material:
None
Non-Ingestible Material:
Mine shapes (non-explosive)</td><td>Military Recoverable Material</td><td colspan="2">Mine shapes (non-explosive)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Sonar and Other Transducer Bins</td><td colspan="5">None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Explosive Bins</td><td colspan="5">None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Procedural Mitigation Measures</td><td colspan="5">Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors: (Section 5.3.4)
Non-explosive bombs and mine shapes</td></tr>
<tr><td>Assumptions Used for Analysis</td><td colspan="5">Mine laying is similar to a non-explosive bombing exercise.
While some mine shapes will be recovered if possible, assume they will not for the analysis.
Nearshore/shallow water events will be planned to minimize/avoid coral impacts.</td></tr>
</table>

A.1.7.9 Mine Neutralization – Explosive Ordnance Disposal

<table>
<tr><th colspan="5">Mine Warfare</th></tr>
<tr><th colspan="5">Mine Neutralization Explosive Ordnance Disposal</th></tr>
<tr><td>Short Description</td><td colspan="2">Personnel disable threat mines using explosive charges.</td><td>Typical Duration</td><td>Up to 4 hours</td></tr>
<tr><td>Long Description</td><td colspan="4">Navy divers, typically explosive ordnance disposal personnel, disable threat mines with explosive charges to create a safe channel for friendly vessels to transit.

Personnel detect, identify, evaluate, and neutralize mines in the water with an explosive device and may involve detonation of one or more explosive typically up to 20 pounds (lb.) of TNT equivalent. These operations are normally conducted during daylight hours for safety reasons.

Time delay fuses may be used for these events.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Typical Components</td><td colspan="4">Platforms: Rotary-wing aircraft, small boats
Targets: Mine shapes
Systems being Trained/Tested: None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Standard Operating Procedures (Section 2.3.3)</td><td colspan="2">Underwater detonation safety
Aircraft safety
Vessel safety
Target deployment and retrieval safety</td><td colspan="2">Typical Locations
Range Complexes/Testing Ranges:
Agat Bay underwater detonation site
Piti and Outer Apra Harbor underwater detonation sites
Bays/Estuaries/Pierside:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Biological Resources</td><td>Acoustic:
Aircraft noise
Vessel noise

Explosive:
In-water explosions</td><td colspan="2">Physical Disturbance and Strike:
Aircraft and aerial targets
Vessels and in-water devices
Military expended materials
Seafloor devices

Ingestion:
Military expended materials – munitions
Military expended materials – other than munitions</td><td>Energy:
None

Entanglement:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Physical Resources</td><td colspan="2">Air Quality:
Criteria air pollutants</td><td colspan="2">Sediments and Water Quality:
Explosives
Metals
Chemicals
Other materials</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Human Resources</td><td>Cultural Resources:
Explosives
Physical disturbance and strike</td><td>Socioeconomic Resources:
Accessibility
Airborne acoustics
Physical disturbance and strike</td><td colspan="2">Public Health and Safety:
In-water energy
Physical interactions</td></tr>
<tr><td>Military Expended Material</td><td colspan="2">Ingestible Material:
Target fragments

Non-Ingestible Material:
None</td><td>Military Recoverable Material</td><td>Mine shapes (non-explosive)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Sonar and Other Transducer Bins</td><td colspan="4">None</td></tr>
</table>

Mine Warfare		
Mine Neutralization Explosive Ordnance Disposal		
Explosive Bins	E5 E6	
Procedural Mitigation Measures	**Explosive Stressors:** *(Section 5.3.3)* Explosive Mine Neutralization Activities Involving Navy Divers	**Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors:** *(Section 5.3.4)* Vessel movement
Assumptions Used for Analysis	Charge placed anywhere in water column, including bottom. Mine shapes will be recovered when practicable. Some will explode, and fragments will not be recovered. Agat Bay underwater detonation site has a maximum charge size of 20 lb. net explosive weight (NEW). Piti and Outer Apra Harbor underwater detonation sites have a maximum charge size of 10 lb. NEW.	

A.1.7.10 Submarine Mine Exercise

<table>
<tr><th colspan="6">Mine Warfare</th></tr>
<tr><th colspan="6">Submarine Mine Exercise</th></tr>
<tr><td>Short Description</td><td colspan="3">Submarine crews practice detecting mines in a designated area.</td><td>Typical Duration
Varies</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Long Description</td><td colspan="5">Submarine crews use active sonar to detect and avoid mines or other underwater hazardous objects, while navigating restricted areas or channels, such as while entering or leaving port. This event trains submarine crews to detect and avoid mines. Training utilizes simulated minefields constructed of moored or bottom mines, or instrumented mines that can record effectiveness of mine detection efforts. In a typical training exercise, submarine crews will use high-frequency sonar to locate and avoid the mine shapes. Each mine avoidance exercise involves one submarine operating the high-frequency sonar to navigate through the training minefield</td></tr>
<tr><td>Typical Components</td><td colspan="5">Platforms: Submarines
Targets: Mine shapes
Systems being Trained/Tested: High-frequency sonar (hull mounted)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Standard Operating Procedures (Section 2.3.3)</td><td colspan="2">Vessel safety
Target deployment and retrieval safety</td><td colspan="3">Typical Locations
Range Complexes/Testing Ranges:
Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area; nearshore, littorals
Bays/Estuaries/Pierside:</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Biological Resources</td><td>Acoustic:
Sonar and other transducers
Explosive:
None</td><td colspan="2">Physical Disturbance and Strike:
Vessels and in-water devices
Military expended materials
Seafloor Devices
Ingestion:
None</td><td colspan="2">Energy:
None
Entanglement:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Physical Resources</td><td colspan="2">Air Quality:
None</td><td colspan="3">Sediments and Water Quality:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Human Resources</td><td>Cultural Resources:
None</td><td colspan="2">Socioeconomic Resources:
None</td><td colspan="2">Public Health and Safety:
In-water energy
Physical interactions</td></tr>
<tr><td>Military Expended Material</td><td colspan="2">Ingestible Material:
None
Non-Ingestible Material:
None</td><td>Military Recoverable Material</td><td colspan="2">Mine shapes (non-explosive)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Sonar and Other Transducer Bins</td><td colspan="5">High Frequency:
HF1</td></tr>
<tr><td>Explosive Bins</td><td colspan="5">None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Procedural Mitigation Measures</td><td colspan="2">Acoustic Stressors: (Section 5.3.2)
Active sonar</td><td colspan="3">Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors: (Section 5.3.4)
Vessel movement</td></tr>
</table>

Mine Warfare	
Submarine Mine Exercise	
Assumptions Used for Analysis	There is potential for temporarily placed mine shapes to be used. This event could involve submarines placing mine shapes.

A.1.7.11 Surface Ship Object Detection

<table>
<tr><th colspan="6">Mine Warfare</th></tr>
<tr><th colspan="6">Surface Ship Object Detection</th></tr>
<tr><td>Short Description</td><td colspan="3">Ship crews detect and avoid mines while navigating restricted areas or channels using active sonar.</td><td>Typical Duration</td><td>Up to 15 hours</td></tr>
<tr><td>Long Description</td><td colspan="5">Surface ship crews detect and avoid mines or other underwater hazardous objects while navigating restricted areas or channels using active sonar. A Littoral Combat Ship utilizes unmanned surface vehicles and remotely operated vehicles to tow mine detection (hunting) equipment. Systems will operate from a shallow zone greater than 40 feet (ft.) to deep water. Events could be embedded within major training exercises.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Typical Components</td><td colspan="5">Platforms: Surface combatant, unmanned surface vehicle
Targets: Sub-surface targets (mine shapes), targets of opportunity (buoys, fish aggregating devices)
Systems being Trained/Tested: High-frequency sonar, mid-frequency sonar, towed sonar systems</td></tr>
<tr><td>Standard Operating Procedures (Section 2.3.3)</td><td colspan="2">Vessel safety
Unmanned aerial and underwater vehicle procedures
Towed in-water device safety
Target deployment and retrieval safety</td><td colspan="3">Typical Locations
Range Complexes/Testing Ranges:
Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area
Bays/Estuaries/Pierside:
Apra Harbor</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Biological Resources</td><td>Acoustic:
Sonar and other transducers
Vessel noise
Explosive:
None</td><td colspan="2">Physical Disturbance and Strike:
Vessels and in-water devices
Seafloor devices
Ingestion:
None</td><td colspan="2">Energy:
None
Entanglement:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Physical Resources</td><td colspan="2">Air Quality:
Criteria air pollutants</td><td colspan="3">Sediments and Water Quality:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Human Resources</td><td>Cultural Resources:
Physical disturbance and strike</td><td colspan="2">Socioeconomic Resources:
Accessibility
Physical disturbance and strike</td><td colspan="2">Public Health and Safety:
In-water energy
In-air energy
Physical interactions</td></tr>
<tr><td>Military Expended Material</td><td colspan="2">Ingestible Material:
None
Non-Ingestible Material:
None</td><td>Military Recoverable Material</td><td colspan="2">Mine shapes (non-explosive)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Sonar and Other Transducer Bins</td><td colspan="2">Mid-Frequency:
MF1K</td><td colspan="3">High-Frequency:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Explosive Bins</td><td colspan="5">None</td></tr>
</table>

Mine Warfare		
Surface Ship Object Detection		
Procedural Mitigation Measures	**Acoustic Stressors:** Active sonar	**Physical Disturbance and Strike:** Vessel movement Towed in-water devices
Assumptions Used for Analysis	No explosives are used. Constraints: Assume system will be operated in areas free of obstructions, and will be towed well above the seafloor. Towed system will be operated in a manner to avoid entanglement and damage. Events will take place in water depths 40 ft. and greater. Existing placed mine shapes/targets of opportunity to be used. There is the potential for temporary placement of mine shapes. Potential locations for this activity include Mariana Littorals and Apra Harbor.	

A.1.7.12 Underwater Demolition Qualification and Certification

Mine Warfare				
Underwater Demolition Qualification and Certification				
Short Description	Navy divers conduct various levels of training and certification in placing underwater demolition charges.	**Typical Duration**	Varies	
Long Description	Underwater explosive charges, up to 20 lb. net explosive weight are detonated to complete training qualification or certification.			
Typical Components	**Platforms:** Rotary-wing aircraft, small boats **Targets:** Mine shapes **Systems being Trained/Tested:** None			
Standard Operating Procedures *(Section 2.3.3)*	Aircraft safety Vessel safety Underwater detonation safety Target deployment and retrieval safety	**Typical Locations**		
		Range Complexes/Testing Ranges: Agat Bay underwater detonation site Piti and Outer Apra Harbor underwater detonation sites	**Bays/Estuaries/Pierside:** None	
Stressors to Biological Resources	**Acoustic:** Aircraft noise Vessel noise **Explosive:** In-air explosions In-water explosions	**Physical Disturbance and Strike:** Aircraft and aerial targets Vessels and in-water devices Military expended materials Seafloor devices **Ingestion:** Military expended materials – other than munitions	**Energy:** None **Entanglement:** None	
Stressors to Physical Resources	**Air Quality:** Criteria air pollutants	**Sediments and Water Quality:** Explosives Metals	Chemicals Other materials	
Stressors to Human Resources	**Cultural Resources:** Explosives Physical disturbance and strike	**Socioeconomic Resources:** Accessibility Airborne acoustics Physical disturbance and strike	**Public Health and Safety:** In-water energy Physical interactions	
Military Expended Material	**Ingestible Material:** Target fragments **Non-Ingestible Material:** Mine shape (non-explosive)	**Military Recoverable Material**	None	
Sonar and Other Transducer Bins	None			
Explosive Bins	E5 E6			
Procedural Mitigation Measures	**Explosive Stressors:** *(Section 5.3.3)* Explosive mine neutralization activities involving Navy divers	**Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors:** *(Section 5.3.4)* Vessel movement		

Mine Warfare	
Underwater Demolition Qualification and Certification	
Assumptions Used for Analysis	Agat Bay underwater detonation site has a maximum charge size of 20 lb. net explosive weight (NEW). Piti and Outer Apra Harbor underwater detonation sites have a maximum charge size of 10 lb. NEW.

A.1.8 STRIKE WARFARE

A.1.8.1 Bombing Exercise (Air-to-Ground)

<table>
<tr><th colspan="6">Strike Warfare</th></tr>
<tr><th colspan="6">Bombing Exercise (Air-to-Ground)</th></tr>
<tr><td>Short Description</td><td colspan="3">Fixed-wing aircraft drop bombs against a land target.</td><td>Typical Duration</td><td>1–2 hours</td></tr>
<tr><td>Long Description</td><td colspan="5">Bombing exercise involves training of bomber or strike fighter aircraft delivery of ordnance against land targets in day or night conditions. The bombing exercise may involve close air support training in direct support of and in close proximity to forces on the ground, such as Navy or Marine forces engaged in training exercises on land, and may include the use of targeting laser.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Typical Components</td><td colspan="5">Platforms: Fixed-wing aircraft
Targets: Land targets
Systems being Trained/Tested: Targeting laser systems</td></tr>
<tr><td>Standard Operating Procedures (Section 2.3.3)</td><td colspan="2">Aircraft safety
Laser Procedures</td><td colspan="3">Typical Locations
Range Complexes/Testing Ranges:
Farallon de Medinilla, R-7201, R-7201A
Bays/Estuaries/Pierside:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Biological Resources</td><td colspan="2">Acoustic:
Aircraft noise
Explosive:
None</td><td colspan="2">Physical Disturbance and Strike:
Aircraft and aerial targets
Military expended material
Ingestion:
None</td><td>Energy:
None
Entanglement:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Physical Resources</td><td colspan="2">Air Quality:
Criteria pollutants</td><td colspan="3">Sediments and Water Quality:
Metals</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Human Resources</td><td colspan="2">Cultural Resources:
Explosives
Physical disturbance and strike</td><td colspan="2">Socioeconomic Resources:
Airborne acoustics</td><td>Public Health and Safety:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Military Expended Material</td><td colspan="2">Ingestible Material:
None
Non-Ingestible Material:
None</td><td>Military Recoverable Material</td><td colspan="2">None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Sonar and Other Transducer Bins</td><td colspan="5">None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Explosive Bins</td><td colspan="5">None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Procedural Mitigation Measures</td><td colspan="5">None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Assumptions Used for Analysis</td><td colspan="5">Bombs are released in accordance with range standard operating procedures. Land targets only.</td></tr>
</table>

A.1.8.2 Gunnery Exercise (Air-to-Ground)

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6">Strike Warfare</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="6">Gunnery Exercise (Air-to-Ground)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Short Description</td><td colspan="3">Helicopter crews fire guns at stationary land targets; fixed-wing aircraft also strafe land targets.</td><td colspan="2">Typical Duration
1 hour</td></tr>
<tr><td>Long Description</td><td colspan="5">Fixed-wing aircraft and helicopter crews use guns to attack ground targets, day or night, with the goal of destroying or disabling enemy vehicles, structures, or personnel.
Aircraft will fire a burst of rounds, then break off and reposition for another strafing run until each aircraft expends its exercise ordnance allowance. This exercise may include the use of targeting laser.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Typical Components</td><td colspan="5">Platforms: Fixed-wing aircraft, rotary-wing aircraft
Targets: Land targets
Systems being Trained/Tested: Targeting laser systems</td></tr>
<tr><td>Standard Operating Procedures (Section 2.3.3)</td><td colspan="2">Aircraft safety
Weapons firing safety
Laser procedures</td><td colspan="3">Typical Locations
Range Complexes/Testing Ranges:
Farallon de Medinilla, R 7201, R 7201A
Bays/Estuaries/Pierside:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Biological Resources</td><td colspan="2">Acoustic:
Aircraft noise
Weapons noise
Explosive:
None</td><td colspan="2">Physical Disturbance and Strike:
Aircraft and aerial targets
Military expended materials
Ingestion:
Military expended materials – munitions</td><td>Energy:
None
Entanglement:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Physical Resources</td><td colspan="2">Air Quality:
Criteria pollutants</td><td colspan="3">Sediments and Water Quality:
Metals</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Human Resources</td><td colspan="2">Cultural Resources:
Explosives
Physical disturbance and strike</td><td colspan="2">Socioeconomic Resources:
Airborne acoustics</td><td>Public Health and Safety:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Military Expended Material</td><td colspan="2">Ingestible Material:
Projectile casings
Non-Ingestible Material:
None</td><td>Military Recoverable Material</td><td colspan="2">None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Sonar and Other Transducer Bins</td><td colspan="5">None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Explosive Bins</td><td colspan="5">None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Procedural Mitigation Measures</td><td colspan="5">None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Assumptions Used for Analysis</td><td colspan="5">Land-based targets only</td></tr>
</table>

A.1.8.3 Missile Exercise

<table>
<tr><th colspan="6">Strike Warfare</th></tr>
<tr><th colspan="6">Missile Exercise (MISSILEX)</th></tr>
<tr><td>Short Description</td><td colspan="3">Missiles or rockets are launched against a land target.</td><td>Typical Duration
1–2 hours</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Long Description</td><td colspan="5">Fixed-wing aircraft, helicopter, ship or submarine crews use missiles to attack ground targets, day or night, with the goal of destroying or disabling enemy vehicles, structures, or personnel.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Typical Components</td><td colspan="5">Platforms: Fixed-wing aircraft, rotary-wing aircraft, surface ships, submarines
Targets: Land targets
Systems being Trained/Tested: Targeting Lasers</td></tr>
<tr><td>Standard Operating Procedures (Section 2.3.3)</td><td colspan="2">Aircraft safety
Weapons firing safety
Vessel safety
Laser Procedures</td><td colspan="3">Typical Locations
Range Complexes/Testing Ranges:
Farallon de Medinilla, R 7201, R 7201A
Bays/Estuaries/Pierside:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Biological Resources</td><td colspan="2">Acoustic:
Aircraft noise
Weapons noise
Vessel noise
Explosive:
None</td><td colspan="2">Physical Disturbance and Strike:
Aircraft and aerial target
Military expended materials
Vessel and in-water device
Ingestion:
None</td><td>Energy:
None
Entanglement:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Physical Resources</td><td colspan="2">Air Quality:
Criteria pollutants</td><td colspan="3">Sediments and Water Quality:
Metals</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Human Resources</td><td colspan="2">Cultural Resources:
Explosives
Physical disturbance and strike</td><td colspan="2">Socioeconomic Resources:
Airborne acoustics</td><td>Public Health and Safety:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Military Expended Material</td><td colspan="2">Ingestible Material:
None
Non-Ingestible Material:
Missile booster sections</td><td>Military Recoverable Material</td><td colspan="2">None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Sonar and Other Transducer Bins</td><td colspan="5">None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Explosive Bins</td><td colspan="5">Land based, various munitions included.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Procedural Mitigation Measures</td><td colspan="5">Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors:
(Section 5.3.4)
Vessel movement</td></tr>
<tr><td>Assumptions Used for Analysis</td><td colspan="5">Land-based targets only</td></tr>
</table>

A.1.9 SURFACE WARFARE TRAINING

Surface warfare is a type of naval warfare in which aircraft, surface ships, and submarines employ weapons and sensors in operations directed against enemy surface ships or small boats. Aircraft-to-surface warfare is conducted by long-range attacks using air-launched cruise missiles, precision guided munitions, or aircraft guns. Surface warfare also is conducted by warships employing torpedoes, naval guns, and surface-to-surface missiles. Submarines attack surface ships using torpedoes or submarine-launched, anti-ship cruise missiles. Training in surface warfare includes surface-to-surface gunnery and missile exercises, air-to-surface gunnery and missile exercises, and submarine missile or torpedo launch events. Gunnery and missile training generally involves expenditure of ordnance against a towed target. A sinking exercise is a specialized training event that provides an opportunity for ship, submarine, and aircraft crews to use multiple weapons systems to deliver high-explosive ordnance on a deactivated vessel, which is deliberately sunk.

Surface warfare also encompasses maritime security, that is, the interception of a suspect surface ship by a Navy ship for the purpose of boarding-party inspection or the seizure of the suspect ship. Training in these tasks is conducted in visit, board, search and seizure exercises.

A.1.9.1 Bombing Exercise Air-to-Surface

<table>
<tr><td colspan="5">Surface Warfare</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="5">Bombing Exercise Air-to-Surface</td></tr>
<tr><td>Short Description</td><td colspan="2">Fixed-wing aircrews deliver bombs against surface targets.</td><td>Typical Duration
1 hour</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Long Description</td><td colspan="4">Fixed-wing aircraft conduct bombing exercises against stationary floating targets (e.g., MK-58 smoke buoy), towed targets, or maneuvering targets. An aircraft clears the area, deploys a smoke buoy, and then delivers high-explosive or non-explosive practice munitions bomb(s) on the target. A range boat may be used to deploy towed or maneuvering targets for an aircraft to attack.

Exercises for strike fighters typically involve a flight of two aircraft delivering unguided or guided munitions that may be either high-explosive or non-explosive. The following munitions may be employed by strike fighter aircraft in the course of bombing exercise: Unguided munitions include non-explosive subscale bombs (MK-76 and BDU-45), explosive and non-explosive general purpose bombs (MK-80 series), MK-20 cluster bomb (explosive, non-explosive). Precision-guided munitions include laser-guided bombs (explosive, non-explosive), laser-guided training rounds (non-explosive), Joint Direct Attack Munition (explosive, non-explosive).</td></tr>
<tr><td>Typical Components</td><td colspan="4">Platforms: Fixed-wing aircraft, support craft
Targets: Surface targets
Systems being Trained/Tested: Aircraft platforms, bombs, non-explosive practice munitions, targeting lasers</td></tr>
<tr><td>Standard Operating Procedures (Section 2.3.3)</td><td>Aircraft safety
Weapons firing safety
Laser Procedures</td><td colspan="3">Typical Locations
Range Complexes/Testing Ranges:
Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area, Primary areas: Special Use Airspace
Bays/Estuaries/Pierside:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Biological Resources</td><td colspan="4">Acoustic:
Vessel noise
Aircraft noise
Weapons noise
Explosive:
In-water explosions
Physical Disturbance and Strike:
Aircraft and aerial target
Vessels and in-water devices
Military expended materials
Ingestion:
Military expended materials – munitions
Military expended materials – other than munitions
Energy:
None
Entanglement:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Physical Resources</td><td colspan="4">Air Quality:
Criteria air pollutants
Sediments and Water Quality:
Explosives
Metals</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Human Resources</td><td colspan="4">Cultural Resources:
Explosives
Physical disturbance and strike
Socioeconomic Resources:
Accessibility
Airborne acoustics
Physical disturbance and strike
Public Health and Safety:
In-water energy
In-air energy
Physical interactions</td></tr>
<tr><td>Military Expended Material</td><td colspan="2">Ingestible Material:
Bomb fragments, target fragments
Non-Ingestible Material:
Bomb (non-explosive), marine marker, surface target (stationary)</td><td>Military Recoverable Material</td><td>None</td></tr>
</table>

Surface Warfare				
Bombing Exercise Air-to-Surface				
Sonar and Other Transducer Bins	None			
Explosive Bins	E9	E10	E12	
Procedural Mitigation Measures	**Explosive Stressors:** *(Section 5.3.3)* Explosive bombs			**Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors:** *(Section 5.3.4)* Vessel movement Non-explosive bombs and mine shapes
Assumptions Used for Analysis	Explosive bombs are assumed to explode just below the surface. This activity would occur at least 12 NM from land (FDM excepted).			

A.1.9.2 Gunnery Exercise Air-to-Surface Medium-Caliber

Surface Warfare			
Gunnery Exercise Air-to-Surface Medium-Caliber			
Short Description	Fixed-wing and helicopter aircrews fire medium-caliber guns at surface targets.	**Typical Duration**	1 hour
Long Description	Fighter and helicopter aircrew, engage surface targets with medium-caliber guns. Targets simulate enemy ships, boats, swimmers, and floating/near- surface mines. Fighter aircraft descend on a target firing high-explosive or non-explosive practice munitions medium-caliber projectiles. Helicopters will fly a racetrack pattern around an at-sea target. Aircrew will engage the target with medium-caliber weapons. Targets range from a smoke float, or an empty steel drum, to high-speed remote-controlled boats and jet-skis.		
Typical Components	**Platforms:** Fixed-wing aircraft, rotary-wing aircraft, support vessels **Targets:** Surface targets **Systems being Trained/Tested:** Medium-caliber gun systems		
Standard Operating Procedures *(Section 2.3.3)*	Aircraft safety Weapons firing safety Target deployment and retrieval safety	**Typical Locations** **Range Complexes/Testing Ranges:** Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area, Primary areas: Special Use Airspace	**Bays/Estuaries/Pierside:** None
Stressors to Biological Resources	**Acoustic:** Vessel noise Aircraft noise Weapons noise **Explosive:** In-air explosions In-water explosions	**Physical Disturbance and Strike:** Aircraft and aerial target Vessels and in-water devices Military expended materials **Ingestion:** Military expended materials – munitions Military expended materials – other than munitions	**Energy:** None **Entanglement:** None
Stressors to Physical Resources	**Air Quality:** Criteria air pollutants	**Sediments and Water Quality:** Metals Explosives	
Stressors to Human Resources	**Cultural Resources:** Physical disturbance and strike Explosives	**Socioeconomic Resources:** Accessibility Airborne acoustics Physical disturbance and strike	**Public Health and Safety:** In-water energy Physical interactions
Military Expended Material	**Ingestible Material:** Medium-caliber casings, medium-caliber projectiles **Non-Ingestible Material:** Marine marker	**Military Recoverable Material**	Surface target (mobile and stationary)
Sonar and Other Transducer Bins	None		
Explosive Bins	E0 (*de minimis*), E1, and E2		

Surface Warfare		
Gunnery Exercise Air-to-Surface Medium-Caliber		
Procedural Mitigation Measures	**Explosive Stressors:** *(Section 5.3.3)* Explosive medium-caliber and large-caliber projectiles	**Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors:** *(Section 5.3.4)* Vessel movement Small-, medium-, and large-caliber non-explosive practice munitions
Assumptions Used for Analysis	Most medium-caliber air-to-surface gunnery exercises will be with non-explosive training projectiles. High-explosive rounds will supplement when non-explosive training projectiles are not available. Fixed-wing casings remain with aircraft, and helicopter shell casings are expended into the water. This activity occurs greater than 3 NM from land (FDM excepted).	

A.1.9.3 Gunnery Exercise Air-to-Surface Small-Caliber

<table>
<tr><th colspan="5">Surface Warfare</th></tr>
<tr><th colspan="5">Gunnery Exercise Air-to-Surface Small-Caliber</th></tr>
<tr><td>Short Description</td><td colspan="2">Helicopter and tilt-rotor aircrews, use small-caliber guns to engage surface targets.</td><td>Typical Duration
1 hour</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Long Description</td><td colspan="4">Helicopters and tilt-rotor aircraft, fly a racetrack pattern around an at-sea target. Targets simulate enemy ships, boats, and floating/near-surface mines. Each gunner will engage the target with small-caliber weapons. Targets range from a smoke float, an empty steel drum, to high-speed remote-controlled boats and jet-skis.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Typical Components</td><td colspan="4">Platforms: Rotary-wing aircraft, tilt-rotor aircraft
Targets: Surface targets (e.g., MK 58 marine marker, empty steel drum, high-speed remote-controlled boats and jet-skis)
Systems being Trained/Tested: Small-caliber gun systems</td></tr>
<tr><td>Standard Operating Procedures (Section 2.3.3)</td><td>Aircraft safety
Weapons firing safety
Target deployment and retrieval safety</td><td colspan="3">Typical Locations
Range Complexes/Testing Ranges:
Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area, Primary areas: Special Use Airspace
Bays/Estuaries/Pierside:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Biological Resources</td><td colspan="4">Acoustic:
Aircraft noise
Vessel noise
Weapons noise
Explosive:
None
Physical Disturbance and Strike:
Aircraft and aerial target
Vessels and in-water devices
Military expended materials
Ingestion:
Military expended materials – munitions
Military expended materials – other than munitions
Energy:
None
Entanglement:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Physical Resources</td><td colspan="4">Air Quality:
Criteria air pollutants
Sediments and Water Quality:
Metals</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Human Resources</td><td colspan="4">Cultural Resources:
Physical disturbance and strike
Socioeconomic Resources:
Accessibility
Airborne acoustics
Physical disturbance and strike
Public Health and Safety:
Physical interactions</td></tr>
<tr><td>Military Expended Material</td><td colspan="2">Ingestible Material:
Small-caliber projectile (non-explosive), small-caliber casings
Non-Ingestible Material:
MK 58 marine marker</td><td>Military Recoverable Material</td><td>Surface target (mobile)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Sonar and Other Transducer Bins</td><td colspan="4">None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Explosive Bins</td><td colspan="4">None</td></tr>
</table>

Surface Warfare		
Gunnery Exercise Air-to-Surface Small-Caliber		
Procedural Mitigation Measures	**Acoustic Stressors:** *(Section 5.3.2)* Weapons firing noise	**Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors:** *(Section 5.3.4)* Vessel movement Small-, medium-, and large-caliber non-explosive practice munitions
Assumptions Used for Analysis	One target used per event. Expendable smoke float (50 percent), stationary target (45 percent), or remote-controlled target (5 percent). This activity occurs greater than 12 NM from land.	

A.1.9.4 Gunnery Exercise Surface-to-Surface Boat Medium-Caliber

<table>
<tr><th colspan="6">Surface Warfare</th></tr>
<tr><th colspan="6">Gunnery Exercise Surface-to-Surface Boat Medium-Caliber</th></tr>
<tr><td>Short Description</td><td colspan="3">Small boat crews fire medium-caliber guns at surface targets.</td><td>Typical Duration</td><td>1 hour</td></tr>
<tr><td>Long Description</td><td colspan="5">Small boat crews fire medium-caliber guns at surface targets. Boat crews may use high or low speeds to approach and engage targets simulating other boats, floating mines, or nearshore land targets with medium-caliber (up to and including 40-millimeter [mm]) weapons. A commonly used target is an empty steel drum. This event also includes use of anti-swimmer grenades, which may be employed within harbors.

A number of different types of boats are used depending on the unit using the boat and their mission. Boats are most used to protect ships in harbors and high value units, such as: aircraft carriers, nuclear submarines, liquid natural gas tankers, etc., while entering and leaving ports, as well as to conduct riverine operations, and various naval special warfare operations. The boats used by these units include small unit river craft, combat rubber raiding craft, rigid-hull inflatable boats, patrol craft, and many other versions of these types of boats. These boats use inboard or outboard, diesel or gasoline engines with either propeller or water jet propulsion.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Typical Components</td><td colspan="5">Platforms: Small boat
Targets: Surface targets
Systems being Trained/Tested: Medium-caliber gun systems</td></tr>
<tr><td>Standard Operating Procedures (Section 2.3.3)</td><td colspan="2">Vessel safety
Weapons firing safety
Target deployment and retrieval safety</td><td colspan="3">Typical Locations
Range Complexes/Testing Ranges:
Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area

Bays/Estuaries/Pierside:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Biological Resources</td><td colspan="2">Acoustic:
Vessel noise
Weapons noise

Explosive:
In-air explosions
In-water explosions</td><td colspan="2">Physical Disturbance and Strike:
Vessels and in-water devices
Military expended materials

Ingestion:
Military expended materials – munitions
Military expended materials – other than munitions</td><td>Energy:
None

Entanglement:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Physical Resources</td><td colspan="2">Air Quality:
Criteria air pollutants</td><td colspan="3">Sediments and Water Quality:
Explosives
Metals</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Human Resources</td><td>Cultural Resources:
Explosives
Physical disturbance and strike</td><td colspan="2">Socioeconomic Resources:
Accessibility
Airborne acoustics
Physical disturbance and strike</td><td colspan="2">Public Health and Safety:
In-water energy
Physical interactions</td></tr>
<tr><td>Military Expended Material</td><td colspan="2">Ingestible Material:
Grenade (explosive) fragments, medium-caliber projectiles (non-explosive), medium-caliber casings, target fragments

Non-Ingestible Material:
Surface target (stationary)</td><td>Military Recoverable Material</td><td colspan="2">Surface target (stationary and mobile)</td></tr>
</table>

Surface Warfare		
Gunnery Exercise Surface-to-Surface Boat Medium-Caliber		
Sonar and Other Transducer Bins	None	
Explosive Bins	E2	
Procedural Mitigation Measures	**Acoustic Stressors:** *(Section 5.3.2)* Weapons firing noise **Explosive Stressors:** *(Section 5.3.3)* Explosive medium-caliber and large-caliber projectiles Maritime security operations – anti swimmer grenades	**Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors:** *(Section 5.3.4)* Vessel movement Small-, medium-, and large-caliber non-explosive practice munitions
Assumptions Used for Analysis	Assume all events include the use of some explosive rounds. Most events will involve boat crews training with MK 203 40 mm grenade launcher. One target used per event, typically a stationary target such as a 50-liter steel drum. Explosive rounds would be fired greater than 12 NM from land. Non-explosive rounds would be fired greater than 3 NM from land.	

A.1.9.5 Gunnery Exercise Surface-to-Surface Boat Small-Caliber

<table>
<tr><td colspan="5">Surface Warfare</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="5">Gunnery Exercise Surface-to-Surface Boat Small-Caliber</td></tr>
<tr><td>Short Description</td><td colspan="2">Small boat crews fire small-caliber guns at surface targets.</td><td>Typical Duration
1 hour</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Long Description</td><td colspan="4">Small boat crews fire small-caliber guns at surface targets. Boat crews may use high or low speeds to approach and engage targets simulating other boats, swimmers, floating mines, or nearshore land targets with small-caliber (up to and including .50-caliber) weapons. A commonly used target is an empty steel drum.

A number of different types of boats are used depending on the unit using the boat and their mission. Boats are most used to protect ships in harbors and high value units, such as: aircraft carriers, nuclear submarines, liquid natural gas tankers, etc., while entering and leaving ports, as well as to conduct riverine operations, and various naval special warfare operations. The boats used by these units include small unit river craft, combat rubber raiding craft, rigid-hull inflatable boats, patrol craft, and many other versions of these types of boats. These boats use inboard or outboard, diesel or gasoline engines with either propeller or water jet propulsion.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Typical Components</td><td colspan="4">Platforms: Small Boat
Targets: Surface Targets
Systems being Trained/Tested: Small-caliber gun systems</td></tr>
<tr><td>Standard Operating Procedures (Section 2.3.3)</td><td colspan="2">Vessel safety
Weapons firing safety
Target deployment and retrieval safety</td><td colspan="2">Typical Locations
Range Complexes/Testing Ranges:
Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area
Bays/Estuaries/Pierside:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Biological Resources</td><td>Acoustic:
Vessel noise
Weapons noise

Explosive:
In-air explosions</td><td colspan="2">Physical Disturbance and Strike:
Vessels and in-water devices
Military expended materials

Ingestion:
Military expended materials – munitions
Military expended materials – other than munitions</td><td>Energy:
None

Entanglement:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Physical Resources</td><td colspan="2">Air Quality:
Criteria air pollutants</td><td colspan="2">Sediments and Water Quality:
Metals</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Human Resources</td><td>Cultural Resources:
Physical disturbance and strike</td><td colspan="2">Socioeconomic Resources:
Accessibility
Airborne acoustics
Physical disturbance and strike</td><td>Public Health and Safety:
Physical interactions</td></tr>
<tr><td>Military Expended Material</td><td colspan="2">Ingestible Material:
Small-caliber projectile (non-explosive), small-caliber casings

Non-Ingestible Material:
None</td><td>Military Recoverable Material</td><td>Surface target (mobile and stationary)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Sonar and Other Transducer Bins</td><td colspan="4">None</td></tr>
</table>

Surface Warfare		
Gunnery Exercise Surface-to-Surface Boat Small-Caliber		
Explosive Bins	None	
Procedural Mitigation Measures	**Acoustic Stressors:** *(Section 5.3.2)* Weapons firing noise	**Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors:** *(Section 5.3.4)* Vessel movement Small-, medium-, and large-caliber non-explosive practice munitions
Assumptions Used for Analysis	Events will occur relatively nearshore due to short range of boats and safety concerns. Events mostly occur within 3 NM of the shoreline, but can occur further from shore.	

A.1.9.6 Gunnery Exercise Surface-to-Surface Ship Large-Caliber

<table>
<tr><td colspan="4">Surface Warfare</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">Gunnery Exercise Surface-to-Surface Ship – Large-Caliber</td></tr>
<tr><td>Short Description</td><td colspan="2">Surface ship crews fire large-caliber guns at surface targets.</td><td>Typical Duration
Up to 3 hours</td></tr>
<tr><td>Long Description</td><td colspan="3">This exercise involves ships' gun crews engaging surface targets at sea with their main battery large-caliber (typically 57 millimeter [mm], 76 mm, and 5-inch) guns. Targets include the QST-35 seaborne powered target, high speed maneuverable surface target, or a specially configured remote-controlled water craft. Some targets are expended during the exercise and are not recovered.

The exercise proceeds with the target boat approaching from about 10 nautical miles distance. The target is tracked by radar and when within a predetermined range, it is engaged first with large-caliber "warning shots." As threats get closer all weapons may be used to disable the threat.

This exercise may involve a single firing ship, or be undertaken in the context of a coordinated larger exercise involving multiple ships, including a major training exercise.

Large-caliber guns will also be fired during weapon certification events and in conjunction with weapon maintenance.

During all events, either high-explosive or non-explosive rounds may be used. High-explosive rounds can either be fused for detonation on impact (with water surface or target), or for proximity to the target (in-air detonation).</td></tr>
<tr><td>Typical Components</td><td colspan="3">Platforms: Surface combatant
Targets: Surface targets
Systems being Trained/Tested: Large-caliber gun systems</td></tr>
<tr><td>Standard Operating Procedures (Section 2.3.3)</td><td>Vessel safety
Weapons firing safety</td><td colspan="2">Typical Locations
Range Complexes/Testing Ranges:
Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area, Primary areas: Special Use Airspace
Bays/Estuaries/Pierside:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Biological Resources</td><td colspan="3">Acoustic:
Vessel noise
Weapons noise

Explosive:
In-air explosions
In-water explosions

Physical Disturbance and Strike:
Vessels and in-water devices
Military expended materials

Ingestion:
Military expended materials – munitions
Military expended materials – other than munitions

Energy:
In-air electromagnetic devices

Entanglement:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Physical Resources</td><td colspan="3">Air Quality:
Criteria air pollutants

Sediments and Water Quality:
Explosives
Metals</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Human Resources</td><td colspan="3">Cultural Resources:
Explosives
Physical disturbance and strike

Socioeconomic Resources:
Accessibility
Airborne acoustics
Physical disturbance and strike

Public Health and Safety:
In-air energy
In-water energy
Physical interactions</td></tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr><th colspan="4">Surface Warfare</th></tr>
<tr><th colspan="4">Gunnery Exercise Surface-to-Surface Ship – Large-Caliber</th></tr>
<tr><td>Military Expended Material</td><td>Ingestible Material:
Large-caliber projectile (explosive) fragments, target fragments

Non-Ingestible Material:
Large-caliber projectile (non-explosive), large-caliber casings
Surface target (stationary)</td><td>Military Recoverable Material</td><td>None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Sonar and Other Transducer Bins</td><td colspan="3">None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Explosive Bins</td><td colspan="3">E5</td></tr>
<tr><td>Procedural Mitigation Measures</td><td colspan="3">Acoustic Stressors: (Section 5.3.2)
Weapons firing noise

Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors:
(Section 5.3.4)
Vessel movement
Small-, medium-, and large-caliber non-explosive practice munitions

Explosive Stressors: (Section 5.3.3)
Explosive medium-caliber and large-caliber projectiles</td></tr>
<tr><td>Assumptions Used for Analysis</td><td colspan="3">For analytical purposes assume all high explosive rounds are fused to detonate upon impact with water surface or target.
After impacting the water, the high explosive rounds are expected to detonate within three feet of the surface. Non-explosive rounds and fragments from the high explosive rounds will sink to the bottom of the ocean.
This activity would occur greater than 12 NM from land (FDM excepted).</td></tr>
</table>

A.1.9.7 Gunnery Exercise Surface-to-Surface Ship Small- and Medium-Caliber

<table>
<tr><td colspan="5">Surface Warfare</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="5">Gunnery Exercise Surface-to-Surface Ship Small- and Medium-Caliber</td></tr>
<tr><td>Short Description</td><td colspan="2">Surface ship crews fire medium and small-caliber guns at surface targets.</td><td colspan="2">Typical Duration
2–3 hours</td></tr>
<tr><td>Long Description</td><td colspan="4">Ships use small- and medium-caliber weapons to practice defensive marksmanship, typically against a stationary floating target (a 10-foot diameter red balloon [Killer Tomato]) and high-speed mobile targets. Some targets are expended during the exercise and are not recovered.

Shipboard protection systems (Close-In Weapon System) utilizing medium-caliber projectiles would train against high speed mobile targets.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Typical Components</td><td colspan="4">Platforms: Small boat, surface combatant
Targets: Surface Targets (e.g., stationary floating target, high speed mobile target)
Systems being Trained/Tested: Medium and small-caliber gun systems</td></tr>
<tr><td>Standard Operating Procedures (Section 2.3.3)</td><td colspan="2">Vessel safety
Weapons firing safety
Target deployment and retrieval safety</td><td colspan="2">Typical Locations
Range Complexes/Testing Ranges:
Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area, Primary areas: Special Use Airspace

Bays/Estuaries/Pierside:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Biological Resources</td><td colspan="2">Acoustic:
Vessel noise
Weapons noise

Explosive: In-air explosions
In-water explosions</td><td colspan="2">Physical Disturbance and Strike:
Vessels and in-water devices
Military expended materials

Ingestion:
Military expended materials – munitions
Military expended materials – other than munitions

Energy:
In-air electromagnetic devices

Entanglement:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Physical Resources</td><td colspan="2">Air Quality:
Criteria air pollutant</td><td colspan="2">Sediments and Water Quality:
Explosives
Metals</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Human Resources</td><td>Cultural Resources:
Explosives
Physical disturbance and strike</td><td>Socioeconomic Resources:
Accessibility
Airborne acoustics
Physical disturbance and strike</td><td colspan="2">Public Health and Safety:
In-air energy
In-water energy
Physical interactions</td></tr>
<tr><td>Military Expended Material</td><td colspan="2">Ingestible Material:
Medium-caliber projectiles (non-explosive), medium-caliber projectile (explosive) fragments, small-caliber projectile (explosive) fragments, small-caliber projectile (non-explosive), small-caliber casings, target fragments

Non-Ingestible Material:
Surface target (stationary)</td><td>Military Recoverable Material</td><td>Surface target (mobile) surface target (stationary)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Sonar and Other Transducer Bins</td><td colspan="4">None</td></tr>
</table>

Surface Warfare		
Gunnery Exercise Surface-to-Surface Ship Small- and Medium-Caliber		
Explosive Bins	E1	
Procedural Mitigation Measures	**Acoustic Stressors:** *(Section 5.3.2)* Weapons firing noise **Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors:** *(Section 5.3.4)* Vessel movement Small-, medium-, and large-caliber non-explosive practice munitions	**Explosive Stressors:** *(Section 5.3.3)* Explosive medium-caliber and large-caliber projectiles
Assumptions Used for Analysis	One target used per event. Approximately 50 percent of targets are "Killer Tomatoes" (usually recovered). Approximately 35 percent are high-speed maneuvering targets, which are recovered. Approximately 15 percent of targets are other stationary targets such as a steel drum. This activity would occur greater than 12 NM from land (FDM excepted).	

A.1.9.8 Laser Targeting – At-Sea

<table>
<tr><td colspan="5">Surface Warfare</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="5">Laser Targeting – At-Sea</td></tr>
<tr><td>Short Description</td><td colspan="2">Fixed-wing and helicopter aircrews and shipboard personnel illuminate enemy targets with lasers.</td><td colspan="2">Typical Duration
1–2 hours</td></tr>
<tr><td>Long Description</td><td colspan="4">Fixed-wing and helicopter aircrew and shipboard personnel illuminate enemy targets with lasers for engagement by aircraft with laser guided bombs or missiles. This exercise may be conducted alone or in conjunction with other events utilizing precision guided munitions, such as surface missiles and guided rockets. Events where weapons are fired are addressed in the appropriate activity (e.g., air-to-surface missile exercise).

Lower powered lasers may also be used as non-lethal deterrents during maritime security operations (force protection).</td></tr>
<tr><td>Typical Components</td><td colspan="4">Platforms: Fixed-wing aircraft, rotary-wing aircraft, navy ships and boats, unmanned aerial system – rotary-wing
Targets: Surface targets
Systems being Trained/Tested: Aircraft platforms, lasers</td></tr>
<tr><td>Standard Operating Procedures (Section 2.3.3)</td><td colspan="2">Aircraft safety
Unmanned aerial and underwater vehicle procedures
Vessel safety
Laser procedures
Target deployment and retrieval safety</td><td colspan="2">Typical Locations
Range Complexes/Testing Ranges:
Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area, Primary areas: Special Use Airspace
Bays/Estuaries/Pierside:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Biological Resources</td><td>Acoustic:
Aircraft noise
Vessel noise

Explosive:
None</td><td colspan="2">Physical Disturbance and Strike:
Aircraft and aerial target
Vessel and in-water devices

Ingestion:
None</td><td>Energy:
Lasers

Entanglement:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Physical Resources</td><td colspan="2">Air Quality:
Criteria air pollutants</td><td colspan="2">Sediments and Water Quality:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Human Resources</td><td>Cultural Resources:
None</td><td colspan="2">Socioeconomic Resources:
Accessibility
Airborne acoustics</td><td>Public Health and Safety:
In-air energy
Physical interactions</td></tr>
<tr><td>Military Expended Material</td><td colspan="2">Ingestible Material:
None

Non-Ingestible Material:
None</td><td>Military Recoverable Material</td><td>Surface target (mobile)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Sonar and Other Transducer Bins</td><td colspan="4">None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Explosive Bins</td><td colspan="4">None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Procedural Mitigation Measures</td><td colspan="4">Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors: (Section 5.3.4)
Vessel movement</td></tr>
</table>

Surface Warfare	
Laser Targeting – At-Sea	
Assumptions Used for Analysis	Laser targeting for missile/rocket guidance will occur in areas where these events also occur. Use of lasers as force protection non-lethal deterrents will primarily occur proximate to Navy homeports.

A.1.9.9 Maritime Security Operations

<table>
<tr><th colspan="4">Surface Warfare</th></tr>
<tr><th colspan="4">Maritime Security Operations</th></tr>
<tr><td>Short Description</td><td colspan="2">Helicopter, surface ship, and small boat crews conduct a suite of maritime security operations at sea, to include visit, board, search and seizure, maritime interdiction operations, force protection, and anti-piracy operations.</td><td>Typical Duration
Up to 3 hours</td></tr>
<tr><td>Long Description</td><td colspan="3">Helicopter and surface ship crews conduct a suite of maritime security operations (e.g., visit, board, search and seizure, maritime interdiction operations, force protection, and anti-piracy operations). These activities involve training of boarding parties delivered by helicopters and surface ships to surface vessels for the purpose of simulating vessel search and seizure operations. Various training scenarios are employed and may include small arms with non-explosive blanks, explosive Anti-Swimmer Grenades, and surveillance or reconnaissance unmanned surface and aerial vehicles. The entire exercise may last 2–3 hours.

Vessel Visit, Board, Search, and Seizure: Military personnel from ships and aircraft board suspect vessels, potentially under hostile conditions.

Maritime Interdiction Operations: Ships and aircraft train in pursuing, intercepting, and ultimately detaining suspect vessels.

Maritime Infrastructure Protection and Harbor Defense: Naval personnel train to defend oil platforms, similar at-sea structures, harbors, piers, and other infrastructure.

Warning Shot/Disabling Fire: Naval personnel train in the use of weapons to force fleeing or threatening small boats (typically operating at high speeds) to come to a stop.

Ship Force Protection: Ship crews train in tracking multiple approaching, circling small craft, assessing threat potential, and communicating amongst crewmates and other vessels to ensure ships are protected against attack.

Anti-Piracy Training: Naval and U.S. Coast Guard personnel train in deterring and interrupting piracy activity. Training includes large vessels (pirate “mother ships”), and multiple small, maneuverable, and fast craft.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Typical Components</td><td colspan="3">Platforms: Amphibious warfare ship, rotary-wing aircraft, small boat, surface combatant, unmanned aerial vehicle, unmanned surface vehicle
Targets: Surface targets
Systems being Trained/Tested: Targeting systems, non-lethal deterrents, unmanned systems</td></tr>
<tr><td>Standard Operating Procedures (Section 2.3.3)</td><td>Vessel safety
Aircraft safety
Unmanned aerial and underwater vehicle procedures
Unmanned surface vehicle safety
Laser procedures
Target deployment and retrieval safety</td><td colspan="2">Typical Locations
Range Complexes/Testing Ranges:
Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area
Mariana Islands Range Complex
Mariana littorals

Bays/Estuaries/Pierside:
Apra Harbor</td></tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr><th colspan="5">Surface Warfare</th></tr>
<tr><th colspan="5">Maritime Security Operations</th></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Biological Resources</td><td colspan="4">Acoustic:
Aircraft noise
Vessel noise
Weapons noise
Explosive:
In-air explosions
In-water explosions

Physical Disturbance and Strike:
Aircraft and aerial target
Vessels and in-water devices
Military expended materials

Ingestion:
Military Expended Materials – Munitions

Energy:
None

Entanglement:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Physical Resources</td><td colspan="4">Air Quality:
Criteria air pollutants

Sediments and Water Quality:
Explosives</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Human Resources</td><td>Cultural Resources:
None</td><td colspan="2">Socioeconomic Resources:
Accessibility
Airborne acoustics
Physical disturbance and strike</td><td>Public Health and Safety:
In-air energy
In-water energy
Lasers
Physical interactions</td></tr>
<tr><td>Military Expended Material</td><td colspan="2">Ingestible Material:
Grenade (explosive) fragments

Non-Ingestible Material:
None</td><td>Military Recoverable Material</td><td>None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Sonar and Other Transducer Bins</td><td colspan="4">None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Explosive Bins</td><td colspan="4">E2</td></tr>
<tr><td>Procedural Mitigation Measures</td><td colspan="2">Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors: (Section 5.3.4)
Vessel movement</td><td colspan="2">Explosive Stressors: (Section 5.3.3)
Maritime security operations – Anti-swimmer grenades</td></tr>
<tr><td>Assumptions Used for Analysis</td><td colspan="4">Maritime Security Operations is a broad term used to describe activities intended train naval forces in the skills necessary to protect naval vessels from small boat attack, counter piracy and drug operations (maritime interdiction operations and visit, board, search, and seizure), and protect key infrastructure (e.g., oil platforms). Maritime security operations need to remain broad as naval forces need to be able to tailor training events to respond to emergent threats. Maritime Security Operations events typically do not involve live fire of weapons; however, the use of various non-lethal deterrents is likely. All maritime security operations events involve vessel movement, sometimes at high rates of speed (naval vessels maneuvering to overtake suspect vessel or small boats (targets) closing in and maneuvering around naval vessels), and some event involve helicopters and boarding parties. Maritime security operations training events are typically conducted proximate to naval homeports including during times of transit in and out of port, as well as during major training exercises. These events may occur in littorals throughout the Study Area..</td></tr>
</table>

A.1.9.10 Missile Exercise Air-to-Surface

<table>
<tr><td colspan="5">Surface Warfare</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="5">Missile Exercise Air-to-Surface (MISSILEX)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Short Description</td><td colspan="2">Fixed-wing and helicopter aircrews fire air-to-surface missiles at surface targets.</td><td colspan="2">Typical Duration
2 hours</td></tr>
<tr><td>Long Description</td><td colspan="4">Fighter, maritime patrol aircraft, and helicopter aircrews fire precision-guided missiles against surface targets. Aircraft involved may be unmanned.

Fixed-wing aircraft (fighters or maritime patrol aircraft) approach an at-sea surface target from high altitude, and launch high-explosive precision guided missiles.

Helicopters designate at-sea surface targets with a laser or optics for precision guided missiles. Helicopter launched missiles typically pass through the target's "sail," and, if explosive, detonate at or just below, the water's surface.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Typical Components</td><td colspan="4">Platforms: Fixed-wing aircraft, rotary-wing aircraft, support vessel
Targets: Surface targets
Systems being Trained/Tested: Aircraft platforms</td></tr>
<tr><td>Standard Operating Procedures (Section 2.3.3)</td><td>Aircraft safety
Laser procedures
Weapons firing safety
Target deployment and retrieval safety</td><td colspan="3">Typical Locations
Range Complexes/Testing Ranges:
Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area, Primary areas: Special Use Airspace
Bays/Estuaries/Pierside:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Biological Resources</td><td colspan="4">Acoustic:
Vessel noise
Aircraft noise
Weapons noise
Explosive:
In-air explosions
In-water explosions
Physical Disturbance and Strike:
Vessels and in-water devices
Aircraft and aerial target
Military expended materials
Ingestion:
Military expended materials – munitions
Military expended materials – other than munitions
Energy:
In-air electromagnetic devices
Entanglement:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Physical Resources</td><td colspan="4">Air Quality:
Criteria air pollutants
Sediments and Water Quality:
Explosives Chemicals
Metals</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Human Resources</td><td colspan="4">Cultural Resources:
Explosives
Physical disturbance and strike
Socioeconomic Resources:
Accessibility
Airborne acoustics
Physical disturbance and strike
Public Health and Safety:
In-water energy
In-air energy
Physical interactions</td></tr>
<tr><td>Military Expended Material</td><td colspan="2">Ingestible Material:
Missile (explosive) fragments, target fragments
Non-Ingestible Material:
None</td><td>Military Recoverable Material</td><td>Surface target (mobile and stationary)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Sonar and Other Transducer Bins</td><td colspan="4">None</td></tr>
</table>

Surface Warfare		
Missile Exercise Air-to-Surface (MISSILEX)		
Explosive Bins	E6 E8 E10	
Procedural Mitigation Measures	**Acoustic Stressors** *(Section 5.3.2)* Weapons firing noise **Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors:** *(Section 5.3.4)* Non-explosive missiles and rockets	**Explosive Stressors:** *(Section 5.3.3)* Explosive missiles and rockets
Assumptions Used for Analysis	Assume one missile and one target per event. While missiles could explode above the water's surface after contacting targets, analysis assumes all warheads explode at or just below the water's surface. Targets are usually recovered but could be lost due to damage. This activity occurs greater than 12 NM from land (FDM excepted).	

A.1.9.11 Missile Exercise Air-to-Surface – Rocket

<table>
<tr><td colspan="5">Surface Warfare</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="5">Missile Exercise Air-to-Surface – Rocket</td></tr>
<tr><td>Short Description</td><td colspan="2">Helicopter aircrews fire both precision-guided and unguided rockets at surface targets.</td><td colspan="2">Typical Duration
1 hour</td></tr>
<tr><td>Long Description</td><td colspan="4">Helicopters designate an at-sea surface target with a laser or optics for precision-guided high explosive or non-explosive practice munitions rockets. Unguided rockets may also be used during this event.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Typical Components</td><td colspan="4">Platforms: Fixed-wing aircraft, rotary-wing aircraft, support vessel, unmanned aerial system - rotary wing
Targets: Surface targets
Systems being Trained/Tested: Aircraft platforms</td></tr>
<tr><td>Standard Operating Procedures (Section 2.3.3)</td><td colspan="2">Aircraft safety
laser safety
Weapons firing safety
Laser procedures
Unmanned aerial and underwater vehicle procedures
Target deployment and retrieval safety</td><td colspan="2">Typical Locations
Range Complexes/Testing Ranges:
Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area, Primary areas: Special Use Airspace
Bays/Estuaries/Pierside:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Biological Resources</td><td>Acoustic:
Vessel noise
Aircraft noise
Weapons noise
Explosive:
In-air explosions
In-water explosions</td><td colspan="2">Physical Disturbance and Strike:
Vessels and in-water devices
Aircraft and aerial target
Military expended materials
Ingestion:
Military expended materials – munitions
Military expended materials – other than munitions</td><td>Energy:
In-air electromagnetic devices
Lasers
Entanglement:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Physical Resources</td><td colspan="2">Air Quality:
Criteria air pollutants</td><td colspan="2">Sediments and Water Quality:
Explosives Chemicals
Metals</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Human Resources</td><td>Cultural Resources:
Explosives
Physical disturbance and strike</td><td colspan="2">Socioeconomic Resources:
Accessibility
Airborne acoustics
Physical disturbance and strike</td><td>Public Health and Safety:
In-water energy
In-air energy
Physical interactions</td></tr>
<tr><td>Military Expended Material</td><td colspan="2">Ingestible Material:
Rocket (explosive) fragments, target fragments
Non-Ingestible Material:
Mk 58 marine marker, rocket (non-explosive)</td><td>Military Recoverable Material</td><td>Surface target (mobile and stationary)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Sonar and Other Transducer Bins</td><td colspan="4">None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Explosive Bins</td><td colspan="4">E3</td></tr>
</table>

Surface Warfare		
Missile Exercise Air-to-Surface – Rocket		
Procedural Mitigation Measures	**Acoustic Stressors** *(Section 5.3.2)* Weapons firing noise **Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors:** *(Section 5.3.4)* Non-explosive missiles and rockets	**Explosive Stressors:** *(Section 5.3.3)* Explosive missiles and rockets
Assumptions Used for Analysis	Assume all explosive rockets detonate in water. Rockets may be used in conjunction with force protection events. The in-air low energy laser stressor was used in analysis of potential impacts on human resources. Targets are usually recovered but could be lost due to damage. This activity would occur greater than 12 NM from land (FDM excepted).	

A.1.9.12 Missile Exercise Surface-to-Surface

<table>
<tr><th colspan="5">Surface Warfare</th></tr>
<tr><th colspan="5">Missile Exercise Surface-to-Surface</th></tr>
<tr><td>Short Description</td><td colspan="3">Surface ship crews defend against surface threats (ships or small boats) and engage them with missiles.</td><td>Typical Duration
2–5 hours</td></tr>
<tr><td>Long Description</td><td colspan="4">Surface ships launch missiles at surface maritime targets with the goal of destroying or disabling enemy ships or boats.

After detecting and confirming a surface threat, the ship will fire a precision guided surface missile.

Events with destroyers and cruisers will involve long range (over the horizon) Harpoon (or similar) surface missiles. While past Harpoon events occurred during sinking exercises, the requirement exists for non-sinking exercise events to certify ship crews. If a sinking exercise target is unavailable, a towed sled would likely be used.

Events with littoral combat and patrol combatant ships will involve shorter range surface missiles, such as Hellfire and Griffin. Events with littoral combat and patrol combatant ships would be to certify ship's crew to defend against "close-in" (less than 10 miles) surface threats.

These exercises are live fire, meaning that a missile is fired down range. Surface missiles could be equipped with either high-explosive or non-explosive warheads.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Typical Components</td><td colspan="4">Platforms: Surface combatant
Targets: Surface targets
Systems being Trained/Tested: None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Standard Operating Procedures (Section 2.3.3)</td><td>Vessel safety
Weapons firing safety
Target deployment and retrieval safety</td><td colspan="3">Typical Locations
Range Complexes/Testing Ranges:
Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area, Primary areas: Special Use Airspace
Bays/Estuaries/Pierside:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Biological Resources</td><td>Acoustic:
Vessel noise
Weapons noise

Explosive:
In-air explosions
In-water explosions</td><td colspan="2">Physical Disturbance and Strike:
Vessels and in-water devices
Military expended materials

Ingestion:
Military expended materials – munitions
Military expended materials – other than munitions</td><td>Energy:
In-air electromagnetic devices

Entanglement:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Physical Resources</td><td>Air Quality:
Criteria air pollutants</td><td colspan="3">Sediments and Water Quality:
Explosives Chemicals
Metals</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Human Resources</td><td>Cultural Resources:
Explosives
Physical disturbance and strike</td><td>Socioeconomic Resources:
Accessibility
Airborne acoustics
Physical disturbance and strike</td><td colspan="2">Public Health and Safety:
In-air energy
In-water energy
Physical interactions</td></tr>
</table>

Surface Warfare			
Missile Exercise Surface-to-Surface			
Military Expended Material	**Ingestible Material:** Missile (explosive) fragments, target fragments **Non-Ingestible Material:** None	**Military Recoverable Material**	Surface target (mobile and stationary)
Sonar and Other Transducer Bins	None		
Explosive Bins	E6 E10		
Procedural Mitigation Measures	**Acoustic Stressors** *(Section 5.3.2)* Weapons firing noise **Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors** *(Section 5.3.4)* Vessel movement **Explosive Stressors** (*Section 5.3.3*) Explosive missiles and rockets		
Assumptions Used for Analysis	Assume one missile and one target used per event. While missile could explode above water's surface after contacting target, analysis assumes all warheads explode at or just below surface. Targets are usually recovered but could be lost due to damage. This activity would occur greater than 50 NM from land (FDM excepted).		

A.1.9.13 Sinking Exercise

<table>
<tr><th colspan="4">Surface Warfare</th></tr>
<tr><th colspan="4">Sinking Exercise</th></tr>
<tr><td>Short Description</td><td colspan="2">Aircraft, ship, and submarine crews deliberately sink a seaborne target, usually a decommissioned ship made environmentally safe for sinking according to U.S. Environmental Protection Agency standards, with a variety of ordnance.</td><td>Typical Duration
4–8 hours, possibly over 1–2 days</td></tr>
<tr><td>Long Description</td><td colspan="3">Ship personnel and aircrew deliver high-explosive ordnance on a seaborne target, (large deactivated vessel), which is deliberately sunk using multiple weapon systems. A sinking exercise is typically conducted by aircraft, surface vessels, and submarines to train in live ordnance delivery on a full-size ship target.

The target is typically a decommissioned ship made environmentally safe for sinking according to U.S. Environmental Protection Agency standards. The location is greater than 50 nautical miles from shore and in water depths greater than 6,000 feet (ft.).

Ship, aircraft, and submarine crews attack with coordinated tactics and deliver a variety of inert and high-explosive ordnance. Typically, the exercise lasts for 4–8 hours and possibly over 1–2 days; however, it is unpredictable and ultimately ends when the target ship sinks.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Typical Components</td><td colspan="3">Platforms: Fixed-wing aircraft, submarines, support craft, surface combatant
Targets: Ship hulk
Systems being Trained/Tested: Large-caliber gun systems, missile systems, bombs, torpedoes, small-caliber gun systems, targeting systems</td></tr>
<tr><td>Standard Operating Procedures (Section 2.3.3)</td><td>Vessel safety
Aircraft safety
Weapons firing safety
Sinking exercise safety</td><td colspan="2">Typical Locations
Range Complexes/Testing Ranges:
Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area

Bays/Estuaries/Pierside:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Biological Resources</td><td colspan="3">Acoustic:
Aircraft noise
Vessel noise
Weapons noise

Explosive:
In-air explosions
In-water explosions

Physical Disturbance and Strike:
Aircraft and aerial target
Vessels and in-water devices
Military expended materials
Seafloor devices

Ingestion:
Military expended materials – munitions
Military expended materials – other than munitions

Energy:
In-air electromagnetic devices

Entanglement:
Wires and cables</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Physical Resources</td><td colspan="3">Air Quality:
Criteria air pollutants

Sediments and Water Quality:
Explosives
Chemicals
Metals</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Human Resources</td><td>Cultural Resources:
Explosives
Physical disturbance and strike</td><td>Socioeconomic Resources:
Accessibility
Airborne acoustics
Physical disturbance and strike</td><td>Public Health and Safety:
In-air energy
In-water energy
Physical interactions</td></tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr><th colspan="6">Surface Warfare</th></tr>
<tr><th colspan="6">Sinking Exercise</th></tr>
<tr><td>Military Expended Material</td><td colspan="2">Ingestible Material:
Bomb (explosive) fragments, heavyweight torpedo (explosive) fragments, large-caliber projectile (explosive) fragments, missile (explosive) fragments, small-caliber projectile (non-explosive), small-caliber casings

Non-Ingestible Material:
Ship hulk, heavyweight torpedo accessories, guidance wire, large-caliber projectile (non-explosive), large-caliber casings</td><td>Military Recoverable Material</td><td colspan="2">None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Sonar and Other Transducer Bins</td><td colspan="5">Torpedoes:
TORP2</td></tr>
<tr><td>Explosive Bins</td><td>E5</td><td>E8</td><td>E10</td><td>E11</td><td>E12</td></tr>
<tr><td>Procedural Mitigation Measures</td><td colspan="3">Acoustic Stressors: (Section 5.3.2)
Weapons firing noise

Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors: (Section 5.3.4)
Vessel movement</td><td colspan="2">Explosive Stressors: (Section 5.3.3)

Sinking Exercises</td></tr>
<tr><td>Assumptions Used for Analysis</td><td colspan="5">Events occur greater than 50 nautical miles from shore and in water depths greater than 6,000 ft. during daylight hours only.
The participants and assets typically include:
• 1 full-size target ship hulk
• 1–5 CG, DDG, or LCS ships
• 1-10 Fixed-wing aircraft (e.g., F/A-18, or maritime patrol aircraft)
• 1 or 2 MH-60 helicopters
• 1 E-2 aircraft for Command and Control
• 1 submarine
• 1–3 range clearance aircraft
For purposes of analysis, the below represents the types of munitions that might be employed. Actual SINKEX ordnance expenditures will vary.
• 1–2 Harpoon surface-to-surface or air-to-surface missiles
• 2–4 Maverick or Hellfire air-to-surface missiles
• 2–12 MK-80 series general purpose bombs
• 200 rounds large-caliber projectiles
• 1–2 MK-48 heavyweight submarine-launched torpedo
• Assume 2 guidance wires expended per event
Acoustic effects modeling assumed only a percentage of munitions missed target and exploded in water. Precision guided munitions are assumed to impact target well above waterline and are not modeled (or reported) as in water explosions.</td></tr>
</table>

A.1.10 OTHER TRAINING EXERCISES

A.1.10.1 Direct Action (Tactical Air Control Party)

Other Training Exercises			
Direct Action (Tactical Air Control Party)			
Short Description	Military personnel train for controlling of combat support aircraft; providing airspace de-confliction and terminal control for Close Air Support.	**Typical Duration**	Multiple days
Long Description	Tactical Air Control personnel, once at Farallon de Medinilla, participate in tactical air control training in conjunction with an Air-to-Ground bombing or missile exercise. They may also employ small arms, grenades, mortars, and crew served weapons in direct action against targets on the island.		
Typical Components	**Platforms:** Fixed-wing aircraft, rotary-wing aircraft, small boats **Targets:** None **Systems being Trained/Tested:** Small-caliber rounds, explosive grenades and mortars		
Standard Operating Procedures *(Section 2.3.3)*	Aircraft safety Vessel safety Laser procedures Target Deployment and Retrieval Safety Farallon de Medinilla Access Restrictions	**Typical Locations** **Range Complexes/Testing Ranges:** Farallon de Medinilla	**Bays/Estuaries/Pierside:** None
Stressors to Biological Resources	**Acoustic:** Aircraft noise Vessel noise **Explosive:** None	**Physical Disturbance and Strike:** Aircraft and aerial targets Vessel and in-water devices **Ingestion:** None	**Energy:** None **Entanglement:** None
Stressors to Physical Resources	**Air Quality:** Criteria air pollutants	**Sediments and Water Quality:** None	
Stressors to Human Resources	**Cultural Resources:** None	**Socioeconomic Resources:** None	**Public Health and Safety:** None
Military Expended Material	**Ingestible Material:** None **Non-Ingestible Material:** None	**Military Recoverable Material**	None
Sonar and Other Transducer Bins	None		
Explosive Bins	None		
Procedural Mitigation Measures	**Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors:** *(Section 5.3.4)* Vessel movement		
Assumptions Used for Analysis	May involve overnight camping on FDM.		

A.1.10.2 Intelligence, Surveillance, Reconnaissance

<table>
<tr><th colspan="5">Other Training Exercises</th></tr>
<tr><th colspan="5">Intelligence, Surveillance, Reconnaissance</th></tr>
<tr><td>Short Description</td><td colspan="2">Personnel train to collect and report battlefield intelligence.</td><td>Typical Duration</td><td>Multiple days</td></tr>
<tr><td>Long Description</td><td colspan="4">Personnel conduct event to evaluate the battlefield, enemy forces, and gather intelligence. For training of assault forces, “red cell” units may be positioned ahead of the assault force and permitted a period of time to conduct surveillance and prepare defenses to the assaulting force.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Typical Components</td><td colspan="4">Platforms: Fixed-wing aircraft, small boat, unmanned aerial systems, submarines
Targets: None
Systems being Trained/Tested: None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Standard Operating Procedures (Section 2.3.3)</td><td colspan="2">Aircraft safety
Unmanned Aerial and Underwater Vehicle Procedures
Vessel safety</td><td colspan="2">Typical Locations
Range Complexes/Testing Ranges:
Mariana Islands Range Complex; Guam; Tinian; Rota; Saipan, Mariana littorals
Bays/Estuaries/Pierside:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Biological Resources</td><td>Acoustic:
Aircraft noise
Vessel noise
Explosive:
None</td><td colspan="2">Physical Disturbance and Strike:
Aircraft and aerial targets
Vessel and in-water devices
Ingestion:
Military expended materials – other than munitions</td><td>Energy:
None
Entanglement:
Decelerator/parachute
Wires and cables</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Physical Resources</td><td colspan="2">Air Quality:
Criteria air pollutants</td><td colspan="2">Sediments and Water Quality:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Human Resources</td><td>Cultural Resources:
None</td><td colspan="2">Socioeconomic Resources:
Accessibility
Airborne acoustics
Physical disturbance and strike</td><td>Public Health and Safety:
Physical interactions</td></tr>
<tr><td>Military Expended Material</td><td colspan="2">Ingestible Material:
Decelerator/parachute
Non-Ingestible Material:
Sonobuoys (non-explosive), sonobuoy wires</td><td>Military Recoverable Material</td><td>None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Sonar and Other Transducer Bins</td><td colspan="4">None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Explosive Bins</td><td colspan="4">None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Procedural Mitigation Measures</td><td colspan="4">Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors: (Section 5.3.4)
Vessel movement</td></tr>
<tr><td>Assumptions Used for Analysis</td><td colspan="4">These events may occur in littorals throughout the Study Area.</td></tr>
</table>

A.1.10.3 Precision Anchoring

Other Training Exercises			
Precision Anchoring			
Short Description	Surface ship crews release and retrieve anchors in designated locations.	**Typical Duration**	Up to 1 hour
Long Description	Ship crews choose the best available anchoring sites. The ship uses all means available to determine its position when anchor is dropped to demonstrate calculating and plotting the anchor's position within 100 yards of center of planned anchorage.		
Typical Components	**Platforms:** Navy Ships **Targets:** None **Systems being Trained/Tested:** None		
Standard Operating Procedures *(Section 2.3.3)*	Vessel safety	**Typical Locations** **Range Complexes/Testing Ranges:** Mariana Islands anchorages **Bays/Estuaries/Pierside:** Apra Harbor	
Stressors to Biological Resources	**Acoustic:** Vessel noise **Explosive:** None	**Physical Disturbance and Strike:** Vessels and in-water devices Seafloor devices **Ingestion:** None	**Energy:** None **Entanglement:** None
Stressors to Physical Resources	**Air Quality:** Criteria air pollutants	**Sediments and Water Quality:** Chemicals Other materials	
Stressors to Human Resources	**Cultural Resources:** Physical disturbance and strike	**Socioeconomic Resources:** Accessibility Physical disturbance and strike	**Public Health and Safety:** Physical interactions
Military Expended Material	**Ingestible Material:** None **Non-Ingestible Material:** None	**Military Recoverable Material**	Anchors
Sonar and Other Transducer Bins	None		
Explosive Bins	None		
Procedural Mitigation Measures	**Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors:** *(Section 5.3.4)* Vessel movement		
Assumptions Used for Analysis	None		

A.1.10.4 Search and Rescue At Sea

<table>
<tr><th colspan="6">Other Training Exercises</th></tr>
<tr><th colspan="6">Search and Rescue At Sea</th></tr>
<tr><td>Short Description</td><td colspan="3">Helicopter and ship crews rescue military personnel at sea.</td><td>Typical Duration</td><td>Up to 3 days</td></tr>
<tr><td>Long Description</td><td colspan="5">Helicopter, ship, and submarine crews practice the skills required to recover personnel lost at sea. Helicopters locate survivors and deploy rescue swimmer and rescue basket. Survivors are winched up to the hovering helicopter. Surface ships would conduct man overboard drills and deploy a dummy figure in the water. Ship crews would launch a small boat, direct the recovery of the dummy, and recover the small boat. Submarine crews would maneuver submarine to effect recovery of personnel.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Typical Components</td><td colspan="5">Platforms: Fixed-wing aircraft, rotary-wing aircraft, surface ships, unmanned aerial vehicles
Targets: None
Systems being Trained/Tested:</td></tr>
<tr><td>Standard Operating Procedures (Section 2.3.3)</td><td colspan="2">Aircraft safety
Unmanned Aerial and Underwater Vehicle Procedures
Vessel safety</td><td colspan="3">Typical Locations
Range Complexes/Testing Ranges:
Mariana Islands Test and Training Study Area
Bays/Estuaries/Pierside:
Apra Harbor and Mariana littorals</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Biological Resources</td><td colspan="2">Acoustic:
Aircraft noise
Vessel noise
Explosive:
None</td><td colspan="2">Physical Disturbance and Strike:
Aircraft and aerial targets
Vessel and in-water devices
Military expended materials
Ingestion:
None</td><td>Energy:
None
Entanglement:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Physical Resources</td><td colspan="2">Air Quality:
Criteria air pollutants</td><td colspan="3">Sediments and Water Quality:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Human Resources</td><td>Cultural Resources:
None</td><td colspan="2">Socioeconomic Resources:
Accessibility
Airborne acoustics
Physical disturbance and strike</td><td colspan="2">Public Health and Safety:
Physical interactions</td></tr>
<tr><td>Military Expended Material</td><td colspan="2">Ingestible Material:
None
Non-Ingestible Material:
None</td><td>Military Recoverable Material</td><td colspan="2">None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Sonar and Other Transducer Bins</td><td colspan="5">None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Explosive Bins</td><td colspan="5">None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Procedural Mitigation Measures</td><td colspan="5">Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors: (Section 5.3.4)
Vessel movement</td></tr>
<tr><td>Assumptions Used for Analysis</td><td colspan="5">These events may occur in littorals throughout the Study Area.</td></tr>
</table>

A.1.10.5 Small Boat Attack

<table>
<tr><th colspan="6">Other Training Exercises</th></tr>
<tr><th colspan="6">Small Boat Attack</th></tr>
<tr><td>Short Description</td><td colspan="3">Afloat units defend against small boat or personal water craft attack</td><td>Typical Duration</td><td>6 hours</td></tr>
<tr><td>Long Description</td><td colspan="5">For this activity, one or two small boats or personal watercraft conduct attack activities on units afloat, training ship crews how to respond to small boat attack in harbors, restricted channels, and nearshore areas using non-lethal means or armament appropriate to the threat and location.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Typical Components</td><td colspan="5">Platforms: Small boat, unmanned surface vehicle, ships
Targets: Surface targets
Systems being Trained/Tested: None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Standard Operating Procedures (Section 2.3.3)</td><td colspan="2">Vessel safety
Unmanned Aerial and Underwater Vehicle Procedures
Target deployment and retrieval safety</td><td colspan="3">Typical Locations
Range Complexes/Testing Ranges:
Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area
Bays/Estuaries/Pierside:
Apra Harbor and Mariana littorals</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Biological Resources</td><td colspan="2">Acoustic:
Vessel noise
Explosive:
None</td><td colspan="2">Physical Disturbance and Strike:
Vessel and in-water devices
Military expended materials
Ingestion:
Military Expended Materials – Munitions
Military Expended Materials – Other than munitions</td><td>Energy:
None
Entanglement:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Physical Resources</td><td colspan="2">Air Quality:
Criteria air pollutants</td><td colspan="3">Sediments and Water Quality:
Metals</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Human Resources</td><td colspan="2">Cultural Resources:
None</td><td colspan="2">Socioeconomic Resources:
Accessibility
Airborne acoustics
Physical disturbance and strike</td><td>Public Health and Safety:
Physical interactions
In-air energy</td></tr>
<tr><td>Military Expended Material</td><td colspan="2">Ingestible Material:
Small-caliber projectile (non-explosive), small-caliber casings, small-caliber blanks
Non-Ingestible Material:
None</td><td>Military Recoverable Material</td><td colspan="2">Surface target (stationary)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Sonar and Other Transducer Bins</td><td colspan="5">None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Explosive Bins</td><td colspan="5">None</td></tr>
</table>

Other Training Exercises	
Small Boat Attack	
Procedural Mitigation Measures	**Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors:** *(Section 5.3.4)* Vessel movement
Assumptions Used for Analysis	None

A.1.10.6 Submarine Navigation

Other Training Exercises			
Submarine Navigation			
Short Description	Submarine crews operate sonar for navigation and detection while transiting into and out of port during reduced visibility.	**Typical Duration**	Up to 2 hours
Long Description	Submarine crews train to operate sonar for navigation. The ability to navigate using sonar is critical for detection while transiting into and out of port during periods of reduced visibility. During this activity the submarine will be surfaced.		
Typical Components	**Platforms:** Submarines **Targets:** None **Systems being Trained/Tested:** High-frequency sonar, mid-frequency sonar (hull-mounted)		
Standard Operating Procedures *(Section 2.3.3)*	Vessel safety	**Typical Locations**	**Range Complexes/Testing Ranges:** Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area **Bays/Estuaries/Pierside:** Apra Harbor and Mariana littorals
Stressors to Biological Resources	**Acoustic:** Sonar and other transducers **Explosive:** None	**Physical Disturbance and Strike:** Vessels and in-water devices **Ingestion:** None	**Energy:** None **Entanglement:** None
Stressors to Physical Resources	**Air Quality:** None	**Sediments and Water Quality:** None	
Stressors to Human Resources	**Cultural Resources:** None	**Socioeconomic Resources:** Accessibility Airborne acoustics Physical disturbance and strike	**Public Health and Safety:** Physical interactions In-water energy
Military Expended Material	**Ingestible Material:** None **Non-Ingestible Material:** None	**Military Recoverable Material**	None
Sonar and Other Transducer Bins	**High Frequency:** HF1	**Mid-Frequency:** MF3	
Explosive Bins	None		
Procedural Mitigation Measures	**Acoustic Stressors:** *(Section 5.3.2)* Active sonar	**Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors:** *(Section 5.3.4)* Vessel movement	
Assumptions Used for Analysis	None		

A.1.10.7 Submarine Sonar Maintenance

Other Training Exercises			
Submarine Sonar Maintenance			
Short Description	Maintenance of submarine sonar and other system checks are conducted pierside or at sea.	**Typical Duration**	Up to 1 hour
Long Description	A submarine performs periodic maintenance on the AN/BQQ-10 and submarine high-frequency sonar systems while in port or at sea. Submarines conduct maintenance to their sonar systems in shallow water near their homeport, however, sonar maintenance could occur anywhere as the system's performance may warrant.		
Typical Components	**Platforms:** Submarines **Targets:** None **Systems being Trained/Tested:** Mid-frequency hull mounted sonar		
Standard Operating Procedures *(Section 2.3.3)*	Vessel safety Pierside testing safety	**Typical Locations**	
		Range Complexes/Testing Ranges: Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area	**Bays/Estuaries/Pierside:** Apra Harbor and Mariana littorals
Stressors to Biological Resources	**Acoustic:** Sonar and other transducers **Explosive:** None	**Physical Disturbance and Strike:** Vessels and in-water devices **Ingestion:** None	**Energy:** None **Entanglement:** None
Stressors to Physical Resources	**Air Quality:** None	**Sediments and Water Quality:** None	
Stressors to Human Resources	**Cultural Resources:** None	**Socioeconomic Resources:** Airborne acoustics	**Public Health and Safety:** In-water energy
Military Expended Material	**Ingestible Material:** None **Non-Ingestible Material:** None	**Military Recoverable Material**	None
Sonar and Other Transducer Bins	**Mid-Frequency:** MF3		
Explosive Bins	None		
Procedural Mitigation Measures	**Acoustic Stressors:** *(Section 5.3.2)* Active sonar	**Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors:** *(Section 5.3.4)* Vessel movement	
Assumptions Used for Analysis	Conducted at pier or while underway		

A.1.10.8 Surface Ship Sonar Maintenance

Other Training Exercises			
Surface Ship Sonar Maintenance			
Short Description	Maintenance of surface ship sonar and other system checks are conducted pierside or at sea.	**Typical Duration**	Up to 4 hours
Long Description	This scenario consists of surface ships performing periodic maintenance to the AN/SQS-53 sonar and other ship systems while in port or at sea. This maintenance takes up to four hours. Surface ships operate active sonar systems for maintenance while in shallow water near their homeport, however, sonar maintenance could occur anywhere as the system's performance may warrant.		
Typical Components	**Platforms:** Surface combatant **Targets:** None **Systems being Trained/Tested:** Mid-frequency hull mounted		
Standard Operating Procedures *(Section 2.3.3)*	Vessel safety Pierside testing safety	**Typical Locations**	
		Range Complexes/Testing Ranges: Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area	**Bays/Estuaries/Pierside:** Apra Harbor and Mariana littorals
Stressors to Biological Resources	**Acoustic:** Sonar and other transducers Vessel noise **Explosive:** None	**Physical Disturbance and Strike:** Vessels and in-water devices **Ingestion:** None	**Energy:** In-air electromagnetic devices **Entanglement:** None
Stressors to Physical Resources	**Air Quality:** Criteria air pollutants	**Sediments and Water Quality:** None	
Stressors to Human Resources	**Cultural Resources:** None	**Socioeconomic Resources:** None	**Public Health and Safety:** In-water energy
Military Expended Material	**Ingestible Material:** None **Non-Ingestible Material:** None	**Military Recoverable Material**	None
Sonar and Other Transducer Bins	**Mid-Frequency:** MF1		
Explosive Bins	None		
Procedural Mitigation Measures	**Acoustic Stressors:** *(Section 5.3.2)* Active sonar	**Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors:** *(Section 5.3.4)* Vessel movement	
Assumptions Used for Analysis	Conducted at pier or while underway		

A.1.10.9 Underwater Survey

<table>
<tr><th colspan="6">Other Training Exercises</th></tr>
<tr><th colspan="6">Underwater Survey</th></tr>
<tr><td>Short Description</td><td colspan="3">Navy divers train in survey of underwater conditions and features in preparation for insertion, extraction, or intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance activities.</td><td>Typical Duration</td><td>4 hours</td></tr>
<tr><td>Long Description</td><td colspan="5">A survey of underwater terrain conditions nearshore and a report of findings to provide precise analysis for amphibious landings. Personnel perform methodical reconnoitering of beaches and surf conditions during the day and night to find and clear underwater obstacles and determine the feasibility of landing an amphibious force on a particular beach.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Typical Components</td><td colspan="5">Platforms: Small boats
Targets: None
Systems being Trained/Tested: None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Standard Operating Procedures (Section 2.3.3)</td><td colspan="2">Vessel safety</td><td colspan="3">Typical Locations
Range Complexes/Testing Ranges:
Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area
Bays/Estuaries/Pierside:
Apra Harbor and Mariana littorals</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Biological Resources</td><td colspan="2">Acoustic:
Vessel noise
Explosive:
None</td><td colspan="2">Physical Disturbance and Strike:
Vessel and in-water devices
Ingestion:
None</td><td>Energy:
None
Entanglement:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Physical Resources</td><td colspan="3">Air Quality:
Criteria air pollutants</td><td colspan="2">Sediments and Water Quality:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Human Resources</td><td colspan="2">Cultural Resources:
None</td><td colspan="2">Socioeconomic Resources:
Accessibility
Physical disturbance and strike</td><td>Public Health and Safety:
Physical interactions</td></tr>
<tr><td>Military Expended Material</td><td colspan="2">Ingestible Material:
None
Non-Ingestible Material:
None</td><td>Military Recoverable Material</td><td colspan="2">None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Sonar and Other Transducer Bins</td><td colspan="5">None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Explosive Bins</td><td colspan="5">None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Procedural Mitigation Measures</td><td colspan="5">Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors: (Section 5.3.4)
Vessel movement</td></tr>
<tr><td>Assumptions Used for Analysis</td><td colspan="5">Hand-held (or similar) de minimis sonar sources may be used. During the conduct of underwater survey activities personnel may stand in the surf zone and walk onto the beach.</td></tr>
</table>

A.1.10.10 Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Training and Certification

<table>
<tr><th colspan="6">Other Training Exercises</th></tr>
<tr><th colspan="6">Unmanned Aerial System Training and Certification</th></tr>
<tr><td>Short Description</td><td colspan="3">Units conduct training with unmanned aerial vehicles from a variety of platforms including surface ships and submarines.</td><td>Typical Duration</td><td>2 days</td></tr>
<tr><td>Long Description</td><td colspan="5">Conduct unmanned aerial vehicle activity in support of tactical and theater requirements.

During training, personnel use radio frequency communications to control and communicate with the unmanned aerial system during its flight.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Typical Components</td><td colspan="5">Platforms: Submarines, surface ship, unmanned aerial system-fixed wing
Targets: Land targets, surface targets
Systems being Trained/Tested: None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Standard Operating Procedures (Section 2.3.3)</td><td colspan="2">Aircraft safety
Unmanned aerial and underwater vehicle procedures
Vessel safety</td><td colspan="3">Typical Locations

Range Complexes/Testing Ranges:
Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area
Mariana Islands Range Complex airfields (Orote Point Airfield, Guam; Northwest Airfield, Guam; North Airfield, Tinian)
Mariana Islands Special Use Airspace

Bays/Estuaries/Pierside:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Biological Resources</td><td colspan="2">Acoustic:
Vessel noise

Explosive:
None</td><td colspan="2">Physical Disturbance and Strike:
Aircraft and aerial targets
Military expended materials
Vessel and in-water devices

Ingestion:
None</td><td>Energy:
None

Entanglement:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Physical Resources</td><td colspan="2">Air Quality:
Criteria air pollutants</td><td colspan="3">Sediments and Water Quality:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Human Resources</td><td colspan="2">Cultural Resources:
None</td><td colspan="2">Socioeconomic Resources:
None</td><td>Public Health and Safety:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Military Expended Material</td><td colspan="2">Ingestible Material:
None

Non-Ingestible Material:
Canister, weight, flotation collar</td><td>Military Recoverable Material</td><td colspan="2">None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Sonar and Other Transducer Bins</td><td colspan="5">None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Explosive Bins</td><td colspan="5">None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Procedural Mitigation Measures</td><td colspan="5">Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors: (Section 5.3.4)
Vessel movement</td></tr>
</table>

Other Training Exercises	
Unmanned Aerial System Training and Certification	
Assumptions Used for Analysis	Unmanned aerial vehicles are typically recovered; however, some units may be lost and some are designed to be expendable. Submarine launched unmanned aerial systems result in expenditure of ballast weight and launched capsule. These events may occur in littorals throughout the Study Area.

A.1.10.11 Unmanned Underwater Vehicle Training

<table>
<tr><th colspan="6">Other Training Exercises</th></tr>
<tr><th colspan="6">Unmanned Underwater Vehicle Training</th></tr>
<tr><td>Short Description</td><td colspan="3">Units conduct training with unmanned underwater vehicles from a variety of platforms including surface ships, small boats, and submarines.</td><td>Typical Duration</td><td>Up to 24 hours</td></tr>
<tr><td>Long Description</td><td colspan="5">Conduct unmanned underwater vehicle activities in support of tactical and theater requirements.
Unmanned underwater vehicle activities involve training with unmanned platforms on which various sensors and payloads are attached and used for different purposes, such as mine warfare, bottom mapping, and other missions. Vehicles may be crew served or mechanically launched from ships and submarines.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Typical Components</td><td colspan="5">Platforms: Surface ships, small boats, submarines, support craft, unmanned underwater vehicle
Targets: Mine shapes
Systems being Trained/Tested: Acoustic modem, high-frequency sonar, synthetic aperture sonar</td></tr>
<tr><td>Standard Operating Procedures (Section 2.3.3)</td><td colspan="2">Vessel safety
Unmanned aerial and underwater vehicle procedures
Target deployment and retrieval safety</td><td colspan="3">Typical Locations
Range Complexes/Testing Ranges:
Mariana Islands Range Complex
Bays/Estuaries/Pierside:
Apra Harbor and Mariana littorals</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Biological Resources</td><td colspan="2">Acoustic:
Sonar and other transducers
Vessel noise
Explosive:
None</td><td colspan="2">Physical Disturbance and Strike:
Vessels and in-water devices
Military expended materials
Seafloor devices
Ingestion:
None</td><td>Energy:
None
Entanglement:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Physical Resources</td><td colspan="2">Air Quality:
Criteria air pollutants</td><td colspan="3">Sediments and Water Quality:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Human Resources</td><td>Cultural Resources:
None</td><td colspan="2">Socioeconomic Resources:
Accessibility
Airborne acoustics
Physical disturbance and strike</td><td colspan="2">Public Health and Safety:
Physical interactions
In-air energy
In-water energy</td></tr>
<tr><td>Military Expended Material</td><td colspan="2">Ingestible Material:
None
Non-Ingestible Material:
Anchors</td><td>Military Recoverable Material</td><td colspan="2">Mine shapes (non-explosive)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Sonar and Other Transducer Bins</td><td>Forward Looking Sonar:
FLS2</td><td colspan="2">Acoustic Modems:
M3</td><td colspan="2">Synthetic Aperture Sonar:
SAS2 SAS4</td></tr>
</table>

Other Training Exercises	
Unmanned Underwater Vehicle Training	
Explosive Bins	None
Procedural Mitigation Measures	**Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors:** *(Section 5.3.4)* Vessel movement
Assumptions Used for Analysis	These events may occur in littorals throughout the Study Area.

A.2 TESTING ACTIVITIES

A.2.1 NAVAL AIR SYSTEMS COMMAND TESTING ACTIVITIES

Naval Air Systems Command activities will generally fall under Fleet primary mission areas, such as the testing of airborne mine warfare and anti-submarine warfare weapons and systems. Naval Air Systems Command activities include, but are not limited to, the testing of new aircraft platforms (e.g., the P-8 maritime patrol aircraft), weapons, and systems (e.g., newly developed sonobuoys) that will ultimately be integrated into Fleet training activities. In addition to testing new platforms, weapons, and systems, Naval Air Systems Command also conducts lot acceptance testing of sonobuoys and follow-on testing and evaluation of updated systems in support of Fleet operational units. In general, the potential environmental effects from most Naval Air Systems Command testing events are similar to the associated Fleet training events.

While many of these systems tested by Naval Air Systems Command will ultimately be used by the Fleet, testing activities involving the same or similar systems may be conducted in different locations and manners than when conducted by the Fleet. Because of these differences, the results of the analysis for testing activities may differ from the results for training activities.

A.2.1.1 Anti-Submarine Warfare

A.2.1.1.1 Anti-Submarine Warfare Torpedo Test

<table>
<tr><th colspan="4">Anti-Submarine Warfare</th></tr>
<tr><th colspan="4">Anti-Submarine Warfare Torpedo Test</th></tr>
<tr><td>Short Description</td><td colspan="2">This event is similar to the training event torpedo exercise. Test evaluates anti-submarine warfare systems onboard rotary-wing and fixed-wing aircraft and the ability to search for, detect, classify, localize, track, and attack a submarine or similar target.</td><td>Typical Duration
2–6 flight hours per event</td></tr>
<tr><td>Long Description</td><td colspan="3">Similar to a torpedo exercise, an anti-submarine warfare (ASW) torpedo test evaluates anti-submarine warfare systems onboard rotary-wing (e.g., MH-60R helicopter) and fixed-wing (marine patrol aircraft P-8, P-3) aircraft and the ability to search for, detect, classify, localize, track, and attack a submarine or similar target (e.g., MK-39 expendable mobile ASW training target [EMATT], or MK-30). The focus of the anti-submarine warfare torpedo test is the operation of non-explosive torpedoes (e.g., MK-46 or MK-54), but other anti-submarine warfare systems are often used during the test. MK-39 (EMATT) or MK-30 targets simulate a submarine threat and are deployed at varying depths and speeds. If available, tests may be conducted using an actual submarine as the target. This activity can be conducted in shallow or deep waters and aircraft can originate from a land base or from a surface ship. The torpedo test culminates with the release of an exercise torpedo against the target and is intended to evaluate the targeting, release, and tracking process of deploying torpedoes from aircraft. All exercise torpedoes used in testing are either running or non- running and are non-explosive. Eighty-five percent of torpedoes are recovered. A parachute assembly used for aircraft-launched torpedoes is jettisoned and sinks. Ballast (typically lead weights) may be released from the torpedoes to allow for recovery, and sink to the bottom.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Typical Components</td><td colspan="3">Platforms: Fixed-wing aircraft, rotary-wing aircraft, range support craft
Targets: Sub-surface targets
Systems being Trained/Tested: Torpedoes/torpedo launching systems</td></tr>
<tr><td>Standard Operating Procedures (Section 2.3.3)</td><td>Aircraft safety
Target Deployment and Retrieval Safety
Weapons firing safety</td><td colspan="2">Typical Locations
Range Complexes/Testing Ranges:
Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area
Inland Waters/Pierside:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Biological Resources</td><td>Acoustic:
Sonar and other transducers
Aircraft noise

Explosive:
None</td><td>Physical Disturbance and Strike:
Aircraft and aerial target
Vessels and in-water devices
Military expended materials
Seafloor devices

Ingestion:

Military expended materials – other than munitions</td><td>Energy:
In-air electromagnetic devices

Entanglement:
Decelerators/parachutes
Wires and cables</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Physical Resources</td><td>Air Quality:
Criteria air pollutants</td><td colspan="2">Sediments and Water Quality:
Metals Chemicals
Other materials</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Human Resources</td><td>Cultural Resources:
Physical disturbance and strike</td><td>Socioeconomic Resources:
Accessibility
Airborne acoustics
Physical disturbance and strike</td><td>Public Health and Safety:
In-water energy
Physical interactions</td></tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr><th colspan="4">Anti-Submarine Warfare</th></tr>
<tr><th colspan="4">Anti-Submarine Warfare Torpedo Test</th></tr>
<tr><td>Military Expended Material</td><td colspan="2">Ingestible Material:
Decelerators/parachutes - small

Non-Ingestible Material:
Expended bathythermograph, expended bathythermograph wire, lightweight torpedo accessories, sonobuoy (non-explosive), sonobuoy wires,</td><td>Military Recoverable Material</td><td>Lightweight torpedo (non-explosive), sub-surface target (mobile)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Sonar and Other Transducer Bins</td><td colspan="4">Mid-Frequency:
MF5

Torpedoes:
TORP1</td></tr>
<tr><td>Explosive Bins</td><td colspan="4">None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Procedural Mitigation Measures</td><td colspan="4">Acoustic Stressors: (Section 5.3.2)
Active sonar

Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors: (Section 5.3.4)
Vessel movement</td></tr>
<tr><td>Assumptions Used for Analysis</td><td colspan="4">Assume one torpedo accessory package (parachute, ballast) per torpedo. Assume one target per torpedo.
This activity would occur greater than 3 NM from land.</td></tr>
</table>

A.2.1.1.2 Anti-Submarine Warfare Tracking Test – Maritime Patrol Aircraft

<table>
<tr><th colspan="5">Anti-Submarine Warfare</th></tr>
<tr><th colspan="5">Anti-Submarine Warfare Tracking Test – Maritime Patrol Aircraft</th></tr>
<tr><td>Short Description</td><td colspan="2">The test evaluates the sensors and systems used by maritime patrol aircraft to detect and track submarines and to ensure that aircraft systems used to deploy the tracking systems perform to specifications and meet operational requirements.</td><td colspan="2">Typical Duration
8 flight hours per event</td></tr>
<tr><td>Long Description</td><td colspan="4">Similar to an anti-submarine warfare (ASW) tracking exercise-maritime patrol aircraft, an anti-submarine warfare tracking test – maritime patrol aircraft evaluates the sensors and systems used to detect and track submarines and to ensure that platform systems used to deploy the tracking systems perform to specifications and meet operational requirements. P-3 or P-8 fixed-wing aircraft conduct anti-submarine warfare testing using non-impulsive sonobuoys (e.g., AN/SSQ-62 DICASS), explosive sonobuoys (e.g., MK-61 SUS), passive sonobuoys (e.g., AN/SSQ-53 DIFAR), and smoke devices (e.g., MK-58). Targets (e.g., MK-39 Expendable Mobile ASW Training Target) may also be employed during an anti-submarine warfare scenario. If available, tests may be conducted using an actual submarine as the target. This activity would be conducted in deep (typically beyond 100 feet) waters. Some anti-submarine warfare maritime patrol aircraft tracking tests could be conducted as part of a coordinated event with Fleet training activities.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Typical Components</td><td colspan="4">Platforms: Fixed-wing aircraft, range support craft
Targets: Sub-surface targets
Systems being Trained/Tested: Sonobuoys/sonobuoy launching systems, data transmission systems</td></tr>
<tr><td>Standard Operating Procedures (Section 2.3.3)</td><td>Aircraft safety
Vessel safety
Target Deployment and Retrieval Safety</td><td colspan="3">Typical Locations
Range Complexes/Testing Ranges:
Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area
Inland Waters/Pierside:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Biological Resources</td><td colspan="4">Acoustic:
Sonar and other transducers
Aircraft noise
Vessel noise
Explosive:
In-water explosions
Physical Disturbance and Strike:
Aircraft and aerial target
Vessels and in-water devices
Military expended materials
Ingestion:
Military expended materials – other than munitions
Energy:
In-air electromagnetic devices
Entanglement:
Decelerators/parachutes
Wires and cables</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Physical Resources</td><td colspan="4">Air Quality:
Criteria air pollutants
Sediments and Water Quality:
Explosives
Metals
Chemicals
Other materials</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Human Resources</td><td colspan="4">Cultural Resources:
Explosives
Physical disturbance and strike
Socioeconomic Resources:
Accessibility
Airborne acoustics
Physical disturbance and strike
Public Health and Safety:
In-water energy
Physical interactions</td></tr>
</table>

Anti-Submarine Warfare			
Anti-Submarine Warfare Tracking Test – Maritime Patrol Aircraft			
Military Expended Material	**Ingestible Material:** Sonobuoy (explosive) fragments, decelerators/parachutes – small **Non-Ingestible Material:** Expended bathythermograph, expended bathythermograph wire, sonobuoy (non-explosive), sonobuoy wires	**Military Recoverable Material**	Sub-surface target (mobile)
Sonar and Other Transducer Bins	**Anti-Submarine Warfare:** ASW2 ASW5 **Mid-Frequency:** MF5 MF6		
Explosive Bins	E1 E3		
Procedural Mitigation Measures	**Acoustic Stressors:** *(Section 5.3.2)* Active sonar **Explosive Stressors:** (*Section 5.3.3*) Explosive Sonobuoys		
Assumptions Used for Analysis	This activity would occur greater than 3 NM from land.		

A.2.1.2 Electronic Warfare

A.2.1.2.1 Intelligence Surveillance Reconnaissance/Electronic Warfare Testing

<table>
<tr><th colspan="6">Electronic Warfare</th></tr>
<tr><th colspan="6">ISR/EW Testing</th></tr>
<tr><td>Short Description</td><td colspan="3">Aircrews use all available sensors to collect data on threat vessels.</td><td>Typical Duration</td><td>2–20 flight hours per event</td></tr>
<tr><td>Long Description</td><td colspan="5">An air warfare intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) test involves evaluating communications capabilities of aircraft, including unmanned aerial systems that can carry cameras, sensors, communications equipment, or other payloads. New systems are tested at sea to ensure proper communications between aircraft and ships.
ISR aircraft systems act as eyes in the sky, relaying raw imagery back to military personnel on the ground or to ships at sea. The data is processed, analyzed, and shared with U.S. Navy or other U.S. military aircraft or vessels. New ISR technology systems provide combat identification (friend or foe) and are used for aircraft and ship-based communications.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Typical Components</td><td colspan="5">Platforms: Unmanned aerial system – fixed-wing
Targets: None
Systems being Trained/Tested: ISR systems</td></tr>
<tr><td>Standard Operating Procedures (Section 2.3.3)</td><td colspan="2">Unmanned aerial and underwater vehicle procedures</td><td colspan="3">Typical Locations
Range Complexes/Testing Ranges:
Mariana Islands Range Complex; Guam; Tinian; Rota; Saipan
Inland Waters/Pierside:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Biological Resources</td><td colspan="2">Acoustic:
None
Explosive:
None</td><td colspan="2">Physical Disturbance and Strike:
Aircraft and aerial targets
Ingestion:
None</td><td>Energy:
In-air electromagnetic devices
Entanglement:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Physical Resources</td><td colspan="2">Air Quality:
Criteria air pollutants</td><td colspan="3">Sediments and Water Quality:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Human Resources</td><td colspan="2">Cultural Resources:
None</td><td colspan="2">Socioeconomic Resources:
Airborne acoustics</td><td>Public Health and Safety:
Physical interactions</td></tr>
<tr><td>Military Expended Material</td><td colspan="2">Ingestible Material:
None
Non-Ingestible Material:
None</td><td>Military Recoverable Material</td><td colspan="2">None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Sonar and Other Transducer Bins</td><td colspan="5">None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Explosive Bins</td><td colspan="5">None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Procedural Mitigation Measures</td><td colspan="5">None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Assumptions Used for Analysis</td><td colspan="5">None</td></tr>
</table>

A.2.1.3 Surface Warfare

Surface warfare is a type of naval warfare in which aircraft, surface ships, and submarines employ weapons, sensors, and operations directed against enemy surface vessels. Naval Air Systems Command surface warfare tests include air-to-surface missile, gunnery, and bombing tests, rocket tests, laser targeting tests, and high-energy laser weapons tests.

A sinking exercise is a specialized Fleet training event that provides an opportunity for Naval Air Systems Command aircrew along with ship and submarine crews to deliver explosive ordnance on a deactivated vessel that has been cleaned and environmentally remediated. The vessel is deliberately sunk using multiple weapons systems. A Naval Air Systems Command testing event may take place in conjunction with a sinking exercise to test aircraft or aircraft systems in the delivery of explosive ordnance on a surface target.

A.2.1.3.1 Air-to-Surface Missile Test

<table>
<tr><th colspan="5">Surface Warfare</th></tr>
<tr><th colspan="5">Air-to-Surface Missile Test</th></tr>
<tr><td>Short Description</td><td colspan="2">This event is similar to the training event missile exercise air-to-surface. Test may involve both fixed-wing and rotary-wing aircraft launching missiles at surface maritime targets to evaluate the weapons system or as part of another systems integration test.</td><td colspan="2">Typical Duration
2–4 flight hours per event</td></tr>
<tr><td>Long Description</td><td colspan="4">Similar to a missile exercise air-to-surface, an air-to-surface missile test may involve both fixed-wing and rotary-wing aircraft launching missiles at surface maritime targets to evaluate the weapons system or as part of another systems integration test. Air-to-surface missile tests can include high explosive, non-explosive, or non-firing (captive air training missile) weapons. Laser targeting systems may also be used. Both stationary and mobile targets would be utilized during testing</td></tr>
<tr><td>Typical Components</td><td colspan="4">Platforms: Fixed-wing aircraft
Targets: Surface targets
Systems being Trained/Tested: Missile firing/launching systems</td></tr>
<tr><td>Standard Operating Procedures (Section 2.3.3)</td><td>Aircraft safety
High-energy laser safety
Weapons firing safety
Target deployment and retrieval safety</td><td colspan="3">Typical Locations
Range Complexes/Testing Ranges:
Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area, Primary areas: Special Use Airspace
Inland Waters/Pierside:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Biological Resources</td><td colspan="4">Acoustic:
Aircraft noise
Weapons noise
Explosive:
In-air explosions
In-water explosions
Physical Disturbance and Strike:
Aircraft and aerial targets
Military expended materials
Ingestion:
Military expended materials – munitions
Military expended materials – Other than munitions
Energy:
In-air electromagnetic devices
Entanglement:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Physical Resources</td><td colspan="4">Air Quality:
Criteria air pollutants
Sediments and Water Quality:
Explosives
Metals
Chemicals
Other materials</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Human Resources</td><td colspan="4">Cultural Resources:
Explosives
Physical disturbance and strike
Socioeconomic Resources:
Accessibility
Airborne acoustics
Physical disturbance and strike
Public Health and Safety:
Physical interactions</td></tr>
<tr><td>Military Expended Material</td><td colspan="2">Ingestible Material:
Missile (explosive) fragments, target fragments
Non-Ingestible Material:
Non-explosive missiles</td><td>Military Recoverable Material</td><td>Surface target (mobile and stationary)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Sonar and Other Transducer Bins</td><td colspan="4">None</td></tr>
</table>

Surface Warfare		
Air-to-Surface Missile Test		
Explosive Bins	E10	
Procedural Mitigation Measures	**Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors:** *(Section 5.3.4)* Non-explosive missiles and rockets	**Explosive Stressors:** *(Section 5.3.3)* Explosive missiles and rockets
Assumptions Used for Analysis	This activity would typically occur greater than 50 NM from shore.	

A.2.2 NAVAL SEA SYSTEMS COMMAND TESTING ACTIVITIES

A.2.2.1 Anti-Submarine Warfare

A.2.2.1.1 Anti-Submarine Warfare Mission Package Testing

Anti-Submarine Warfare				
Anti-Submarine Warfare Mission Package Testing				
Short Description	Ships and their supporting platforms (e.g., helicopters and unmanned aerial systems) detect, localize, and prosecute submarines.	**Typical Duration**	1–2 weeks, with 4–8 hours of active sonar use with intervals of non-activity in between.	
Long Description	Littoral combat ships conduct detect-to-engage operations against modern diesel-electric and nuclear submarines using airborne and surface assets (both manned and unmanned). Active and passive acoustic systems are used to detect and track submarine targets, culminating in the deployment of lightweight torpedoes to engage the threat.			
Typical Components	**Platforms:** Rotary-wing aircraft, surface combatant **Targets:** Sub-surface targets **Systems being Trained/Tested:** Sonar systems, countermeasure systems, torpedo systems, sonobuoys			
Standard Operating Procedures *(Section 2.3.3)*	Vessel safety Aircraft safety Towed in-water device safety Target deployment and retrieval safety	**Typical Locations**	**Range Complexes/Testing Ranges:** Mariana Islands Range Complex	**Inland Waters/Pierside:** None
Stressors to Biological Resources	**Acoustic:** Sonar and other transducers Aircraft noise Vessel noise **Explosive:** None	**Physical Disturbance and Strike:** Aircraft and aerial targets Vessels and in-water devices Military expended materials **Ingestion:** Military expended materials – other than munitions	**Energy:** In-air electromagnetic devices **Entanglement:** Decelerators/parachutes Wires and cables	
Stressors to Physical Resources	**Air Quality:** Criteria air pollutants	**Sediments and Water Quality:** Metals Chemicals Other materials		
Stressors to Human Resources	**Cultural Resources:** Physical disturbance and strike	**Socioeconomic Resources:** Accessibility Airborne acoustics Physical disturbance and strike	**Public Health and Safety:** In-water energy In-air energy Physical interactions	
Military Expended Material	**Ingestible Material:** Decelerators/parachutes - small **Non-Ingestible Material:** Acoustic countermeasures, expended bathythermograph, expended bathythermograph wire, lightweight torpedo accessories, sonobuoy (non-explosive), sonobuoy wires	**Military Recoverable Material**	Sub-surface target (mobile) – recovered, lightweight torpedo (non-explosive)	
Sonar and Other Transducer Bins	**Anti-Submarine Warfare:** ASW1 ASW2 ASW3 ASW5	**Mid-Frequency:** MF4 MF5 MF12	**Torpedoes:** TORP1	

Anti-Submarine Warfare		
Anti-Submarine Warfare Mission Package Testing		
Explosive Bins	None	
Procedural Mitigation Measures	**Acoustic Stressors:** *(Section 5.3.2)* Active sonar	**Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors:** *(Section 5.3.4)* Vessel movement Towed in-water devices
Assumptions Used for Analysis	All sonobuoys have parachutes unless otherwise noted. Sub-surface targets are submarines.	

A.2.2.1.2 At-Sea Sonar Testing

<table>
<tr><th colspan="6">Anti-Submarine Warfare</th></tr>
<tr><th colspan="6">At-Sea Sonar Testing</th></tr>
<tr><td>Short Description</td><td colspan="3">At-sea testing to ensure systems are fully functional in an open ocean environment.</td><td>Typical Duration</td><td>From 4 hours to 11 days</td></tr>
<tr><td>Long Description</td><td colspan="5">At-sea sonar testing is required to calibrate or document the functionality of sonar and torpedo systems while the ship or submarine is in an open ocean environment. At-sea sonar testing is conducted to verify the ship meets design acoustic specifications, define the underwater characteristics of the ship, determine effects of systems and equipment on ship’s acoustic characteristics, and provide technical background necessary to initiate development of design improvements to reduce noise. Tests also consist of electronic support measurement, photonics, and sonar sensor accuracy testing. In some instances, a submarine's passive detection capability is tested when a second submarine utilizes its active sonar or is equipped with a noise augmentation system in order to replicate acoustic or electromagnetic signatures of other vessel types or classes.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Typical Components</td><td colspan="5">Platforms: Fixed platform, submarines
Targets: None
Systems being Trained/Tested: High and mid-frequency sonar, acoustic modems</td></tr>
<tr><td>Standard Operating Procedures (Section 2.3.3)</td><td colspan="2">Vessel safety</td><td colspan="3">Typical Locations
Range Complexes/Testing Ranges:
Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area
Inland Waters/Pierside:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Biological Resources</td><td colspan="2">Acoustic:
Sonar and other transducers
Explosive:
None</td><td colspan="2">Physical Disturbance and Strike:
Military expended materials
Ingestion:
None</td><td>Energy:
In-water electromagnetic devices
In-air electromagnetic devices
Entanglement:
Wires and cables</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Physical Resources</td><td colspan="2">Air Quality:
Criteria air pollutants</td><td colspan="3">Sediments and Water Quality:
Metals
Other materials</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Human Resources</td><td>Cultural Resources:
None</td><td>Socioeconomic Resources:
Accessibility
Airborne acoustics
Physical disturbance and strike</td><td colspan="3">Public Health and Safety:
In-water energy
In-air energy
Physical interactions</td></tr>
<tr><td>Military Expended Material</td><td colspan="2">Ingestible Material:
None
Non-Ingestible Material:
Expended bathythermograph, expended bathythermograph wire</td><td>Military Recoverable Material</td><td colspan="2">None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Sonar and Other Transducer Bins</td><td colspan="2">High-Frequency:
HF1 HF6</td><td colspan="2">Acoustic Modems:
M3</td><td>Mid-Frequency:
MF3 MF9</td></tr>
<tr><td>Explosive Bins</td><td colspan="5">None</td></tr>
</table>

Anti-Submarine Warfare		
At-Sea Sonar Testing		
Procedural Mitigation Measures	**Acoustic Stressors:** *(Section 5.3.2)* Active sonar	**Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors:** *(Section 5.3.4)* Vessel movement
Assumptions Used for Analysis	Active sonar is intermittent throughout the duration of this event.	

A.2.2.1.3 Torpedo (Explosive) Testing

<table>
<tr><th colspan="6">Anti-Submarine Warfare</th></tr>
<tr><th colspan="6">Torpedo (Explosive) Testing</th></tr>
<tr><td>Short Description</td><td colspan="3">Air, surface, or submarine crews employ explosive and non-explosive torpedoes against artificial targets.</td><td>Typical Duration</td><td>1–2 days during daylight hours</td></tr>
<tr><td>Long Description</td><td colspan="5">Non-explosive and explosive torpedoes (carrying a warhead) will be launched at a suspended target by a submarine and fixed- or rotary-wing aircraft or surface combatants. Event duration is one to two days during daylight hours.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Typical Components</td><td colspan="5">Platforms: Fixed-wing aircraft, rotary-wing aircraft, moored platform, submarines, support craft, surface combatant
Targets: Sub-surface targets; surface targets
Systems being Trained/Tested: Sonar systems, acoustic countermeasures, sonobuoys, torpedo systems</td></tr>
<tr><td>Standard Operating Procedures (Section 2.3.3)</td><td colspan="2">Vessel safety
Aircraft safety
Weapons firing safety
Target deployment and retrieval safety</td><td colspan="3">Typical Locations
Range Complexes/Testing Ranges:
Mariana Islands Range Complex
Inland Waters/Pierside:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Biological Resources</td><td colspan="2">Acoustic:
Sonar and other transducers
Aircraft noise
Vessel noise
Explosive:
In-water explosions</td><td colspan="2">Physical Disturbance and Strike:
Aircraft and aerial targets
Vessels and in-water devices
Military expended materials
Ingestion:
Military expended materials – munitions
Military expended materials – other than munitions</td><td>Energy:
In-air electromagnetic devices
Entanglement:
Decelerators/parachutes
Wires and cables</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Physical Resources</td><td colspan="2">Air Quality:
Criteria air pollutants</td><td colspan="3">Sediments and Water Quality:
Explosives
Metals
Chemicals
Other materials</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Human Resources</td><td colspan="2">Cultural Resources:
Explosives
Physical disturbance and strike</td><td colspan="2">Socioeconomic Resources:
Accessibility
Airborne acoustics
Physical disturbance and strike</td><td>Public Health and Safety:
In-air energy
In-water energy
Physical interactions</td></tr>
<tr><td>Military Expended Material</td><td colspan="2">Ingestible Material:
Lightweight torpedo (explosive) fragments, heavyweight torpedo (explosive) fragments, decelerators/parachutes - small, target fragments
Non-Ingestible Material:
Buoy (non-explosive), expended bathythermograph, expended bathythermograph wire, guidance wire, heavyweight torpedo accessories, lightweight torpedo accessories, sonobuoy (non-explosive), sonobuoy wires</td><td>Military Recoverable Material</td><td colspan="2">Heavyweight (non-explosive) torpedo, lightweight torpedo (non-explosive), sub-surface target (stationary), surface target (stationary)</td></tr>
</table>

Anti-Submarine Warfare			
Torpedo (Explosive) Testing			
Sonar and Other Transducer Bins	**Anti-Submarine Warfare:** ASW3 **Torpedoes:** TORP1 TORP2	**High-Frequency:** HF1 HF6	**Mid-Frequency:** MF1 MF3 MF4 MF5 MF6
Explosive Bins	E8 E11		
Procedural Mitigation Measures	**Acoustic Stressors:** *(Section 5.3.2)* Active sonar **Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors:** *(Section 5.3.4)* Vessel movement	**Explosive Stressors:** *(Section 5.3.3)* Explosive torpedoes	
Assumptions Used for Analysis	Only one heavyweight torpedo test could occur on a single day; two heavyweight torpedo tests could occur on consecutive days. Two lightweight torpedo tests could occur in a single day. All non-explosive torpedoes are recovered.		

A.2.2.1.4 Torpedo (Non-Explosive) Testing

<table>
<tr><th colspan="6">Anti-Submarine Warfare</th></tr>
<tr><th colspan="6">Torpedo (Non- Explosive) Testing</th></tr>
<tr><td>Short Description</td><td colspan="3">Air, surface, or submarine crews employ non-explosive torpedoes against submarines or surface vessels.</td><td>Typical Duration</td><td>Up to 2 weeks</td></tr>
<tr><td>Long Description</td><td colspan="5">Aerial, surface, and subsurface assets fire exercise torpedoes against surface or subsurface targets or at no target and programmed with a particular run geometry. Torpedo testing evaluates the performance and the effectiveness of hardware and software upgrades of heavyweight or lightweight torpedoes. It also includes testing of experimental torpedoes. Not all torpedo tests involve acoustics. Exercise torpedoes are recovered, typically from surface ships and helicopters that are specifically crewed and outfitted for torpedo recovery. Event duration is dependent on number of torpedoes fired.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Typical Components</td><td colspan="5">Platforms: Fixed-wing aircraft, rotary-wing aircraft, moored platform, submarines, support craft, surface combatant
Targets: Sub-surface targets; surface targets
Systems being Trained/Tested: Sonar systems, acoustic countermeasures, sonobuoys, torpedo systems</td></tr>
<tr><td>Standard Operating Procedures (Section 2.3.3)</td><td colspan="2">Vessel safety
Aircraft safety
Weapons firing safety
Target deployment and retrieval safety</td><td colspan="3">Typical Locations
Range Complexes/Testing Ranges:
Mariana Islands Range Complex
Inland Waters/Pierside:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Biological Resources</td><td colspan="2">Acoustic:
Sonar and other transducers
Aircraft noise
Vessel noise
Explosive:
None</td><td colspan="2">Physical Disturbance and Strike:
Aircraft and aerial targets
Vessels and in-water devices
Military expended materials
Ingestion:
Military expended materials – other than munitions</td><td>Energy:
In-air electromagnetic devices
Entanglement:
Decelerators/parachutes
Wires and cables</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Physical Resources</td><td colspan="2">Air Quality:
Criteria air pollutants</td><td colspan="3">Sediments and Water Quality:
Chemicals
Metals
Other materials</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Human Resources</td><td colspan="2">Cultural Resources:
Physical disturbance and strike</td><td colspan="2">Socioeconomic Resources:
Accessibility
Airborne acoustics
Physical disturbance and strike</td><td>Public Health and Safety:
In-water energy
In-air energy
Physical interactions</td></tr>
<tr><td>Military Expended Material</td><td colspan="2">Ingestible Material:
Decelerators/parachutes - small
Non-Ingestible Material:
Acoustic countermeasures, buoy (non-explosive), expended bathythermograph, expended bathythermograph wire, guidance wire, heavyweight torpedo accessories, lightweight torpedo accessories, anti-torpedo torpedo, anti-torpedo torpedo accessories, sonobuoy (non-explosive), sonobuoy wires</td><td>Military Recoverable Material</td><td colspan="2">Heavyweight (non-explosive) torpedo, lightweight torpedo (non-explosive), sub-surface target (mobile), sub-surface target (stationary)</td></tr>
</table>

Anti-Submarine Warfare					
Torpedo (Non- Explosive) Testing					
Sonar and Other Transducer Bins	**Anti-Submarine Warfare:**		**High-Frequency:**		**Low-Frequency:**
	ASW3	ASW4	HF1	HF6	LF4
	Mid-Frequency:		**Torpedoes:**		
	MF1	MF3	TORP1	TORP2	
	MF4	MF5	TORP3		
	MF6				
Explosive Bins	None				
Procedural Mitigation Measures	**Acoustic Stressors:** *(Section 5.3.2)*		**Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors:** *(Section 5.3.4)*		
	Active sonar		Vessel movement		
Assumptions Used for Analysis	All torpedoes are recovered. Events can last up to two weeks and use up to 40 torpedoes. Typically, no more than eight torpedoes are fired per day during daylight hours.				

A.2.2.2 Electronic Warfare

A.2.2.2.1 Radar and Other System Testing

<table>
<tr><th colspan="6">Electronic Warfare</th></tr>
<tr><th colspan="6">Radar and Other System Testing</th></tr>
<tr><td>Short Description</td><td colspan="3">Test may include radiation of military or commercial radar, communication systems (or simulators), or high-energy lasers. Testing may occur aboard a ship against drones, small boats, rockets, missiles, or other targets.</td><td>Typical Duration</td><td>12 hours per day over a 7-day period</td></tr>
<tr><td>Long Description</td><td colspan="5">At-sea and docked testing may use radiation of military or commercial radar, communication systems (or simulators), or high-energy lasers. No subsurface transmission will occur during this testing. Testing of various air and surface targets may include unmanned aerial systems, or small craft (floating cardboard triwalls, towed, anchored, or self-propelled vessels). High-energy laser testing may include tracking, scoring, and neutralization runs with single or multiple targets.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Typical Components</td><td colspan="5">Platforms: Surface combatant
Targets: Air targets; surface targets
Systems being Trained/Tested: Radar, high-energy lasers</td></tr>
<tr><td>Standard Operating Procedures (Section 2.3.3)</td><td colspan="2">Vessel safety
Laser Procedures
Unmanned aerial and underwater vehicle procedures
High-energy laser safety
Target deployment and retrieval safety</td><td colspan="3">Typical Locations
Range Complexes/Testing Ranges:
Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area
Inland Waters/Pierside:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Biological Resources</td><td>Acoustic:
Vessel noise
Aircraft noise
Explosive:
None</td><td colspan="2">Physical Disturbance and Strike:
Aircraft and aerial targets
Vessels and in-water devices
Military expended materials
Ingestion:
None</td><td colspan="2">Energy:
In-air electromagnetic devices
In-water electromagnetic devices
High-energy lasers
Entanglement:
Decelerators/parachutes</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Physical Resources</td><td colspan="2">Air Quality:
Criteria air pollutants</td><td colspan="3">Sediments and Water Quality:
Other materials</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Human Resources</td><td>Cultural Resources:
Physical disturbance and strike</td><td colspan="2">Socioeconomic Resources:
Accessibility
Airborne acoustics
Physical disturbance and strike</td><td colspan="2">Public Health and Safety:
In-air energy
Physical interactions</td></tr>
<tr><td>Military Expended Material</td><td colspan="2">Ingestible Material:
None
Non-Ingestible Material:
Decelerators/parachutes – large, air target (drone)</td><td>Military Recoverable Material</td><td colspan="2">Surface target (mobile and stationary), air targets</td></tr>
</table>

Electronic Warfare	
Radar and Other System Testing	
Sonar and Other Transducer Bins	None
Explosive Bins	None
Procedural Mitigation Measures	**Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors:** *(Section 5.3.4)* Vessel movement
Assumptions Used for Analysis	High-energy lasers will not be tested pierside. Any sources used during this activity would be *de minimis* and not quantitatively analyzed and therefore are not included under munitions.

A.2.2.3 Mine Warfare

A.2.2.3.1 Mine Countermeasure and Neutralization Testing

<table>
<tr><th colspan="5">Mine Warfare</th></tr>
<tr><th colspan="5">Mine Countermeasure and Neutralization Testing</th></tr>
<tr><td>Short Description</td><td colspan="2">Air, surface, and subsurface vessels neutralize threat mines and mine-like objects.</td><td colspan="2">Typical Duration
1–10 days, with intermittent use of countermeasure/neutralization systems during this period</td></tr>
<tr><td>Long Description</td><td colspan="4">Mine countermeasure-neutralization and mine system testing is required to ensure systems can effectively neutralize threat (live or inert) mines that will otherwise restrict passage through an area and to ensure U.S. Navy mines remain effective against enemy ships. These systems may be deployed with a variety of ships, aircraft, submarines, or unmanned autonomous vehicles and operate in water depths up to 6,000 feet. Mines are neutralized by cutting mooring cables of buoyant mines, producing acoustic energy that fires acoustic-influence mines, employing radar or laser fields, producing electrical energy to replicate the magnetic signatures of surface ships in order to detonate threat mines, detonation of mines using remotely-operated vehicles, and using explosive charges to destroy threat mines.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Typical Components</td><td colspan="4">Platforms: Amphibious warfare ship, mine warfare ship, unmanned aerial system – rotary-wing, rotary-wing aircraft, surface combatant, unmanned underwater vehicle
Targets: Mine shapes
Systems being Trained/Tested: Electromagnetic devices, high-frequency sonar, radar, low energy lasers</td></tr>
<tr><td>Standard Operating Procedures (Section 2.3.3)</td><td colspan="2">Vessel safety
Aircraft safety
Unmanned aerial and underwater vehicle procedures
Towed in-water device safety
Laser Procedures
Target deployment and retrieval safety</td><td colspan="2">Typical Locations
Range Complexes/Testing Ranges:
Mariana Islands Range Complex, nearshore, and littorals
Inland Waters/Pierside:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Biological Resources</td><td>Acoustic:
Sonar and other transducers
Aircraft noise
Vessel noise

Explosive:
In-water explosions</td><td>Physical Disturbance and Strike:
Aircraft and aerial targets
Vessels and in-water devices
Military expended materials
Seafloor devices

Ingestion:
Military expended materials – munitions</td><td colspan="2">Energy:
In-water electromagnetic devices
In-air electromagnetic devices

Entanglement:
Wires and cables</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Physical Resources</td><td>Air Quality:
Criteria air pollutants</td><td colspan="3">Sediments and Water Quality:
Explosives
Metals
Chemicals
Other materials</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Human Resources</td><td>Cultural Resources:
Explosives</td><td>Socioeconomic Resources:
Accessibility
Airborne acoustics
Physical disturbance and strike</td><td colspan="2">Public Health and Safety:
In-water energy
In-air energy
Physical interactions</td></tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr><th colspan="4">Mine Warfare</th></tr>
<tr><th colspan="4">Mine Countermeasure and Neutralization Testing</th></tr>
<tr><td>Military Expended Material</td><td colspan="2">Ingestible Material:
Neutralizer (explosive) fragments

Non-Ingestible Material:
Fiber optic cable, fiber optic can, mine shape (non-explosive)</td><td>Military Recoverable Material</td><td>Anchor - mine</td></tr>
<tr><td>Sonar and Other Transducer Bins</td><td colspan="4">High-Frequency:
HF4</td></tr>
<tr><td>Explosive Bins</td><td colspan="4">E4</td></tr>
<tr><td>Procedural Mitigation Measures</td><td colspan="2">Acoustic Stressors: (Section 5.3.2)
Active sonar

Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors:
(Section 5.3.4)
Vessel movement
Towed in-water devices</td><td colspan="2">Explosive Stressors: (Section 5.3.3)
Explosive mine countermeasure and neutralization activities</td></tr>
<tr><td>Assumptions Used for Analysis</td><td colspan="4">Agat Bay underwater detonation site, 20 lb. net explosive weight (NEW) maximum charge. Piti and Outer Apra Harbor underwater detonation sites, 10 lb. NEW maximum.</td></tr>
</table>

A.2.2.4 Surface Warfare Testing

A.2.2.4.1 Kinetic Energy Weapon Testing

<table>
<tr><th colspan="6">Surface Warfare</th></tr>
<tr><th colspan="6">Kinetic Energy Weapon Testing</th></tr>
<tr><td>Short Description</td><td colspan="3">A kinetic energy weapon uses stored energy released in a burst to accelerate a projectile.</td><td>Typical Duration
1 day</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Long Description</td><td colspan="5">A kinetic energy weapon uses stored energy released in a burst to accelerate a projectile to more than seven times the speed of sound to a range of up to 200 miles.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Typical Components</td><td colspan="5">Platforms: Surface combatant
Targets: Air targets, surface targets
Systems being Trained/Tested: Kinetic energy weapon</td></tr>
<tr><td>Standard Operating Procedures (Section 2.3.3)</td><td colspan="2">Vessel safety
Weapons firing safety</td><td colspan="3">Typical Locations
Range Complexes/Testing Ranges:
Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area, Primary areas: Special Use Airspace
Inland Waters/Pierside:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Biological Resources</td><td colspan="2">Acoustic:
Vessel noise
Weapons noise
Explosive:
In-air explosions</td><td colspan="2">Physical Disturbance and Strike:
Aircraft and aerial targets
Vessels and in-water devices
Military expended materials
Ingestion:
Military expended materials – munitions
Military expended materials – other than munitions</td><td>Energy:
In-air electromagnetic devices
Entanglement:
Decelerators/parachutes</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Physical Resources</td><td colspan="2">Air Quality:
Criteria air pollutants</td><td colspan="3">Sediments and Water Quality:
Metals</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Human Resources</td><td>Cultural Resources:
Physical disturbance and strike</td><td colspan="2">Socioeconomic Resources:
Accessibility
Airborne acoustics
Physical disturbance and strike</td><td colspan="2">Public Health and Safety:
In-air energy
Physical interactions</td></tr>
<tr><td>Military Expended Material</td><td colspan="2">Ingestible Material:
Large-caliber (explosive) fragments, target fragments
Non-Ingestible Material:
Air target (drone), decelerator/parachute – large, kinetic energy round, large-caliber projectile (non-explosive), large-caliber casings, sabot - kinetic energy round, surface target (stationary)</td><td>Military Recoverable Material</td><td colspan="2">None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Sonar and Other Transducer Bins</td><td colspan="5">None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Explosive Bins</td><td colspan="5">None</td></tr>
</table>

Surface Warfare	
Kinetic Energy Weapon Testing	
Procedural Mitigation Measures	**Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors:** *(Section 5.3.4)* Vessel movement
Assumptions Used for Analysis	Assume one target per event. Explosive rounds are designed to detonate above the surface target.

A.2.2.5 Vessel Evaluation

A.2.2.5.1 Undersea Warfare Testing

<table>
<tr><th colspan="6">Vessel Evaluation</th></tr>
<tr><th colspan="6">Undersea Warfare Testing</th></tr>
<tr><td>Short Description</td><td colspan="3">Ships demonstrate capability of countermeasure systems and underwater surveillance, weapons engagement and communications systems. This tests ships ability to detect, track, and engage undersea targets.</td><td>Typical Duration</td><td>Up to 10 days</td></tr>
<tr><td>Long Description</td><td colspan="5">Undersea warfare events may be comprised of tracking and firing events or tests of hull-mounted sonar system capabilities to detect and avoid torpedo type targets. Tracking and firing events ensure the operability of the undersea warfare suite and its interface with the rotary-wing helicopter. Tests include demonstrating the ability of the ship to search, detect, and track a target; and conduct attacks with exercise torpedoes. Detection and avoidance events may use surface craft and underwater platforms to test the capability of mid- and high-frequency acoustic sources. Subsurface moving targets, rocket and air-dropped weapons, sonobuoys, towed arrays and sub-surface torpedo-like devices may be used. Approximately one week of in-port training may precede the event.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Typical Components</td><td colspan="5">Platforms: Rotary-wing aircraft, surface combatant
Targets: Sub-surface targets
Systems being Trained/Tested: Acoustic countermeasures, sonar systems, sonobuoys, torpedo sonar</td></tr>
<tr><td>Standard Operating Procedures (Section 2.3.3)</td><td colspan="2">Vessel safety
Aircraft safety
Target deployment and retrieval safety</td><td colspan="3">Typical Locations
Range Complexes/Testing Ranges:
Mariana Islands Range Complex
Inland Waters/Pierside:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Biological Resources</td><td colspan="2">Acoustic:
Sonar and other transducers
Aircraft noise
Vessel noise
Explosive:
None</td><td colspan="2">Physical Disturbance and Strike:
Aircraft and aerial targets
Vessels and in-water devices
Military expended materials
Ingestion:
Military expended materials – other than munitions</td><td>Energy:
In-air electromagnetic devices
Entanglement:
Decelerators/parachutes
Wires and cables</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Physical Resources</td><td colspan="2">Air Quality:
Criteria air pollutants</td><td colspan="3">Sediments and Water Quality:
Metals Other materials</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Human Resources</td><td colspan="2">Cultural Resources:
Physical disturbance and strike</td><td colspan="2">Socioeconomic Resources:
Accessibility
Airborne acoustics
Physical disturbance and strike</td><td>Public Health and Safety:
In-water energy
In-air energy
Physical interactions</td></tr>
<tr><td>Military Expended Material</td><td colspan="2">Ingestible Material:
Decelerators/parachutes - small
Non-Ingestible Material:
Expended bathythermograph, expended bathythermograph wire, lightweight torpedo accessories, sonobuoy (non-explosive), sonobuoy wires</td><td>Military Recoverable Material</td><td colspan="2">Lightweight torpedo (non-explosive), sub-surface target (mobile)</td></tr>
</table>

Vessel Evaluation				
Undersea Warfare Testing				
Sonar and Other Transducer Bins	**High-Frequency:** HF4	**Mid-Frequency:** MF1 MF4 MF5		**Torpedoes:** TORP1
Explosive Bins	None			
Procedural Mitigation Measures	**Acoustic Stressors:** *(Section 5.3.2)* Active sonar		**Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors:** *(Section 5.3.4)* Vessel movement	
Assumptions Used for Analysis	Five targets per event. Sonobuoys from surface ships do not have an associated parachute. Ships will not be conducting test constantly during the entire duration.			

A.2.2.6 Other Testing

A.2.2.6.1 Simulant Testing

<table>
<tr><th colspan="6">Other Testing Activities</th></tr>
<tr><th colspan="6">Simulant Testing</th></tr>
<tr><td>Short Description</td><td colspan="3">The capability of surface ship defense systems to detect and protect against chemical and biological attacks are tested.</td><td>Typical Duration</td><td>3 days</td></tr>
<tr><td>Long Description</td><td colspan="5">The capabilities of surface ship defense systems to detect and protect in the event of chemical and biological attacks are tested. Testing involves the deployment of harmless compounds (i.e., simulants) as substitutes for chemical and biological warfare agents. Methods of simulant delivery include aerial dispersal and hand-held spray.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Typical Components</td><td colspan="5">Platforms: Fixed-wing aircraft, rotary-wing aircraft, surface combatant
Targets: None
Systems being Trained/Tested: None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Standard Operating Procedures (Section 2.3.3)</td><td colspan="2">Vessel safety
Aircraft safety</td><td colspan="3">Typical Locations
Range Complexes/Testing Ranges:
Marianas Islands Training and Testing Study Area
Inland Waters/Pierside:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Biological Resources</td><td colspan="2">Acoustic:
Aircraft noise
Vessel noise

Explosive:
None</td><td colspan="2">Physical Disturbance and Strike:
Aircraft and aerial targets
Vessels and in-water devices

Ingestion:
None</td><td>Energy:
In-air electromagnetic devices

Entanglement:
None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Physical Resources</td><td colspan="2">Air Quality:
Criteria air pollutants</td><td colspan="3">Sediments and Water Quality:
Chemicals
Other materials</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stressors to Human Resources</td><td colspan="2">Cultural Resources:
None</td><td colspan="2">Socioeconomic Resources:
Accessibility
Airborne acoustics
Physical disturbance and strike</td><td>Public Health and Safety:
Physical interactions</td></tr>
<tr><td>Military Expended Material</td><td colspan="2">Ingestible Material:
None

Non-Ingestible Material:
None</td><td>Military Recoverable Material</td><td colspan="2">None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Sonar and Other Transducer Bins</td><td colspan="5">None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Explosive Bins</td><td colspan="5">None</td></tr>
<tr><td>Procedural Mitigation Measures</td><td colspan="5">Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors: (Section 5.3.4)
Vessel movement</td></tr>
</table>

Other Testing Activities	
Simulant Testing	
Assumptions Used for Analysis	All chemical simulants have low toxicity to humans and the environment. Examples of chemical simulants include glacial acetic acid and triethyl phosphate. All biological simulants are considered to be Biosafety Level 1 organisms. Examples of biological simulants are spore-forming bacteria, non-spore-forming bacteria, the protein ovalbumin, MS2 bacteriophages, and the fungus *Aspergillus niger*.

A.2.3 Office of Naval Research Testing Activities

A.2.3.1 Acoustic and Oceanographic Research

Acoustic and Oceanographic Science and Technology				
Acoustic and Oceanographic Research				
Short Description	Research of oceanographic processes using active transmissions, typically high-frequency (38 kHz and above) oceanographic measurement devices, deployed from ships, unmanned underwater vehicles and on moored platform	**Typical Duration**	1–2 weeks	
Long Description	ONR performs research on oceanographic processes in U.S. territorial waters and international waters using passive measurement devices and active acoustic systems such as acoustic Doppler current profilers and echosounders. Measurement systems may be deployed by ship, unmanned underwater vehicle, or on standard oceanographic moorings. Moorings may be left in place for more than 1 year.			
Typical Components	**Platforms:** Research vessels, unmanned vehicles, oceanographic moorings **Targets:** None **Systems being Trained/Tested:** None			
Standard Operating Procedures *(Section 2.3.3)*	Vessel safety Unmanned aerial and underwater vehicle procedures	**Typical Locations**		
		Range Complexes/Testing Ranges: Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area	**Inland Waters/Pierside:** None	
Stressors to Biological Resources	**Acoustic:** Vessel noise **Explosive:** None	**Physical Disturbance and Strike:** Vessel and in-water devices Seafloor devices **Ingestion:** None	**Energy:** None **Entanglement:** None	
Stressors to Physical Resources	**Air Quality:** Criteria air pollutants	**Sediments and Water Quality:** None		
Stressors to Human Resources	**Cultural Resources:** None	**Socioeconomic Resources:** Accessibility Airborne acoustics Physical disturbance and strike	**Public Health and Safety:** In-water energy In-air energy Physical interactions	
Military Expended Material	**Ingestible Material:** None **Non-Ingestible Material:** None	**Military Recoverable Material**	None	
Sonar and Other Transducer Bins	None			
Explosive Bins	None			
Procedural Mitigation Measures	**Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors:** *(Section 5.3.4)* Vessel movement			

Acoustic and Oceanographic Science and Technology	
Acoustic and Oceanographic Research	
Assumptions Used for Analysis	Approximately 12 non-recoverable bottom moorings may be used. Any sonar transducers used would be *de minimis*.

This page intentionally left blank.

Appendix B: Federal Register Notices

Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/

Overseas Environmental Impact Statement

Mariana Islands Training and Testing

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPENDIX B FEDERAL REGISTER NOTICES..... B-1

List of Figures

There are no figures in this appendix.

List of Tables

There are no tables in this appendix.

This page intentionally left blank.

APPENDIX B FEDERAL REGISTER NOTICES

Appendix B contains the following Federal Register Notices:

1. Notice of Intent To Prepare a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement for Mariana Islands Training and Testing
2. Notice of Public Meetings for the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement for Mariana Islands Training and Testing
3. Notice of Availability for the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement for Mariana Islands Training and Testing
4. Notice of Rescheduled Public Meetings and Extension of Public Comment Period for the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement for Mariana Islands Training and Testing
5. Notice of Extension of Public Comment Period for the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement for Mariana Islands Training and Testing
6. Proposed Rule for Takes of Marine Mammals Incidental to U.S. Navy Training and Testing Activities in the Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area [85 FR 5782]

SIDCO/SUBPART C DCO REGULATIONS—RECORDKEEPING COLLECTION—Continued

	Estimated number of recordkeepers per year	Records to be kept annually by each	Total annual responses	Estimated average number of hours per record	Estimated total number of hours of annual burden in fiscal year
Liquidity Resource Due Diligence and Testing	7	4	28	10	280
Financial and Liquidity Resources, Excluding Due Diligence	7	4	28	10	280
Generally	7	28	196	10	1960
Totals		118	662	31	4570

[FR Doc. 2017–16019 Filed 7–31–17; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6351–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Navy

Meeting of the Board of Visitors of Marine Corps University

AGENCY: Department of the Navy, DOD.
ACTION: Notice of open meeting.

SUMMARY: The Board of Visitors of the Marine Corps University (BOV MCU) will meet to review, develop and provide recommendations on all aspects of the academic and administrative policies of the University; examine all aspects of professional military education operations; and provide such oversight and advice, as is necessary, to facilitate high educational standards and cost effective operations. The Board will be focusing primarily on the internal procedures of Marine Corps University. All sessions of the meeting will be open to the public.

DATES: The meeting will be held on Thursday, September 14, 2017, from 9:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. and Friday, September 15, 2017, from 8:00 a.m. to 2:30 p.m. Eastern Time Zone.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will be held at Marine Corps University in Quantico, Virginia. The address is: 2076 South St., Quantico, VA.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. Kim Florich, Director of Faculty Development and Outreach, Marine Corps University Board of Visitors, 2076 South Street, Quantico, Virginia 22134, telephone number 703–432–4682.

Dated: July 24, 2017.

A.M. Nichols,
Lieutenant Commander, Judge Advocate General's Corps, U.S. Navy, Federal Register Liaison Officer.

[FR Doc. 2017–16150 Filed 7–31–17; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 3810–FF–P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Navy

Notice of Intent To Prepare a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement for Mariana Islands Training and Testing

AGENCY: Department of the Navy, DOD.
ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969 and regulations implemented by the Council on Environmental Quality, the Department of the Navy (DoN) announces its intent to prepare a supplement to the 2015 Final Mariana Islands Training and Testing (MITT) Environmental Impact Statement/ Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (EIS/OEIS).

DATES: Public scoping meetings will not be held, but public comments will be accepted during the scoping period from August 1, 2017 to September 15, 2017.

ADDRESSES: The DoN invites scoping comments on the MITT Supplemental EIS/OEIS from all interested parties. Substantive comments may be provided by mail to the address below and through the project Web site at *http://mitt-eis.com/*. Comments must be postmarked or received by September 15, 2017, for consideration during the development of the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Naval Facilities Engineering Command Pacific, Attention: MITT Supplemental EIS/OEIS Project Manager, 258 Makalapa Drive, Suite 100, Pearl Harbor, HI 96860–3134.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Navy will assess the potential environmental impacts associated with ongoing and proposed military readiness activities conducted within the MITT EIS/OEIS Study Area (hereafter known as the "Study Area"). The Supplement to the 2015 Final EIS/OEIS is being prepared to support ongoing and future activities conducted at sea and on Farallon de Medinilla (FDM) within the Study Area beyond 2020. Military readiness activities include training and research, development, testing, and evaluation (hereafter known as "testing"). The Supplemental EIS/OEIS will include an analysis of training and testing activities using new information available after the release of the 2015 Final MITT EIS/ OEIS. New information includes an updated acoustic effects model, updated marine mammal density data, and other best available science. Proposed activities are generally consistent with those analyzed in the 2015 Final MITT EIS/OEIS and are representative of training and testing activities the DoN has been conducting in the Study Area for decades.

The Study Area remains unchanged since the 2015 Final MITT EIS/OEIS. The Study Area includes the existing Mariana Islands Range Complex (MIRC); areas on the high seas to the north and west of the MIRC; a transit corridor between the MIRC and the Hawaii Range Complex, starting at the International Date Line; and Apra Harbor and select DoN pierside and harbor locations. The Study Area includes only the in-water components of the range complex and FDM; land components associated with the range complex are not included in the Study Area.

As part of this process the DoN will seek the issuance of regulatory permits and authorizations under the Marine Mammal Protection Act and Endangered Species Act to support training and testing requirements within the Study Area, beyond 2020, thereby ensuring critical Department of Defense requirements are met.

Pursuant to 40 CFR 1501.6, the DoN will invite the National Marine Fisheries Service to be a cooperating agency in preparation of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.

The DoN's lead action proponent is Commander, U.S. Pacific Fleet. Additional action proponents include Naval Sea Systems Command, Naval Air Systems Command, and the Office of Naval Research.

The DoN's Proposed Action is to conduct military training and testing activities within the Study Area. Activities include the use of active sonar and explosives while employing appropriate marine species protective mitigation measures. The Proposed Action does not alter the DoN's original purpose and need as presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.

The purpose of the Proposed Action is to maintain a ready force, which is needed to ensure the military can accomplish its mission to maintain, train, and equip combat-ready naval forces capable of winning wars, deterring aggression, and maintaining freedom of the seas, consistent with Congressional direction in section 5062 of Title 10 of the U.S. Code. A Supplemental EIS/OEIS is considered the appropriate document, as there is recent scientific information including revised acoustic criteria to consider, in furtherance of NEPA, relevant to the environmental effects of the DoN's Proposed Action, and the analysis will support Marine Mammal Protection Act authorization requests.

Proposed training and testing activities are generally consistent to those analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. The Supplemental EIS/OEIS will propose changes to the tempo and types of training and testing activities, accounting for the introduction of new technologies, the evolving nature of international events, advances in war fighting doctrine and procedures, and changes in the organization of vessels, aircraft, weapon systems, and military personnel. The MITT Supplemental EIS/OEIS will reflect the compilation of training and testing activities required to fulfill the DoN's military readiness requirements beyond 2020, and therefore includes the analysis of newly proposed activities and changes to previously analyzed activities.

In the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the DoN will evaluate the potential environmental impacts of a No Action Alternative and action alternatives. Resources to be evaluated include, but are not limited to, marine mammals, sea turtles, essential fish habitat, and threatened and endangered species.

The scoping process is used to identify public concerns and local issues to be considered during the development of the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Federal agencies, local agencies, the public, and interested persons are encouraged to provide substantive comments to the DoN on environmental resources and issue areas of concern the commenter believes the DoN should consider.

Comments must be postmarked or received online by September 15, 2017, for consideration during the development of the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Comments can be mailed to: Naval Facilities Engineering Command Pacific, Attention: MITT Supplemental EIS/OEIS Project Manager, 258 Makalapa Drive, Suite 100, Pearl Harbor, HI, 96869–3134. Comments can be submitted online via the project Web site at *http://mitt-eis.com/*.

Dated: July 20, 2017.

A.M. Nichols,

Lieutenant Commander, Judge Advocate General's Corps, U.S. Navy, Federal Register Liaison Officer.

[FR Doc. 2017–15939 Filed 7–31–17; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3810–FF–P

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Final Waiver and Extension of the Project Period for the Native American Career and Technical Education Program

[Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) Number: 84.101A]

AGENCY: Office of Career, Technical, and Adult Education, Department of Education.

ACTION: Final waiver and extension of the project period.

SUMMARY: For the 24-month projects originally funded in fiscal year (FY) 2013 and extended for an additional 24-months in FY 2015 under the Native American Career and Technical Education Program (NACTEP), the Secretary: Waives the requirements in Education Department regulations that generally prohibit project extensions involving the obligation of additional Federal funds; and extends the project period for the current 30 NACTEP grantees for an additional 12 months under the existing program authority. This waiver and extension will allow the 30 current NACTEP grantees to seek FY 2017 continuation awards for the project period through FY 2018.

DATES: As of August 1, 2017, the waiver and extension of the project period are finalized.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Gwen Washington by telephone at (202) 245–7790 or by email at *gwen.washington@ed.gov*. You may also contact Linda Mayo by telephone at (202) 245–7792 or by email at *linda.mayo@ed.gov*. If you use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) or a text telephone (TTY), call the Federal Relay Service, toll free, at 1–800–877–8339.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On April 26, 2017, we published a notice in the Federal Register (82 FR 19240) proposing to waive the requirements of 34 CFR 75.261(a) and (c)(2) that generally prohibit project period extensions involving the obligation of additional Federal funds. In that notice, the Secretary also proposed to extend the NACTEP project period for up to an additional 12 months. The proposed waiver and extension of project period would enable the Secretary to provide continuation awards to the current NACTEP grantees through FY 2018 under the existing program authority.

That notice contained background information and our reasons for proposing the waiver and extension of the project period. This notice makes the waiver and extension of the project period final. Any activities carried out during the period of a NACTEP continuation award must be consistent with, or a logical extension of, the scope, goals, and objectives of the grantee's application as approved in the FY 2013 NACTEP competition. The requirements applicable to continuation awards for this competition set forth in the 2013 notice inviting applications and the requirements in 34 CFR 75.253 will apply to any continuation awards sought by the current NACTEP grantees.

We will make decisions regarding the continuation awards based on grantee program narratives, budgets and budget narratives, program performance reports, and the requirements in 34 CFR 75.253. We will not announce a new competition or make new awards in FY 2017.

The final waiver and project period extension will not exempt the current NACTEP grantees from the appropriation account closing provisions of 31 U.S.C. 1552(a), nor will it extend the availability of funds previously awarded to current NACTEP grantees. As a result of 31 U.S.C. 1552(a), appropriations available for a limited period may be used for payment of valid obligations for only five years after the expiration of their period of availability for Federal obligation. After that time, the unexpended balance of those funds is canceled and returned to the U.S. Department of the Treasury and is unavailable for restoration for any purpose (31 U.S.C. 1552(b)).

Public Comment: In response to our invitation in the proposed waiver and extension, we received 85 comments.

Authority: 35 U.S.C. 207, 37 CFR part 404.

Dated: January 28, 2019.

M.S. Werner,

Commander, Judge Advocate General's Corps, U.S. Navy, Federal Register Liaison Officer.

[FR Doc. 2019–00373 Filed 1–30–19; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3810–FF–P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Navy

Notice of Public Meetings for the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement for Mariana Islands Training and Testing

AGENCY: Department of the Navy, DoD.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as implemented by the Council on Environmental Quality, and Presidential Executive Order (E.O.) 12114, the Department of the Navy (DoN) has prepared and filed with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency a Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (EIS/OEIS). In the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the DoN reassesses the potential environmental impacts associated with conducting ongoing and future military readiness activities, which includes training activities and research, development, testing, and evaluation activities (referred to as "testing activities") conducted at sea and on Farallon de Medinilla (FDM) within the Mariana Islands Training and Testing (MITT) Study Area (hereafter referred to as the Study Area) beyond 2020. In the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the DoN evaluates new, relevant information, such as more recent marine mammal density data and new scientific information, and updates the environmental analyses as appropriate. The DoN prepared the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS to support the issuance of federal regulatory permits and authorizations under the Marine Mammal Protection Act and the Endangered Species Act. The National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) is a cooperating agency for this Supplemental EIS/OEIS.

DATES: This notice announces the public comment period and the dates and locations of the public meetings, includes information about how the public can review and comment on the document, and provides supplementary information about the environmental planning effort. All comments must be postmarked or received online by March 18, 2019, Chamorro Standard Time, for consideration in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Federal and local agencies and officials, and interested organizations and individuals, are encouraged to provide substantive comments on the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS during the public review period or in person at one of the scheduled open house public meetings.

ADDRESSES: Public meetings will be held in an open-house format, with DoN representatives available to provide information and answer questions related to the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Open house public meetings will be held on Guam and Saipan. The public may arrive at any time during the open house, as there will not be a presentation or formal oral comment session. Open house public meetings will be held on the following dates and at the following locations:

1. 5:00 to 8:00 p.m. February 26, 2019, at University of Guam, Jesus & Eugenia Leon Guerrero School of Business and Public Administration Building, Anthony Leon Guerrero Multi-Purpose Room 129 and Henry Sy Atrium, Mangilao, Guam 96923.

2. 5:00 to 8:00 p.m. February 27, 2019, at Kanoa Resort Saipan, Seaside Hall, Beach Road in Susupe, Saipan, MP 96950.

Attendees will be able to submit written comments during the open house public meetings. A stenographer will be available for attendees wishing to provide oral comments, one-on-one. Equal weight will be given to oral and written comments. Comments may also be mailed to Naval Facilities Engineering Command Pacific, Attention: MITT Supplemental EIS/OEIS Project Manager, 258 Makalapa Drive, Suite 100, Pearl Harbor, HI 96860–3134, or electronically via the project website at *www.MITT-EIS.com*. All comments, written or oral, submitted during the public comment period will become part of the public record and substantive comments will be addressed in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Naval Facilities Engineering Command Pacific, Attention: MITT Supplemental EIS/OEIS Project Manager, 258 Makalapa Drive, Suite 100, Pearl Harbor, HI 96860–3134.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS was distributed to federal and local agencies with which the DoN consulted. Copies of the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS are available for public review at the following public libraries:

1. Robert F. Kennedy Memorial Library, University of Guam, UOG Station, Mangilao, GU 96923–1871.

2. Nieves M. Flores Memorial Library, 254 Martyr Street, Hagåtña, GU 96910–5141.

3. Tinian Public Library, San Jose Village, Tinian, MP 96952–9997.

4. Antonio C. Atalig Memorial Library (Rota Public Library), Rota, MP 96951–9997.

5. Joeten-Kiyu Public Library, Insatto Street, Saipan, MP 96950–9996.

The MITT Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS is available for electronic viewing or download at *www.MITT-EIS.com*. A compact disc of the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS will be made available upon written request by contacting: Naval Facilities Engineering Command Pacific, Attention: MITT Supplemental EIS/OEIS Project Manager, 258 Makalapa Drive, Suite 100, Pearl Harbor, HI 96860–3134.

Dated: January 25, 2019.

M.S. Werner,

Commander, Judge Advocate General's Corps, U.S. Navy, Federal Register Liaison Officer.

[FR Doc. 2019–00368 Filed 1–30–19; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3810–FF–P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Navy

Notice of Availability of the Record of Decision for the Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for Land-Water Interface and Service Pier Extension at Naval Base Kitsap Bangor, Kitsap County, WA

AGENCY: Department of the Navy, DoD.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The United States Department of the Navy (Navy), announces its decision to construct and operate a Service Pier Extension (SPE) and associated support facilities in Hood Canal on the waterfront of Naval Base (NAVBASE) Kitsap Bangor, Washington (WA). The Navy will implement Alternative 2, short pier configuration, which is the preferred alternative in the October 2018 Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) for the Land-Water Interface (LWI) and SPE, NAVBASE Kitsap Bangor, WA. The Alternative 2 short pier configuration is also the environmentally preferred alternative and will fully meet the Navy's purpose and need for the proposed action.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The existing Service Pier will be extended by 520 feet and will require in-water as well as upland construction of

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket Nos. IS18–766–000, IS18–767–000]

Notice Rescheduling Technical Conference: Mid-America Pipeline Company, LLC; Seminole Pipeline Company LLC

The technical conference originally scheduled for January 17, 2016, in the above-referenced proceeding, is hereby rescheduled to convene on February 20, 2019, at 9:00 a.m. (Eastern Standard Time). It will occur in Hearing Room 2 at the Commission's Washington DC offices.[1]

Dated: January 15, 2019.

Kimberly D. Bose,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2019–00541 Filed 1–31–19; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[ER–FRL–9043–2]

Environmental Impact Statements; Notice of Availability

Responsible Agency: Office of Federal Activities, General Information 202–564–5632 or *https://www.epa.gov/nepa/.*

Receipt of Environmental Impact Statements
Filed 12/21/2018 Through 01/25/2019
Pursuant to 40 CFR 1506.9.

Notice

Section 309(a) of the Clean Air Act requires that EPA make public its comments on EISs issued by other Federal agencies. EPA's comment letters on EISs are available at: *https://cdxnodengn.epa.gov/cdx-enepa-public/action/eis/search.*

EIS No. 20180325, Final, USFS, WA, Sunrise Vegetation and Fuels Management, *Review Period Ends:* 03/04/2019, *Contact:* Johnny Collin 509–843–4643

EIS No. 20180326, Draft Supplement, BR, CA, Long-Term Water Transfers, *Comment Period Ends:* 03/18/2019, *Contact:* Dan Cordova 916–987–5483

EIS No. 20180327, Final, TxDOT, TX, Oakhill Parkway, *Contact:* Carlos Swonke 512–416–2734

Under 23 U.S.C. 139(n)(2), TxDOT has issued a single document that consists of a supplemental final environmental impact statement and record of decision. Therefore, the 30-day wait/review period under NEPA does not apply to this action.

EIS No. 20180328, Draft, HUD, CT, Resilient Bridgeport, *Comment Period Ends:* 03/18/2019, *Contact:* Rebecca French 860–270–8231

EIS No. 20180329, Draft, USACE, CA, Amoruso Ranch, *Comment Period Ends:* 03/18/2019, *Contact:* Leah M. Fisher 916–557–6639

EIS No. 20180330, Draft, FHWA, LA, Lafayette Regional Xpressway Tier 1, *Comment Period Ends:* 03/18/2019, *Contact:* Todd Jeter 225–757–7612

EIS No. 20180331, Final, FERC, LA, Driftwood LNG Project, *Review Period Ends:* 03/04/2019, *Contact:* Office of External Affairs 866–208–3372

EIS No. 20180332, Final, FERC, CA, Yuba River Development Project, *Review Period Ends:* 03/04/2019, *Contact:* Alan Mitchnick 202–502–6074

EIS No. 20180333, Final, FERC, OR, Swan Lake North Pumped Storage Project, *Review Period Ends:* 03/04/2019, *Contact:* Office of External Affairs 866–208–3372

EIS No. 20180334, Final, FERC, NY, Northeast Supply Enhancement Project, *Review Period Ends:* 03/04/2019, *Contact:* Office of External Affairs 866–208–3372

EIS No. 20180335, Draft Supplement, USN, GU, Mariana Islands Training and Testing Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement, *Comment Period Ends:* 03/18/2019, *Contact:* Nora Macariola-See 808–472–1402

EIS No. 20180336, Draft, FHWA, NY, Van Wyck Expressway Capacity and Access Improvements to JFK Airport, *Comment Period Ends:* 03/18/2019, *Contact:* Hans Anker 518–431–8896

Amended Notices

EIS No. 20180282, Final, USACE, IL, The Great Lakes and Mississippi River Interbasin Study—Brandon Road Integrated Feasibility Study and Environmental Impact Statement—Will County, Illinois, *Review Period Ends:* 02/22/2019, *Contact:* Andrew Leichty 309–794–5399. Revision to FR Notice Published 12/21/2018; Extending the Comment Period from 01/07/2019 to 02/22/2019.

Dated: January 29, 2019.

Robert Tomiak,

Director, Office of Federal Activities.

[FR Doc. 2019–00664 Filed 1–31–19; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

FARM CREDIT SYSTEM INSURANCE CORPORATION

Regular Meeting; Farm Credit System Insurance Corporation Board

AGENCY: Farm Credit System Insurance Corporation.

ACTION: Notice, regular meeting.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given of the regular meeting of the Farm Credit System Insurance Corporation Board (Board).

DATES: The meeting of the Board will be held at the offices of the Farm Credit Administration in McLean, Virginia, on January 17, 2019, from 2:00 p.m. until such time as the Board concludes its business.

ADDRESSES: Farm Credit System Insurance Corporation, 1501 Farm Credit Drive, McLean, Virginia 22102. Submit attendance requests via email to *VisitorRequest@FCA.gov.* See **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** for further information about attendance requests.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dale Aultman, Secretary to the Farm Credit System Insurance Corporation Board, (703) 883–4009, TTY (703) 883–4056, *aultmand@fca.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Parts of this meeting of the Board will be open to the public (limited space available), and parts will be closed to the public. Please send an email to *VisitorRequest@FCA.gov* at least 24 hours before the meeting. In your email include: Name, postal address, entity you are representing (if applicable), and telephone number. You will receive an email confirmation from us. Please be prepared to show a photo identification when you arrive. If you need assistance for accessibility reasons, or if you have any questions, contact Dale Aultman, Secretary to the Farm Credit System Insurance Corporation Board, at (703) 883–4009. The matters to be considered at the meeting are:

Open Session

A. Approval of Minutes

- December 13, 2018

B. New Business

- Review of Insurance Premium Rates

[1] See the *Notice of Technical Conference* issued on December 12, 2018, for additional details regarding this conference.

EXEMPTIONS PROMULGATED FOR THE SYSTEM:
None.

HISTORY:
February 22, 1993, 58 FR 10227.

[FR Doc. 2019–04191 Filed 3–7–19; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 5001–06–P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Office of the Secretary

[Docket ID: DOD–2018–OS–0104]

Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

AGENCY: Office of the Secretary of Defense, DoD.

ACTION: 30-Day information collection notice.

SUMMARY: The Department of Defense has submitted to OMB for clearance the following proposal for collection of information under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act.

DATES: Consideration will be given to all comments received by April 8, 2019.

ADDRESSES: Comments and recommendations on the proposed information collection should be emailed to Ms. Jasmeet Seehra, DoD Desk Officer, at *oira_submission@omb.eop.gov*. Please identify the proposed information collection by DoD Desk Officer, Docket ID number, and title of the information collection.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Angela James, 571–372–7574, or *whs.mc-alex.esd.mbx.dd-dod-information-collections@mail.mil.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Title; Associated Form; and OMB Number: Vietnam War Commemoration Program Partner Events; DD Form 2953; DD Form 2954; DD Form 3027; DD Form 3028; DD Form 3029; OMB Control Number 0704–0500.

Type of Request: Extension.

Number of Respondents: 16,020.

Responses per Respondent: 1.8739.

Annual Responses: 30,020.

Average Burden per Response: 15 minutes.

Annual Burden Hours: 7,505.

Needs and Uses: This information collection requirement is necessary to notify the United States of America Vietnam War Commemoration Program of Commemorative Partner's planned events. Information is submitted for inclusion on the program's events calendar and to request event support in the form of materials and/or speakers from the program. The information collection is necessary to obtain, vet, record, process and provide Certificates of Honor to be presented on behalf of a grateful nation by partner organizations. Additionally, this collection is necessary for the partner organizations to communicate to the Commemoration program the results of their events and lessons learned.

Affected Public: Businesses or other for-profits; Not-for-profit institutions; Federal Government; State, local or tribal government, or, by exception, eligible individuals or households.

Frequency: On occasion.

Respondent's Obligation: Voluntary.

OMB Desk Officer: Ms. Jasmeet Seehra.

You may also submit comments and recommendations, identified by Docket ID number and title, by the following method:

- *Federal eRulemaking Portal: http://www.regulations.gov*. Follow the instructions for submitting comments.

Instructions: All submissions received must include the agency name, Docket ID number, and title for this **Federal Register** document. The general policy for comments and other submissions from members of the public is to make these submissions available for public viewing on the internet at *http://www.regulations.gov* as they are received without change, including any personal identifiers or contact information.

DOD Clearance Officer: Ms. Angela James.

Requests for copies of the information collection proposal should be sent to Ms. James at *whs.mc-alex.esd.mbx.dd-dod-information-collections@mail.mil.*

Dated: March 4, 2019.

Aaron T. Siegel,

Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense.

[FR Doc. 2019–04173 Filed 3–7–19; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 5001–06–P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Navy

Notice of Rescheduled Public Meetings and Extension of Public Comment Period for the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/ Overseas Environmental Impact Statement for Mariana Islands Training and Testing

AGENCY: Department of the Navy, DoD.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: A notice of public meetings was published in the **Federal Register** by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency on January 31, 2019 for the Department of the Navy's (DoN) Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (EIS/OEIS) for the Mariana Islands Training and Testing (MITT) Study Area. Due to the effects of Typhoon Wutip, Navy officials postponed public meetings supporting the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS planned for February 26–27, 2019.

DATES: This notice announces the dates and locations of the rescheduled public meetings in March 2019, and a 15-day extension of the public comment period from March 18, 2019, to April 2, 2019.

ADDRESSES: Public meetings will be held in an open-house format with DoN representatives available to provide information and answer questions related to the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The public may arrive at any time during meetings, as there will not be a presentation or public oral comment session. Open house public meetings will be held on the following dates and at the following locations:

1. 1:00 to 3:30 p.m. March 14, 2019, at Tinian Public Library, San Jose Village, Tinian, MP 96952.
2. 1:30 to 4:30 p.m. March 15, 2019, at Mayor's Conference Hall, Songsong Village, Rota, MP 96951.
3. 5:00 to 8:00 p.m. March 18, 2019, at Kanoa Resort Saipan, Seaside Hall, Beach Road in Susupe, Saipan, MP 96950.
4. 5:00 to 8:00 p.m. March 19, 2019, at University of Guam, Jesus & Eugenia Leon Guerrero School of Business and Public Administration Building, Anthony Leon Guerrero Multi-Purpose Room 129 and Henry Sy Atrium, Mangilao, Guam 96923.

Attendees will be able to submit comments during the open house public meetings. Comments may also be mailed to Naval Facilities Engineering Command Pacific, Attention: MITT Supplemental EIS/OEIS Project Manager, 258 Makalapa Drive, Suite 100, Pearl Harbor, HI 96860–3134, or electronically via the project website at *www.MITT-EIS.com*. All comments submitted during the public comment period will become part of the public record and substantive comments will be addressed in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS. All comments must be postmarked or received online by April 2, 2019, Chamorro Standard Time, for consideration in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS.

Naval Facilities Engineering Command Pacific, Attention: MITT Supplemental EIS/OEIS Project Manager, 258 Makalapa Drive, Suite 100, Pearl Harbor, HI 96860–3134.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS is available

electronically for public viewing at *www.MITT-EIS.com* and at the following public libraries:

1. Robert F. Kennedy Memorial Library, University of Guam, UOG Station, Mangilao, GU 96923–1871.
2. Nieves M. Flores Memorial Library, 254 Martyr St., Hagåtña, GU 96910–5141.
3. Tinian Public Library, San Jose Village, Tinian, MP 96952–9997.
4. Antonio C. Atalig Memorial Library (Rota Public Library), Rota, MP 96951–9997.
5. Joeten-Kiyu Public Library, Beach Road and Insatto St., Saipan, MP 96950–9996.

Dated: March 1, 2019.

M.S. Werner,

Commander, Judge Advocate General's Corps, U.S. Navy, Federal Register Liaison Officer.

[FR Doc. 2019–04019 Filed 3–7–19; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3810–FF–P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Navy

Notice of Intent To Grant Exclusive Patent License; Nanocrine, Inc.

AGENCY: Department of the Navy, DoD.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Department of the Navy hereby gives notice of its intent to grant to Nanocrine, Inc., of Frederick, Maryland an exclusive license in the field of use of products and services for use in cell biology research for cell signaling and phenotyping studies and the field of use of products and services for use in cell biology research for cell protein and chemical secretion, in the United States, to U.S. Patent 9,791,368: Nanoplasmonic Imaging Technique for the Spatio-temporal Mapping of Single Cell Secretions in Real Time, Navy Case No. 102,395.//U.S. Patent Application No. 15/784,433: Nanoplasmonic Imaging Technique for the Spatio-Temporal Mapping of Single Cell Secretion in Real Time, Navy Case No, 102,395.//U.S. Patent No. 9,915,654: Light Microscopy Chips and Data Analysis Methodology for Quantitative Localized Surface Plasmon Resonance (LSPR) Biosensing and Imaging, Navy Case No. 101,529.//U.S. Patent Application No. 15/882,081: Light Microscopy Chips and Data Analysis Methodology for Quantitative Localized Surface Plasmon Resonance (LSPR) Biosensing and Imaging, Navy Case No. 101,529.//U.S Patent Application No. 14/039,326: Calibrating Single Plasmonic Nanostructures for Quantitative Biosensing, Navy Case No. 102,043.//U.S Patent Application No. 15/186,742: Determining Extracellular Protein Concentration with Nanoplasmonic Sensors, Navy Case No. 103,502.//U.S. Patent Application No. 16/196,097: Substrates with Indendently Tunable Topographies and Chemistries for Quantifying Surface-Induced Cell Behavior, Navy Case No. 107,399 and any continuations, divisionals, or re-issues thereof.

DATES: Anyone wishing to object to the grant of this license must file written objections along with supporting evidence, if any, not later than March 25, 2019.

ADDRESSES: Written objections are to be filed with the Naval Research Laboratory, Code 1004, 4555 Overlook Avenue SW, Washington, DC 20375–5320.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Amanda Horansky McKinney, Head, Technology Transfer Office, NRL Code 1004, 4555 Overlook Avenue SW, Washington, DC 20375–5320, telephone 202–767–1644. Due to U.S. Postal delays, please fax 202–404–7920, email: *techtran@.nrl.navy.mil* or use courier delivery to expedite response.

(Authority: 35 U.S.C. 207, 37 CFR part 404.)

M.S. Werner,

Commander, Judge Advocate General's Corps, U.S. Navy, Federal Register Liaison Officer.

[FR Doc. 2019–04220 Filed 3–7–19; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3810–FF–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Energy Conservation Program for Consumer Products: Representative Average Unit Costs of Energy

AGENCY: Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In this notice, the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) is forecasting the representative average unit costs of five residential energy sources for the year 2019 pursuant to the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (Act). The five sources are electricity, natural gas, No. 2 heating oil, propane, and kerosene.

DATES: The representative average unit costs of energy contained in this notice will become effective April 8, 2019 and will remain in effect until further notice.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: John Cymbalsky, U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Forrestal Building, Mail Station EE–5B, 1000 Independence Avenue SW, Washington, DC 20585–0121, (202) 287–1692, *ApplianceStandardsQuestions@ee.doe.gov.*

Francine Pinto, Esq. U.S. Department of Energy, Office of General Counsel Forrestal Building, Mail Station GC–33, 1000 Independence Avenue SW, Washington, DC 20585–0103, (202) 586–7432, *Francine.Pinto@hq.doe.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Section 323 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act requires that DOE prescribe test procedures for the measurement of the estimated annual operating costs or other measures of energy consumption for certain consumer products specified in the Act. (42 U.S.C. 6293(b)(3)) These test procedures are found in Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) part 430, subpart B.

Section 323(b)(3) of the Act requires that the estimated annual operating costs of a covered product be calculated from measurements of energy use in a representative average use cycle or period of use and from representative average unit costs of the energy needed to operate such product during such cycle. (42 U.S.C. 6293(b)(3)) The section further requires that DOE provide information to manufacturers regarding the representative average unit costs of energy. (42 U.S.C. 6293(b)(4)) This cost information should be used by manufacturers to meet their obligations under section 323(c) of the Act. Most notably, these costs are used to comply with Federal Trade Commission (FTC) requirements for labeling. Manufacturers are required to use the revised DOE representative average unit costs when the FTC publishes new ranges of comparability for specific covered products, 16 CFR part 305. Interested parties can also find information covering the FTC labeling requirements at *http://www.ftc.gov/appliances.*

DOE last published representative average unit costs of residential energy in a **Federal Register** notice entitled, ''Energy Conservation Program for Consumer Products: Representative Average Unit Costs of Energy'', dated April 24, 2018, 83 FR 17811.

On April 8, 2019, the cost figures published in this notice will become effective and supersede those cost figures published on April 24, 2018. The cost figures set forth in this notice will be effective until further notice.

DOE's Energy Information Administration (EIA) has developed the 2019 representative average unit after-tax residential costs found in this notice. These costs for electricity,

and Recreation Department, Oregon Department of Environmental Quality, Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development, Oregon Department of State Lands, and Oregon Department of Agriculture.

Alternatives. The EIS will evaluate a no action alternative and action alternatives. The no action alternative is the current management direction for the WVS. Action alternatives will be composed of various measures for continued operations and maintenance of the WVS, as well as measures that will be developed to meet ESA obligations to avoid jeopardizing the continued existence of listed species. Comments received during the scoping comment period will inform the development of action alternatives.

Scoping Process/Public Involvement. The Corps invites all affected federal, state, and local agencies, affected Native American Tribes, other interested parties, and the general public to participate in the NEPA process during development of the EIS. The purpose of the public scoping process is to provide information to the public, narrow the scope of analysis to significant environmental issues, serve as a mechanism to solicit agency and public input on alternatives and issues of concern, and ensure full and open participation in scoping for the Draft EIS. Numerous public scoping meetings will be held during the scoping period. The specific dates, times, and locations of the meetings will be published on the Corps' project website: *https://www.nwp.usace.army.mil/Locations/Willamette-Valley/Evaluation/.*

This is not a notice for the public comment periods for the Cougar Downstream Passage and Detroit Downstream Passage projects; public comment periods for those projects will be noticed separately.

Documents and other important information related to the EIS will be available for review on the Corps' project website.

Aaron L. Dorf,
Colonel, Corps of Engineers, District Commander.

[FR Doc. 2019-06258 Filed 3-29-19; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3720-58-P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Navy

Notice of Availability of Government-Owned Inventions; Available for Licensing

AGENCY: Department of the Navy, DoD.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Department of the Navy (DoN) announces the availability of the inventions listed below, assigned to the United States Government, as represented by the Secretary of the Navy, for domestic and foreign licensing by the Department of the Navy.

ADDRESSES: Requests for copies of the patents cited should be directed to Naval Surface Warfare Center, Crane Div, Code OOL, Bldg 2, 300 Highway 361, Crane, IN 47522–5001.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Christopher Monsey, Naval Surface Warfare Center, Crane Div, Code OOL, Bldg 2, 300 Highway 361, Crane, IN 47522–5001, Email *Christopher.Monsey@navy.mil*, 812–854–2777.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The following patents are available for licensing: Patent No. 10,200,081 (Navy Case No. 200348): SYSTEMS AND METHODS FOR SIGNAL DETECTION AND DIGITAL BANDWIDTH REDUCTION IN DIGITAL PHASED ARRAYS// Patent No. 10,204,875 (Navy Case No. 200421): SYSTEMS AND METHODS FOR INHIBITING BACKEND ACCESS TO INTEGRATED CIRCUITS BY INTEGRATING PHOTON AND ELECTRON SENSING LATCH-UP CIRCUITS// Patent No. 10,209,342 (Navy Case No. 200479): ELECTROMAGNETIC RADIATION SOURCE LOCATING SYSTEM// and Patent No. 10,215,531 (Navy Case No. 200357): TESTING SYSTEM FOR OPTICAL AIMING SYSTEMS WITH LIGHT EMITTER SYSTEMS INCLUDING TESTING SYSTEM FOR THERMAL DRIFT AND RELATED METHODS.

Authority: 35 U.S.C. 207, 37 CFR part 404.

Dated: March 26, 2019.

M.S. Werner,
Commander, Judge Advocate General's Corps, U.S. Navy, Federal Register Liaison Officer.

[FR Doc. 2019-06163 Filed 3-29-19; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3810-FF-P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Navy

Notice of Extension of Public Comment Period for the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement for Mariana Islands Training and Testing

AGENCY: Department of the Navy, DoD.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: A notice of public meetings was published in the **Federal Register** by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency on January 31, 2019 and March 8, 2019 for the Department of the Navy's (DoN) Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (EIS/OEIS) for the Mariana Islands Training and Testing (MITT) Study Area.

DATES: This notice announces a 15-day extension of the public comment period from April 2, 2019, to April 17, 2019.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be mailed to Naval Facilities Engineering Command Pacific, Attention: MITT Supplemental EIS/OEIS Project Manager, 258 Makalapa Drive, Suite 100, Pearl Harbor, HI 96860–3134, or electronically via the project website at *www.MITT-EIS.com*. All comments submitted during the public comment period will become part of the public record and substantive comments will be addressed in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS. All comments must be postmarked or received online by April 17, 2019, Chamorro Standard Time, for consideration in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS.

Naval Facilities Engineering Command Pacific, Attention: MITT Supplemental EIS/OEIS Project Manager, 258 Makalapa Drive, Suite 100, Pearl Harbor, HI 96860–3134.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS is available electronically for public viewing at *www.MITT-EIS.com* and at the following public libraries:

1. Robert F. Kennedy Memorial Library, University of Guam, UOG Station, Mangilao, GU 96923–1871.

2. Nieves M. Flores Memorial Library, 254 Martyr St., Hagåtña, GU 96910–5141.

3. Tinian Public Library, San Jose Village, Tinian, MP 96952–9997.

4. Antonio C. Atalig Memorial Library (Rota Public Library), Rota, MP 96951–9997.

5. Joeten-Kiyu Public Library, Beach Road and Insatto St., Saipan, MP 96950–9996.

Dated: March 25, 2019.

M.S. Werner,
Commander, Judge Advocate General's Corps, U.S. Navy, Federal Register Liaison Officer.

[FR Doc. 2019-06028 Filed 3-29-19; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3810-FF-P

Appendix C: Agency Correspondence

Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/ Overseas Environmental Impact Statement Mariana Islands Training and Testing

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPENDIX C AGENCY CORRESPONDENCE C-1

C.1 Cooperating Agency Status C-2
C.1.1 Navy Request Letter to the U.S. Coast Guard C-2
C.1.2 U.S. Coast Guard Response Letter C-4
C.1.3 Navy Request Letter to the National Marine Fisheries Service C-7
C.1.4 National Marine Fisheries Service Response Letter C-11
C.2 Coastal Zone Management Act C-12
C.2.1 Navy Consistency Determination Letters – Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands C-12
C.2.2 Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands Response Letters C-14
C.2.3 Navy Consistency Determination Letter – Government of Guam C-39
C.2.4 Government of Guam Response Letter C-40
C.3 Endangered Species Act Consultation C-66
C.3.1 Navy Request Letter for Formal Consultation with National Marine Fisheries Service C-66
C.4 Essential Fish Habitat Assessment C-69
C.4.1 Navy Essential Fish Habitat Assessment Submission Transmittal Letter to National Marine Fisheries Service C-69
C.4.2 National Marine Fisheries Service Essential Fish Habitat Assessment Recommendation Letter C-71
C.4.3 Navy Response Letter to National Marine Fisheries Service Essential Fish Habitat Recommendations C-84
C.4.4 National Marine Fisheries Service Response Letter to the Navy C-95
C.5 National Historic Preservation Act Compliance C-104
C.5.1 Navy Section 106 Consultation Letters – Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands C-104
C.5.2 Navy Section 106 Consultation Letters – Guam C-108

List of Figures

There are no figures in this appendix.

List of Tables

There are no tables in this appendix.

This page intentionally left blank.

APPENDIX C AGENCY CORRESPONDENCE

This appendix contains correspondence between the Navy and government agencies with respect to cooperating agency status, the Coastal Zone Management Act, the Endangered Species Act, the Essential Fish Habitat Assessment, and the National Historic Preservation Act.

C.1 COOPERATING AGENCY STATUS

C.1.1 NAVY REQUEST LETTER TO THE U.S. COAST GUARD

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
COMMANDER
UNITED STATES PACIFIC FLEET
250 MAKALAPA DRIVE
PEARL HARBOR, HAWAII 96860-3131

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5090
Ser N465/1489
December 13, 2019

RADM Kevin Lunday
Commander, Fourteenth Coast Guard District
300 Ala Moana Blvd FL 9-204
Honolulu, HI 96850-4982

Dear RADM Lunday:

SUBJECT: MARIANA ISLANDS TRAINING AND TESTING SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT/OVERSEA ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT - COOPERATING AGENCY REQUEST

In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969 and Executive Order (EO) 12114, the United States (U.S.) Department of the Navy (Navy) is preparing a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (EIS/OEIS) to assess the potential environmental impacts associated with the continuation of military readiness activities, which consist of training as well as research, development, testing and evaluation (RDT&E, hereinafter referred to as "testing") activities that include the use of active sonar and explosives in the Mariana Islands Training and Testing (MITT) Study Area. The Navy's purpose of the Proposed Action is to conduct training and testing activities to ensure that the Navy and other Services meet their respective missions, which, for the Navy under Title 10 United States Code (U.S.C.) Section 8062, is to maintain, train, and equip combat-ready military forces capable of winning wars, deterring aggression, and maintaining freedom of the seas.

This MITT Supplemental EIS/OEIS represents the third phase (Phase III) of ongoing NEPA and EO 12114 compliance for continuation of at-sea training and testing. It will evaluate the conduct of military readiness activities from 2020 into the reasonably foreseeable future and accommodate evolving mission requirements associated with force structure changes, including those resulting from the development, testing, and ultimate introduction of new platforms (vessels, aircraft, and weapon systems) into the Fleet.

The Phase III MITT Study Area remains consistent with the area studied in the Phase II MITT EIS/OEIS completed in 2015 and consists of the established at sea ranges, operating areas and special use airspace in the region of the Mariana Islands that are part of the Mariana Islands Range Complex (MIRC) and its surrounding seas, and includes a transit corridor. The transit corridor is outside the geographic boundaries of the MIRC and is a direct route across the high seas for Navy ships in transit between the MIRC and the Hawaii Range Complex. The Proposed

5090
Ser N465/1489
December 13, 2019

Action also includes pierside sonar maintenance and testing alongside Navy piers located in Inner Apra Harbor.

The MITT Phase III Supplemental EIS/OEIS is intended to serve as a basis for the renewal of current regulatory permits and authorizations and the analysis of emerging and future force structure changes and training and testing requirements. An important aspect of the MITT Supplemental EIS/OEIS will be the analysis of the potential effects to marine species protected under the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA) and the Endangered Species Act (ESA) and habitats protected under the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act. The existing MMPA Final Rule and Letters of Authorization for Phase II MITT activities will expire in August 2020.

Pursuant to 40 CFR Section 1501.6, the Navy requests the U.S. Coast Guard's participation in the NEPA process as a cooperating agency.

We appreciate your consideration of our request and look forward to your response. If you require additional information or have questions regarding this project, my points of contact for this matter are Mr. John Van Name, john.vanname@navy.mil, (808) 471-1714 and Ms. Suzanne Smith, suzanne.smith3@navy.mil, (808) 471-4696.

Sincerely,

DANIEL McNAIR
Director, Fleet Environmental Readiness
By direction of the Commander

Copy to:
ASN (EI&E)
DASN (E)
OAGC (EI&E)
CNIC (N45)
COMMANDER, JOINT REGION MARIANAS
NAVFAC PACIFIC
NAVFAC MARIANAS
CNO (N45)

C.1.2 U.S. COAST GUARD RESPONSE LETTER

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
United States Coast Guard

Commander
Fourteenth Coast Guard District

300 Ala Moana Blvd
Honolulu, HI 96850-4982
Staff Symbol: (d)
Phone: (808) 535-3201
Email: Kevin.E.Lunday@uscg.mil

5090
April 1, 2020

United States Pacific Fleet
Attn: Mr. Daniel McNair
Director, Fleet Environmental Readiness
250 Makalapa Drive
Pearl Harbor, Hawaii 96860-3131

Dear Mr. McNair:

Subject: MARIANA ISLANDS TRAINING AND TESTING SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT/OVERSEA ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT – COAST GUARD COOPERATING AGENCY ACCEPTANCE

Ref: (a) National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), 42 U.S.C 4321, et seq.
(b) Council on Environmental Quality Regulations for Implementing the Procedural Provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act, 40 C.F.R. § 1500–1508
(c) Environmental Effects Abroad of Major Federal Actions, Executive Order 12114
(d) U.S. Coast Guard Environmental Planning Policy, COMDTINST 5090.1

The United States Coast Guard (Coast Guard), in response to your letter of 13 December 2019, and in accordance with references (a), (b), and (c), is pleased to accept cooperating agency status with the United States Navy (Navy) as part of the Mariana Islands Training and Testing (MITT) Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS)/Overseas Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (OSEIS). The Coast Guard acknowledges that the Navy is the lead federal agency for SEIS/OSEIS and is primarily responsible for the scope and content of the document. The Coast Guard will participate in the Navy NEPA process as a cooperating agency in order to provide special expertise for Coast Guard training and testing activities analyzed in the SEIS/OSEIS in the MITT study area. The SEIS/OSEIS assesses the potential environmental impacts associated with the continuation of these military readiness activities, which consist of training as well as research, development, testing, and evaluation (RDT&E, hereinafter referred to as "testing") activities that include the use of active sonar and explosives in the MITT study area.

The Coast Guard's actions in the MITT will include surface-to-surface gunnery exercises with small to medium caliber weapons that may include firearms and shoulder line-throwing guns, maritime security operations and civilian port defense using helicopters and vessels to simulate visiting, boarding, and seizing vessels, search and rescue exercises, and precision anchoring training. The purpose of the Coast Guard's actions in the MITT is to ensure effective, close coordination and mission execution between the Navy, Air Force, and Coast Guard operators and assets during actual emergencies and security operations. Joint exercises allow for Navy, Air Force, and Coast Guard commands, operators, and assets to more quickly and effectively respond to threats in the maritime environment and/or prevent such threats.

Subject: MARIANA ISLANDS TRAINING AND TESTING SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT/OVERSEA ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT – COAST GUARD COOPERATING AGENCY ACCEPTANCE

5090
April 1, 2020

As previously discussed between the Navy and Coast Guard, the Coast Guard intends to adopt the final Navy MITT SEIS/OSEIS (and by SEIS/OSEIS reference the 2015 Navy MITT EIS/OEIS) to provide NEPA compliance coverage for Coast Guard training and testing activities conducted in the MITT and analyzed jointly in the SEIS/OSEIS with Navy and Air Force training and testing activities. The Coast Guard is required by reference (d) to issue and publish a Coast Guard Record of Decision (ROD)/Overseas Decision (OD) when adopting another federal agency's final EIS/OEIS. This Coast Guard policy is based on a similar policy found in the current Department of Homeland Security's NEPA policy.

As a cooperating agency in the MITT SEIS/OSEIS, the Coast Guard agrees to:

a. Participate in the MITT NEPA process;

b. Provide data to the Navy on Coast Guard testing and training activities that take place in the MITT SEIS/OSEIS study area;

c. Assume, on request of the Navy, responsibility for developing information and preparing portions of the SEIS/OSEIS, for which the Coast Guard has special expertise;

d. Provide staff support at the Navy's request to fulfill environmental compliance, consistent with operational and mitigation requirements;

e. Participate, as necessary, in the biweekly meetings hosted by the Navy for discussion of issues related to the SEIS/OSEIS;

f. Provide the draft Coast Guard ROD/OD to Navy for review and comment for a minimum of 10 working days; and

g. Coordinate with Navy on the timing and release of Coast Guard's ROD/OD so that it is synchronized with Navy's ROD release.

The Coast Guard understands that the Navy agrees to:

a. Provide the Coast Guard with a draft final Navy ROD as early as possible in its NEPA process to assist the Coast Guard in the preparation of its own ROD/OD and to facilitate, to the extent appropriate, consistency between the Navy and Coast Guard versions;

b. Provide Coast Guard with comments to Coast Guard's draft ROD/OD within 10 working days of when the Coast Guard submits its draft ROD/OD to Navy;

c. Coordinate with Coast Guard on the timing and publication of Navy's ROD so that Coast Guard can synchronize the publication of its ROD/OD; and

d. Provide the Coast Guard with a copy of the final SEIS/OSEIS.

2

Subject: MARIANA ISLANDS TRAINING AND TESTING SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT/OVERSEA ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT – COAST GUARD COOPERATING AGENCY ACCEPTANCE

5090
April 1, 2020

We look forward to working with the Navy to successfully complete the MITT SEIS/OSEIS process. The main Coast Guard point of contact for this matter is Ms. Maile Norman. Ms. Norman's contact information is:

Ms. Maile Norman
Coast Guard District Fourteen Enforcement
300 Ala Moana BLVD, FL 9 RM 232
Honolulu, Hawaii 96850
(808) 535-3264
Maile.C.Norman@uscg.mil


Sincerely,

K. E. LUNDAY
Rear Admiral, U. S. Coast Guard
Commander, Fourteenth Coast Guard District

Copy: Commandant, U.S. Coast Guard (CG-DCMS, CG-LMI-E, CG-4, CG-47, CG-7)
Commander, Coast Guard Pacific Area (PAC-00)
Commander, Coast Guard Sector Guam (s)
CNO (N45 – Dawn Schroeder)

3

C.1.3 NAVY REQUEST LETTER TO THE NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS
2000 NAVY PENTAGON
WASHINGTON DC 20350-2000

5090
Ser N45/17U132422
September 27, 2017

Ms. Donna S. Wieting
Director, Office of Protected Resources
National Marine Fisheries Service
1315 East West Highway
Silver Spring, MD 20910

SUBJECT: MARIANA ISLANDS TRAINING AND TESTING SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT/OVERSEAS ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT - COOPERATING AGENCY REQUEST

Dear Ms. Wieting:

In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969 and Executive Order (EO) 12114, the United States (U.S.) Department of the Navy (Navy) is preparing a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (EIS/OEIS) to assess the potential environmental impacts associated with the continuation of military readiness activities, which consist of training as well as research, development, testing, and evaluation (RDT&E, hereinafter referred to as "testing") activities that include the use of active sonar and explosives in the Mariana Islands Training and Testing (MITT) Study Area. The proposed training and testing activities within the MITT Study Area supports the Navy's Title 10 of the U.S. Code requirements to achieve and maintain military readiness by ensuring the Navy can provide trained and equipped combat-ready forces capable of winning wars, deterring aggression, and maintaining freedom of the seas.

This MITT Supplemental EIS/OEIS represents the third phase (Phase III) of ongoing NEPA and EO 12114 compliance for continuation of at-sea training and testing. It will evaluate the conduct of military readiness activities from 2020 into the reasonably foreseeable future and accommodate evolving mission requirements associated with force structure changes, including those resulting from the development, testing, and ultimate introduction of new platforms (vessels, aircraft, and weapon systems) into the Fleet.

The Phase III MITT Study Area remains consistent with the area studied in the Phase II MITT EIS/OEIS completed in 2015 and consists of the established at sea ranges, operating areas, and special use airspace in the region of the Mariana Islands that are part of the Mariana Islands Range Complex (MIRC) and its surrounding seas, and includes a transit corridor. The transit corridor is outside the geographic boundaries of the MIRC and is a direct route across the high seas for Navy ships in transit between the MIRC and the Hawaii Range Complex. The Proposed Action also includes pierside sonar maintenance and testing alongside Navy piers located in Inner Apra Harbor.

5090
Ser N45/17U132422
September 27, 2017

The MITT Phase III Supplemental EIS/OEIS is intended to serve as a basis for the renewal of current regulatory permits and authorizations and the analysis of emerging and future force structure changes and training and testing requirements. An important aspect of the MITT Supplemental EIS/OEIS will be the analysis of the potential effects to marine species protected under the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA) and the Endangered Species Act (ESA) and habitats protected under the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act. The existing MMPA Final Rule and Letters of Authorization for Phase II MITT activities will expire in August 2020.

To complete the analysis required by the permitting and consultation process pursuant to MMPA and ESA in an efficient and effective way, the Navy believes that participation by the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) is needed. Therefore, in accordance with the Council on Environmental Quality's (CEQ) regulations implementing NEPA (specifically 40 CFR Part 1501) and CEQ's 2002 guidance on cooperating agencies, the Navy requests that the NMFS serve as a cooperating agency for the development of the Phase III MITT Supplemental EIS/OEIS.

Consistent with 40 CFR 1501.6, the Navy is requesting NMFS' participation as early in the planning process as possible. As the lead agency, the Navy will:

a. Gather all necessary background information and prepare the Phase III Supplemental EIS/OEIS and all necessary permit applications associated with acoustic issues within the Study Area;

b. Work with NMFS personnel to determine the method of estimating potential effects to protected marine species, including threatened and endangered species;

c. Determine the scope of the Phase III MITT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, including the alternatives evaluated;

d. Circulate the NEPA document to the general public and any other interested parties;

e. Schedule and supervise meetings held in support of the NEPA process and compile comments received; and

f. Maintain an administrative record and respond to Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) requests relating to the Phase III Supplemental EIS/OEIS.

Navy respectfully requests that NMFS, in its role as a cooperating agency, provide the following support:

2

5090
Ser N45/17U132422
September 27, 2017

a. Participate in the NEPA process, to include public participation efforts pertaining to the Phase III Supplemental EIS/OEIS, and fund such support through its own sources to the maximum extent possible;

b. Provide timely comments on working drafts of the Phase III Supplemental EIS/OEIS in accordance with the approved project schedule and commenting protocols, and provide minutes of any agency information meeting that have been adjudicated within the agency;

c. Adhere to the overall schedule as set forth by the Navy in coordination with NMFS;

d. Respond to Navy requests for information, in particular, those related to review of the acoustic effects analysis and evaluation of the effectiveness of protection and mitigation measures;

e. Coordinate, to the maximum extent practicable, any public comment periods that are necessary in the MMPA permitting process with the Navy's NEPA public comment periods;

f. Make available staff support at Navy's request to enhance the Navy's interdisciplinary capability;

g. Participate, as necessary, in meetings hosted by the Navy for discussion of issues related to the Phase III Supplemental EIS/OEIS;

h. Utilize NMFS resources, including funding where appropriate, in support of executing its cooperating agency responsibilities.;

i. Prepare any NMFS-specific documents required to support the NMFS decision-making process;

j. Maintain an administrative record and respond to FOIA requests relating to the Phase III Supplemental EIS/OEIS; and

k. Provide a formal, written response to this request.

The Navy views this agreement as important to the successful completion of the environmental planning process for the Phase III MITT Supplemental EIS/OEIS. It is the Navy's goal to complete the analysis as expeditiously as possible, while using the best scientific information available. NMFS assistance is invaluable to this endeavor.

3

5090
Ser N45/17U132422
September 27, 2017

We appreciate your consideration of our request and look forward to your response. The point of contact for this action is Ms. Dawn Schroeder, (703) 695-5219, email: dawn.schroeder@navy.mil.

Sincerely,

C. A. LAHTI
Director, Energy and Environmental
Readiness Division

Copy to:
ASN (EI&E)
DASN (E)
OAGC (EI&E)
OPNAV (N9I, N83)
Commander, U.S. Fleet Forces Command (N46)
Commander, U.S. Pacific Fleet (N465)
Commander, Navy Installations Command (N45)
Commander, Naval Sea Systems Command
Commander, Naval Air Systems Command
Commander, Joint Region Marianas
Commander, Naval Facilities Engineering Command, (N45)

4

C.1.4 NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE RESPONSE LETTER

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Captain C.A. Lahti
Director, Energy and
Environmental and Readiness Division
Department of the Navy
2000 Navy Pentagon
Washington, DC 20350-2000

Dear Captain Lahti:

Thank you for your letter requesting the National Marine Fisheries Service (NOAA Fisheries) be a cooperating agency in the preparation of a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (EIS/OEIS) to evaluate potential environmental effects in the Department of the Navy's (Navy) Mariana Islands Training and Testing (MITT) Study Area. Activities conducted in the MITT Study Area will achieve and maintain military readiness and include current, emerging, and future training activities and research, development, test and evaluation events (Phase III). We support the Navy's decision to prepare a Supplemental EIS/OEIS on this activity and agree to be a cooperating agency, due, in part, to our responsibilities under section 101(a)(5)(A) of the Marine Mammal Protection Act and under section 7 of the Endangered Species Act. NOAA Fisheries will make every effort to support the Navy in the development of a Supplemental EIS/OEIS, including:

- Participating, as necessary, in meetings hosted by the Navy for the discussion of issues related to the Phase III Supplemental EIS/OEIS;
- Providing timely comments on working drafts of the Phase III Supplemental EIS/OEIS in accordance with the approved project schedule and commenting protocols;
- Responding to Navy requests for information, in particular, those related to review of the acoustic effects analysis and evaluation of the effectiveness of protection and mitigation measures; and
- Adhering to the overall schedule as set forth by the Navy in coordination with NMFS.

If you need any additional information, please contact Jolie Harrison at (301) 427-8420.

Sincerely,

Samuel D. Rauch III
Deputy Assistant Administrator for
Regulatory Programs
National Marine Fisheries Service

cc: Michael Tosatto, NMFS PIRO
Vicki Wedell, NMFS HQ NMS
Steve Leathery, NMFS HQ NEPA
Dawn Schroeder, Navy

Printed on Recycled Paper

C.2 COASTAL ZONE MANAGEMENT ACT

C.2.1 NAVY CONSISTENCY DETERMINATION LETTERS – COMMONWEALTH OF THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
COMMANDER
UNITED STATES PACIFIC FLEET
250 MAKALAPA DRIVE
PEARL HARBOR, HAWAII 96860-3131

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5090
Ser N465/1491
December 16, 2019

Mr. Arthur Charsauros
Director
Division of Coastal Resources Management
Bureau of Environmental and Coastal Quality
P.O. Box 501304, Saipan, MP 96950

Dear Mr. Charsauros:

SUBJECT: CONSISTENCY DETERMINATION FOR MILITARY TRAINING AND TESTING WITHIN THE COASTAL ZONE OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS

In accordance with the Federal Coastal Zone Management Act and 15 C.F.R. § 930, the U.S. Navy submits the enclosed Federal Consistency Determination (CD) for proposed activities in the Mariana Islands Training and Testing (MITT) Study Area that have reasonably foreseeable coastal effects on the coastal zone of the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (CNMI).

Based on the enclosed consistency assessment and the activities and analysis contained in the enclosed Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Impact Statement (DSEIS/OEIS), the Navy finds that the proposed military training and testing activities presented in Alternative 2 are consistent to the maximum extent practicable with the enforceable policies of the CNMI Coastal Resource Management Program.

If you have any questions, please contact Mr. John Van Name at (808) 471-1714 or john.vanname@navy.mil or Ms. Suzanne Smith at (808) 471-4696 or suzanne.smith3@navy.mil.

Sincerely,

DANIEL McNAIR
Director, Fleet Environmental Readiness
By direction of the Commander

Enclosures: 1. CD for the CNMI
2. CDROM – MITT DSEIS/OEIS

Copy to:
COMNAVREGMARIANAS (w/o enclosure)
OPNAV N45 (w/o enclosure)
MS. GLENNA SP REYES, DIRECTOR, BUREAU OF MILITARY AFFAIRS, OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR COMMONWEALTH OF THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS, JUAN A. SABLAN MEMORIAL BUILDING, CALLER BOX 10007, SAIPAN, MP 96950 (w/enclosures)

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
COMMANDER
UNITED STATES PACIFIC FLEET
250 MAKALAPA DRIVE
PEARL HARBOR, HAWAII 96860-3131

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5090
Ser N465/1492
December 16, 2019

Ms. Glenna SP Reyes
Director, Bureau of Military Affairs
Office of the Governor
Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands
Juan A. Sablan Memorial Building
Caller Box 10007
Saipan, MP 96950

Dear Ms. Reyes:

SUBJECT: CONSISTENCY DETERMINATION FOR MILITARY TRAINING AND TESTING WITHIN THE COASTAL ZONE OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS

In accordance with the Federal Coastal Zone Management Act and 15 C.F.R. § 930, the U.S. Navy submits the enclosed Federal Consistency Determination (CD) for proposed activities in the Mariana Islands Training and Testing (MITT) Study Area that have reasonably foreseeable coastal effects on the coastal zone of the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (CNMI).

Based on the enclosed consistency assessment and the activities and analysis contained in the enclosed Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Impact Statement (DSEIS/OEIS), the Navy finds that the proposed military training and testing activities presented in Alternative 2 are consistent to the maximum extent practicable with the enforceable policies of the CNMI Coastal Resource Management Program.

If you have any questions, please contact Mr. John Van Name at (808) 471-1714 or john.vanname@navy.mil or Ms. Suzanne Smith at (808) 471-4696 or suzanne.smith3@navy.mil.

Sincerely,

DANIEL McNAIR
Director, Fleet Environmental Readiness
By direction of the Commander

Enclosures: 1. CD for the CNMI
2. CDROM – MITT DSEIS/OEIS

Copy to:
COMNAVREGMARIANAS (w/o enclosure)
OPNAV N45 (w/o enclosure)
MR. ARTHUR CHARSAUROS, DIRECTOR, DIVISION OF COASTAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT BUREAU OF ENVIRONMENTAL AND COASTAL QUALITY, P.O. BOX 501304, SAIPAN, MP 96950 (w/enclosures)

C.2.2 COMMONWEALTH OF THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS RESPONSE LETTERS

Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR
Bureau of Environmental and Coastal Quality
Division of Coastal Resources Management
P.O. Box 501304, Saipan, MP 96950
Tel: (670) 664-8300; Fax: (670) 664-8315
www.dcrm.gov.mp

Eli D. Cabrera
Administrator

Janice E. Castro
Director, DCRM

March 9, 2020

Mr. John Van Name & Ms. Suzanne Smith
Environmental Program Manager, United States Pacific Fleet
Department of the Navy
250 Makalapa Drive
Pearl Harbor, HI 96860-3131

Re: Consistency Determination for Military Training and Testing Within the Coastal Zone of the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas Islands (CNMI)

Dear Mr. Van Name and Ms. Smith,

The Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands' (CNMI) Division of Coastal Resources Management (DCRM) has reviewed the U.S. Department of the Navy's Federal Consistency Determination (CD) submitted and received by our office on December 17, 2019 for the proposed activities in the Marianas Islands Training and Testing (MITT) Study Area within the Coastal Zone of the CNMI.

After carefully reviewing this CD, and as outlined further herein, DCRM finds that the proposed MITT activities as reflected in Alternative 2 of the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement / Overseas Impact Statement (DSEIS/OEIS) are not consistent with the enforceable policies of the CNMI Coastal Management Program. Therefore, DCRM recommends the Department of the Navy revise its CD to address data gaps, including inconsistencies and lack of up-to-date data, as well as detail and include further mitigation of potential effects on the CNMI's coastal resources.

To support DCRM's CD response, comments from both divisions under the Bureau of Environmental and Coastal Quality (BECQ) as well as the public comments received during the extended public commenting period of 30 days are enclosed and incorporated by reference here. Comments raised concerns that DCRM shares regarding the lack of inclusion of land-based training activities in this CD as it appears from the draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) that changes in land-based training are indeed proposed.

The government of the CNMI recognizes the important training needs of the U.S. Military and hopes to accommodate those needs in a manner that is consistent with the federally approved coastal management policies of the CNMI Coastal Management Program. We look forward to the opportunity to discuss our concerns and how consistency with the policies of the CNMI Coastal Management Program can be achieved to the greatest extent practicable.

As detailed further herein, DCRM finds that the current DEIS/OEIS MITT proposal is not consistent with the enforceable policies of the CNMI Coastal Management Program as the submitted information is not sufficient for a complete and adequate analysis. In fact, it is not entirely evident from current submissions what mitigation measures are being proposed for review. Although Section 930.37 of Federal Consistency regulations provide for use of a DEIS to support a consistency determination, "a Federal agency's federal consistency obligations under the Act are independent of those required under NEPA and are not necessarily fulfilled by the NEPA document." As such, references to mitigation measures or conservation recommendations that will be implemented as results from initiated Endangered Species Act (ESA) and Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA) consultations cannot be considered as part of this CD as they have not yet been completed.

In order for MITT activities to achieve consistency with CNMI's enforceable policies, it is essential that the Navy clearly outline existing conditions, rigorously assess effects, and detail what monitoring and mitigation efforts will be implemented. It is encouraged that critical data gaps including lack of baseline information relating to water quality, species diversity and abundance within the training areas including wildlife populations around Saipan, Farallon de Medinilla (FDM), Tinian, and Rota be addressed through additional studies designed if not implemented in coordination with CNMI and that resulting data be shared in a timely manner to support review. As outlined in the Consistency with Enforceable Policies section of this letter, additional information is needed on the following items in order to assess the consistency of the MITT with the CNMI enforceable policies:

NMIAC § 15-10

- **Part 300 - Standards for CRM Permit Issuance**
  § 15-10-301, General Standards for all CRM Permits
  § 15-10-305, Standards for DCRM Permit Issuance General Criteria
  § 15-10-315, Specific Criteria; Areas of Particular Concern; Lagoons and Reefs
  § 15-10-325, Specific Criteria; Areas of Particular Concern; Coral Reefs
  § 15-10-335, Specific Criteria; Areas of Particular Concern; Shorelines
  § 15-10-340, Specific Criteria; Areas of Particular Concern; Ports and Industrial Areas:

  Provide substantial details as to why each of these Areas of Particular Concern (APC) will not be affected by the direct, indirect, or cumulative effects from the proposed activities including analysis of potential spillover impacts.

- **Part 500 - Standards for Determining Major Siting**
  § 15-10-501, Determination of Major Siting
  § 15-10-505, Specific Criteria for Major Siting

  Part 600 - CRM Permit Conditions

  Provide substantial details as to why the Navy's Proposed Action does not meet the criteria for a Major Siting, and analysis regarding how the Proposed Action would

otherwise not have the potential to directly and significantly impact CNMI coastal resources with the potential for significant adverse effects .

Division of Environmental Quality (DEQ) Water Quality Standards: Classification and Establishment of Water Use Areas and Specific Water Quality Criteria

Data has not been provided to confirm baseline water quality in areas of proposed activities or to substantiate statements that there are no reasonably foreseeable effects. To achieve consistency please provide literature cited in the CD as well as any recent scientific studies which contain current and accurate scientific data and clear impacts criteria for direct and cumulative impacts incorporated into the CD analysis on water quality. If such data is lacking for activities in the study area, reasonable efforts to conduct such data collection and assessments to demonstrate that CNMI waters are kept "shall be free from toxic pollutants in concentrations that are lethal to, or that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, or animal life" should be undertaken.

CNMI Public Law No. 3-47; Policy Elements 4, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17 & 21:

Provide a timeline, detailed analysis, and sufficient data for the discussion of mitigation measures outlined throughout these policy elements. To be consistent with enforceable policies of the CNMI, the Navy needs to specify monitoring and mitigation – including providing reasonable details regarding *how and when* impacts will be mitigated – and provide implementation timelines to ensure impacts of these activities are in fact being avoided, minimized, and mitigated to the greatest extent practicable.

Provide current detailed analysis and sufficient data for all applicable coastal resources, particularly coral and algae diversity, cover, and structural complexity; especially for ESA-listed corals in critical areas such as those listed in MITT Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS Vol. 2 sites on Tinian (Unai Babui, Unai Dankulu, and Unai Chulu), and where training areas will overlap with nearshore habitats.

Provide current data or modeling that determines that emissions from the proposed activity will not lead to a violation of National Ambient Air Quality standards (NAAQS) in the coastal zones of Saipan, Tinian, and Rota. Please see attached BECQ comments for an in-depth description of these policy elements.

It is also critical that the Navy takes steps to provide meaningful analysis of data and standards of DCRM's enforceable policies. Details and analysis deficiencies noted in received comments that DCRM hopes the Navy can remedy include the following:

- **Policy Element 4** – "Plan for and manage any use or activity with the potential for causing a direct and significant impact on coastal resources. Significant adverse impacts shall be mitigated to the extent practicable."

  The Coastal Zone Management Act broadly defines the environment. Instead of considering impacts of increased activities to the people of the CNMI and the coastal

resources that comprise our home, the CD narrowly discusses potential impacts to marine mammals, coral, and fishes in water and does not reassess impacts of land-based activities on Saipan, Tinian, and Rota or FDM, stating that no changes in these activities are proposed. As previously mentioned, FDM activities appear to be significantly increasing, and mitigation measures proposed by DCRM to ensure consistency with land-based operations in the 2015 MITT do not appear to have been implemented regularly – particularly as they pertain to early coordination and data sharing with CNMI. It is unclear why the Navy states that mitigation measures are outside of the scope of this SEIS/OEIS (CD enclosure pg. 23), especially given the fact that the 2014 CD correspondence from DCRM noted that "[i]n order to comply with the enforceable polices of the CNMI, further measures are needed to protect the wildlife and habitats of the CNMI."

Similarly, in this CD request like the 2014 submission, the basis for finding that the MITT is consistent to the maximum extent practicable has not been established. The Navy must show how its proposed actions are fully consistent by providing data, not speculative conclusions such as that potential effects to endangered species will be addressed through pending biological opinions. As also noted previously, the statement that the "Navy's Proposed Action provides special protection to coastal resources and mitigates adverse impacts" is inadequate to demonstrate consistency as the SEIS/OEIS does not actually commit to mitigation measures or timelines for implementation of mitigation, making these assurances rather hollow and unenforceable. If the Navy plans to rely on the suite of mitigation options discussed in the Draft SEIS/OEIS to demonstrate compliance with CNMI's enforceable policies including the requirement of mitigation of adverse impacts, meaningful and enforceable commitments and timelines for implementation should be developed as part of this CD correspondence.

- **Policy Element 10** – "Maintain or improve coastal water quality through control of erosion, sedimentation, runoff, siltation, sewage and other discharges."

  Assessment of this policy element and supporting regulations is inadequate and this analysis should be revised to support DCRM's review of this CD request.

- **Policy Elements 11 and 12** – Impacts to cultural resources.

  Although Section 106 consultations are ongoing to support the reissuance of the expired Programmatic Agreement, the analysis of impacts to cultural resources referenced in Section 3.11 of the draft SEIS/OEIS does not include sufficient data to make any determination regarding likely significant impacts to cultural resources within CNMI waters and on FDM. Absence of evidence is not evidence of absence and the DoD has an obligation to implement reasonable assessment of resources that are likely to be impacted by MITT activities. Lacking that data, there is therefore no basis for the Navy's conclusion that this proposed action is consistent with these policy elements. Data gaps should be remedied to ensure consistency with these policies and the CNMI's significant and compelling interest to protect and preserve our cultural resources.

Doc. No. 35GL-20-1874.*

- **Policy Element 13** – "Require compliance with all local air and water quality laws and regulations and any applicable federal air and water quality standards."

  Data must be provided to support the conclusory statements that air emissions will be minimal on Saipan and Rota and will be "intermittent and short term, resulting in minimal impact on the air quality of Tinian". Models are available to assess these activities for compliance with local and federal air quality standards and should be included for review in this submission. Comments regarding water quality standards are incorporated by reference here.

- **Policy Elements 15 and 16** – Management of marine resources and consistency with other policies.

  As noted in the response to Policy Element 4, the Navy's analysis of impacts to coastal resources is overly narrow and does not meaningfully address impacts to the human environment. This is especially true regarding impacts to the integrity of our reefs and wildlife habitat (Policy 15) and the management and development of our local subsistence, sport, and commercial fisheries (Policy 16). The draft SEIS/OEIS contains insufficient assessment of the potential impacts to these resources and the "analysis" under Policy Element 4 does not address potential impacts to human uses such as fishing and traditional access to important fishing areas. Thus, it is unclear how the Navy can conclude their proposed actions are consistent when analysis is completely lacking. An updated CD should address this gap, preferably through a revised SEIS that provides meaningful analysis of impacts to these important coastal resources.

- **Policy Element 17** – "Protect all coastal resources, particularly sand, coral and fish from taking beyond sustainable levels and in the case of marine mammals and any species on the Commonwealth endangered species list, from any taking whatsoever."

  The Navy explains that "the Proposed Action has the potential to take marine mammals and species on the Commonwealth endangered species list" and that "[a]ny take occurring as a result of the Proposed Action would be incidental to, and not the purpose of, the Navy's otherwise lawful training and testing activities" and notes that protective measures intended to avoid and minimize the "take" of endangered species will be updated as appropriate upon completion of the Section 7 consultation. As noted previously, past promises of mitigation and monitoring have not been executed, or, if they have been, have not been shared with the CNMI, therefore, it is encouraged that any monitoring and mitigation agreements that are the basis for a consistency determination include timebound deliverables so that consistency can be demonstrated.

- **Policy Element 21** – "Encourage the preservation of traditional rights of public access to and along the shorelines consistent with the rights of private property owners."

  Contrary to the Navy's statement that the "MITT Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS does not propose any change to the public access normally allowed on federally leased lands including FDM, which would remain restricted for security and safety reasons" and that

the "MITT Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS does not propose a change to the ocean areas currently used by both the Navy and the public", increases in the intensity and use of CNMI lands and waters is more likely than not to have significant impacts to public access of shorelines and traditional fishing areas. Already, three nautical miles (nm) surrounding the abundant fishery surrounding FDM is periodically restricted and this SEIS proposes to extend that "danger zone" to 12 nm and increase the frequency of restricted use in this area. These restrictions can have direct and significant impacts to boaters and the fishing community by increasing travel time and forcing seagoing vessels to travel well out of their traditional navigation routes. Similarly, periodic exercises on Tinian significantly restrict community access to forests and shorelines that have been traditionally used for subsistence and commercial activities. The frequency and timing of these restrictions should be discussed further with the CNMI in order to maximize access for users of these ocean resources while ensuring the Navy can meet its training objectives. Given that assessment of impacts and commitment to reasonable mitigation measures are lacking in the SEIS/OEIS, meaningful commitments should be articulated in supplemental analysis in a revised CD in order to ensure consistency with this enforceable policy.

Consistency with Enforceable Policies

The CNMI has determined the MITT is inconsistent with the enforceable policies of the CNMI Coastal Management Program in the following ways:

NMIAC § 15-10 Part 300 - Standards for CRM Permit Issuance
§ 15-10-301, General Standards for all CRM Permits
§ 15-10- 305, Standards for DCRM Permit Issuance General Criteria

As stated in the CD, "Not Applicable. The Navy's Proposed Action does not include applying for permits with the CNMI". However, if these sections are not applicable, further details explaining why these proposed actions do not apply should be outlined to frame discussion regarding their applicability to DCRMs enforceable policies.

NMIAC § 15-10 Part 300 - Standards for CRM Permit Issuance
§ 15-10-315, Specific Criteria; Areas of Particular Concern; Lagoons and Reefs
§ 15-10-325, Specific Criteria; Areas of Particular Concern; Coral Reefs
§ 15-10-335, Specific Criteria; Areas of Particular Concern; Shorelines
§ 15-10-340, Specific Criteria; Areas of Particular Concern; Ports and Industrial Areas

The information stated in the CD does not provide substantial details as to why these Areas of Particular Concern (APC) will not be affected by the direct, indirect, or cumulative effects from the proposed action. DCRM has previously commented on portions of the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Impact Statement (DSEIS/OEIS), requesting best available scientific data and clear impacts criteria for direct, indirect and cumulative impact analysis. The current data outlined in the CD does not support meaningful analysis of the impacts and possible mitigation of these impacts.

Doc. No. 35GL-20-1874.*

NMIAC § 15-10 Part 500 - Standards for Determining Major Siting
§ 15-10-501: Determination of Major Siting
§ 15-10-505: Specific Criteria for Major Sitings

NMIAC § 15-10 Part 600 - CRM Permit Conditions

As stated in the CD, "Not Applicable. The Navy's Proposed Action does not meet the criteria for a major siting." Under the CNMI's enforceable policies, a "major siting" is defined as "any proposed project which has the potential to directly and significantly impact coastal resources" including "proposed projects with potential for significant adverse effects on submerged lands,…reefs, wetlands, beaches and lakes…and endangered or threatened species or marine mammal habitats" (§15-10-020(uu)(4)). Consistency with major siting standards of §15-10-505 should be assessed, especially in terms of how training and testing activities will affect the broadly defined coastal environment including fish and wildlife habitat, cultural resources, and the natural integrity of CNMI water bodies and what mitigation responses will be implement to ensure impacts are avoided, minimized, and mitigated. Moreover, based on the lack of data, substantive details, and meaningful analysis in the CD regarding the impacts to these coastal resources, DCRM believes the proposed MITT activities are likely to have significant adverse effects on the CNMI's coastal resources. Meaningful analysis of data and standards of enforceable policies are necessary to support a review of proposed activities to ensure consistency and should be included in revised documentation to facilitate this effort.

DEQ Water Quality Standards: Classification and Establishment of Water Use Areas and Specific Water Quality Criteria

The information stated in the CD does not provide critical details to adequately address DEQ Water Quality Standards. The literature cited is not included in full detail in the CD, and it appears that DoD has collected no water quality sampling, monitoring, or analysis within the Marianas Islands Range Complex. Additionally, information cited from the previous MITT does not provide current and accurate scientific data and clear impacts criteria for direct and cumulative impacts related to water quality. To ensure consistency, it is recommended that the Navy develop and implement a monitoring plan to ensure water quality stays within CNMI standards. To provide baseline data necessary to substantiate the conclusion that activities have had and will continue to have "no effects" on water quality, it is strongly encouraged that the Navy take reasonable steps to provide additional data on bio-accumulation of toxins associated with ordinance in marine life and localized effects within the monitoring plan, including assessment of fish and filter-feeding invertebrates around Saipan, FDM, Tinian, and Rota.

CNMI Public Law No. 3-47; Policy Elements 4, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17 & 21:

The information stated in the CD does not provide substantial details and data to adequately address Policy Elements 4, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17 & 21. Currently the CD does not look at the combined impacts of the MITT with other military activities in the study area and therefore does not present adequate information on direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts. There is also limited information regarding the duration, temporal, and spatial context of proposed activities, and

whether activities will occur in separate or simultaneous locations and times – critical details when discussing the context and intensity and therefore the "significance" of a proposed action and its effects. DCRM holds that additional information regarding proposed activities and mitigation measures are needed in order to comply with the enforceable policies of the CNMI.

Review Standards for Federal Consistency

Under the Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA) of 1972, 16 USC § § 1451-1465, § 1456(c)(1), and Federal Consistency regulations, 15 CFR § § 930.30-930.46, Federal agency activities with reasonably foreseeable effects on the State's coastal zone must be consistent to the maximum extent practicable with the enforceable policies of the States' federally approved CZMA programs. Under 15 CFR §930.32(a)(1), the standard for "consistent to the maximum extent practicable" means fully consistent with the enforceable policies of the CNMI's management programs unless full consistency is prohibited by existing law applicable to the Federal agency. Thus, the Navy must show how existing law prohibits full consistency with the CNMI's Coastal Management Program. However, the Navy has not provided any description of any statutory provisions, legislative history, or other legal authority which limits the Navy's discretion to be fully consistent with the enforceable policies of CNMI's management program.

Furthermore, 15 CFR §930.32(a)(2) details that 16 USC § 1456(e), "construction with other laws", or "Section 307(e) of the Act does not relieve Federal agencies of the consistency requirements under the Act. The Act was intended to cause substantive changes in Federal agency decision making within the context of the discretionary powers residing in such agencies. Accordingly, ***whenever legally permissible, Federal agencies shall consider the enforceable policies of management programs as requirements to be adhered to in addition to existing Federal agency statutory mandates***. If a Federal agency asserts that full consistency with the management program is prohibited, it shall clearly describe, in writing, to the State agency the statutory provisions, legislative history, or other legal authority which limits the Federal agency's discretion to be fully consistent with the enforceable policies of the management program" (emphasis added).

As such, if there are impediments to achieving consistency as outlined here, DCRM encourages the Navy to work with the CNMI through the Bureau of Military Affairs and our office to discuss and remedy these challenges. Lacking such restraints, CNMI encourages the Navy to provide the requisite details to demonstrate full consistency with all applicable DCRM enforceable policies including:

- Full consistency with local permitting considerations;
- Application of CD analysis to all relevant enforceable policies;
- Reasonable collection and analysis of relevant data and standards to support assessment of impacts; and
- Time-bound commitments to proposed mitigation measures that will be implemented to ensure consistency to the maximum extent practicable.

In conclusion, insufficient information has been provided in this CD for DCRM to agree that the MITT activities are consistent with the CNMI's rules and regulations. Given these challenges, it would seem prudent that the Navy consider coordinating with the CNMI to address data gaps

further and submitting a revised Consistency Determination Request after an updated Final Supplemental EIS has been circulated and comments have been received and reviewed. The Coastal Zone Management Act does provide for flexibility in timelines to support robust review of impacts to coastal resources, and DCRM would welcome the opportunity to discuss a mutually agreeable timeline for revisions or resubmission of this determination request when a preferred alternative has been selected.

To achieve consistency with CNMI's enforceable policies, the Department of the Navy will need to modify its MITT proposal to provide reasonably sufficient details to support analysis as to why each of these sets of proposed actions will not cause significant direct, indirect, and/or cumulative effects including spillover impacts on the CNMI's coastal resources. Additionally, DCRM would welcome further clarification and discussion of specific mitigation measures and alternatives proposed by the Navy to support your timelines and ensure adverse impacts are being appropriately mitigated. The CNMI recognizes the critical mission and ongoing training needs of the U.S. Military and looks forward to discussing ways the MITT can become consistent with the CNMI's enforceable policies.

Please note the included comments from CNMI Bureau of Environmental and Coastal Quality, as well as public comments which are attached to this consistency determination. Should you have any questions or require further information, please contact (670) 664-8308 or fedcon@dcrm.gov.mp.

Sincerely,

JANICE E. CASTRO
Director
Division of Coastal Resources Management

Enclosures: Comments from BECQ-DCRM
Comments from BECQ-DEQ
Comments from Kathy Yuknavage
Comments from the CNMI Office of the Governor

cc: Jeffrey L. Payne, Director, Office for Coastal Management, NOAA
Ralph DLG. Torres, Governor, CNMI
Arnold I. Palacios, Lieutenant Governor, CNMI
Glenna SP Reyes, Special Assistant, Commonwealth Bureau of Military Affairs
Eliceo D. Cabrera, Administrator, BECQ
Kodep Ogumoro-Uludong, Director, Office of Planning and Development
CRM Agency Board

Page 9 of 9

CONSISTENCY DETERMINATION FOR COMMONWEALTH OF THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS

PUBLIC LAW No. 3-47

Policy Element 4. *Plan for and manage any use or activity with the potential for causing a direct and significant impact on coastal resources. Significant adverse impacts shall be mitigated to the extent practicable.*

Policy Element 15. *Manage ecologically significant resource areas for their contribution to marine productivity and value as wildlife habitats, and preserve the functions and integrity of reefs, marine meadows, salt ponds, mangroves and other significant natural areas.*

Policy Element 17. *Protect all coastal resources, particularly sand, coral and fish from taking beyond sustainable levels and in the case of marine mammals and any species on the Commonwealth endangered species list, from any taking whatsoever.*

Comment:

In regards to Public Law No.3-47, Policy Elements 4, 15, and 17, the impact on coastal resources, specifically coral reefs, is not adequately addressed. Table 1 of the consistency document lists several activities that will occur in the Marianas littorals and Tinian, which will overlap fringing reefs. Section 3.8-11 of the MITT Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS Vol. 2 lists beaches on Tinian (Unai Babui, Unai Dankulu, and Unai Chulu), where training areas will overlap nearshore habitats and states:

"However, the combined consequences of all physical disturbance and strike stressors could degrade habitat quality at some locations. As stated above, combat swimmers and Marines may be required to walk through nearshore areas and reefs during these activities, potentially causing damage to coral species. As stated in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and above, these activities could cause injury or mortality to individuals, but impacts on marine invertebrate populations, including ESA-listed corals, are unlikely."

Since the distribution of ESA-listed corals in the Marianas has not been mapped out, the statement that impacts to marine invertebrate populations and ESA-listed corals is not supported. We do share many coral species with other Pacific reefs, however, the Marianas region is isolated in terms of genetic connectivity to the rest of Micronesia, where the majority of coral and fish larvae originate from Saipan and Tinian (Kendall & Poti, 2014; Maynard et al., 2015; Randall, 1995). Therefore, any physical disturbance through accidental damage on reef structure can impede recovery for the coral reefs of the CNMI that are still recovering from mass bleaching events, two category 5 typhoons, and multiple crown-of thorns outbreaks.

In addition, assessing species or population level impacts of marine invertebrate populations for shallow coral reefs provides an incomplete analysis on the environmental impacts for our region. Coral and algae diversity, cover, and structural complexity are also important indicators of reef ecosystem function and health. The CNMI has suffered severe coral mortality from back to back bleaching events in 2013, 2014, 2016, and 2017 (Heron et al., 2016; Reynolds et al., 2014). For example, Unai Babui in Tinian is designated as a training area in the MITT EIS, and is one of CRM's long-term marine monitoring sites since 2001. Since 2009, Unai Babui has had a steady decline in coral cover with a large increase in macroalgae cover, and loss in crustose coralline algae (CCA). CCA is extremely important in

strengthening reef structure and are resistant to ocean acidification (Nash et al., 2013; Nelson, 2009). Coral cover at Unai Babui is hovering at less than 10% and for Unai Dankulu at less than 15% in 2018. Maintaining coral cover above 10% is a critical threshold for sustaining reef function (Darling et al., 2019). The shallow water reefs around Tinian are already vulnerable from past storm and bleaching disturbances, and decline in coral cover is now at a critical threshold where further loss can severely reduce chances of recovery. In addition, any damage to reef structure, whether live or dead coral, will degrade habitat quality by accelerating reef breakage and loss of structural complexity, resulting in loss of habitat for diverse species, potential loss of storm protection, and accelerates erosion of the reef. Therefore, proposed listed actions in Table 1, for the Mariana littoral zone and Tinian are not sustainable and would further put CNMI's coastal resources at risk of further degradation.

References

Darling, E. S., Mcclanahan, T. R., Maina, J., & Gurney, G. G. (2019). Social–environmental drivers inform strategic management of coral reefs in the Anthropocene. *Nature Ecology & Evolution*. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41559-019-0953-8

Heron, S. F., Johnston, L., Liu, G., Geiger, E. F., Maynard, J. A., De La Cour, J. L., et al. (2016). Validation of reef-scale thermal stress satellite products for coral bleaching monitoring. *Remote Sensing*, *8*(59), 1–16. https://doi.org/10.3390/rs8010059

Kendall, M. S., & Poti, M. (2014). Potential larval sources, destinations, and self-seeding in the mariana archipelago documented using ocean drifters. *Journal of Oceanography*, *70*(6), 549–557. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10872-014-0251-7

Maynard, J. A., McKagan, S., Raymundo, L., Johnson, S., Ahmadia, G. N., Johnston, L., et al. (2015). Assessing relative resilience potential of coral reefs to inform management. *Biological Conservation*, *192*, 109–119. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2015.09.001

Nash, M. C., Opdyke, B. N., Troitzsch, U., Russell, B. D., Adey, W. H., Kato, A., et al. (2013). Dolomite-rich coralline algae in reefs resist dissolution in acidified conditions. *Nature Climate Change*, *3*, 268–272. https://doi.org/10.1038/nclimate1760

Nelson, W. A. (2009). Calcified macroalgae - critical to coastal ecosystems and vulnerable to change: A review. *Marine and Freshwater Research*, *60*(8), 787–801. https://doi.org/10.1071/MF08335

Randall, R. H. (1995). Biogeography of Reef-Building Corals in the Mariana and Palau Islands in Relation to Back-Arc Rifting and the Formation of the Eastern Philippine Sea. *Nat. Hist. Res.*, *3*(2), 193–210.

Reynolds, T., Burdick, D., Houk, P., Raymundo, L., & Johnson, S. (2014). Unprecedented coral bleaching across the Marianas Archipelago. *Coral Reefs*, *33*, 499. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00338-014-1139-0

December 2019 Consistency Determination
Air Quality Comments – Larry Maurin

COASTAL ZONE MANAGEMENT ACT – CONSISTENCY DETERMINATION FOR COMMONWEALTH OF THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS

Public Law No. 3-47

Policy Element 13. Require compliance with all local air and water quality laws and regulations and any applicable federal air and water quality standards.

Page 24: Comments on Air Quality Impacts of the Proposed Action

- Air quality impacts of criteria and hazardous air pollutants from additional activities in the Proposed Action (i.e. Phase III) have not been quantified and included in the consistency determination, so the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS is not representative of cumulative air emissions.
- Emissions of criteria and hazardous air pollutants that may affect the Rota and Saipan Coastal Zones have not been quantified, and no modeling has been done to determine if these emissions will lead to a violation of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) and CNMI Ambient Air Quality Standards. There must be a basis for the claim that "air quality impacts attributable to the military training and testing activities" to the Saipan and Rota coastal zone "uses and resources would be minimal." No basis for this claim has been presented.
- Additional emissions of criteria and hazardous air pollutants from Phase III activities that may affect the coastal zone of Tinian have not been quantified. There must be a basis for the claim that "combined effects from air quality impacts attributable to the military training and testing activities to the Tinian coastal zone uses and resources would be minimal." No basis for this claim has been presented.
- There must be a basis for the claim that "the Proposed Action complies with all local air quality laws and regulation and any applicable federal air quality standards". No quantification of additional impacts from Phase III has been conducted and no modeling analysis has been submitted to ensure compliance with the NAAQS and CNMI Ambient Air Quality Standards.
- There must be a basis for the statement that "air emissions generated as a result of the Proposed Action would be minimal, intermittent, and short term. Thus, the Proposed Action would not have a significant impact on ambient air quality and is in compliance with local and federal air quality standards." No modeling analysis of the Proposed Action has been submitted to demonstrate that there would be no significant impact on the NAAQS or CNMI Ambient Air Quality Standards.

Comments - Military Training and Testing within the CZ of the CNMI Kathy Yuknavage

DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ACTION

Page: 2

Navy states that, "These training and testing activities include the use of active sonar and explosives at sea in the MIRC (the Navy is not proposing to use explosives at sea within the CNMI coastal zone)."

The use of sonar and explosives at sea around the MIRC and the transit corridor between the MIRC and the Hawaii Range Complex is of concern due to potential impacts to Cetacea and other aquatic mammals and organisms. These waters and those of the Marianas Trench Monument are high quality waters of ecological significance that provide an important migration marine corridor and breeding ground for these species. The Department of the Navy states that these 'active sonar and explosives at sea' will not cause harm to these or other aquatic life, without citing specific data from peer reviewed or defensible research studies.

It should also be noted that these marine species are important not only to the CNMI tourist economy, but also to the international community where they are known to migrate to, and from.

The CNMI Water Quality Standards (WQS) antidegradation policy states that, "Tier 3: ***High quality waters*** which constitute an outstanding Commonwealth resource, such as waters of National Parks, marine sanctuaries, wildlife refuges and ***waters of exceptional recreational or ecological significance shall be maintained and protected. Actions which would lower water quality in such waters are prohibited***, with the exception of temporary degradation deemed necessary for the construction of important Park infrastructure, pollution control devices, and BMPs designed to improve water quality.".

Pages: 3 - 4

The Navy states that for both the Islands of Tinian and Rota that, "Only those activities that are new and include the use of sonar are analyzed in this Consistency Determination. Other activities that include the use of sonar were previously analyzed in the 2014 Consistency Determination document, which determined the ***Proposed Action was consistent to the maximum extent practicable with applicable enforceable policies***."

Please define 'maximum extent practicable with applicable enforceable policies.'. Whose policies are these?

Provide evidence that no other alternatives could be used for tracking other than sonar in these waters given that recent studies have found sonar to have serious detrimental impacts on whales feeding modes and behavior. (2016. "Impacts of Sonar on Marine Mammals", SERDP ESTCP.; 2013. Goldbogen, et.al., "Blue whales respond to simulated mid-frequency military sonar": https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2013.0657; 2000. ECM Parsons, "Impacts of Navy sonar on whales and dolphins: Now beyond a smoking gun?" Env. Sci, and Policy, George Mason Univ. VA).

DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY WATER QUALITY STANDARDS: CLASSIFICATION AND ESTABLISHMENT OF WATER USE AREAS AND SPECIFIC WATER QUALITY CRITERIA

Page: 16

The Navy states that, "the majority of concerns regarding bioaccumulation are associated with urban coastal environments with specific point source and non-point source contributors of pollutants. ***The studies concerning military sites suggest that metals exposed to seawater are of less concern because of decreased bioavailability***."

There are still concerns regarding bioaccumulation of heavy metals and toxins from munition constituents associated with on-going live fire and bombing ranges.

Which studies are being discussed? None are cited to defend this claim. Please provide scientifically defensible research to support this statement.

Page: 17

The Navy states that, "activities occurring beyond the CNMI coastal zone would not affect the land or water use, or natural resource of the coastal zone because **(1) most of the explosives would be consumed during detonation; (2) the frequency of low-order detonations would be low, and therefore the frequency of releases of explosives would be low; (3) the amounts of explosives used would be small relative to the area within which they would be distributed; and (4) the constituents of explosives would be subject to physical, chemical, and biological processes that would render the materials harmless or otherwise disperse them to undetectable levels**." This section sites the "2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS as containing a detailed analysis of fate and transport of byproducts produced during military training and testing activities".

This citation from an EIS, produced five years ago is insufficient to substantiate the above claim. The findings from the MITT analysis that defends claims (1) – (4) should be described herein for new reviewers and to refresh those that took part in reviewing previous EIS and Federal Consistency Determinations. Specifically, to address potential pollution from "inert" munitions constituents, e.g., heavy metals, 2,4,6-Trinitrotoluene (TNT), Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC), Royal Demolition Explosive (RDX), other toxic propellants, and their by-products, and spills, and leaks of other pollutants from being transported and bound into the ocean floor's benthic habitats where a myriad of aquatic species live and breed.

Given the first EIS was provided to the CNMI in 1997, it is disconcerting to see that the Navy has still not conducted studies to provide defensible evidence that explosives and other munitions and their constituents will NOT become bioavailable. The Navy has had over two decades to conduct meaningful research and yet nothing is provided herein, or cited directly.

Given the evidence of bioaccumulation of heavy metals in biota and invertebrates found at WWII dumps sites around the island of Saipan, substantiates our concern that further accumulation from ongoing exercises may result in cumulative impacts to aquatic organisms. Some of Gary Denton's studies (University of Guam, Water Environmental Research Institute) are cited herein:

Denton, G.R.W., et.al, (2016). *Impact of WWII dumpsites on Saipan (CNMI): heavy metal status of soils and sediments,* Environ Sci Pollut Res, DOI 10.1007/s11356-016-6603-7.

Denton, G.R.W., et.al, (2014). *Influence of Urban Runoff, Inappropriate Waste Disposal Practices and World War II on the Heavy Metal Status of Sediments in the Southern Half of Saipan Lagoon, Saipan, CNMI*. Mar. Pollut. Bull.

Denton, G.R.W., Starmer, J.A., Masga, R. (June 2013). *Environmental Impacts of FUDS and Brownfield Sties in Watershed on the Eastern Side of Saipan,* (CNMI). Phase 2: Impact on Aquatic Resources. *WERI Project Synopsis Report.*

Denton, G.R.W., Morrison, Bearden, Houk, Starmer, and Wood (2009). *Impact of a coastal dump in a tropical lagoon on trace metal concentrations in surrounding marine biota: A case study from Saipan, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (CNMI).* Marine Pollution Bulletin 25 (2009) 424-455.

Denton, G.R.W., Bearden, B.G., Houk, P., Starmer J.A. & Wood H.R. (2008). *Heavy Metals in Biotic representatives from the Intertidal Zone and Nearshore Waters of Tanapag Lagoon, Saipan, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (CNMI).* WERI Technical Report No. 123: 50 pp.

The Navy also states, "Metals released into the marine environment are not expected to exceed water quality standards in the CNMI coastal zone because corrosion and biological processes (e.g., colonization by marine organisms) would reduce exposure of military expended materials to seawater, decreasing the rate of leaching. Further, **leached metals would bind to sediments and other organic matter, thereby localizing the concentration to the site of deposition**."

The fact that heavy metals and other munition constituents may not be found in seawater at levels that would exceed the CNMI WQS is because of their octanol/water coefficient. In other words, these constituents instead partition into sediment and other organics. Heavy metal contaminants in the benthic habitat would be bioavailable to the fish and shellfish which results in bioaccumulation. Therein lies the issue. These pollutants would continue to be a source of contamination that may cause harm to aquatic marine life, and subsequently the people of the CNMI that rely heavily on subsistence fishing as significant part of their diet.

It is also the intent of the US Clean Water Act to protect our waters designated uses, which includes the protection and propagation of fish, shellfish and wildlife, and to ensure that fish in these waters are safe for human consumption.

A sediment study conducted in 2008-2009, off Saipan's west coast by Denton et.al., of University of Guam Water Environmental Research Institute found mercury "spikes" accompanied by increased CU, FE, MN and Zn enrichment, "which suggest they were remnant artifacts of the US invasion of Saipan in 1944. Mercury fulminate, for example, was the primary explosive used in primers and detonators of artillery shells and percussion caps of bullets during WWII (US Navy, 1947)."

In addition, this page also states that, "Some expended plastics from military readiness activities are unavoidable because they are used in ordnance or targets. Targets, however, would typically be recovered following training and testing activities. ***Chaff fibers are composed of nonreactive metals and glass, and would be dispersed by ocean currents as they float and slowly sink toward the bottom***. The fine, neutrally buoyant chaff streamers would act like particulates in the water, temporarily increasing the turbidity of the ocean's surface. The chaff fibers would quickly disperse, and turbidity readings would return to normal. Because activities would occur in areas outside of the CNMI coastal zone and the rapid settling and non-reactivity of materials not recovered after use, water quality standards in the CNMI coastal zone would not be exceeded."

However, the deposition of these nonrecoverable pollutants would contaminate the ocean bottom, benthic habitat, biota, and add to the growing volume of marine debris found in Pacific gyres, which have created the "Great Pacific Garbage Patch". The Department of the Navy is approaching these contaminants as being acceptable outcomes without explanation.

CNMI WQS stipulates that "all surface waters shall be free of substances attributable to domestic, industrial, or ***other controllable sources of pollutants and shall be capable of supporting desirable aquatic life*** and be suitable for recreation in and on the water." Waters are "subject to verification by monitoring as may be prescribed by the Administrator to assure freedom from any of the following conditions: ***.....(2) floating debris***, oil, grease, scum, or other ***floating materials..... (4)*** High temperatures; biocides; pathogenic organisms; ***toxic, corrosive, or other deleterious substances at levels or in combinations sufficient to be toxic or harmful to human health or aquatic life***, of in amounts sufficient to interfere with any beneficial use of the water." Detrimental responses include ***significant alterations in water biota***.

The presence of marine debris has been shown to be harmful to aquatic life in peer reviewed research papers from NOAA, US and European government agencies, and non-government agencies. The accumulation of military exercise contaminants in the habitat where fish and other aquatic life live, feed and breed are also of concern. The CNMI WQS states that, "all waters shall be free from toxic pollutants **in concentrations that are lethal to, or produce detrimental physiological responses in human, *plant or animal life***."

With this in mind, we continue with our concerns with statements made in the following section:

PUBLIC LAW NO. 3-47

Pages: 20 - 22

Adverse physiological responses in marine animals were marginally evaluated. To quote, "**Acoustic Stressors**. Pursuant to the MMPA***, acoustic sources may result in Level A and Level B harassment of certain marine mammals.*** The analysis completed by ***the Navy predicts no mortalities*** and therefore the Navy is not requesting an incidental take under the MMPA for mortality. Pursuant to the ESA, sonar and other transducers, weapons noise, vessel noise, air guns, and aircraft may affect certain ESA-listed marine mammals. herein."

A similar stance was taken with other stressors discussed in this section. Only mortality is considered, not morbidity that may further weaken marine animals causing a cumulative affect leading to latent mortality from chronic exposure to these and other climate related stressors.

The CNMI has experienced two Super Typhoons in the last five (5) years, and increasing marine water temperatures. These climate related stressors alone have led to marine animal morbidity and death, and wide spread coral reef damage. Stressing marine plants and animals further with acoustic, explosive, physical disturbance from sonar, vessel strikes or near misses, entanglement and ingestion stressors, is indefensible, as morbidity furthers their vulnerability to an avoidable early death.

RALPH DLG. TORRES
Governor

ARNOLD I. PALACIOS
Lieutenant Governor

COMMONWEALTH of the NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR

February 7, 2020

Janice E. Castro
Director
Division of Coastal Resources Management
P.O. Box 501304
Saipan, MP 96950

Re: *Comment on Federal Consistency Determination Request for Military Training and Testing (MITT) Within the Coastal Zone of the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands*

Dear Director Castro,

Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the Federal Consistency Determination (CD) request currently under consideration by the Bureau of Environmental and Coastal Quality's Division of Coastal Resources Management (DCRM), dated Dec. 19, 2019 and submitted to the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (CNMI) Bureau of Military Affairs (BMA). As you know, ensuring consistency of significant federal actions with requirements put in place to protect our coastal resources is a policy matter of utmost importance to the CNMI. For the reasons outlined below, the 2019 CD submission is inadequate and in many aspects in disagreement with land management policies and mandates established by the CNMI Constitution and the Covenant, as well as key enforceable policies of the CNMI's Coastal Zone Management Program. As such, I encourage you to work with the Navy to ensure these concerns are addressed and that a sufficient CD request is submitted to you, with the Commonwealth Bureau of Military Affairs (CBMA) copied as is required, for your review and determination upon this proposal.

Procedural Issues

- **Streamlined submission supports local review**. The Navy's inclusion of the CBMA in their CD request is appreciated, however, the process outlined in **16 U.S.C. § 1456(c)(1)(C) and reflected** on the DCRM website and federal consistency guidance does clearly state that these requests should be provided to the "relevant State agency designated under section 1455(d)(6)" and therefore CDs should be addressed to the DCRM Director. As outlined in Executive Order 2019-09, CBMA is a clearing house and coordinating entity that functions as a custodian to support Department of Defense (DoD) related activities in the Commonwealth, and the Special Assistant acts as a liaison between DoD and CNMI Agencies. As such we believe that a proper CD submission would be addressed to the DCRM Director who reviews such determinations, in care of the CBMA Special Assistant. The CBMA Special Assistant has concurred with this assessment in discussions regarding this submission. We hope that a revised CD might be provided to your office to address the substantive deficiencies outlined here and ensure timely processing, as well as to support meaningful public notice and comment and participation opportunities moving forward.

- **References to obscure supporting documents complicates local review.** Documents referenced in CD should be included in the request itself. Although your DCRM staff have helpfully provided additional background information, the CD from DCRM on record for the MITT was dated January 20, 2015, we do not have a copy of the Navy's original documents. These materials are necessary to support meaningful review of this request, which relies heavily on this past correspondence. Therefore, it is

Page 1 of 8

requested that DoD provide this document and any other referenced supporting documents as links or digital files in a properly submitted CD request in advance of DCRM's final determination on this contention proposal.

- **Insufficient information is included in the Draft SEIS to support review at this time.** Data relied on in the SEIS is insufficient to assess likely impacts to coastal resources and as such, this CD request is not ripe for review. We encourage DCRM to request that the Navy treat the December 2019 as a draft and properly submit a revised CD request to you, the Director of the CNMI's Coastal Zone Program with the coordinating office of the BMA copied upon release of the updated draft or final SEIS. Where data gaps exist in terms of impacts to limited access, water quality, impacts to cetaceans and other marine life especially during spawning events, and mass wasting at FDM are not properly addressed, we hope DCRM can work with the Navy through this process to provide time bound conditions for execution of compliant activities as well as data sharing and coordination with local resource management agencies in CNMI.

Substantive Issues

- **Impacts to all CNMI lands and waters should be assessed for consistency.** Impacts to all CNMI land and coastal waters should be assessed for consistency with DCRM enforceable policies. The 2019 CD incorrectly excludes land-based activities proposed on FDM and Tinian from analysis based on the fact that "federally controlled lands are excluded from the coastal zone" (2019 CD, pg. 4). While CNMI does not dispute that the federal government has an interest in these lands, these lands have been "***made available to the Government of the United States by lease*** to enable it to carry out its defense responsibilities" and thus remain Commonwealth property which will revert to CNMI control when the leases terms expire (CNMI Covenant, Section 802, emphasis added). It is unclear on what basis the Navy states that these lands are not subject to federal consistency review, which should also include consideration of potential spillover effects to all CNMI-owned submerged lands and waters.

- **Details regarding activities and impacts are insufficient for review.** It is unclear from the description provided on page 2 of the 2019 CD what proposed activities would be occurring within three (3) nautical miles of the CNMI's shorelines. Thus, insufficient information has been provided to CNMI for DCRM to assess and determine whether the proposed MITT activities are consistent with applicable regulations as detailed further in discussion of application of specific enforceable policies below.

- **CD does not address direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts to lands and waters of the CNMI.** The CD incorrectly states that there are "no changes in land-based training proposal" (2019 CD, pg. 2). Assessment of activities in the 2019 Draft MITT Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement indicates that "[a]lternative 1 reflects a level of training and testing activities to be conducted at sea ***and on FDM***, with adjustments from the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS that account for changes in the types and tempo of activities necessary to meet current and future military readiness requirements beyond 2020" and "Alternative 2 includes the same type of training and testing activities that would occur under Alternative 1. Alternative 2 also considers an increase in tempo of some training and testing activities, including additional Fleet exercises and associated unit-level activities, should unanticipated emergent world events require increased readiness levels" (2019 MITT Draft SEIS, Volume 1, pg. ES-5, emphasis added). In reviewing the "Summary of Impacts" table in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, additional details are provided indicating that:

  - Under Alternative 1, "more aircraft would fly over ***and land on FDM and more ordnance would be used on FDM***. The total increase, in terms of net explosive weight (NEW) under Alternative 1 would be less than 1 percent compared to ordnance use on FDM described in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS" and, "the number of training and testing activities under Alternative 2 would increase

CNMI Office of the Governor | Juan A. Sablan Memorial Building | Capitol Hill, Saipan
Caller Box 10007 | Saipan, MP 96950 | Telephone: (670) 237-2200 | Facsimile: (670) 664-2211 | www.gov.mp
Ralph DLG. Torres | CNMI Office of the Governor

over what is proposed for Alternative 1. However, this increase would be a slight change and would not appreciably change the potential for impacts over what is analyzed for Alternative 1" (Draft SEIS, pg. ES-18, emphasis added). The basis for this statement is unclear, as Table 3.0-19 of the DEIS, *Annual Number of Munitions Used on Farallon de Medinilla* shows greater than 1 percent increases in use explosive missiles (85 missiles authorized in 2015 Final EIS, 115 proposed under Alternatives 1 and 2), explosive grenades and mortars (600 authorized in 2015 Final EIS, 1,000 proposed under Alternatives 1 and 2), as well as increases in use of small-caliber rounds and medium caliber projectiles (see DEIS pg. 3-28). It also appears that annual in-water and in-air explosives munitions detailed in Tables 3.0-7 and 3.0-8 of the DEIS (pg. 3-22 – 23) will include increasing use of "E8", "E9", and "E10" explosives. It is unclear what portion of these munitions are proposed for testing activities in areas around FDM or in proximity to other CNMI lands and territorial waters, however, it appears that the proposed change is rather substantial for some explosive categories (e.g. bombs with net explosive weight between 60 – 500 pounds). The DEIS notes that "[a]s described in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, physical disturbance and strike stressors can result from the Navy's proposed use of aircraft and aerial targets, vessels, in-water devices, military expended materials, seafloor devices, and, on the island of FDM, ground disturbance and wildfires" (DEIS, pg. 3-25). It is suggested that the actual proposed changes and likely impacts of these changes be meaningfully discussed in the updated DEIS and corresponding revised CD to ensure consistency with enforceable policies in sea and on land.

- **As currently submitted, the proposed action is not consistent with DCRM Enforceable Policies.** Under the Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA) of 1972, 16 USC § § 1451-1465, § 1456(c)(1), and Federal Consistency regulations, 15 CFR § § 930.30-930.46, Federal agency activities with reasonably foreseeable effects on the State's coastal zone must be consistent to the maximum extent practicable with the enforceable policies of the States' federally approved CZMA programs. Under 15 CFR §930.32(a)(1), the standard for "consistent to the maximum extent practicable" means fully consistent with the enforceable policies of the CNMI's management programs unless full consistency is prohibited by existing law applicable to the Federal agency. Thus, the Navy must show how existing law prohibits full consistency with the CNMI's Coastal Management Program. However, the Navy has not provided any description of any statutory provisions, legislative history, or other legal authority which limits the Navy's discretion to be fully consistent with the enforceable policies of CNMI's management program. Furthermore, 15 CFR §930.32(a)(2) details that 16 USC § 1456(e), "construction with other laws", or "Section 307(e) of the Act does not relieve Federal agencies of the consistency requirements under the Act. The Act was intended to cause substantive changes in Federal agency decision making within the context of the discretionary powers residing in such agencies. Accordingly, ***whenever legally permissible, Federal agencies shall consider the enforceable policies of management programs as requirements to be adhered to in addition to existing Federal agency statutory mandates***. If a Federal agency asserts that full consistency with the management program is prohibited, it shall clearly describe, in writing, to the State agency the statutory provisions, legislative history, or other legal authority which limits the Federal agency's discretion to be fully consistent with the enforceable policies of the management program" (emphasis added). Accordingly, for the reasons cited below, the proposed MITT is not fully consistent with enforceable policies of the CNMI's approved CZMA program:

  - **Full consistency with local permitting required**. The 2019 CD incorrectly states that General Provisions (15-10-020, 15-10-025) and Standards for CRM Permit Issuance (15-10-301, 305, 315, 320, 325, 335, 340, 345), Major Siting Standards (15-10-501, 505), and CRM Permit Conditions (15-10-610) and numerous policy elements of Public Law 3-47 do not apply. If the Navy feels that certain sections do not apply, details should be provided to further frame discussion regarding the applicability and extent of the enforceable policies for the CNMI's CZMP. That being said, these provisions have been applied to CD review and should continue to be applied to ensure consistency with CNMI's enforceable polices. Concerns regarding specific subsections are outlined further

CNMI Office of the Governor | Juan A. Sablan Memorial Building | Capitol Hill, Saipan
Caller Box 10007 | Saipan, MP 96950 | Telephone: (670) 237-2200 | Facsimile: (670) 664-2211 | www.gov.mp
Ralph DLG. Torres | CNMI Office of the Governor

below. However, it is a misconstruction of the intent and letter of the CZMA to state that mandatory conditions and management standards of the CZMA are not applicable. Rather, proposed activities must comply with substantive local permitting requirements as they are incorporated through the DCRM Coastal Management Program. Given the extensive mitigation that should be implemented to address impacts of proposed increases in the activities outlined in Table 1 of the 2019 CD, the Navy should anticipate coordinating with local regulatory agencies to implement required clean up activities. Obtaining local permits, although it may not be required for all potential survey, clearing, and clean-up activities, would demonstrate the Navy's commitment to complying with local requirements and coordinating with our local agencies. This is a best practice that other federal agencies engage in and we encourage you to ask the Navy and other DoD branches to extend this courtesy to our regulatory and resource management partners. At minimum, the 2015 Federal Consistency Determination from DCRM conditioned coordination with local authorities which, to this day, has been insufficient and in some cases as resulted in avoidable losses of or damage to important CNMI assets that DoD has yet to remedy.

- **Application of CD analysis to all relevant enforceable policies is necessary.** Similar to the concerns raised in the Oct. 2014 DCRM response to the Sept. 2014 CD request, it appears that numerous elements of the currently proposed revised and expanded MITT are not consistent with DCRM's enforceable policies. These include:

  - Assessment of impacts for compliance with general standards (15-10-305), Areas of Particular Concern (15-10-315, 325, 335, 340) and specific criteria for major sitings (15-10-505).

    As stated in the Office of the Governor's comments on the MITT DEIS, there has been insufficient analysis of direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts of MITT activities. This analysis should include all reasonably foreseeable and related activities including but not limited to activities described in the Guam and CNMI Military Relocation FEIS/OEIS, Divert Activities and Exercises, the MITT expansion, and upcoming CNMI Joint Military Training DEIS/OEIS. If implemented these activities will undoubtedly have cumulative effects on CNMI's coastal resources. Thus far, insufficient information has been provided in supporting documents and in this CD request for CNMI assess consistency with this provision. As outlined in 15-10-305, criteria for development, which is defined to include activities relevant to the MITT "discharge or disposal of … any gaseous, liquid, solid, or thermal waste" (15-10-020(z)(2)); a "change in the density or intensity of use of land" (15-10-020(z)(4)); a "change in the intensity of use of water, the ecology related thereto, or the access thereto" (15-10-020(z)(5)); or the "removal of a significant amount of vegetation, whether native or non-native" (15-10-020(z)(7)), development criteria must include consideration of cumulative impacts, compatibility, alternatives, conservation, compliance with local and Federal laws, consistency with the CNMI's Constitutional right to a clean and healthful environment, effects on existing public services, adequate public access, setbacks, management measures for control of nonpoint source pollution, and buffers for environmentally sensitive areas (15-10-305). If the Navy feels that consistency with these standards is not legally permissible, they should detail their rationale for this position in their CD request – otherwise the applicable regulations appear to direct that these policies be considered and adhered to. Reasonably foreseeable impacts to Areas of Particular Concern should also be assessed for consistency, especially in terms of potential direct and spillover effects to lagoon and reefs (15-10-315), coral reefs (15-10-325), shorelines (15-10-335) and ports (15-10-345), categories which the CD summarily said were not applicable due to unnecessarily narrow interpretation of these areas and their management standards. Similarly, "major siting" is defined as "any proposed project which has the potential to directly and significantly impact coastal resources" which includes "[p]roposed projects with potential for significant adverse effects on submerged lands, groundwater recharge areas,

CNMI Office of the Governor | Juan A. Sablan Memorial Building | Capitol Hill, Saipan
Caller Box 10007 | Saipan, MP 96950 | Telephone: (670) 237-2200 | Facsimile: (670) 664-2211 | www.gov.mp
Ralph DLG. Torres | CNMI Office of the Governor

cultural areas, historic or archeological sites and properties, designated conservation and pristine areas, or uninhabited islands, sparsely populated islands, mangroves, reefs, wetlands, beaches and lakes, areas of scientific interest, recreational areas, limestone, volcanic and cocos forest, and endangered or threatened species or marine mammal habitats" (15-10-020(uu)(4)). Given that this project clearly qualifies as a major siting, consistency with major siting standards of 15-10-505 should also be assessed.

- **Meaningful analysis of data and standards of enforceable policies is necessary.** In addition to lacking analysis noted above, as outlined herein, the CD analysis is currently inadequate in terms of assessment of impacts and analysis and application of enforceable policies in regards to discussion on water quality, Public Law 3-47 Policy Elements 4, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, and 21.

  - Assessment of impacts to water quality. The CD states that "military readiness activities that generate stressors to water quality do not occur in the water use areas; rather, they occur outside of the CNMI coastal zone, and are analyzed in the context of their potential to induce reasonably foreseeable effects into Class "AA" or Class "A" water use areas." It goes on to restate conclusory statements that no effects are anticipated from explosives and explosive byproducts (Section 3.1.3.1), metals (Section 3.1.3.2), and other materials (Section 3.1.3.4) based on the analysis that activities would "occur in areas outside of the CNMI coastal zone" and in "rapid settling and non-reactivity of materials not recovered after use". Data has not been provided to confirm baseline water quality in areas of proposed activities or to substantiate these statements. This is especially disconcerting in regards to turbidity and total suspended solids where health and habitat protective standards aim to ensure that "[c]oncentrations of suspended matter at any point shall not be increased from ambient conditions at any time, and should not exceed 5 mg/l except when due to natural conditions" (for TSS) and "[t]urbidity at any point, as measured by NTU, shall not exceed 0.5 NTU over ambient conditions except when due to natural conditions." Additionally, the standard for all CNMI waters is that they "shall be free from toxic pollutants in concentrations that are lethal to, or that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, or animal life. Detrimental responses include, but are not limited to: decreased growth rate and decreased reproductive success of resident or indicator species; or significant alterations in population, community ecology, or receiving water biota." Insufficient data has been provided to demonstrate that proposed increasing uses of weapons that will deposit explosives and explosive byproducts, metals, and other materials into CNMI waters will not violate this standard.

  - Policy Element 4 – "Plan for and manage any use or activity with the potential for causing a direct and significant impact on coastal resources. Significant adverse impacts shall be mitigated to the extent practicable." The Coastal Zone Management Act broadly defines the environment. Instead of considering impacts of increased activities to the people of the CNMI and the coastal resources that comprise our home, the CD narrowly discusses potential impacts to marine mammals, coral, and fishes in water and does not reassess impacts of land-based activities on Saipan, Tinian, and Rota or FDM, stating that no changes in these activities are proposed. As previously mentioned, FDM activities appear to be significantly increasing, and mitigation measures proposed by DCRM to ensure consistency with land-based operations in the 2015 MITT do not appear to have been implemented regularly – particularly as they pertain to early coordination and data sharing with CNMI. It is unclear why the Navy states that mitigation measures are outside of the scope of this SEIS/OEIS (CD enclosure pg. 23), especially given the fact that the 2014 CD correspondence from DCRM noted that "[i]n order to comply with the enforceable polices of the CNMI, further measures are needed to protect the wildlife and habitats of the CNMI". Similarly, in this CD request like the 2014 submission, the basis for finding that the MITT is consistent to the maximum extent practicable has not

CNMI Office of the Governor | Juan A. Sablan Memorial Building | Capitol Hill, Saipan
Caller Box 10007 | Saipan, MP 96950 | Telephone: (670) 237-2200 | Facsimile: (670) 664-2211 | www.gov.mp
Ralph DLG. Torres | CNMI Office of the Governor

been established. The Navy must show how its proposed actions are fully consistent by providing data, not speculative conclusions such as that potential effects to endangered species will be addressed through pending biological opinions. As also noted previously, the statement that the "Navy's Proposed Action provides special protection to coastal resources and mitigates adverse impacts" is inadequate to demonstrate consistency as the SEIS/OEIS does not actually commit to mitigation measures or timelines for implementation of mitigation, making these assurances rather hollow and unenforceable. If the Navy plans to rely on the suite of mitigation options discussed in the Draft SEIS/OEIS to demonstrate compliance with CNMI's enforceable policies including the requirement of mitigation of adverse impacts, meaningful and enforceable commitments and timelines for implementation should be developed as part of this CD correspondence.

- Policy Element 10 – "Maintain or improve coastal water quality through control of erosion, sedimentation, runoff, siltation, sewage and other discharges." It is unclear how the Navy is able to state that proposed activities will not result in siltation, runoff, and other discharges given the use of munitions on land at FDM and in the CNMI's coastal waters. Assessment of this policy element and supporting regulations is inadequate and this analysis should be revised to support DCRM's review of this CD request.

- Policy Elements 11 and 12 – Impacts to cultural resources. Although Section 106 consultations are ongoing to support the reissuance of the expired Programmatic Agreement, the analysis of impacts to cultural resources referenced in Section 3.11 of the draft SEIS/OEIS does not include sufficient data to make any determination regarding likely significant impacts to cultural resources within CNMI waters and on FDM. Absence of evidence is not evidence of absence and the DoD has an obligation to implement reasonable assessment of resources that are likely to be impacted by MITT activities. Lacking that data, there is therefore no basis for the Navy's conclusion that this proposed action is consistent with these policy elements. Data gaps should be remedied to ensure consistency with these policies and the CNMI's significant and compelling interest to protect and preserve our cultural resources.

- Policy Element 13 – "Require compliance with all local air and water quality laws and regulations and any applicable federal air and water quality standards." Data must be provided to support the conclusory statements that air emissions will be minimal on Saipan and Rota and will be "intermittent and short term, resulting in minimal impact on the air quality of Tinian". Models are available to assess these activities for compliance with local and federal air quality standards and should be included for review in this submission. Comments regarding water quality standards are incorporated by reference here.

- Policy Elements 15 and 16 – Management of marine resources and consistency with other policies. As noted in the response to Policy Element 4, the Navy's analysis of impacts to coastal resources is overly narrow and does not meaningfully address impacts to the human environment. This is especially true regarding impacts to the integrity of our reefs and wildlife habitat (Policy 15) and the management and development of our local subsistence, sport, and commercial fisheries (Policy 16). The draft SEIS/OEIS contains insufficient assessment of the potential impacts to these resources and the "analysis" under Policy Element 4 does not address potential impacts to human uses such as fishing and traditional access to important fishing areas. Thus, it is unclear how the Navy can conclude their proposed actions are consistent when analysis is completely lacking. An updated CD should address this gap, preferably through a revised SEIS that provides meaningful analysis of impacts to these important coastal resources.

CNMI Office of the Governor | Juan A. Sablan Memorial Building | Capitol Hill, Saipan
Caller Box 10007 | Saipan, MP 96950 | Telephone: (670) 237-2200 | Facsimile: (670) 664-2211 | www.gov.mp
Ralph DLG. Torres | CNMI Office of the Governor

- Policy Element 17 – "Protect all coastal resources, particularly sand, coral and fish from taking beyond sustainable levels and in the case of marine mammals and any species on the Commonwealth endangered species list, from any taking whatsoever." The Navy explains that "the Proposed Action has the potential to take marine mammals and species on the Commonwealth endangered species list" and that "[a]ny take occurring as a result of the Proposed Action would be incidental to, and not the purpose of, the Navy's otherwise lawful training and testing activities" and notes that protective measures intended to avoid and minimize the "take" of endangered species will be updated as appropriate upon completion of the Section 7 consultation. As noted previously, past promises of mitigation and monitoring have not been executed, or, if they have been, have not been shared with the CNMI, therefore, it is encouraged that any monitoring and mitigation agreements that are the basis for a consistency determination include timebound deliverables so that consistency can be demonstrated.

- Policy Element 21 – "Encourage the preservation of traditional rights of public access to and along the shorelines consistent with the rights of private property owners." Contrary to the Navy's statement that the "MITT Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS does not propose any change to the public access normally allowed on federally leased lands including FDM, which would remain restricted for security and safety reasons" and that the "MITT Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS does not propose a change to the ocean areas currently used by both the Navy and the public", increases in the intensity and use of CNMI lands and waters is more likely than not to have significant impacts to public access of shorelines and traditional fishing areas. Already, three nautical miles (nm) surrounding the abundant fishery surrounding FDM is periodically restricted and this SEIS proposes to extend that "danger zone" to 12 nm and increase the frequency of restricted use in this area. These restrictions can have direct and significant impacts to boaters and the fishing community by increasing travel time and forcing seagoing vessels to travel well out of their traditional navigation routes. Similarly, periodic exercises on Tinian significantly restrict community access to forests and shorelines that have been traditionally used for subsistence and commercial activities. The frequency and timing of these restrictions should be discussed further with the CNMI in order to maximize access for users of these ocean resources while ensuring the Navy can meet its training objectives. Given that assessment of impacts and commitment to reasonable mitigation measures are lacking in the SEIS/OEIS, meaningful commitments should be articulated in supplemental analysis in a revised CD in order to ensure consistency with this enforceable policy.

- **Enforceable commitments to proposed offsets and mitigations needed.** DCRM's October 2014 response to the September, 2014 CD (letter 5090 Ser N465/0926) outlines numerous mitigation measures that the Navy would need to implement to ensure consistency with CNMI enforceable policies. These include collection of baseline data on impacts to essential fish habitat areas, assessment of impacts to endangered bird, marine mammals, and sea turtle populations, water quality monitoring to ensure water quality stays within CNMI standards, and suggests addressing mass wasting concerns at Farallon de Medinilla as well as the removal of Rota for any activities. It does not appear these data gaps were ever addressed, or, if they were, that data was never shared with the CNMI. Additionally, in recent MITT discussions CNMI was informed that the Navy is unable to commit to mitigation actions or timelines due to lack of advance appropriations for these activities. The result of this procedural issue is ongoing activities with insufficient mitigation measures. Avoidance and minimization of impacts should be the first step in the scoping process, and mitigation actions that are agreed to should be implemented in a timely manner. As it stands, it appears that the majority of mitigation measures outlined in the 2014 CD correspondence have still not been implemented. Without these measures, the 2015 – 2020 MITT activities do not reflect good faith efforts to comply with conditions from the last CD process, let alone establish a record

CNMI Office of the Governor | Juan A. Sablan Memorial Building | Capitol Hill, Saipan
Caller Box 10007 | Saipan, MP 96950 | Telephone: (670) 237-2200 | Facsimile: (670) 664-2211 | www.gov.mp
Ralph DLG. Torres | CNMI Office of the Governor

of performance that can be relied upon as a basis for ongoing and significantly expanded activities on land and at sea. Direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts must be meaningfully assessed in order to be avoided, minimized, and then actually mitigated. We believe an updated CD and revised draft SEIS will be necessary to address the substantial data gaps identified here and that time bound commitments for key mitigation measures will be needed to support substantive compliance with the federal consistency review process.

For the reasons outlined herein, our office encourages DCRM to work with the Navy to resolve the procedural and substantive concerns raised by the December 2019 CD. We strongly encourage a supplemental submission be considered when data gaps identified in the draft SEIS are resolved.

Thank you for your consideration of these concerns and your ongoing support of this process.

Sincerely,

GILBERT J. BIRNBRICH
Legal Counsel – Office of the Governor

CNMI Office of the Governor | Juan A. Sablan Memorial Building | Capitol Hill, Saipan
Caller Box 10007 | Saipan, MP 96950 | Telephone: (670) 237-2200 | Facsimile: (670) 664-2211 | www.gov.mp
Ralph DLG. Torres | CNMI Office of the Governor

C.2.3 NAVY CONSISTENCY DETERMINATION LETTER – GOVERNMENT OF GUAM

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
COMMANDER
UNITED STATES PACIFIC FLEET
250 MAKALAPA DRIVE
PEARL HARBOR, HAWAII 96860-3131

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5090
Ser N465/1462
December 09, 2019

Mr. Tyrone J. Taitano
Director
Bureau of Statistics and Plans
P.O. Box 2950
Hagatna, Guam 96932

Dear Mr. Taitano:

SUBJECT: CONSISTENCY DETERMINATION FOR MILITARY TRAINING AND TESTING WITHIN THE GUAM COASTAL ZONE

In accordance with the Federal Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA) and 15 C.F.R. Part 930, the U.S. Navy submits the enclosed Federal Consistency Determination (CD) for proposed activities in the Mariana Islands Training and Testing (MITT) Study Area that have reasonably foreseeable coastal effects on the coastal use or resources of Guam.

Based on the enclosed consistency determination and the activities and analysis contained in the enclosed Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Impact Statement (DSEIS/OEIS), the Navy finds that the proposed military training and testing activities presented in Alternative 2 are consistent to the maximum extent practicable with the enforceable policies of the Guam Coastal Management Program.

We look forward to your timely review of and concurrence with the Navy's determination. If you have any questions, please contact Mr. John Van Name at (808) 471-1714 or john.vanname@navy.mil or Ms. Suzanne Smith at (808) 471-4696 or suzanne.smith3@navy.mil.

Sincerely,

DANIEL McNAIR
Director, Fleet Environmental Readiness
By direction of the Commander

Enclosures: (1) CD for Guam
(2) CDROM – MITT DSEIS/OEIS

Copy to: COMNAVREGMARIANAS (w/o enclosure)
OPNAV N45 (w/o enclosure)

C.2.4 GOVERNMENT OF GUAM RESPONSE LETTER

Lourdes A. Leon Guerrero
Governor of Guam

Joshua F. Tenorio
Lieutenant Governor

BUREAU OF STATISTICS & PLANS
SAGAN PLANU SIHA YAN EMFOTMASION
Government of Guam
P.O. Box 2950 Hagåtña, Guam 96932
Tel: (671) 472-4201/3
Fax: (671) 477-1812

Tyrone J. Taitano
Director
Matthew Santos
Deputy Director

MAR 06 2020

John C. Aquilino
Commander
United States Pacific Fleet
Department of the Navy
250 Makalapa Drive
Pearl Harbor, Hawaii 96860

RE: Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA) Federal Consistency Review for Department of the Navy's proposed activities in Mariana Islands Training and Testing (MITT) Study Area *(GCMP FC No. 2020-0001)*

Hafa adai! The Guam Coastal Management Program of the Bureau of Statistics and Plans (Bureau) has completed its review of the Federal Consistency Determination by the Department of the Navy received on January 8, 2020. The Department of the Navy ("the federal agency") has submitted its consistency determination relative to its proposed activities in Mariana Islands Training and Testing (MITT) Study Area.

The Bureau coordinated this review with partnering agencies, provided Public Notice, and received comments from Senator Sabina F. Perez, the Guam Environmental Protection Agency (GEPA), the Guam Waterworks Authority, the Department of Agriculture, and the Department of Parks and Recreation. Furthermore, the Bureau hereby concurs with the federal agency's determination that the proposal is consistent with the enforceable policies of the Bureau's Guam Coastal Management Program (GCMP) based upon the following comments and conditions:

Resource Policy. Conservation of Natural Resources—Overall Policy. *The value of Guam's natural resources as recreational areas, critical marine and wildlife habitats, the major source of drinking water, and the foundation of the island's economy shall be protected through policies and programs affecting such resources.*

According to the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the proposed activity is expected to result in the equivalent of at least 151,918 metric tons of carbon dioxide emissions per year (which would total 759,590 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent emissions over 5 years). As climate change is expected to result in sea level rises, potentially more damaging tropical storms, a reduction in the recharge rate of the Northern Guam Lens Aquifer, and other environmental and societal

Doc. No. 35GL-20-1874.*

impacts, substantial increases in greenhouse gas emissions provide impacts in several of the different elements of this policy for the conservation of natural resources.

Pursuant to this resource policy, the federal agency is hereby advised to consider mitigation strategies to reduce the net carbon dioxide equivalent emissions of the proposed action, to the maximum extent practicable, which could include methods of reducing carbon dioxide equivalent emissions or methods of capturing carbon dioxide equivalent emissions through natural or other processes.

Resource Policy 1. Air Quality. *All activities and uses shall comply with all local air pollution regulations and all appropriate Federal air quality standards in order to ensure the maintenance of Guam's relatively high air quality.*

The federal agency's proposed actions are estimated to increase annual emissions from criteria pollutants within the study area of 77 tons per year for nitrogen oxide and 78 tons per year for carbon monoxide under Alternative 1 or 78 tons per year for nitrogen oxide and 79 tons per year for carbon monoxide under Alternative 2, both compared to baseline emissions. These are under the 250 ton per year prevention of significant deterioration (PSD) thresholds. Other criteria pollutants have significantly lower additional output under both alternatives. The federal agency further finds that the quantities of hazardous pollutants released would result in negligible quantities of hazardous air pollutants in localized areas not publicly accessible. According to the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the proposed activity is expected to result in the equivalent of at least 151,918 metric tons of carbon dioxide emissions per year (which would total 759,590 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent emissions over 5 years).

The conclusion based upon the detailed stressor analysis in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS that air pollution is minimal, intermittent and short-term does not adequately address cumulative impacts of repeated exposure of the population to criteria air or hazardous pollutants and the potential health impacts. Moreover, the analysis does not adequately evaluate cascading and cumulative impacts of the deposition of air pollutants on land, water, terrestrial and aquatic organisms and the ecosystem.

Pursuant to Resource Policy 1, Air Quality, the federal agency shall, to the maximum extent practicable:

(1) be advised to establish an empirical baseline for the health of the population which are in or near the most likely areas to experience effects from repeated exposure to air pollution due to the proposed activities in or near the coastal zone and conduct occasional monitoring of the health of the population within the likely affected areas. If findings indicate significant deterioration of the health of the most likely affected populations, the federal agency should coordinate its response with local agencies.

(2) be advised to establish an empirical baseline for the health of terrestrial and aquatic species which are in or near the most likely areas to

experience effects from repeated exposure to air pollution due to the proposed activities in or near the coastal zone and conduct occasional monitoring of the health of such species within the likely affected areas. If findings indicate significant deterioration of the health of terrestrial or aquatic species, the federal agency should coordinate its response with local agencies.

Resource Policy 2. Water Quality. *Safe drinking water shall be assured and aquatic recreation sites shall be protected through the regulation of uses and discharges that pose a pollution threat to Guam's waters, particularly in estuarine, reef and aquifer areas.*

The federal agency stated in its consistency determination that activities including the use of explosives and explosion byproducts, military materials with metal components, and chemicals other than explosives would occur in federally owned submerged land, or more than 3 NM offshore, thus outside of Guam's coastal zone. Impacted sediments and water quality would only be immediately adjacent to the munitions, hence activities would have no significant effect on sediments and water quality within Guam's coastal zone. Furthermore, the Navy concluded that neither state nor federal standards or guidelines would be violated by the chemical, physical, or biological changes in sediment or water quality measurable at the detonation site.

The federal agency should continue to conduct water quality impact analysis to determine that explosives and explosive byproducts, metals and other materials expended during training and testing described in the MITT Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS would not exceed regulatory thresholds and guidelines [Sediment characterization methods in Guam Water Quality Standards (2017) and USEPA established criteria for concentrations of explosives, explosive byproducts and metal in saltwater] established for measuring impacts on sediment and water quality.

GEPA has expressed its concern that there was no discussion of marine debris cleanup as a result of the MITT activities once completed. The MITT Final EIS/OES 2015 (p. 3.1-55) discusses other materials as follows: Other military expended materials include plastics, marine markers, flares, and chaff. Some expended plastics from training and testing activities are unavoidable because they are used in ordnance or targets. (Although plastics are resistant to degradation, they do gradually break down into smaller particles because of sunlight and mechanical wear [Law et al. 2010]. Thompson et al, [2004] found that microscopic particles were common in marine sediments at 18 beaches around the United Kingdom. They noted that such particles were ingested by small filter and deposit feeders, with unknown effects.) Targets, however, would typically be recovered following training and testing activities. Chaff fibers are composed of nonreactive metals and glass, and would be dispersed by ocean currents as they float and slowly sink toward the bottom. The fine, neutrally buoyant chaff streamers would act like particulates in water, temporarily increasing the turbidity of the ocean's surface. The chaff fibers could quickly disperse, and turbidity readings would return to normal.

Section 2 of the 2019 MITT Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS describes the annual Proposed Action and Alternatives. However, the MITT has a five-year term. Cumulative impacts of the Range activities, in terms of the amount of Ordnance (or other expended items, if any) should be considered over five years, on-going versus Alternative 1 and Alternative 2. Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2 compare the proposed SEIS/OEIS action alternatives with on-going training and testing activities. Each table describes the activities in terms of the activity name and where in the Study Area the federal agency proposes to conduct it. The next two columns show the annual occurrence and ordnance or other expended items (if any) involved in the activity as is currently ongoing (under the heading "2015 MITT EIS/OEIS Ongoing Activities"). The final two pairs of columns present the same information (annual occurrence and ordnance/items) as the activities are analyzed in the 2019 Supplemental EIS/OEIS for Alternative 1 and Alternative 2, respectively. As an example, page 2-33 has a Surface Warfare range activity located 12 NM from land. Ongoing activities list 242 events per year (1,210 over 5 years) and 48,040 small caliber rounds annually (or 240,200 small caliber rounds over 5 years) The number of rounds increases in the Alternative 1 & 2 scenarios by 128,400 small caliber rounds annually or 642,000 small caliber rounds over 5 years. The narrative in Section 4.4.1, Sediment and Water Quality, concludes that proposed changes in training and testing activities under Alternative 1 or Alternative 2 would be negligible.

In the 2019 Supplemental MITT, Section 3.1.2.3 Other Materials explains that detonations, explosions, and other activities may result in dispersal of glass, carbon fibers, plastics, rubber, steel, iron, concrete, etc. There is no discussion of any effort to clean up the marine debris as a result of the proposed activities.

In the 2019 Supplemental MITT, Section 5.1.2.2.1.1 Adaptive Management states that the adaptive management process is to help the federal agency have better knowledge of ecological systems. The process involves technical review meetings and ongoing discussions between the Department of the Navy, National Marine Fisheries Service, the Marine Mammal Commission, and other experts in the scientific community.

Pursuant to Resource Policy 2, Water Quality, the federal agency shall, to the maximum extent practicable:

(1) be advised to provide a map delineating the proposed Agat Bay and Piti underwater Mine Warfare detonation sites to the Bureau and Guam Environmental Protection Agency to clarify that those sites are outside of Guam's coastal zone, as represented.

(2) continue to conduct water quality impact analysis to determine that explosives and explosive byproducts, metals and other materials expended during training and testing described in the MITT Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS would not exceed regulatory thresholds and guidelines [Sediment characterization methods in Guam Water Quality Standards (2017) and USEPA established criteria for concentrations of explosives, explosive byproducts and metal in saltwater] established for measuring impacts on sediment and water quality.

(3) be advised to provide information on planned cleanup activities, if any, for marine debris to the Bureau and GEPA.
(4) be advised to include local stakeholders or local natural resource managers such as GEPA, Guam Department of Agriculture, and the Bureau.

Resource Policy 3. Fragile Areas. *Development in the following types of fragile areas shall be regulated to protect their unique character.*

- *historical and archeological sites*
- *wildlife habitats*
- *pristine marine and terrestrial communities*

As stated in the 2019 MITT Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, activities involving vessels and in-water devices are not intended to contact the seafloor. This would include amphibious and expeditionary events such as Amphibious Assaults, Amphibious Raids, Personnel, Insertion/Extraction/ and Underwater Surveys, which are proposed to continue in this SEIS/OEIS. As is current practice, coral and other hard bottom habitats would continue to be avoided to the greatest extent practical under the Proposed Action (see Section 2.3.3, Standard Operating Procedures and Chapter 5 – Mitigation). However, combat swimmers and Marines may be required to walk through nearshore areas during these activities. For example, as the boat approaches a beach, Marines may be required to exit the boat, stand up, and walk through the shallow water habitats. GEPA noted that in previous assaults on Guam, it has been observed that physical damages, including corals crushed or turned over, from these training activities occurred. As discussed in Section 5.4.1 (Mitigation Areas for Seafloor Resources), the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce impacts from precision anchoring and military expended materials on seafloor resources in mitigation areas throughout the Study Area.

Portions of the study area include marine communities. The Guam Department of Agriculture's Division of Aquatic and Wildlife Resources (DAWR) is the responsible local agency with the responsibility for protecting aquatic and wildlife resources, including marine preserves and sensitive areas.

Pursuant to Resource Policy 3, Fragile Areas, the federal agency shall, to the maximum extent practicable:

(1) be advised that any and all construction that is related to the proposed activities may be subject to permitting by GEPA and such permitted activity shall meet all relevant requirements of GEPA regulations and permitting by U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and subject to further federal consistency review.
(2) be advised to instruct swimmers and Marines to exercise caution when interacting with sensitive marine environments.
(3) be advised to communicate with DAWR in regards to planned activities involving sensitive areas.
(4) be advised to establish a coral damage response plan, which includes triage, restoration, and subsequent monitoring.

Resource Policy 4. Living Marine Resources. *All living resources within the territorial waters of Guam, particularly corals and fish, shall be protected from over harvesting and, in the case of marine mammals, from any taking whatsoever.*

GEPA finds that the proposed federal agency activities are consistent with the GCMP resource policies for marine invertebrates. Benthic invertebrates of the reef crest or flat, such as crabs, clams, and polychaete worms, within the disturbed area could be displaced, injured, or killed during amphibious operations. GEPA notes that the federal agency notifies local regulatory agencies of upcoming underwater Mine Detonation activities within Outer Apra Harbor and Agat Bay. Neither the public nor the regulatory agencies receive any form of after-action reporting on the outcome of these activities, specifically if any environmental damages occurred. There is not a current mechanism to evaluate whether the activities, quantities, and reported impacts met or exceeded the anticipated levels.

The Department of Agriculture finds that the presence of ESA-listed sperm whales is well-documented within 3-5 NM offshore in the Agat area. Recently there have been multiple instances of whale strandings, raising the concern that additional explosive impacts or sonar activities may result in an intensification of similar occurrences. Increased boat activity greatly increases the potential for boat strike of sperm whales. Navy lookouts undergo extensive training in order to qualify as a watch stander. The effectiveness of watch standers should be evaluated.

The Department of Agriculture is concerned about the impact of landing craft exercises on the dolphins that reside in Agat Bay. The federal agency has contended that there are unavoidable impacts and recognizes the common occurrence of spinner dolphins within Agat Bay and developed mitigation measures in consultation with the National Marine Fisheries Service under provisions of the Marine Mammal Protection Act. Beachmasters are shore-based observers with binoculars whose sole purpose is to ensure the safety of craft including avoidance of marine and terrestrial animals. Beachmasters are to work with environmental monitors and natural resource managers. The effectiveness of beachmasters should be evaluated.

While there is discussion of metals which will be introduced into the natural aquatic environment as a result of activities as well as bioaccumulation of pollutants in aquatic species, the possibility of biomagnification is not introduced into the discussion of potential impacts. Bioaccumulation is the accumulation of toxic chemicals in the tissues of an organism, while biomagnification is the increasing concentration of toxic chemicals for animals which are higher on the "food chain." This tends to mean that the highest concentrations of toxic chemicals which are capable of bioaccumulation may occur in aquatic animals that are apex predators. For this reason, one may expect that where bioaccumulation occurs that higher concentrations might be found in predatory fish such as mahi, various species of tuna, etc.

Pursuant to Resource Policy 4, Living Marine Resources, the federal agency shall, to the maximum extent practicable:

(1) be advised to provide some form of report outlining Mine Detonation activities and highlighting any issues regarding water quality, fish kills, protected species sightings, and marine debris to the public and/or local regulatory agencies.

(2) be advised to establish a standard operating procedure to resume, at least biannually, pre-coordination meetings on Mine Detonation activities with regulatory agencies.

(3) be advised to produce an annual report summarizing activities identified in the MITT to indicate whether activities and quantities reported in the MITT are met or exceeded and reporting on environmental impacts of such activities.

(4) refrain from taking any non-pelagic fishes within the Piti Marine Preserve Area.

(5) be advised to clarify and analyze the potential effects to marine animals and habitats from underwater demolition, including habitat mapping in a more detailed manner, identification of the cetacean species that utilize the proposed area, and include impacts to sea turtles.

(6) not engage in any takings of endangered species.

(7) be advised to evaluate the effectiveness of watch standers and beachmasters in their ability to detect marine mammals, such as sperm whales.

(8) be advised to investigate whether there is a connection between military training activities conducted in or near Guam and whale strandings. If there is found to be a likely connection between training and whale strandings, then the federal agency is advised to adjust its standard operating procedures to reduce the likelihood of continued adverse impacts to whales in the waters around Guam.

(9) be advised to establish an empirical baseline for the health of aquatic species for which biomagnification cause higher concentrations of toxic chemicals, especially those which are commonly used for fishing purposes. If findings indicate significant increases in toxic chemicals in the species of aquatic species, the federal agency should coordinate its response with local agencies.

Resource Policy 7. Public Access. *The public's right of unrestricted access shall be ensured to all non-federally owned beach areas and all territorial recreation areas, parks, scenic overlooks, designated conservation areas and their public lands; and agreements shall be encouraged with the owners of private and federal property for the provision of releasable access to and use of resources of public nature located on such land.*

Previous proposed military activities have indicated the closure of fishing areas such as Ritidian and Pati Point. Further restrictions on access to fishing areas within territorial waters, whether by actions inside or outside of the coastal zone, due to training activities within territorial waters must be mitigated. Other boaters, including divers and other recreational users frequent many areas within the MITT study area. There is no clear indication of how extensive closures will be.

Access to reefs and seashore areas can sometimes be accomplished merely by passage within the coastal zone, but sometimes passage over federally owned submerged lands, including surface danger zones, may be required due to the freeflowing nature of the coastal marine environment and the impracticality of passage outside of the 3 or more NM contour, as the case may be, in order to access territorial waters for the purpose or recreation, fishing, or for other reasons.

Pursuant to Resource Policy 7, Public Access, the federal agency shall, to the maximum extent practicable:

(1) clarify the period lengths of time for which closure of access to territorial waters may occur and to propose mitigation to compensate for loss of access.
(2) establish standard operating procedures that will avoid, where possible, or minimize, where unavoidable, disruption of public access to reefs and seashore areas.
(3) propose one or more mitigation measures to compensate for unavoidable disruption of public access to reefs and seashore areas, whether for fishing or for other purposes.

Therefore, based on the conditional concurrence stated above and the Bureau's review of all other information submitted, we find the application to be consistent with the approved development and resource policies of the Guam Coastal Management Program (GCMP), in accordance with the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972, (P.L. 92-583) as amended, (P.L. 94-370). The Federal Consistency concurrence, however, does not preclude the need for securing other federal and Government of Guam permits, clearances and approvals prior to the start of this project.

Per 15 CFR §930.4(b), if the requirements for conditional concurrences specified in 15 CFR §930.4(a), (1) through (3), are not met, then all parties shall treat this conditional concurrence letter as an objection pursuant to 15 CFR Part 930 subpart D. Furthermore, if an objection is determined, you are hereby notified that, pursuant to 15 CFR §930.63(e) and 15 CFR Part 930, subpart H, you have the opportunity to appeal an objection resulting from not meeting the requirements of 15 CFR §930.4(a), (1) through (3), to the Secretary of Commerce within 30 days after receiving this conditional concurrence letter, or 30 days after receiving notice from the Federal agency that your application will not be approved as amended by the conditions required by this concurrence.

The proposed action shall be operated and completed as represented in the Coastal Zone Management (CZM) federal consistency determination. Significant changes to the subject proposal shall be submitted to the Bureau for review and approval and may require a full CZM federal consistency review, including publication of a public notice and provision for public review and comment. This condition is necessary to ensure that the proposed actions are implemented as reviewed for consistency with the enforceable policies of GCMP. Guam Land Use

policies (E.O. 78-37), are the federally approved enforceable policies of GCMP that applies to this condition.

Please do not hesitate to contact Mr. Julian Janssen, Federal Consistency Coordinator at 475-9664 or email julian.janssen@bsp.guam.gov or Mr. Edwin Reyes, Coastal Program Administrator at 475-9672 or email edwin.reyes@bsp.guam.gov. *Si Yu'os Ma'åse'.*

Sincerely,

TYRONE TAITANO
Director

Attachments

Cc: NOAA-OCM
GEPA
GWA
DoAgr-DAWR
DLM
DPR-SHPO
DPW

OFFICE OF SENATOR SABINA FLORES PEREZ

I MINA'TRENTAI SINGKO NA LIHESLATURAN GUÅHAN
35TH GUAM LEGISLATURE

March 5, 2020

Tyrone Taitano
Director
Bureau of Statistics and Plans (BSP)
P.O. Box 2950
Hagåtña, Guam 96932

SUBJECT: Comments

Reference: Federal Consistency Review GCMP FC2020-0001 Memorandum and Consistency Determination for the Department of the Navy's proposed activities in Mariana Islands Training and Testing (MITT) Study Area

Håfa Adai Mr. Taitano,

After careful review, I find the Department of the Navy's GCMP application for Federal Consistency determination, referenced above, does not sufficiently and thoroughly address the cumulative impacts of the MITT, and other federal actions taken by the Department of Defense, to the integrity of our island's environmental and cultural resources; and to terrestrial and aquatic species and habits. Further, the referenced federal action is inconsistent with Government of Guam commitments to mitigating the effects of climate change, and our responsibility as environmental stewards of the land, air, and water.

I am therefore urging a review of the referenced federal action which, per 40 CFR § 1508.7, takes into consideration the incremental impacts of this federal action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions taken by federal agencies operating in and around Guam.

The military buildup is one of the most pressing social, political, and environmental issues of our time; and its effects will undoubtedly be felt for decades. In making your determination, I ask that you consider the effects of the ongoing construction of the five live-fire training ranges at Northwest Field, which impact our sacred sites and irreplaceable natural and cultural resources.

RP 1. Air Quality
The Department of the Navy asserts, although most of the training and testing is offshore, where the Clean Air Act National Ambient Air Quality Standards do not apply, air quality of adjacent onshore areas may be impacted depending on the direction of the wind. The Department of the Navy states that "the reasonably foreseeable direct and indirect effect of military training and testing activities on Guam's air quality as a resource of the Guam coastal zone is an increase in air pollutants." The pollutants include regulated or hazardous chemicals derived from detonation of targets, expenditure of fuels that power various vessels, leaks of petroleum from mechanical devices, and use of flares, propellants, projectiles, explosives, and other devices. However, the

Doc. No. 35GL-20-1874.*

Department of the Navy argues that the impact would be minimal due to the distance of most of the activity from shore, "strong ventilation from regional meteorological conditions," and because testing and training activities will not occur simultaneously and continuously. The conclusion based on detailed stressor analysis in the MITT Draft Supplemental EIS that air pollution is minimal, intermittent and short-term does not adequately address cumulative impacts of repeated exposure of the population to criteria air or hazardous pollutants and the resulting health impacts. Moreover, the analysis does not adequately evaluate cascading and cumulative impacts of deposition of air pollutants on land, water, terrestrial and aquatic organisms, and the ecosystem as a whole. Further, my office urges that baseline health conditions of the population and the environment, pertaining to impacts of air pollution, are established at this time to adequately monitor future cumulative impacts.

Additionally, studies of proposed action at sites within the coastal zone of Guam outside of the non-attainment zone for sulfur dioxide and other criteria pollutants due to proposed activities were not addressed in the application. The methodology for determining *de minimus* needs to be clarified. I would highly recommend a determination based on bioaccumulation of pollutants as a means of determining cumulative impacts of air pollutants.

RP 2. Water Quality

This section lacks evidence to support the claim that impact would be in compliance with existing federal statutes and regulations in the context of Guam. The narrative provided focuses on limited studies conducted in non-jurisdictional locations that may or may not be applicable to local conditions. I recommend that local studies be conducted by different researches using different approaches and that results are shared for proper evaluation of the impacts to water quality.

RP 3. Fragile Areas

More than seventy-nine (79) ancestral and historic sites will be adversely impacted at or near *Litekyan*, fourteen (14) historic sites have already been destroyed, and eighteen (18) inadvertent discoveries of human remains have been found since 2018 in the course of the military buildup on Guam. Further, the construction of a fifth firing range requires the clearing of primary limestone forest that is habitat for at least eleven (11) endangered or threatened species, some of which are found nowhere else in the world—effectively jeopardizing the survival of these species.

RP 4. Living Marine Resources

The Department of the Navy lists stressors to marine mammals from the Proposed Action "include acoustic (sonar and other transducers, vessel noise, aircraft noise, weapons noise), explosives (in-water explosions), energy (in-water electromagnetic devices and high-energy lasers), physical disturbance and strike (vessels and in-water devices, military expended materials, seafloor devices), entanglement (wires and cables, decelerators/parachutes), ingestion (military expended materials - munitions, and military expended materials - other), and secondary (impacts on habitat, impacts on prey availability)" which will affect ESA-listed marine mammals. Despite recent studies indicating strandings of marine mammals in the Marians occurring within six (6) days of Navy sonar operations, the Department of the Navy concludes that "no mortalities" will occur from the Proposed Action. This is highly questionable, as is their assertion that the "maximum extent practicable" can sincerely provide protection for living marine resources in our waters.

194 Hernan Cortes Avenue, Terlaje Professional Building, 1st Floor, *Hagåtña*, Guam 96910
671.989.2968•office@senatorperez.org•

RP 7. Public Access

The Department of the Navy deems RP 7 "not applicable" to the Proposed Action. However, bearing in mind once more that such actions should be reviewed in context to cumulative impacts, I must object to this assertion and refer again to *Litekyan*, which is adjacent to the live-fire training ranges and designated as critical habitat for three protected species. The ranges, when fully operational, will limit public access to the area for up to 39 weeks of the year. As well, the Surface Danger Zone of the range extends beyond the land and up to five (5) miles from the shore, restricting access to the waters by Guam fishermen. With this in mind, I find the Department of the Navy's application insufficient.

With these comments in mind, I respectfully urge the Bureau of Statistics and Plans to review the Department of the Navy's GCMP application for Federal Consistency determination in context with the cumulative impacts of all past, present, and forseeable federal actions.

Sincerely,

Sabina F. Perez

Sabina F. Perez
Senator, 35th Guam Legislature

194 Hernan Cortes Avenue, Terlaje Professional Building, 1st Floor, *Hagåtña*, Guam 96910
671.989.2968•office@senatorperez.org•

GUAM ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY • *AHENSIAN PRUTEKSIÓN LINA'LA' GUÅHAN*
LOURDES A. LEON GUERRERO • GOVERNOR OF GUAM | JOSHUA F. TENORIO • LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR OF GUAM
WALTER S. LEON GUERRERO • ADMINISTRATOR | MICHELLE C. R. LASTIMOZA • DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR

FEB 07 2020

MEMORANDUM

TO: Director, Bureau of Statistics and Plans (BSP)

FROM: Administrator

SUBJECT: Comments

Reference: Federal Consistency Review GCMP FC2020-0001 Memorandum and Consistency Determination for the Department of the Navy's proposed activities in Mariana Islands Training and Testing (MITT) Study Area

Hafa Adai Mr. Taitano,

The Guam Environmental Protection Agency has reviewed the Navy's GCMP application for Federal Consistency determination, referenced above, and provides the following comments:

RESOURCES POLICIES (RP):

RP 2. Water Quality

Reference is made to the comprehensive water quality impact analysis of the Proposed Action presented in Section 3.1 (Sediments and Water Quality) of the MITT Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Additional supporting information regarding the water quality assessment is summarized in the application on pages 7-9. These cited research and case studies are used to demonstrate that the Proposed Action would be fully consistent with the GCMP enforceable policy to ensure safe drinking water and protection of aquatic recreation sites from uses and discharges that pose a pollution threat to Guam's waters, particularly in estuaries, reefs, and aquifer areas.

The Navy stated in its application that activities including the use of explosives and explosion byproducts, military materials with metal components, and chemicals other than explosives would occur in federally owned submerged land, or more than 3 NM off shore, thus outside of Guam's coastal zone. Impacted sediments and water quality would only be immediately adjacent to the munition, hence activities would have no significant effect on sediments and water quality within Guam's coastal zone. Furthermore, the Navy concluded that neither state nor federal standards or guidelines would be violated by the chemical, physical, or biological changes in sediment or water quality measureable at the detonation site. The Navy

GUAM EPA | 17 3304 Mariner Avenue Tiyan Barrigada, Guam 96913-1617 | Tel: (671) 300.4751/2 | Fax: (671) 300.4531 | epa.guam.gov
ALL LIVING THINGS OF THE EARTH ARE ONE • *MANUNU TODU I MANTÅLATA*
Like and follow guamepa


should provide a map delineating the Agat Bay and Piti underwater Mine Warfare detonation sites which it states are outside of Guam's coastal zone.

The Navy should continue to conduct water quality impact analysis to demonstrate that explosives and explosive byproducts, metals and other materials expended during training and testing described in the MITT Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS would not exceed regulatory thresholds and guidelines [Sediment chemical characterization methods in Guam Water Quality Standards (2017) and USEPA established criteria for concentrations of explosives, explosive byproducts and metal in saltwater] established for measuring impacts on sediment and water quality.

Guam EPA is concerned that there was no discussion of marine debris cleanup as a result of the MITT activities once completed. The MITT Final EIS/OEIS 2015 (p. 3.1-55) discusses other materials as follows: Other military expended materials include plastics, marine markers, flares, and chaff. Some expended plastics from training and testing activities are unavoidable because they are used in ordnance or targets. (Although plastics are resistant to degradation, they do gradually break down into smaller particles because of sunlight and mechanical wear (Law et al. 2010). Thompson et al. (2004) found that microscopic particles were common in marine sediments at 18 beaches around the United Kingdom. They noted that such particles were ingested by small filter and deposit feeders, with unknown effects.) Targets, however, would typically be recovered following training and testing activities. Chaff fibers are composed of nonreactive metals and glass, and would be dispersed by ocean currents as they float and slowly sink toward the bottom. The fine, neutrally buoyant chaff streamers would act like particulates in the water, temporarily increasing the turbidity of the ocean's surface. The chaff fibers would quickly disperse, and turbidity readings would return to normal.

Section 2 of the 2019 MITT Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS describes the *annual* Proposed Action and Alternatives. However, the MITT has a five year term. Cumulative impacts of the Range activities, in terms of the number of Ordnances (or other expended items, if any) should be considered **over 5 years**, On-going versus Alternative 1 and Alternative 2. Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2 (beginning on page 2-26) compare the proposed SEIS/OEIS action alternatives (Alternative 1 and Alternative 2) with on-going training and testing activities. Each table describes the activities in terms of the activity name and where in the Study Area the Navy proposes to conduct it (first two columns). The next two columns show the **annual** occurrence and ordnance or other expended items (if any) involved in the activity as is currently ongoing (under the heading "2015 MITT EIS/OEIS Ongoing Activities".) The final two pairs of columns present the same information (**annual** occurrence and ordnance/items) as the activities are analyzed in the 2019 Supplemental EIS/OEIS for Alternative 1 and Alternative 2, respectively. As an example, page 2-33 has a Surface Warfare range activity located 12 NM from land. Ongoing activities list 242 events per year (1,210 over 5 years) and **48,040** small caliber rounds *annually* (or **240,200** small caliber rounds **over 5 years**). The number of rounds increases in the Alternative 1 & 2 scenarios to **128,400** small caliber rounds *annually* or **642,000 small caliber rounds over 5 years.** The narrative in Section 4.4.1, Sediment and Water Quality, concludes that proposed changes in training and testing activities under Alternative 1 or Alternative 2 would be *negligible*.

GUAM EPA | 17 3304 Mariner Avenue Tiyan Barrigada, Guam 96913 1617 | Tel: (671) 300.4751/2 | Fax: (671) 300.4531 | epa.guam.gov
ALL LIVING THINGS OF THE EARTH ARE ONE • *MANUNU TODU I MANTALAYA*
Like and follow guamepa



AHENSIAN PRUTEKSION LINA'LA GUÅHAN
LOURDES A. LEON GUERRERO, GOVERNOR OF GUAM • JOSHUA F. TENORIO, LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR OF GUAM
WALTER S. LEON GUERRERO, ADMINISTRATOR

MEMORANDUM

TO: The Honorable Lourdes A. Leon Guerrero, Maga'hågan Guhåhan

FROM: Acting Administrator, Guam EPA

SUBJECT: Agency's Comments to the 2019 Mariana Islands Training and Testing Supplemental EIS/OEIS (MITT).

Transmitted via hand delivery and email: tony.babauta@guam.gov

Hafa Adai Maga' Håga,

In response to the Governor's Circular (GC) #2019-018, requesting comments on the 2019 Mariana Islands Training and Testing Supplemental EIS/OEIS (MITT), below are the Agency's comments. Several comments pertain to the 2015 Mariana Islands Training and Testing EIS/OEIS (2015 MITT), as well as the 2019 MITT Supplemental, as we feel these issues have not been specifically addressed.

1. The Navy does a respectable job of notifying the local regulatory agencies of upcoming underwater Mine Detonation activities within Outer Apra Harbor and Agat Bay. But the public nor the regulatory agencies ever receive any form of feedback/after action reports on outcome of these activities. Specifically if any environmental damages occurred. Guam EPA request that some form of report be produce outlining these activities and highlight any issues regarding water quality, fish kills, protected species sightings, and marine debris be made available to the public and local agencies.

2. In the past, pre-coordination meetings on these activities were conducted with the local regulatory agencies. Guam EPA requests to make these meetings standard operating procedures, at a minimum of bi-annual basis.

3. At a minimum, a yearly report should be produced summarizing all activities identified in the MITT. There is no current mechanism to evaluate if the activities and quantities identified in the MITT are met or exceeded. Report should also address any impacts to stressor types.

4. Neither the 2015 MITT nor the 2019 Supplemental MITT have a discussion on the rational for an increase from a 10 lbs. underwater mine charge to the new standard of a 20 lbs. charge for the listed mine detonation activities. What is the justification for the increase? This needs to be further explained and justified.

5. In the 2015 MITT, page 3.1-18, Section 3.1.3, it states that Amphibious assaults and raids sediment plumes are temporary and since no military materials are expended, "…no further analysis of this

GUAM EPA | 17-3304 Mariner Avenue Tiyan Barrigada, Guam 96913-1617 | Tel: (671) 300.4751/2 | Fax: (671) 300.4531 | epa.guam.gov
TODU Y NILALA Y TANO MAN UNO • ALL LIVING THINGS ARE ONE
Like and follow guamepa

Development and Operating Regulations, Part II: Guidelines for Water Works Development (22 GAR Chapter 7), and the Water and Wastewater Operator Certification Regulations (22 GAR Chapter 11

12. The 2019 MITT Supplemental states there have been no new information since the 2015 MITT, which identifies specific data gaps within the report about the environmental impact of previously used ammunition and/or the degradation products on the marine ecosystems in that area. There needs to be a discussion on this topic.

If you have any questions or concerns, please contact me directly by email at jesse.cruz@epa.guam.gov or by telephone at 671-300-4795.

GUAM EPA | 17-3304 Mariner Avenue Tiyan Barrigada, Guam 96913-1617 | Tel: (671) 300.4751/2 | Fax: (671) 300.4531 | epa.guam.gov
TODU Y NILALA Y TANO MAN UNO • ALL LIVING THINGS ARE ONE
Like and follow guamepa

GUAM WATERWORKS AUTHORITY
"Better Water. Better Lives."
Gloria B. Nelson Public Service Building | Suite 200, 688 Route 15, Mangilao, Guam 96913
P.O. Box 3010, Hagåtña, Guam 96932
Tel. No. (671) 300-6846/48 Fax No. (671) 648-3290

March 3, 2020

MEMORANDUM

To: Tyrone Taitano, Director, Bureau of Statistics and Plans (BSP)

From: Paul Kemp, Assistant Manager, Compliance and Safety

Subject: Federal Consistency Review: Department of the navy Proposed Activities in the Mariana Islands Training and Testing (MITT) Study Area GCMP FC- 2020-001

Håfa Adai,

The Guam Waterworks Authority has reviewed the 2019 Draft Mariana Islands Training and Testing (MITT) Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement. The GWA reviews proposed planned military activity to ensure protection of the Northern Guam Lens Aquifer and wastewater discharge into Guam's waters.

Land based training located on Guam was covered under the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS under the existing Mariana Island Range Complex (MIRC). This Supplemental EIS/OEIS considers activities conducted at sea and on Farallon de Medinilla (FDM). This supplemental EIS/OEIS incorporated new models, information, data and science as required by the Council on Environmental Quality Regulations. However, there are no changes made to land based activities proposed on Guam. The analysis on impacts on sedimentation and water quality are assessed for activities that will impact water quality off shore and not impacts to the Northern Guam Aquifer.

The proposed activities listed in this draft MITT Supplemental EIS/OEIS will not have an impact to the ability for GWA to provide safe drinking water to its customers and ensure that wastewater discharge is conducted in appropriate manner.

Sincerely,

Paul Kemp
Assistant General Manager – Compliance and Safety

The Bureau of Statistics & Plans Mail - MITT https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0?ik=7120dcbbc2&view=pt&s

Julian Janssen <julian.janssen@bsp.guam.gov>

MITT

Aguon Celestino F. <tinoaguon@gmail.com> Thu, Mar 5, 2020 at 6:01 AM
To: Julian Janssen <julian.janssen@bsp.guam.gov>
Cc: "Jay T. Gutierrez" <Jay.Gutierrez@doag.guam.gov>

Here is the document we had submitted in 2013. Just in case time runs out I included the draft-document.

Tino

2 attachments

MITT-2019.docx
73K

NewCoverltr-MITT.docx
137K

1 of 1 3/6/2020, 9:28 A

DOD March 2019

Re: Marianas Island Training and Technology- Comments

Hafa Adai,

The Division of Aquatic and Wildlife Resources has reviewed the proposed Marianas Island Training and Technology and provides the following comments:

1. The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Marinas Islands Military Testing and Training (MITT) was released and available for public comment.

2. Please be aware that the island and its surrounding marine environment is inhabited by Endangered species of whales and dolphins, and any military activity should be aware of their presence.

3. The action should consider the impact to the marine mammals near Guam. The Division has recorded stranding's of these animals, and should take all precautions not to impact them

DRAFT

March 4,2020

DOD, Ms. Nora Macariola
Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Pacific 258 Makalapa Drive, Suite I00
Pearl Harbor, Hawaii 96860-3134.
Attn: MIIT EIS/OEIS Project Manager Email: Marianas.tap.eis@navy.mil

Subject: Comments on the Supplemental Draft Overseas Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement for the Mariana Islands Training and Testing Activities

Hafa Adai:

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement for the Mariana Islands Military Testing and Training (MIITT DEIS) Volume I and II were released for public review September 13, 2013. The Guam Department of Agriculture, Division of Aquatic and Wildlife Resources requested and received a hard copy of the MIITT DEIS for review pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 [42 U.S.C. 4321 *et seq.;* 83 Stat.852] (NEPA) on November 12, 2013.

The initial action was discontinued. A subsequent was published, and a public hearing was held at the University of Guam's School of Business and Public Administration, Leon Guerero Building, on march 19, 2019, from 5pm-10pm. Public comments were accepted, and DAWR staff attended the meeting.

The proposed action by the US Department of the Navy (DON) includes reevaluation and reauthorization of the training and testing activities reviewed in the Marianas Islands Range Complex (MJRC) in May 2010, with an expansion of the study area to include high seas and transit corridors not previously approved, as well as adjustments to locations and tempo of training and testing activities. The actions are proposed to achieve and maintain military readiness, to support and to conduct current, emerging, and future training and Research, Development, Test and Evaluation activities, while enhancing training resources through investment in Guam and the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas Islands. The draft MIIT DEIS commit sat-sea and land-based training areas on Guam and CNMI, as well as transit corridors between Guam and CNMI.

As the local state agency mandated to monitor and protect Guam's biological resources, the Guam Department of Agriculture (Dog) submits the following general comments to be addressed in the development of the MITT Final Environmental Impact Statement and Record of Decision. In addition, we have included comments in table form referencing specific document pages (see attachment).

1. First and foremost, DOD needs to provide a progressive, comprehensive plan for the recovery of native species on DOD property in consultation and coordination with DoAg. Without the ability to reintroduce federally endangered species on DOD property the cumulative impacts of DOD actions are jeopardizing the DoAg's ability to recover Guam's native species. Furthermore, DOD's failure to coordinate with DoAg as required by the Sikes Act of 1960 [16 U.S.C. *et seq.;* 74 stat. 1052], as amended, and recognize the DoAg's ability to assist DOD in meeting their Section 7 requirements under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 [16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.:* 87 Stat. 884], as amended, results in a waste of taxpayers' dollars. The DoAg further emphasizes the need to be consulted and notified in matters that may impact the natural resources of Guam.

2. Secondly, the Final EIS needs to outline how DON will address long-standing issues regarding timely access for the DoAg Division of Aquatic and Wildlife Resources (DAWR) staff to all DOD lands to monitor and manage Guam's natural resources. The DOAg-DAWR staff could complete monitoring of resources under annual federal funded grant objectives, without cost, or at a much lower cost to DON that is currently being contracted and assist with meeting Sikes Act coordination obligations. The current access requirements for DoAg-DA WR staff are cumbersome and prevent timely coordination as opposed to those procedures for federal employees and contractors.

3. All Navy contractors should communicate with the Division in regards to sensitive areas, resource-wise.

4. The Final MITT DEIS needs to address another long-standing issue that is DOD's failure to comply with local laws. The MITT activities and study area include the Piti Marine Preserve Area that extends to the 600-foot contour. Any take of non-pelagic fishes within this area is a violation of Guam law.

5. The Final MITT DEIS must mitigate the cumulative impacts to recreational ~~fishing in the oceanic areas that will be impacted by the proposed action. The~~ NEPA documents for other proposed military activities indicate the closure of important fishing areas such as Ritidian and Pati Point. The additional loss of key recreational fishing areas proposed in the Draft MITT EIA is unacceptable.

6. Other boaters, including divers and other recreational users, also frequent many areas within the MITT study area. There is no clear indication of how extensive closures will be -do events last for an hour, or a day, or a week? The Final EIS and ROD need to minimize closure of areas regularly used by recreational boaters and identify clearly the space and time of the closures.

DoAg Comments on Draft MITT F2019 OEIS

Page 2

7. When notices to mariners is sent out, DOD should insure that notices are sent out to all media source outlets, to inform the public of Surface-Danger –Zone activities as the actions are implemented. Prior to training exercises, the DON and USCG issue NOTMARs and NOTAMs to announce an exercise and to notify the public of potential hazards in the exercise area. DON must ensure these notices are adequately distributed to the public and with a much larger area proposed in the MITT distribution must be assessed for adequacy.

8. The ROD must clearly indicate how the Micronesia Biosecurity Plan will be implemented, including funding mechanisms, to prevent the spread of invasive alien species (lAS) throughout the region. For example, I 00% inspection rates for brown tree-snake (BTS) at ports of exit from Guam and entry points to other regional areas are necessary to ensure BTS does not impact bird, bat and lizard populations on other islands. These populations are necessary for the recovery of Guam's native ecosystem.

9.

DoAg Comments on Draft MITT F2019 OEIS

Page 2

10. Although there are currently BTS inspections of cargo and vessels from Guam, there is a potential for the system to be overwhelmed by the increase in tempo of activities. The MITT DEIS also needs to be mindful of other IAS that Guam could infect CNMI with that would be devastating to endangered wildlife and Its habitats, i.e., little fire ant and coconut rhinoceros beetle.

11. Consistent monitoring of behavior and distribution of Mariana fruit bat/island swiftlet/common moorhen/megapode (and other terrestrial species of regional concern) must be conducted prior to and after MITT related activities in-order-to evaluate the impact of activities, particularly on species of greatest conservation need. Appropriate measures must be incorporated to reduce impacts to terrestrial species, as well as measures to avoid impacting species that aggregate when feeding in open water ocean. Impacts to aggregations of individuals in the expanded areas of MIIT activities may impact species on a population level.

12. The assessment of potential effects to marine animals and habitat from underwater demolition needs more clarified and analyzed. The habitat mapping needs to be more detailed, the Cetacean species that utilize the area proposed for the MITT need to be identified, as well as the impacts such activity will have on these species. The analysis also needs to include the impacts to sea turtles. The presence of ESA-listed sperm whales is well documented within three to five miles offshore in the Agat area. Effects to this species and the m itigation for these actions are not addressed in the MITT DEIS. The increased boat activity greatly increases the potential for boat strike of sperm whales. Navy lookouts undergo extensive training in order o qualify as a watch stander. It seems the use of these watch standers been how successful & should be measured.

I0. DoAg is concerned about the impact of landing craft exercises on the dolphins that reside in Agat Bay. The DON contended unavoidable impacts. The Navy recognizes the common occurrence of spinner dolphins within Agat Bay and has developed mitigation measures in consultation with NMFS under provisions of the MMPA. Beachmasters are shore-based observers with binoculars whose sole purpose is to ensure safety of craft including avoidance of marine and terrestrial animals. Beachmasters were to work with environmental monitors and the natural resource managers. These measures have been utilized - how successful have they been and how has that success been measured?

Doc. No. 35GL-20-1874.*

The MITT DEIS must address impacts to the existing community of resource users and the need to mitigate economic impacts by avoiding near shore populations and their habitats. The training activities themselves present additional challenges that may alter

Lourdes A. Leon Guerrero
Governor
Joshua F. Tenorio
Lt. Governor

Department of Parks and Recreation
Dipattamenton Plaset yan Dibuetsion
Government of Guam
Director's Office, Parks and Recreation Divisions
#1 Paseo de Susana, Hagåtña, Guam 96910
P.O. Box 2950, Hagåtña, Guam 96932
(671) 475-6288; Facsimile (671) 477-0997
Guam Historic Resources Division
490 Chalan Palasyo, Agana Heights, Guam 96910
(671) 475-6294/6355; Facsimile (671) 477-2822

Jesse G. Garcia
Acting Director
Victor R. Villagomez
Acting Deputy Director

In reply refer to:
RC2020-0361

February 27, 2020

MEMORANDUM

To: Director, Bureau of Statistics and Plans

From: Acting Director, Department of Parks and Recreation

Subject: Federal Consistency Review: Department of the Navy Proposed Activities in the Mariana Islands Training and Testing (MITT) Study Area GCMP FC2020-0001

Dear Mr. Taitano,

We have reviewed the subject Federal Consistency Application for the Department of the Navy proposed activities in the Mariana Islands Training and Testing (MITT) Study Area and have the following comments:

1. In response to your request we reviewed the enforceable policies pursuant to the Executive Order 78-37, Guam Land Use Policies. We are currently working to assess and mitigate any adverse effects to historic properties with the Department of the Navy (DoN).

2. We have had Section 106 consultations with the DoN, expressing our concerns with regards to the project's potential to affect historic and archaeological sites within the project's areas of potential effect (APE). At this time, we are working off of a 2009 Programmatic Agreement (PA) extension, while the affects to historic properties are being assessed by the DoN. We are working to have a new PA that will address any and all adverse effects to historic properties within the near future.

Based on the aforementioned, we have not completed our consultation on the affects to historic properties and, therefore, we cannot agree with a Federal Consistency Determination for the subject undertaking.

Should you have any questions with regards to our comments, please contact Mr. John Mark Joseph, State Archaeologist, at 475-6339.

Sincerely,

Jesse G. Garcia
PL

Cc: Julian Janssen, Federal Consistency Coordinator
Julian.janssen@bsp.guam.gov

C.3 Endangered Species Act Consultation

C.3.1 Navy Request Letter for Formal Consultation with National Marine Fisheries Service

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
COMMANDER
UNITED STATES PACIFIC FLEET
250 MAKALAPA DRIVE
PEARL HARBOR, HAWAII 96860-3131

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5090
Ser N465/0703
18 June 2019

Director, Office of Protected Resources
National Marine Fisheries Service
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
B-SSMC3, Room 13821
1315 East-West Highway
Silver Spring, MD 20910-3282

Dear Director:

SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR INITIATION OF ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT SECTION 7 FORMAL CONSULTATION FOR COMMANDER, UNITED STATES PACIFIC FLEET TRAINING AND TESTING ACTIVITIES

In accordance with section 7 of the Endangered Species Act (ESA), the U.S. Navy requests initiation of formal consultation on the Mariana Islands Training and Testing (MITT) activities occurring within the Pacific Ocean in the surrounding waters of the Mariana Islands.

The proposed action may affect listed species that reside within the MITT Study Area by exposing them to sound and other environmental stressors associated with training and testing activities. The enclosed Biological Assessment (BA) is the Navy's primary document that provides the required information pursuant to 50 C.F.R. §402.12(f). The U.S. Navy is requesting formal consultation on Alternative 2 within the MITT Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/ Environmental Impact Statement (EIS/OEIS).

The Navy is requesting formal consultation on ESA-listed species including the blue whale (*Balaenoptera musculus*), fin whale (*Balaenoptera physalus*), humpback whale (*Megaptera novaeangliae*) from the Western North Pacific Distinct Population Segment (DPS), sei whale (*Balaenoptera borealis*), sperm whale (*Physeter macrocephalus*), green sea turtle (*Chelonia mydas*) from the Central West Pacific DPS, East Indian-West Pacific DPS, and North Central Pacific DPS, hawksbill sea turtle (*Eretmochelys imbricata*), leatherback sea turtle (*Dermochelys coriacea*), loggerhead sea turtle (*Caretta caretta*), olive ridley sea turtle (*Lepidochelys olivacea*), giant manta ray (*Manta birostris*), oceanic whitetip shark (*Carcharhinus longimanus*), scalloped hammerhead shark (*Sphyrna lewini*) from the Indo-West Pacific DPS, and three coral species *Acropora globiceps*, *Acropora retusa*, *Seriatopora aculeata* (no common name).

Doc. No. 35GL-20-1874.*

5090
Ser N465/0703
18 June 2019

The Navy also seeks concurrence on our high-energy laser No Effect determinations for coral, giant manta rays, oceanic whitetip sharks, and hammerhead sharks.

High-energy lasers are a new testing activity not analyzed in previous consultations between the Navy and National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) within the MITT Study Area. High-energy laser weapons are designed to disable surface targets, rendering them immobile. These laser systems are extremely unlikely to strike the water directly, since that is not an aimpoint for the system. Even though the probability is very low, if there is a target miss by the laser, a laser beam would typically intersect the water surface in the 200 m (219 yds) to 6.5 km (3.5 NM) range or more. At these ranges, the low angles to the water will reflect most of the laser energy. The little remaining laser energy after reflection that might enter the water would do so at much lower power levels, reaching eye-safe levels within 0.3 m (12 in) of the surface at 200 m (219 yds) and within 0.18 m (7 in) at 1 km (0.5 NM). Unlike marine mammals and sea turtles that surface to breath, ESA-listed fish would normally be found at depths greater than 7-12 inches over most of their distribution.

There are additional layered safeguards on these systems that further reduce the probability of a water strike. First, the system will only fire when the operator pulls the trigger. Second, the system has provisions that only permit firing when locked onto a target and automatically interrupts firing if the target track is lost. This gives the operator time to reacquire the target lock before firing again. Third, the operator is also trained to stop firing when the laser aim point moves off the selected target in the event the automated system does not turn the laser off first. Even if at the water surface, such as when a shark's dorsal fin is above water, the depth of a given shark's body would still mean eyes and other sensitive organs would be deeper than 7-12 inches. Given these high-energy laser procedural measures and technological characteristics, the low probability of laser energy accidentally hitting the water surface, the low power of a laser if it did hit the water and limited penetration depth, effects on ESA-listed fish species are not expected to occur.

The Navy also seeks concurrence on our simulant No Effect determinations for all species. Simulants are another new testing activity not analyzed in previous consultations between the Navy and NMFS within the MITT Study Area.

The Navy uses compounds, referred to as simulants, as substitutes for chemical and biological warfare agents to test equipment intended to detect their presence. Simulants must have one or more characteristics of a real chemical or biological agent-size, density, or aerosol behavior to effectively mimic the agent, but must also pose a minimal risk to health and the environment in order to be used safely in outdoor tests. They are relatively benign compounds (e.g., oil of wintergreen) that disperse as an aerosol and are expected to dissipate before hitting the water. Exposure levels during testing activities would be well below concentrations associated with any adverse health or environmental effects. The degradation products of simulants used during testing would also be harmless. Given these characteristics of simulants used during testing activities, no effects are expected on any ESA-listed species.

2

5090
Ser N465/0703
18 June 2019

Analysis supporting the application is contained within the BA. Due to the large file size and page count of the MITT BA (>750 pages), the Navy will be electronically submitting the BA directly to the appropriate NMFS staff.

Please extend my thanks to your staff for their continued support of the U.S. Navy's compliance process. My point of contact for these matters is Mr. Chip Johnson at 619-767-1567 or chip.johnson@navy.mil

Sincerely,

D. A. McNAIR
Director, Environmental Readiness Division
By Direction of the Commander

Enclosure: Mariana Islands Training and Testing Biological Assessment

Copy to: Ms. Kris Peterson, NMFS Office of Protected Resources, F/PR5

C.4 Essential Fish Habitat Assessment

C.4.1 Navy Essential Fish Habitat Assessment Submission Transmittal Letter to National Marine Fisheries Service

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
COMMANDER
UNITED STATES PACIFIC FLEET
250 MAKALAPA DRIVE
PEARL HARBOR, HAWAII 96860-3131

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5090
Ser N465/1397
21 November 2019

Assistant Regional Administrator, Habitat Conservation Division
Pacific Islands Regional Office, National Marine Fisheries Service
1845 Wasp Boulevard, Building 176
Honolulu, HI 96818-5007

Dear Director:

SUBJECT: SUBMISSION OF 2019 NAVY SUPPLEMENTAL ESSENTIAL FISH HABITAT ASSESSMENT IN SUPPORT OF THE MARIANA ISLANDS TRAINING AND TESTING SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT/ OVERSEAS ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

This letter provides the Pacific Islands Regional Office (PIRO) of the National Marine Fisheries Service with supplemental information for the U.S. Navy's continuing training and testing activities previously analyzed in the 2015 Mariana Islands Training and Testing (MITT) Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (EIS/OEIS).

In support of the 2015 EIS/OEIS, the Navy also prepared an Essential Fish Habitat Assessment (EFHA) in May 2014 analyzing potential impacts of Navy activities on designated EFH within the MITT Study Area in accordance with the Magnuson-Stevens Fisheries Conservation and Management Act of 1976, Public Law 94-265 as amended through January 12, 2007, section 305(b)(2) and 50 C.F.R 600. The 2015 EIS/OEIS and associated EFHA was subject to PIRO EFH consultation concluding in August 2014.

The U.S. Navy prepared a draft supplemental MITT EIS/OEIS using new information available after the release of the 2015 EIS/OEIS to cover similar activities from November 2020 and into the reasonably foreseeable future (https://mitt-eis.com). With few exceptions, there are no substantive changes to activities and their impacts, to the geographic extent of these activities, or to designated EFH areas in the MITT Study Area that would alter the conclusion from the 2014 EFHA or affect the basis for PIRO's previous EFH Conservation Recommendations.

The U.S. Navy requests reinitiation of a MITT supplemental EFH consultation pursuant to 50 C.F.R. 600.920(a)(1) to address only the changes in proposed activities that may adversely affect EFH as well as any new information that affects the basis for NMFS EFH Conservation Recommendations. A new supplemental EHFA has been prepared to support this request (Enclosure 1).

5090
Ser N465/1397
21 November 2019

Please extend my thanks to your staff for their continued support of the U.S. Navy's environmental stewardship and compliance process. If you need additional information or have questions, my point of contact is Mr. Chip Johnson (619-767-1567 or chip.johnson@navy.mil).

Sincerely,

D. A. McNAIR
Director, Environmental Readiness Division
By Direction of the Commander

Enclosures: 1. MITT Supplemental EFHA, October 2019
2. MITT EFHA, May 2014

Copy to: (w/enclosures)
Mr. Steve McKagan, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands Field Office
Dr. Kelly Ebert, Chief of Naval Operations (N454)

C.4.2 National Marine Fisheries Service Essential Fish Habitat Assessment Recommendation Letter

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
national marine fisheries service
Pacific Islands Regional Office
1845 Wasp Blvd., Bldg 176
Honolulu, Hawaii 96818
(808) 725-5000 · Fax: (808) 725-5215

Mr. D. A. McNair
Director, Environmental Readiness
Department of the Navy
United States Pacific Fleet
250 Makalapa Drive
Pearl Harbor, HI 96860-3131

December 19, 2019

Dear Mr. McNair:

The National Marine Fisheries Service, Pacific Islands Regional Office (NMFS), received a request from your staff at the Commander, U.S. Pacific Fleet (hereafter, Navy) to complete a supplemental essential fish habitat (EFH) consultation for updates to the Mariana Islands Training and Testing (MITT) Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)/Overseas EIS (OEIS). The scope of the supplemental consultation includes aspects of the proposed activities that have changed since the 2014 EFH consultation was completed, and incorporation of any new scientific information that changes the basis of prior conservation recommendations. The Navy requested that the consultation be completed by December 21, 2019, and NMFS appreciates this opportunity to coordinate with the Navy and provide revised conservation recommendations pursuant to the Magnuson-Stevens Fisheries Conservation and Management Act (Magnuson-Stevens Act), Section 305 (b) (2) and 50 C.F.R 600.920.

Overview

In order to streamline the MITT supplemental EFH consultation, all supporting materials and analysis from the 2014 consultation are incorporated by reference 50 CFR 600.920(e)(5). Project activities and methods are superseded only where new information has been provided by the Navy; however, NMFS will consider sources of scientific information that may be new. The ten conservation recommendations from 2014 still apply, and will be revised only where these new sources of supplemental information change the basis for NMFS determination.

Doc. No. 35GL-20-1874.*

Essential Fish Habitat

The marine water column from the surface to a depth of 1,000 m from shoreline to the outer boundary of the Exclusive Economic Zone (5,150 kilometers/200 nautical miles/230 miles), and the seafloor from the shoreline out to a depth of 400 m around each of the Mariana Islands, have been designated as EFH. As such, the water column and bottom and all surrounding waters and submerged lands within the Mariana's Archipelago are designated as EFH and support various life stages for the management unit species (MUS) identified under the Western Pacific Regional Fishery Management Council's, Pelagic and Mariana Archipelago Fishery Ecosystem Plans (hereafter, Mariana FEP). The MUS and life stages found specifically within the Mariana's Archipelago include eggs, larvae, juveniles, and adults for Bottomfish and Pelagic MUS. Habitat Areas of Particular Concern (HAPCs) only occur for these MUS within the Marianas. Specific types of habitat considered as EFH include coral reef, patch reefs, hard substrate, artificial substrate, seagrass beds, soft substrate, mangrove, lagoon, estuarine, surge zone, deep-slope terraces and pelagic/open ocean.

Ecological Roles

The principal benthic organisms provide ecological services (e.g., water filtration and maintaining balanced nutrient concentrations) and provide physical habitat at both micro- and macro-scales. At a micro scale, the shape of benthic organisms change water movement, which can influence the settlement (McDougall 1943) and behavior of larvae and the availability of planktonic prey (Williams 1964). Sessile organisms provide refuge from predators, particularly for larvae and small sized species (Russ 1980; Sutherland 1974). Sessile organisms provide new ecological niches increasing species diversity. At a macro-scale, corals are the primary habitat builders in the coral reef ecosystem that benefit juvenile, sub-adult, and adult life stages of the MUS that utilize this designated EFH. The morphology, shape, and composite features of benthic organisms can also influence feeding strategies of these MUS.

NMFS Concerns

Adverse Effect Determinations

This EFH supplemental consultation incorporates by reference all information previously provided from previous phases of MITT activities, except were new information has been provided. In addition, all previous determinations and conservations recommendations apply except where explicitly amended. NMFS has determined that the activities described within the Supplemental MITT EFHA may result in adverse effects to EFH, and has provided seven new conservation recommendations to help avoid, minimize, offset for, or otherwise mitigate potential impacts.

NMFS categorizes adverse effect types in four categories: temporary, short-term, long-term, and permanent. The severity is measured by intensity and spatial extent of the stressor, while the adverse effect type is based on the recovery rate from the impact and the pervasiveness of the impact at the

ecological scale. Standard EFH effects analysis normally will use the most sensitive and hard-to-replace EFH resources based on the recovery time back to the baseline or the highest following stable state likely. Considering recruitment and growth rates of impacted fauna, oceanographic and geomorphologic features, and anticipated future conditions, living EFH resources which are altered or lost can be quantified as a debt. Non-living resources can also be adversely affected and lost, such as removal or impairment of feature to serve as shelter. These types of effects tend to be permanent.

The threshold for what effects are considered adverse to EFH is highly variable among the hundreds of species managed by the Western Pacific Fishery Management Council and NMFS. For example, multiple species included in each of the MUS in all FEPs have strong associations with the water column, especially the water surface in their egg and larval life stages. Those species typically have eggs that float very close to the surface (buoyant) and/or become planktonic as larvae. Therefore, physical disturbance of the surface (e.g., boat propeller churning) may be an adverse effect to the water column, which may reduce the fecundity of both MUS, their prey, and habitat forming organisms (e.g., coral). Both power generation studies (Schlezinger et al., 2013) and those that investigate the impacts of boating on zooplankton (Bickel et al., 2011) provide useful proxies in this respect. However, the severity of those potential adverse effects are dependent upon many factors that are complex to predict, including but not limited to: the reproductive cycles of a diverse assemblage of organisms potentially affected, oceanographic conditions (e.g., tides, prevailing currents, nearshore eddies), and the frequency of and forces generated by the vessels being operated.

The Navy provided a summary table of adverse effects determinations within the supplemental EFHA that are inconsistent with the definition of adverse effect in the Magnuson-Stevens Act (50 C.F.R. § 600.810). NMFS does not agree with the 'no effect' determinations made for acoustic, explosive, or physical disturbance and strike stressors. Below we list select stressors from Table 5-1 of the supplemental EFHA, followed by a description of how these stressors may impart temporary, short-term, long-term, permanent, and cumulative adverse effects on EFH (see *EFH Stressors* section below). My staff is willing to investigate more specific descriptions of adverse effects determinations for the stressors summarized in this document, if the Navy initiates an expanded EFH consultation.

Acoustic

The Navy lists sonar, vessel noise, and weapons noise as acoustic stressors. The Navy uses sonar (underwater sound) to navigate, communicate, or detect underwater objects. Active sonar emits sound waves which reflect off objects and returns to the receiver whereas passive sonar uses listening equipment to pick up underwater sounds (MITT EFH Assessment 2014). Vessels will be used for the majority of all proposed activities. Noise will be discharged from vessel engines during maneuvers and staging. Vessel noise can adversely affect fish and coral recruitment (see below). The use of sonar and weapons noise may result in temporary acoustic impacts to water column EFH, as it will alter the natural soundscape affecting the quality of water column EFH.

Explosives

Underwater explosive and other impulsive activities include ordnance and munitions such as projectiles, missiles, bombs, and other munitions (e.g. demolition charges). Explosives detonated near the surface would result in a shock wave and recurring pressure waves in the water column Although most explosives would be at or below the water surface, charges associated with mine neutralization could occur near the ocean bottom. Temporary physical and acoustic effects to water column EFH will occur from explosives detonated near the surface. Explosives detonated near the bottom may result in physical impacts to benthic communities, increase in turbidity (through disturbance of seafloor), and increase in acoustic impact. Physical impacts to soft bottom will be short-term, including an increase in turbidity, whereas physical impact changes to hard bottom will be permanent. Temporary effects to fish may be change in fish behavior or distribution, and permanent effects may be fish mortality.

Physical Disturbance and Strike

The Navy includes vessel movement, in-water devices, military expended materials, seafloor devices, and personnel disturbance as stressors under this category. Vessels are used in nearly all training and testing activities and include multiple types of vessels such as aircraft carriers, surface combatant, amphibious warfare ships, support crafts, and submarines Vessels that approach the shore or beach such as amphibious vessels could cause physical effects to benthic communities; physical impacts to soft-bottom will be short-term, including an increase in turbidity, whereas physical impact changes to hard bottom will be permanent. In 2017 a French Navy vessel grounded at Jade Shoals on Guam during military exercises and damaged the reef, highlighting the need for a funded vessel grounding response plan to ensure quick removal of the vessel, documentation of damages and offset of any permanent loss.

Military expended materials include: non-explosive practice munitions, fragments from high explosive munitions; and expended materials other than ordnance, such as sonobuoys, ship hulls, expendable targets and aircraft stores (fuel tanks, carriages, dispensers, racks, carriages or similar types of support systems on aircraft which could be expended or recovered Materials that are not recovered will result in marine debris that will either sink to the bottom or float and be transported by wind and ocean currents. Debris that sinks will result in permanent physical impacts to benthic habitat. Although ingestion rates are lower than sea turtles and marine mammals, ingestion of marine debris has been documented in approximately 40 fish species (CBD 2012).

Seafloor devices are items that are deployed onto the seafloor and may later be recovered, including moored mine shapes, anchors, bottom placed instruments, and robotic vehicles referred to as "crawlers." Seafloor devices are either stationary or move very slowly along the bottom Physical impacts to soft bottom will be short-term, including an increase in turbidity, whereas physical impact changes to hard bottom will be permanent.

4

Energy

Electromagnetic devices use magnetic influence in activities such as mine neutralization and mine countermeasure activities. The majority of the activities include towed or unmanned mine warfare systems that mimic the electromagnetic signature of a passing vessel which may result in temporary behavioral effects to susceptible fish and invertebrates.

EFH Stressors

The proposed MITT activities may result in adverse effects to EFH including physical impacts to benthic communities, enhanced sedimentation and turbidity, enhanced chemical contaminants, increase in acoustic and energy impacts, and introduction and propagation of invasive species. Any proposed activity that occurs within designated EFH may cause the following adverse effects, described generally in this section. The extent and severity of individual stressors will be highly variable across the spectrum of MITT activities, and the adverse effects may not be consistent from year to year even though the activities remain the same, due to external factors (i.e., climate change).

Physical Impacts to Benthic Communities – Physical damage to coral or coral reefs is often associated with the breaking of colonies or in the form of abrasion. The amount of damage is dependent on many factors, but is mostly due to the nature of the physical force and the types of corals being impacted (Storlazzi *et al.* 2005, Shimabukuro 2014). Corals, which are primarily responsible for the structural complexity of coral reefs, are particularly vulnerable to physical damage because their slow-growing carbonate skeleton is relatively brittle and their polyps are easily damaged. In general, lobate, encrusting, and other massive colony morphologies tend to withstand breakage better than foliose, table, plating, and branching morphologies; more fragile forms tend to have higher growth rates (Rützler 2001). Reduction of topographic complexity in the habitats of the coral reef ecosystem reduces biodiversity and productivity (Alvarez-Filip et al. 2009). In 2017, a MITT-related vessel grounding occurred in the nearshore coral reef ecosystem of Guam, resulting in the long-term to permanent loss of coral ecosystem services and function due to the absence of contingency/response planning and sufficient offset.

NMFS has reviewed the Navy's approach to managing the risk from physical impacts to EFH, including corals, associated with explosive stressors, vessel movements, and personnel disturbance. NMFS agrees that the proposed BMPs will help to avoid and minimize some impacts. However, NMFS still has concerns regarding the proposed increased usage and the lack of updated benthic mapping and surveys at the Guam UNDET site. We are also concerned about the ability of personnel and small boats to consistently remain within designated approach pathways during beach assault training activities. We also see a need to formalize planning and funding for response, assessment, and mitigation following potential vessel grounding events. In addition to direct physical damage from a grounding, these events break down the reef into rubble, which then becomes a long-term scouring hazard with the potential to induce further physical damage to corals due to wave action.

5

Increase in Sedimentation and Turbidity – Suspended sediment can elicit short- and long-term responses from aquatic organisms depending on the quantity, quality, and duration of suspended sediment exposure (Kjelland et al. 2015, Philipp and Fabricius 2003). Coral reef organisms are easily smothered by sediment (Golbuu et al. 2003), and rates >100 milligrams/centimeter^2/day can kill exposed coral tissue within a few days (Riegl and Branch 1995), although corals show considerable interspecific variability. Sedimentation can also reduce photosynthetic rates (Philipp and Fabricius 2003), disrupt polyp gas exchange, inhibit nutrient acquisition (Richmond 1996), cause tissue damage (Rogers, 1990), reduce recruitment success (Gilmour 1999) and increase metabolic costs due to enhanced mucus production (Telesnicki and Goldberg 1995).

NMFS has reviewed the Navy's approach to managing the risk from sediment and turbidity to EFH, including corals. We remain particularly concerned about these stressors at the Guam UNDET site due to the proposed increase in tempo and usage in the nearshore ecosystem, where there is a lack of updated benthic habitat mapping and coral reef surveys. Due to uncertainty from the lack of recent, quantitative resource survey assessment and geomorphologic information, NMFS must assume that enhanced sedimentation and turbidity will result in potential mortality and the degradation in the condition of corals present. New surveys and updated benthic habitat maps may help to alleviate these concerns.

Increase in Noise – Noise has a broad range of potential effects, especially when it is very loud and has high amplitude (Casper *et al.* 2016), or when it is less intense but long-lasting (Popper and Hastings 2009). Behavioral changes can occur, resulting in animals leaving feeding or reproduction grounds (Slabbekoorn et al., 2012) or becoming more susceptible to mortality through decreased predator-avoidance responses (Simpson et al., 2016). Less intense but chronic noise can cause a general increase in background noise over a large area. Chronic noise will not likely result in mortality, but may mask biologically important sounds and alter the natural soundscape, cause hearing loss, and/or have an adverse effect on an organism's stress levels and immune system (Minton 2017). Masking of the normal reef sounds by artificial sounds may have an impact on species abundances and numbers on coral reefs. Research has shown that larvae of several reef fish families preferentially select traps emitting high frequency sounds over traps emitting sounds similar in frequency to normal background frequencies (Simpson *et al.* 2008). Studies on an invertebrate species has shown that chronic exposure to noise may lead to increased metabolic rates, causing a reduction in growth and reproduction (Lagardère 1982). Recent advances in passive acoustic technology and analysis indicates that coral reef larvae are using lower frequency sounds such as those made by grunting fishes. These daily sounds are primarily produced at night and during dusk and dawn. However, these types of sounds are produced most abundantly during spawning. Corals exposed to enhanced anthropogenic noise, including that from vessel engines, will have disrupted settlement of their planulae (Lecchini et al. 2018).

NMFS disagrees with the Navy's conclusion that noise generated as part of MITT activities will have no effect on EFH. There are reasonable avoidance and minimization measures that can be

implemented to reduce adverse effects to coral, bottomfish life history stages, and organisms that serve as prey-base for bottomfish. Some of these measures include establishing avoidance/buffer zones and turning off vessel engines (particularly small vessels in nearshore ecosystems) and sonar when not needed.

Invasive Species – Introduced species are organisms that have been moved, intentionally or unintentionally, into areas where they do not naturally occur. Species can be introduced to new biogeographies, typically via transport on vessel hulls or in ballast water, such as those that may be used in the Applicant's cable laying and trenching operations. Invasive species rapidly increase in abundance to the point that they come to dominate their new environment, creating adverse ecological effects to other species of the ecosystem and the functions and services it may provide (Goldberg and Wilkinson 2004). Invasive species can decrease species diversity, change trophic structure, and diminish physical structure, but adverse effects are highly variable and species-specific.

NMFS is concerned that the increase in vessel movements and personnel disturbances proposed within the MITT may also increase the risk of introducing and spreading invasive species within the region through direct physical introduction or transportation resulting from hull fouling and ballast water. A description of how the Navy plans to avoid and control for the possible spread of invasive species during these activities would help alleviate this concern.

Cumulative Adverse Effects

A cumulative effects analysis must consider the changes to the marine environment that are expected to occur under our current climate trajectory. Considering that many effects in marine ecosystems have long durations due to slow ecosystem recovery (e.g., corals), activities proposed today could result in significant and irreversible damage to EFH in coming decades. In addition, individual adverse effects (stresses) often interact in ways that increase adverse effects (Brown 1997, Negri and Hooganbloom 2011). For example, elevated seawater temperatures can cause coral bleaching, but the temperature threshold at which coral bleaching occurs is lowered under elevated nutrient conditions. In another example, nutrient enrichment combined with large-scale physical damage can increase the probability of a shift in dominance from coral to algae, known as "phase-shifts."

Crain *et al.* (2008) reviewed over 200 studies examining cumulative effects for multiple stressors in intertidal and nearshore marine ecosystems to elucidate general patterns in cumulative stressor effects. The cumulative effects of any two stressors were distributed among all interaction types with 26% being additive, *i.e.*, no interaction, 36% synergistic and 38% antagonistic. In 62% of all cases, interactions between stressors resulted in an adverse effect on the species or ecosystem that was at least additive. In cases where a third stressor was considered, over two-thirds of the interaction became more negative, and the number of synergistic interactions increased to 66% of the cases.

7

The amount of Navy materials being deposited (i.e., MEM) is planned to continue for the foreseeable future. At an unidentified inflection point adverse effects to EFH from the continual deposition of these materials over the same footprint will be reached. As that point is approached it will become more difficult to mitigate and restore ecological functions and services. We expect that the Navy will calculate the deposition rates and decomposition rates to determine maximum MEM loads as this action becomes decadal, since offset may become appropriate if MEM loading impairs the habitat function. In addition, there may be cumulative adverse effects from personnel usage and unexpected vessel groundings in the absence of proper contingency planning, including resources for regular and on-the-spot survey damage assessments at all sites used for amphibious assaults.

NMFS is concerned about past, present, and future adverse effects to EFH resources from these stressors. The concerns about MEM can be assessed through the Navy's calculation of deposition and decomposition rates to determine maximum MEM loads as this action becomes decadal; this would inform potential offset. Quantitative resource survey assessments, updated benthic habitat substrate and biological cover mapping, and vessel grounding planning and contingencies would help to avoid, minimize, offset for, or otherwise mitigate potential cumulative adverse effects from these stressors.

Revised Conservation Recommendations

NMFS provides the following supplemental EFH conservation recommendations in accordance with the EFH provisions of the Magnuson-Stevens Act (50 C.F.R. 600.920) to help Navy ensure that adverse effects to EFH including coral reef resources are avoided, minimized, and offset. These recommendations are additions to the ten original conservation recommendations provided as part of the 2014 consultation.

Conservation Recommendation 11: The Navy should work with NMFS and local agencies to develop a vessel grounding response plan that includes a funding mechanism and protocols for expedited vessel removal, damage assessment surveys, and strategies to offset any unavoidable loss to EFH resources (e.g., corals, seagrass, etc.). This would also inform and minimize potential cumulative adverse effects from unexpected groundings as MITT continues into the future.

Conservation Recommendation 12: Surveys should be performed annually at the Apra Harbor UNDET site to include georeferenced status and condition information for habitat forming EFH resources (e.g., corals and seagrass) within a 100-ft buffer surrounding the site. This will help to document potential adverse effects associated with both direct physical impacts and suspension of sediments to inform potential minimization (i.e., transplantation) and offset.

Conservation Recommendation 13: Shallow reef areas and reef flats that are being used for amphibious assaults should be surveyed immediately following each training exercise to document physical impacts, quantify coral condition, and stabilize and/or translocate any broken corals. NMFS is ready and willing to assist with such planning.

8

Conservation Recommendation 14: Implement a 300-yard buffer around coral reef habitats and as much as practicable avoid continuous emission of sounds (i.e., turn off vessel engines and sonar when not needed or in use) in these habitats. This would minimize potential adverse effects of chronic noise on corals (e.g., disruption of coral planulae settlement), Bottomfish MUS life history stages (e.g., hearing, immune system disruption, etc.), and reef fish (e.g., hearing, immune system disruption, etc.) that serve as prey-base for juvenile and adult Bottomfish MUS.

Conservation Recommendation 15: The Navy should ensure that in-water activities minimize potential introduction of nuisance or invasive species. Any vessels coming from outside of the CNMI's EEZ should comply with U.S. Coast Guard ballast water discharge standards (i.e. no ballast water discharge within 12 nautical miles or use approved ballast water management system) to prevent introduction of new invasive species. Any equipment, materials and gear entering the nearshore waters of Rota should also be checked prior to deployment.

Conservation Recommendation 16: The Navy should calculate MEM deposition and decomposition rates to determine maximum loads as this action becomes decadal. This would inform potential offset for potential cumulative adverse effects.

Conservation Recommendation 17: The Navy should conduct regular (i.e., every 3-5 years) quantitative resource survey assessments and updated benthic habitat substrate and biological cover mapping at representative nearshore sites to document cumulative impacts over time. This would reduce uncertainty, quantify changes in coral condition and state due to ongoing MITT activities, inform potential offset, and minimize cumulative adverse effects by informing adaptive management.

Conclusion

NMFS supports the need for military readiness and believes the mission of the Pacific Fleet is of utmost national security importance. NMFS supports Navy's intent to be good resource stewards and appreciate Navy's future effort in working with us to ensure that any unavoidable impacts to our trust resources are adequately mitigated. We therefore highlight the importance of continued cooperation and coordination to resolve NMFS's concerns. Also, NMFS is enclosing a report (Minton 2017) that provides a comprehensive review of typical adverse effects to EFH in the Pacific Islands region, which will be helpful to the Navy for future consultations. NMFS believes that our positive working relationship and mutual desire for a meaningful outcome for NOAA trust resources at risk while meeting the needs of the Fleet can be achieved. Please do not hesitate to contact Steve McKagan at 670-234-0004 and/or steven.mckagan@noaa.gov with any questions or to request further technical assistance.

9

Sincerely,

Gerry Davis
Assistant Regional Administrator
Habitat Conservation Division

cc by e-mail:
Ms. Arlene Pangilinan, NMFS
Dr. Malia Chow, NMFS
Barbara Prine, Navy
Chip Johnston, Navy

10

Enclosures

Minton, D. 2017. Non-fishing effects that may adversely affect essential fish habitat in the Pacific Islands Region. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Final Report for contract AB-133F-15-CQ-0014.

References

Bickel, S. L., J. D. Malloy Hammond & K. W. Tang. 2011. Boat-generated turbulence as a potential source of mortality among copepods. Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology 401: 105–109.

Brown, B. 1997. Disturbances to Reefs in Recent Times. In: Life and Death of Coral Reefs (C. Birkeland, ed.). Kluwer Academic Publishers. pp. 354-379.

Casper, B. M., T. J. Carlson, M. B. Halvorsen, A. N. Popper. 2016. Effects of Impulsive Pile-Driving Exposure on Fishes. Adv. Exp. Med. Biol. 875: 125-32

Crain, C. M., K. Kroeker, and B. S. Halpern. 2008. Interactive and cumulative effects of multiple stressors in marine systems. Ecol. Lett. 11: 1304-15.

Edmonds, N. J., C. J. Firmin, D. Goldsmith, R. C. Faulkner and D. T. Wood. 2016. A review of crustacean sensitivity to high amplitude underwater noise: Data needs for effective risk assessment in relation to UK commercial species. Mar. Poll. Bull. 108: 5–11.

Gilmour J. 1999. Experimental investigation into the effects of suspended sediment on fertilisation, larval survival and settlement in a scleractinian coral. Marine Biology. 135(3):451-462.

Golbuu Y, Victor S, Wolanski E, Richmond RH. 2003. Trapping of fine sediment in a semi-enclosed bay,Palau, Micronesia. Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science. 57(5):941-949.

Goldberg, J. and C. Wilkenson. 2004. Global threats to coral reefs: coral bleaching, global climate change, disease, predator plagues, and invasive species. In Status of the Coral Reefs of the World: 2004 (C. Wilkinson, ed.). Australian Institute of Marine Science, Townsville, Queensland. pp. 67-92.

Hawkins, A. D., and A. N. Popper. 2017. "A sound approach to assessing the impact of underwater noise on marine fishes and invertebrates." ICES Journal of Marine Science 74.3:635-651.

Hédouin L, Gates RD. Assessing fertilization success of the coral Montipora capitata under copper exposure: does the night of spawning matter?. Marine pollution bulletin. 2013 Jan 15;66(1-2):221-4.

Iafrate, J. D., S. L. Watwood, E. A. Reyier, D. M. Scheidt, G. A. Dossot and S. E. Crocker. 2016. Effects of pile driving on the residency and movement of tagged reef fish. PLoS ONE 11(11): e0163638.

Kjelland, M.E., Woodley, C.M., Swannack, T.M., Smith, D.L. 2015. A review of the potential effects of suspended sediment on fishes: potential dredging-related physiological, behavioural, and transgenerational implications. Environment Systems and Decisions: 1-17.

11

Lagardère, J.P. 1982. Effects of Noise on Growth and Reproduction of *Crangon crangon* in Rearing Tanks. Mar. Biol. 71: 177.

Lecchini D, Bertucci F, Gache C, Khalife A, Besson M, Roux N, Berthe C, Singh S, Parmentier E, Nugues MM, Brooker RM. Boat noise prevents soundscape-based habitat selection by coral planulae. Scientific reports. 2018 Jun 18;8(1):9283.

McDougall, K.D. 1943. Sessile Marine Invertebrates of Beaufort, North Carolina: A Study of Settlement, Growth, and Seasonal Fluctuations among Pile-Dwelling Organisms. Ecological Monographs, 13: 321-374.

Minton, D. 2017. Non-fishing effects that may adversely affect essential fish habitat in the Pacific Islands Region. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Final Report for contract AB-133F-15-CQ-0014.

Nedelec, S. L., A. N. Radford, L. Pearl, B. Nedelec, M. I. McCormick, M. G. Meekan, S. D. Simpson. 2017. "Motorboat noise impacts parental behaviour and offspring survival in a reef fish." Proc. R. Soc. B. Vol. 284. No. 1856.

Nedelec, S. L., S. C. Mills, D. Lecchini, B. Nedelec, S. D. Simpson, A. N. Radford. 2016. "Repeated exposure to noise increases tolerance in a coral reef fish." Environmental Pollution 216: 428-436.

Negri, A., and M. Hoogenboom. 2011. Water Contamination Reduces the Tolerance of Coral Larvae to Thermal Stress. PLoS ONE 6(5): e19703.

Nichols, T. A., T. W. Anderson and A. Širović. 2015. Intermittent Noise Induces Physiological Stress in a Coastal Marine Fish. PLOS One 10: e0139157

Philipp, E. and K. Fabricius. 2003. Photophysiological stress in scleractinian corals in response to short-term sedimentation. J. Exp. Mar. Biol. Ecol. 287: 57-78.

Popper, A. and Hastings, M. 2009. The effects of anthropogenic sources of sound on fishes. Journal of Fish Biology, 75: 455-489.

Richmond RH. 1996. Effects of coastal runoff on coral reproduction. Biological Conservation. 76(2):360-364.

Riegl B, Branch GM. 1995. Effects of sediment on the energy budgets of four scleractinian (bourne 1900) and five alcyonacean (lamouroux 1816) corals. Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology. 186(2):259-275.

Rogers, C.S., 1990. Responses of coral reefs and reef organisms to sedimentation. -Mar. Ecol. Progr. Ser., 62: 185-202, Oldendorf.

Russ G.R. 1980. Effects of predation by fishes, competition, and structural complexity of the substratum on the establishment of a marine epifaunal community. J. Exp. Mar. Biol. Ecol. 42:55-69

Schlezinger,D.R., C.D. Taylor, and B.L. Howes. 2013. Assessment of zooplankton injury and mortality associated with underwater turbines for tidal energy production Mar Technol Soc J, 47 pp. 142-150.

Slabbekoorn, H., Yang, X-J., & Halfwerk, W. 2012. Birds and Anthropogenic Noise: Singing Higher May Matter (A Comment on Nemeth and Brumm, "Birds and Anthropogenic Noise: Are Urban Songs Adaptive?"). The American Naturalist, 180(1), 142-145.

12

Simpson S.D., Meekan M.G., Jeffs A., Montgomery J.C., McCauley R.D. 2008. Settlement-stage coral reef fishes prefer the higher frequency invertebrate-generated audible component of reef noise. Anim Behav 75:1861–8.

Simpson, S. D., A, N. Radford, S. L. Nedelec, M. C.O. Ferrari, D. P. Chivers, M. I. McCormick and M. G. Meekan. 2016. Anthropogenic noise increases fish mortality by predation. Nat. Comm. 7: 10544.

Sutherland, J. P. 1974. Multiple stable points in natural communities. Am. Nat. 108:859-873.

Telesnicki G. J., Goldberg WM. 1995. Effects of turbidiy on the photosynthesis and respiration of two south Florida reef coral species. Bulletin of Marine Science. 57(2):527-539.

Williams, L.G. 1964. Possible Relationships Between Plankton-Diatom Species Numbers and Water-Quality Estimates. Ecology, 45: 809-823

Wooldridge, S. A., T. J. Done, C. R. Thomas, I. I. Gordon, P. A. Marshall and R. N. Jones. 2012. Safeguarding coastal coral communities on the central Great Barrier Reef (Australia) against climate change: realizable local and global actions. Clim. Change 112: 945-61.

13

C.4.3 NAVY RESPONSE LETTER TO NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE ESSENTIAL FISH HABITAT RECOMMENDATIONS

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
COMMANDER
UNITED STATES PACIFIC FLEET
250 MAKALAPA DRIVE
PEARL HARBOR, HAWAII 96860-3131

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5090
Ser N465/0145
29 January 2020

Assistant Regional Administrator, Habitat Conservation Division
Pacific Islands Regional Office, National Marine Fisheries Service
1845 Wasp Boulevard, Building 176
Honolulu, HI 96818-5007

Dear Mr. Davis:

SUBJECT: NAVY FINAL RESPONSE TO THE NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE LETTER ON THE NAVY'S 2019 SUPPLEMENTAL ESSENTIAL FISH HABITAT ASSESSMENT IN SUPPORT OF THE MARIANA ISLANDS TRAINING AND TESTING SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT/OVERSEAS ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The Navy thanks you for the comments provided in your letter of December 19, 2019, as well as the prompt review from your office of our supplemental Essential Fish Habitat Assessment for the Mariana Islands Training and Testing Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement.

This letter contains enclosures that responds to the seven additional conservation recommendations to avoid, minimize, offset for, or otherwise mitigate potential impacts in your letter.

We thank you for your continued support of this critical project.

Sincerely,

D. A. McNAIR
Director, Environmental Readiness Division
By direction of the Commander

Enclosure: Navy Response To NMFS' December 19, 2019 Essential Fish Habitat Letter

Copy to: (w/enclosure)
Mr. Steve McKagan, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands Field Office
Dr. Kelly Ebert, Chief of Naval Operations (N454)
Mr. Dana Lujan, Joint Region Marianas
Michael Noah, Joint Region Mari

Enclosure: Navy Response To NMFS' December 19, 2019 Essential Fish Habitat Letter

The U.S. Navy (Navy) addressed National Marine Fisheries Service Conservation Recommendations from the 2014 consultation in Table 4-2 of the Navy's 2019 supplemental Essential Fish Habitat Assessment (EFHA). This included incorporation of the Navy's original 2014 response to NMFS, as well as updated information addressing how some of the recommendations had been addressed.

The below text contains the Navy's response to the additional Conservation Recommendations from the NMFS letter to the Navy of December 19, 2019.

***NMFS Conservation Recommendation 11**: The Navy should work with NMFS and local agencies to develop a vessel grounding response plan that includes a funding mechanism and protocols for expedited vessel removal, damage assessment surveys, and strategies to offset any unavoidable loss to EFH resources (e.g., corals, seagrass, etc.). This would also inform and minimize potential cumulative adverse effects from unexpected groundings MITT continues into the future.*

Navy Response to Recommendation 11: Although a naval vessel grounded in 2017, the Navy asserts such events are not reasonably foreseeable impacts from the proposed action. Vessel groundings are rare and typically result from a series of unusual and unpredictable circumstances. The Navy is already prepared to respond to such events. The Navy maintains salvage and towing response capability through the employment of Navy assets and through worldwide salvage contracts. Contingency planning is required for preparedness, and the Navy can ensure that baseline conditions of natural resources within the management control of the Navy are identified and kept current through implementation of the 2019 Joint Region Marianas Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan to which NMFS is a signatory partner. Furthermore, the INRMP identifies strategies and actions to address Marine Habitat Management (Sections 5.4.2.1, 8.4.2.1, and 9.4.2.1) and Marine Protected Species Management (Section 5.4.2.3), specifically:

- "Develop protocol for immediate assessment and response to reef damage caused by unanticipated events such as ship groundings and anchor damage. The protocol will outline responsible parties, coordination process, and initial reef damage assessment requirements. This protocol will inform the long-term response plan."
- "Ensure no impact to coral or hard substrates during MITT training activities occurring within or adjacent to reef habitats by implementing appropriate avoidance measures."

Enclosure: Navy Response To NMFS' December 19, 2019 Essential Fish Habitat Letter

***NMFS Conservation Recommendation 12**: Surveys should be performed annually at the Apra Harbor UNDET site to include georeferenced status and condition information for habitat forming EFH resources (e.g., corals and seagrass) within a 100-ft buffer surrounding the site. This will help to document potential adverse effects associated with both direct physical impacts and suspension of sediments to inform potential minimization (i.e., transplantation) and offset.*

Navy Response to Recommendation 12: The Navy asserts this recommendation is already being satisfied under the mandates of the Joint Region Marianas INRMP, to which the NMFS is a signatory, as briefly summarized in the Navy's 2019 supplemental EFHA (page 5-2).. Details specific to previous surveys in Apra Harbor including the Outer Apra Harbor UNDET site can be found in the INRMP starting in Section 5.3. Continued similar efforts are recommended and planned in Sections 5.4.2 (Marine Ecosystems Management) as well as in Chapter 13 (Planning, Integration, and Implementation). Specific INRMP activities include:

- "Enhance coral habitat by monitoring health and acute impacts and through focused reef restoration efforts."
- "Establish long-term monitoring programs to track changes in the health of corals and water quality that are compatible with existing monitoring programs in Guam and the region. JRM has programmed for active/continuous remote monitoring of water quality parameters at select locations starting in FY19."
- "Work with regulatory partners and local subject matter experts to identify priority resilience indicators….The measures for assessing resilience include: macroalgae percent cover (to be obtained as coarse level data in the benthic habitat mapping project), coral community (available for some sites from past studies), bleaching resistance, coral recruitment and connectivity, coral diversity (available for some sites from past studies), herbivorous fish community (available for some of Apra Harbor from past studies), herbivore average functional group biomass, temperature variability, land-based sources of pollution, and accessibility due to wave exposure."
- "JRM will coordinate with local partners and subject matter experts (SMEs) to determine appropriate locations and methods for coral population enhancement and restoration efforts. JRM will align projects with the proposed Guam Restoration Strategy (in development). This may include projects that include sexual propagation that collect gametes, settle them on tiles, and eventually outplant new colonies, but can also include out-planting colonies, clones, or asexual propagation from fragments, or other restoration strategies such as algal removal."
- "Update and continuously maintain existing centralized GIS database to effectively inform and guide future management of marine natural resources on NBG Main Base and meet natural resources goals and objectives. Readily available GIS data will be used to develop natural resources constraints maps for use in current and future JRM management and planning decisions for NBG Main Base."

Enclosure: Navy Response To NMFS' December 19, 2019 Essential Fish Habitat Letter





Figure 1. UNDET activities at the Outer Apra Harbor UNDET site. The substrate is mostly sand and contains little coral or seagrass

Enclosure: Navy Response To NMFS' December 19, 2019 Essential Fish Habitat Letter

***NMFS Conservation Recommendation 13**: Shallow reef areas and reef flats that are being used for amphibious assaults should be surveyed immediately following each training exercise to document physical impacts, quantify coral condition, and stabilize and/or translocate any broken corals. NMFS is ready and willing to assist with such planning.*

Navy Response to Recommendation 13: The Navy asserts this recommendation is already being satisfied under the mandates of the Joint Region Marianas INRMP, to which the NMFS is a signatory, as briefly summarized in the Navy's 2019 supplemental EFHA (page 5-2).. While not tied to specific training events, the INRMP directs repeated surveys across all submerged Navy controlled areas in the Mariana Islands. This would include beaches used for landing events. Cumulative impacts, if any can, be assessed over time as the program evolves. Additionally, the INRMP includes the previously described plans to develop protocols to respond to reef damage (Marine Habitat Management (Sections 5.4.2.1, 8.4.2.1, and 9.4.2 and Marine Protected Species Management Section 5.4.2.3). Specific INRMP activities include:

- "Enhance coral habitat by monitoring health and acute impacts and through focused reef restoration efforts."
- "Establish long-term monitoring programs to track changes in the health of corals and water quality that are compatible with existing monitoring programs in Guam and the region. JRM has programmed for active/continuous remote monitoring of water quality parameters at select locations starting in FY19."
- "Work with regulatory partners and local subject matter experts to identify priority resilience indicators….The measures for assessing resilience include: macroalgae percent cover (to be obtained as coarse level data in the benthic habitat mapping project), coral community (available for some sites from past studies), bleaching resistance, coral recruitment and connectivity, coral diversity (available for some sites from past studies), herbivorous fish community (available for some of Apra Harbor from past studies), herbivore average functional group biomass, temperature variability, land-based sources of pollution, and accessibility due to wave exposure."
- "JRM will coordinate with local partners and subject matter experts (SMEs) to determine appropriate locations and methods for coral population enhancement and restoration efforts. JRM will align projects with the proposed Guam Restoration Strategy (in development). This may include projects that include sexual propagation that collect gametes, settle them on tiles, and eventually outplant new colonies, but can also include out-planting colonies, clones, or asexual propagation from fragments, or other restoration strategies such as algal removal."
- "Develop protocol for immediate assessment and response to reef damage caused by unanticipated events such as ship groundings and anchor damage. The protocol will outline responsible parties, coordination process, and initial reef damage assessment requirements. This protocol will inform the long-term response plan."
- "Ensure no impact to coral or hard substrates during MITT training activities occurring within or adjacent to reef habitats by implementing appropriate avoidance measures."

While unrelated to specific training events, the 2019 JRM INRMP identifies the strategies and actions across all Navy submerged lands, to include coastal beaches, in the Mariana Islands. Cumulative impacts, if any, can, be assessed continually as the program evolves.

Enclosure: Navy Response To NMFS' December 19, 2019 Essential Fish Habitat Letter

***Conservation Recommendation 14**: Implement a 300-yard buffer around coral reef habitats and as much as practicable avoid continuous emission of sounds (i.e., turn off vessel engines and sonar when not needed or in use) in these habitats. This would minimize potential adverse effects of chronic noise on corals (e.g., disruption of coral planulae settlement), Bottomfish MUS life history stages (e.g., hearing, immune system disruption, etc.), and reef fish (e.g., hearing, immune system disruption, etc.) that serve as prey-base for juvenile and adult Bottomfish MUS.*

Navy Response to Recommendation 14: The Navy asserts meeting this recommendation is impractical and would jeopardize navigational safety, which could increase potential groundings. In practice, large naval vessels such as amphibious assault ships rarely close within 300 yards of a coastline. The NMFS recommendation would apply to landing craft, amphibious assault vehicles, and combat rubber raiding craft approaching or departing from a given landing location. However, these types of craft always need to maintain steerage way. In fact, the main objective is transporting personnel to and from a beach beyond a reef as quickly as possible; therefore, engines cannot be turned off. These types of craft would delay their approach, increasing the potential for drifting or potential grounding, which could present navigational hazards depending on the sea state (e.g., swamping). The Navy's 2019 Supplemental EFHA lists (in Table 4-2) ongoing standard operating procedures limiting the spatial spread of a landing (landing craft approaching in a line), as well as some engine noise (turning off combat rubber raiding craft motors to paddle across reefs to the beach). Finally, the Navy would not characterize the spatially and temporarily limited use of vessels during discreet training events as a chronic noise. There would be significant time between events (e.g., weeks or months) when landing events close to shore would not occur.

High-power sonar used for antisubmarine warfare would not generally occur within 3 NM of land, and hence would be well beyond the 300-yard buffer.

Enclosure: Navy Response To NMFS' December 19, 2019 Essential Fish Habitat Letter

***NMFS Conservation Recommendation 15**: The Navy should ensure that in-water activities minimize potential introduction of nuisance or invasive species. Any vessels coming from outside of the CNMI's EEZ should comply with U.S. Coast Guard ballast water discharge standards (i.e. no ballast water discharge within 12 nautical miles or use approved ballast water management system) to prevent introduction of new invasive species. Any equipment, materials and gear entering the nearshore waters of Rota should also be checked prior to deployment.*

Navy Response to Recommendation 15: The Navy asserts this recommendation is already being satisfied under the mandates of the Navy's internal compliance with established regulations. The Navy implements strict ballast water discharge requirements, consistent with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, U.S. Coast Guard, and adheres to applicable international regulations, through internal instructions, directions, and guidance. Vessels not equipped with ballast water treatment systems are required to perform exchanges greater than 12 NM from land or hold discharges, when appropriate and practicable, to minimize the introduction of invasive species.

The NMFS is a signatory to the 2019 JRM INRMP which identifies strategies and actions to address Marine Invasive Species Management (Sections 5.4.2.2, 8.4.2.2, 9.4.2.2, and 11.4.2.2), specifically:

- "Develop and maintain a Marine Invasive Species Management Plan for NBG Main Base, NCTS, AAFB, and Tinian MLA."
- "JRM will work with appropriate U.S. Navy commands to determine if updates are warranted for Navy hull husbandry standards (Naval Sea Systems Command S9086-CQ STM-010) (U.S. Navy 2006) and ballast water requirements (Note: The U.S. Navy adopts USCG standards)."
- "Participate in the quarterly Guam Invasive Species Advisory Council meetings and coordinate regularly with the territorial marine invasive species coordinator once hired."

Enclosure: Navy Response To NMFS' December 19, 2019 Essential Fish Habitat Letter

***NMFS Conservation Recommendation 16**: The Navy should calculate MEM deposition and decomposition rates to determine maximum loads as this action becomes decadal. This would inform potential offset for potential cumulative adverse effects.*

Navy Response to Recommendation 16: The Navy would reiterate that MEM use is across a very large spatial extent and rarely sequentially concentrated in small areas. Furthermore, the total cumulative MEM footprint as listed in Table 2-1 of the Navy's 2019 supplemental EFHA, is only 132,930 m^2 which is actually 37,866 m^2 less than the Navy's 2014 EFHA MEM footprint (170,796 m^2). Potential MEM footprint, 132,930 m^2 or 0.133 km^2, represents less than 0.0000001% of the total MITT study area (1,721,376 km^2).

Although absent in the MITT Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Oversea Environmental Impact Statement (EIS/OEIS), the Navy has updated Appendix J (Statistical Probability Analysis for Estimating Direct Strike Impact and Number of Potential Exposures from Military Expended Materials) for the pending MITT final supplemental EIS/OEIS. This update will show the anticipated footprint of estimated annual MEM use, which can be summed across multiple years, or at least until a new supplemental EIS/OEIS is required. At that time, MEM usage would be re-evaluated. The Navy can provide the revised Appendix J to the NMFS as soon as final edits are complete. Finally, while the exact decomposition rates for all material in MEM is unknown, it is likely that major components such as aluminum and steel will corrode slowly in deep ocean waters. Overtime MEM would either be incorporated into sediments (i.e., buried) or remain on the ocean bottom subject to corrosion (Ocean News 2016, Edwards and Beldowski 2016[1]). Edwards and Beldowski 2016, alone with various contributing authors have documented the fate and condition of WWII munitions and post-war disposed items. Their work includes assessments corrosion of items deposited at a 300-600 m deep-water disposal site south of Oahu[2] (Figure 2).

[1] Edwards, M, and J. Beldowski, ed. 2016. Chemical Munitions Dumped at Sea-Special Edition. Deep Sea Research II 128. 136 pg. https://www.sciencedirect.com/journal/deep-sea-research-part-ii-topical-studies-in-oceanography/vol/128 ; Ocean News. 2016. WWII Bombs Provide Living Laboratories for Cold-Water Coral Reefs. Online published 01 June 2016.

[2] The site had military munitions and items dumps from post-World War II through 1972. The site also had civilian dredged material dumped from Pearl Harbor, Honolulu Harbor, and Ali Wai Canal.

Enclosure: Navy Response To NMFS' December 19, 2019 Essential Fish Habitat Letter




Fig. 2. Examples of DMM corrosion observed:(a) moderately corroded aerial bomb,(b) depth charge exhibiting mild corrosion,(c) significantly corroded artillery projectile, (d) bundle of brass artillery cartridges with significantly corroded projectiles,(e) severely corroded cluster bomb, and (f) severely corroded depth charge.
From: Silva and Chock. 2016. Munitions integrity and corrosion features observed during the HUMMA deep-sea munitions disposal site investigations. Deep Sea Research II 128:14-24.

Figure 2. Representative images from Deep Sea Research II Vol 128- Chemical Munitions At Sea-CORROSION (Edwards and Beldowski, ed. 2016)

Enclosure: Navy Response To NMFS' December 19, 2019 Essential Fish Habitat Letter

***NMFS Conservation Recommendation 17**: The Navy should conduct regular (i.e., every 3-5 years) quantitative resource survey assessments and updated benthic habitat substrate and biological cover mapping at representative nearshore sites to document cumulative impacts over time. This would reduce uncertainty, quantify changes in coral condition and state due to ongoing MITT activities, inform potential offset, and minimize cumulative adverse effects by informing adaptive management.*

Navy Response to Recommendation 17: The Navy asserts this recommendation has been identified in the 2019 JRM INRMP, as briefly summarized in the Navy's 2019 supplemental EFHA (page 5-2). The NMFS is a signatory to the 2019 JRM INRMP which identifies strategies and actions to address Marine Habitat Management (Sections 5.4.2.1, 8.4.2.1, 9.4.2.1, 11.4.2.1, and 12.4.2.1) and Marine Protected Species Management (Sections 5.4.2.3 and 11.4.2.3), specifically:

- "Enhance coral habitat by monitoring health and acute impacts and through focused reef restoration efforts."
- "Establish long-term monitoring programs to track changes in the health of corals and water quality that are compatible with existing monitoring programs in Guam and the region. JRM has programmed for active/continuous remote monitoring of water quality parameters at select locations starting in FY19."
- "Work with regulatory partners and local subject matter experts to identify priority resilience indicators….The measures for assessing resilience include: macroalgae percent cover (to be obtained as coarse level data in the benthic habitat mapping project), coral community (available for some sites from past studies), bleaching resistance, coral recruitment and connectivity, coral diversity (available for some sites from past studies), herbivorous fish community (available for some of Apra Harbor from past studies), herbivore average functional group biomass, temperature variability, land-based sources of pollution, and accessibility due to wave exposure."
- "JRM will coordinate with local partners and subject matter experts (SMEs) to determine appropriate locations and methods for coral population enhancement and restoration efforts. JRM will align projects with the proposed Guam Restoration Strategy (in development). This may include projects that include sexual propagation that collect gametes, settle them on tiles, and eventually outplant new colonies, but can also include out-planting colonies, clones, or asexual propagation from fragments, or other restoration strategies such as algal removal."
- "Develop protocol for immediate assessment and response to reef damage caused by unanticipated events such as ship groundings and anchor damage. The protocol will outline responsible parties, coordination process, and initial reef damage assessment requirements. This protocol will inform the long-term response plan."
- "Ensure no impact to coral or hard substrates during MITT training activities occurring within or adjacent to reef habitats by implementing appropriate avoidance measures."

Enclosure: Navy Response To NMFS' December 19, 2019 Essential Fish Habitat Letter

Additionally, the 2019 JRM INRMP identifies planning, integration, and implementation strategies to coordinate natural resources requirements with other federal, territorial, or commonwealth agencies, including the acquisition of INRMP mutual agreements between the DON, USFWS, NOAA-NMFS, and territorial and commonwealth fish and wildlife agencies (see Chapter 13).

C.4.4 National Marine Fisheries Service Response Letter to the Navy

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE
Pacific Islands Regional Office
1845 Wasp Blvd., Bldg 176
Honolulu, Hawaii 96818
(808) 725-5000 · Fax: (808) 725-5215

Mr. D. A. McNair
Director, Environmental Readiness
Department of Navy
United States Pacific Fleet
250 Makalapa Drive
Pearl Harbor, HI 96860-3131

February 7, 2020

Dear Mr. McNair:

On January 29, 2020, the National Marine Fisheries Service, Pacific Islands Regional Office, Habitat Conservation Division (NMFS) received your letter by direction of the Commander, U.S. Pacific Fleet (hereafter, Navy) titled 'Navy Final Response To The National Marine Fisheries Service Letter On Navy's 2019 Supplemental Essential Fish Habitat Assessment In Support Of The Mariana Islands Training And Testing Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement'. The Navy's letter provides individual responses to each of the Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) conservation recommendations that we provided in response to the supplemental Mariana Islands Training and Testing (MITT) EHF consultation.

NMFS would like to thank the Navy for taking a close look at each of the new conservation recommendations that we put forward as part of this Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) for MITT activities. Furthermore, NMFS is proud of the progress we have made as a partner and signatory on the Joint Region Marianas (JRM) Integrated Natural Resource Management Plan (INRMP), which was completed in June 2019. The INRMP, as referenced in your letter, is full of progressive strategies and actions which have the potential to address many of our conservation concerns if implemented in an effective and coordinated fashion. NMFS agrees with Navy that the JRM INRMP will be an important tool in the avoidance, minimization, and offset of adverse effects to EFH resulting from MITT activities. However, we are not comfortable deferring each of the proposed conservation recommendations to the INRMP. We request to continue our ongoing coordination to better understand a) the current status of INRMP projects directly related to our MITT-specific EFH concerns, and b) future planning and funding of INRMP projects to better understand how and when the products of these projects could be applied to our MITT-specific EFH concerns.

Doc. No. 35GL-20-1874.*

NMFS Responses

Navy has opted not to accept any of the seven new conservation recommendations provided as part of the supplemental EFH consultation and has instead asserted that NMFS concerns are already addressed through existing procedures (CR#'s 11, 15), are covered by the INRMP (CR#'s 11, 12, 13, 15, 17), are impractical (CR#14), or are minimal at large spatial scales (CR#16). Below, we restate all conservation recommendations, Navy responses; and the subsequent responses by NMFS either accepting the responses by Navy, maintaining our position, or providing opportunities for ongoing partnership to meet our shared conservation goals.

Below, and pursuant to the EFH provisions of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (Magnuson-Stevens Act, Section 305(b) as described by 50 CFR 600.920), NMFS evaluates the sufficiency of Navy responses.

Conservation Recommendation 11 (CR#11): Navy should work with NMFS and local agencies to develop a vessel grounding response plan that includes a funding mechanism and protocols for expedited vessel removal, damage assessment surveys, and strategies to offset any unavoidable loss to EFH resources (e.g., corals, seagrass, etc.). This would also inform and minimize potential cumulative adverse effects from unexpected groundings MITT continues into the future.

Navy Response: Although a naval vessel grounded in 2017, Navy asserts such events are not reasonably foreseeable impacts from the proposed action. Vessel groundings are rare and typically result from a series of unusual and unpredictable circumstances. Navy is already prepared to respond to such events. Navy maintains salvage and towing response capability through the employment of Navy assets and through worldwide salvage contracts. Contingency planning is required for preparedness, and Navy can ensure that baseline conditions of natural resources within the management control of Navy are identified and kept current through implementation of the 2019 Joint Region Marianas Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan to which NMFS is a signatory partner. Furthermore, the INRMP identifies strategies and actions to address Marine Habitat Management (Sections 5.4.2.1, 8.4.2.1, and 9.4.2.1) and Marine Protected Species Management (Section 5.4.2.3), specifically:

- "Develop protocol for immediate assessment and response to reef damage caused by unanticipated events such as ship groundings and anchor damage. The protocol will outline responsible parties, coordination process, and initial reef damage assessment requirements. This protocol will inform the long-term response plan."
- "Ensure no impact to coral or hard substrates during MITT training activities occurring within or adjacent to reef habitats by implementing appropriate avoidance measures."

NMFS Response: We appreciate Navy's readiness to respond to grounding events and intent to better integrate damage assessment and mitigation protocols through the INRMP. We agree that the INRMP provides an opportunity to address this conservation recommendation, but would like to further coordinate with the Navy to ensure that our MITT-specific EFH concerns are proactively integrated into the projects currently being developed within the INRMP while working collectively to help enable funding of these projects and their deliverables. NMFS would like to suggest that we schedule a meeting with the MITT Environmental Readiness Division, INRMP project leads and other stakeholders to discuss how to ensure the strategies and activities stemming

Doc. No. 35GL-20-1874.*

from the new INRMP translate to projects and outcomes that satisfy this conservation recommendation.

Conservation Recommendation 12 (CR#12): Surveys should be performed annually at the Apra Harbor UNDET site to include georeferenced status and condition information for habitat forming EFH resources (e.g., corals and seagrass) within a 100-ft buffer surrounding the site. This will help to document potential adverse effects associated with both direct physical impacts and suspension of sediments to inform potential minimization (i.e., transplantation) and offset.

Navy Response: The Navy asserts this recommendation is already being satisfied under the mandates of the Joint Region Marianas INRMP, to which the NMFS is a signatory, as briefly summarized in the Navy's 2019 supplemental EFHA (page 5-2).. Details specific to previous surveys in Apra Harbor including the Outer Apra Harbor UNDET site can be found in the INRMP starting in Section 5.3. Continued similar efforts are recommended and planned in Sections 5.4.2 (Marine Ecosystems Management) as well as in Chapter 13 (Planning, Integration, and Implementation). Specific INRMP activities include:

- "Enhance coral habitat by monitoring health and acute impacts and through focused reef restoration efforts."
- "Establish long-term monitoring programs to track changes in the health of corals and water quality that are compatible with existing monitoring programs in Guam and the region. JRM has programmed for active/continuous remote monitoring of water quality parameters at select locations starting in FY19."
- "Work with regulatory partners and local subject matter experts to identify priority resilience indicators….The measures for assessing resilience include: macroalgae percent cover (to be obtained as coarse level data in the benthic habitat mapping project), coral community (available for some sites from past studies), bleaching resistance, coral recruitment and connectivity, coral diversity (available for some sites from past studies), herbivorous fish community (available for some of Apra Harbor from past studies), herbivore average functional group biomass, temperature variability, land-based sources of pollution, and accessibility due to wave exposure."
- "JRM will coordinate with local partners and subject matter experts (SMEs) to determine appropriate locations and methods for coral population enhancement and restoration efforts. JRM will align projects with the proposed Guam Restoration Strategy (in development). This may include projects that include sexual propagation that collect gametes, settle them on tiles, and eventually outplant new colonies, but can also include out-planting colonies, clones, or asexual propagation from fragments, or other restoration strategies such as algal removal."
- "Update and continuously maintain existing centralized GIS database to effectively inform and guide future management of marine natural resources on NBG Main Base and meet natural resources goals and objectives. Readily available GIS data will be used to develop natural resources constraints maps for use in current and future JRM management and planning decisions for NBG Main Base."

NMFS Response: We agree that the INRMP provides an opportunity to address this conservation recommendation, but would like to further coordinate with the Navy to ensure that our MITT-

specific EFH concerns are proactively integrated into the projects currently being developed within the INRMP while working collectively to help enable funding of these projects and their deliverables. NMFS would like to suggest that we schedule a meeting with the MITT Environmental Readiness Division, INRMP project leads and other stakeholders to discuss how to ensure the strategies and activities stemming from the new INRMP translate to projects and outcomes that satisfy this conservation recommendation.

Conservation Recommendation 13 (CR#13): Shallow reef areas and reef flats that are being used for amphibious assaults should be surveyed immediately following each training exercise to document physical impacts, quantify coral condition, and stabilize and/or translocate any broken corals. NMFS is ready and willing to assist with such planning.

Navy Response: The Navy asserts this recommendation is already being satisfied under the mandates of the Joint Region Marianas INRMP, to which the NMFS is a signatory, as briefly summarized in the Navy's 2019 supplemental EFHA (page 5-2).. While not tied to specific training events, the INRMP directs repeated surveys across all submerged Navy controlled areas in the Mariana Islands. This would include beaches used for landing events. Cumulative impacts, if any can, be assessed over time as the program evolves. Additionally, the INRMP includes the previously described plans to develop protocols to respond to reef damage (Marine Habitat Management (Sections 5.4.2.1, 8.4.2.1, and 9.4.2 and Marine Protected Species Management Section 5.4.2.3). Specific INRMP activities include:

- "Enhance coral habitat by monitoring health and acute impacts and through focused reef restoration efforts."
- "Establish long-term monitoring programs to track changes in the health of corals and water quality that are compatible with existing monitoring programs in Guam and the region.
- JRM has programmed for active/continuous remote monitoring of water quality parameters at select locations starting in FY19."
- "Work with regulatory partners and local subject matter experts to identify priority resilience indicators….The measures for assessing resilience include: macroalgae percent cover (to be obtained as coarse level data in the benthic habitat mapping project), coral community (available for some sites from past studies), bleaching resistance, coral recruitment and connectivity, coral diversity (available for some sites from past studies), herbivorous fish community (available for some of Apra Harbor from past studies), herbivore average functional group biomass, temperature variability, land-based sources of pollution, and accessibility due to wave exposure."
- "JRM will coordinate with local partners and subject matter experts (SMEs) to determine appropriate locations and methods for coral population enhancement and restoration efforts. JRM will align projects with the proposed Guam Restoration Strategy (in development). This may include projects that include sexual propagation that collect gametes, settle them on tiles, and eventually outplant new colonies, but can also include out-planting colonies, clones, or asexual propagation from fragments, or other restoration strategies such as algal removal."
- "Develop protocol for immediate assessment and response to reef damage caused by unanticipated events such as ship groundings and anchor damage. The protocol will

outline responsible parties, coordination process, and initial reef damage assessment requirements.

- This protocol will inform the long-term response plan."
- "Ensure no impact to coral or hard substrates during MITT training activities occurring within or adjacent to reef habitats by implementing appropriate avoidance measures."

While unrelated to specific training events, the 2019 JRM INRMP identifies the strategies and actions across all Navy submerged lands, to include coastal beaches, in the Mariana Islands. Cumulative impacts, if any, can, be assessed continually as the program evolves.

NMFS Response: We agree that the INRMP provides an opportunity to address this conservation recommendation, but would like to further coordinate with the Navy to ensure that our MITT-specific EFH concerns are proactively integrated into the projects currently being developed within the INRMP while working collectively to help enable funding of these projects and their deliverables. NMFS would like to suggest that we schedule a meeting with the MITT Environmental Readiness Division, INRMP project leads and other stakeholders to discuss how to ensure the strategies and activities stemming from the new INRMP translate to projects and outcomes that satisfy this conservation recommendation.

Conservation Recommendation 14 (CR#14): Implement a 300-yard buffer around coral reef habitats and as much as practicable avoid continuous emission of sounds (i.e., turn off vessel engines and sonar when not needed or in use) in these habitats. This would minimize potential adverse effects of chronic noise on corals (e.g., disruption of coral planulae settlement), Bottomfish MUS life history stages (e.g., hearing, immune system disruption, etc.), and reef fish (e.g., hearing, immune system disruption, etc.) that serve as prey-base for juvenile and adult Bottomfish MUS.

Navy Response: The Navy asserts meeting this recommendation is impractical and would jeopardize navigational safety, which could increase potential groundings. In practice, large naval vessels such as amphibious assault ships rarely close within 300 yards of a coastline. The NMFS recommendation would apply to landing craft, amphibious assault vehicles, and combat rubber raiding craft approaching or departing from a given landing location. However, these types of craft always need to maintain steerage way. In fact, the main objective is transporting personnel to and from a beach beyond a reef as quickly as possible; therefore, engines cannot be turned off. These types of craft would delay their approach, increasing the potential for drifting or potential grounding, which could present navigational hazards depending on the sea state (e.g., swamping). The Navy's 2019 Supplemental EFHA lists (in Table 4-2) ongoing standard operating procedures limiting the spatial spread of a landing (landing craft approaching in a line), as well as some engine noise (turning off combat rubber raiding craft motors to paddle across reefs to the beach). Finally, the Navy would not characterize the spatially and temporarily limited use of vessels during discreet training events as a chronic noise. There would be significant time between events (e.g., weeks or months) when landing events close to shore would not occur.

High-power sonar used for antisubmarine warfare would not generally occur within 3 NM of land, and hence would be well beyond the 300-yard buffer.

NMFS Response: We agree that Navy should not jeopardize personnel or marine resources in an effort to minimize sound emissions and should only consider sound reduction strategies when engines and/or sonar are not needed or actively in use.

Conservation Recommendation 15 (CR#15): The Navy should ensure that in-water activities minimize potential introduction of nuisance or invasive species. Any vessels coming from outside of the CNMI's EEZ should comply with U.S. Coast Guard ballast water discharge standards (i.e. no ballast water discharge within 12 nautical miles or use approved ballast water management system) to prevent introduction of new invasive species. Any equipment, materials and gear entering the nearshore waters of Rota should also be checked prior to deployment.

NAVY Response: The Navy asserts this recommendation is already being satisfied under the mandates of the Navy's internal compliance with established regulations. The Navy implements strict ballast water discharge requirements, consistent with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, U.S. Coast Guard, and adheres to applicable international regulations, through internal instructions, directions, and guidance. Vessels not equipped with ballast water treatment systems are required to perform exchanges greater than 12 NM from land or hold discharges, when appropriate and practicable, to minimize the introduction of invasive species.
The NMFS is a signatory to the 2019 JRM INRMP which identifies strategies and actions to address Marine Invasive Species Management (Sections 5.4.2.2, 8.4.2.2, 9.4.2.2, and 11.4.2.2), specifically:

- "Develop and maintain a Marine Invasive Species Management Plan for NBG Main Base,
- NCTS, AAFB, and Tinian MLA."
- "JRM will work with appropriate U.S. Navy commands to determine if updates are warranted for Navy hull husbandry standards (Naval Sea Systems Command S9086-CQ STM-010) (U.S. Navy 2006) and ballast water requirements (Note: The U.S. Navy adopts USCG standards)."
- "Participate in the quarterly Guam Invasive Species Advisory Council meetings and coordinate regularly with the territorial marine invasive species coordinator once hired."

NMFS Response: We appreciate Navy's adherence to all local and federal requirements regarding ballast water and ongoing efforts to control the spread of invasive species through biosecurity protocols outlined within the INRMP. The INRMP biosecurity project has done an excellent job managing terrestrial invasive species risks and has shown a growing awareness of marine threats. NMFS would like to suggest that we schedule a meeting with the MITT Environmental Readiness Division, INRMP project leads and other stakeholders to discuss how to ensure the strategies and activities stemming from the new INRMP translate to projects and outcomes that continue to reduce the risk of marine invaders.

Conservation Recommendation 16 (CR#16): The Navy should calculate MEM deposition and decomposition rates to determine maximum loads as this action becomes decadal. This would inform potential offset for potential cumulative adverse effects.

NAVY Response: The Navy would reiterate that MEM use is across a very large spatial extent and rarely sequentially concentrated in small areas. Furthermore, the total cumulative MEM

footprint as listed in Table 2-1 of the Navy's 2019 supplemental EFHA, is only 132,930 m^2 which is actually 37,866 m^2 less than the Navy's 2014 EFHA MEM footprint (170,796 m^2). Potential MEM footprint, 132,930 m^2 or 0.133 km^2, represents less than 0.0000001% of the total MITT study area (1,721,376 km^2).

Although absent in the MITT Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Oversea Environmental Impact Statement (EIS/OEIS), the Navy has updated Appendix J (Statistical Probability Analysis for Estimating Direct Strike Impact and Number of Potential Exposures from Military Expended Materials) for the pending MITT final supplemental EIS/OEIS. This update will show the anticipated footprint of estimated annual MEM use, which can be summed across multiple years, or at least until a new supplemental EIS/OEIS is required. At that time, MEM usage would be re-evaluated. The Navy can provide the revised Appendix J to the NMFS as soon as final edits are complete. Finally, while the exact decomposition rates for all material in MEM is unknown, it is likely that major components such as aluminum and steel will corrode slowly in deep ocean waters. Overtime MEM would either be incorporated into sediments (i.e., buried) or remain on the ocean bottom subject to corrosion (Ocean News 2016, Edwards and Beldowski 2016). Edwards and Beldowski 2016, alone with various contributing authors have documented the fate and condition of WWII munitions and post-war disposed items. Their work includes assessments corrosion of items deposited at a 300-600 m deep-water disposal site south of Oahu2 (Figure 2).

NMFS Response: NMFS understands the Navy's position, and appreciates that the MEM footprint will be reduced. We are still concerned about the size of the MEM footprint (132,930 m^2) and do not consider this negligible. Therefore, we maintain our position in CR#16 if the distribution of those items is not better characterized and monitored at longer time scales.

Conservation Recommendation 17 (CR#17): The Navy should conduct regular (i.e., every 3-5 years) quantitative resource survey assessments and updated benthic habitat substrate and biological cover mapping at representative nearshore sites to document cumulative impacts over time. This would reduce uncertainty, quantify changes in coral condition and state due to ongoing MITT activities, inform potential offset, and minimize cumulative adverse effects by informing adaptive management.

NAVY Response: The Navy asserts this recommendation has been identified in the 2019 JRM INRMP, as briefly summarized in the Navy's 2019 supplemental EFHA (page 5-2). The NMFS is a signatory to the 2019 JRM INRMP which identifies strategies and actions to address Marine Habitat Management (Sections 5.4.2.1, 8.4.2.1, 9.4.2.1, 11.4.2.1, and 12.4.2.1) and Marine Protected Species Management (Sections 5.4.2.3 and 11.4.2.3), specifically:

- "Enhance coral habitat by monitoring health and acute impacts and through focused reef restoration efforts."
- "Establish long-term monitoring programs to track changes in the health of corals and water quality that are compatible with existing monitoring programs in Guam and the region.
- JRM has programmed for active/continuous remote monitoring of water quality parameters at select locations starting in FY19."

7

- "Work with regulatory partners and local subject matter experts to identify priority resilience indicators….The measures for assessing resilience include: macroalgae percent cover (to be obtained as coarse level data in the benthic habitat mapping project), coral community (available for some sites from past studies), bleaching resistance, coral recruitment and connectivity, coral diversity (available for some sites from past studies), herbivorous fish community (available for some of Apra Harbor from past studies), herbivore average functional group biomass, temperature variability, land-based sources of pollution, and accessibility due to wave exposure."
- "JRM will coordinate with local partners and subject matter experts (SMEs) to determine appropriate locations and methods for coral population enhancement and restoration efforts. JRM will align projects with the proposed Guam Restoration Strategy (in development). This may include projects that include sexual propagation that collect gametes, settle them on tiles, and eventually outplant new colonies, but can also include out-planting colonies, clones, or asexual propagation from fragments, or other restoration strategies such as algal removal."
- "Develop protocol for immediate assessment and response to reef damage caused by unanticipated events such as ship groundings and anchor damage. The protocol will outline responsible parties, coordination process, and initial reef damage assessment requirements. This protocol will inform the long-term response plan."
- "Ensure no impact to coral or hard substrates during MITT training activities occurring within or adjacent to reef habitats by implementing appropriate avoidance measures."

Additionally, the 2019 JRM INRMP identifies planning, integration, and implementation strategies to coordinate natural resources requirements with other federal, territorial, or commonwealth agencies, including the acquisition of INRMP mutual agreements between the DON, USFWS, NOAA-NMFS, and territorial and commonwealth fish and wildlife agencies (see Chapter 13).

NMFS Response: We agree that the INRMP provides an opportunity to address this conservation recommendation, but would like to further coordinate with the Navy to ensure that our MITT-specific EFH concerns are proactively integrated into the projects currently being developed within the INRMP while working collectively to help enable funding of these projects and their deliverables.. NMFS would like to suggest that we schedule a meeting with the MITT Environmental Readiness Division, INRMP project leads and other stakeholders to discuss how to ensure the strategies and activities stemming from the new INRMP translate to projects and outcomes that satisfy this conservation recommendation.

Conclusion

NMFS has addressed each of Navy responses to individual EFH conservation recommendations provided in our December 21, 2019 letter pertaining to the supplemental MITT Environmental Impact Statement. NMFS maintains our stated positions on CR#16 and believes that we can meet the intent of all our other conservation recommendations through increased coordination and integration into ongoing INRMP activities. We appreciate the opportunity to provide comments on Navy's response to our EFH conservation recommendations for this proposed project. We are committed to providing continued cooperation and subject matter technical expertise as identified

8

in the conservation recommendations, and as requested, to Navy in order to achieve the project goals and sufficiently comply with the EFH provisions of the Magnuson-Stevens Act. Please do not hesitate to contact me with any comments, questions or to request further technical assistance.

Sincerely,

Gerry Davis
Assistant Regional Administrator
Habitat Conservation Division

cc by e-mail:
Ms. Arlene Pangilinan, NMFS
Dr. Malia Chow, NMFS
Ms. Barbara Prine, Navy
Mr. Chip Johnston, Navy
Mr. Steven McKagan, NMFS
Dr. Kelly Ebert, Chief of Naval Operations (N454)
Mr. Dana Lujan, Joint Region Marianas
Mr. Michael Noah, Joint Region Marinas

9

C.5 NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT COMPLIANCE

C.5.1 NAVY SECTION 106 CONSULTATION LETTERS – COMMONWEALTH OF THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
COMMANDER
UNITED STATES PACIFIC FLEET
250 MAKALAPA DRIVE
PEARL HARBOR, HAWAII 96860-3131

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5090
Ser N465/0006
January 4, 2019

Ms. Rita Chong
CNMI Historic Preservation Office
Department of Community and Cultural Affairs
P.O. Box 10007
Saipan, MP 96950

Dear Ms. Chong:

SUBJECT: NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT, SECTION 106 CONSULTATION FOR PROPOSED MARIANA ISLANDS TRAINING AND TESTING ACTIVITIES

In accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966, as amended, the United States Department of the Navy (Navy) is initiating consultation on the CNMI portion of the proposed continuation of Mariana Islands Training and Testing (MITT) activities. A supplemental analysis of the activities included in the 2015 MITT Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (EIS/OEIS) is being prepared to support ongoing and future activities conducted at sea and on Farallon de Medinilla beyond 2020. The proposed continuation of MITT activities is generally consistent with those analyzed in the 2015 Final EIS/OEIS and are representative of training and testing the military has conducted for decades. However, reanalysis of the activities is being completed using new information available after the release of the 2015 Final EIS/OEIS. In part, this supplemental document will support the renewal of regulatory permits and authorizations under the Marine Mammal Protection Act and Endangered Species Act for training and testing activities. As defined by 36 CFR §800.16(y), the Navy has determined that the proposed activities represent an undertaking requiring consultation.

The current 2009 Programmatic Agreement (PA) among the Department of Defense Representative Guam, Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas Islands (CNMI), Federated States of Micronesia and Republic of Palau, Commander Joint Region Marianas (JRM), Commander 36th Wing Andersen Air Force Base, the Guam Historic Preservation Officer, and the CNMI Preservation Officer expires on December 11, 2019. The PA as written provides NHPA compliance for military activities associated with the Mariana Islands Range Complex (MIRC), including at-sea training and testing, as well as a myriad of land-based activities, most of which are associated with JRM installation actions. The Navy's undertaking for this consultation will be limited to the activities described in our 2015 MITT EIS/OEIS and as proposed in our MITT supplemental EIS/OEIS. The JRM installation-type activities are independent of the MITT and thus, will not be covered under this consultation.

5090
Ser N465/0006
January 4, 2019

The Navy will hold its initial Section 106 consultation meetings from January 22-25, 2019. We welcome your attendance and participation. Ms. Carly Antone of the Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Pacific's Environmental Business Line will be my point of contact for coordination of location, dates, and times. Ms. Antone may be reached by telephone at (808) 472-1464 or by email at carly.antone@navy.mil.

Sincerely,

Timothy C. Liberatore
Captain, Civil Engineer Corps, U.S. Navy
By direction of the Commander

Copy to:
Katharine Kerr, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
John Salas, Commander, Joint Region Marianas

2

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
COMMANDER
UNITED STATES PACIFIC FLEET
250 MAKALAPA DRIVE
PEARL HARBOR, HAWAII 96860-3131

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5090
Ser N465/0024
January 9, 2019

Dear Sir/Madam:

SUBJECT: NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT, SECTION 106 CONSULTATION MEETING FOR PROPOSED CONTINUATION OF MARIANA ISLANDS TRAINING AND TESTING ACTIVITIES

In accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966, as amended, the United States Department of the Navy (Navy) is initiating consultation on the CNMI portion of the proposed continuation of Mariana Islands Training and Testing (MITT) activities. A supplemental analysis of the activities included in the 2015 MITT Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (EIS/OEIS) is being prepared to support ongoing and future activities conducted at sea and on Farallon de Medinilla beyond 2020. The proposed continuation of MITT activities is generally consistent with those analyzed in the 2015 Final EIS/OEIS and are representative of training and testing the military has conducted for decades. However, reanalysis of the activities is being completed using new information available after the release of the 2015 Final EIS/OEIS. In part, this supplemental document will support the renewal of regulatory permits and authorizations under the Marine Mammal Protection Act and Endangered Species Act for training and testing activities. As defined by 36 CFR §800.16(y), the Navy has determined that the proposed activities represent an undertaking requiring consultation.

The current 2009 Programmatic Agreement (PA) among the Department of Defense Representative Guam, Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas Islands (CNMI), Federated States of Micronesia and Republic of Palau, Commander Joint Region Marianas (JRM), Commander 36th Wing Andersen Air Force Base, the Guam Historic Preservation Officer, and the CNMI Preservation Officer expires on December 11, 2019. The PA as written provides NHPA compliance for military activities associated with the Mariana Islands Range Complex (MIRC), including at-sea training and testing, as well as a myriad of land-based activities, most of which are associated with JRM installation actions. The Navy's undertaking for this consultation will be limited to the activities described in our 2015 MITT EIS/OEIS and as proposed in our MITT supplemental EIS/OEIS. The JRM installation-type activities are independent of the MITT and thus, will not be covered under this consultation.

The current list of consulting parties for this undertaking includes the State Historic Preservation Officer, National Park Service, and other interested parties identified through previous consultations. We invite you to attend and participate in the Navy's initial Section 106 consultation meetings in Saipan and Tinian being held on January 24 and 25, 2019, respectively.

5090
Ser N465/0024
January 9, 2019

Should you be aware of an interested entity/individual not included in the "Copy to" section of this letter, please forward the invitation accordingly.

On Saipan, we will meet at the Kanoa Resort, Latte Stone Room, from 4:00-7:00 pm. On Tinian, we will meet at the Mayor's Offices, from 10:00 am – to 1230 pm.

The meetings will focus on the following:

1) Explanation of the NHPA Section 106 process;
2) Details about the Undertaking;
3) Development of the Area of Potential Effects;
4) Identification of Historic Properties
5) Potential effects of the Undertaking on Historic Properties

To attend, please respond no later than January 18, 2019 to give us an opportunity to ensure accommodations for all attendees at the meeting venues. Ms. Carly Antone of the Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Pacific's Environmental Business Line will be my point of contact for coordination. Ms. Antone may be reached by telephone at (808) 472-1464 or by email at carly.antone@navy.mil.

Sincerely,

Timothy C. Liberatore
Captain, Civil Engineer Corps, U.S. Navy
By direction of the Commander

Copy to:
David M. Apatang, Mayor of Saipan
Stanley Austin, Pacific West Region, National Park Service
Bonnie Borja, Department of Community and Cultural Affairs, Office of the Mayor, Tinian
John Castro
Don Farrell
Walt Goodridge
Robert Hunter, CNMI Department of Community and Cultural Affairs
Stanley Iakopo, Civil Military Liaison Office, Office of the Governor, CNMI
Katharine Kerr, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
Gregorio Kilili Camacho Sablan, Congressman, CNMI
Polly DLG Masga, Northern Marianas Humanities Council
Randel Sablan, Joint Region Marianas (Saipan)
John F. Salas, Regional Environmental Director (J45), Joint Region Marianas
Joey Patrick San Nicholas, Mayor of Tinian
Oscar C. Torres, Military Liaison and Veterans Affairs, Office of the Governor, CNMI

2

C.5.2 NAVY SECTION 106 CONSULTATION LETTERS – GUAM

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
COMMANDER
UNITED STATES PACIFIC FLEET
250 MAKALAPA DRIVE
PEARL HARBOR, HAWAII 96860-3131

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5090
Ser N465/0005
January 4, 2019

Ms. Lynda Bordallo Aguon
State Historic Preservation Officer
Department of Parks & Recreation
490 Chalan Palasyo
Agaña Heights, Guam 96910

Dear Ms. Aguon:

SUBJECT: NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT, SECTION 106 CONSULTATION FOR PROPOSED MARIANA ISLANDS TRAINING AND TESTING ACTIVITIES

In accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966, as amended, the United States Department of the Navy (Navy) is initiating consultation on the Guam portion of the proposed continuation of Mariana Islands Training and Testing (MITT) activities. A supplemental analysis of the activities included in the 2015 MITT Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (EIS/OEIS) is being prepared to support ongoing and future activities conducted at sea beyond 2020. The proposed continuation of MITT activities is generally consistent with those analyzed in the 2015 Final EIS/OEIS and are representative of training and testing the military has conducted for decades. However, reanalysis of the activities is being completed using new information available after the release of the 2015 Final EIS/OEIS. In part, this supplemental document will support the renewal of regulatory permits and authorizations under the Marine Mammal Protection Act and Endangered Species Act for training and testing activities. As defined by 36 CFR §800.16(y), the Navy has determined that the proposed activities represent an undertaking requiring consultation.

The current 2009 Programmatic Agreement (PA) among the Department of Defense Representative Guam, Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas Islands (CNMI), Federated States of Micronesia and Republic of Palau, Commander Joint Region Marianas (JRM), Commander 36th Wing Andersen Air Force Base, the Guam Historic Preservation Officer, and the CNMI Preservation Officer expires on December 11, 2019. The PA as written provides NHPA compliance for military activities associated with the Mariana Islands Range Complex (MIRC), including at-sea training and testing, as well as a myriad of land-based activities, most of which are associated with JRM installation actions. The Navy's undertaking for this consultation will be limited to the activities described in our 2015 MITT EIS/OEIS and as proposed in our MITT supplemental EIS/OEIS. The JRM installation-type activities are independent of the MITT and thus, will not be covered under this consultation.

5090
Ser N465/0005
January 4, 2019

The Navy will hold its initial Section 106 consultation meetings from January 22-25, 2019. We welcome your attendance and participation. Ms. Carly Antone of the Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Pacific's Environmental Business Line will be my point of contact for coordination of location, dates, and times. Ms. Antone may be reached by telephone at (808) 472-1464 or by email at carly.antone@navy.mil.

Sincerely,

Timothy C. Liberatore
Captain, Civil Engineer Corps, U.S. Navy
By direction of the Commander

Copy to:
Katharine Kerr, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
John Salas, Commander, Joint Region Marianas

2

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
COMMANDER
UNITED STATES PACIFIC FLEET
250 MAKALAPA DRIVE
PEARL HARBOR, HAWAII 96860-3131

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5090
Ser N465/0025
January 10, 2019

Dear Sir/Madam:

SUBJECT: NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT, SECTION 106 CONSULTATION MEETING FOR PROPOSED CONTINUATION OF MARIANA ISLANDS TRAINING AND TESTING ACTIVITIES

In accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966, as amended, the United States Department of the Navy (Navy) is initiating consultation on the Guam portion of the proposed continuation of Mariana Islands Training and Testing (MITT) activities. A supplemental analysis of the activities included in the 2015 MITT Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (EIS/OEIS) is being prepared to support ongoing and future activities conducted at sea and on beyond 2020. The proposed continuation of MITT activities is generally consistent with those analyzed in the 2015 Final EIS/OEIS and are representative of training and testing the military has conducted for decades. However, reanalysis of the activities is being completed using new information available after the release of the 2015 Final EIS/OEIS. In part, this supplemental document will support the renewal of regulatory permits and authorizations under the Marine Mammal Protection Act and Endangered Species Act for training and testing activities. As defined by 36 CFR §800.16(y), the Navy has determined that the proposed activities represent an undertaking requiring consultation.

The current 2009 Programmatic Agreement (PA) among the Department of Defense Representative Guam, Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas Islands (CNMI), Federated States of Micronesia and Republic of Palau, Commander Joint Region Marianas (JRM), Commander 36th Wing Andersen Air Force Base, the Guam Historic Preservation Officer, and the CNMI Preservation Officer expires on December 11, 2019. The PA as written provides NHPA compliance for military activities associated with the Mariana Islands Range Complex (MIRC), including at-sea training and testing, as well as a myriad of land-based activities, most of which are associated with JRM installation actions. The Navy's undertaking for this consultation will be limited to the activities described in our 2015 MITT EIS/OEIS and as proposed in our MITT supplemental EIS/OEIS. The JRM installation-type activities are independent of the MITT and thus, will not be covered under this consultation.

The current list of consulting parties for this undertaking includes the State Historic Preservation Officer, National Park Service, and other interested parties identified through previous consultations. We invite you to attend and participate in the Navy's initial Section 106 consultation meetings in Guam being held on January 22 and 23, 2019. Should you be aware of an interested entity/individual not included in the "Copy to" section of this letter, please forward the invitation accordingly.

On January 22, we will meet at the Daniel L. Perez Elementary School cafeteria from 3:30-6:00 pm. On January 23, we will meet at the Guam Museum multi-purpose room, from 4:00-7:00 pm.

The meetings will focus on the following:

1) Explanation of the NHPA Section 106 process;
2) Details about the Undertaking;
3) Development of the Area of Potential Effects;
4) Identification of Historic Properties
5) Potential effects of the Undertaking on Historic Properties

5090
Ser N465/0025
January 10, 2019

To attend, please respond no later than January 18, 2019 to give us an opportunity to ensure accommodations for all attendees at the meeting venues. Ms. Carly Antone of the Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Pacific's Environmental Business Line will be my point of contact for coordination. Ms. Antone may be reached by telephone at (808) 472-1464 or by email at carly.antone@navy.mil.

Sincerely,

Timothy C. Liberatore
Captain, Civil Engineer Corps, U.S. Navy
By direction of the Commander

Copy to:
Julian Aguon
Stanley Austin, Pacific West Region, National Park Service
Michael Lujan Bevacqua, Famomsaiyan
Chamorro Land Trust Commission
Hope A. Cristobal, Guahan Coalition for Peace and Justice
Jose Ulloa Garrido, Commission on Decolonization
Galaide Group
Guam Ancestral Lands Commission
Victoria-Lola Leon Guerrero, Reclaim Guahan Collective
Leonard Iriarte, I Fanlalai'an Oral History Project
Danny Jackson, Nasion Chamoru
Ramona Jones, Jones and Guerrero, Inc.
Katharine Kerr, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation

Dave Lotz, Guam Boonie Stompers
Rufo Lujan, Organization of People for Indigenous Rights
Mayor's Council of Guam
Lisalinda Natividad
Prutehi Litekyan - Save Ritidian
Joseph Quinata, Guam Preservation Trust
Frank Rabon, Pä'å Taotao Tåno
Johnny Sablan, Department of Chamorro Affairs
John F. Salas, Regional Environmental Director (J45), Joint Region Marianas
Frank J. Schacher, Chamorro Tribe
Rlene Santos Steffy, Micronesia Publishing
Dianne Strong
Trini Torres, Chamorro Cultural Development and Research Institute

2

This page intentionally left blank.

Appendix D: Air Quality Emissions Calculations

Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/ Overseas Environmental Impact Statement Mariana Islands Training and Testing

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPENDIX D AIR QUALITY EMISSIONS CALCULATIONS AND RECORD OF NON-APPLICABILITY D-1

D.1 Surface Activities Emissions D-1
D.2 Air Activities Emissions D-2
D.3 Ordnance and Munitions Emissions D-2
D.4 Emissions Estimates Spreadsheets D-3
D.5 Record of Non-Applicability D-46

List of Figures

There are no figures in this appendix.

List of Tables

TABLE D-1: SUMMARY OF EMISSIONS RELEASED WITHIN 3 NAUTICAL MILES OF THE COAST D-3
TABLE D-2: VESSEL EMISSIONS FACTORS D-4
TABLE D-3: AIRCRAFT EMISSIONS FACTORS D-5
TABLE D-4: ORDNANCE EMISSIONS FACTORS D-6
TABLE D-5: VESSEL EMISSIONS – NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE D-11
TABLE D-6: AIRCRAFT EMISSIONS – NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE D-15
TABLE D-7: EMISSIONS FROM ORDNANCE – NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE D-21
TABLE D-8: VESSEL EMISSIONS – ALTERNATIVE 1 ..... D-23
TABLE D-9: AIRCRAFT EMISSIONS – ALTERNATIVE 1 ..... D-28
TABLE D-10: EMISSIONS FROM ORDNANCE – ALTERNATIVE 1 ..... D-33
TABLE D-11: VESSEL EMISSIONS – ALTERNATIVE 2 ..... D-35
TABLE D-12: AIRCRAFT EMISSIONS – ALTERNATIVE 2 ..... D-39
TABLE D-13: EMISSIONS FROM ORDNANCE – ALTERNATIVE 2 ..... D-45

This page intentionally left blank.

APPENDIX D Air Quality Emissions Calculations and Record of Non-Applicability

This appendix discusses emission factor development, calculations, and assumptions used in the air quality analyses presented in the Air Quality section of Chapter 3 (Section 3.2). Section D-5 of this Appendix contains the Record of Applicability (RONA) for the Preferred Alternative.

D.1 Surface Activities Emissions

Surface activities are associated with vessel movements. Fleet training activities use a variety of marine vessels, including cruisers, destroyers, frigates, carriers, submarines, amphibious vessels, and small boats. Testing activities use a variety of marine vessels, including various testing support vessels, work boats, torpedo recovery vessels, unmanned surface vehicles, and small boats. These vessels use a variety of propulsion methods, including marine outboard engines, diesel engines, and gas turbines.

Marine Outboard Engines:

Emission factors for small surface craft involved in amphibious training and testing activities were obtained from the Navy and Military Sealift Command (MSC) Marine Engine Fuel Consumption & Emission Calculator database. Emissions for surface craft using outboard engines were calculated using Navy and MSC emission factors which are provided in terms of emissions per hour, and multiplied by the hours of operation.

$$Emissions = HR/YR \times EF \times ENG$$

Where:

Emissions = surface craft emissions (pounds [lb.])
HR/YR = hours per year
EF = emission factor for specific engine type (lb./hour [hr.])
ENG = number of engines

To obtain the total criteria pollutant emissions for the Proposed Action, emissions were calculated for each training or testing activity, type of surface vessel, and criteria pollutant. These individual estimates of emissions, in units of tons per year, were then summed by criteria pollutant to obtain the aggregate emissions for surface vessel emissions activities.

Diesel Engines:

Emission factors for small surface craft involved in amphibious training and testing activities were obtained from the Navy and MSC Marine Engine Fuel Consumption & Emission Calculator database. Diesel was assumed to be the primary fuel to ensure a conservative estimate. Calculation methods similar to those described for Marine Outboard Engines were used to obtain emissions estimates for diesel engines.

$$Emissions = HR/YR \times EF \times ENG$$

Where:

Emissions = surface craft emissions (lb.)
HR/YR = hours per year
EF = emission factor for specific engine type (lb./hr.)
ENG = number of engines

Diesel engine emission factors were multiplied by the annual hours of operation to calculate the pollutant emissions per year.

D.2 AIR ACTIVITIES EMISSIONS

Fleet training and Naval Air Systems Command testing consists of the activities of various aircraft, including the F/A-18, P-8, SH-60B, MH-53, MH-60S, and Lear jet. Research Development Testing & Evaluation air activities consist of various aircraft, including the 1UH-1N, SH-60B, MH-53, MH-60S, and Cessna-172. Aircraft activities of concern are those that occur from ground level up to 3,000 feet (ft.) above ground level (AGL). The 3,000 ft. AGL ceiling was assumed to be the atmospheric mixing height above which any pollutant generated would not contribute to increased pollutant concentrations at ground level (known as the mixing zone). All criteria pollutant emissions from aircraft generated above 3,000 ft. AGL are excluded from analysis of compliance with National Ambient Air Quality Standards. The pollutant emission rate is a function of the aircraft engine's fuel flow rate and efficiency. Emissions for one complete training activity for a particular aircraft are calculated by knowing the specific engine pollutant emission factors for each mode of operation.

For this Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS)/Overseas EIS (OEIS), emission factors for most military engines were obtained from Navy's Aircraft Environmental Support Office memoranda and previous Navy Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)/OEIS documentation (primarily citing the Federal Aviation Administration's Emissions and Dispersion Modeling System model). For those aircraft for which engine data were unavailable, an applicable surrogate was used. Pollutant emissions for each aircraft/organization were calculated by applying the equation below.

$$Emissions = TIM \times FF \times EF \times ENG \times CF$$

Where:

Emissions = aircraft emissions (lb.)
TIM = time-in-mode at a specified power setting (hr./operation).
FF = fuel flow at a specified power setting (gal./hr./engine)
EF = emission factor for specific engine type and power setting (lb./1,000 gal. of fuel used)
ENG = number of engines on aircraft
CF = conversion factor (0.001)

D.3 ORDNANCE AND MUNITIONS EMISSIONS

Available emissions factors (AP-42, *Compilation of Air Pollutant Emission Factors*) were used. These factors were then multiplied by the net weight of the explosive and the number of items that were used per year. This calculation provides estimates of annual emissions.

$$Emissions = EXP/YR \times EF \times Net\ Wt$$

Where:

Emissions = ordnance emissions (lb.)
EXP/YR = explosives, propellants, and pyrotechnics used per year
EF = emissions factor (lb./item)
Net Wt = net weight of explosive (lb.)

D.4 EMISSIONS ESTIMATES SPREADSHEETS

The following spreadsheets show the emissions calculations for ships, aircraft, and ordnance involved in training and testing activities. These spreadsheets were developed for each range complex and testing area. The spreadsheets show the calculations developed for each alternative analyzed in this SEIS/OEIS.

Table D-1: Summary of Emissions Released Within 3 Nautical Miles of the Coast

Source	*Emissions by Air Pollutant (TPY)*					
	CO	*NO_X*	*VOC*	*SO_X*	*PM_{10}*	*$PM_{2.5}$*
Baseline Emissions	404	461	118	237	97	88
Alternative 1 Emissions	467	528	166	254	119	107
Alternative 2 Emissions	473	549	168	313	131	119

[1] Table includes criteria pollutant precursors (e.g., volatile organic compounds). Individual values may not add exactly to total values due to rounding.

Notes: NM = nautical miles, CO = carbon monoxide, NO_X = nitrogen oxides, $PM_{2.5}$ = particulate matter ≤ 2.5 microns in diameter, PM_{10} = particulate matter ≤ 10 microns in diameter, SO_X = sulfur oxides, TPY = tons per year, VOC = volatile organic compounds

Table D-2: Vessel Emissions Factors

Vessel Mode	Emissions Factors (lb/hr) Propulsion Engines + Generators				
	CO	NOx	HC	SOx	PM10
CG-3	61.51	79.58	4.32	77.63	2.79
DDG-3	60.16	114.52	4.01	88.53	3.64
FFG-3	32.94	47.16	3	34.92	2.31
TRB-3	6.47	56.22	1.55	7.40	1.18
AOE-2	109.76	311.31	10.6	119.99	10.41
USCG	5.74	57.91	0.88	11.55	0.21
LHA-1	7.38	43.53	5.53	130.97	26.29
LHD-2	8.08	47.83	5.77	135.50	28.58
LPD-2	3.48	21.00	2.58	60.82	12.85
LCAC	18.32	114.53	3.49	54.61	5.14
LCU	5.06	15.7	1.27	2.91	0.75
AAV-2	0.76	6.22	0.82	1.25	0.26
AAAV					
PC-2	37.36	74.17	6.02	23.42	2.6
MK V-2	3.86	29.49	0.99	4.73	0.40
RIB-4	0.34	9.14	0.06	1.44	0.15
CRRC-5		0.15	12.90		
AE-2	2.61	15.84	1.94	45.83	9.67
BW-3	111.75	1.60	45.89	0.31	0.08
SSN	0	0.00	0.00	0	0
SSGN	0	0.00	0.00	0	0
T-AGO(LFA)	6.67	39.37	5.00	119.43	23.77
CG-PARTNER	107.79	47.10	9.90	21	2.6
DDG-PARTNER	103.99	49.90	9.00	17.9	2.5
SS-PARTNER	2.94	17.32	2.20	52.11	10.46
LCS	727.98	171.04	2.82	67.28	6.94
LSD	21.25	334.51	10.84	35.04	2.71

Table D-3: Aircraft Emissions Factors

Aircraft	Emission Indices, lb/1,000 lb fuel					Emissions Factors (lb/hr)				
	CO	NOx	VOC	SOx	PM	CO	NOx	VOC	SOx	PM
AH-1W	11.21	5.44	0.57	0.40	4.20	9.10	4.42	0.46	0.32	3.41
AV-8B	7.70	8.60	0.54	0.40	3.80	46.20	51.60	3.24	2.40	22.80
C-130 F/R/T	2.07	8.16	0.47	0.40	3.97	9.32	36.72	2.12	1.80	17.87
CH-46	17.04	4.12	2.64	0.40	1.78	20.45	4.94	3.17	0.48	2.14
CH-53	2.13	8.08	0.15	0.40	2.21	9.51	36.07	0.67	1.79	9.87
E-2 / E-2C	2.54	10.04	0.36	0.40	0.94	5.59	22.09	0.79	0.88	2.07
EA-18G	0.72	14.75	0.12	0.40	6.56	7.44	152.49	1.24	4.14	67.82
EA-6B	7.99	5.71	1.09	0.40	12.12	51.06	36.49	6.97	2.56	77.45
EP-3	2.51	7.73	0.58	0.40	3.97	10.57	32.56	2.44	1.68	16.72
F-15	3.62	46.72	0.65	0.40	8.15	22.43	289.48	4.03	2.48	50.50
FA-18A/C	2.44	6.74	0.44	0.40	6.36	16.19	44.73	2.92	2.65	42.20
FA-18E/F	0.72	14.75	0.12	0.40	6.56	7.44	152.49	1.24	4.14	67.82
HH-60	6.25	6.40	0.55	0.40	4.20	7.50	7.68	0.66	0.48	5.04
Learjet	22.38	5.90	4.26	0.40	1.27	23.81	6.28	4.53	0.43	1.35
MH-60R/S	6.25	6.40	0.55	0.40	4.20	7.50	7.68	0.66	0.48	5.04
P-3C	2.51	7.73	0.58	0.40	3.97	12.05	37.10	2.78	1.92	19.06
P-8 MMA	1.24	9.26	0.28	0.40	0.56	4.05	30.21	0.91	1.31	1.83
S-3	14.10	4.07	1.86	0.40	3.62	32.29	9.32	4.26	0.92	8.29
S-3B	14.10	4.07	1.86	0.40	3.62	32.29	9.32	4.26	0.92	8.29
SH-60	6.25	6.40	0.55	0.40	4.20	7.50	7.68	0.66	0.48	5.04
SH-60B	6.25	6.40	0.55	0.40	4.20	7.50	7.68	0.66	0.48	5.04
SH-60B/F	6.25	6.40	0.55	0.40	4.20	7.50	7.68	0.66	0.48	5.04
SH-60F	6.25	6.40	0.55	0.40	4.20	7.50	7.68	0.66	0.48	5.04
UH-1N	3.34	4.72	0.17	0.40	4.20	1.80	2.55	0.09	0.22	2.27
A-10	4	8.83	0.4	0.4	2.67	12.104	26.71958	1.2104	1.2104	8.07942
B-1B	0.84	13.12	0.11	0.4	0.14	5.5776	87.1168	0.7304	2.656	0.9296
E-2	0.65	10.45	0.16	0.4	3.97	2.8847	46.3771	0.71008	1.7752	17.61886
E-3	2.07	8.45	0.31	0.4	0.26	67.65588	276.1798	10.13204	13.0736	8.49784
KC-135	1.34	13.5	0.03	0.4	0.13	30.66992	308.988	0.68664	9.1552	2.97544
MQ-4C						2.1	38.84	0.66	3.54	0.61
MV-22	19.74	3.94	3.43	0.40	1.78	22.1088	4.4128	3.8416	0.448	1.9936

Table D-4: Ordnance Emissions Factors

Ordnance Type	Ordnance	Emission Factor (lb per lb)							Emission Factor (lb/item)						
		CO_2	CO	NO_x	PM_{10}	$PM_{2.5}$	SO_2	Lead	CO_2	CO	NO_x	PM_{10}	$PM_{2.5}$	SO_2	Lead
BOMB	CBU MK20 ROCKEYE									0.00					
	GBU32I JDAM		0.1482							57.06					
	LGTR									0.00					
	MK76		0.085							0.26					
	BDU 48		0.085							0.26					
	MK82 HE		0.3184							61					
	GBU12 - Paveway II		0.3184							61					
	MK82 INERT		0.085							0.26					
	BDU 45		0.085							0.26					
	MK83 HE		0.1482							62					
	GBU 16		0.1482							66					
	MK84		0.1482							140					
	MK83 INERT		0.085							0.26					
OTHER ORD	**Type**														
	EER/IEER AN/SQQ-110	1.2	0.0044	0.011				0.00004		0.02					
	BLASTING CAP MK11								1.80E-03	3.10E-04	4.50E-05	4.60E-04	2.90E-04		1.30E-04
	Detonator														
	FIRING DEVICE														
	FUSE														
	GRENADE SIMULATOR								4.10E-03	0.0004	5.60E-03	0.12		4.70E-04	1.40E-06
	Grenades	6.30E-01	0.021	6.30E-03	2.10E-02	1.50E-02	1.20E-04	1.40E-04		0.00					
	Haversacks	6.30E-01	0.021	6.30E-03	2.10E-02	1.50E-02	1.20E-04	1.40E-04		0.42					
	K143 Antipersonnel Mine	6.30E-01	0.021	6.30E-03	2.10E-02	1.50E-02	1.20E-04	1.40E-04		0.03					
	M1A2 BANGALORE TORP	6.30E-01	0.021	6.30E-03	2.10E-02	1.50E-02	1.20E-04	1.40E-04		0.21					
	M7 BANDOLEER MK57 (Claymore mine)		0.15108												

Table D-4: Ordnance Emissions Factors (continued)

Ordnance Type	Ordnance	Emission Factor (lb per lb)							Emission Factor (lb/item)						
		CO_2	CO	NO_x	PM_{10}	$PM_{2.5}$	SO_2	Lead	CO_2	CO	NO_x	PM_{10}	$PM_{2.5}$	SO_2	Lead
	M112 DEMO CHARGE								7.90E-01	2.60E-02	7.90E-03	2.60E-02	1.90E-02		1.70E-04
	M700 BLASTING FUSE		0.149						0.0008	0.0003	0.0002	0.00009	0.00009	0.000002	0
	Flare, Aircraft Parachute														
		0.039	0.021	0.054	0.1	0.092	0.00018			5.91E-05	0.000152	0.000282	0.000259	5.07E-07	
	Chaff	0.039	0.021	0.054	0.1	0.092	0.00018			5.91E-05	0.000152	0.000282	0.000259	5.07E-07	
	MK36 M0 DEMO CHARGE														
	MK75 CHARGE														
	MK84 [86] EOD Shaped Charge														
	MK120 NONELEC DET (ft)														
	MK123 NONELEC DET (ft)														
	MK138 DEMO CHG ASSEMBLY	6.30E-01	0.021	6.30E-03	2.10E-02	1.50E-02	1.20E-04	1.40E-04							
	MK140 FLEXIBLE CHARGE														
	PBXN-109 TEST Det Cord														
	SIGNAL MK 18(G950) SMOKE														
	C4 1.25 LB	6.30E-01	0.021	6.30E-03	2.10E-02	1.50E-02	1.20E-04	1.40E-04		0.02625	0.007875	0.02625	0.01875	0.00015	
	C4 5 LB	6.30E-01	0.021	6.30E-03	2.10E-02	1.50E-02	1.20E-04	1.40E-04		0.105	0.0315	0.105	0.075	0.0006	
	C4 15 LB	6.30E-01	0.021	6.30E-03	2.10E-02	1.50E-02	1.20E-04	1.40E-04		0.315	0.0945	0.315	0.225	0.0018	
	C4 40 LB	6.30E-01	0.021	6.30E-03	2.10E-02	1.50E-02	1.20E-04	1.40E-04		0.84	0.252	0.84	0.6	0.0048	0.0056
	C4 100 LB	6.30E-01	0.021	6.30E-03	2.10E-02	1.50E-02	1.20E-04	1.40E-04		2.1	0.63	2.1	1.5	0.012	0.014

Table D-4: Ordnance Emissions Factors (continued)

Ordnance Type	Ordnance	Emission Factor (lb per lb)							Emission Factor (lb/item)						
		CO_2	CO	NO_x	PM_{10}	$PM_{2.5}$	SO_2	Lead	CO_2	CO	NO_x	PM_{10}	$PM_{2.5}$	SO_2	Lead
	C4 300 LB	6.30E-01	0.021	6.30E-03	2.10E-02	1.50E-02	1.20E-04	1.40E-04		0.021	0.0063	0.021	0.015	0.00012	0.00014
	C4 500 LB	6.30E-01	0.021	6.30E-03	2.10E-02	1.50E-02	1.20E-04	1.40E-04		0.021	0.0063	0.021	0.015	0.00012	0.00014
	TNT Blocks 0.5 lbd		0.398												
	DEMO SHEET														
	DETONATING CORD														
	DEMO CHARGE														
	SIMULATED ARTILLERY	6.30E-01	0.021	6.30E-03	2.10E-02	1.50E-02	1.20E-04	1.40E-04		0.002888	0.000866	0.002888	0.002063	1.65E-05	
PROJECTILE (LARGE)	155MM HE	6.51	2.35E+01	1.43E+00	0.496	0.2418		2.26E-03							
	155MM ILL								6.00	8.63	0.087	3.44	0.13	0.0027	0.029
	5"/54 Inert	2.60E-04	3.50E-04	3.60E-05	2.60E-05	2.30E-05		6.70E-04		0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00
5"/54	5"/54 BLP	1.60E-02	2.00E-02		1.20E-03	9.30E-04		6.00E-06							
	5"/54 HCVT+32 (EOD)	1.60E-02	2.00E-02		1.20E-03	9.30E-04		6.00E-06		0.16	0	0.0096	0.00744	0	0.000048
	5"/54 HECVT	1.60E-02	2.00E-02		1.20E-03	9.30E-04		6.00E-06		0.1280	0.1600	0.0096	0.0074		
	5"/54 HEPD	1.60E-02	2.00E-02		1.20E-03	9.30E-04		6.00E-06		0.16	0	0.0096	0.00744	0	0.000048
	5"/54 HEVT	1.60E-02	2.00E-02		1.20E-03	9.30E-04		6.00E-06		1.60E-01	0.00E+00	9.60E-03	7.44E-03	0.00E+00	4.80E-05
	5"/54 ILL	1.50E-02	1.40E-02	3.60E-04	9.20E-04	7.60E-04		1.30E-06		1.12E-01	2.88E-03	7.36E-03	6.08E-03	0.00E+00	1.04E-05
	5"54/54 VTNF	1.60E-02	2.00E-02		1.20E-03	9.30E-04		6.00E-06		1.60E-01	0.00E+00	9.60E-03	7.44E-03	0.00E+00	4.80E-05
5"/62	5"/62	1.60E-02	2.00E-02		1.20E-03	9.30E-04		6.00E-06		1.60E-01	0.00E+00	9.60E-03	7.44E-03	0.00E+00	4.80E-05
	5"/62 HE-MFF	1.60E-02	2.00E-02		1.20E-03	9.30E-04		6.00E-06		1.60E-01	0.00E+00	9.60E-03	7.44E-03	0.00E+00	4.80E-05
	5"/62 HECVT	1.60E-02	2.00E-02		1.20E-03	9.30E-04		6.00E-06		1.60E-01	0.00E+00	9.60E-03	7.44E-03	0.00E+00	4.80E-05
	5"/62 HEET	1.60E-02	2.00E-02		1.20E-03	9.30E-04		6.00E-06		1.60E-01	0.00E+00	9.60E-03	7.44E-03	0.00E+00	4.80E-05
	5"/62 KEET	1.60E-02	2.00E-02		1.20E-03	9.30E-04		6.00E-06		1.60E-01	0.00E+00	9.60E-03	7.44E-03	0.00E+00	4.80E-05
60mm	60MM								0.4	0.06	0.005	0.062	0.03		0.0004
	60MM WP								0.13	0.154	0.0124	0.221	0.494	0.00014	0.001
76mm	76MM BLP	1.44E-02	1.80E-02		1.08E-03	8.37E-04		5.40E-06							
	81MM HE								1.48	0.14	0.016	0.173	0.096		0.0007
	81MM ILL								1.48	0.14	0.016	0.173	0.096		0.0007
CAS	GAU-17 30mm														
PROJECTILE (SMALL)	20MM	0.19	0.38	0.0049	0.0075	0.0053		0.00026	0.016	0.033	0.00043	0.00066	0.00046		0.000023

Table D-4: Ordnance Emissions Factors (continued)

Ordnance Type	Ordnance	Emission Factor (lb per lb)							Emission Factor (lb/item)						
		CO_2	CO	NO_x	PM_{10}	$PM_{2.5}$	SO_2	Lead	CO_2	CO	NO_x	PM_{10}	$PM_{2.5}$	SO_2	Lead
	25MM								0.11	0.019	0.00067	0.0027	0.0017		0.000055
	30MM EFV Main Gun	0.14	0.028	0.0063	0.13	0.08		0.00037		7.28E-03	1.64E-03	3.38E-02	2.08E-02	0.00E+00	9.62E-05
	40MM	5.70E-01	6.00E-02	1.30E-02	1.10E-01	5.60E-02		6.20E-04	4.90E-02	4.00E-03	1.30E-03	9.50E-03	5.10E-03	0.00E+00	8.00E-05
	40MM HE	5.70E-01	6.00E-02	1.30E-02	1.10E-01	5.60E-02		6.20E-04	4.90E-02	4.00E-03	1.30E-03	9.50E-03	5.10E-03	0.00E+00	8.00E-05
	40MM ILL	7.20E-02	2.40E-02	6.50E-03	1.40E-01	1.20E-01	0.00019	7.90E-04	0.015	0.005	0.0014	0.029	0.025	0.00004	1.60E-04
	40MM PRACTICE	2.60E-01	2.50E-01	9.50E-03	1.40E-02	1.10E-02		1.10E-03	2.70E-03	2.60E-03	9.70E-05	1.40E-04	1.20E-04	0.00E+00	1.10E-05
	.45 CAL	2.80E-01	3.40E-01	1.00E-02	4.70E-02	4.00E-02		1.60E-02	2.20E-04	2.60E-04	8.10E-06	3.70E-05	3.10E-05		1.20E-05
	5.56	2.40E-01	4.40E-01	1.30E-02	9.20E-03	7.60E-03		3.20E-03	8.70E-04	1.60E-03	8.50E-05	3.90E-05	2.80E-05		5.10E-06
	5.56 BLANK	2.60E-01	3.20E-01	2.30E-02	7.80E-03	6.80E-03	0.00011	1.10E-03	2.30E-04	2.80E-04	2.00E-05	6.90E-06	6.00E-06	9.80E-09	9.70E-07
	.50CAL	1.50E-01	3.30E-01	3.60E-02	9.60E-03	5.60E-03		4.00E-04	5.10E-03	1.10E-02	1.20E-03	3.10E-04	1.90E-04		1.30E-05
	.50CAL	1.50E-01	3.30E-01	3.60E-02	9.60E-03	5.60E-03		4.00E-04	5.10E-03	1.10E-02	1.20E-03	3.10E-04	1.90E-04		1.30E-05
	.50CAL BLANK	3.10E-01	2.70E-01	4.10E-03	1.40E-02	1.30E-02		1.70E-03	5.10E-03	1.10E-02	1.20E-03	3.10E-04	1.90E-04		1.30E-05
	7.62	3.50E-01	2.50E-01	1.60E-02	6.10E-03	5.60E-03	0.00013	9.70E-04	1.20E-03	2.30E-03	9.70E-05	5.10E-05	3.80E-05		4.90E-06
	7.62	3.50E-01	2.50E-01	1.60E-02	6.10E-03	5.60E-03	0.00013	9.70E-04	1.20E-03	2.30E-03	9.70E-05	5.10E-05	3.80E-05		4.90E-06
	9MM								2.00E-04	3.10E-04	1.50E-05	2.40E-05	2.00E-05	8.20E-08	6.80E-06
	.300 WIN MAG								1.90E-03	3.00E-03	1.50E-05	9.40E-05	7.30E-05		1.80E-05
	.223 Rifle Rounds								7.50E-05	8.00E-05	5.00E-06	3.40E-06	2.60E-06		1.90E-06
	.22 Magnum								7.50E-05	8.00E-05	5.00E-06	3.40E-06	2.60E-06		1.90E-06
	.22 Long Rifle								7.50E-05	8.00E-05	5.00E-06	3.40E-06	2.60E-06		1.90E-06
	12 Guage Shotgun	5.10E-03	1.10E-02	1.20E-03	3.10E-04	1.90E-04		1.30E-05							
MINE SHAPE	M18A1	1.6	2.00E-02	1.80E-02	4.90E-02	2.60E-02		5.70E-05							
	MK76														
MISSILE	AGM-114B														
	AGM-65 Maverick														
	AGM-84	0.4		0.06	0.1025	0.1025			140	30.62356	35.574	61.795	61.795		
	AIM-120														
	AIM-7														
	AIM-9														
	BGM-71E **TOW**-A														
	GBU-9														

Table D-4: Ordnance Emissions Factors (continued)

Ordnance Type	Ordnance	Emission Factor (lb per lb)							Emission Factor (lb/item)						
		CO_2	CO	NO_x	PM_{10}	$PM_{2.5}$	SO_2	Lead	CO_2	CO	NO_x	PM_{10}	$PM_{2.5}$	SO_2	Lead
	AGM-88 HARM														
	NSM														
	JSOW														
	Japanese Missile Tests														
	Tactical Tomahawk														
	Seasparrow Missile														
	SLAM ER														
	SM2 or equivalent														
ROCKET	2.75" RKT	4.50E-01	5.60E-02	7.10E-03	6.10E-02	3.80E-02		1.20E-03							
	2.75" RKT HE	3.00E-01	1.70E-01	2.40E-03	1.00E-01	5.30E-02		2.60E-04	5.5	0.93	0.0056	0.4	0.29		0.07
	2.75" RKT I	4.50E-01	5.60E-02	7.10E-03	6.10E-02	3.80E-02		1.20E-03							
PYROTECHNICS	MK58 Marine Location Marker	1	1.30E-02	1.20E-02	3.20E-02	1.70E-02	6.10E-05	3.80E-05							
	Smoke Grenade AN-M8								3.30E-02	4.60E-02	1.00E-03	6.80E-01	1.10E-01	1.20E-04	4.70E-04

Table D-5: Vessel Emissions – No Action Alternative

Type Training	Training Ops (#)	OPERATIONAL INFORMATION - VESSELS									EMISSIONS/YEAR (lb) BY JURISDICTION												EMISSIONS/YEAR (lb) BY JURISDICTION												GHG Emissions (lb)					
		Ship / Vessel / Boat			Range Time (hr)			Distribution (hr)			State (0-3 nm offshore)						Waters of U S (3-12 nm)						Int Waters (> 12 nm)						Total Emissions											
		Number	Ship Type	Participation	Per Ship	Time at Each Power Level (%)	Total	0-3 nm from shore	3-12 nm from shore	>12 nm from shore	CO	NO_x	HC	SO_x	PM_{10}	PM2.5	CO	NO_x	HC	SO_x	PM_{10}	PM2.5	CO	NO_x	HC	SO_x	PM_{10}	PM2.5	CO	NO_x	HC	SO_x	PM_{10}	PM2.5	Fuel Flow (GPH)	Annual Fuel Consumption (gal)	CO_2	N_2O	CH_4	CO_{2-e}
AIR WARFARE																																								
Air Combat Maneuver	4800																																							
Air Defense Exercise	100																																							
Air Intercept Control	4800																																							
Gunnery Exercise, A-A (Medium Caliber)	36																																							
Missile Exercise, A-A	18																																							
Gunnery Exercise, S-A (Large Caliber)	5	10	FFG	2.00	2.0	100%	20.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	659	943	60	698	46	42	659	943	60	698	46	42	79	1,580	33,265	1	1	33,620
Gunnery Exercise, S-A (Medium Caliber)	12	24	FFG	2.00	2.0	100%	48.0	0.0	0.0	48.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,581	2,264	144	1,676	111	100	1,581	2,264	144	1,676	111	100	79	3,792	79,837	3	2	80,687
Missile Exercise, S-A	15	30	FFG	2.00	2.0	100%	60.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79	0	0	0	0	0
STRIKE WARFARE																																								
Bombing Exercise, A-G	2300																																							
Missile Exercise, A-G	85																																							
Gunnery Exercise, A-G	96																																							
AMPHIBIOUS WARFARE																																								
Fire Support Exercise - Land-Based target	10	10	CG	1	8.0	100%	80.00	80.0	0.0	0.0	4,921	6,366	346	6,210	223	201	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4,921	6,366	346	6,210	223	201	184	14,720	309,915	10	9	313,215
Amphibious Rehearsal, No Landing – Marine Air Ground Task Force	12	48	LSD	4	24.0	100%	1152.0	1152.0	0.0	0.0	24,480	385,356	12,488	40,366	3,122	2,810	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24,480	385,356	12,488	40,366	3,122	2,810	184	1,461,888	30,778,590	998	870	31,106,382
		48	LHA/LHD	4	24.0	100%	1152.0	1152.0	0.0	0.0	9,308	55,100	6,647	156,096	32,924	29,632	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9,308	55,100	6,647	156,096	32,924	29,632	373	1,461,888	30,778,590	998	870	31,106,382
		48	LPD	4	24.0	100%	1152.0	1152.0	0.0	0.0	4,009	24,192	2,972	70,065	14,803	13,323	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4,009	24,192	2,972	70,065	14,803	13,323	373	1,461,888	30,778,590	998	870	31,106,382
Amphibious Assault - Marine Air Ground Task Force	6	6	CG	1	8.0	100%	48.0	48.0	0.0	0.0	2,952	3,820	207	3,726	134	121	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,952	3,820	207	3,726	134	121	184	60,912	1,282,441	42	36	1,296,099
		6	LHA	1	8.0	100%	48.0	48.0	0.0	0.0	354	2,089	265	6,287	1,262	1,136	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	354	2,089	265	6,287	1,262	1,136	373	60,912	1,282,441	42	36	1,296,099
		12	LPD	2	8.0	100%	96.0	96.0	0.0	0.0	334	2,016	248	5,839	1,234	1,110	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	334	2,016	248	5,839	1,234	1,110	373	121,824	2,564,882	83	72	2,592,198
		12	FFG	2	8.0	100%	96.0	96.0	0.0	0.0	3,162	4,527	288	3,352	222	200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,162	4,527	288	3,352	222	200	79	121,824	2,564,882	83	72	2,592,198
Amphibious Raid - Special Purpose Marine Air Ground Task Force	6	6	LHA	1	6.0	100%	36.0	36.0	0.0	0.0	266	1,567	199	4,715	946	852	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	266	1,567	199	4,715	946	852	373	45,684	961,831	31	27	972,074
		12	LPD	2	2.5	100%	30.0	30.0	0.0	0.0	104	630	77	1,825	386	347	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	104	630	77	1,825	386	347	373	38,070	801,526	26	23	810,062
Non-Combatant Evacuation Operation	5	5	LHA	1	80.0	100%	400.0	400.0	0.0	0.0	2,952	17,412	2,212	52,388	10,516	9,464	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,952	17,412	2,212	52,388	10,516	9,464	373	149,200	3,141,257	102	89	3,174,711
		10	LPD	2	80.0	100%	800.0	800.0	0.0	0.0	2,784	16,800	2,064	48,656	10,280	9,252	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,784	16,800	2,064	48,656	10,280	9,252	373	298,400	6,282,514	204	178	6,349,422
		5	LCU	1	80.0	100%	400.0	400.0	0.0	0.0	7,328	45,812	1,396	21,844	2,056	1,850	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7,328	45,812	1,396	21,844	2,056	1,850	611	244,400	5,145,598	167	145	5,200,398
Humanitarian Assistance/ Disaster Relief Operations	5	5	LHA	1	8.0	100%	40.0	40.0	0.0	0.0	295	1,741	221	5,239	1,052	946	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	295	1,741	221	5,239	1,052	946	373	50,760	1,068,701	35	30	1,080,083
		10	LPD	2	8.0	100%	80.0	80.0	0.0	0.0	278	1,680	206	4,866	1,028	925	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	278	1,680	206	4,866	1,028	925	373	101,520	2,137,402	69	60	2,160,165
		5	LCAC	1	8.0	100%	40.0	40.0	0.0	0.0	733	4,581	140	2,184	206	185	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	733	4,581	140	2,184	206	185	611	50,760	1,068,701	35	30	1,080,083
Unmanned Aerial Vehicle - Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconaissance	100																																							

Table D-5: Vessel Emissions – No Action Alternative (continued)

Type Training	Training Ops (#)	OPERATIONAL INFORMATION - VESSELS									EMISSIONS/YEAR (lb) BY JURISDICTION												EMISSIONS/YEAR (lb) BY JURISDICTION												GHG Emissions (lb)					
		Ship / Vessel / Boat			Range Time (hr)			Distribution (hr)			State (0-3 nm offshore)						Waters of U S (3-12 nm)						Int Waters (> 12 nm)						Total Emissions						Fuel Flow (GPH)	Annual Fuel Consumption (gal)	CO_2	N_2O	CH_4	CO_{2-e}
		Number	Ship Type	Participation	Per Ship	Time at Each Power Level (%)	Total	0-3 nm from shore	3-12 nm from shore	>12 nm from shore	CO	NO_x	HC	SO_x	PM_{10}	PM2.5	CO	NO_x	HC	SO_x	PM_{10}	PM2.5	CO	NO_x	HC	SO_x	PM_{10}	PM2.5	CO	NO_x	HC	SO_x	PM_{10}	PM2.5						
SURFACE WARFARE																																								
Gunnery Exercise, A-S (Small Caliber) - Ship	242																																							
Gunnery Exercise, A-S (Medium Caliber) - Ship	295																																							
Missile Exercise (A-S) - Rocket	3																																							
Missile Exercise (A-S)	20																																							
Laser Targeting	600																																							
Bombing Exercise (A-S)	37																																							
Torpedo Exercise (Submarine to Surface)	5																																							
Missile Exercise (S-S)	12	24	FFG	2.00	2.0	100%	48.0	0.0	0.0	48.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,581	2,264	144	1,676	111	100	1,581	2,264	144	1,676	111	100	79	3,792	79,837	3	2	80,687
Gunner Exercise (Surface-to-Surface) Ship – Large-caliber	140	30.8	CG	0.22	2.5	100%	77.00	0.0	21.6	55.4	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,326	1,716	93	1,674	60	54	3,410	4,412	240	4,304	155	139	4,736	6,128	333	5,978	215	193	184	14,168	298,293	10	8	301,470
		63	DDG	0.45	2.5	100%	157.5	0.0	44.1	113.4	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,653	5,050	177	3,904	161	144	6,822	12,987	455	10,039	413	371	9,475	18,037	632	13,943	573	516	187	29,453	620,093	20	18	626,697
		21	FFG	0.15	2.5	100%	52.5	0.0	14.7	37.8	0	0	0	0	0	0	484	693	44	513	34	31	1,245	1,783	113	1,320	87	79	1,729	2,476	158	1,833	121	109	79	4,148	87,321	3	2	88,251
		16.8	USCG	0.12	2.5	100%	42.0	0.0	11.8	30.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	681	10	136	2	2	174	1,751	27	349	6	6	241	2,432	37	485	9	8	66	2,772	58,362	2	2	58,983
Gunner Exercise (Surface-to-Surface) Ship – Medium-caliber	100	22	CG	0.22	2.5	100%	55.00	0.0	15.4	39.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	947	1,226	67	1,196	43	39	2,436	3,151	171	3,074	110	99	3,383	4,377	238	4,270	153	138	184	10,120	213,066	7	6	215,336
		45	DDG	0.45	2.5	100%	112.5	0.0	31.5	81.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,895	3,607	126	2,789	115	103	4,873	9,276	325	7,171	295	265	6,768	12,884	451	9,960	410	369	187	21,038	442,924	14	13	447,641
		15	FFG	0.15	2.5	100%	37.5	0.0	10.5	27.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	346	495	32	367	24	22	889	1,273	81	943	62	56	1,235	1,769	113	1,310	87	78	79	2,963	62,372	2	2	63,037
		1	LPD	0.01	2.5	100%	2.5	0.0	0.7	1.8	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	2	43	9	8	6	38	5	109	23	21	9	53	6	152	32	29	373	933	19,633	1	1	19,842
		12	USCG	0.12	2.5	100%	30.0	0.0	8.4	21.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	486	7	97	2	2	124	1,251	19	249	5	4	172	1,737	26	347	6	6	66	1,980	41,687	1	1	42,131
Sinking Exercise (SINKEX)	2	10	FFG	5.00	16.0	100%	160.0	0.0	0.0	160.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5,270	7,546	480	5,587	370	333	5,270	7,546	480	5,587	370	333	79	12,640	266,123	9	8	268,957
Gunnery Exercise (S-S) Boat – Medium-caliber	10	50	FFG	5.00	3.0	100%	150.0	0.0	0.0	150.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4,941	7,074	450	5,238	347	312	4,941	7,074	450	5,238	347	312	79	11,850	249,490	8	7	252,147
Gunnery Exercise (S-S) Small-caliber	40	80	CRRC	2	3.0	100%	240.0	0.0	0.0	240.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	3,096	0	0	0	0	36	3,096	0	0	0	3	720	15,159	0	0	15,320
Maritime Security Operations (MSO)	40	40	FFG	1	8.0	100%	320.0	0.0	0.0	320.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10,541	15,091	960	11,174	739	665	10,541	15,091	960	11,174	739	665	79	25,280	532,245	17	15	537,914
		40	RHIB	1	8.0	100%	320.0	0.0	0.0	320.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	108.8	2924.8	19.2	460.8	48.0	43	109	2,925	19	461	48	43	14	4,480	94,322	3	3	95,326
		40	CRRC	1	8.0	100%	320.0	0.0	0.0	320.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	4,128	0	0	0	0	48	4,128	0	0	0	3	960	20,212	1	1	20,427
ANTI-SUBMARINE WARFARE																																								
Tracking Exercise-Helo	62																																							
Torpedo Exercise-Helo	4																																							
Tracking Exercise-Maritime Patrol Advanced Extended Echo Ranging Sonobuoys	11																																							
Tracking Exercise -Maritime Patrol Aircraft	34																																							
Torpedo Exercise-Maritime Patrol Aircraft	4																																							
Tracking Exercise –Surface	132	30	FFG	0.23	2.0	100%	60.7	0.0	30.4	30.4	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,000	1,432	91	1,060	70	63	1,000	1,432	91	1,060	70	63	2,000	2,864	182	2,120	140	126	79	4,797	100,994	3	3	102,069
		92	DDG	0.7	2.0	100%	184.8	0.0	92.4	92.4	0	0	0	0	0	0	5,559	10,582	371	8,180	336	303	5,559	10,582	371	8,180	336	0	11,118	21,163	741	16,360	673	303	187	34,558	727,576	24	21	735,324
		10	LCS	0.075	2.0	100%	19.8	0.0	9.9	9.9	0	0	0	0	0	0	7,207	1,693	28	666	69	62	7,207	1,693	28	666	69	0	14,414	3,387	56	1,332	137	62	66	1,307	27,513	1	1	27,806
Torpedo Exercise-Surface	3	3	FFG	1	2.0	100%	6.0	0.0	3.0	3.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	99	141	9	105	7	6	99	141	9	105	7	6	198	283	18	210	14	12	79	474	9,980	0	0	10,086
Tracking Exercise– Submarine	12																																							
Torpedo Exercise – Submarine	10																																							

Table D-5: Vessel Emissions – No Action Alternative (continued)

Type Training	Training Ops (#)	OPERATIONAL INFORMATION - VESSELS									EMISSIONS/YEAR (lb) BY JURISDICTION												EMISSIONS/YEAR (lb) BY JURISDICTION												GHG Emissions (lb)					
		Ship / Vessel / Boat			Range Time (hr)			Distribution (hr)			State (0-3 nm offshore)						Waters of U S (3-12 nm)						Int Waters (> 12 nm)						Total Emissions											
		Number	Ship Type	Participation	Per Ship	Time at Each Power Level (%)	Total	0-3 nm from shore	3-12 nm from shore	>12 nm from shore	CO	NO_x	HC	SO_x	PM_{10}	PM2.5	CO	NO_x	HC	SO_x	PM_{10}	PM2.5	CO	NO_x	HC	SO_x	PM_{10}	PM2.5	CO	NO_x	HC	SO_x	PM_{10}	PM2.5	Fuel Flow (GPH)	Annual Fuel Consumption (gal)	CO_2	N_2O	CH_4	CO_{2-e}
MAJOR TRAINING EXERCISES																																							
Joint Expeditionary Exercise	1	1.0	CVN	1	80.0	100%	80.0	0.0	80.0	0.0							4,921	6,366	346	6,210	223	201	0	0	0	0	0	0	4,921	6,366	346	6,210	223	201	184	14,720	309,915	10	9	313,215
		1.0	CG	1	80.0	100%	80.0	0.0	80.0	0.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4,921	6,366	346	6,210	223	201	0	0	0	0	0	0	4,921	6,366	346	6,210	223	201	184	14,720	309,915	10	9	313,215
		2.0	FFG	2	80.0	100%	160.0	0.0	160.0	0.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5,270	7,546	480	5,587	370	333	0	0	0	0	0	0	5,270	7,546	480	5,587	370	333	79	12,640	266,123	9	8	268,957
		5.0	DDG	5	80.0	100%	400.0	0.0	400.0	0.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24,064	45,808	1,604	35,412	1,456	1,310	0	0	0	0	0	0	24,064	45,808	1,604	35,412	1,456	1,310	187	74,800	1,574,839	51	45	1,591,611
		1.0	LHD/LHA	1	80.0	100%	80.0	0.0	80.0	0.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	590	3,482	442	10,478	2,103	1,893	0	0	0	0	0	0	590	3,482	442	10,478	2,103	1,893	373	29,840	628,251	20	18	634,942
		2.0	LSD	2	80.0	100%	160.0	0.0	160.0	0.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,400	53,522	1,734	5,606	434	390	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,400	53,522	1,734	5,606	434	390	373	59,680	1,256,503	41	36	1,269,884
		1.0	LPD	1	80.0	100%	80.0	0.0	80.0	0.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	278	1,680	206	4,866	1,028	925	0	0	0	0	0	0	278	1,680	206	4,866	1,028	925	373	29,840	628,251	20	18	634,942
		1.0	TAOE	1	80.0	100%	80.0	0.0	80.0	0.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8,781	24,905	848	9,599	833	750	0	0	0	0	0	0	8,781	24,905	848	9,599	833	750	1,865	149,200	3,141,257	102	89	3,174,711
		1.0	SSN	1	80.0	100%	80.0	0.0	80.0	0.0																														
		1.0	SSGN	1	80.0	100%	80.0	0.0	80.0	0.0																														
		2.0	T-AGO(LF	2	80.0	100%	160.0	0.0	160.0	0.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,067	6,299	800	19,109	3,803	3,423	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,067	6,299	800	19,109	3,803	3,423	1,865	298,400	6,282,514	204	178	6,349,422
		1.0	CG-PARTI	1	80.0	100%	80.0	0.0	80.0	0.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8,623	3,768	792	1,680	208	187	0	0	0	0	0	0	8,623	3,768	792	1,680	208	187	184	14,720	309,915	10	9	313,215
		2.0	DDG-PAR	2	80.0	100%	160.0	0.0	160.0	0.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16,638	7,984	1,440	2,864	400	360	0	0	0	0	0	0	16,638	7,984	1,440	2,864	400	360	187	29,920	629,936	20	18	636,644
		1.0	SS-PARTI	1	80.0	100%	80.0	0.0	80.0	0.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	235	1,386	176	4,169	837	753	0	0	0	0	0	0	235	1,386	176	4,169	837	753	373	29,840	628,251	20	18	634,942
		5.0	LCAC	5	80.0	100%	400.0	0.0	400.0	0.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7,328	45,812	1,396	21,844	2,056	1,850	0	0	0	0	0	0	7,328	45,812	1,396	21,844	2,056	1,850	611	507,600	10,687,010	347	302	10,800,827
		2.0	LCU	2	80.0	100%	160.0	0.0	160.0	0.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,931	18,325	558	8,738	822	740	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,931	18,325	558	8,738	822	740	611	97,760	2,058,239	67	58	2,080,159
		19.0	CRRC	19	80.0	100%	1520.0	0.0	1520.0	0.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	226	19,610	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	226	19,610	0	0	0	3	4,560	96,006	3	3	97,029
		2.0	RHIB	2	80.0	100%	160.0	0.0	160.0	0.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	1,462	10	230	24	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	1,462	10	230	24	22	373	59,680	1,256,503	41	36	1,269,884
		14.0	AAV	14	80.0	100%	1120.0	0.0	1120.0	0.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	851	6,966	918	1,400	291	262	0	0	0	0	0	0	851	6,966	918	1,400	291	262	3	3,360	70,741	2	2	71,495
Joint Multi-Strike Group Exercise	1	3.0	CVN	3	80.0	100%	240.0	0.0	0.0	240.0																														
		3.0	CG	3	80.0	100%	240.0	0.0	0.0	240.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14,762	19,099	1,037	18,631	670	603	14,762	19,099	1,037	18,631	670	603	184	44,160	929,745	30	26	939,646
		3.0	FFG	3	80.0	100%	240.0	0.0	0.0	240.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7,906	11,318	720	8,381	554	499	7,906	11,318	720	8,381	554	499	79	18,960	399,184	13	11	403,435
		12.0	DDG	12	80.0	100%	960.0	0.0	0.0	960.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57,754	109,939	3,850	84,989	3,494	3,145	57,754	109,939	3,850	84,989	3,494	3,145	187	179,520	3,779,614	123	107	3,819,867
		3.0	TAOE	3	80.0	100%	240.0	0.0	0.0	240.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26,342	74,714	2,544	28,798	2,498	2,249	26,342	74,714	2,544	28,798	2,498	2,249	1,865	447,600	9,423,770	306	266	9,524,134
		5.0	SSN	5	80.0	100%	400.0	0.0	0.0	400.0																														
		2.0	T-AGO(LF	2	80.0	100%	160.0	0.0	0.0	160.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,067	6,299	800	19,109	3,803	3,423	1,067	6,299	800	19,109	3,803	3,423	1,865	298,400	6,282,514	204	178	6,349,422
		1.0	SS-PARTI	1	80.0	100%	80.0	0.0	0.0	80.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	235	1,386	176	4,169	837	753	235	1,386	176	4,169	837	753	373	29,840	628,251	20	18	634,942
ELECTRONIC WARFARE																																							
Electronic Warfare Operations	480	480	FFG	1	4	100%	1920.0	0.0	0.0	1920.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63,245	90,547	5,760	67,046	4,435	3,992	63,245	90,547	5,760	67,046	4,435	3,992	79	151,680	3,193,471	104	90	3,227,481
Flare Exercise	3200																																							
Chaff Exercise - Ship	40	40	FFG	1	4	100%	160.0	0.0	0.0	160.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5,270	7,546	480	5,587	370	333	5,270	7,546	480	5,587	370	333	79	12,640	266,123	9	8	268,957
Chaff Exercise - Aircraft	3200																																							
MINE WARFARE																																							
Civilian Port Defense	1	1	RHIB	1	24.0	100%	24.0	24.0	0.0	0.0	8.2	219.4	1.4	34.6	3.6	3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	8	219	1	35	4	3	14	336	7,074	0	0	7,149
Mine Laying - Aircraft	4																																							
Mine Neutralization – Explosive Ordnance Disposal	20	60	RHIB	3	12.0	100%	720.0	720.0	0.0	0.0	244.8	6580.8	43.2	1036.8	108.0	97	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	245	6,581	43	1,037	108	97	14	10,080	212,224	7	6	214,485
Limpet Mine Neutralization System/Shock Wave Generator	40	40	RHIB	1	4.0	100%	160.0	160.0	0.0	0.0	54.4	1462.4	9.6	230.4	24.0	22	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	54	1,462	10	230	24	22	14	2,240	47,161	2	1	47,663
Airborne Mine Countermeasure – Mine Detection	4																																							
Mine Countermeasure Exercise – Towed Sonar (AQS-20,LCS)	4																																							
Mine Countermeasure Exercise – Surface (SMCMEX) Sonar (SQQ-32, MCM)	4																																							
Mine Neutralization – Remotely Operated Vehicle Soanr (ASQ-235 [AQS-20], SLQ-48)	4																																							
Mine Countermeasure – Towed Mine Detection	4																																							
Underwater Demolition Qualification/Certification	30	30	CRRC	1	8.0	100%	240.0	0.0	240.0	0.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	3,096	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	3,096	0	0	0	3	720	15,159	0	0	15,320
Submarine Mine Exercise	16																																							
NAVAL SPECIAL WARFARE																																							
Personnel I&E	240	1200	RHIB	5	8.0	100%	9600.0	9600.0	0.0	0.0	3264.0	87744.0	576.0	13824.0	1440.0	1,296	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	3,264	87,744	576	13,824	1,440	1,296	48	460,800	9,701,683	315	274	9,805,006
		1440	CRRC	6	8.0	100%	11520.0	11520.0	0.0	0.0	0	1,711	148,625	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,711	148,625	0	0	0	3	34,560	727,626	24	21	735,375
Parachute Insertion	20																																							

Table D-5: Vessel Emissions – No Action Alternative (continued)

Type Training	Training Ops (#)	OPERATIONAL INFORMATION - VESSELS									EMISSIONS/YEAR (lb) BY JURISDICTION												EMISSIONS/YEAR (lb) BY JURISDICTION												GHG Emissions (lb)					
		Ship / Vessel / Boat			Range Time (hr)			Distribution (hr)			State (0-3 nm offshore)						Waters of U S (3-12 nm)						Int Waters (> 12 nm)						Total Emissions											
		Number	Ship Type	Participation	Per Ship	Time at Each Power Level (%)	Total	0-3 nm from shore	3-12 nm from shore	>12 nm from shore	CO	NO_x	HC	SO_x	PM_{10}	PM2.5	CO	NO_x	HC	SO_x	PM_{10}	PM2.5	CO	NO_x	HC	SO_x	PM_{10}	PM2.5	CO	NO_x	HC	SO_x	PM_{10}	PM2.5	Fuel Flow (GPH)	Annual Fuel Consumption (gal)	CO_2	N_2O	CH_4	CO_{2-e}
OTHER																																							
Direct Action (Tactical Air Control Party)	18																																						
Intelligence, Surveillance, Reconnaissance	16																																						
Search and Rescue At Sea	0																																						
Surface Ship Sonar Maintenance	42	42	FFG	1	4.0	100%	168.0	168.0	0.0	0.0	5,534	7,923	504	5,867	388	349	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5,534	7,923	504	5,867	388	349	79	13,272	279,429	9	8	282,405
Submarine Sonar Maintenance	48																																						
Small Boat Attack	18	18	CRRC	1	4.0	100%	72.0	0.0	72.0	0.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	929	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	929	0	0	0	3	216	4,548	0	0	4,596
Sub Navigation / Sub Nav Under Ice	8																																						
Precision Anchoring	18	18	FFG	1	4.0	100%	72.0	72.0	0.0	0.0	2,372	3,396	216	2,514	166	150	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,372	3,396	216	2,514	166	150	79	5,688	119,755	4	3	121,031
Underwater Survey	32	96	RHIB	3	8.0	100%	768.0	768.0	0.0	0.0	261.1	7019.5	46.1	1105.9	115.2	104	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	261	7,020	46	1,106	115	104	48	36.864	776,135	25	22	784,400
		96	CRRC	3	8.0	100%	768.0	768.0	0.0	0.0	0	114	9,908	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	114	9,908	0	0	0	3	2,304	48,508	2	1	49,025
Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Operation	1000																																						
Unmanned Underwater Vehicle Training	0																																						
TOTAL TRAINING (lbs per year)								**29,450**	**5,726**	**6,810**	**76,000**	**689,860**	**189,906**	**458,270**	**82,638**	**74,374**	**106,668**	**263,401**	**36,443**	**158,521**	**15,820**	**14,238**	**235,108**	**408,808**	**26,782**	**300,791**	**20,071**	**17,700**	**417,775**	**1,362,069**	**253,131**	**917,582**	**118,529**	**106,312**		**9,104,892**	**191,694,392**	**6,219**	**5,417**	**193,735,936**
TOTAL TRAINING (tons per year)											**38**	**345**	**95**	**229**	**41**	**37**	**53**	**132**	**18**	**79**	**8**	**7**	**118**	**204**	**13**	**150**	**10**	**9**	**209**	**681**	**127**	**459**	**59**	**53**			**95,847**	**3**	**3**	**96,868**
ANTI-SUBMARINE WARFARE TESTING																																							
Anti-submarine Warfare Tracking Test - MPA	188																																						
LIFECYCLE ACTIVITIES TESTING																																							
Littoral Combat Ship (LCS) Mission Package Testing-ASW	0	0	LCS	1	60.0	100%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79	0	0	0	0	0
Ship Signature Testing	0	0	FFG	1	4.0	100%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79	0	0	0	0	0
SURFACE WARFARE / ANTI-SUBMARINE WARFARE TESTING																																							
Torpedo Testing (Explosive and Non-explosive)	2	6.0	DDG	3	4.0	100%	24.0	0.0	0.0	24.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,444	2,748	96	2,125	87	79	1,444	2,748	96	2,125	87	79	187	4,488	94,490	3	3	95,497
Countermeasure / Acoustic Systems Testing	0	0.0	DDG	2	2.0	100%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	187	0	0	0	0	0
At-Sea Sonar Testing	0	0.0	SSN	4	2.0	100%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0																													
		0.0	CG	1	2.0	100%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	184	0	0	0	0	0
		0.0	DDG	4	2.0	100%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	187	0	0	0	0	0
SHIPBOARD PROTECTION SYSTEMS AND SWIMMER DEFENSE TESTING																																							
Pierside Integrated Swimmer Defense	0	0	FFG	1	8.0	100%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79	0	0	0	0	0
MINE WARFARE TESTING																																							
Mine Detection and Classification Testing	4	4	FFG	1	4	100%	16.0	5.3	5.3	5.4	174	249	16	184	12	11	174	249	16	184	12	11	179	257	16	190	13	11	527	755	48	559	37	33	79	1,264	26,612	1	1	26,896
UNMANNED VEHICLE TESTING																																							
Unmanned Vehicle Development and Payload Testing	0																																						
OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH																																							
North Pacific Acoustic Lab Philippine Sea 2018-19 Experiment (Deep Water)	1																																						
TOTAL TESTING (lbs per year)								**5**	**5**	**29**	**174**	**249**	**16**	**184**	**12**	**11**	**174**	**249**	**16**	**184**	**12**	**11**	**1,623**	**3,005**	**113**	**2,315**	**100**	**90**	**1,971**	**3,503**	**144**	**2,683**	**124**	**112**		**5,752**	**121,103**	**4**	**3**	**122,392**
TOTAL TESTING (tons per year)											**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**2**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**2**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**			**61**	**0**	**0**	**61**

Table D-6: Aircraft Emissions – No Action Alternative

Type Training	Training Ops (#)	OPERATIONAL INFORMATION - AIRCRAFT													EMISSIONS/YEAR (lb) BY JURISDICTION												EMISSIONS/YEAR (lb) BY JURISDICTION												Training Platform		Annual Fuel Use (total)		GHG Emissions (lb)			
		Aircraft			Time		Altitude		Distribution (%)			Distribution (hr)			State (0-3 nm offshore)						Waters of U S (3-12 nm)						Int Waters (> 12 nm)						Total Emissions															
		Distribution	A/C Sorties (#)	Type	Ave Time on Range (hr)	Total Time on Range (hr)	Time < 3,000 ft (%)	Time < 3,000 ft (hr)	0-3 nm from shore	3-12 nm from Shore	>12 nm from Shore	Total Time 0-3 nm from shore	Total Time 3-12 nm from shore	Total Time >12 nm from shore	CO	NOx	HC	SOx	PM	PM2.5	CO	NOx	HC	SOx	PM	PM2.5	CO	NOx	HC	SOx	PM	PM2.5	CO	NOx	HC	SOx	PM	PM2.5	Engines (#)	Fuel Flow (lb/hr)	Pounds	Gallons	CO_2	N_2O	CH_4	CO_{2-e}
AIR WARFARE																																													
Air Combat Maneuv	4800	1	4800	FA-18E/F	1.0	4800.0	0%	0.0	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	10,338	49622400	7297412	153639707	4984	4342	155,275,969
		1	4800	AV-8B	1.0	4800.0	0%	0.0	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6,000	28800000	4235294	89169882	2893	2520	90,119,541
Air Defense Exercis	100	2	200	FA-18E/F	1.0	200.0	50%	100.0	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	100.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	744	15249	124	414	6782	6104	744	15249	124	414	6782	6104	2	10,338	2067600	304059	6401654	208	181	6,469,832
Air Intercept Control	4800	2	9600	FA-18E/F	1.0	9600.0	50%	4800.0	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	4800.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35728	731930	5955	19849	325523	292971	35728	731930	5955	19849	325523	292971	2	10,338	99244800	14594824	307279415	9968	8684	310,551,939
Gunnery Exercise, A-A (Medium Caliber)	36	1	36	AV-8B	1.0	36.0	0%	0.0	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6,000	216000	31765	668774	22	19	675,897
		1	36	FA-18E/F	1.0	36.0	0%	0.0	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	10,338	372168	54731	1152298	37	33	1,164,570
Missile Exercise, A-	18	1	18	AV-8B	1.0	18.0	0%	0.0	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6,000	108000	15882	334387	11	9	337,948
		1	18	FA-18E/F	1.0	18.0	0%	0.0	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	10,338	186084	27365	576149	19	16	582,285
Gunnery Exercise, S-A (Large Caliber)	5																																												
Gunnery Exercise, S-A (Medium Caliber)	12																																												
Missile Exercise, S-A	15																																												
STRIKE WARFARE																																													
Bombing Exercise, A-G	2300	1	2300	FA-18E/F	1.0	2300.0	10%	230.0	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	230.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1712	35072	285	951	15598	14038	1712	35072	285	951	15598	14038	2	10,338	23777400	3496676	73619026	2388	2081	74,403,069
Missile Exercise, A-G	85	0.5	43	FA-18E/F	2.0	85.0	10%	8.5	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	8.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63	1296	11	35	576	519	63	1296	11	35	576	519	2	10,338	878730	129225	2720703	88	77	2,749,679
		0.5	43	SH-60B	2.0	85.0	100%	85.0	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	85.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	638	653	56	41	428	386	638	653	56	41	428	386	2	1200	102000	15000	315810	10	9	319,173
Gunnery Exercise, A-G	96	0.5	48	FA-18E/F	2.0	96.0	10%	9.6	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	9.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71	1464	12	40	651	586	71	1464	12	40	651	586	2	10,338	992448	145948	3072794	100	87	3,105,519
		0.5	48	SH-60B	2.0	96.0	100%	96.0	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	96.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	720	737	63	46	484	435	720	737	63	46	484	435	2	1200	115200	16941	356680	12	10	360,478

Table D-6: Aircraft Emissions – No Action Alternative (continued)

Type Training	Training Ops (#)	OPERATIONAL INFORMATION - AIRCRAFT													EMISSIONS/YEAR (lb) BY JURISDICTION												EMISSIONS/YEAR (lb) BY JURISDICTION												Training Platform		Annual Fuel Use (total)		GHG Emissions (lb)			
		Aircraft			Time		Altitude		Distribution (%)			Distribution (hr)			State (0-3 nm offshore)						Waters of U S (3-12 nm)						Int Waters (> 12 nm)						Total Emissions								Annual Fuel Use (total)		GHG Emissions (lb)			
		Distribution	A/C Sorties (#)	Type	Ave Time on Range (hr)	Total Time on Range (hr)	Time < 3,000 ft (%)	Time < 3,000 ft (hr)	0-3 nm from shore	3-12 nm from Shore	>12 nm from Shore	Total Time 0-3 nm from shore	Total Time 3-12 nm from shore	Total Time >12 nm from shore	CO	NOx	HC	SOx	PM	PM2.5	CO	NOx	HC	SOx	PM	PM2.5	CO	NOx	HC	SOx	PM	PM2.5	CO	NOx	HC	SOx	PM	PM2.5	Engines (#)	Fuel Flow (lb/hr)	Pounds	Gallons	CO_2	N_2O	CH_4	CO_{2-e}
AMPHIBIOUS WARFARE																																													
Fire Support Exercise - Land-Based target	10																																												
Amphibious Rehearsal, No Landing – Marine Air Ground Task Force	12	4	48.0	CH-53	18.0	864.0	100%	864.0	100%	0%	0%	864.00	0.00	0.00	8215	31164	579	1543	8524	7671	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8215	31164	579	1543	8524	7671	3	4,464	3856896	567191	11941631	387	337	12,068,809
		10	120.0	MV-22	18.0	2160.0	100%	2160.0	100%	0%	0%	2160.00	0.00	0.00	47755	9532	8298	968	4306	3876	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47755	9532	8298	968	4306	3876	2	2240	4838400	711529	14980540	486	423	15,140,083
		2	24.0	UH-1	18.0	432.0	100%	432.0	100%	0%	0%	432.00	0.00	0.00	779	1101	40	93	980	882	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	779	1101	40	93	980	882	2	540	233280	34306	722276	23	20	729,968
		4	48.0	AH-1	18.0	864.0	100%	864.0	100%	0%	0%	864.00	0.00	0.00	7865	3817	400	281	2947	2652	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7865	3817	400	281	2947	2652	2	812	701568	103172	2172178	70	61	2,195,312
		4	48.0	AV-8	18.0	864.0	0%	0.0	100%	0%	0%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6,000	5184000	762353	16050579	521	454	16,221,517
Amphibious Assault - Marine Air Ground Task Force	6	4	24.0	CH-53	18.0	432.0	100%	432.0	100%	0%	0%	432.00	0.00	0.00	4108	15582	289	771	4262	3836	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4108	15582	289	771	4262	3836	3	4,464	1928448	283595	5970815	194	169	6,034,404
		10	60.0	MV-22	18.0	1080.0	100%	1080.0	100%	0%	0%	1080.00	0.00	0.00	23878	4766	4149	484	2153	1938	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23878	4766	4149	484	2153	1938	2	2240	2419200	355765	7490270	243	212	7,570,041
		2	12.0	UH-1	18.0	216.0	100%	216.0	100%	0%	0%	216.00	0.00	0.00	390	551	20	47	490	441	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	390	551	20	47	490	441	2	540	116640	17153	361138	12	10	364,984
		4	24.0	AH-1	18.0	432.0	100%	432.0	100%	0%	0%	432.00	0.00	0.00	3932	1908	200	140	1473	1326	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3932	1908	200	140	1473	1326	2	812	350784	51586	1086089	35	31	1,097,656
		4	24.0	AV-8	18.0	432.0	0%	0.0	100%	0%	0%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6,000	2592000	381176	8025289	260	227	8,110,759
Amphibious Raid - Special Purpose Marine Air Ground Task Force	6	4	24.0	H-53	12.0	288.0	100%	288.0	100%	0%	0%	288.00	0.00	0.00	2738	10388	193	514	2841	2557	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2738	10388	193	514	2841	2557	3	4,464	1285632	189064	3980544	129	112	4,022,936
		10	60.0	MV-22	12.0	720.0	100%	720.0	100%	0%	0%	720.00	0.00	0.00	15918	3177	2766	323	1435	1292	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15918	3177	2766	323	1435	1292	2	2240	1612800	237176	4993513	162	141	5,046,694
		2	12.0	UH-1	12.0	144.0	100%	144.0	100%	0%	0%	144.00	0.00	0.00	260	367	13	31	327	294	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	260	367	13	31	327	294	2	540	77760	11435	240759	8	7	243,323
		4	24.0	AH-1	12.0	288.0	100%	288.0	100%	0%	0%	288.00	0.00	0.00	2622	1272	133	94	982	884	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2622	1272	133	94	982	884	2	812	233856	34391	724059	23	20	731,771
		4	24.0	AV-8	12.0	288.0	0%	0.0	100%	0%	0%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6,000	1728000	254118	5350193	174	151	5,407,172
Non-Combatant Evacuation Operation	5	10	50	MV-22	20.0	1000.0	100%	1000.0	100%	0%	0%	1000.00	0.00	0.00	22109	4413	3842	448	1994	1794	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22109	4413	3842	448	1994	1794	2	2240	2240000	329412	6935435	225	196	7,009,298
		4	20	H-53	20.0	400.0	100%	400.0	100%	0%	0%	400.00	0.00	0.00	3803	14428	268	714	3946	3552	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3803	14428	268	714	3946	3552	3	4,464	1785600	262588	5528533	179	156	5,587,412
		2	10	UH-1	20.0	200.0	100%	200.0	100%	0%	0%	200.00	0.00	0.00	361	510	18	43	454	408	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	361	510	18	43	454	408	2	540	108000	15882	334387	11	9	337,948
		4	20	AH-1	20.0	400.0	100%	400.0	100%	0%	0%	400.00	0.00	0.00	3641	1767	185	130	1364	1228	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3641	1767	185	130	1364	1228	2	812	324800	47765	1005638	33	28	1,016,348
		4	20	AV-8	20.0	400.0	0%	0.0	100%	0%	0%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6,000	2400000	352941	7430824	241	210	7,509,962
Humanitarian Assistance/ Disaster Relief Operations	5	10	50	MV-22	20.0	1000.0	100%	1000.0	100%	0%	0%	1000.00	0.00	0.00	22109	4413	3842	448	1994	1794	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22109	4413	3842	448	1994	1794	2	2240	2240000	329412	6935435	225	196	7,009,298
		4	20	H-53	20.0	400.0	100%	400.0	100%	0%	0%	400.00	0.00	0.00	3803	14428	268	714	3946	3552	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3803	14428	268	714	3946	3552	3	4,464	1785600	262588	5528533	179	156	5,587,412
		2	10	UH-1	20.0	200.0	100%	200.0	100%	0%	0%	200.00	0.00	0.00	361	510	18	43	454	408	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	361	510	18	43	454	408	2	540	108000	15882	334387	11	9	337,948
		4	20	AH-1	20.0	400.0	100%	400.0	100%	0%	0%	400.00	0.00	0.00	3641	1767	185	130	1364	1228	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3641	1767	185	130	1364	1228	2	812	324800	47765	1005638	33	28	1,016,348
		4	20	AV-8	20.0	400.0	0%	0.0	100%	0%	0%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6,000	2400000	352941	7430824	241	210	7,509,962
Unmanned Aerial Vehicle - Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconaissance	100	1	100.0	MQ-4C	4.0	400.0	100%	400.0	100%	0%	0%	400.00	0.00	0.00	840	15536	264	1416	244	220	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	840	15536	264	1416	244	220	1	2,532	1012800	148941	3135808	102	89	3,169,204

Table D-6: Aircraft Emissions – No Action Alternative (continued)

Type Training	Training Ops (#)	OPERATIONAL INFORMATION - AIRCRAFT													EMISSIONS/YEAR (lb) BY JURISDICTION												EMISSIONS/YEAR (lb) BY JURISDICTION												Training Platform		Annual Fuel Use (total)		GHG Emissions (lb)			
		Aircraft			Time		Altitude		Distribution (%)			Distribution (hr)			State (0-3 nm offshore)						Waters of U S (3-12 nm)						Int Waters (> 12 nm)						Total Emissions													
		Distribution	A/C Sorties (#)	Type	Ave Time on Range (hr)	Total Time on Range (hr)	Time < 3,000 ft (%)	Time < 3,000 ft (hr)	0-3 nm from shore	3-12 nm from Shore	>12 nm from Shore	Total Time 0-3 nm from shore	Total Time 3-12 nm from shore	Total Time >12 nm from shore	CO	NOx	HC	SOx	PM	PM2.5	CO	NOx	HC	SOx	PM	PM2.5	CO	NOx	HC	SOx	PM	PM2.5	CO	NOx	HC	SOx	PM	PM2.5	Engines (#)	Fuel Flow (lb/hr)	Pounds	Gallons	CO_2	N_2O	CH_4	CO_{2-e}
SURFACE WARFARE																																													
Gunnery Exercise, A-S (Small Caliber) - Ship	242	0.25	60.5	FA-18E/F	2.0	121.0	10%	12.1	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	12.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90	1845	15	50	821	739	90	1845	15	50	821	739	2	10,338	1250898	183956	3873001	126	109	3,914,248
		0.75	181.5	SH-60B	2.0	363.0	100%	363.0	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	363.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2723	2788	240	174	1830	1647	2723	2788	240	174	1830	1647	2	1200	435600	64059	1348694	44	38	1,363,058
Gunnery Exercise, A-S (Medium Caliber) - Ship	295	0.25	73.75	FA-18E/F	2.0	147.5	10%	14.8	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	14.75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	110	2249	18	61	1000	900	110	2249	18	61	1000	900	2	10,338	1524855	224243	4721220	153	133	4,771,501
		0.75	221.25	SH-60B	2.0	442.5	100%	442.5	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	442.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3319	3398	292	212	2230	2007	3319	3398	292	212	2230	2007	2	1200	531000	78088	1644070	53	46	1,661,579
Missile Exercise (A-S) - Rocket	3	0.33	0.99	FA-18E/F	2.0	2.0	10%	0.2	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	0.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	30	0	1	13	12	1	30	0	1	13	12	2	10,338	20469.24	3010	63376	2	2	64,051
		0.66	1.98	SH-60B	2.0	4.0	100%	4.0	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	3.96	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	30	3	2	20	18	30	30	3	2	20	18	2	1200	4752	699	14713	0	0	14,870
Missile Exercise (A-S)	20	0.5	10	FA-18E/F	2.0	20.0	10%	2.0	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	2.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	305	2	8	136	122	15	305	2	8	136	122	2	10,338	206760	30406	640165	21	18	646,983
		0.5	10	SH-60B	2.0	20.0	100%	20.0	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	20.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	150	154	13	10	101	91	150	154	13	10	101	91	2	1200	24000	3529	74308	2	2	75,100
Laser Targeting	600	0.5	300	FA-18E/F	1.0	300.0	10%	30.0	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	30.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	223	4575	37	124	2035	1831	223	4575	37	124	2035	1831	2	10,338	3101400	456088	9602482	312	271	9,704,748
		0.5	300	SH-60B	1.0	300.0	100%	300.0	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	300.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2250	2304	198	144	1512	1361	2250	2304	198	144	1512	1361	2	1200	360000	52941	1114624	36	32	1,126,494
Bombing Exercise (A-S)	37	0.5	19	FA-18E/F	1.0	18.5	10%	1.9	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	1.85	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	282	2	8	125	113	14	282	2	8	125	113	2	10,338	191253	28125	592153	19	17	598,459
		0.5	19	P-3	1.0	18.5	10%	1.9	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	1.85	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	69	5	4	35	32	22	69	5	4	35	32	4	4,800	88800	13059	274940	9	8	277,869
Torpedo Exercise (Submarine to Surface)	5																																												
Missile Exercise (S-S)	12																																												
Sinking Exercise (SINKEX)	2	2	4	FA-18E/F	8.0	32.0	10%	3.2	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	3.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	488	4	13	217	195	24	488	4	13	217	195	2	10,338	330816	48649	1024265	33	29	1,035,173
		1	2	P-3	8.0	16.0	10%	1.6	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	1.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	59	4	3	30	27	19	59	4	3	30	27	4	4,800	76800	11294	237786	8	7	240,319
		1	2	SH-60B	8.0	16.0	100%	16.0	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	16.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	120	123	11	8	81	73	120	123	11	8	81	73	2	1200	19200	2824	59447	2	2	60,080
Gunnery Exercise (S-S) Boat – Medium-caliber	10																																												
Gunnery Exercise (S-S) Small-caliber	40																																												
Maritime Security Operations (MSO)	40	1	40	SH-60B	4.0	160.0	100%	160.0	100%	0%	0%	160.00	0.00	0.00	1200	1229	106	77	806	726	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1200	1229	106	77	806	726	2	1200	192000	28235	594466	19	17	600,797
ANTI-SUBMARINE WARFARE																																												
Tracking Exercise-Helo	62	3	186	SH-60B	4.0	744.0	100%	744.0	0%	100%	0%	0.00	744.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	5580	5714	491	357	3750	3375	0	0	0	0	0	0	5580	5714	491	357	3750	3375	2	1200	892800	131294	2764266	90	78	2,793,706
Torpedo Exercise-Helo	4	3	12	SH-60B	4.0	48.0	100%	48.0	0%	100%	0%	0.00	48.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	360	369	32	23	242	218	0	0	0	0	0	0	360	369	32	23	242	218	2	1200	57600	8471	178340	6	5	180,239
Tracking Exercise-Maritime Patrol Advanced Extended Echo Ranging Sonobuoys	11	1	11	P-3	6.0	66.0	75%	49.5	0%	100%	0%	0.00	49.50	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	596	1837	138	95	943	849	0	0	0	0	0	0	596	1837	138	95	943	849	4	4,800	316800	46588	980869	32	28	991,315
Tracking Exercise - Maritime Patrol Aircraft	34	1	34	P-3	6.0	204.0	75%	153.0	0%	100%	0%	0.00	153.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	1843	5677	426	294	2916	2624	0	0	0	0	0	0	1843	5677	426	294	2916	2624	4	4,800	979200	144000	3031776	98	86	3,064,064
Torpedo Exercise-Maritime Patrol Aircraft	4	1	4	P-3	6.0	24.0	75%	18.0	0%	100%	0%	0.00	18.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	217	668	50	35	343	309	0	0	0	0	0	0	217	668	50	35	343	309	4	4,800	115200	16941	356680	12	10	360,478
Tracking Exercise –Surface	132																																												
Torpedo Exercise-Surface	3																																												
Tracking Exercise–Submarine	12																																												
Torpedo Exercise – Submarine	10																																												

Table D-6: Aircraft Emissions – No Action Alternative (continued)

Type Training	Training Ops (#)	OPERATIONAL INFORMATION - AIRCRAFT													EMISSIONS/YEAR (lb) BY JURISDICTION												EMISSIONS/YEAR (lb) BY JURISDICTION												Training Platform		Annual Fuel Use (total)		GHG Emissions (lb)			
		Aircraft			Time		Altitude		Distribution (%)			Distribution (hr)			State (0-3 nm offshore)						Waters of U S (3-12 nm)						Int Waters (> 12 nm)						Total Emissions														
		Distribution	A/C Sorties (#)	Type	Ave Time on Range (hr)	Total Time on Range (hr)	Time < 3,000 ft (%)	Time < 3,000 ft (hr)	0-3 nm from shore	3-12 nm from Shore	>12 nm from Shore	Total Time 0-3 nm from shore	Total Time 3-12 nm from shore	Total Time >12 nm from shore	CO	NOx	HC	SOx	PM	PM2.5	CO	NOx	HC	SOx	PM	PM2.5	CO	NOx	HC	SOx	PM	PM2.5	CO	NOx	HC	SOx	PM	PM2.5	Engines (#)	Fuel Flow (lb/hr)	Pounds	Gallons	CO_2	N_2O	CH_4	CO_{2-e}
MAJOR TRAINING EXERCISES																																													
Joint Expeditionary Exercise	1	48	48	FA-18E/F	8.0	384.0	10%	38.4	0%	100%	0%	0.00	38.40	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	286	5855	48	159	2604	2344	0	0	0	0	0	0	286	5855	48	159	2604	2344	2	10,338	3969792	583793	12291177	399	347	12,422,078
		4	4	EA-6B	8.0	32.0	10%	3.2	0%	100%	0%	0.00	3.20	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	148	165	10	8	73	66	0	0	0	0	0	0	148	165	10	8	73	66	1	6,000	192000	28235	594466	19	17	600,797
		4	4	E-2	8.0	32.0	10%	3.2	0%	100%	0%	0.00	3.20	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	71	3	3	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	71	3	3	7	6	1	1,100	35200	5176	108985	4	3	110,146
		3	3	P-3	8.0	24.0	10%	2.4	0%	100%	0%	0.00	2.40	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	89	7	5	46	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	89	7	5	46	41	4	4,800	115200	16941	356680	12	10	360,478
		6	6	AV-8B	8.0	48.0	10%	4.8	0%	100%	0%	0.00	4.80	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	222	248	16	12	109	98	0	0	0	0	0	0	222	248	16	12	109	98	1	6,000	288000	42353	891699	29	25	901,195
		2	2	C-130	8.0	16.0	10%	1.6	0%	100%	0%	0.00	1.60	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	59	3	3	29	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	59	3	3	29	26	4	4,500	72000	10588	222925	7	6	225,299
		4	4	A-10	8.0	32.0	10%	3.2	0%	100%	0%	0.00	3.20	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	86	4	4	26	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	86	4	4	26	23	2	6,052	193664	28480	599618	19	17	606,004
		1	1	E-3	8.0	8.0	10%	0.8	0%	100%	0%	0.00	0.80	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	221	8	10	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	221	8	10	7	6	4	######	1045888	153807	3238254	105	92	3,272,741
		1	1	KC-135	8.0	8.0	10%	0.8	0%	100%	0%	0.00	0.80	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	247	1	7	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	247	1	7	2	2	4	91,552	732416	107708	2267689	74	64	2,291,840
		15	15	SH-60B	8.0	120.0	100%	120.0	0%	100%	0%	0.00	120.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	900	922	79	58	605	544	0	0	0	0	0	0	900	922	79	58	605	544	2	1200	144000	21176	445849	14	13	450,598
		4	4	CH-53	8.0	32.0	100%	32.0	0%	100%	0%	0.00	32.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	304	1154	21	57	316	284	0	0	0	0	0	0	304	1154	21	57	316	284	3	4,464	142848	21007	442283	14	12	446,993
		12	12	CH-46	8.0	96.0	100%	96.0	0%	100%	0%	0.00	96.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	2454	593	380	58	256	231	0	0	0	0	0	0	2454	593	380	58	256	231	2	1200	144000	21176	445849	14	13	450,598
		4	4	AH-1	8.0	32.0	100%	32.0	0%	100%	0%	0.00	32.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	291	141	15	10	109	98	0	0	0	0	0	0	291	141	15	10	109	98	2	812	25984	3821	80451	3	2	81,308
		2	2	UH-1	8.0	16.0	100%	16.0	0%	100%	0%	0.00	16.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	41	1	3	36	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	41	1	3	36	33	2	540	8640	1271	26751	1	1	27,036
		10	10	MV-22	8.0	80.0	100%	80.0	0%	100%	0%	0.00	80.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	1769	353	307	36	159	144	0	0	0	0	0	0	1769	353	307	36	159	144	2	2240	179200	26353	554835	18	16	560,744
Joint Multi-Strike Group Exercise	1	144	144	FA-18E/F	8.0	1152.0	10%	115.2	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	115.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	857	17566	143	476	7813	7031	857	17566	143	476	7813	7031	2	10,338	11909376	1751379	36873530	1196	1042	37,266,233
		12	12	EA-6B	8.0	96.0	10%	9.6	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	9.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	444	495	31	23	219	197	444	495	31	23	219	197	1	6,000	576000	84706	1783398	58	50	1,802,391
		12	12	E-2	8.0	96.0	10%	9.6	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	9.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	212	8	8	20	18	54	212	8	8	20	18	1	1,100	105600	15529	326956	11	9	330,438
		5	5	P-3	8.0	40.0	10%	4.0	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	4.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	148	11	8	76	69	48	148	11	8	76	69	4	4,800	192000	28235	594466	19	17	600,797
		1	1	E-3	8.0	8.0	10%	0.8	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	0.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	221	8	10	7	6	54	221	8	10	7	6	4	######	1045888	153807	3238254	105	92	3,272,741
		2	2	KC-135	8.0	16.0	10%	1.6	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	1.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	494	1	15	5	4	49	494	1	15	5	4	4	91,552	1464832	215416	4535378	147	128	4,583,680
		6	6	B-1B	8.0	48.0	10%	4.8	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	4.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	418	4	13	4	4	27	418	4	13	4	4	4	26,560	1274880	187482	3947253	128	112	3,989,292
		24	24	F-15	8.0	192.0	10%	19.2	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	19.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	431	5558	77	48	970	873	431	5558	77	48	970	873	2	6196	1189632	174946	3683311	119	104	3,722,538
		45	45	SH-60B	8.0	360.0	100%	360.0	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	360.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2700	2765	238	173	1814	1633	2700	2765	238	173	1814	1633	2	1200	432000	63529	1337548	43	38	1,351,793
ELECTRONIC WARFARE																																													
Electronic Warfare Operations	480	1	480	FA-18E/F	2.0	960.0	0%	0.0	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	10,338	9924480	1459482	30727941	997	868	31,055,194
Flare Exercise	3200	0.9	2880	F-15	3.0	8640.0	0%	0.0	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	6196	53533440	7872565	165748977	5377	4684	167,514,203
		0.06	192	FA-18E/F	3.0	576.0	0%	0.0	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	10,338	5954688	875689	18436765	598	521	18,633,116
		0.04	128	SH-60B	3.0	384.0	100%	384.0	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	384.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2880	2949	253	184	1935	1742	2880	2949	253	184	1935	1742	2	1200	460800	67765	1426718	46	40	1,441,913
Chaff Exercise - Shi	40																																												
Chaff Exercise - Aircraft	3200	0.9	2880	F-15	3.0	8640.0	0%	0.0	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	6196	53533440	7872565	165748977	5377	4684	167,514,203
		0.06	192	FA-18E/F	3.0	576.0	0%	0.0	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	10,338	5954688	875689	18436765	598	521	18,633,116
		0.04	128	SH-60B	3.0	384.0	100%	384.0	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	384.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2880	2949	253	184	1935	1742	2880	2949	253	184	1935	1742	2	1200	460800	67765	1426718	46	40	1,441,913
MINE WARFARE																																													
Mine Laying - Aircraft	4	0.5	2	FA-18E/F	0.5	1.0	0%	0.0	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	10,338	10338	1520	32008	1	1	32,349
		0.5	2	P-3	1.0	2.0	0%	0.0	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4,800	9600	1412	29723	1	1	30,040
																																												0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0
Mine Neutralization – Explosive Ordnance Disposal	20																																												
Limpet Mine Neutralization System/Shock Wave Generator	40																																												
NAVAL SPECIAL WARFARE																																													
Personnel I&E	240	4	960	H-60	8.0	7680.0	100%	7680.0	100%	0%	0%	7680.00	0.00	0.00	57600	58982	5069	3686	38707	34836	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57600	58982	5069	3686	38707	34836	2	1200	9216000	1355294	28534362	926	806	28,838,253
		2	480	MV-22	8.0	3840.0	100%	3840.0	100%	0%	0%	3840.00	0.00	0.00	84898	16945	14752	1720	7655	6890	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84898	16945	14752	1720	7655	6890	2	2240	8601600	1264941	26632072	864	753	26,915,703
Parachute Insertion	20	1	20	C-130	4.0	80.0	100%	80.0	100%	0%	0%	80.00	0.00	0.00	745	2938	169	144	1429	1286	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	745	2938	169	144	1429	1286	4	4,500	360000	52941	1114624	36	32	1,126,494
		1	20	CH-46	4.0	80.0	100%	80.0	100%	0%	0%	80.00	0.00	0.00	1636	0	253	38	171	154	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1636	0	253	38	171	154	2	1200	96000	14118	297233	10	8	300,398
		1	20	H-60	4.0	80.0	100%	80.0	100%	0%	0%	80.00	0.00	0.00	600	614	53	38	403	363	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	600	614	53	38	403	363	2	1200	96000	14118	297233	10	8	300,398

Table D-6: Aircraft Emissions – No Action Alternative (continued)

Type Training	Training Ops (#)	OPERATIONAL INFORMATION - AIRCRAFT													EMISSIONS/YEAR (lb) BY JURISDICTION												EMISSIONS/YEAR (lb) BY JURISDICTION												Training Platform		Annual Fuel Use (total)		GHG Emissions (lb)			
		Aircraft			Time		Altitude		Distribution (%)			Distribution (hr)			State (0-3 nm offshore)						Waters of U S (3-12 nm)						Int Waters (> 12 nm)						Total Emissions													
		Distribution	A/C Sorties (#)	Type	Ave Time on Range (hr)	Total Time on Range (hr)	Time < 3,000 ft (%)	Time < 3,000 ft (hr)	0-3 nm from shore	3-12 nm from Shore	>12 nm from Shore	Total Time 0-3 nm from shore	Total Time 3-12 nm from shore	Total Time >12 nm from shore	CO	NOx	HC	SOx	PM	PM2.5	CO	NOx	HC	SOx	PM	PM2.5	CO	NOx	HC	SOx	PM	PM2.5	CO	NOx	HC	SOx	PM	PM2.5	Engines (#)	Fuel Flow (lb/hr)	Pounds	Gallons	CO_2	N_2O	CH_4	CO_{2-e}
OTHER																																													
Surface Ship Sonar Maintenance	42																																												
Submarine Sonar Maintenance	48																																												
Small Boat Attack	18																																												
Sub Navigation / Sub Nav Under Ice	8																																												
Precision Anchoring	18																																												
Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Operation	1000																																												
Direct Action (TAC-P)	18																																												
Intelligence, Surveillance, Reconnaissance	16	1	16.0	MQ-4C	4.0	64.0	100%	64.0	0%	50%	50%	0.00	32.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	1243	21	113	20	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	1243	21	113	20	18	1	2,532	162048	23831	501729	16	14	507,073
Underwater Survey	16	1	16	SH-60B	2.0	32.0	100%	32.0	100%	0%	0%	32.00	0.00	0.00	240	246	21	15	161	145	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	240	246	21	15	161	145	2	1200	38400	5647	118893	4	3	120,159
Unmanned Underwater Vehicle Training	0																																												
TOTAL TRAINING (lbs per year)															**326,045**	**222,348**	**46,392**	**15,094**	**95,812**	**86,231**	**15,245**	**25,751**	**2,061**	**1,349**	**12,597**	**11,338**	**59,210**	**838,876**	**8,378**	**23,339**	**375,026**	**337,524**	**400,193**	**1,085,487**	**56,789**	**39,654**	**483,255**	**434,930**			**432,983,259**	**63,674,009**	**1,339,971,957**	**43,469**	**37,868**	**1,354,242,652**
TOTAL TRAINING (tons per year)															**163**	**111**	**23**	**8**	**48**	**43**	**8**	**13**	**1**	**1**	**6**	**6**	**30**	**419**	**4**	**12**	**188**	**169**	**200**	**543**	**28**	**20**	**242**	**217**			**216,492**	**63,674,009**	**669,986**	**22**	**19**	**677,121**
ANTI-SUBMARINE WARFARE TESTING																																												
Anti-submarine Warfare Tracking Test - MPA	33	1	33	P-3	6.0	198.0	75%	148.5	0%	100%	0%	0.00	148.50	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	1789	5510	413	285	2830	2547	0	0	0	0	0	0	1789	5510	413	285	2830	2547	4	4,800	950400	139765	2942606	95	83	2,973,945
LIFECYCLE ACTIVITIES TESTING																																												
Littoral Combat Ship (LCS) Mission Package Testing-ASW	0																																											
Ship Signature Testing	0																																												
SURFACE WARFARE / ANTI-SUBMARINE WARFARE TESTING																																												
Torpedo Testing (Explosive and Non-explosive)	6																																												
Countermeasure / Acoustic Systems Testing	0																																												
At-Sea Sonar Testing	0																																												
SHIPBOARD PROTECTION SYSTEMS AND SWIMMER DEFENSE TESTING																																												
Pierside Integrated Swimmer Defense	0																																												
MINE WARFARE TESTING																																												
Mine Detection and Classification Testing	4	1	4	SH-60B	2.0	8.0	100%	8.0	33%	33%	34%	2.64	2.64	2.72	20	20	2	1	13	12	20	20	2	1	13	12	20	21	2	1	14	12	60	61	5	4	40	36	2	1200	9600	1412	29723	1	1	30,040
UNMANNED VEHICLE TESTING																																												
Unmanned Vehicle Development and Payload Testing	0																																												
OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH																																												
North Pacific Acoustic Lab Philippine Sea 2018-19 Experiment (Deep Water)	1																																												
TOTAL TESTING (lbs per year)															**20**	**20**	**2**	**1.2672**	**13.3056**	**11.97504**	**1808.928**	**5530.219**	**415.166**	**286.39**	**2843.122**	**2558.81**	**20.4**	**20.8896**	**1.7952**	**1.3056**	**13.7088**	**12.33792**	**1849.128**	**5571.384**	**418.704**	**288.96**	**2870.136**	**2583.1224**			**960000**	**141176.4706**	**2972329.412**	**96.423529**	**84**	**3003984.706**
TOTAL TESTING (tons per year)															**0.0099**	**0.0101376**	**0.000871**	**0.000634**	**0.006653**	**0.005988**	**0.904464**	**2.76511**	**0.20758**	**0.1432**	**1.421561**	**1.2794**	**0.0102**	**0.0104448**	**0.0009**	**0.0006528**	**0.0068544**	**0.00616896**	**0.924564**	**2.785692**	**0.209352**	**0.14448**	**1.435068**	**1.2915612**				**141176.4706**	**1486.164706**	**0.0482118**	**0.042**	**1501.992353**

This page intentionally left blank.

Table D-7: Emissions from Ordnance – No Action Alternative

MEM Category	Location	Training MEM	Testing MEM	Emissions (lb/year) Training						Emissions (lb/year) Testing					
		#/yr	#/yr	CO	NOx	VOC	SOx	PM10	PM2.5	CO	NOx	VOC	SOx	PM10	PM2.5
BOMBS															
Bombs (H-E)	MITT	6,454	0	394,551.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Bombs (N-E)	MITT	3,038	0	774.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
PROJECTILES															
Small Caliber	MITT	138,640	0	318.9	13.4	0.0	0.0	7.1	5.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Medium Caliber (H-E)	MITT	25,500	2040	102.0	33.2	0.0	0.0	242.3	130.1	8.2	2.7	0.0	0.0	19.4	10.4
Medium Caliber (N-E)	MITT	179,650	2040	467.1	17.4	0.0	0.0	25.2	21.6	5.3	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.2
Large Caliber (H-E)	MITT	2,500	3290	320.0	400.0	0.0	0.0	24.0	18.6	421.1	526.4	0.0	0.0	31.6	24.5
Large Caliber (N-E)	MITT	7,038	2310	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Missiles (H-E)	MITT	210	12	6,430.9	7,470.5	0.0	0.0	12,977.0	12,977.0	367.5	426.9	0.0	0.0	741.5	741.5
Missiles (N-E)	MITT	0	12	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	367.5	426.9	0.0	0.0	741.5	741.5
Rockets (H-E)	MITT	2,114	8	1,966.0	11.8	0.0	0.0	845.6	613.1	7.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.2	2.3
Rockets (N-E)	MITT	0	8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
COUNTERMEASURES															
Chaff	MITT	25,840	0	1.5	3.9	0.0	0.0	7.3	6.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Flares	MITT	25,600	0	1.5	3.9	0.0	0.0	7.2	6.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
TARGETS															
Airborne targets	MITT	12	0												
Surface targets	MITT	200	0												
Expendable sub-surface targets	MITT	87	0												
TOTAL EMISSIONS (lbs per year)				404,934	7,954	0	0	14,136	13,779	1,177	1,383	0	0	1,538	1,521
TOTAL EMISSIONS (tons per year)				202.5	4.0	0.0	0.0	7.1	6.9	0.6	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.8	0.8

This page intentionally left blank.

Table D-8: Vessel Emissions – Alternative 1

Type Training	Training Ops (#)	OPERATIONAL INFORMATION - VESSELS										EMISSIONS/YEAR (lb) BY JURISDICTION												EMISSIONS/YEAR (lb) BY JURISDICTION												GHG Emissions (lb)					
		Ship / Vessel / Boat				Range Time (hr)				Distribution (hr)		State (0-3 nm offshore)						Waters of U S (3-12 nm)						Int Waters (> 12 nm)						Total Emissions											
		Number	Ship Type	Type	Participation	Per Ship	Time at Each Power Level (%)	Total	0-3 nm from shore	3-12 nm from shore	>12 nm from shore	CO	NO_x	HC	SO_x	PM_{10}	PM2.5	CO	NO_x	HC	SO_x	PM_{10}	PM2.5	CO	NO_x	HC	SO_x	PM_{10}	PM2.5	CO	NO_x	HC	SO_x	PM_{10}	PM2.5	Fuel Flow (GPH)	Annual Fuel Consumption (gal)	CO_2	N_2O	CH_4	CO_{2-e}
AIR WARFARE																																									
Air Combat Maneuver	3600																																								
Air Defense Exercise	100																																								
Air Intercept Control	5300																																								
Gunnery Exercise, A-A (Medium Caliber)	36																																								
Missile Exercise, A-A	18																																								
Gunnery Exercise, S-A (Large Caliber)	6	12	FFG	Guided Missile Frigate	2.00	2.0	100%	24.0	0.0	0.0	24.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	791	1,132	72	838	55	50	791	1,132	72	838	55	50	79	1,896	39,918	1	1	40,344
Gunnery Exercise, S-A (Medium Caliber)	13	26	FFG	Guided Missile Frigate	2.00	2.0	100%	52.0	0.0	0.0	52.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,713	2,452	156	1,816	120	108	1,713	2,452	156	1,816	120	108	79	4,108	86,490	3	2	87,411
Missile Exercise, S-A	18	36	FFG	Guided Missile Frigate	2.00	2.0	100%	72.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79	0	0	0	0	0
STRIKE WARFARE																																									
Bombing Exercise, A-G	2300																																								
Missile Exercise, A-G	115																																								
Gunnery Exercise, A-G	96																																								
AMPHIBIOUS WARFARE																																									
Fire Support Exercise - Land-Based target	10	10	CG	Cruiser	1	8.0	100%	80.00	80.0	0.0	0.0	4,921	6,366	346	6,210	223	201	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4,921	6,366	346	6,210	223	201	184	14,720	309,915	10	9	313,215
Amphibious Rehearsal, No Landing – Marine Air Ground Task Force	12	48	LSD	Cruiser	4	24.0	100%	1152.0	1152.0	0.0	0.0	24,480	385,356	12,488	40,366	3,122	2,810	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24,480	385,356	12,488	40,366	3,122	2,810	184	1,461,888	30,778,590	998	870	31,106,382
		48	LHA/LHD	Amphib. Assault Ship - Tarawa	4	24.0	100%	1152.0	1152.0	0.0	0.0	9,308	55,100	6,647	156,096	32,924	29,632	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9,308	55,100	6,647	156,096	32,924	29,632	373	1,461,888	30,778,590	998	870	31,106,382
		48	LPD	Amphibious Transport Dock - Wasp	4	24.0	100%	1152.0	1152.0	0.0	0.0	4,009	24,192	2,972	70,065	14,803	13,323	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4,009	24,192	2,972	70,065	14,803	13,323	373	1,461,888	30,778,590	998	870	31,106,382
Amphibious Assault - Marine Air Ground Task Force	12	12	CG	Cruiser	1	8.0	100%	96.0	96.0	0.0	0.0	5,905	7,640	415	7,452	268	241	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5,905	7,640	415	7,452	268	241	184	121,824	2,564,882	83	72	2,592,198
		12	LHA	Amphib. Assault Ship - Tarawa	1	8.0	100%	96.0	96.0	0.0	0.0	708	4,179	531	12,573	2,524	2,271	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	708	4,179	531	12,573	2,524	2,271	373	121,824	2,564,882	83	72	2,592,198
		24	LPD	Amphibious Transport Dock - Wasp	2	8.0	100%	192.0	192.0	0.0	0.0	668	4,032	495	11,677	2,467	2,220	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	668	4,032	495	11,677	2,467	2,220	373	243,648	5,129,765	166	145	5,184,397
		24	FFG	Guided Missile Frigate	2	8.0	100%	192.0	192.0	0.0	0.0	6,324	9,055	576	6,705	444	399	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6,324	9,055	576	6,705	444	399	79	243,648	5,129,765	166	145	5,184,397
Amphibious Raid - Special Purpose Marine Air Ground Task Force	6	6	LHA	Amphib. Assault Ship - Tarawa	1	6.0	100%	36.0	36.0	0.0	0.0	266	1,567	199	4,715	946	852	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	266	1,567	199	4,715	946	852	373	45,684	961,831	31	27	972,074
		12	LPD	Amphibious Transport Dock - Wasp	2	2.5	100%	30.0	30.0	0.0	0.0	104	630	77	1,825	386	347	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	104	630	77	1,825	386	347	373	38,070	801,526	26	23	810,062
Non-Combatant Evacuation Operation	5	5	LHA	Amphib. Assault Ship - Tarawa	1	80.0	100%	400.0	400.0	0.0	0.0	2,952	17,412	2,212	52,388	10,516	9,464	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,952	17,412	2,212	52,388	10,516	9,464	373	149,200	3,141,257	102	89	3,174,711
		10	LPD	Amphibious Transport Dock - Wasp	2	80.0	100%	800.0	800.0	0.0	0.0	2,784	16,800	2,064	48,656	10,280	9,252	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,784	16,800	2,064	48,656	10,280	9,252	373	298,400	6,282,514	204	178	6,349,422
		5	LCU	Landing Craft Utility	1	80.0	100%	400.0	400.0	0.0	0.0	7,328	45,812	1,396	21,844	2,056	1,850	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7,328	45,812	1,396	21,844	2,056	1,850	611	244,400	5,145,598	167	145	5,200,398
Humanitarian Assistance/ Disaster Relief Operations	5	5	LHA	Amphib. Assault Ship - Tarawa	1	8.0	100%	40.0	40.0	0.0	0.0	295	1,741	221	5,239	1,052	946	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	295	1,741	221	5,239	1,052	946	373	50,760	1,068,701	35	30	1,080,083
		10	LPD	Amphibious Transport Dock - Wasp	2	8.0	100%	80.0	80.0	0.0	0.0	278	1,680	206	4,866	1,028	925	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	278	1,680	206	4,866	1,028	925	373	101,520	2,137,402	69	60	2,160,165
		5	LCAC	Landing Craft Air Cushioned	1	8.0	100%	40.0	40.0	0.0	0.0	733	4,581	140	2,184	206	185	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	733	4,581	140	2,184	206	185	611	50,760	1,068,701	35	30	1,080,083
Unmanned Aerial Vehicle - Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconaissance	100																																								

Table D-8: Vessel Emissions – Alternative 1 (continued)

Type Training	Training Ops (#)	OPERATIONAL INFORMATION - VESSELS										EMISSIONS/YEAR (lb) BY JURISDICTION												EMISSIONS/YEAR (lb) BY JURISDICTION												GHG Emissions (lb)					
		Ship / Vessel / Boat				Range Time (hr)				Distribution (hr)		State (0-3 nm offshore)						Waters of U S (3-12 nm)						Int Waters (> 12 nm)						Total Emissions											
		Number	Ship Type	Type	Participation	Per Ship	Time at Each Power Level (%)	Total	0-3 nm from shore	3-12 nm from shore	>12 nm from shore	CO	NO_x	HC	SO_x	PM_{10}	PM2.5	CO	NO_x	HC	SO_x	PM_{10}	PM2.5	CO	NO_x	HC	SO_x	PM_{10}	PM2.5	CO	NO_x	HC	SO_x	PM_{10}	PM2.5	Fuel Flow (GPH)	Annual Fuel Consumption (gal)	CO_2	N_2O	CH_4	CO_{2e}
SURFACE WARFARE																																								
Gunnery Exercise, A-S (Small Caliber) - Ship	321																																								
Gunnery Exercise, A-S (Medium Caliber) - Ship	120																																								
Missile Exercise (A-S) - Rocket	110																																								
Missile Exercise (A-S)	10																																								
Laser Targeting	600																																								
Bombing Exercise (A-S)	37																																								
Torpedo Exercise (Submarine to Surface)	0																																								
Missile Exercise (S-S)	19	38	FFG	Guided Missile Frigate	2.00	2.0	100%	76.0	0.0	0.0	76.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,503	3,584	228	2,654	176	158	2,503	3,584	228	2,654	176	158	79	6,004	126,408	4	4	127,754
Gunner Exercise (Surface-to-Surface) Ship – Large-caliber	140	30.8	CG	Cruiser	0.22	2.5	100%	77.00	0.0	21.6	55.4	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,326	1,716	93	1,674	60	54	3,410	4,412	240	4,304	155	139	4,736	6,128	333	5,978	215	193	184	14,168	298,293	10	8	301,470
		63	DDG		0.45	2.5	100%	157.5	0.0	44.1	113.4	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,653	5,050	177	3,904	161	144	6,822	12,987	455	10,039	413	371	9,475	18,037	632	13,943	573	516	187	29,453	620,093	20	18	626,697
		21	FFG	Guided Missile Frigate	0.15	2.5	100%	52.5	0.0	14.7	37.8	0	0	0	0	0	0	484	693	44	513	34	31	1,245	1,783	113	1,320	87	79	1,729	2,476	158	1,833	121	109	79	4,148	87,321	3	2	88,251
		16.8	USCG	US Coast Guard	0.12	2.5	100%	42.0	0.0	11.8	30.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	681	10	136	2	2	174	1,751	27	349	6	6	241	2,432	37	485	9	8	66	2,772	58,362	2	2	58,983
Gunner Exercise (Surface-to-Surface) Ship – Medium-caliber	100	22	CG	Cruiser	0.22	2.5	100%	55.00	0.0	15.4	39.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	947	1,226	67	1,196	43	39	2,436	3,151	171	3,074	110	99	3,383	4,377	238	4,270	153	138	184	10,120	213,066	7	6	215,336
		45	DDG		0.45	2.5	100%	112.5	0.0	31.5	81.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,895	3,607	126	2,789	115	103	4,873	9,276	325	7,171	295	265	6,768	12,884	451	9,960	410	369	187	21,038	442,924	14	13	447,641
		15	FFG	Guided Missile Frigate	0.15	2.5	100%	37.5	0.0	10.5	27.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	346	495	32	367	24	22	889	1,273	81	943	62	56	1,235	1,769	113	1,310	87	78	79	2,963	62,372	2	2	63,037
		1	LPD	Amphibious Transport Dock - Wasp	0.01	2.5	100%	2.5	0.0	0.7	1.8	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	2	43	9	8	6	38	5	109	23	21	9	53	6	152	32	29	373	933	19,633	1	1	19,842
		12	USCG	US Coast Guard	0.12	2.5	100%	30.0	0.0	8.4	21.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	486	7	97	2	2	124	1,251	19	249	5	4	172	1,737	26	347	6	6	66	1,980	41,687	1	1	42,131
Sinking Exercise (SINKEX)	21	105	FFG	Guided Missile Frigate	5.00	16.0	100%	1680.0	0.0	0.0	1680.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55,339	79,229	5,040	58,666	3,881	3,493	55,339	79,229	5,040	58,666	3,881	3,493	79	132,720	2,794,287	91	79	2,824,046
Gunnery Exercise (S-S) Boat – Medium-caliber	20	100	FFG	Guided Missile Frigate	5.00	3.0	100%	300.0	0.0	0.0	300.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9,882	14,148	900	10,476	693	624	9,882	14,148	900	10,476	693	624	79	23,700	498,980	16	14	504,294
Gunnery Exercise (S-S) Small-caliber	43	86	CRRC	Combat Rubber Raiding Craft	2	3.0	100%	258.0	0.0	0.0	258.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	3,329	0	0	0	0	38	3,329	0	0	0	3	774	16,296	1	0	16,469
Maritime Security Operations (MSO)	40	40	FFG	Guided Missile Frigate	1	8.0	100%	320.0	0.0	0.0	320.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10,541	15,091	960	11,174	739	665	10,541	15,091	960	11,174	739	665	79	25,280	532,245	17	15	537,914
		40	RHIB	Rigid Hulled Inflatable Boat	1	8.0	100%	320.0	0.0	0.0	320.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	108.8	2924.8	19.2	460.8	48.0	43	109	2,925	19	461	48	43	14	4,480	94,322	3	3	95,326
		40	CRRC	Combat Rubber Raiding Craft	1	8.0	100%	320.0	0.0	0.0	320.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	4,128	0	0	0	0	48	4,128	0	0	0	3	960	20,212	1	1	20,427
ANTI-SUBMARINE WARFARE																																								
Tracking Exercise-Helo	65																																							
Torpedo Exercise-Helo	4																																							
Tracking Exercise-Maritime Patrol Advanced Extended Echo Ranging Sonobuoys	0																																							
Tracking Exercise -Maritime Patrol Aircraft	36																																							
Torpedo Exercise-Maritime Patrol Aircraft	4																																							
Tracking Exercise –Surface	91	91	FFG	Guided Missile Frigate	1	2.0	100%	182.0	0.0	91.0	91.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,998	4,292	273	3,178	210	189	2,998	4,292	273	3,178	210	189	5,995	8,583	546	6,355	420	378	79	14,378	302,714	10	9	305,938
Torpedo Exercise-Surface	4	4	FFG	Guided Missile Frigate	1	2.0	100%	8.0	0.0	4.0	4.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	132	189	12	140	9	8	132	189	12	140	9	8	264	377	24	279	18	17	79	632	13,306	0	0	13,448
Tracking Exercise– Submarine	4																																							
Torpedo Exercise – Submarine	6																																							
Small Joint Coordinated ASW exercise (Multi-Sail/GUAMEX)	2																																							

Table D-8: Vessel Emissions – Alternative 1 (continued)

Type Training	Training Ops (#)	OPERATIONAL INFORMATION - VESSELS									EMISSIONS/YEAR (lb) BY JURISDICTION												EMISSIONS/YEAR (lb) BY JURISDICTION												GHG Emissions (lb)					
		Ship / Vessel / Boat			Participation	Range Time (hr)			Distribution (hr)			State (0-3 nm offshore)						Waters of U S (3-12 nm)						Int Waters (> 12 nm)						Total Emissions											
		Number	Ship Type	Type		Per Ship	Time at Each Power Level (%)	Total	0-3 nm from shore	3-12 nm from shore	>12 nm from shore	CO	NO_x	HC	SO_x	PM_{10}	PM2.5	CO	NO_x	HC	SO_x	PM_{10}	PM2.5	CO	NO_x	HC	SO_x	PM_{10}	PM2.5	CO	NO_x	HC	SO_x	PM_{10}	PM2.5	Fuel Flow (GPH)	Annual Fuel Consumption (gal)	CO_2	N_2O	CH_4	CO_{2e}
MAJOR TRAINING EXERCISES																																								
Joint Expeditionary Exercise	1	1.0	CVN	Nuclear Carrier (No emissions)	1	80.0	100%	80.0	0.0	80.0	0.0																														
		1.0	CG		1	80.0	100%	80.0	0.0	80.0	0.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4,921	6,366	346	6,210	223	201	0	0	0	0	0	0	4,921	6,366	346	6,210	223	201	184	14,720	309,915	10	9	313,215
		2.0	FFG		2	80.0	100%	160.0	0.0	160.0	0.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5,270	7,546	480	5,587	370	333	0	0	0	0	0	0	5,270	7,546	480	5,587	370	333	79	12,640	266,123	9	8	268,957
		5.0	DDG		5	80.0	100%	400.0	0.0	400.0	0.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24,064	45,808	1,604	35,412	1,456	1,310	0	0	0	0	0	0	24,064	45,808	1,604	35,412	1,456	1,310	187	74,800	1,574,839	51	45	1,591,611
		1.0	LHD/LHA		1	80.0	100%	80.0	0.0	80.0	0.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	590	3,482	442	10,478	2,103	1,893	0	0	0	0	0	0	590	3,482	442	10,478	2,103	1,893	373	29,840	628,251	20	18	634,942
		2.0	LSD		2	80.0	100%	160.0	0.0	160.0	0.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,293	7,653	923	21,680	4,573	4,116	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,293	7,653	923	21,680	4,573	4,116	373	59,680	1,256,503	41	36	1,269,884
		1.0	LPD		1	80.0	100%	80.0	0.0	80.0	0.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	278	1,680	206	4,866	1,028	925	0	0	0	0	0	0	278	1,680	206	4,866	1,028	925	373	29,840	628,251	20	18	634,942
		1.0	TAOE		1	80.0	100%	80.0	0.0	80.0	0.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8,781	24,905	848	9,599	833	750	0	0	0	0	0	0	8,781	24,905	848	9,599	833	750	1,865	149,200	3,141,257	102	89	3,174,711
		1.0	SSN	Nuclear Carrier (No emissions)	1	80.0	100%	80.0	0.0	80.0	0.0																														
		1.0	SSGN	Nuclear Carrier (No emissions)	1	80.0	100%	80.0	0.0	80.0	0.0																														
		2.0	T-AGO(LFA)		2	80.0	100%	160.0	0.0	160.0	0.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,067	6,299	800	19,109	3,803	3,423	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,067	6,299	800	19,109	3,803	3,423	1,865	298,400	6,282,514	204	178	6,349,422
		1.0	CG-PARTNER		1	80.0	100%	80.0	0.0	80.0	0.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8,623	3,768	792	1,680	208	187	0	0	0	0	0	0	8,623	3,768	792	1,680	208	187	184	14,720	309,915	10	9	313,215
		2.0	DDG-PARTNER		2	80.0	100%	160.0	0.0	160.0	0.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16,638	7,984	1,440	2,864	400	360	0	0	0	0	0	0	16,638	7,984	1,440	2,864	400	360	187	29,920	629,936	20	18	636,644
		1.0	SS-PARTNER		1	80.0	100%	80.0	0.0	80.0	0.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	235	1,386	176	4,169	837	753	0	0	0	0	0	0	235	1,386	176	4,169	837	753	373	29,840	628,251	20	18	634,942
		5.0	LCAC		5	80.0	100%	400.0	0.0	400.0	0.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7,328	45,812	1,396	21,844	2,056	1,850	0	0	0	0	0	0	7,328	45,812	1,396	21,844	2,056	1,850	611	507,600	10,687,010	347	302	10,800,827
		2.0	LCU		2	80.0	100%	160.0	0.0	160.0	0.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,931	18,325	558	8,738	822	740	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,931	18,325	558	8,738	822	740	611	97,760	2,058,239	67	58	2,080,159
		19.0	CRRC		19	80.0	100%	1520.0	0.0	1520.0	0.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	226	19,610	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	226	19,610	0	0	0	3	4,560	96,006	3	3	97,029
		2.0	RHIB		2	80.0	100%	160.0	0.0	160.0	0.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	1,462	10	230	24	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	1,462	10	230	24	22	373	59,680	1,256,503	41	36	1,269,884
		14.0	AAV		14	80.0	100%	1120.0	0.0	1120.0	0.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	851	6,966	918	1,400	291	262	0	0	0	0	0	0	851	6,966	918	1,400	291	262	3	3,360	70,741	2	2	71,495
Joint Multi-Strike Group Exercise	1	3.0	CVN		3	80.0	100%	240.0	0.0	0.0	240.0																														
		3.0	CG		3	80.0	100%	240.0	0.0	0.0	240.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14,762	19,099	1,037	18,631	670	603	184	44,160	929,745	30	26	939,646
		3.0	FFG		3	80.0	100%	240.0	0.0	0.0	240.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7,906	11,318	720	8,381	554	499	79	18,960	399,184	13	11	403,435
		12.0	DDG		12	80.0	100%	960.0	0.0	0.0	960.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57,754	109,939	3,850	84,989	3,494	3,145	187	179,520	3,779,614	123	107	3,819,867
		3.0	TAOE		3	80.0	100%	240.0	0.0	0.0	240.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26,342	74,714	2,544	28,798	2,498	2,249	1,865	447,600	9,423,770	306	266	9,524,134
		5.0	SSN		5	80.0	100%	400.0	0.0	0.0	400.0																														
		2.0	T-AGO(LFA)		2	80.0	100%	160.0	0.0	0.0	160.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,067	6,299	800	19,109	3,803	3,423	1,067	6,299	800	19,109	3,803	3,423	1,865	298,400	6,282,514	204	178	6,349,422
		1.0	SS-PARTNER		1	80.0	100%	80.0	0.0	0.0	80.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	235	1,386	176	4,169	837	753	235	1,386	176	4,169	837	753	373	29,840	628,251	20	18	634,942
ELECTRONIC WARFARE																																								
Electronic Warfare Operations	522	522	FFG	Guided Missile Frigate	1	4	100%	2088.0	0.0	0.0	2088.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68,779	98,470	6,264	72,913	4,823	4,341	68,779	98,470	6,264	72,913	4,823	4,341	79	164,952	3,472,899	113	98	3,509,886
Flare Exercise	2200																																							
Chaff Exercise - Ship	41	41	FFG	Guided Missile Frigate	1	4	100%	164.0	0.0	0.0	164.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5,402	7,734	492	5,727	379	341	5,402	7,734	492	5,727	379	341	79	12,956	272,776	9	8	275,681
Chaff Exercise - Aircraft	2200																																							
MINE WARFARE																																								
Civilian Port Defense	1	1	RHIB	Rigid Hulled Inflatable Boat	1	24.0	100%	24.0	24.0	0.0	0.0	8.2	219.4	1.4	34.6	3.6	3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	8	219	1	35	4	3	14	336	7,074	0	0	7,149
Mine Laying - Aircraft	4																																							
Mine Neutralization – Explosive Ordnance Disposal	20	60	RHIB	Rigid Hulled Inflatable Boat	3	12.0	100%	720.0	720.0	0.0	0.0	244.8	6580.8	43.2	1036.8	108.0	97	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	245	6,581	43	1,037	108	97	14	10,080	212,224	7	6	214,485
Limpet Mine Neutralization System/Shock Wave Generator	60	60	RHIB	Rigid Hulled Inflatable Boat	1	4.0	100%	240.0	240.0	0.0	0.0	81.6	2193.6	14.4	345.6	36.0	32	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	82	2,194	14	346	36	32	14	3,360	70,741	2	2	71,495
Airborne Mine Countermeasure – Mine Detection	4																																							
Mine Countermeasure Exercise – Towed Sonar (AQS-20,LCS)	4																																							
Mine Countermeasure Exercise – Surface (SMCMEX) Sonar (SQQ-32, MCM)	4																																							
Mine Neutralization – Remotely Operated Vehicle Soanr (ASQ-235 [AQS-20], SLQ-48)	4																																							
Mine Countermeasure – Towed Mine Detection	4																																							
Underwater Demolition Qualification/Certification	45	45	CRRC	Combat Rubber Raiding Craft	1	8.0	100%	360.0	0.0	360.0	0.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53	4,645	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53	4,645	0	0	0	3	1,080	22,738	1	1	22,980
Submarine Mine Exercise	1																																							

Table D-8: Vessel Emissions – Alternative 1 (continued)

Type Training	Training Ops (#)	OPERATIONAL INFORMATION - VESSELS										EMISSIONS/YEAR (lb) BY JURISDICTION												EMISSIONS/YEAR (lb) BY JURISDICTION												GHG Emissions (lb)					
		Ship / Vessel / Boat				Range Time (hr)			Distribution (hr)			State (0-3 nm offshore)						Waters of U S (3-12 nm)						Int Waters (> 12 nm)						Total Emissions											
		Number	Ship Type	Type	Participation	Per Ship	Time at Each Power Level (%)	Total	0-3 nm from shore	3-12 nm from shore	>12 nm from shore	CO	NO_x	HC	SO_x	PM_{10}	PM2.5	CO	NO_x	HC	SO_x	PM_{10}	PM2.5	CO	NO_x	HC	SO_x	PM_{10}	PM2.5	CO	NO_x	HC	SO_x	PM_{10}	PM2.5	Fuel Flow (GPH)	Annual Fuel Consumption (gal)	CO_2	N_2O	CH_4	CO_{2e}
NAVAL SPECIAL WARFARE																																								
Personnel I&E	365	1825	RHIB	Rigid Hulled Inflatable Boat	5	8.0	100%	14600.0	14600.0	0.0	0.0	4964.0	133444.0	876.0	21024.0	2190.0	1,971	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	4,964	133,444	876	21,024	2,190	1,971	48	700,800	14,754,643	479	417	14,911,780
		2190	CRRC	Combat Rubber Raiding Craft	6	8.0	100%	17520.0	17520.0	0.0	0.0	0	2,603	226,033	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,603	226,033	0	0	0	3	52,560	1,106,598	36	31	1,118,384
Parachute Insertion	64																																							
Embassy Reinforcement	0	0	LCAC	Landing Craft Air Cushioned	1	24.0	100%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	611	0	0	0	0	0
Underwater Demolition Qualifications	0	0	CRRC	Combat Rubber Raiding Craft	1	8.0	100%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0
Intelligence, Surveillance, Reconnaissance	44																																							
Urban Warfare Training	0	0.0	LHA	Amphib. Assault Ship - Tarawa	1	40.0	100%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	373	0	0	0	0	0
		0.0	LPD	Amphibious Transport Dock - Wasp	2	40.0	100%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	373	0	0	0	0	0
OTHER																																								
Direct Action (Tactical Air Control Party)	30																																							
Intelligence, Surveillance, Reconnaissance	44																																							
Surface Ship Sonar Maintenance	44	44	FFG	Guided Missile Frigate	1	4.0	100%	176.0	176.0	0.0	0.0	5,797	8,300	528	6,146	407	366	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5,797	8,300	528	6,146	407	366	79	13,904	292,735	9	8	295,852
Submarine Sonar Maintenance	32																																							
Small Boat Attack	18	18	CRRC	Combat Rubber Raiding Craft	1	4.0	100%	72.0	0.0	72.0	0.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	929	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	929	0	0	0	3	216	4,548	0	0	4,596
Sub Navigation / Sub Nav Under Ice	8																																							
Precision Anchoring	18	18	FFG	Guided Missile Frigate	1	4.0	100%	72.0	72.0	0.0	0.0	2,372	3,396	216	2,514	166	150	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,372	3,396	216	2,514	166	150	79	5,688	119,755	4	3	121,031
Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Operation	950																																							
Search and Rescue At Sea	45																																							
Underwater Survey	32	96	RHIB	Rigid Hulled Inflatable Boat	3	8.0	100%	768.0	768.0	0.0	0.0	261.1	7019.5	46.1	1105.9	115.2	104	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	261	7,020	46	1,106	115	104	48	36,864	776,135	25	22	784,400
		96	CRRC	Combat Rubber Raiding Craft	3	8.0	100%	768.0	768.0	0.0	0.0	0	114	9,908	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	114	9,908	0	0	0	3	2,304	48,508	2	1	49,025
Unmanned Underwater Vehicle Training	64																																							
TOTAL TRAINING (lbs per year)									40,826	5,806	8,665	84,793	750,012	268,652	485,068	86,270	77,643	93,825	208,182	36,967	167,900	19,696	17,727	286,234	488,009	32,434	359,677	24,147	21,732	464,852	1,446,204	338,053	1,012,646	130,113	117,102		9,852,767	207,440,146	6,729	5,862	209,649,382
TOTAL TRAINING (tons per year)												42	375	134	243	43	39	47	104	18	84	10	9	143	244	16	180	12	11	232	723	169	506	65	59			103,720	3	3	104,825

Table D-8: Vessel Emissions – Alternative 1 (continued)

Type Training	Training Ops (#)	OPERATIONAL INFORMATION - VESSELS										EMISSIONS/YEAR (lb) BY JURISDICTION												EMISSIONS/YEAR (lb) BY JURISDICTION												GHG Emissions (lb)					
		Ship / Vessel / Boat				Range Time (hr)				Distribution (hr)																															
												State (0-3 nm offshore)						Waters of U S (3-12 nm)						Int Waters (> 12 nm)						Total Emissions											
		Number	Ship Type	Type	Participation	Per Ship	Time at Each Power Level (%)	Total	0-3 nm from shore	3-12 nm from shore	>12 nm from shore	CO	NO_x	HC	SO_x	PM_{10}	PM2.5	CO	NO_x	HC	SO_x	PM_{10}	PM2.5	CO	NO_x	HC	SO_x	PM_{10}	PM2.5	CO	NO_x	HC	SO_x	PM_{10}	PM2.5	Fuel Flow (GPH)	Annual Fuel Consumption (gal)	CO_2	N_2O	CH_4	CO_{2-e}
LIFECYCLE ACTIVITIES TESTING																																								
Littoral Combat Ship (LCS) Mission Package Testing-ASW	2	2	LCS		1	60.0	100%	120.0	0.0	120.0	0.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,953	5,659	360	4,190	277	249	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,953	5,659	360	4,190	277	249	79	152,280	3,206,103	104	91	3,240,248
Ship Signature Testing	40	40	FFG	Guided Missile Frigate	1	4.0	100%	160.0	52.8	52.8	54.4	1,739	2,490	158	1,844	122	110	1,739	2,490	158	1,844	122	110	1,792	2,566	163	1,900	126	113	5,270	7,546	480	5,587	370	333	79	203,040	4,274,804	139	121	4,320,331
ANTI-SUBMARINE WARFARE TESTING																																								
Anti-submarine Warfare Tracking Test - MPA	26																																							
Torpedo (Explosive) Testing	2	6.0	DDG		3	4.0	100%	24.0	0.0	0.0	24.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,444	2,748	96	2,125	87	79	1,444	2,748	96	2,125	87	79	187	4,488	94,490	3	3	95,497
Torpedo (Non-explosive Testing)	6																																							
Countermeasure / Acoustic Systems Testing	2	4.0	DDG		2	2.0	100%	8.0	4.0	4.0	0.0	241	458	16	354	15	13	241	458	16	354	15	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	481	916	32	708	29	26	187	1,496	31,497	1	1	31,832
At-Sea Sonar Testing	27	108.0	SSN	Nuclear Carrier (No emissions)	4	2.0	100%	216.0	0.0	0.0	216.0																													
		27.0	CG		1	2.0	100%	54.0	0.0	0.0	54.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,322	4,297	233	4,192	151	136	3,322	4,297	233	4,192	151	136	184	9,936	209,193	7	6	211,420
		108.0	DDG		4	2.0	100%	216.0	0.0	0.0	216.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12,995	24,736	866	19,122	786	708	12,995	24,736	866	19,122	786	708	187	40,392	850,413	28	24	859,470
SHIPBOARD PROTECTION SYSTEMS AND SWIMMER DEFENSE TESTING																																								
Pierside Integrated Swimmer Defense	0	0	FFG	Guided Missile Frigate	1	8.0	100%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79	0	0	0	0	0
MINE WARFARE TESTING																																								
Mine Detection and Classification Testing	4	4	FFG	Guided Missile Frigate	1	4	100%	16.0	5.3	5.3	5.4	174	249	16	184	12	11	174	249	16	184	12	11	179	257	16	190	13	11	527	755	48	559	37	33	79	1,264	26,612	1	1	26,896
UNMANNED VEHICLE TESTING																																								
Unmanned Vehicle Development and Payload Testing	0																																							
OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH																																								
North Pacific Acoustic Lab Philippine Sea 2018-19 Experiment (Deep Water)	1																																							
TOTAL TESTING (lbs per year)										62	182	570	2,154	3,197	190	2,382	149	134	6,107	8,856	550	6,573	426	383	19,731	34,604	1,375	27,529	1,162	1,046	27,991	46,658	2,116	36,484	1,737	1,563		412,896	8,693,112	282	246	8,785,694
TOTAL TESTING (tons per year)													1	2	0	1	0	0	3	4	0	3	0	0	10	17	1	14	1	1	14	23	1	18	1	1			4,347	0	0	4,393

Table D-9: Aircraft Emissions – Alternative 1

Type Training	Training Ops (#)	OPERATIONAL INFORMATION - AIRCRAFT													EMISSIONS/YEAR (lb) BY JURISDICTION												EMISSIONS/YEAR (lb) BY JURISDICTION												Training Platform		Annual Fuel Use (total)		GHG Emissions (lb)			
		Aircraft			Time		Altitude		Distribution (%)			Distribution (hr)			State (0-3 nm offshore)						Waters of U S (3-12 nm)						Int Waters (> 12 nm)						Total Emissions															
		Distribution	A/C Sorties (#)	Type	Ave Time on Range (hr)	Total Time on Range (hr)	Time < 3,000 ft (%)	Time < 3,000 ft (hr)	0-3 nm from shore	3-12 nm from Shore	>12 nm from Shore	Total Time 0-3 nm from shore	Total Time 3-12 nm from shore	Total Time >12 nm from shore	CO	NOx	HC	SOx	PM	PM2.5	CO	NOx	HC	SOx	PM	PM2.5	CO	NOx	HC	SOx	PM	PM2.5	CO	NOx	HC	SOx	PM	PM2.5	Engines (#)	Fuel Flow (lb/hr)	Pounds	Gallons	CO_2	N_2O	CH_4	CO_{2-e}
AIR WARFARE																																													
Air Combat Maneuver	3600	1	3600	FA-18E/F	1.0	3600.0	0%	0.0	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	10,338	37216800	5473059	115229780	3738	3256	116,456,977
		1	3600	AV-8B	1.0	3600.0	0%	0.0	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6,000	21600000	3176471	66877412	2170	1890	67,589,656
Air Defense Exercise	100	2	200	FA-18E/F	1.0	200.0	50%	100.0	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	100.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	744	15249	124	414	6782	6104	744	15249	124	414	6782	6104	2	10,338	2067600	304059	6401654	208	181	6,469,832
Air Intercept Control	5300	2	10600	FA-18E/F	1.0	10600.0	50%	5300.0	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	5300.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39450	808173	6575	21917	359432	323488	39450	808173	6575	21917	359432	323488	2	10,338	109582800	16115118	339287687	11007	9588	342,901,099
Gunnery Exercise, A-A (Medium Caliber)	36	1	36	AV-8B	1.0	36.0	0%	0.0	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6,000	216000	31765	668774	22	19	675,897
		1	36	FA-18E/F	1.0	36.0	0%	0.0	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	10,338	372168	54731	1152298	37	33	1,164,570
Missile Exercise, A-A	18	1	18	AV-8B	1.0	18.0	0%	0.0	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6,000	108000	15882	334387	11	9	337,948
		1	18	FA-18E/F	1.0	18.0	0%	0.0	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	10,338	186084	27365	576149	19	16	582,285
Gunnery Exercise, S-A (Large Caliber)	6																																												
Gunnery Exercise, S-A (Medium Caliber)	13																																												
Missile Exercise, S-A	18																																												
STRIKE WARFARE																																													
Bombing Exercise, A-G	2300	1	2300	FA-18E/F	1.0	2300.0	10%	230.0	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	230.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1712	35072	285	951	15598	14038	1712	35072	285	951	15598	14038	2	10,338	23777400	3496676	73619026	2388	2081	74,403,069
Missile Exercise, A-G	115	0.5	58	FA-18E/F	2.0	115.0	10%	11.5	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	11.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86	1754	14	48	780	702	86	1754	14	48	780	702	2	10,338	1188870	174834	3680951	119	104	3,720,153
		0.5	58	SH-60B	2.0	115.0	100%	115.0	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	115.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	863	883	76	55	580	522	863	883	76	55	580	522	2	1200	138000	20294	427272	14	12	431,823
Gunnery Exercise, A-G	96	0.5	48	FA-18E/F	2.0	96.0	10%	9.6	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	9.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71	1464	12	40	651	586	71	1464	12	40	651	586	2	10,338	992448	145948	3072794	100	87	3,105,519
		0.5	48	SH-60B	2.0	96.0	100%	96.0	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	96.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	720	737	63	46	484	435	720	737	63	46	484	435	2	1200	115200	16941	356680	12	10	360,478

Table D-9: Aircraft Emissions – Alternative 1 (continued)

Type Training	Training Ops (#)	OPERATIONAL INFORMATION - AIRCRAFT													EMISSIONS/YEAR (lb) BY JURISDICTION												EMISSIONS/YEAR (lb) BY JURISDICTION												Training Platform		Annual Fuel Use (total)		GHG Emissions (lb)			
		Aircraft			Time		Altitude		Distribution (%)			Distribution (hr)			State (0-3 nm offshore)						Waters of U S (3-12 nm)						Int Waters (> 12 nm)						Total Emissions													
		Distribution	A/C Sorties (#)	Type	Ave Time on Range (hr)	Total Time on Range (hr)	Time < 3,000 ft. (%)	Time <.3,000 ft. (hr)	0-3 nm from shore	3-12 nm from Shore	>12 nm from Shore	Total Time 0-3 nm from shore	Total Time 3-12 nm from shore	Total Time >12 nm from shore	CO	NOx	HC	SOx	PM	PM2.5	CO	NOx	HC	SOx	PM	PM2.5	CO	NOx	HC	SOx	PM	PM2.5	CO	NOx	HC	SOx	PM	PM2.5	Engines (#)	Fuel Flow (lb/hr)	Pounds	Gallons	CO_2	N_2O	CH_4	CO_{2-e}
AMPHIBIOUS WARFARE																																													
Fire Support Exercise - Land-Based target	10																																												
Amphibious Rehearsal, No Landing – Marine Air Ground Task Force	12	4	48.0	CH-53	18.0	864.0	100%	864.0	100%	0%	0%	864.00	0.00	0.00	8215	31164	579	1543	8524	7671	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8215	31164	579	1543	8524	7671	3	4,464	3856896	567191	11941631	387	337	12,068,809
		10	120.0	MV-22	18.0	2160.0	100%	2160.0	100%	0%	0%	2160.00	0.00	0.00	47755	9532	8298	968	4306	3876	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47755	9532	8298	968	4306	3876	2	2240	4838400	711529	14980540	486	423	15,140,083
		2	24.0	UH-1	18.0	432.0	100%	432.0	100%	0%	0%	432.00	0.00	0.00	779	1101	40	93	980	882	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	779	1101	40	93	980	882	2	540	233280	34306	722276	23	20	729,968
		4	48.0	AH-1	18.0	864.0	100%	864.0	100%	0%	0%	864.00	0.00	0.00	7865	3817	400	281	2947	2652	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7865	3817	400	281	2947	2652	2	812	701568	103172	2172178	70	61	2,195,312
		4	48.0	AV-8	18.0	864.0	0%	0.0	100%	0%	0%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6,000	5184000	762353	16050579	521	454	16,221,517
Amphibious Assault Marine Air Ground Task Force	12	4	48.0	CH-53	18.0	864.0	100%	864.0	100%	0%	0%	864.00	0.00	0.00	8215	31164	579	1543	8524	7671	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8215	31164	579	1543	8524	7671	3	4,464	3856896	567191	11941631	387	337	12,068,809
		10	120.0	MV-22	18.0	2160.0	100%	2160.0	100%	0%	0%	2160.00	0.00	0.00	47755	9532	8298	968	4306	3876	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47755	9532	8298	968	4306	3876	2	2240	4838400	711529	14980540	486	423	15,140,083
		2	24.0	UH-1	18.0	432.0	100%	432.0	100%	0%	0%	432.00	0.00	0.00	779	1101	40	93	980	882	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	779	1101	40	93	980	882	2	540	233280	34306	722276	23	20	729,968
		4	48.0	AH-1	18.0	864.0	100%	864.0	100%	0%	0%	864.00	0.00	0.00	7865	3817	400	281	2947	2652	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7865	3817	400	281	2947	2652	2	812	701568	103172	2172178	70	61	2,195,312
		4	48.0	AV-8	18.0	864.0	0%	0.0	100%	0%	0%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6,000	5184000	762353	16050579	521	454	16,221,517
Amphibious Raid - Special Purpose Marine Air Ground Task Force	6	4	24.0	H-53	12.0	288.0	100%	288.0	100%	0%	0%	288.00	0.00	0.00	2738	10388	193	514	2841	2557	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2738	10388	193	514	2841	2557	3	4,464	1285632	189064	3980544	129	112	4,022,936
		10	60.0	MV-22	12.0	720.0	100%	720.0	100%	0%	0%	720.00	0.00	0.00	15918	3177	2766	323	1435	1292	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15918	3177	2766	323	1435	1292	2	2240	1612800	237176	4993513	162	141	5,046,694
		2	12.0	UH-1	12.0	144.0	100%	144.0	100%	0%	0%	144.00	0.00	0.00	260	367	13	31	327	294	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	260	367	13	31	327	294	2	540	77760	11435	240759	8	7	243,323
		4	24.0	AH-1	12.0	288.0	100%	288.0	100%	0%	0%	288.00	0.00	0.00	2622	1272	133	94	982	884	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2622	1272	133	94	982	884	2	812	233856	34391	724059	23	20	731,771
		4	24.0	AV-8	12.0	288.0	0%	0.0	100%	0%	0%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6,000	1728000	254118	5350193	174	151	5,407,172
Non-Combatant Evacuation Operation	5	10	50	MV-22	20.0	1000.0	100%	1000.0	100%	0%	0%	1000.00	0.00	0.00	22109	4413	3842	448	1994	1794	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22109	4413	3842	448	1994	1794	2	2240	2240000	329412	6935435	225	196	7,009,298
		4	20	H-53	20.0	400.0	100%	400.0	100%	0%	0%	400.00	0.00	0.00	3803	14428	268	714	3946	3552	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3803	14428	268	714	3946	3552	3	4,464	1785600	262588	5528533	179	156	5,587,412
		2	10	UH-1	20.0	200.0	100%	200.0	100%	0%	0%	200.00	0.00	0.00	361	510	18	43	454	408	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	361	510	18	43	454	408	2	540	108000	15882	334387	11	9	337,948
		4	20	AH-1	20.0	400.0	100%	400.0	100%	0%	0%	400.00	0.00	0.00	3641	1767	185	130	1364	1228	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3641	1767	185	130	1364	1228	2	812	324800	47765	1005638	33	28	1,016,348
		4	20	AV-8	20.0	400.0	0%	0.0	100%	0%	0%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6,000	2400000	352941	7430824	241	210	7,509,962
Humanitarian Assistance/ Disaster Relief Operations	5	10	50	MV-22	20.0	1000.0	100%	1000.0	100%	0%	0%	1000.00	0.00	0.00	22109	4413	3842	448	1994	1794	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22109	4413	3842	448	1994	1794	2	2240	2240000	329412	6935435	225	196	7,009,298
		4	20	H-53	20.0	400.0	100%	400.0	100%	0%	0%	400.00	0.00	0.00	3803	14428	268	714	3946	3552	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3803	14428	268	714	3946	3552	3	4,464	1785600	262588	5528533	179	156	5,587,412
		2	10	UH-1	20.0	200.0	100%	200.0	100%	0%	0%	200.00	0.00	0.00	361	510	18	43	454	408	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	361	510	18	43	454	408	2	540	108000	15882	334387	11	9	337,948
		4	20	AH-1	20.0	400.0	100%	400.0	100%	0%	0%	400.00	0.00	0.00	3641	1767	185	130	1364	1228	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3641	1767	185	130	1364	1228	2	812	324800	47765	1005638	33	28	1,016,348
		4	20	AV-8	20.0	400.0	0%	0.0	100%	0%	0%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6,000	2400000	352941	7430824	241	210	7,509,962
Unmanned Aerial Vehicle - Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconaissance	100	1	100.0	MQ-4C	4.0	400.0	100%	400.0	100%	0%	0%	400.00	0.00	0.00	840	15536	264	1416	244	220	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	840	15536	264	1416	244	220	1	2,532	1012800	148941	3135808	102	89	3,169,204

Table D-9: Aircraft Emissions – Alternative 1 (continued)

Type Training	Training Ops (#)	OPERATIONAL INFORMATION - AIRCRAFT													EMISSIONS/YEAR (lb) BY JURISDICTION												EMISSIONS/YEAR (lb) BY JURISDICTION												Training Platform		Annual Fuel Use (total)		GHG Emissions (lb)			
		Aircraft			Time		Altitude		Distribution (%)			Distribution (hr)			State (0-3 nm offshore)						Waters of U S (3-12 nm)						Int Waters (> 12 nm)						Total Emissions													
		Distribution	A/C Sorties (#)	Type	Ave Time on Range (hr)	Total Time on Range (hr)	Time < 3,000 ft. (%)	Time < 3,000 ft. (hr)	0-3 nm from shore	3-12 nm from Shore	>12 nm from Shore	Total Time 0-3 nm from shore	Total Time 3-12 nm from shore	Total Time >12 nm from shore	CO	NOx	HC	SOx	PM	PM2.5	CO	NOx	HC	SOx	PM	PM2.5	CO	NOx	HC	SOx	PM	PM2.5	CO	NOx	HC	SOx	PM	PM2.5	Engines (#)	Fuel Flow (lb/hr)	Pounds	Gallons	CO_2	N_2O	CH_4	CO_{2-e}
SURFACE WARFARE																																													
Gunnery Exercise, A-S (Small Caliber) - Ship	321	0.25	80.25	FA-18E/F	2.0	160.5	10%	16.1	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	16.05	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	119	2447	20	66	1088	980	119	2447	20	66	1088	980	2	10,338	1659249	244007	5137328	167	145	5,192,040
		0.75	240.75	SH-60B	2.0	481.5	100%	481.5	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	481.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3611	3698	318	231	2427	2184	3611	3698	318	231	2427	2184	2	1200	577800	84971	1788971	58	51	1,808,023
Gunnery Exercise, A-S (Medium Caliber) - Ship	120	0.25	30	FA-18E/F	2.0	60.0	10%	6.0	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	6.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	915	7	25	407	366	45	915	7	25	407	366	2	10,338	620280	91218	1920496	62	54	1,940,950
		0.75	90	SH-60B	2.0	180.0	100%	180.0	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	180.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1350	1382	119	86	907	816	1350	1382	119	86	907	816	2	1200	216000	31765	668774	22	19	675,897
Missile Exercise (A-S) - Rocket	110	0.33	36.3	FA-18E/F	2.0	72.6	10%	7.3	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	7.26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	1107	9	30	492	443	54	1107	9	30	492	443	2	10,338	750538.8	110373	2323801	75	66	2,348,549
		0.66	72.6	SH-60B	2.0	145.2	100%	145.2	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	145.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1089	1115	96	70	732	659	1089	1115	96	70	732	659	2	1200	174240	25624	539478	18	15	545,223
Missile Exercise (A-S)	10	0.5	5	FA-18E/F	2.0	10.0	10%	1.0	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	1.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	152	1	4	68	61	7	152	1	4	68	61	2	10,338	103380	15203	320083	10	9	323,492
		0.5	5	SH-60B	2.0	10.0	100%	10.0	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	10.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	77	7	5	50	45	75	77	7	5	50	45	2	1200	12000	1765	37154	1	1	37,550
Laser Targeting	600	0.5	300	FA-18E/F	1.0	300.0	10%	30.0	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	30.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	223	4575	37	124	2035	1831	223	4575	37	124	2035	1831	2	10,338	3101400	456088	9602482	312	271	9,704,748
		0.5	300	SH-60B	1.0	300.0	100%	300.0	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	300.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2250	2304	198	144	1512	1361	2250	2304	198	144	1512	1361	2	1200	360000	52941	1114624	36	32	1,126,494
Bombing Exercise (A-S)	37	0.5	19	FA-18E/F	1.0	18.5	10%	1.9	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	1.85	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	282	2	8	125	113	14	282	2	8	125	113	2	10,338	191253	28125	592153	19	17	598,459
		0.5	19	P-3	1.0	18.5	10%	1.9	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	1.85	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	69	5	4	35	32	22	69	5	4	35	32	4	4,800	88800	13059	274940	9	8	277,869
Torpedo Exercise (Submarine to Surface)	0																																												
Missile Exercise (S-S)	19																																												
Sinking Exercise (SINKEX)	1	2	2	FA-18E/F	8.0	16.0	10%	1.6	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	1.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	244	2	7	109	98	12	244	2	7	109	98	2	10,338	165408	24325	512132	17	14	517,587
		1	1	P-3	8.0	8.0	10%	0.8	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	0.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	30	2	2	15	14	10	30	2	2	15	14	4	4,800	38400	5647	118893	4	3	120,159
		1	1	SH-60B	8.0	8.0	100%	8.0	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	8.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	61	5	4	40	36	60	61	5	4	40	36	2	1200	9600	1412	29723	1	1	30,040
Gunnery Exercise (S-S) Boat – Medium-caliber	20																																											
Gunnery Exercise (S-S) Small-caliber	43																																											
Maritime Security Operations (MSO)	40	1	40	SH-60B	4.0	160.0	100%	160.0	100%	0%	0%	160.00	0.00	0.00	1200	1229	106	77	806	726	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1200	1229	106	77	806	726	2	1200	192000	28235	594466	19	17	600,797
ANTI-SUBMARINE WARFARE																																												
Tracking Exercise-Helo	65	3	195	SH-60B	4.0	780.0	100%	780.0	0%	100%	0%	0.00	780.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	5850	5990	515	374	3931	3538	0	0	0	0	0	0	5850	5990	515	374	3931	3538	2	1200	936000	137647	2898021	94	82	2,928,885
Torpedo Exercise-Helo	4	3	12	SH-60B	4.0	48.0	100%	48.0	0%	100%	0%	0.00	48.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	360	369	32	23	242	218	0	0	0	0	0	0	360	369	32	23	242	218	2	1200	57600	8471	178340	6	5	180,239
Tracking Exercise-Maritime Patrol Advanced Extended Echo Ranging Sonobuoys	0	1	0	P-3	6.0	0.0	75%	0.0	0%	100%	0%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4,800	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tracking Exercise - Maritime Patrol Aircraft	36	1	36	P-3	6.0	216.0	75%	162.0	0%	100%	0%	0.00	162.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	1952	6011	451	311	3087	2778	0	0	0	0	0	0	1952	6011	451	311	3087	2778	4	4,800	1036800	152471	3210116	104	91	3,244,303
Torpedo Exercise-Maritime Patrol Aircraft	4	1	4	P-3	6.0	24.0	75%	18.0	0%	100%	0%	0.00	18.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	217	668	50	35	343	309	0	0	0	0	0	0	217	668	50	35	343	309	4	4,800	115200	16941	356680	12	10	360,478
Tracking Exercise –Surface	91																																											
Torpedo Exercise-Surface	4																																											
Tracking Exercise–Submarine	4																																											
Torpedo Exercise – Submarine	6																																											

Table D-9: Aircraft Emissions – Alternative 1 (continued)

Type Training	Training Ops (#)	OPERATIONAL INFORMATION - AIRCRAFT												EMISSIONS/YEAR (lb) BY JURISDICTION										EMISSIONS/YEAR (lb) BY JURISDICTION										Training Platform		Annual Fuel Use (total)		GHG Emissions (lb)			
		Aircraft			Time		Altitude		Distribution (%)			Distribution (hr)		State (0-3 nm offshore)						Waters of U S (3-12 nm)						Int Waters (> 12 nm)						Total Emissions											
		Distribution	A/C Sorties (#)	Type	Ave Time on Range (hr)	Total Time on Range (hr)	Time < 3,000 ft. (%)	Time < 3,000 ft. (hr)	0-3 nm from shore	3-12 nm from Shore	>12 nm from Shore	Total Time 0-3 nm from shore	Total Time 3-12 nm from shore	Total Time >12 nm from shore	CO	NOx	HC	SOx	PM	PM2.5	CO	NOx	HC	SOx	PM	PM2.5	CO	NOx	HC	SOx	PM	PM2.5	CO	NOx	HC	SOx	PM	PM2.5	Engines (#)	Fuel Flow (lb/hr)	Pounds	Gallons	CO_2	N_2O	CH_4	CO_{2-e}
MAJOR TRAINING EVENTS																																									
Joint Expeditionary Exercise	1	48	48	FA-18E/I	8.0	384.0	10%	38.4	0%	100%	0%	0.00	38.40	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	286	5855	48	159	2604	2344	0	0	0	0	0	0	286	5855	48	159	2604	2344	2	10,338	3969792	583793	12291177	399	347	12,422,078
		4	4	EA-6B	8.0	32.0	10%	3.2	0%	100%	0%	0.00	3.20	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	148	165	10	8	73	66	0	0	0	0	0	0	148	165	10	8	73	66	1	6,000	192000	28235	594466	19	17	600,797
		4	4	E-2	8.0	32.0	10%	3.2	0%	100%	0%	0.00	3.20	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	71	3	3	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	71	3	3	7	6	1	1,100	35200	5176	108985	4	3	110,146
		3	3	P-3	8.0	24.0	10%	2.4	0%	100%	0%	0.00	2.40	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	89	7	5	46	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	89	7	5	46	41	4	4,800	115200	16941	356680	12	10	360,478
		6	6	AV-8B	8.0	48.0	10%	4.8	0%	100%	0%	0.00	4.80	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	222	248	16	12	109	98	0	0	0	0	0	0	222	248	16	12	109	98	1	6,000	288000	42353	891699	29	25	901,195
		2	2	C-130	8.0	16.0	10%	1.6	0%	100%	0%	0.00	1.60	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	59	3	3	29	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	59	3	3	29	26	4	4,500	72000	10588	222925	7	6	225,299
		4	4	A-10	8.0	32.0	10%	3.2	0%	100%	0%	0.00	3.20	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	86	4	4	26	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	86	4	4	26	23	2	6,052	193664	28480	599618	19	17	606,004
		1	1	E-3	8.0	8.0	10%	0.8	0%	100%	0%	0.00	0.80	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	221	8	10	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	221	8	10	7	6	4	130,736	1045888	153807	3238254	105	92	3,272,741
		1	1	KC-135	8.0	8.0	10%	0.8	0%	100%	0%	0.00	0.80	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	247	1	7	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	247	1	7	2	2	4	91,552	732416	107708	2267689	74	64	2,291,840
		15	15	SH-60B	8.0	120.0	100%	120.0	0%	100%	0%	0.00	120.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	900	922	79	58	605	544	0	0	0	0	0	0	900	922	79	58	605	544	2	1200	144000	21176	445849	14	13	450,598
		4	4	CH-53	8.0	32.0	100%	32.0	0%	100%	0%	0.00	32.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	304	1154	21	57	316	284	0	0	0	0	0	0	304	1154	21	57	316	284	3	4,464	142848	21007	442283	14	12	446,993
		12	12	CH-46	8.0	96.0	100%	96.0	0%	100%	0%	0.00	96.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	2454	593	380	58	256	231	0	0	0	0	0	0	2454	593	380	58	256	231	2	1200	144000	21176	445849	14	13	450,598
		4	4	AH-1	8.0	32.0	100%	32.0	0%	100%	0%	0.00	32.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	291	141	15	10	109	98	0	0	0	0	0	0	291	141	15	10	109	98	2	812	25984	3821	80451	3	2	81,308
		2	2	UH-1	8.0	16.0	100%	16.0	0%	100%	0%	0.00	16.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	41	1	3	36	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	41	1	3	36	33	2	540	8640	1271	26751	1	1	27,036
		10	10	MV-22	8.0	80.0	100%	80.0	0%	100%	0%	0.00	80.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	1769	353	307	36	159	144	0	0	0	0	0	0	1769	353	307	36	159	144	2	2240	179200	26353	554835	18	16	560,744
Joint Multi-Strike Group Exercise	1	144	144	FA-18E/I	8.0	1152.0	10%	115.2	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	115.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	857	17566	143	476	7813	7031	857	17566	143	476	7813	7031	2	10,338	11909376	1751379	36873530	1196	1042	37,266,233
		12	12	EA-6B	8.0	96.0	10%	9.6	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	9.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	444	495	31	23	219	197	444	495	31	23	219	197	1	6,000	576000	84706	1783398	58	50	1,802,391
		12	12	E-2	8.0	96.0	10%	9.6	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	9.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	212	8	8	20	18	54	212	8	8	20	18	1	1,100	105600	15529	326956	11	9	330,438
		5	5	P-3	8.0	40.0	10%	4.0	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	4.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	148	11	8	76	69	48	148	11	8	76	69	4	4,800	192000	28235	594466	19	17	600,797
		1	1	E-3	8.0	8.0	10%	0.8	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	0.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	221	8	10	7	6	54	221	8	10	7	6	4	130,736	1045888	153807	3238254	105	92	3,272,741
		2	2	KC-135	8.0	16.0	10%	1.6	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	1.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	494	1	15	5	4	49	494	1	15	5	4	4	91,552	1464832	215416	4535378	147	128	4,583,680
		6	6	B-1B	8.0	48.0	10%	4.8	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	4.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	418	4	13	4	4	27	418	4	13	4	4	4	26,560	1274880	187482	3947253	128	112	3,989,292
		24	24	F-15	8.0	192.0	10%	19.2	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	19.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	431	5558	77	48	970	873	431	5558	77	48	970	873	2	6196	1189632	174946	3683311	119	104	3,722,538
		45	45	SH-60B	8.0	360.0	100%	360.0	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	360.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2700	2765	238	173	1814	1633	2700	2765	238	173	1814	1633	2	1200	432000	63529	1337548	43	38	1,351,793
ELECTRONIC WARFARE																																									
Electronic Warfare Operations	522	1	522	FA-18E/I	2.0	1044.0	0%	0.0	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	10,338	10792872	1587187	33416636	1084	944	33,772,523
Flare Exercise	2200	0.9	1980	F-15	3.0	5940.0	0%	0.0	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	6196	36804240	5412388	113952422	3697	3220	115,166,015
		0.06	132	FA-18E/I	3.0	396.0	0%	0.0	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	10,338	4093848	602036	12675276	411	358	12,810,267
		0.04	88	SH-60B	3.0	264.0	100%	264.0	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	264.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1980	2028	174	127	1331	1198	1980	2028	174	127	1331	1198	2	1200	316800	46588	980869	32	28	991,315
Chaff Exercise - Ship	41																																								
Chaff Exercise - Aircraft	2200	0.9	1980	F-15	3.0	5940.0	0%	0.0	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	6196	36804240	5412388	113952422	3697	3220	115,166,015
		0.06	132	FA-18E/I	3.0	396.0	0%	0.0	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	10,338	4093848	602036	12675276	411	358	12,810,267
		0.04	88	SH-60B	3.0	264.0	100%	264.0	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	264.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1980	2028	174	127	1331	1198	1980	2028	174	127	1331	1198	2	1200	316800	46588	980869	32	28	991,315
MINE WARFARE																																									
Mine Laying - Aircraft	4	0.5	2	FA-18E/I	0.5	1.0	0%	0.0	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	10,338	10338	1520	32008	1	1	32,349
		0.5	2	P-3	1.0	2.0	0%	0.0	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4,800	9600	1412	29723	1	1	30,040
																																								0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0
Mine Neutralization – Explosive Ordnance Disposal	20																																								
Limpet Mine Neutralization System/Shock Wave Generator	60																																								
NAVAL SPECIAL WARFARE																																									
Personnel I&E	364	4	1456	H-60	8.0	11648.0	100%	11648.0	100%	0%	0%	11648.00	0.00	0.00	87360	89457	7688	5591	58706	52835	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87360	89457	7688	5591	58706	52835	2	1200	13977600	2055529	43277116	1404	1223	43,738,017
		2	728	MV-22	8.0	5824.0	100%	5824.0	100%	0%	0%	5824.00	0.00	0.00	128762	25700	22373	2609	11611	10450	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	128762	25700	22373	2609	11611	10450	2	2240	13045760	1918494	40391975	1310	1142	40,822,149
Parachute Insertion	64	1	64	C-130	4.0	256.0	100%	256.0	100%	0%	0%	256.00	0.00	0.00	2385	9400	541	461	4573	4116	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2385	9400	541	461	4573	4116	4	4,500	1152000	169412	3566795	116	101	3,604,782
		1	64	CH-46	4.0	256.0	100%	256.0	100%	0%	0%	256.00	0.00	0.00	5235	0	811	123	547	492	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5235	0	811	123	547	492	2	1200	307200	45176	951145	31	27	961,275
		1	64	H-60	4.0	256.0	100%	256.0	100%	0%	0%	256.00	0.00	0.00	1920	1966	169	123	1290	1161	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1920	1966	169	123	1290	1161	2	1200	307200	45176	951145	31	27	961,275

Table D-9: Aircraft Emissions – Alternative 1 (continued)

Type Training	Training Ops (#)	OPERATIONAL INFORMATION - AIRCRAFT													EMISSIONS/YEAR (lb) BY JURISDICTION												EMISSIONS/YEAR (lb) BY JURISDICTION												Training Platform		Annual Fuel Use (total)		GHG Emissions (lb)			
		Aircraft			Time		Altitude		Distribution (%)			Distribution (hr)			State (0-3 nm offshore)						Waters of U S (3-12 nm)						Int Waters (> 12 nm)						Total Emissions														
		Distribution	A/C Sorties (#)	Type	Ave Time on Range (hr)	Total Time on Range (hr)	Time < 3,000 ft. (%)	Time < 3,000 ft. (hr)	0-3 nm from shore	3-12 nm from Shore	>12 nm from Shore	Total Time 0-3 nm from shore	Total Time 3-12 nm from shore	Total Time >12 nm from shore	CO	NOx	HC	SOx	PM	PM2.5	CO	NOx	HC	SOx	PM	PM2.5	CO	NOx	HC	SOx	PM	PM2.5	CO	NOx	HC	SOx	PM	PM2.5	Engines (#)	Fuel Flow (lb/hr)	Pounds	Gallons	CO_2	N_2O	CH_4	CO_{2-e}
OTHER																																													
Surface Ship Sonar Maintenance	44																																												
Submarine Sonar Maintenance	32																																												
Small Boat Attack	18																																												
Sub Navigation / Sub Nav Under Ice	8																																												
Precision Anchoring	18																																												
Intelligence, Surveillance, Reconnaissance	44	1	44.0	MQ-4C	4.0	176.0	100%	176.0	0%	50%	50%	0.00	88.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	185	3418	58	312	54	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	185	3418	58	312	54	48	1	2,532	445632	65534	1379755	45	39	1,394,450
Underwater Survey	32	1	32	SH-60B	2.0	64.0	100%	64.0	100%	0%	0%	64.00	0.00	0.00	480	492	42	31	323	290	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	480	492	42	31	323	290	2	1200	76800	11294	237786	8	7	240,319
Unmanned Underwater Vehicle Training	64																																												
Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Operation	950																																												
TOTAL TRAINING (lbs per year)															**438,775**	**292,444**	**62,357**	**19,831**	**132,713**	**119,442**	**15,145**	**26,700**	**2,009**	**1,487**	**12,041**	**10,837**	**61,211**	**913,723**	**8,847**	**25,306**	**407,937**	**367,144**	**515,130**	**1,232,868**	**73,214**	**46,623**	**552,692**	**497,422**			**405,297,073**	**59,602,511**	**1,254,871,260**	**40,709**	**35,463**	**1,268,235,633**
TOTAL TRAINING (tons per year)															**219**	**146**	**31**	**10**	**66**	**60**	**8**	**13**	**1**	**1**	**6**	**5**	**31**	**457**	**4**	**13**	**204**	**184**	**258**	**616**	**37**	**23**	**276**	**249**			**202,649**	**59,602,511**	**627,436**	**20**	**18**	**634,118**
ANTI-SUBMARINE WARFARE TESTING																																												
Anti-submarine Warfare Tracking Test - MPA	26	1	26	P-3	6.0	156.0	75%	117.0	0%	100%	0%	0.00	117.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	1410	4341	326	225	2230	2007	0	0	0	0	0	0	1410	4341	326	225	2230	2007	4	4,800	748800	110118	2318417	75	66	2,343,108
LIFECYCLE ACTIVITIES TESTING																																												
Littoral Combat Ship (LCS) Mission Package Testing-ASW	2																																											
Ship Signature Testing	40																																											
SURFACE WARFARE / ANTI-SUBMARINE WARFARE TESTING																																												
Torpedo Testing (Explosive and Non-explosive)	6																																												
Countermeasure / Acoustic Systems Testing	2																																												
At-Sea Sonar Testing	27																																												
SHIPBOARD PROTECTION SYSTEMS AND SWIMMER DEFENSE TESTING																																												
Pierside Integrated Swimmer Defense	0																																												
MINE WARFARE TESTING																																												
Mine Detection and Classification Testing	4	1	4	SH-60B	2.0	8.0	100%	8.0	33%	33%	34%	2.64	2.64	2.72	20	20	2	1	13	12	20	20	2	1	13	12	20	21	2	1	14	12	60	61	5	4	40	36	2	1200	9600	1412	29723	1	1	30,040
UNMANNED VEHICLE TESTING																																												
Unmanned Vehicle Development and Payload Testing	0																																												
OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH																																												
North Pacific Acoustic Lab Philippine Sea 2018-19 Experiment (Deep Water)	1																																												
TOTAL TESTING (lbs per year)															**19.8**	**20.3**	**1.7**	**1.3**	**13.3**	**12.0**	**1429.4**	**4361.4**	**327.5**	**225.9**	**2242.9**	**2018.6**	**20.4**	**20.9**	**1.8**	**1.3**	**13.7**	**12.3**	**1469.6**	**4402.6**	**331.0**	**228.5**	**2269.9**	**2042.9**			**758400.0**	**111529.4**	**2348140.2**	**76.2**	**66.4**	**2373147.9**
TOTAL TESTING (tons per year)															**0.0**	**0.0**	**0.0**	**0.0**	**0.0**	**0.0**	**0.7**	**2.2**	**0.2**	**0.1**	**1.1**	**1.0**	**0.0**	**0.0**	**0.0**	**0.0**	**0.0**	**0.0**	**0.7**	**2.2**	**0.2**	**0.1**	**1.1**	**1.0**			**111529.4**	**1174.1**	**0.0**	**0.0**	**1186.6**	

Table D-10: Emissions from Ordnance – Alternative 1

MEM Category	Location	Training MEM	Testing MEM	Emissions (lb/year) Training						Emissions (lb/year) Testing					
		#/yr	#/yr	CO	NOx	VOC	SOx	PM10	PM2.5	CO	NOx	VOC	SOx	PM10	PM2.5
BOMBS															
Bombs (H-E)	MITT	6,454	0	394,551.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Bombs (N-E)	MITT	2,820	0	719.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
PROJECTILES															
Small Caliber	MITT	307,105	0	706.3	29.8	0.0	0.0	15.7	11.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Medium Caliber (H-E)	MITT	22,780	4082	91.1	29.6	0.0	0.0	216.4	116.2	16.3	5.3	0.0	0.0	38.8	20.8
Medium Caliber (N-E)	MITT	218,855	0	569.0	21.2	0.0	0.0	30.6	26.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Large Caliber (H-E)	MITT	5,102	240	653.1	816.3	0.0	0.0	49.0	38.0	30.7	38.4	0.0	0.0	2.3	1.8
Large Caliber (N-E)	MITT	16,370	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Missiles (H-E)	MITT	240	20	7,349.7	8,537.8	0.0	0.0	14,830.8	14,830.8	612.5	711.5	0.0	0.0	1,235.9	1,235.9
Missiles (N-E)	MITT	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Rockets (H-E)	MITT	4,100	16	3,813.0	23.0	0.0	0.0	1,640.0	1,189.0	14.9	0.1	0.0	0.0	6.4	4.6
Rockets (N-E)	MITT	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
COUNTERMEASURES															
Chaff	MITT	17,844	0	1.1	2.7	0.0	0.0	5.0	4.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Flares	MITT	17,600	0	1.0	2.7	0.0	0.0	5.0	4.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
TARGETS															
Airborne targets	MITT	16	0												
Surface targets	MITT	240	0												
Expendable sub-surface targets	MITT	261	0												
TOTAL EMISSIONS (lbs per year)				408,454	9,463	0	0	16,792	16,221	674	755	0	0	1,283	1,263
TOTAL EMISSIONS (tons per year)				204.2	4.7	0.0	0.0	8.4	8.1	0.3	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.6

This page intentionally left blank.

Table D-11: Vessel Emissions – Alternative 2

Type Training	Training Ops (#)	OPERATIONAL INFORMATION - VESSELS										EMISSIONS/YEAR (lb) BY JURISDICTION												EMISSIONS/YEAR (lb) BY JURISDICTION												GHG Emissions (lb)					
		Ship / Vessel / Boat				Range Time (hr)			Distribution (hr)			State (0-3 nm offshore)						Waters of U S (3-12 nm)						Int Waters (> 12 nm)						Total Emissions											
		Number	Ship Type	Type	Participation	Per Ship	Time at Each Power Level (%)	Total	0-3 nm from shore	3-12 nm from shore	>12 nm from shore	CO	NO_x	HC	SO_x	PM_{10}	PM2.5	CO	NO_x	HC	SO_x	PM_{10}	PM2.5	CO	NO_x	HC	SO_x	PM_{10}	PM2.5	CO	NO_x	HC	SO_x	PM_{10}	PM2.5	Fuel Flow (GPH)	Annual Fuel Consumption (gal)	CO_2	N_2O	CH_4	CO_{2-e}
AIR WARFARE																																									
Air Combat Maneuver	3600																																								
Air Defense Exercise	100																																								
Air Intercept Control	5300																																								
Gunnery Exercise, A-A (Medium Caliber)	36																																								
Missile Exercise, A-A	18																																								
Gunnery Exercise, S-A (Large Caliber)	9	18	FFG	Guided Mi	2.00	2.0	100%	36.0	0.0	0.0	36.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,186	1,698	108	1,257	83	75	1,186	1,698	108	1,257	83	75	79	2,844	59,878	2	2	60,515
Gunnery Exercise, S-A (Medium Caliber)	19	38	FFG	Guided Mi	2.00	2.0	100%	76.0	0.0	0.0	76.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,503	3,584	228	2,654	176	158	2,503	3,584	228	2,654	176	158	79	6,004	126,408	4	4	127,754
Missile Exercise, S-A	27	54	FFG	Guided Mi	2.00	2.0	100%	108.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79	0	0	0	0	0
STRIKE WARFARE																																									
Bombing Exercise, A-G	7100																																								
Missile Exercise, A-G	80																																								
Gunnery Exercise, A-G	26																																								
AMPHIBIOUS WARFARE																																									
Fire Support Exercise - Land-Based target	15	15	CG	Cruiser	1	8.0	100%	120.00	120.0	0.0	0.0	7,381	9,550	518	9,316	335	301	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7,381	9,550	518	9,316	335	301	184	22,080	464,872	15	13	469,823
Amphibious Rehearsal, No Landing – Marine Air Ground Task Force	12	48	LSD	Cruiser	4	24.0	100%	1152.0	1152.0	0.0	0.0	24,480	385,356	12,488	40,366	3,122	2,810	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24,480	385,356	12,488	40,366	3,122	2,810	184	1,461,888	30,778,590	998	870	31,106,382
		48	LHA/LHD	Amphib. A	4	24.0	100%	1152.0	1152.0	0.0	0.0	9,308	55,100	6,647	156,096	32,924	29,632	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9,308	55,100	6,647	156,096	32,924	29,632	373	1,461,888	30,778,590	998	870	31,106,382
		48	LPD	Amphibiou	4	24.0	100%	1152.0	1152.0	0.0	0.0	4,009	24,192	2,972	70,065	14,803	13,323	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4,009	24,192	2,972	70,065	14,803	13,323	373	1,461,888	30,778,590	998	870	31,106,382
Amphibious Assault - Marine Air Ground Task Force	12	12	CG	Cruiser	1	8.0	100%	96.0	96.0	0.0	0.0	5,905	7,640	415	7,452	268	241	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5,905	7,640	415	7,452	268	241	184	121,824	2,564,882	83	72	2,592,198
		12	LHA	Amphib. A	1	8.0	100%	96.0	96.0	0.0	0.0	708	4,179	531	12,573	2,524	2,271	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	708	4,179	531	12,573	2,524	2,271	373	121,824	2,564,882	83	72	2,592,198
		24	LPD	Amphibiou	2	8.0	100%	192.0	192.0	0.0	0.0	668	4,032	495	11,677	2,467	2,220	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	668	4,032	495	11,677	2,467	2,220	373	243,648	5,129,765	166	145	5,184,397
		24	FFG	Guided Mi	2	8.0	100%	192.0	192.0	0.0	0.0	6,324	9,055	576	6,705	444	399	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6,324	9,055	576	6,705	444	399	79	243,648	5,129,765	166	145	5,184,397
Amphibious Raid - Special Purpose Marine Air Ground Task Force	6	6	LHA	Amphib. A	1	6.0	100%	36.0	36.0	0.0	0.0	266	1,567	199	4,715	946	852	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	266	1,567	199	4,715	946	852	373	45,684	961,831	31	27	972,074
		12	LPD	Amphibiou	2	2.5	100%	30.0	30.0	0.0	0.0	104	630	77	1,825	386	347	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	104	630	77	1,825	386	347	373	38,070	801,526	26	23	810,062
Non-Combatant Evacuation Operation	5	5	LHA	Amphib. A	1	80.0	100%	400.0	400.0	0.0	0.0	2,952	17,412	2,212	52,388	10,516	9,464	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,952	17,412	2,212	52,388	10,516	9,464	373	149,200	3,141,257	102	89	3,174,711
		10	LPD	Amphibiou	2	80.0	100%	800.0	800.0	0.0	0.0	2,784	16,800	2,064	48,656	10,280	9,252	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,784	16,800	2,064	48,656	10,280	9,252	373	298,400	6,282,514	204	178	6,349,422
		5	LCU	Landing C	1	80.0	100%	400.0	400.0	0.0	0.0	7,328	45,812	1,396	21,844	2,056	1,850	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7,328	45,812	1,396	21,844	2,056	1,850	611	244,400	5,145,598	167	145	5,200,398
Humanitarian Assistance/ Disaster Relief Operations	5	5	LHA	Amphib. A	1	8.0	100%	40.0	40.0	0.0	0.0	295	1,741	221	5,239	1,052	946	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	295	1,741	221	5,239	1,052	946	373	50,760	1,068,701	35	30	1,080,083
		10	LPD	Amphibiou	2	8.0	100%	80.0	80.0	0.0	0.0	278	1,680	206	4,866	1,028	925	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	278	1,680	206	4,866	1,028	925	373	101,520	2,137,402	69	60	2,160,165
		5	LCAC	Landing C	1	8.0	100%	40.0	40.0	0.0	0.0	733	4,581	140	2,184	206	185	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	733	4,581	140	2,184	206	185	611	50,760	1,068,701	35	30	1,080,083
Unmanned Aerial Vehicle - Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconaissance	100																																								

Table D-11: Vessel Emissions – Alternative 2 (continued)

Type Training	Training Ops (#)	OPERATIONAL INFORMATION - VESSELS										EMISSIONS/YEAR (lb) BY JURISDICTION												EMISSIONS/YEAR (lb) BY JURISDICTION												GHG Emissions (lb)					
		Ship / Vessel / Boat				Range Time (hr)			Distribution (hr)			State (0-3 nm offshore)						Waters of U S (3-12 nm)						Int Waters (> 12 nm)						Total Emissions											
		Number	Ship Type	Type	Participation	Per Ship	Time at Each Power Level (%)	Total	0-3 nm from shore	3-12 nm from shore	>12 nm from shore	CO	NO_x	HC	SO_x	PM_{10}	PM2.5	CO	NO_x	HC	SO_x	PM_{10}	PM2.5	CO	NO_x	HC	SO_x	PM_{10}	PM2.5	CO	NO_x	HC	SO_x	PM_{10}	PM2.5	Fuel Flow (GPH)	Annual Fuel Consumption (gal)	CO_2	N_2O	CH_4	CO_{2-e}
SURFACE WARFARE																																								
Gunnery Exercise, A-S (Small Caliber) - Ship	220																																							
Gunnery Exercise, A-S (Medium Caliber) - Ship	295																																							
Missile Exercise (A-S) - Rocket	10																																							
Missile Exercise (A-S)	20																																							
Laser Targeting	60																																							
Bombing Exercise (A-S)	37																																							
Torpedo Exercise (Submarine to Surface)	0																																							
Missile Exercise (S-S)	12	24	FFG	Guided Mi	2.00	2.0	100%	48.0	0.0	0.0	48.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,581	2,264	144	1,676	111	100	1,581	2,264	144	1,676	111	100	79	3,792	79,837	3	2	80,687
Gunner Exercise (Surface-to-Surface) Ship – Large-caliber	140	30.8	CG	Cruiser	0.22	2.5	100%	77.00	0.0	21.6	55.4	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,326	1,716	93	1,674	60	54	3,410	4,412	240	4,304	155	139	4,736	6,128	333	5,978	215	193	184	14,168	298,293	10	8	301,470
		63	DDG		0.45	2.5	100%	157.5	0.0	44.1	113.4	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,653	5,050	177	3,904	161	144	6,822	12,987	455	10,039	413	371	9,475	18,037	632	13,943	573	516	187	29,453	620,093	20	18	626,697
		21	FFG	Guided Mi	0.15	2.5	100%	52.5	0.0	14.7	37.8	0	0	0	0	0	0	484	693	44	513	34	31	1,245	1,783	113	1,320	87	79	1,729	2,476	158	1,833	121	109	79	4,148	87,321	3	2	88,251
		16.8	USCG	US Coast	0.12	2.5	100%	42.0	0.0	11.8	30.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	681	10	136	2	2	174	1,751	27	349	6	6	241	2,432	37	485	9	8	66	2,772	58,362	2	2	58,983
Gunner Exercise (Surface-to-Surface) Ship – Medium-caliber	100	22	CG	Cruiser	0.22	2.5	100%	55.00	0.0	15.4	39.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	947	1,226	67	1,196	43	39	2,436	3,151	171	3,074	110	99	3,383	4,377	238	4,270	153	138	184	10,120	213,066	7	6	215,336
		45	DDG		0.45	2.5	100%	112.5	0.0	31.5	81.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,895	3,607	126	2,789	115	103	4,873	9,276	325	7,171	295	265	6,768	12,884	451	9,960	410	369	187	21,038	442,924	14	13	447,641
		15	FFG	Guided Mi	0.15	2.5	100%	37.5	0.0	10.5	27.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	346	495	32	367	24	22	889	1,273	81	943	62	56	1,235	1,769	113	1,310	87	78	79	2,963	62,372	2	2	63,037
		1	LPD	Amphibiou	0.01	2.5	100%	2.5	0.0	0.7	1.8	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	2	43	9	8	6	38	5	109	23	21	9	53	6	152	32	29	373	933	19,633	1	1	19,842
		12	USCG	US Coast	0.12	2.5	100%	30.0	0.0	8.4	21.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	486	7	97	2	2	124	1,251	19	249	5	4	172	1,737	26	347	6	6	66	1,980	41,687	1	1	42,131
Sinking Exercise (SINKEX)	2	10	FFG	Guided Mi	5.00	16.0	100%	160.0	0.0	0.0	160.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5,270	7,546	480	5,587	370	333	5,270	7,546	480	5,587	370	333	79	12,640	266,123	9	8	268,957
Gunnery Exercise (S-S) Boat – Medium-caliber	10	50	FFG	Guided Mi	5.00	3.0	100%	150.0	0.0	0.0	150.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4,941	7,074	450	5,238	347	312	4,941	7,074	450	5,238	347	312	79	11,850	249,490	8	7	252,147
Gunnery Exercise (S-S) Small-caliber	40	80	CRRC	Combat R	2	3.0	100%	240.0	0.0	0.0	240.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	3,096	0	0	0	0	36	3,096	0	0	0	3	720	15,159	0	0	15,320
Maritime Security Operations (MSO)	8	8	FFG	Guided Mi	1	8.0	100%	64.0	0.0	0.0	64.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,108	3,018	192	2,235	148	133	2,108	3,018	192	2,235	148	133	79	5,056	106,449	3	3	107,583
		8	RHIB	Rigid Hulle	1	8.0	100%	64.0	0.0	0.0	64.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	21.8	585.0	3.8	92.2	9.6	9	22	585	4	92	10	9	14	896	18,864	1	1	19,065
		8	CRRC	Combat R	1	8.0	100%	64.0	0.0	0.0	64.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	826	0	0	0	0	10	826	0	0	0	3	192	4,042	0	0	4,085
ANTI-SUBMARINE WARFARE																																								
Tracking Exercise-Helo	65																																							
Torpedo Exercise-Helo	6																																							
Tracking Exercise-Maritime Patrol Advanced Extended Echo Ranging Sonobuoys	0																																							
Tracking Exercise -Maritime Patrol Aircraft	36																																							
Torpedo Exercise-Maritime Patrol Aircraft	6																																							
Tracking Exercise –Surface	91	91	FFG	Guided Mi	1	2.0	100%	182.0	0.0	91.0	91.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,998	4,292	273	3,178	210	189	2,998	4,292	273	3,178	210	189	5,995	8,583	546	6,355	420	378	79	14,378	302,714	10	9	305,938
Torpedo Exercise-Surface	6	6	FFG	Guided Mi	1	2.0	100%	12.0	0.0	6.0	6.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	198	283	18	210	14	12	198	283	18	210	14	12	395	566	36	419	28	25	79	948	19,959	1	1	20,172
Tracking Exercise– Submarine	4																																							
Torpedo Exercise – Submarine	9																																							

Table D-11: Vessel Emissions – Alternative 2 (continued)

Type Training	Training Ops (#)	OPERATIONAL INFORMATION - VESSELS										EMISSIONS/YEAR (lb) BY JURISDICTION												EMISSIONS/YEAR (lb) BY JURISDICTION												GHG Emissions (lb)					
		Ship / Vessel / Boat				Range Time (hr)			Distribution (hr)			State (0-3 nm offshore)						Waters of U S (3-12 nm)						Int Waters (> 12 nm)						Total Emissions											
		Number	Ship Type	Type	Participation	Per Ship	Time at Each Power Level (%)	Total	0-3 nm from shore	3-12 nm from shore	>12 nm from shore	CO	NO_x	HC	SO_x	PM_{10}	PM2.5	CO	NO_x	HC	SO_x	PM_{10}	PM2.5	CO	NO_x	HC	SO_x	PM_{10}	PM2.5	CO	NO_x	HC	SO_x	PM_{10}	PM2.5	Fuel Flow (GPH)	Annual Fuel Consumption (gal)	CO_2	N_2O	CH_4	CO_{2-e}
MAJOR TRAINING EXERCISES																																									
Joint Expeditionary Exercise	1	1.0	CVN	Nuclear C	1	80.0	100%	80.0	0.0	80.0	0.0																														
		1.0	CG		1	80.0	100%	80.0	0.0	80.0	0.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4,921	6,366	346	6,210	223	201	0	0	0	0	0	0	4,921	6,366	346	6,210	223	201	184	14,720	309,915	10	9	313,215
		2.0	FFG		2	80.0	100%	160.0	0.0	160.0	0.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5,270	7,546	480	5,587	370	333	0	0	0	0	0	0	5,270	7,546	480	5,587	370	333	79	12,640	266,123	9	8	268,957
		5.0	DDG		5	80.0	100%	400.0	0.0	400.0	0.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24,064	45,808	1,604	35,412	1,456	1,310	0	0	0	0	0	0	24,064	45,808	1,604	35,412	1,456	1,310	187	74,800	1,574,839	51	45	1,591,611
		1.0	LHD/LHA		1	80.0	100%	80.0	0.0	80.0	0.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	590	3,482	442	10,478	2,103	1,893	0	0	0	0	0	0	590	3,482	442	10,478	2,103	1,893	373	29,840	628,251	20	18	634,942
		2.0	LSD		2	80.0	100%	160.0	0.0	160.0	0.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,293	7,653	923	21,680	4,573	4,116	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,293	7,653	923	21,680	4,573	4,116	373	59,680	1,256,503	41	36	1,269,884
		1.0	LPD		1	80.0	100%	80.0	0.0	80.0	0.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	278	1,680	206	4,866	1,028	925	0	0	0	0	0	0	278	1,680	206	4,866	1,028	925	373	29,840	628,251	20	18	634,942
		1.0	TAOE		1	80.0	100%	80.0	0.0	80.0	0.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8,781	24,905	848	9,599	833	750	0	0	0	0	0	0	8,781	24,905	848	9,599	833	750	1,865	149,200	3,141,257	102	89	3,174,711
		1.0	SSN	Nuclear C	1	80.0	100%	80.0	0.0	80.0	0.0																														
		1.0	SSGN	Nuclear C	1	80.0	100%	80.0	0.0	80.0	0.0																														
		2.0	T-AGO(LFA)		2	80.0	100%	160.0	0.0	160.0	0.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,067	6,299	800	19,109	3,803	3,423	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,067	6,299	800	19,109	3,803	3,423	1,865	298,400	6,282,514	204	178	6,349,422
		1.0	CG-PARTNER		1	80.0	100%	80.0	0.0	80.0	0.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8,623	3,768	792	1,680	208	187	0	0	0	0	0	0	8,623	3,768	792	1,680	208	187	184	14,720	309,915	10	9	313,215
		2.0	DDG-PARTNER		2	80.0	100%	160.0	0.0	160.0	0.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16,638	7,984	1,440	2,864	400	360	0	0	0	0	0	0	16,638	7,984	1,440	2,864	400	360	187	29,920	629,936	20	18	636,644
		1.0	SS-PARTNER		1	80.0	100%	80.0	0.0	80.0	0.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	235	1,386	176	4,169	837	753	0	0	0	0	0	0	235	1,386	176	4,169	837	753	373	29,840	628,251	20	18	634,942
		5.0	LCAC		5	80.0	100%	400.0	0.0	400.0	0.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7,328	45,812	1,396	21,844	2,056	1,850	0	0	0	0	0	0	7,328	45,812	1,396	21,844	2,056	1,850	611	507,600	10,687,010	347	302	10,800,827
		2.0	LCU		2	80.0	100%	160.0	0.0	160.0	0.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,931	18,325	558	8,738	822	740	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,931	18,325	558	8,738	822	740	611	97,760	2,058,239	67	58	2,080,159
		19.0	CRRC		19	80.0	100%	1520.0	0.0	1520.0	0.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	226	19,610	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	226	19,610	0	0	0	3	4,560	96,006	3	3	97,029
		2.0	RHIB		2	80.0	100%	160.0	0.0	160.0	0.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	1,462	10	230	24	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	1,462	10	230	24	22	373	59,680	1,256,503	41	36	1,269,884
		14.0	AAV		14	80.0	100%	1120.0	0.0	1120.0	0.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	851	6,966	918	1,400	291	262	0	0	0	0	0	0	851	6,966	918	1,400	291	262	3	3,360	70,741	2	2	71,495
Joint Multi-Strike Group Exercise	1	3.0	CVN		3	80.0	100%	240.0	0.0	0.0	240.0																														
		3.0	CG		3	80.0	100%	240.0	0.0	0.0	240.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14,762	19,099	1,037	18,631	670	603	184	44,160	929,745	30	26	939,646
		3.0	FFG		3	80.0	100%	240.0	0.0	0.0	240.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7,906	11,318	720	8,381	554	499	79	18,960	399,184	13	11	403,435
		12.0	DDG		12	80.0	100%	960.0	0.0	0.0	960.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57,754	109,939	3,850	84,989	3,494	3,145	187	179,520	3,779,614	123	107	3,819,867
		3.0	TAOE		3	80.0	100%	240.0	0.0	0.0	240.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26,342	74,714	2,544	28,798	2,498	2,249	1,865	447,600	9,423,770	306	266	9,524,134
		5.0	SSN		5	80.0	100%	400.0	0.0	0.0	400.0																														
		2.0	T-AGO(LFA)		2	80.0	100%	160.0	0.0	0.0	160.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,067	6,299	800	19,109	3,803	3,423	1,865	298,400	6,282,514	204	178	6,349,422
		1.0	SS-PARTNER		1	80.0	100%	80.0	0.0	0.0	80.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	235	1,386	176	4,169	837	753	373	29,840	628,251	20	18	634,942
ELECTRONIC WARFARE																																									
Electronic Warfare Operations	522	522	FFG	Guided Mi	1	4	100%	2088.0	0.0	0.0	2088.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68,779	98,470	6,264	72,913	4,823	4,341	68,779	98,470	6,264	72,913	4,823	4,341	79	164,952	3,472,899	113	98	3,509,886
Flare Exercise	2200																																								
Chaff Exercise - Ship	60	60	FFG	Guided Mi	1	4	100%	240.0	0.0	0.0	240.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7,906	11,318	720	8,381	554	499	7,906	11,318	720	8,381	554	499	79	18,960	399,184	13	11	403,435
Chaff Exercise - Aircraft	2200																																								
MINE WARFARE																																									
Civilian Port Defense	1	1	RHIB	Rigid Hulle	1	24.0	100%	24.0	24.0	0.0	0.0	8.2	219.4	1.4	34.6	3.6	3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	8	219	1	35	4	3	0	336	7,074	0	0	7,149
Mine Laying - Aircraft	4																																								
Mine Neutralization – Explosive Ordnance Disposal	20	60	RHIB	Rigid Hulle	3	12.0	100%	720.0	720.0	0.0	0.0	244.8	6580.8	43.2	1036.8	108.0	97	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	245	6,581	43	1,037	108	97	66	47,520	1,000,486	32	28	1,011,141
Limpet Mine Neutralization System/Shock Wave Generator	40	40	RHIB	Rigid Hulle	1	4.0	100%	160.0	160.0	0.0	0.0	54.4	1462.4	9.6	230.4	24.0	22	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	54	1,462	10	230	24	22	14	2,240	47,161	2	1	47,663
NAVAL SPECIAL WARFARE																																									
Personnel I&E	364	1820	RHIB	Rigid Hulle	5	8.0	100%	14560.0	14560.0	0.0	0.0	4950.4	133078.4	873.6	20966.4	2184.0	1,966	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	4,950	133,078	874	20,966	2,184	1,966	48	698,880	14,714,220	477	416	14,870,926
		2184	CRRC	Combat R	6	8.0	100%	17472.0	17472.0	0.0	0.0	0	2,595	225,414	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,595	225,414	0	0	0	3	52,416	1,103,566	36	31	1,115,319
Parachute Insertion	64																																								

Table D-11: Vessel Emissions – Alternative 2 (continued)

Type Training	Training Ops (#)	OPERATIONAL INFORMATION - VESSELS										EMISSIONS/YEAR (lb) BY JURISDICTION												EMISSIONS/YEAR (lb) BY JURISDICTION												GHG Emissions (lb)					
		Ship / Vessel / Boat				Range Time (hr)			Distribution (hr)			State (0-3 nm offshore)						Waters of U S (3-12 nm)						Int Waters (> 12 nm)						Total Emissions											
		Number	Ship Type	Type	Participation	Per Ship	Time at Each Power Level (%)	Total	0-3 nm from shore	3-12 nm from shore	>12 nm from shore	CO	NO_x	HC	SO_x	PM_{10}	PM2.5	CO	NO_x	HC	SO_x	PM_{10}	PM2.5	CO	NO_x	HC	SO_x	PM_{10}	PM2.5	CO	NO_x	HC	SO_x	PM_{10}	PM2.5	Fuel Flow (GPH)	Annual Fuel Consumption (gal)	CO_2	N_2O	CH_4	CO_{2-e}
OTHER																																								
Surface Ship Sonar Maintenance	44	44	FFG	Guided Mi	1	4.0	100%	176.0	176.0	0.0	0.0	5,797	8,300	528	6,146	407	366	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5,797	8,300	528	6,146	407	366	79	13,904	292,735	9	8	295,852
Submarine Sonar Maintenance	32																																								
Small Boat Attack	27	27	CRRC	Combat R	1	4.0	100%	108.0	0.0	108.0	0.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	1,393	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	1,393	0	0	0	3	324	6,821	0	0	6,894
Sub Navigation / Sub Nav Under Ice	8																																								
Precision Anchoring	18	18	FFG	Guided Mi	1	4.0	100%	72.0	72.0	0.0	0.0	2,372	3,396	216	2,514	166	150	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,372	3,396	216	2,514	166	150	79	5,688	119,755	4	3	121,031
Direct Action (TAC-P)□	30																																								
Underwater Demolition Qualifications	30	30	CRRC	Combat R	1	8.0	100%	240.0	0.0	240.0	0.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	3,096	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	3,096	0	0	0	3	720	15,159	0	0	15,320
Intelligence, Surveillance, Reconnaissance	44																																								
Underwater Survey	32	96	RHIB	Rigid Hulle	3	8.0	100%	768.0	768.0	0.0	0.0	261.1	7019.5	46.1	1105.9	115.2	104	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	261	7,020	46	1,106	115	104	48	36,864	776,135	25	22	784,400
		96	CRRC	Combat R	3	8.0	100%	768.0	768.0	0.0	0.0	0	114	9,908	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	114	9,908	0	0	0	3	2,304	48,508	2	1	49,025
Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Operation	950																																								
Unmanned Underwater Vehicle Training	64																																								
Search and Rescue At Sea	45																																								
TOTAL TRAINING (lbs per year)									**38,136**	**5,687**	**6,050**	**94,390**	**792,565**	**273,202**	**603,139**	**110,685**	**99,617**	**86,879**	**198,805**	**35,431**	**170,591**	**21,996**	**19,797**	**206,338**	**367,585**	**22,511**	**281,238**	**21,530**	**19,377**	**362,654**	**915,048**	**306,053**	**828,914**	**109,079**	**98,171**		**6,518,690**	**137,244,499**	**4,452**	**6,121**	**218,775,098**
TOTAL TRAINING (tons per year)												**47**	**396**	**137**	**302**	**55**	**50**	**43**	**99**	**18**	**85**	**11**	**10**	**103**	**184**	**11**	**141**	**11**	**10**	**181**	**458**	**153**	**414**	**55**	**49**			**68,622**	**2**	**3**	**109,388**
ANTI-SUBMARINE WARFARE TESTING																																								
Anti-submarine Warfare Tracking Test - MPA	8																																								
LIFECYCLE ACTIVITIES TESTING																																								
Littoral Combat Ship (LCS) Mission Package Testing-ASW	2	2	LCS		1	60.0	100%	120.0	0.0	120.0	0.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,953	5,659	360	4,190	277	249	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,953	5,659	360	4,190	277	249	79	152,280	3,206,103	104	91	3,240,248
Ship Signature Testing	40	40	FFG	Guided Mi	1	4.0	100%	160.0	52.8	52.8	54.4	1,739	2,490	158	1,844	122	110	1,739	2,490	158	1,844	122	110	1,792	2,566	163	1,900	126	113	5,270	7,546	480	5,587	370	333	79	203,040	4,274,804	139	121	4,320,331
SURFACE WARFARE / ANTI-SUBMARINE WARFARE TESTING																																								
Torpedo Testing (Explosive and Non-explosive)	6	18.0	DDG		3	4.0	100%	72.0	0.0	0.0	72.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4,332	8,245	289	6,374	262	236	4,332	8,245	289	6,374	262	236	187	13,464	283,471	9	8	286,490
Countermeasure / Acoustic Systems Testing	3	6.0	DDG		2	2.0	100%	12.0	6.0	6.0	0.0	361	687	24	531	22	20	361	687	24	531	22	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	722	1,374	48	1,062	44	39	187	2,244	47,245	2	1	47,748
At-Sea Sonar Testing	30	120.0	SSN	Nuclear C	4	2.0	100%	240.0	0.0	0.0	240.0																														
		30.0	CG		1	2.0	100%	60.0	0.0	0.0	60.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,691	4,775	259	4,658	167	151	3,691	4,775	259	4,658	167	151	184	11,040	232,436	8	7	234,912
		120.0	DDG		4	2.0	100%	240.0	0.0	0.0	240.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14,438	27,485	962	21,247	874	786	14,438	27,485	962	21,247	874	786	187	44,880	944,904	31	27	954,967
SHIPBOARD PROTECTION SYSTEMS AND SWIMMER DEFENSE TESTING																																								
Pierside Integrated Swimmer Defense	0	0	FFG	Guided Mi	1	8.0	100%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79	0	0	0	0	0
MINE WARFARE TESTING																																								
Mine Detection and Classification Testing	2	2	FFG	Guided Mi	1	4	100%	8.0	2.6	2.6	2.7	87	125	8	92	6	5	87	125	8	92	6	5	90	128	8	95	6	6	264	377	24	279	18	17	79	632	13,306	0	0	13,448
UNMANNED VEHICLE TESTING																																								
Unmanned Vehicle Development and Payload Testing	0																																								
OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH																																								
North Pacific Acoustic Lab Philippine Sea 2018-19 Experiment (Deep Water)	1																																								
TOTAL TESTING (lbs per year)									**61**	**181**	**669**	**2,187**	**3,302**	**190**	**2,467**	**150**	**135**	**6,140**	**8,961**	**550**	**6,658**	**427**	**384**	**24,342**	**43,199**	**1,682**	**34,274**	**1,435**	**1,292**	**32,669**	**55,461**	**2,422**	**43,398**	**2,012**	**1,811**		**427,580**	**9,002,269**	**292**	**254**	**9,098,143**
TOTAL TESTING (tons per year)												**1**	**2**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**3**	**4**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**12**	**22**	**1**	**17**	**1**	**1**	**16**	**28**	**1**	**22**	**1**	**1**			**4,501**	**0**	**0**	**4,549**

Table D-12: Aircraft Emissions – Alternative 2

Type Training	Training Ops (#)	OPERATIONAL INFORMATION - AIRCRAFT													EMISSIONS/YEAR (lb) BY JURISDICTION												EMISSIONS/YEAR (lb) BY JURISDICTION												Training Platform Information			Annual Fuel Use (total)		GHG Emissions (lb)			
		Aircraft			Time		Altitude		Distribution (%)			Distribution (hr)			State (0-3 nm offshore)						Waters of U S (3-12 nm)						Int Waters (> 12 nm)						Total Emissions																	
		Distribution	A/C Sorties (#)	Type	Ave Time on Range (hr)	Total Time on Range (hr)	Time < 3,000 ft (%)	Time < 3,000 ft (hr)	0-3 nm from shore	3-12 nm from Shore	>12 nm from Shore	Total Time 0-3 nm from shore	Total Time 3-12 nm from shore	Total Time >12 nm from shore	CO	NOx	HC	SOx	PM	PM2.5	CO	NOx	HC	SOx	PM	PM2.5	CO	NOx	HC	SOx	PM	PM2.5	CO	NOx	HC	SOx	PM	PM2.5	Engine Model	Engines (#)	Fuel Flow (lb/hr)	Pounds	Gallons	CO_2	N_2O	CH_4	CO_{2-e}
AIR WARFARE																																															
Air Combat Maneu	3600	1	3600	FA-18E/F	1.0	3600.0	0%	0.0	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	F414-GE-4	2	10,338	37216800	5473059	115229780	3738	3256	116,456,977
		1	3600	AV-8B	1.0	3600.0	0%	0.0	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	F402-RR-4	1	6,000	21600000	3176471	66877412	2170	1890	67,589,656
Air Defense Exerci	100	2	200	FA-18E/F	1.0	200.0	50%	100.0	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	100.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	744	15249	124	414	6782	6104	744	15249	124	414	6782	6104	F414-GE-4	2	10,338	2067600	304059	6401654	208	181	6,469,832
Air Intercept Contr	5300	2	10600	FA-18E/F	1.0	10600.0	50%	5300.0	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	5300.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39450	808173	6575	21917	359432	323488	39450	808173	6575	21917	359432	323488	F414-GE-4	2	10,338	109582800	16115118	339287687	11007	9588	342,901,099
Gunnery Exercise, A-A (Medium Caliber)	36	1	36	AV-8B	1.0	36.0	0%	0.0	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	F402-RR-4	1	6,000	216000	31765	668774	22	19	675,897
		1	36	FA-18E/F	1.0	36.0	0%	0.0	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	F414-GE-4	2	10,338	372168	54731	1152298	37	33	1,164,570
Missile Exercise, A	18	1	18	AV-8B	1.0	18.0	0%	0.0	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	F402-RR-4	1	6,000	108000	15882	334387	11	9	337,948
		1	18	FA-18E/F	1.0	18.0	0%	0.0	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	F414-GE-4	2	10,338	186084	27365	576149	19	16	582,285
Gunnery Exercise, S-A (Large Caliber)	9																																													
Gunnery Exercise, S-A (Medium Caliber)	19																																													
Missile Exercise, S-A	27																																													
STRIKE WARFARE																																														
Bombing Exercise, A-G	2300	1	2300	FA-18E/F	1.0	2300.0	10%	230.0	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	230.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1712	35072	285	951	15598	14038	1712	35072	285	951	15598	14038	F414-GE-4	2	10,338	23777400	3496676	73619026	2388	2081	74,403,069
Missile Exercise, A-G	115	0.5	58	FA-18E/F	2.0	115.0	10%	11.5	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	11.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86	1754	14	48	780	702	86	1754	14	48	780	702	F414-GE-4	2	10,338	1188870	174834	3680951	119	104	3,720,153
		0.5	58	SH-60B	2.0	115.0	100%	115.0	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	115.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	863	883	76	55	580	522	863	883	76	55	580	522	T700-GE-4	2	1200	138000	20294	427272	14	12	431,823
Gunnery Exercise, A-G	96	0.5	48	FA-18E/F	2.0	96.0	10%	9.6	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	9.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71	1464	12	40	651	586	71	1464	12	40	651	586	F414-GE-4	2	10,338	992448	145948	3072794	100	87	3,105,519
		0.5	48	SH-60B	2.0	96.0	100%	96.0	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	96.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	720	737	63	46	484	435	720	737	63	46	484	435	T700-GE-4	2	1200	115200	16941	356680	12	10	360,478

Table D-12: Aircraft Emissions – Alternative 2 (continued)

Type Training	Training Ops (#)	OPERATIONAL INFORMATION - AIRCRAFT													EMISSIONS/YEAR (lb) BY JURISDICTION												EMISSIONS/YEAR (lb) BY JURISDICTION												Training Platform Information			Annual Fuel Use (total)		GHG Emissions (lb)			
		Aircraft			Time		Altitude		Distribution (%)			Distribution (hr)			State (0-3 nm offshore)						Waters of U S (3-12 nm)						Int Waters (> 12 nm)						Total Emissions															
		Distribution	A/C Sorties (#)	Type	Ave Time on Range (hr)	Total Time on Range (hr)	Time < 3,000 ft (%)	Time < 3,000 ft (hr)	0-3 nm from shore	3-12 nm from Shore	>12 nm from Shore	Total Time 0-3 nm from shore	Total Time 3-12 nm from shore	Total Time >12 nm from shore	CO	NOx	HC	SOx	PM	PM2.5	CO	NOx	HC	SOx	PM	PM2.5	CO	NOx	HC	SOx	PM	PM2.5	CO	NOx	HC	SOx	PM	PM2.5	Engine Model	Engines (#)	Fuel Flow (lb/hr)	Pounds	Gallons	CO_2	N_2O	CH_4	CO_{2-e}
AMPHIBIOUS WARFARE																																														
Fire Support Exercise - Land-Based target	10																																													
Amphibious Rehearsal, No Landing – Marine Air Ground Task Force	12	4	48.0	CH-53	18.0	864.0	100%	864.0	100%	0%	0%	864.00	0.00	0.00	8215	31164	579	1543	8524	7671	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8215	31164	579	1543	8524	7671	T64-GE-41	3	4,464	3856896	567191	11941631	387	337	12,068,809
		10	120.0	MV-22	18.0	2160.0	100%	2160.0	100%	0%	0%	2160.00	0.00	0.00	47755	9532	8298	968	4306	3876	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47755	9532	8298	968	4306	3876		2	2240	4838400	711529	14980540	486	423	15,140,083
		2	24.0	UH-1	18.0	432.0	100%	432.0	100%	0%	0%	432.00	0.00	0.00	779	1101	40	93	980	882	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	779	1101	40	93	980	882	T400-CP-4	2	540	233280	34306	722276	23	20	729,968
		4	48.0	AH-1	18.0	864.0	100%	864.0	100%	0%	0%	864.00	0.00	0.00	7865	3817	400	281	2947	2652	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7865	3817	400	281	2947	2652	T700-GE-4	2	812	701568	103172	2172178	70	61	2,195,312
		4	48.0	AV-8	18.0	864.0	0%	0.0	100%	0%	0%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	F402-RR-4	1	6,000	5184000	762353	16050579	521	454	16,221,517
Amphibious Assault - Marine Air Ground Task Force	12	4	48.0	CH-53	18.0	864.0	100%	864.0	100%	0%	0%	864.00	0.00	0.00	8215	31164	579	1543	8524	7671	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8215	31164	579	1543	8524	7671	T64-GE-41	3	4,464	3856896	567191	11941631	387	337	12,068,809
		10	120.0	MV-22	18.0	2160.0	100%	2160.0	100%	0%	0%	2160.00	0.00	0.00	47755	9532	8298	968	4306	3876	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47755	9532	8298	968	4306	3876		2	2240	4838400	711529	14980540	486	423	15,140,083
		2	24.0	UH-1	18.0	432.0	100%	432.0	100%	0%	0%	432.00	0.00	0.00	779	1101	40	93	980	882	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	779	1101	40	93	980	882	T400-CP-4	2	540	233280	34306	722276	23	20	729,968
		4	48.0	AH-1	18.0	864.0	100%	864.0	100%	0%	0%	864.00	0.00	0.00	7865	3817	400	281	2947	2652	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7865	3817	400	281	2947	2652	T700-GE-4	2	812	701568	103172	2172178	70	61	2,195,312
		4	48.0	AV-8	18.0	864.0	0%	0.0	100%	0%	0%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	F402-RR-4	1	6,000	5184000	762353	16050579	521	454	16,221,517
Amphibious Raid - Special Purpose Marine Air Ground Task Force	6	4	24.0	H-53	12.0	288.0	100%	288.0	100%	0%	0%	288.00	0.00	0.00	2738	10388	193	514	2841	2557	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2738	10388	193	514	2841	2557	T64-GE-41	3	4,464	1285632	189064	3980544	129	112	4,022,936
		10	60.0	MV-22	12.0	720.0	100%	720.0	100%	0%	0%	720.00	0.00	0.00	15918	3177	2766	323	1435	1292	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15918	3177	2766	323	1435	1292		2	2240	1612800	237176	4993513	162	141	5,046,694
		2	12.0	UH-1	12.0	144.0	100%	144.0	100%	0%	0%	144.00	0.00	0.00	260	367	13	31	327	294	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	260	367	13	31	327	294	T400-CP-4	2	540	77760	11435	240759	8	7	243,323
		4	24.0	AH-1	12.0	288.0	100%	288.0	100%	0%	0%	288.00	0.00	0.00	2622	1272	133	94	982	884	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2622	1272	133	94	982	884	T700-GE-4	2	812	233856	34391	724059	23	20	731,771
		4	24.0	AV-8	12.0	288.0	0%	0.0	100%	0%	0%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	F402-RR-4	1	6,000	1728000	254118	5350193	174	151	5,407,172
Non-Combatant Evacuation Operation	5	10	50	MV-22	20.0	1000.0	100%	1000.0	100%	0%	0%	1000.00	0.00	0.00	22109	4413	3842	448	1994	1794	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22109	4413	3842	448	1994	1794		2	2240	2240000	329412	6935435	225	196	7,009,298
		4	20	H-53	20.0	400.0	100%	400.0	100%	0%	0%	400.00	0.00	0.00	3803	14428	268	714	3946	3552	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3803	14428	268	714	3946	3552	T64-GE-41	3	4,464	1785600	262588	5528533	179	156	5,587,412
		2	10	UH-1	20.0	200.0	100%	200.0	100%	0%	0%	200.00	0.00	0.00	361	510	18	43	454	408	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	361	510	18	43	454	408	T400-CP-4	2	540	108000	15882	334387	11	9	337,948
		4	20	AH-1	20.0	400.0	100%	400.0	100%	0%	0%	400.00	0.00	0.00	3641	1767	185	130	1364	1228	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3641	1767	185	130	1364	1228	T700-GE-4	2	812	324800	47765	1005638	33	28	1,016,348
		4	20	AV-8	20.0	400.0	0%	0.0	100%	0%	0%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	F402-RR-4	1	6,000	2400000	352941	7430824	241	210	7,509,962
Humanitarian Assistance/ Disaster Relief Operations	5	10	50	MV-22	20.0	1000.0	100%	1000.0	100%	0%	0%	1000.00	0.00	0.00	22109	4413	3842	448	1994	1794	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22109	4413	3842	448	1994	1794		2	2240	2240000	329412	6935435	225	196	7,009,298
		4	20	H-53	20.0	400.0	100%	400.0	100%	0%	0%	400.00	0.00	0.00	3803	14428	268	714	3946	3552	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3803	14428	268	714	3946	3552	T64-GE-41	3	4,464	1785600	262588	5528533	179	156	5,587,412
		2	10	UH-1	20.0	200.0	100%	200.0	100%	0%	0%	200.00	0.00	0.00	361	510	18	43	454	408	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	361	510	18	43	454	408	T400-CP-4	2	540	108000	15882	334387	11	9	337,948
		4	20	AH-1	20.0	400.0	100%	400.0	100%	0%	0%	400.00	0.00	0.00	3641	1767	185	130	1364	1228	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3641	1767	185	130	1364	1228	T700-GE-4	2	812	324800	47765	1005638	33	28	1,016,348
		4	20	AV-8	20.0	400.0	0%	0.0	100%	0%	0%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	F402-RR-4	1	6,000	2400000	352941	7430824	241	210	7,509,962
Unmanned Aerial Vehicle - Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconaissance	100	1	100.0	MQ-4C	4.0	400.0	100%	400.0	100%	0%	0%	400.00	0.00	0.00	840	15536	264	1416	244	220	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	840	15536	264	1416	244	220	AE3007H	1	2,532	1012800	148941	3135808	102	89	3,169,204

Table D-12: Aircraft Emissions – Alternative 2 (continued)

Type Training	Training Ops (#)	OPERATIONAL INFORMATION - AIRCRAFT													EMISSIONS/YEAR (lb) BY JURISDICTION																		Training Platform Information			Annual Fuel Use (total)		GHG Emissions (lb)			
		Aircraft			Time		Altitude		Distribution (%)			Distribution (hr)			State (0-3 nm offshore)						Waters of U S (3-12 nm)						Int Waters (> 12 nm)						Total Emissions												
		Distribution	A/C Sorties (#)	Type	Ave Time on Range (hr)	Total Time on Range (hr)	Time < 3,000 ft (%)	Time < 3,000 ft (hr)	0-3 nm from shore	3-12 nm from Shore	>12 nm from Shore	Total Time 0-3 nm from shore	Total Time 3-12 nm from shore	Total Time >12 nm from shore	CO	NOx	HC	SOx	PM	$PM_{2.5}$	CO	NOx	HC	SOx	PM	$PM_{2.5}$	CO	NOx	HC	SOx	PM	$PM_{2.5}$	CO	NOx	HC	SOx	PM	$PM_{2.5}$	Engine Model	Engines (#)	Fuel Flow (lb/hr)	Pounds	Gallons	CO_2	N_2O	CH_4	CO_{2-e}
SURFACE WARFARE																																										
Gunnery Exercise, A-S (Small Caliber) - Ship	321	0.25	80.25	FA-18E/F	2.0	160.5	10%	16.1	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	16.05	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	119	2447	20	66	1088	980	119	2447	20	66	1088	980	F414-GE-4	2	10,338	1659249	244007	5137328	167	145	5,192,040
		0.75	240.75	SH-60B	2.0	481.5	100%	481.5	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	481.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3611	3698	318	231	2427	2184	3611	3698	318	231	2427	2184	T700-GE-4	2	1200	577800	84971	1788971	58	51	1,808,023
Gunnery Exercise, A-S (Medium Caliber) - Ship	120	0.25	30	FA-18E/F	2.0	60.0	10%	6.0	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	6.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	915	7	25	407	366	45	915	7	25	407	366	F414-GE-4	2	10,338	620280	91218	1920496	62	54	1,940,950
		0.75	90	SH-60B	2.0	180.0	100%	180.0	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	180.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1350	1382	119	86	907	816	1350	1382	119	86	907	816	T700-GE-4	2	1200	216000	31765	668774	22	19	675,897
Missile Exercise (A-S) - Rocket	110	0.33	36.3	FA-18E/F	2.0	72.6	10%	7.3	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	7.26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	1107	9	30	492	443	54	1107	9	30	492	443	F414-GE-4	2	10,338	750538.8	110373	2323801	75	66	2,348,549
		0.66	72.6	SH-60B	2.0	145.2	100%	145.2	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	145.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1089	1115	96	70	732	659	1089	1115	96	70	732	659	T700-GE-4	2	1200	174240	25624	539478	18	15	545,223
Missile Exercise (A-S)	10	0.5	5	FA-18E/F	2.0	10.0	10%	1.0	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	1.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	152	1	4	68	61	7	152	1	4	68	61	F414-GE-4	2	10,338	103380	15203	320083	10	9	323,492
		0.5	5	SH-60B	2.0	10.0	100%	10.0	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	10.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	77	7	5	50	45	75	77	7	5	50	45	T700-GE-4	2	1200	12000	1765	37154	1	1	37,550
Laser Targeting	600	0.5	300	FA-18E/F	1.0	300.0	10%	30.0	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	30.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	223	4575	37	124	2035	1831	223	4575	37	124	2035	1831	F414-GE-4	2	10,338	3101400	456088	9602482	312	271	9,704,748
		0.5	300	SH-60B	1.0	300.0	100%	300.0	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	300.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2250	2304	198	144	1512	1361	2250	2304	198	144	1512	1361	T700-GE-4	2	1200	360000	52941	1114624	36	32	1,126,494
Bombing Exercise (A-S)	37	0.5	19	FA-18E/F	1.0	18.5	10%	1.9	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	1.85	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	282	2	8	125	113	14	282	2	8	125	113	F414-GE-4	2	10,338	191253	28125	592153	19	17	598,459
		0.5	19	P-3	1.0	18.5	10%	1.9	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	1.85	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	69	5	4	35	32	22	69	5	4	35	32	T56-A-14	4	4,800	88800	13059	274940	9	8	277,869
Torpedo Exercise (Submarine to Surface)	0																																										
Missile Exercise (S-S)	28																																										
Sinking Exercise (SINKEX)	1	2	2	FA-18E/F	8.0	16.0	10%	1.6	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	1.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	244	2	7	109	98	12	244	2	7	109	98	F414-GE-4	2	10,338	165408	24325	512132	17	14	517,587
		1	1	P-3	8.0	8.0	10%	0.8	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	0.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	30	2	2	15	14	10	30	2	2	15	14	T56-A-14	4	4,800	38400	5647	118893	4	3	120,159
		1	1	SH-60B	8.0	8.0	100%	8.0	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	8.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	61	5	4	40	36	60	61	5	4	40	36	T700-GE-4	2	1200	9600	1412	29723	1	1	30,040
Gunnery Exercise (S-S) Boat – Medium-caliber	20																																										
Gunnery Exercise (S-S) Small-caliber	43																																										
Maritime Security Operations (MSO)	40	1	40	SH-60B	4.0	160.0	100%	160.0	100%	0%	0%	160.00	0.00	0.00	1200	1229	106	77	806	726	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1200	1229	106	77	806	726	T700-GE-4	2	1200	192000	28235	594466	19	17	600,797

Table D-12: Aircraft Emissions – Alternative 2 (continued)

Type Training	Training Ops (#)	OPERATIONAL INFORMATION - AIRCRAFT: Aircraft: Distribution	A/C Sorties (#)	Type	Time: Ave Time on Range (hr)	Time: Total Time on Range (hr)	Altitude: Time < 3,000 ft (%)	Altitude: Time < 3,000 ft (hr)	Distribution (%): 0-3 nm from shore	Distribution (%): 3-12 nm from Shore	Distribution (%): >12 nm from Shore	Distribution (hr): Total Time 0-3 nm from shore	Distribution (hr): Total Time 3-12 nm from shore	Distribution (hr): Total Time >12 nm from shore	EMISSIONS/YEAR (lb) BY JURISDICTION: State (0-3 nm offshore): CO	NOx	HC	SOx	PM	PM2.5	Waters of U S (3-12 nm): CO	NOx	HC	SOx	PM	PM2.5	Int Waters (> 12 nm): CO	NOx	HC	SOx	PM	PM2.5	Total Emissions: CO	NOx	HC	SOx	PM	PM2.5	Training Platform Information: Engine Model	Engines (#)	Fuel Flow (lb/hr)	Annual Fuel Use (total): Pounds	Gallons	GHG Emissions (lb): CO_2	N_2O	CH_4	CO_{2-e}
ANTI-SUBMARINE WARFARE																																																
Tracking Exercise-Helo	65	3	195	SH-60	4.0	780.0	100%	780.0	0%	100%	0%	0.00	780.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	5850	5990	515	374	3931	3538	0	0	0	0	0	0	5850	5990	515	374	3931	3538	T700-GE-4	2	1200	936000	137647	2898021	94	82	2,928,885
Torpedo Exercise-Helo	6	3	18	SH-60	4.0	72.0	100%	72.0	0%	100%	0%	0.00	72.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	540	553	48	35	363	327	0	0	0	0	0	0	540	553	48	35	363	327	T700-GE-4	2	1200	86400	12706	267510	9	8	270,359
Tracking Exercise-Maritime Patrol Advanced Extended Echo Ranging Sonobuoys	0	1	0	P-3	6.0	0.0	75%	0.0	0%	100%	0%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	T56-A-14 (	4	4,800	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tracking Exercise-Maritime Patrol Aircraft	36	1	36	P-3	6.0	216.0	75%	162.0	0%	100%	0%	0.00	162.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	1952	6011	451	311	3087	2778	0	0	0	0	0	0	1952	6011	451	311	3087	2778	T56-A-14 (	4	4,800	1036800	152471	3210116	104	91	3,244,303
Torpedo Exercise-Maritime Patrol Aircraft	6	1	6	P-3	6.0	36.0	75%	27.0	0%	100%	0%	0.00	27.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	325	1002	75	52	515	463	0	0	0	0	0	0	325	1002	75	52	515	463	T56-A-14 (	4	4,800	172800	25412	535019	17	15	540,717
Tracking Exercise –Surface	91																																															
Torpedo Exercise-Surface	6																																															
Tracking Exercise–	4																																															
Torpedo Exercise – Submarine	9																																															
MAJOR TRAINING EVENTS																																																
Joint Expeditionary	1	48	48	FA-18E	8.0	384.0	10%	38.4	0%	100%	0%	0.00	38.40	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	286	5855	48	159	2604	2344	0	0	0	0	0	0	286	5855	48	159	2604	2344	F414-GE-4	2	10,338	3969792	583793	12291177	399	347	12,422,078
		4	4	EA-6B	8.0	32.0	10%	3.2	0%	100%	0%	0.00	3.20	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	148	165	10	8	73	66	0	0	0	0	0	0	148	165	10	8	73	66	F402-RR-4	1	6,000	192000	28235	594466	19	17	600,797
		4	4	E-2	8.0	32.0	10%	3.2	0%	100%	0%	0.00	3.20	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	71	3	3	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	71	3	3	7	6	T56-A-425	1	1,100	35200	5176	108985	4	3	110,146
		3	3	P-3	8.0	24.0	10%	2.4	0%	100%	0%	0.00	2.40	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	89	7	5	46	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	89	7	5	46	41	T56-A-14 (	4	4,800	115200	16941	356680	12	10	360,478
		6	6	AV-8B	8.0	48.0	10%	4.8	0%	100%	0%	0.00	4.80	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	222	248	16	12	109	98	0	0	0	0	0	0	222	248	16	12	109	98	F402-RR-4	1	6,000	288000	42353	891699	29	25	901,195
		2	2	C-130	8.0	16.0	10%	1.6	0%	100%	0%	0.00	1.60	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	59	3	3	29	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	59	3	3	29	26	T56-A-425	4	4,500	72000	10588	222925	7	6	225,299
		4	4	A-10	8.0	32.0	10%	3.2	0%	100%	0%	0.00	3.20	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	86	4	4	26	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	86	4	4	26	23		2	6,052	193664	28480	599618	19	17	606,004
		1	1	E-3	8.0	8.0	10%	0.8	0%	100%	0%	0.00	0.80	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	221	8	10	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	221	8	10	7	6		4	130,736	1045888	153807	3238254	105	92	3,272,741
		1	1	KC-135	8.0	8.0	10%	0.8	0%	100%	0%	0.00	0.80	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	247	1	7	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	247	1	7	2	2		4	91,552	732416	107708	2267689	74	64	2,291,840
		15	15	SH-60B	8.0	120.0	100%	120.0	0%	100%	0%	0.00	120.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	900	922	79	58	605	544	0	0	0	0	0	0	900	922	79	58	605	544	T700-GE-4	2	1200	144000	21176	445849	14	13	450,598
		4	4	CH-53	8.0	32.0	100%	32.0	0%	100%	0%	0.00	32.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	304	1154	21	57	316	284	0	0	0	0	0	0	304	1154	21	57	316	284	T64-GE-41	3	4,464	142848	21007	442283	14	12	446,993
		12	12	CH-46	8.0	96.0	100%	96.0	0%	100%	0%	0.00	96.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	2454	593	380	58	256	231	0	0	0	0	0	0	2454	593	380	58	256	231	T58-GE-16	2	1200	144000	21176	445849	14	13	450,598
		4	4	AH-1	8.0	32.0	100%	32.0	0%	100%	0%	0.00	32.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	291	141	15	10	109	98	0	0	0	0	0	0	291	141	15	10	109	98	T700-GE-4	2	812	25984	3821	80451	3	2	81,308
		2	2	UH-1	8.0	16.0	100%	16.0	0%	100%	0%	0.00	16.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	41	1	3	36	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	41	1	3	36	33	T400-CP-4	2	540	8640	1271	26751	1	1	27,036
		10	10	MV-22	8.0	80.0	100%	80.0	0%	100%	0%	0.00	80.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	1769	353	307	36	159	144	0	0	0	0	0	0	1769	353	307	36	159	144		2	2240	179200	26353	554835	18	16	560,744
Joint Multi-Strike Group Exercise	1	144	144	FA-18E	8.0	1152.0	10%	115.2	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	115.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	857	17566	143	476	7813	7031	857	17566	143	476	7813	7031	F414-GE-4	2	10,338	11909376	1751379	36873530	1196	1042	37,266,233
		12	12	EA-6B	8.0	96.0	10%	9.6	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	9.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	444	495	31	23	219	197	444	495	31	23	219	197	F402-RR-4	1	6,000	576000	84706	1783398	58	50	1,802,391
		12	12	E-2	8.0	96.0	10%	9.6	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	9.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	212	8	8	20	18	54	212	8	8	20	18	T56-A-425	1	1,100	105600	15529	326956	11	9	330,438
		5	5	P-3	8.0	40.0	10%	4.0	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	4.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	148	11	8	76	69	48	148	11	8	76	69	T56-A-14 (	4	4,800	192000	28235	594466	19	17	600,797
		1	1	E-3	8.0	8.0	10%	0.8	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	0.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	221	8	10	7	6	54	221	8	10	7	6		4	130,736	1045888	153807	3238254	105	92	3,272,741
		2	2	KC-135	8.0	16.0	10%	1.6	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	1.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	494	1	15	5	4	49	494	1	15	5	4		4	91,552	1464832	215416	4535378	147	128	4,583,680
		6	6	B-1B	8.0	48.0	10%	4.8	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	4.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	418	4	13	4	4	27	418	4	13	4	4		4	26,560	1274880	187482	3947253	128	112	3,989,292
		24	24	F-15	8.0	192.0	10%	19.2	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	19.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	431	5558	77	48	970	873	431	5558	77	48	970	873	F100-PW-2	2	6196	1189632	174946	3683311	119	104	3,722,538
		45	45	SH-60B	8.0	360.0	100%	360.0	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	360.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2700	2765	238	173	1814	1633	2700	2765	238	173	1814	1633	T700-GE-4	2	1200	432000	63529	1337548	43	38	1,351,793
ELECTRONIC WARFARE																																																
Electronic Warfare Operations	522	1	522	FA-18E	2.0	1044.0	0%	0.0	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	F414-GE-4	2	10,338	10792872	1587187	33416636	1084	944	33,772,523
Flare Exercise	2200	0.9	1980	F-15	3.0	5940.0	0%	0.0	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	F100-PW-2	2	6196	36804240	5412388	113952422	3697	3220	115,166,015
		0.06	132	FA-18E	3.0	396.0	0%	0.0	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	F414-GE-4	2	10,338	4093848	602036	12675276	411	358	12,810,267
		0.04	88	SH-60B	3.0	264.0	100%	264.0	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	264.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1980	2028	174	127	1331	1198	1980	2028	174	127	1331	1198	T700-GE-4	2	1200	316800	46588	980869	32	28	991,315
Chaff Exercise - Ship	60																																														
Chaff Exercise - Aircraft	2200	0.9	1980	F-15	3.0	5940.0	0%	0.0	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	F100-PW-2	2	6196	36804240	5412388	113952422	3697	3220	115,166,015
		0.06	132	FA-18E	3.0	396.0	0%	0.0	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	F414-GE-4	2	10,338	4093848	602036	12675276	411	358	12,810,267
		0.04	88	SH-60B	3.0	264.0	100%	264.0	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	264.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1980	2028	174	127	1331	1198	1980	2028	174	127	1331	1198	T700-GE-4	2	1200	316800	46588	980869	32	28	991,315
MINE WARFARE																																															
Mine Laying - Aircraft	4	0.5	2	FA-18E	0.5	1.0	0%	0.0	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	F414-GE-4	2	10,338	10338	1520	32008	1	1	32,349
		0.5	2	P-3	1.0	2.0	0%	0.0	0%	0%	100%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	T56-A-14 (	4	4,800	9600	1412	29723	1	1	30,040
																																												0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0
Mine Neutralization – Explosive Ordnance	20																																															
Limpet Mine Neutralization System/Shock Wave Generator	60																																															

Table D-12: Aircraft Emissions – Alternative 2 (continued)

Type Training	Training Ops (#)	OPERATIONAL INFORMATION - AIRCRAFT													EMISSIONS/YEAR (lb) BY JURISDICTION												EMISSIONS/YEAR (lb) BY JURISDICTION												Training Platform Information			Annual Fuel Use (total)		GHG Emissions (lb)			
		Aircraft			Time		Altitude		Distribution (%)			Distribution (hr)			State (0-3 nm offshore)						Waters of U S (3-12 nm)						Int Waters (> 12 nm)						Total Emissions														
		Distribution	A/C Sorties (#)	Type	Ave Time on Range (hr)	Total Time on Range (hr)	Time < 3,000 ft (%)	Time < 3,000 ft (hr)	0-3 nm from shore	3-12 nm from Shore	>12 nm from Shore	Total Time 0-3 nm from shore	Total Time 3-12 nm from shore	Total Time >12 nm from shore	CO	NOx	HC	SOx	PM	PM2.5	CO	NOx	HC	SOx	PM	PM2.5	CO	NOx	HC	SOx	PM	PM2.5	CO	NOx	HC	SOx	PM	PM2.5	Engine Model	Engines (#)	Fuel Flow (lb/hr)	Pounds	Gallons	CO_2	N_2O	CH_4	CO_{2-e}
NAVAL SPECIAL WARFARE																																														
Personnel I&E	364	4	1456	H-60	8.0	11648.0	100%	11648.0	100%	0%	0%	11648.00	0.00	0.00	87360	89457	7688	5591	58706	52835	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87360	89457	7688	5591	58706	52835	T700-GE-4	2	1200	13977600	2055529	43277116	1404	1223	43,738,017
		2	728	MV-22	8.0	5824.0	100%	5824.0	100%	0%	0%	5824.00	0.00	0.00	128762	25700	22373	2609	11611	10450	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	128762	25700	22373	2609	11611	10450		2	2240	13045760	1918494	40391975	1310	1142	40,822,149
Parachute Insertion	64	1	64	C-130	4.0	256.0	100%	256.0	100%	0%	0%	256.00	0.00	0.00	2385	9400	541	461	4573	4116	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2385	9400	541	461	4573	4116	T56-A-425	4	4,500	1152000	169412	3566795	116	101	3,604,782
		1	64	CH-46	4.0	256.0	100%	256.0	100%	0%	0%	256.00	0.00	0.00	5235	0	811	123	547	492	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5235	0	811	123	547	492	T58-GE-16	2	1200	307200	45176	951145	31	27	961,275
		1	64	H-60	4.0	256.0	100%	256.0	100%	0%	0%	256.00	0.00	0.00	1920	1966	169	123	1290	1161	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1920	1966	169	123	1290	1161	T700-GE-4	2	1200	307200	45176	951145	31	27	961,275
OTHER																																														
Surface Ship Sonar Maintenance	42																																													
Submarine Sonar Maintenance	48																																												
Small Boat Attack	27																																												
Sub Navigation / Sub Nav Under Ice	8																																												
Precision Anchoring	18																																												
Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Operation	950																																												
Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance	44	1	44.0	MQ-4C	4.0	176.0	100%	176.0	0%	50%	50%	0.00	88.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	185	3418	58	312	54	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	185	3418	58	312	54	48	AE3007H	1	2,532	445632	65534	1379755	45	39	1,394,450
Underwater Survey	32	1	32	SH-60B	2.0	64.0	100%	64.0	100%	0%	0%	64.00	0.00	0.00	480	492	42	31	323	290	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	480	492	42	31	323	290	T700-GE-4	2	1200	76800	11294	237786	8	7	240,319
Unmanned Underwater Vehicle Training	64																																													
TOTAL TRAINING (lbs per year)															**438,775**	**292,444**	**62,357**	**19,831**	**132,713**	**119,442**	**15,433**	**27,219**	**2,050**	**1,515**	**12,334**	**11,100**	**61,211**	**913,723**	**8,847**	**25,306**	**407,937**	**367,144**	**515,419**	**1,233,386**	**73,255**	**46,652**	**552,984**	**497,686**				**405,383,473**	**59,615,217**	**1,255,138,770**	**40,717**	**35,471**	**1,268,505,992**
TOTAL TRAINING (tons per year)															**219**	**146**	**31**	**10**	**66**	**60**	**8**	**14**	**1**	**1**	**6**	**6**	**31**	**457**	**4**	**13**	**204**	**184**	**258**	**617**	**37**	**23**	**276**	**249**				**202,692**	**59,615,217**	**627,569**	**20**	**18**	**634,253**
ANTI-SUBMARINE WARFARE TESTING																																													
Anti-submarine Warfare Tracking Test - MPA	8	1	8	P-3	6.0	48.0	75%	36.0	0%	100%	0%	0.00	36.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	434	1336	100	69	686	617	0	0	0	0	0	0	434	1336	100	69	686	617	T56-A-14	4	4,800	230400	33882	713359	23	20	720,956
LIFECYCLE ACTIVITIES TESTING																																													
Littoral Combat Ship (LCS) Mission Package Testing-ASW	2																																												
Ship Signature Testing	40																																												
SURFACE WARFARE / ANTI-SUBMARINE WARFARE TESTING																																													
Torpedo Testing (Explosive and Non-explosive)	6																																												
Countermeasure / Acoustic Systems Testing	3																																												
At-Sea Sonar Testing	30																																												
SHIPBOARD PROTECTION SYSTEMS AND SWIMMER DEFENSE TESTING																																													
Pierside Integrated Swimmer Defense	0																																												
MINE WARFARE TESTING																																													
Mine Detection and Classification Testing	2	1	2	SH-60B	2.0	4.0	100%	4.0	33%	33%	34%	1.32	1.32	1.36	10	10	1	1	7	6	10	10	1	1	7	6	10	10	1	1	7	6	30	31	3	2	20	18	T700-GE-4	2	1200	4800	706	14862	0	0	15,020
UNMANNED VEHICLE TESTING																																													
Unmanned Vehicle Development and Payload Testing	0																																												
OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH																																													
North Pacific Acoustic Lab Philippine Sea 2018-19 Experiment (Deep Water)	1																																												
TOTAL TESTING (lbs per year)															**9.9**	**10.1**	**0.9**	**0.6**	**6.7**	**6.0**	**443.6**	**1345.9**	**101.1**	**69.8**	**692.7**	**623.4**	**10.2**	**10.4**	**0.9**	**0.7**	**6.9**	**6.2**	**463.7**	**1366.5**	**102.9**	**71.0**	**706.2**	**635.6**				**235200.0**	**34588.2**	**728220.7**	**23.6**	**20.6**	**735976.3**
TOTAL TESTING (tons per year)															**0.0**	**0.0**	**0.0**	**0.0**	**0.0**	**0.0**	**0.2**	**0.7**	**0.1**	**0.0**	**0.3**	**0.3**	**0.0**	**0.0**	**0.0**	**0.0**	**0.0**	**0.0**	**0.2**	**0.7**	**0.1**	**0.0**	**0.4**	**0.3**				**34588.2**	**364.1**	**0.0**	**0.0**	**368.0**

This page intentionally left blank.

Table D-13: Emissions from Ordnance – Alternative 2

MEM Category	Location	Training MEM	Testing MEM	Emissions (lb/year) Training						Emissions (lb/year) Testing					
		#/yr	#/yr	CO	NOx	VOC	SOx	PM10	PM2.5	CO	NOx	VOC	SOx	PM10	PM2.5
BOMBS															
Bombs (H-E)	MITT	6,454	0	394,551.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Bombs (N-E)	MITT	2,820	0	719.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
PROJECTILES															
Small Caliber	MITT	310,155	0	713.4	30.1	0.0	0.0	15.8	11.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Medium Caliber (H-E)	MITT	23,020	4082	92.1	29.9	0.0	0.0	218.7	117.4	16.3	5.3	0.0	0.0	38.8	20.8
Medium Caliber (N-E)	MITT	309,275	0	804.1	30.0	0.0	0.0	43.3	37.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Large Caliber (H-E)	MITT	6,757	240	864.9	1,081.1	0.0	0.0	64.9	50.3	30.7	38.4	0.0	0.0	2.3	1.8
Large Caliber (N-E)	MITT	24,540	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Missiles (H-E)	MITT	258	20	7,900.9	9,178.1	0.0	0.0	15,943.1	15,943.1	612.5	711.5	0.0	0.0	1,235.9	1,235.9
Missiles (N-E)	MITT	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Rockets (H-E)	MITT	4,100	16	3,813.0	23.0	0.0	0.0	1,640.0	1,189.0	14.9	0.1	0.0	0.0	6.4	4.6
Rockets (N-E)	MITT	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
COUNTERMEASURES															
Chaff	MITT	18,204	0	1.1	2.8	0.0	0.0	5.1	4.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Flares	MITT	17,600	0	1.0	2.7	0.0	0.0	5.0	4.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
TARGETS															
Airborne targets	MITT	16	0												
Surface targets	MITT	240	0												
Expendable sub-surface targets	MITT	261	0												
TOTAL EMISSIONS (lbs per year)				409,461	10,378	0	0	17,936	17,358	674	755	0	0	1,283	1,263
TOTAL EMISSIONS (tons per year)				204.7	5.2	0.0	0.0	9.0	8.7	0.3	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.6

D.5 RECORD OF NON-APPLICABILITY

RECORD OF NON-APPLICABILITY

The Proposed Action falls under the Record of Non-Applicability (RONA) category and is documented with this RONA.

PROPOSED ACTION

Action Proponent: Commander, U.S. Pacific Fleet

Location: Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area

Proposed Action: Mariana Islands Training and Testing (MITT) Military Readiness Activities

Proposed Action and Emissions Summary:

The Proposed Action is to conduct military readiness activities within the MITT Study Area. The Proposed Action involves operation of military aircraft, vessels, and small boats.

Federal actions may be exempt from conformity determinations if their emissions do not exceed designated *de minimis* levels for the criteria pollutants of nonattainment or maintenance in the areas of the federal action (40 CFR part 93.153[b]). A portion of the Study Area is located within the Guam Piti-Cabras area, which has been designated nonattainment for sulfur dioxide (SO_2), unclassifiable for particles with an aerodynamic diameter less than or equal to a nominal 10 micrometers, and unclassifiable/attainment for carbon monoxide, ozone, nitrogen dioxide, lead, and particles with an aerodynamic diameter less than or equal to a nominal 2.5 micrometers. As a result, the action alternatives emissions were evaluated to assess compliance with the General Conformity Rule *de minimis* thresholds. The estimated annual emissions for SO_2 for Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 compared to the baseline are shown in Table 1. The detailed calculations for emissions are shown in Table D-1 through D-13 of Appendix D of the MITT Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement.

Table 1: Estimated Emissions from Training and Testing Activities Between 0 and 3 Nautical Miles from Shore, Alternative 1 & 2

Criteria Pollutant	Annual SO_2 Emissions (tons per year)
Baseline Emissions	237
Alternative 1 Emissions	254
Alternative 2 Emissions	313
Net Change from Alternative 1	**17**
Net Change from Alternative 2	**76**
De minimis thresholds	100
Alternative 1 Exceeds Threshold?	No
Alternative 2 Exceeds Threshold?	No

Notes: Individual values may not add exactly to total values due to rounding. SO_2 = sulfur dioxide

Doc. No. 35GL-20-1874.*

PROPOSED ACTION EXEMPTION(S)

The Proposed Action is exempt from the General Conformity Rule Requirements because the projected SO_2 emissions as shown in Table 1 are below the *de minimis* thresholds.

ATTAINMENT AREA STATUS AND EMISSIONS EVALUATION CONCLUSION

Since the Proposed Action's projected emissions as reflected in Table 1 do not exceed the *de minimis thresholds*, the Navy concludes that formal Conformity Determination procedures are not required, resulting in this RONA.

Affected Air Basin: Piti-Cabras, Guam

Date RONA Prepared: March 6, 2020

Rona Prepared by: Naval Facilities Engineering Command

RONA Approval

MCNAIR.DANIEL.ANTHONY.1166125894 Digitally signed by MCNAIR.DANIEL.ANTHONY.1166125894 Date: 2020.05.11 08:56:09 -10'00'

Date: 11 May 2020

D. A. McNAIR
Director, Environmental Readiness
By direction of the Commander
U.S. Pacific Fleet

Mariana Islands Training and Testing
Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS May 2020

This page intentionally left blank.

Doc. No. 35GL-20-1874.*



Farallon de Medinilla

Saipan

Tinian

Rota

Guam

The Mariana Islands Training and Testing

Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement
United States Department of the Navy

Volume 3

June 2020 | Final

NAVSEA
NAVAL SEA SYSTEMS COMMAND

ONR
Science & Technology

Doc. No. 35GL-20-1874.*

Mariana Islands Training and Testing Activities Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement

Volume 3

June 2020

MITT SEIS/OEIS Project Manager
Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Pacific/EV21
258 Makalapa Dr., Suite 100
Pearl Harbor, HI 96860-3134

Doc. No. 35GL-20-1874.*

Appendix E: Estimated Marine Mammal and Sea Turtle Impacts from Exposure to Acoustic and Explosive Stressors Under Navy Training and Testing Activities

Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/ Overseas Environmental Impact Statement Mariana Islands Training and Testing

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPENDIX E ESTIMATED MARINE MAMMAL AND SEA TURTLE IMPACTS FROM EXPOSURE TO ACOUSTIC AND EXPLOSIVE STRESSORS UNDER NAVY TRAINING AND TESTING ACTIVITIES E-1

E.1 Estimated Marine Mammal Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers Under Navy Training and Testing Activities E-1

E.2 Estimated Marine Mammal Impacts per Seven-Year Period from Sonar and Other Transducers Under Navy Training and Testing Activities E-4

E.3 Estimated Marine Mammal Impacts from Explosives Under Navy Training and Testing Activities E-5

E.4 Estimated Marine Mammal Impacts per Seven-Year Period from Explosives Under Navy Training and Testing Activities E-7

E.5 Estimated Sea Turtle Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers Under Navy Training and Testing Activities E-9

E.6 Estimated Sea Turtle Impacts from Explosives Under Navy Training and Testing Activities E-9

E.7 Estimated Sea Turtle Impacts per Seven-Year Period from Explosives Under Navy Training and Testing Activities E-10

List of Figures

There are no figures in this appendix.

List of Tables

Table E-1: Estimated Marine Mammals Impacts per Year from Sonar Training and Testing Activities E-2

Table E-2: Estimated Marine Mammals Impacts per Seven-Year Period from Sonar Training and Testing Activities E-4

Table E-3: Estimated Marine Mammals Impacts per Year from Explosive Training and Testing Activities.... ..... E-5

Table E-4: Estimated Marine Mammals Impacts per Seven-Year Period from Explosive Training and Testing Activities E-7

Table E-5: Estimated Sea Turtle Impacts per Year from Explosive Training and Testing Activities E-9

Table E-6: Estimated Sea Turtle Impacts per Seven-Year Period from Explosive Training and Testing Activities E-10

This page intentionally left blank.

APPENDIX E Estimated Marine Mammal and Sea Turtle Impacts from Exposure to Acoustic and Explosive Stressors Under Navy Training and Testing Activities

Navy training and testing activities would result in the incidental takes of marine mammals and sea turtles within the Study Area. This appendix provides the estimated number of marine mammal and sea turtle impacts. Specifically, estimated impacts are derived from the quantitative analysis for activities under Alternatives 1 and 2 that involve the use of acoustic or explosive stressors. The quantitative analysis takes into account Navy activities, marine species density layers, acoustic modeling, and other environmental parameters. A detailed explanation of the quantitative analysis is provided in the technical report *Quantifying Acoustic Impacts on Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles: Methods and Analytical Approach for Phase III Training and Testing* (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2018). It is important to note that *impacts*, as discussed in this appendix, represent the estimated instances of take of marine mammals or sea turtles, not necessarily the number of individuals impacted (i.e., some marine mammals or sea turtles could be impacted several times, while others would not experience any impact). In addition, across training and testing activities, the seven-year total impacts in each table may be slightly more or less than seven times the maximum impact in any year.

E.1 Estimated Marine Mammal Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers Under Navy Training and Testing Activities

Table E-1 provides a summary of the estimated number of marine mammal impacts from exposure to sonar and other transducers used during Navy training and testing activities under Alternatives 1 and 2 over the course of one year.

Table E-1: Estimated Marine Mammals Impacts per Year from Sonar Training and Testing Activities

Species	Alternative 1 – Minimum			Alternative 1 – Maximum			Alternative 2 – Maximum		
	Behavioral Response	TTS	PTS	Behavioral Response	TTS	PTS	Behavioral Response	TTS	PTS
Mysticetes									
Blue whale*	4	19	0	4	19	0	4	20	0
Bryde's whale	33	236	0	33	236	0	36	256	0
Fin whale*	4	18	0	4	18	0	5	20	0
Humpback whale*	46	387	0	46	387	0	51	419	0
Minke whale	8	78	0	8	78	0	9	84	0
Omura's whale	3	23	0	3	23	0	3	25	0
Sei whale*	15	125	0	15	125	0	17	135	0
Odontocetes									
Blainville's beaked whale	1,554	26	0	1,557	26	0	1,691	27	0
Cuvier's beaked whale	599	4	0	600	4	0	642	4	0
Ginkgo-toothed beaked whale	3,366	63	0	3,373	63	0	3,659	65	0
Longman's beaked whale	5,473	103	0	5,483	103	0	5,958	106	0
Bottlenose dolphin	104	21	0	104	21	0	116	21	0
Dwarf sperm whale	1,180	6,428	28	1,186	6,434	28	1,289	7,046	29
Pygmy sperm whale	463	2,593	11	465	2,595	11	508	2,840	11
False killer whale	571	117	0	573	117	0	641	121	0
Fraser's dolphin	10,123	1,896	0	10,150	1,896	0	11,322	1,947	0

Table E-1: Estimated Marine Mammals Impacts per Year from Sonar Training and Testing Activities (continued)

Species	*Alternative 1 – Minimum*			*Alternative 1 – Maximum*			*Alternative 2 – Maximum*		
	Behavioral Response	*TTS*	*PTS*	*Behavioral Response*	*TTS*	*PTS*	*Behavioral Response*	*TTS*	*PTS*
Killer whale	32	7	0	32	7	0	36	8	0
Melon-headed whale	2,058	488	0	2,064	488	0	2,305	508	0
Pantropical spotted dolphin	10,733	2,717	0	10,764	2,717	0	12,074	2,815	0
Pygmy killer whale	77	16	0	78	16	0	87	17	0
Risso's dolphin	2,359	504	0	2,365	505	0	2,649	519	0
Rough-toothed dolphin	145	35	0	146	35	0	161	36	0
Short-finned pilot whale	873	172	0	876	172	0	986	176	0
Sperm whale*	184	11	0	184	11	0	192	11	0
Spinner dolphin	1,040	223	0	1,042	223	0	1,185	228	0
Striped dolphin	2,891	723	0	2,899	723	0	3,255	750	0

* ESA-listed species within the MITT Study Area

Notes: PTS = permanent threshold shift, TTS = temporary threshold shift

E.2 Estimated Marine Mammal Impacts per Seven-Year Period from Sonar and Other Transducers Under Navy Training and Testing Activities

Table E-2 provides a summary of the estimated number of marine mammal impacts from exposure to sonar and other transducers used during Navy training and testing activities under Alternatives 1 and 2 over the course of seven years.

Table E-2: Estimated Marine Mammals Impacts per Seven-Year Period from Sonar Training and Testing Activities

Species	*Alternative 1 – 7-Year*			*Alternative 2 – 7-Year*		
	Behavioral Response	*TTS*	*PTS*	*Behavioral Response*	*TTS*	*PTS*
Mysticetes						
Blue whale*	26	103	0	29	140	0
Bryde's whale	226	1,338	0	253	1,792	0
Fin whale*	30	100	0	34	139	0
Humpback whale*	318	2,199	0	357	2,933	0
Minke whale	56	453	0	63	590	0
Omura's whale	21	130	0	23	172	0
Sei whale*	105	708	0	119	947	0
Odontocetes						
Blainville's beaked whale	10,117	118	0	11,844	189	0
Cuvier's beaked whale	3,923	19	0	4,498	31	0
Ginkgo-toothed beaked whale	21,937	282	0	25,626	454	0
Longman's beaked whale	35,630	477	0	41,731	743	0
Bottlenose dolphin	674	92	0	811	150	0
Dwarf sperm whale	8,275	37,761	127	9,029	49,298	204
Pygmy sperm whale	3,247	15,230	50	3,560	19,868	79
False killer whale	3,700	531	0	4,487	844	0
Fraser's dolphin	64,859	8,401	0	79,242	13,627	0
Killer whale	209	32	0	255	54	0
Melon-headed whale	13,364	2,179	0	16,127	3,552	0
Pantropical spotted dolphin	69,701	12,367	0	84,487	19,707	0
Pygmy killer whale	499	71	0	609	117	0
Risso's dolphin	15,223	2,288	0	18,536	3,630	0
Rough-toothed dolphin	943	162	0	1,127	252	0
Short-finned pilot whale	5,639	792	0	6,901	1,235	0
Sperm whale*	1,087	47	0	1,344	76	0
Spinner dolphin	6,747	970	0	8,292	1,598	0
Striped dolphin	18,723	3,257	0	22,776	5,250	0

* ESA-listed species within the MITT Study Area
Notes: PTS = permanent threshold shift, TTS = temporary threshold shift

E.3 Estimated Marine Mammal Impacts from Explosives Under Navy Training and Testing Activities

Table E-3 provides a summary of the estimated number of marine mammal impacts from exposure to explosives used during Navy training and testing activities under Alternatives 1 and 2 over the course of one year.

Table E-3: Estimated Marine Mammals Impacts per Year from Explosive Training and Testing Activities

Species	*Alternative 1 – Minimum*				*Alternative 1 – Maximum*				*Alternative 2 – Maximum*			
	Behavioral Response	*TTS*	*PTS*	*Injury*	*Behavioral Response*	*TTS*	*PTS*	*Injury*	*Behavioral Response*	*TTS*	*PTS*	*Injury*
Mysticetes												
Blue whale*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bryde's whale	3	1	0	0	3	2	0	0	4	2	0	0
Fin whale*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Humpback whale*	5	3	0	0	6	3	0	0	6	3	0	0
Minke whale	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0
Omura's whale	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Sei whale*	1	1	0	0	2	1	0	0	2	1	0	0
Odontocetes												
Blainville's beaked whale	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cuvier's beaked whale	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ginkgo-toothed beaked whale	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0
Longman's beaked whale	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0
Bottlenose dolphin	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dwarf sperm whale	57	89	17	0	58	92	18	0	64	100	21	0
Pygmy sperm whale	23	32	7	0	23	33	8	0	25	37	8	0

Table E-3: Estimated Marine Mammals Impacts per Year from Explosive Training and Testing Activities (continued)

Species	*Alternative 1 – Minimum*				*Alternative 1 – Maximum*				*Alternative 2 – Maximum*			
	Behavioral Response	*TTS*	*PTS*	*Injury*	*Behavioral Response*	*TTS*	*PTS*	*Injury*	*Behavioral Response*	*TTS*	*PTS*	*Injury*
False killer whale	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fraser's dolphin	4	4	1	0	4	4	1	0	4	5	1	0
Killer whale	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Melon-headed whale	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0
Pantropical spotted dolphin	4	2	1	0	4	2	1	0	4	3	1	0
Pygmy killer whale	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Risso's dolphin	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0
Rough-toothed dolphin	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Short-finned pilot whale	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Sperm whale*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Spinner dolphin	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0
Striped dolphin	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0

* ESA-listed species within the MITT Study Area

Notes: PTS = permanent threshold shift, TTS = temporary threshold shift

E.4 Estimated Marine Mammal Impacts per Seven-Year Period from Explosives Under Navy Training and Testing Activities

Table E-4 provides a summary of the estimated number of marine mammal impacts from exposure to explosives used during Navy training and testing activities under Alternatives 1 and 2 over the course of seven years.

Table E-4: Estimated Marine Mammals Impacts per Seven-Year Period from Explosive Training and Testing Activities

Species	*Alternative 1 – 7-Year*				*Alternative 2 – 7-Year*			
	Behavioral Response	*TTS*	*PTS*	*Injury*	*Behavioral Response*	*TTS*	*PTS*	*Injury*
Mysticetes								
Blue whale*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bryde's whale	21	11	0	0	22	11	0	0
Fin whale*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Humpback whale*	38	19	0	0	38	20	0	0
Minke whale	8	4	0	0	8	4	0	0
Omura's whale	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0
Sei whale*	11	5	0	0	12	5	0	0
Odontocetes								
Blainville's beaked whale	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cuvier's beaked whale	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ginkgo-toothed beaked whale	0	4	0	0	4	4	0	0
Longman's beaked whale	5	7	0	0	5	8	0	0
Bottlenose dolphin	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dwarf sperm whale	403	635	125	0	446	686	137	0
Pygmy sperm whale	160	231	52	0	175	250	57	0
False killer whale	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fraser's dolphin	28	30	7	0	29	33	8	0

Table E-4: Estimated Marine Mammals Impacts per Seven-Year Period from Explosive Training and Testing Activities (continued)

Species	*Alternative 1 – 7-Year*				*Alternative 2 – 7-Year*			
	Behavioral Response	*TTS*	*PTS*	*Injury*	*Behavioral Response*	*TTS*	*PTS*	*Injury*
Melon-headed whale	8	4	0	0	8	4	0	0
Killer whale	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pantropical spotted dolphin	28	17	6	0	30	18	7	0
Pygmy killer whale	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Risso's dolphin	7	5	0	0	7	6	0	0
Rough-toothed dolphin	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Short-finned pilot whale	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0
Sperm whale*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Spinner dolphin	0	6	0	0	0	6	4	0
Striped dolphin	5	5	0	0	6	6	0	0

* ESA-listed species within the MITT Study Area

Notes: PTS = permanent threshold shift, TTS = temporary threshold shift

E.5 Estimated Sea Turtle Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers Under Navy Training and Testing Activities

Based on the quantitative analysis, no sea turtle impacts are anticipated from exposure to sonar and other transducers used during Navy training and testing activities under Alternatives 1 and 2 over the course of one year or seven years.

E.6 Estimated Sea Turtle Impacts from Explosives Under Navy Training and Testing Activities

Table E-5 provides a summary of the estimated number of sea turtle impacts from exposure to explosives used during Navy training and testing activities under Alternatives 1 and 2 over the course of one year.

Table E-5: Estimated Sea Turtle Impacts per Year from Explosive Training and Testing Activities

Species	*Alternative 1 – Minimum*			*Alternative 1 – Maximum*			*Alternative 2 – Maximum*		
	TTS	*PTS*	*Injury*	*TTS*	*PTS*	*Injury*	*TTS*	*PTS*	*Injury*
Explosive Training and Testing Activities									
Family Cheloniidae (hardshell turtles)									
Green turtle*	6	3	0	6	3	0	6	3	0
Hawksbill turtle*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Loggerhead turtle*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Family Dermochelyidae (scuteless turtles)									
Leatherback turtle*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

* ESA-listed species within the MITT Study Area

Notes: PTS = permanent threshold shift, TTS = temporary threshold shift

E.7 Estimated Sea Turtle Impacts per Seven-Year Period from Explosives Under Navy Training and Testing Activities

Table E-6 provides a summary of the estimated number of sea turtle impacts from exposure to explosives used during Navy training and testing activities under Alternatives 1 and 2 per seven-year period.

Table E-6: Estimated Sea Turtle Impacts per Seven-Year Period from Explosive Training and Testing Activities

Species	*Alternative 1 – 7-Year*			*Alternative 2 – 7-Year*		
	TTS	*PTS*	*Injury*	*TTS*	*PTS*	*Injury*
Explosive Training and Testing Activities						
Family Cheloniidae (hardshell turtles)						
Green turtle*	40	20	0	40	20	0
Hawksbill turtle*	0	0	0	0	0	0
Loggerhead turtle*	0	0	0	0	0	0
Family Dermochelyidae (scuteless turtles)						
Leatherback turtle*	0	0	0	0	0	0

* ESA-listed species within the MITT Study Area

Notes: PTS = permanent threshold shift, TTS = temporary threshold shift

REFERENCES

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2018). *Quantifying Acoustic Impacts on Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles: Methods and Analytical Approach for Phase III Training and Testing* (Technical Report prepared by NUWC Division Newport, Space and Naval Warfare Systems Center Pacific, G2 Software Systems, and the National Marine Mammal Foundation). Newport, RI: Naval Undersea Warfare Center.

This page intentionally left blank.

Appendix F: Training and Testing Activities Matrices

Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/ Overseas Environmental Impact Statement Mariana Islands Training and Testing

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPENDIX F TRAINING AND TESTING ACTIVITIES MATRICES F-1

List of Figures

There are no figures in this appendix.

List of Tables

Table F-1: Stressors by Training Activity F-3
Table F-2: Stressors by Testing Activity F-9
Table F-3: Stressors by Resource F-11

This page intentionally left blank.

Appendix F Training and Testing Activities Matrices

This appendix contains three matrices. The first two matrices (Table F-1 and Table F-2) in this appendix list the training and testing activities that occur in the Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area and their associated stressors. The third matrix (Table F-3) lists the resources analyzed in this Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement and the stressors they are potentially affected by.

This page intentionally left blank.

Table F-1: Stressors by Training Activity

Mariana Islands Training Activity	Biological Resources																				Physical Resources					Human Resources[2]							
	Acoustic Stressors				Explosives		Energy Stressors			Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors							Entanglement Stressors		Ingestion Stressors		Air Quality Stressor	Sediments and Water Quality Stressors				Cultural Resource Stressors		Socioeconomic Stressors			Public Health & Safety Stressors		
	Sonar & Other Transducers	Vessel Noise	Aircraft Noise	Weapons Noise	In-Air Explosions	In-Water Explosions	In-Air Electromagnetic Devices	In-Water Electromagnetic Devices	High Energy Lasers	Vessels & In-water Devices	Aircraft & Aerial Targets	Military Expended Material	Seafloor Devices	Personnel Disturbance	Ground Disturbance	Wildfires	Wires & Cables	Decelerators/Parachutes	Military Expended Materials – Munitions	Military Expended Materials – Other than Munitions	Criteria Air Pollutants	Explosives	Metals	Chemicals	Other Materials[1]	Explosives[3]	Physical Disturbance & Strike[4]	Accessibility[5]	Airborne Acoustics[6]	Physical Disturbance & Strike[4]	In-Water Energy[7]	In-Air Energy[8]	Physical Interactions[9]
Legend																						= Decrease in number of events from 2015 Final MITT EIS/OEIS						= Increase in number of events from 2015 Final MITT EIS/OEIS							
Major Training Exercises																																	
Joint Expeditionary Exercise	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Joint Multi-Strike Group Exercise (decrease for Alt 1 only)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓					✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Air Warfare (AW)																																	
Air Combat Maneuver (ACM)			✓				✓				✓										✓		✓						✓	✓			
Air Defense Exercise (ADEX)		✓	✓				✓			✓	✓										✓						✓		✓	✓			✓
Air Intercept Control (AIC)			✓								✓										✓								✓	✓			
Gunnery Exercise (Air-to-Air) Medium-Caliber GUNEX A-A			✓	✓			✓				✓	✓							✓		✓		✓				✓	✓	✓	✓			✓
Gunnery Exercise (Surface-to-Air) Large-Caliber GUNEX S-A		✓	✓	✓	✓		✓			✓	✓	✓							✓		✓	✓	✓		✓		✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓
Gunnery Exercise (Surface-to-Air) Medium-Caliber GUNEX S-A		✓	✓	✓	✓		✓			✓	✓	✓							✓		✓		✓		✓		✓	✓	✓	✓			✓
Missile Exercise (Air-to-Air) MISSILEX A-A		✓	✓	✓	✓		✓			✓	✓	✓						✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓	✓	✓			✓
Missile Exercise (Surface-to-Air) MISSILEX S-A		✓	✓	✓	✓		✓			✓	✓	✓							✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓	✓	✓			✓
Amphibious Warfare (AW)																																	
Amphibious Rehearsal, No Landing		✓								✓											✓						✓	✓		✓			✓
Marine Air Ground Task Force Exercise (Amphibious) – Battalion	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓					✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Table F-1: Stressors by Training Activity (continued)

Mariana Islands Training Activity	Biological Resources																			Physical Resources					Human Resources[2]								
	Acoustic Stressors				Explosives		Energy Stressors			Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors							Entanglement Stressors		Ingestion Stressors		Air Quality Stressor	Sediments and Water Quality Stressors				Cultural Resource Stressors		Socioeconomic Stressors			Public Health & Safety Stressors		
	Sonar & Other Transducers	Vessel Noise	Aircraft Noise	Weapons Noise	In-Air Explosions	In-Water Explosions	In-Air Electromagnetic Devices	In-Water Electromagnetic Devices	High Energy Lasers	Vessels & In-water Devices	Aircraft & Aerial Targets	Military Expended Material	Seafloor Devices	Personnel Disturbance	Ground Disturbance	Wildfires	Wires & Cables	Decelerators/Parachutes	Military Expended Materials – Munitions	Military Expended Materials – Other than Munitions	Criteria Air Pollutants	Explosives	Metals	Chemicals	Other Materials[1]	Explosives[3]	Physical Disturbance & Strike[4]	Accessibility[5]	Airborne Acoustics[6]	Physical Disturbance & Strike[4]	In-Water Energy[7]	In-Air Energy[8]	Physical Interactions[9]
Amphibious Warfare (AW) (continued)																																	
Amphibious Assault		✓	✓							✓	✓			✓							✓						✓	✓		✓			✓
Amphibious Raid		✓	✓							✓	✓			✓							✓						✓	✓		✓			✓
Humanitarian Assistance/Disaster Relief Operations		✓	✓				✓			✓	✓										✓						✓	✓		✓			✓
Naval Surface Fire Support Exercise – Land-based target (Land) (increase Alt 2 only)		✓		✓	✓			✓		✓											✓							✓	✓				✓
Noncombatant Evacuation Operation		✓	✓				✓			✓	✓										✓		✓	✓	✓			✓		✓			✓
Special Purpose Marine Air Ground Task Force Exercise		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓				✓	✓	✓							✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Unmanned Aerial Vehicle – Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance			✓								✓										✓						✓	✓	✓	✓			✓
Anti-Submarine Warfare (ASW)																																	
Torpedo Exercise (TORPEX) – Helicopter (increase Alt 2 only)	✓	✓	✓				✓			✓	✓	✓					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓
Torpedo Exercise (TORPEX) – Maritime Patrol Aircraft (increase Alt 2 only)	✓		✓				✓			✓	✓	✓					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓
Torpedo Exercise (TORPEX) – Submarine	✓	✓								✓		✓					✓			✓			✓				✓			✓	✓		✓
Torpedo Exercise (TORPEX) – Surface	✓	✓					✓			✓		✓					✓	✓		✓	✓		✓				✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓
Tracking Exercise (TRACKEX) – Helicopter	✓		✓				✓			✓	✓	✓					✓	✓		✓	✓		✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓

Table F-1: Stressors by Training Activity (continued)

Mariana Islands Training Activity	Biological Resources																			Physical Resources					Human Resources[2]								
	Acoustic Stressors				Explosives		Energy Stressors			Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors							Entanglement Stressors		Ingestion Stressors		Air Quality Stressor	Sediments and Water Quality Stressors				Cultural Resource Stressors		Socioeconomic Stressors			Public Health & Safety Stressors		
	Sonar & Other Transducers	Vessel Noise	Aircraft Noise	Weapons Noise	In-Air Explosions	In-Water Explosions	In-Air Electromagnetic Devices	In-Water Electromagnetic Devices	High Energy Lasers	Vessels & In-water Devices	Aircraft & Aerial Targets	Military Expended Material	Seafloor Devices	Personnel Disturbance	Ground Disturbance	Wildfires	Wires & Cables	Decelerators/Parachutes	Military Expended Materials – Munitions	Military Expended Materials – Other than Munitions	Criteria Air Pollutants	Explosives	Metals	Chemicals	Other Materials[1]	Explosives[3]	Physical Disturbance & Strike[4]	Accessibility[5]	Airborne Acoustics[6]	Physical Disturbance & Strike[4]	In-Water Energy[7]	In-Air Energy[8]	Physical Interactions[9]
Anti-Submarine Warfare (ASW) (continued)																																	
Tracking Exercise (TRACKEX) – Maritime Patrol Aircraft	✓		✓				✓			✓	✓	✓					✓	✓		✓	✓		✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓		✓
Tracking Exercise (TRACKEX)– Submarine	✓	✓								✓		✓					✓						✓				✓			✓	✓		✓
Tracking Exercise (TRACKEX) – Surface	✓	✓					✓	✓		✓		✓					✓				✓						✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓
Small Joint Coordinated ASW Exercise (Multi-Sail/GUAMEX)	✓	✓	✓				✓			✓	✓	✓					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Electronic Warfare (EW)																																	
Counter Targeting Chaff Exercise – Aircraft			✓								✓	✓								✓	✓				✓				✓				✓
Counter Targeting Chaff Exercise – Ship		✓								✓		✓								✓	✓				✓			✓					✓
Counter Targeting Flare Exercise – Aircraft			✓				✓				✓	✓								✓	✓		✓		✓				✓				✓
Electronic Warfare Operations		✓	✓				✓			✓	✓										✓							✓	✓	✓			✓
Expeditionary Warfare																																	
Parachute Insertion		✓	✓							✓	✓			✓							✓	✓			✓		✓	✓	✓	✓			✓
Personnel Insertion/Extraction		✓	✓							✓	✓			✓							✓						✓	✓		✓			✓
Mine Warfare (MIW)																																	
Civilian Port Defense	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓				✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Limpet Mine Neutralization System		✓				✓				✓											✓	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓

Table F-1: Stressors by Training Activity (continued)

Mariana Islands Training Activity	Biological Resources																			Physical Resources					Human Resources[2]								
	Acoustic Stressors				Explosives		Energy Stressors			Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors							Entanglement Stressors		Ingestion Stressors		Air Quality Stressor	Sediments and Water Quality Stressors				Cultural Resource Stressors		Socioeconomic Stressors			Public Health & Safety Stressors		
	Sonar & Other Transducers	Vessel Noise	Aircraft Noise	Weapons Noise	In-Air Explosions	In-Water Explosions	In-Air Electromagnetic Devices	In-Water Electromagnetic Devices	High Energy Lasers	Vessels & In-water Devices	Aircraft & Aerial Targets	Military Expended Material	Seafloor Devices	Personnel Disturbance	Ground Disturbance	Wildfires	Wires & Cables	Decelerators/Parachutes	Military Expended Materials – Munitions	Military Expended Materials – Other than Munitions	Criteria Air Pollutants	Explosives	Metals	Chemicals	Other Materials[1]	Explosives[3]	Physical Disturbance & Strike[4]	Accessibility[5]	Airborne Acoustics[6]	Physical Disturbance & Strike[4]	In-Water Energy[7]	In-Air Energy[8]	Physical Interactions[9]
Mine Warfare (MIW) (continued)																																	
Mine Neutralization – Remotely Operated Vehicle Sonar (ASQ-235 [AQS-20], SLQ-48)	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓				✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓
Mine Countermeasure Exercise – Surface Ship Sonar (SQQ-32, MCM)	✓	✓					✓			✓			✓								✓							✓			✓		✓
Mine Countermeasure – Towed Mine Neutralization		✓	✓				✓	✓		✓	✓		✓								✓						✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Airborne Mine Countermeasure – Towed Mine Detection	✓	✓	✓							✓	✓		✓								✓						✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Mine Countermeasure Exercise – Towed Sonar (AQS-20, LCS)	✓	✓					✓	✓		✓	✓		✓								✓	✓					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓
Mine Laying		✓	✓								✓	✓	✓								✓		✓				✓	✓	✓	✓			✓
Mine Neutralization – Explosive Ordnance Disposal		✓	✓			✓				✓	✓	✓	✓						✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓
Submarine Mine Exercise	✓									✓		✓	✓																	✓		✓
Surface Ship Object Detection	✓	✓								✓			✓								✓						✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓
Underwater Demolition Qualification/Certification		✓	✓		✓	✓				✓	✓	✓	✓							✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓
Strike Warfare (STW)																																	
Bombing Exercise (Air-to-Ground)			✓								✓	✓									✓		✓			✓	✓		✓				
Gunnery Exercise (Air-to-Ground)			✓	✓							✓	✓							✓		✓		✓			✓	✓		✓				
Missile Exercise (MISSILEX)		✓	✓	✓						✓	✓	✓									✓		✓			✓	✓		✓				

Doc. No. 35GL-20-1874.*

Table F-1: Stressors by Training Activity (continued)

Mariana Islands Training Activity	Biological Resources																			Physical Resources					Human Resources[2]								
	Acoustic Stressors				Explosives		Energy Stressors			Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors							Entanglement Stressors		Ingestion Stressors		Air Quality Stressor	Sediments and Water Quality Stressors				Cultural Resource Stressors		Socioeconomic Stressors			Public Health & Safety Stressors		
	Sonar & Other Transducers	Vessel Noise	Aircraft Noise	Weapons Noise	In-Air Explosions	In-Water Explosions	In-Air Electromagnetic Devices	In-Water Electromagnetic Devices	High Energy Lasers	Vessels & In-water Devices	Aircraft & Aerial Targets	Military Expended Material	Seafloor Devices	Personnel Disturbance	Ground Disturbance	Wildfires	Wires & Cables	Decelerators/Parachutes	Military Expended Materials – Munitions	Military Expended Materials – Other than Munitions	Criteria Air Pollutants	Explosives	Metals	Chemicals	Other Materials[1]	Explosives[3]	Physical Disturbance & Strike[4]	Accessibility[5]	Airborne Acoustics[6]	Physical Disturbance & Strike[4]	In-Water Energy[7]	In-Air Energy[8]	Physical Interactions[9]
Surface Warfare (SUW)																																	
Bombing Exercise (Air-to-Surface)		✓	✓	✓		✓				✓	✓	✓							✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Gunnery Exercise (Air-to-Surface) – Medium-Caliber		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓				✓	✓	✓							✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓
Gunnery Exercise (Air-to-Surface) – Small-Caliber		✓	✓	✓						✓	✓	✓							✓	✓	✓		✓				✓	✓	✓	✓			✓
Gunnery Exercise (Surface-to-Surface) Boat – Small- and Medium-Caliber		✓		✓	✓					✓		✓							✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓
Gunnery Exercise (Surface-to-Surface) Ship – Large-Caliber		✓		✓	✓	✓				✓		✓							✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Gunnery Exercise (Surface-to-Surface) Ship – Small- and Medium-Caliber		✓		✓	✓	✓	✓			✓		✓							✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Laser Targeting (at sea)		✓	✓						✓	✓	✓										✓							✓		✓		✓	✓
Maritime Security Operations		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓				✓	✓	✓							✓		✓	✓	✓					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Missile Exercise (Air-to-Surface) MISSILEX		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓	✓							✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Missile Exercise (Air-to-Surface) Rocket		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓							✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Missile Exercise (Surface-to-Surface)		✓		✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓		✓							✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Sinking Exercise		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓	✓	✓				✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Other Training Activities																																	
Direct Action (Tactical Air Control Party)		✓	✓							✓	✓										✓												

Table F-1: Stressors by Training Activity (continued)

Mariana Islands Training Activity	Biological Resources																		Physical Resources					Human Resources[2]								
	Acoustic Stressors				Explosives		Energy Stressors			Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors							Entanglement Stressors		Ingestion Stressors		Air Quality Stressor	Sediments and Water Quality Stressors				Cultural Resource Stressors		Socioeconomic Stressors			Public Health & Safety Stressors		
	Sonar & Other Transducers	Vessel Noise	Aircraft Noise	Weapons Noise	In-Air Explosions	In-Water Explosions	In-Air Electromagnetic Devices	In-Water Electromagnetic Devices	High Energy Lasers	Vessels & In-water Devices	Aircraft & Aerial Targets	Military Expended Material	Seafloor Devices	Personnel Disturbance	Ground Disturbance	Wildfires	Wires & Cables	Decelerators/Parachutes	Military Expended Materials – Munitions	Military Expended Materials – Other than Munitions	Criteria Air Pollutants	Explosives	Metals	Chemicals	Other Materials[1]	Explosives[3]	Physical Disturbance & Strike[4]	Accessibility[5]	Airborne Acoustics[6]	Physical Disturbance & Strike[4]	In-Water Energy[7]	In-Air Energy[8]	Physical Interactions[9]
Other Training Activities (continued)																																
Intelligence, Surveillance, Reconnaissance		✓	✓							✓	✓						✓	✓		✓									✓	✓	✓		✓
Precision Anchoring		✓								✓			✓								✓			✓	✓		✓	✓		✓			✓
Search and Rescue at Sea		✓	✓							✓	✓	✓									✓							✓	✓	✓	✓		✓
Small Boat Attack (increase for Alt 2 only)		✓								✓		✓							✓	✓	✓		✓					✓	✓	✓		✓	✓
Submarine Navigation	✓									✓																		✓	✓	✓	✓		✓
Submarine Sonar Maintenance	✓									✓																			✓		✓		
Surface Ship Sonar Maintenance	✓	✓					✓			✓											✓										✓		
Underwater Survey		✓								✓											✓						✓	✓					✓
Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Training and Certification		✓								✓	✓	✓									✓								✓				
Unmanned Underwater Vehicle Training	✓	✓								✓		✓	✓								✓							✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Legend — = Decrease in number of events from 2015 Final MITT EIS/OEIS; = Increase in number of events from 2015 Final MITT EIS/OEIS

[1] Other Materials include marine markers and flares, chaff, towed and stationary targets, and miscellaneous components of other expended objects
[2] Area of interest is U.S. Territorial Waters (seaward of the mean high water line to 12 nautical miles and any inshore waters)
[3] Vibration and shock waves from underwater explosions
[4] Physical disturbance and strike stressors resulting from in-water devices, military expended materials, seafloor devices, pile driving, and vibration from sonic booms in U.S. territorial waters (seaward of the mean high water line to 12 nautical miles).
[5] Availability of access on the ocean and in the air
[6] Loud noises from weapons firing, in-air explosions, and sonic booms
[7] Active sonar, underwater explosions, air guns, vessel movements, mine warfare training devices, and unmanned underwater systems
[8] Sources of electromagnetic energy and lasers
[9] Interaction of Navy or Marine Corps aircraft, vessels, and equipment with general public
Note: A check indicates training and/or testing event that trigger the stressor as it applies to the specific resource.

Table F-2: Stressors by Testing Activity

Mariana Islands Testing Activity	Biological Resources																		Physical Resources					Human Resources[2]								
	Acoustic Stressors				Explosives		Energy Stressors			Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors							Entanglement Stressors		Ingestion Stressors		Air Quality Stressor	Sediments and Water Quality Stressors				Cultural Resource Stressors		Socioeconomic Stressors			Public Health & Safety Stressors		
	Sonar & Other Transducers	Vessel Noise	Aircraft Noise	Weapons Noise	In Air Explosions	In Water Explosions	In-Air Electromagnetic Devices	In-Water Electromagnetic Devices	High Energy Lasers	Vessels & In-water Devices	Aircraft & Aerial Targets	Military Expended Material	Seafloor Devices	Personnel Disturbance	Ground Disturbance	Wildfires	Wires & Cables	Decelerators/Parachutes	Military Expended Materials – Munitions	Military Expended Materials – Other than Munitions	Criteria Air Pollutants	Explosives	Metals	Chemicals	Other Materials[1]	Explosives[3]	Physical Disturbance & Strike[4]	Accessibility[5]	Airborne Acoustics[6]	Physical Disturbance & Strike[4]	In-Water Energy[7]	In-Air Energy[8]	Physical Interactions[9]
Legend																					= Decrease in number of events from 2015 Final MITT EIS/OEIS							= Increase in number of events from 2015 Final MITT EIS/OEIS								
NAVAL AIR SYSTEMS COMMAND																																	
Anti-Submarine Warfare (ASW)																																	
Anti-Submarine Warfare Torpedo Test	✓		✓				✓			✓	✓	✓	✓				✓	✓		✓	✓		✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓
Anti-Submarine Warfare Tracking Test – Maritime Patrol Aircraft (Sonobuoys)	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓			✓	✓	✓					✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓
Electronic Warfare (EW)																																	
Intelligence, Surveillance, Reconnaissance ISR/EW Electronic Warfare Testing (previously named Broad Area Maritime Surveillance Testing – MQ-4C)							✓				✓										✓								✓				✓
Surface Warfare (SUW)																																	
Air-to-Surface Missile Test			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓				✓	✓							✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓
NAVAL SEA SYSTEMS COMMAND																																	
Anti-Submarine Warfare (ASW)																																	
Anti-Submarine Warfare Mission Package Testing	✓	✓	✓				✓			✓	✓	✓					✓	✓		✓	✓		✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
At-Sea Sonar Testing	✓						✓	✓				✓					✓				✓		✓		✓			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Torpedo (Explosive) Testing	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓			✓	✓	✓					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Torpedo (Non-explosive) Testing	✓	✓	✓				✓			✓	✓	✓					✓	✓		✓	✓		✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Table F-2: Stressors by Testing Activity (continued)

Mariana Islands Testing Activity	Biological Resources																		Physical Resources					Human Resources[2]								
	Acoustic Stressors				Explosives		Energy Stressors			Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors							Entanglement Stressors		Ingestion Stressors		Air Quality Stressor	Sediments and Water Quality Stressors				Cultural Resource Stressors		Socioeconomic Stressors			Public Health & Safety Stressors		
	Sonar & Other Transducers	Vessel Noise	Aircraft Noise	Weapons Noise	In Air Explosions	In Water Explosions	In-Air Electromagnetic Devices	In-Water Electromagnetic Devices	High Energy Lasers	Vessels & In-water Devices	Aircraft & Aerial Targets	Military Expended Material	Seafloor Devices	Personnel Disturbance	Ground Disturbance	Wildfires	Wires & Cables	Decelerators/Parachutes	Military Expended Materials – Munitions	Military Expended Materials – Other than Munitions	Criteria Air Pollutants	Explosives	Metals	Chemicals	Other Materials[1]	Explosives[3]	Physical Disturbance & Strike[4]	Accessibility[5]	Airborne Acoustics[6]	Physical Disturbance & Strike[4]	In-Water Energy[7]	In-Air Energy[8]	Physical Interactions[9]
Electronic Warfare (EW)																																
Radar and Other System Testing		✓	✓				✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓						✓			✓				✓		✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓
Mine Warfare (MIW)																																
Mine Countermeasure and Neutralization Testing	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓				✓		✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Surface Warfare																																
Kinetic Energy Weapon Testing		✓		✓	✓		✓			✓	✓	✓					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓				✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓
Vessel Evaluation																																
Undersea Warfare Testing	✓	✓	✓				✓			✓	✓	✓					✓	✓		✓	✓		✓		✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Other Testing Activities																																
Simulant Testing		✓	✓				✓			✓	✓										✓			✓	✓			✓	✓	✓			✓
OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH																																
Acoustic and Oceanographic Research		✓								✓			✓								✓							✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Legend = Decrease in number of events from 2015 Final MITT EIS/OEIS; = Increase in number of events from 2015 Final MITT EIS/OEIS

[1] Other Materials include marine markers and flares, chaff, towed and stationary targets, and miscellaneous components of other expended objects
[2] Area of interest is U.S. Territorial Waters (seaward of the mean high water line to 12 nautical miles and any inshore waters)
[3] Vibration and shock waves from underwater explosions.
[4] Physical disturbance and strike stressors resulting from in-water devices, military expended materials, seafloor devices, pile driving, and vibration from sonic booms in U.S. territorial waters (seaward of the mean high water line to 12 nautical miles).
[5] Availability of access on the ocean and in the air
[6] Loud noises from weapons firing, in-air explosions, and sonic booms
[7] Active sonar, underwater explosions, air guns, vessel movements, mine warfare training devices, and unmanned underwater systems
[8] Sources of electromagnetic energy and lasers
[9] Interaction of Navy or Marine Corps aircraft, vessels, and equipment with general public
Note: A check indicates training and/or testing events that trigger the stressor as it applies to the specific resource.

Table F-3: Stressors by Resource

Stressors vs. Resource		Biological Resources																		Physical Resources					Human Resources[2]								
		Acoustic Stressors				Explosives		Energy Stressors			Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors							Entanglement Stressors		Ingestion Stressors		Air Quality Stressor	Sediments and Water Quality Stressors				Cultural Resource Stressors		Socioeconomic Stressors			Public Health & Safety Stressors		
		Sonar & Other Transducers	Vessel Noise	Aircraft Noise	Weapons Noise	In Air Explosions	In Water Explosions	In-Air Electromagnetic Devices	In-Water Electromagnetic Devices	High Energy Lasers	Vessels & In-water Devices	Aircraft & Aerial Targets	Military Expended Material	Seafloor Devices	Personnel Disturbance	Ground Disturbance	Wildfires	Wires & Cables	Decelerators/Parachutes	Military Expended Materials – Munitions	Military Expended Materials – Other than Munitions	Criteria Air Pollutants	Explosives	Metals	Chemicals	Other Materials[1]	Explosives[3]	Physical Disturbance & Strike[4]	Accessibility[5]	Airborne Acoustics[6]	Physical Disturbance & Strike[4]	In-Water Energy[7]	In-Air Energy[8]	Physical Interactions[9]
Physical Resources	Sediments and Water Quality																						✓	✓	✓	✓								
	Air Quality					✓																✓												
Biological Resources	Marine Habitats						✓				✓		✓	✓	✓																			
	Marine Mammals	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓		✓	✓	✓		✓	✓				✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓								
	Sea Turtles	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓		✓	✓	✓		✓	✓		✓		✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓								
	Marine Birds	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓							✓	✓													
	Marine Vegetation						✓				✓		✓	✓									✓	✓	✓	✓								
	Marine Invertebrates	✓					✓		✓		✓		✓	✓	✓			✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓								
	Fish	✓	✓		✓		✓		✓	✓	✓		✓	✓		✓		✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓								
	Terrestrial			✓	✓	✓						✓	✓			✓	✓																	
Human Resources	Cultural Resources			✓			✓						✓	✓													✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			
	Socioeconomic Resources	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓					✓	✓				✓	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓	✓			
	Public Health and Safety	✓			✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓																	✓	✓	✓

Table F-3: Stressors by Resource (continued)

Stressors vs. Resource	Biological Resources																		Physical Resources					Human Resources[2]								
	Acoustic Stressors				Explosives		Energy Stressors			Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors							Entanglement Stressors		Ingestion Stressors		Air Quality Stressor	Sediments and Water Quality Stressors				Cultural Resource Stressors		Socioeconomic Stressors			Public Health & Safety Stressors		
	Sonar & Other Transducers	Vessel Noise	Aircraft Noise	Weapons Noise	In Air Explosions	In Water Explosions	In-Air Electromagnetic Devices	In-Water Electromagnetic Devices	High Energy Lasers	Vessels & In-water Devices	Aircraft & Aerial Targets	Military Expended Material	Seafloor Devices	Personnel Disturbance	Ground Disturbance	Wildfires	Wires & Cables	Decelerators/Parachutes	Military Expended Materials – Munitions	Military Expended Materials – Other than Munitions	Criteria Air Pollutants	Explosives	Metals	Chemicals	Other Materials[1]	Explosives[3]	Physical Disturbance & Strike[4]	Accessibility[5]	Airborne Acoustics[6]	Physical Disturbance & Strike[4]	Underwater Energy[7]	In-Air Energy[8]	Physical Interactions[9]

[1] Other Materials include marine markers and flares, chaff, towed and stationary targets, and miscellaneous components of other expended objects

[2] Area of interest is U.S. Territorial Waters (seaward of the mean high water line to 12 nautical miles and any inshore waters)

[3] Vibration and shock waves from underwater explosions.

[4] Physical disturbance and strike stressors resulting from in-water devices, military expended materials, seafloor devices, pile driving, and vibration from sonic booms in U.S. territorial waters (seaward of the mean high water line to 12 nautical miles).

[5] Availability of access on the ocean and in the air

[6] Loud noises from weapons firing, in-air explosions, and sonic booms

[7] Active sonar, underwater explosions, air guns, vessel movements, mine warfare training devices, and unmanned underwater systems

[8] Sources of electromagnetic energy and lasers

[9] Interaction of Navy or Marine Corps aircraft, vessels, and equipment with general public

Note: A check indicates training and/or testing events that trigger the stressor as it applies to the specific resource.

Appendix G: Conceptual Framework for Assessing Effects on Biological Resources

Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/ Overseas Environmental Impact Statement Mariana Islands Training and Testing

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPENDIX G CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK FOR ASSESSING EFFECTS ON BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.. G-1

G.1 Conceptual Framework for Assessing Effects from Acoustic and Explosive Activities G-1

G.1.1 Injury G-2

G.1.2 Hearing Loss G-5

G.1.3 Masking G-7

G.1.4 Physiological Stress G-8

G.1.5 Behavioral Reactions G-9

G.1.6 Long-Term Consequences G-10

G.2 Conceptual Framework for Assessing Effects from Energy-Producing Activities G-11

G.2.1 Stimuli G-11

G.2.1.1 Magnitude of the Energy Stressor G-11

G.2.1.2 Location of the Energy Stressor G-11

G.2.1.3 Behavior of the Organism G-11

G.2.2 Immediate Response and Costs to the Individual G-11

G.2.3 Long-Term Consequences to the Individual and Population G-12

G.3 Conceptual Framework for Assessing Effects from Physical Disturbance or Strike G-12

G.3.1 Stimuli G-12

G.3.1.1 Size and Weight of the Objects G-12

G.3.1.2 Location and Speed of the Objects G-12

G.3.1.3 Buoyancy of the Objects G-12

G.3.1.4 Behavior of the Organism G-13

G.3.2 Immediate Response and Costs to the Individual G-13

G.3.3 Long-Term Consequences to the Population G-13

G.4 Conceptual Framework for Assessing Effects from Entanglement G-13

G.4.1 Stimuli G-13

G.4.1.1 Physical Properties of the Objects G-13

G.4.1.2 Physical Features of the Resource G-14

G.4.1.3 Location of the Objects G-14

G.4.1.4 Buoyancy of Objects G-14

G.4.1.5 Behavior of the Organism G-14
G.4.2 Immediate Response and Costs to the Individual G-14
G.4.3 Long-Term Consequences to the Individual and Population G-14
G.5 Conceptual Framework for Assessing Effects from Ingestion G-15
G.5.1 Stimuli G-15
G.5.1.1 Size of the Objects G-15
G.5.1.2 Location of the Objects G-15
G.5.1.3 Buoyancy of the Objects G-15
G.5.1.4 Feeding Behavior G-15
G.5.2 Immediate Response and Costs to the Individual G-15
G.5.3 Long-Term Consequences to the Individual and Population G-16
G.6 Conceptual Framework for Assessing Effects from Secondary Stressors G-16
G.6.1 Secondary Stressors G-16
G.6.1.1 Impacts on Habitat G-16
G.6.1.2 Impacts on Prey Availability G-17
G.6.2 Immediate Response and Costs to the Individual G-17
G.6.3 Long-Term Consequences to the Individual and Population G-17

List of Figures

Figure G-1: Flow Chart of the Evaluation Process of Sound-Producing Activities G-3
Figure G-2: Two Hypothetical Threshold Shifts G-6

List of Tables

There are no tables in this appendix.

APPENDIX G Conceptual Framework for Assessing Effects on Biological Resources

The analysis of impacts on biological resources focused on the likelihood of encountering the stressor, the primary stimulus, response, and recovery of individual organisms. Where appropriate, the potential of a biological resource to overlap with a stressor was analyzed with consideration given to the specific geographic area (large marine ecosystems, open ocean areas, range complexes, operating areas, and other training and testing areas) in which the overlap could occur. Additionally, the differential impacts of training versus testing activities that introduce stressors to the resource were considered.

For each of the non-biological resources considered in this Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement, the methods are unique to each specific resource and are therefore described in each resource section. For Sediments and Water Quality, Air Quality, Cultural Resources, Socioeconomics, and for Public Health and Safety, see Section 3.0.1 (Overall Approach to Analysis).

G.1 Conceptual Framework for Assessing Effects from Acoustic and Explosive Activities

This conceptual framework describes the potential effects from exposure to acoustic and explosive activities and the accompanying short-term costs to the animal (e.g., expended energy or missed feeding opportunity). It then outlines the conditions that may lead to long-term consequences for the individual if the animal cannot fully recover from the short-term costs and how these in turn may affect the population. Within each biological resource section (e.g., marine mammals, birds, and fishes) the detailed methods to predict effects on specific taxa are derived from this conceptual framework.

An animal is considered "exposed" to a sound if the received sound level at the animal's location is above the background ambient noise level within a similar frequency band. A variety of effects may result from exposure to acoustic and explosive activities.

The categories of potential effects are listed below:

- ***Injury*** *and other non-auditory injury – Injury to organs or tissues of an animal*
- ***Hearing loss*** *– A noise-induced decrease in hearing sensitivity, which can be either temporary or permanent and may be limited to a narrow frequency range of hearing*
- ***Masking*** *– When the perception of a biologically important sound (i.e., signal) is interfered with by a second sound (i.e., noise)*
- ***Physiological stress*** *– An adaptive process that helps an animal cope with changing conditions; although, too much stress can result in physiological problems*
- ***Behavioral response*** *– A reaction ranging from very minor and brief changes in attentional focus, changes in biologically important behaviors, and avoidance of a sound source or area, to aggression or prolonged flight*

Figure G-1 is a flowchart that diagrams the process used to evaluate the potential effects to marine animals exposed to sound-producing activities. The shape and color of each box on the flowchart represents either a decision point in the analysis (green diamonds); specific processes such as responses, costs, or recovery (blue rectangles); external factors to consider (purple parallelograms); and final outcomes for the individual or population (orange ovals and rectangles). Each box is labeled for reference throughout the following sections. For simplicity, sound is used here to include not only sound

waves but also blast waves generated from explosive sources. Box A1, the Sound-Producing Activity, is the source of this stimuli and therefore the starting point in the analysis.

The first step in predicting whether an activity is capable of affecting a marine animal is to define the stimuli experienced by the animal. The stimuli include the overall level of activity, the surrounding acoustical environment, and characteristics of the sound when it reaches the animal.

Sounds emitted from a sound-producing activity (Box A1) travel through the environment to create a spatially variable sound field. The received sound at the animal (Box A2) determines the range of possible effects. The received sound can be evaluated in several ways, including number of times the sound is experienced (repetitive exposures), total received energy, or highest sound pressure level experienced.

Sounds that are higher than the ambient noise level and within an animal's hearing sensitivity range (Box A3) have the potential to cause effects. There can be any number of individual sound sources in a given activity, each with its own unique characteristics. For example, a United States Department of the Navy training exercise may involve several ships and aircraft using several types of sonar. Environmental factors such as temperature and bottom type impact how sound spreads and attenuates through the environment. Additionally, independent of the sounds, the overall level of activity and the number and movement of sound sources are important to help predict the probable reactions.

The magnitude of the responses is predicted based on the characteristics of the acoustic stimuli and the characteristics of the animal (species, susceptibility, life history stage, size, and past experiences). Very high exposure levels close to explosives have the potential to cause injury. High-level, long-duration, or repetitive exposures may potentially cause some hearing loss. All perceived sounds may lead to behavioral responses, physiological stress, and masking. Many sounds, including sounds that are not detectable by the animal, could have no effect (Box A4).

G.1.1 Injury

Injury (Box B1) refers to the direct injury of tissues and organs by shock or pressure waves impinging upon or traveling through an animal's body. Marine animals are well adapted to large, but relatively slow, hydrostatic pressures changes that occur with changing depth. However, injury may result from exposure to rapid pressure changes, such that the tissues do not have time to adequately adjust.

Therefore, injury is normally limited to relatively close ranges from explosions. Injury can be mild and fully recoverable or, in some cases, lead to mortality.

Injury includes both auditory and non-auditory injury. Auditory injury is the direct mechanical injury to hearing-related structures, including tympanic membrane rupture, disarticulation of the middle ear ossicles, and injury to the inner ear structures such as the organ of Corti and the associated hair cells. Auditory injury differs from auditory fatigue in that the latter involves the overstimulation of the auditory system at levels below those capable of causing direct mechanical damage. Auditory injury is always injurious but can be temporary. One of the most common consequences of auditory injury is hearing loss.




Figure G-1: Flow Chart of the Evaluation Process of Sound-Producing Activities

This page intentionally left blank.

Non-auditory injury can include hemorrhaging of small blood vessels and the rupture of gas-containing tissues such as the lung, swim bladder, or gastrointestinal tract. After the ear (or other sound-sensing organs), these are usually the organs and tissues most sensitive to explosive injury. An animal's size and anatomy are important in determining its susceptibility to non-auditory injury (Box B2). Larger size indicates more tissue to protect vital organs. Therefore, larger animals should be less susceptible to injury than smaller animals. In some cases, acoustic resonance of a structure may enhance the vibrations resulting from noise exposure and result in an increased susceptibility to injury. The size, geometry, and material composition of a structure determine the frequency at which the object will resonate. Because most biological tissues are heavily damped, the increase in susceptibility from resonance is limited.

Vascular and tissue bubble formation resulting from sound exposure is a hypothesized mechanism of injury to breath-holding marine animals. Bubble formation and growth due to direct sound exposure have been hypothesized (Crum & Mao, 1996; Crum et al., 2005); however, the experimental laboratory conditions under which these phenomena were observed would not be replicated in the wild. Certain dive behaviors by breath-holding animals are predicted to result in conditions of blood nitrogen super-saturation, potentially putting an animal at risk for decompression sickness (Fahlman et al., 2014), although this phenomena has not been observed (Houser et al., 2009). In addition, animals that spend long periods of time at great depths are predicted to have super-saturated tissues that may slowly release nitrogen if the animal then spends a long time at the surface (i.e., stranding) (Houser et al., 2009).

Injury could increase the animal's physiological stress (Box B8), which feeds into the stress response (Box B7) and also increases the likelihood or severity of a behavioral response. Injury may reduce an animal's ability to secure food by reducing its mobility or the efficiency of its sensory systems, making the injured individual less attractive to potential mates, increasing an individual's chances of contracting diseases or falling prey to a predator (Box D2), or increasing an animal's overall physiological stress level (Box D10). Severe injury can lead to the death of the individual (Box D1).

Damaged tissues from mild to moderate injury may heal over time. The predicted recovery of direct injury is based on the severity of the injury, availability of resources, and characteristics of the animal. The animal may also need to recover from any potential costs due to a decrease in resource gathering efficiency and any secondary effects from predators or disease. Severe injuries can lead to reduced survivorship (longevity), elevated stress levels, and prolonged alterations in behavior that can reduce an animal's lifetime reproductive success. An animal with decreased energy stores or a lingering injury may be less successful at mating for one or more breeding seasons, thereby decreasing the number of offspring produced over its lifetime.

G.1.2 Hearing Loss

Hearing loss, also called a noise-induced threshold shift, is possibly the most studied type of effect from sound exposures to animals. Hearing loss manifests itself as loss in hearing sensitivity across part of an animal's hearing range, which is dependent upon the specifics of the noise exposure. Hearing loss may be either PTS or TTS. If the threshold shift eventually returns to zero (the animal's hearing returns to pre-exposure value), the threshold shift is a TTS. If the threshold shift does not return to zero but leaves some finite amount of threshold shift, then that remaining threshold shift is a PTS. Figure G-2 shows one hypothetical threshold shift that completely recovers, a TTS, and one that does not completely recover, leaving some PTS.




Figure G-2: Two Hypothetical Threshold Shifts

The characteristics of the received sound stimuli are used and compared to the animal's hearing sensitivity and susceptibility to noise (Box A3) to determine the potential for hearing loss. The amplitude, frequency, duration, and temporal pattern of the sound exposure are important parameters for predicting the potential for hearing loss over a specific portion of an animal's hearing range. Duration is particularly important because hearing loss can increase with prolonged exposure time. Longer exposures with lower sound levels can cause more threshold shift than a shorter exposure using the same amount of energy overall. The frequency of the sound also plays an important role. Experiments show that animals are most susceptible to hearing loss (Box B3) within their most sensitive hearing range. Sounds outside of an animal's audible frequency range do not cause hearing loss.

The mechanisms responsible for hearing loss may consist of a variety of mechanical and biochemical processes in the inner ear, including physical damage or distortion of the tympanic membrane (not including tympanic membrane rupture which is considered auditory injury), physical damage or distortion of the cochlear hair cells, hair cell death, changes in cochlear blood flow, and swelling of cochlear nerve terminals (Henderson et al., 2006; Kujawa & Liberman, 2009). Although the outer hair cells are the most prominent target for fatigue effects, severe noise exposures may also result in inner hair cell death and loss of auditory nerve fibers (Henderson et al., 2006).

The relationship between TTS and PTS is complicated and poorly understood, even in humans and terrestrial mammals, where numerous studies failed to delineate a clear relationship between the two. Relatively small amounts of TTS (e.g., less than 40–50 decibels measured two minutes after exposure) will recover with no apparent permanent effects; however, terrestrial mammal studies revealed that larger amounts of threshold shift can result in permanent neural degeneration, despite the hearing thresholds returning to normal (Kujawa & Liberman, 2009). The amounts of threshold shift induced by Kujawa and Liberman (2009) were described as being "at the limits of reversibility." It is unknown whether smaller amounts of threshold shift can result in similar neural degeneration, or if effects would translate to other species such as marine animals.

Hearing loss can increase an animal's physiological stress (Box B8), which feeds into the stress response (Box B7). Hearing loss can increase the likelihood or severity of a behavioral response and increase an animal's overall physiological stress level (Box D10). Hearing loss reduces the distance over which animals can communicate and detect other biologically important sounds (Box D3). Hearing loss could

also be inconsequential for an animal if the frequency range affected is not critical for that animal to hear within, or the hearing loss is of such short duration (e.g., a few minutes) that there are no costs to the individual.

Small to moderate amounts of hearing loss may recover over a period of minutes to days, depending on the amount of initial threshold shift. Severe noise-induced hearing loss may not fully recover, resulting in some amount of PTS. An animal whose hearing does not recover quickly and fully could suffer a reduction in lifetime reproductive success. An animal with PTS may be less successful at mating for one or more breeding seasons, thereby decreasing the number of offspring it can produce over its lifetime.

G.1.3 Masking

Masking occurs if the noise from an activity interferes with an animal's ability to detect, understand, or recognize biologically relevant sounds of interest (Box B4). In this context noise refers to unwanted or unimportant sounds that mask an animal's ability to hear sounds of interest. Sounds of interest include those from conspecifics such as offspring, mates, and competitors; echolocation clicks; sounds from predators; natural, abiotic sounds that may aid in navigation; and reverberation, which can give an animal information about its location and orientation within the ocean. The probability of masking increases as the noise and sound of interest increase in similarity and the masking noise increases in level. The frequency, received level, and duty cycle of the noise determines the potential degree of auditory masking. Masking only occurs during the sound exposure.

A behavior decision (either conscious or instinctive) is made by the animal when the animal detects increased background noise, or possibly, when the animal recognizes that biologically relevant sounds are being masked (Box C1). An animal's past experiences can be important in determining the behavioral response when dealing with masking (Box C4). For example, an animal may modify its vocalizations to reduce the effects of masking noise. Other stimuli present in the environment can influence an animal's behavior decision (Box C5) such as the presence of predators, prey, or potential mates.

An animal may exhibit a passive behavioral response when coping with masking (Box C2). It may simply not respond and keep conducting its current natural behavior. An animal may also stop calling until the background noise decreases. These passive responses do not present a direct energetic cost to the animal; however, masking will continue, depending on the acoustic stimuli.

An animal may actively compensate for masking (Box C3). An animal can vocalize more loudly to make its signal heard over the masking noise. An animal may also shift the frequency of its vocalizations away from the frequency of the masking noise. This shift can actually reduce the masking effect for the animal and other animals that are listening in the area.

If masking impairs an animal's ability to hear biologically important sounds (Box D3) it could reduce an animal's ability to communicate with conspecifics or reduce opportunities to detect or attract more distant mates, gain information about their physical environment, or navigate. An animal that modifies its vocalization in response to masking could also incur a cost (Box D4). Modifying vocalizations may cost the animal energy, interfere with the behavioral function of a call, or reduce a signaler's apparent quality as a mating partner. For example, songbirds that shift their calls up an octave to compensate for increased background noise attract fewer or less-desirable mates, and many terrestrial species advertise body size and quality with low-frequency vocalizations (Slabbekoorn & Ripmeester, 2007). Masking may also lead to no measurable costs for an animal. Masking could be of short duration or intermittent such that biologically important sounds that are continuous or repeated are received by the animal between masking noise.

Masking only occurs when the sound source is operating; therefore, direct masking effects stop immediately upon cessation of the sound-producing activity. Masking could have long-term consequences for individuals if the activity was continuous or occurred frequently enough.

G.1.4 Physiological Stress

Marine animals naturally experience physiological stress as part of their normal life histories. The physiological response to a stressor, often termed the stress response, is an adaptive process that helps an animal cope with changing external and internal environmental conditions. Sound-producing activities have the potential to cause additional stress. However, too much of a stress response can be harmful to an animal, resulting in physiological dysfunction.

If a sound is detected (i.e., heard or sensed) by an animal, a stress response can occur (Box B7). The severity of the stress response depends on the received sound level at the animal (Box A2), the details of the sound-producing activity (Box A1), and the animal's life history stage (e.g., juvenile or adult, breeding or feeding season), and past experience with the stimuli (Box B5). An animal's life history stage is an important factor to consider when predicting whether a stress response is likely (Box B5). An animal's life history stage includes its level of physical maturity (i.e., larva, infant, juvenile, sexually mature adult) and the primary activity in which it is engaged such as mating, feeding, or rearing/caring for young. Prior experience with a stressor may be of particular importance because repeated experience with a stressor may dull the stress response via acclimation (St. Aubin & Dierauf, 2001) or increase the response via sensitization. Additionally, if an animal suffers injury or hearing loss, a physiological stress response will occur (Box B8).

The generalized stress response is characterized by a release of hormones (Reeder & Kramer, 2005) and other chemicals (e.g., stress markers) such as reactive oxidative compounds associated with noise-induced hearing loss (Henderson et al., 2006). Stress hormones include norepinephrine and epinephrine (i.e., the catecholamines), which produce elevations in the heart and respiration rate, increase awareness, and increase the availability of glucose and lipid for energy. Other stress hormones are the glucocorticoid steroid hormones cortisol and aldosterone, which are classically used as an indicator of a stress response and to characterize the magnitude of the stress response (Hennessy et al., 1979).

An acute stress response is traditionally considered part of the startle response and is hormonally characterized by the release of the catecholamines. Annoyance type reactions may be characterized by the release of either or both catecholamines and glucocorticoid hormones. Regardless of the physiological changes that make up the stress response, the stress response may contribute to an animal's decision to alter its behavior.

Elevated stress levels may occur whether or not an animal exhibits a behavioral response (Box D10). Even while undergoing a stress response, competing stimuli (e.g., food or mating opportunities) may overcome any behavioral response. Regardless of whether the animal displays a behavioral response, this tolerated stress could incur a cost to the animal. Reactive oxygen compounds produced during normal physiological processes are generally counterbalanced by enzymes and antioxidants; however, excess stress can lead to damage of lipids, proteins, and nucleic acids at the cellular level (Berlett & Stadtman, 1997; Sies, 1997; Touyz, 2004).

Frequent physiological stress responses may accumulate over time increasing an animal's chronic stress level. Each component of the stress response is variable in time, and stress hormones return to baseline levels at different rates. Elevated chronic stress levels are usually a result of a prolonged or repeated

disturbance. Chronic elevations in the stress levels (e.g., cortisol levels) may produce long-term health consequences that can reduce lifetime reproductive success.

G.1.5 Behavioral Reactions

Behavioral responses fall into two major categories: alterations in natural behavior patterns and avoidance. These types of reactions are not mutually exclusive, and many overall reactions may be combinations of behaviors or a sequence of behaviors. Severity of behavioral reactions can vary drastically between minor and brief reorientations of the animal to investigate the sound, to severe reactions such as aggression or prolonged flight. The type and severity of the behavioral response will determine the cost to the animal. The total number of vehicles and platforms involved, the size of the activity area, the distance between the animal and activity, and the duration of the activity are important considerations when predicting the initial behavioral responses.

A physiological stress response (Box B7) such as an annoyance or startle reaction, or cueing or alerting (Box B6) may cause an animal to make a behavior decision (Box C6). Any exposure that produces an injury or hearing loss is also assumed to produce a stress response (Box B7) and increase the severity or likelihood of a behavioral reaction. Both an animal's experience (Box C4) and competing and reinforcing stimuli (Box C5) can affect an animal's behavior decision. The decision can result in three general types of behavioral reactions: no response (Box C9), area avoidance (Box C8), or alteration of a natural behavior (Box C7).

An animal's past experiences can be important in determining what behavior decision it may make when dealing with a stress response (Box C4). Habituation is the process by which an animal learns to ignore or tolerate stimuli over some period and return to a normal behavior pattern, perhaps after being exposed to the stimuli with no negative consequences. Sensitization is when an animal becomes more sensitive to a set of stimuli over time, perhaps as a result of a past, negative experience that could result in a stronger behavioral response.

Other stimuli (Box C5) present in the environment can influence an animal's behavioral response. These stimuli may be conspecifics or predators in the area or the drive to engage in a natural behavior. Other stimuli can also reinforce the behavioral response caused by acoustic stimuli. For example, the awareness of a predator in the area coupled with the sound-producing activity may elicit a stronger reaction than the activity alone would have.

An animal may reorient, become more vigilant, or investigate if it detects a sound-producing activity (Box C7). These behaviors all require the animal to divert attention and resources, therefore slowing or stopping their presumably beneficial natural behavior. This can be a very brief diversion, or an animal may not resume its natural behaviors until after the activity has concluded. An animal may choose to leave or avoid an area where a sound-producing activity is taking place (Box C8). A more severe form of this comes in the form of flight or evasion. Avoidance of an area can help the animal avoid further effects by avoiding or reducing further exposure. An animal may also choose not to respond to a sound-producing activity (Box C9).

An animal that alters its natural behavior in response to stress or an auditory cue may slow or cease its natural behavior and instead expend energy reacting to the sound-producing activity (Box D5). Natural behaviors include feeding, breeding, sheltering, and migrating. The cost of feeding disruptions depends on the energetic requirements of individuals and the potential amount of food missed during the disruption. Alteration in breeding behavior can result in delaying reproduction. The costs of a brief interruption to migrating or sheltering are less clear.

An animal that avoids a sound-producing activity may expend additional energy moving around the area, be displaced to poorer resources, miss potential mates, or have social interactions affected (Box D6). The amount of energy expended depends on the severity of the behavioral response. Missing potential mates can result in delaying reproduction. Groups could be separated during a severe behavioral response such as flight and offspring that depend on their parents may die if they are permanently separated. Splitting up an animal group can result in a reduced group size, which can have secondary effects on individual foraging success and susceptibility to predators.

Some severe behavioral reactions can lead to stranding (Box D7) or secondary injury (Box D8). Animals that take prolonged flight, a severe avoidance reaction, may injure themselves or strand in an environment for which they are not adapted. Some injury is likely to occur to an animal that strands (Box D8). Injury can reduce the animal's ability to secure food and mates, and increase the animal's susceptibility to predation and disease (Box D2). An animal that strands and does not return to a hospitable environment may die (Box D9).

G.1.6 Long-Term Consequences

The potential long-term consequences from behavioral responses are difficult to discern. Animals displaced from their normal habitat due to an avoidance reaction may return over time and resume their natural behaviors. This is likely to depend upon the severity of the reaction and how often the activity is repeated in the area. In areas of repeated and frequent acoustic disturbance, some animals may habituate to the new baseline; conversely, species that are more sensitive may not return, or return but not resume use of the habitat in the same manner. For example, an animal may return to an area to feed but no longer rest in that area. Long-term abandonment or a change in the utilization of an area by enough individuals can change the distribution of the population. Frequent disruptions to natural behavior patterns may not allow an animal to recover between exposures, which increase the probability of causing long-term consequences to individuals.

The magnitude and type of effect and the speed and completeness of recovery (i.e., return to baseline conditions) must be considered in predicting long-term consequences to the individual animal (Box E4). The predicted recovery of the animal (Box E1) is based on the cost to the animal from any reactions, behavioral or physiological. Available resources fluctuate by season, location, and year and can play a major role in an animal's rate of recovery (Box E2). Recovery can occur more quickly if plentiful food resources, many potential mates, or refuge or shelter is available. An animal's health, energy reserves, size, life history stage, and resource gathering strategy affect its speed and completeness of recovery (Box E3). Animals that are in good health and have abundant energy reserves before an effect takes place will likely recover more quickly.

Animals that recover quickly and completely are unlikely to suffer reductions in their health or reproductive success, or experience changes in habitat utilization (Box F2). No population-level effects would be expected if individual animals do not suffer reductions in their lifetime reproductive success or change their habitat utilization (Box G2). Animals that do not recover quickly and fully could suffer reductions in their health and lifetime reproductive success; they could be permanently displaced or change how they use the environment; or they could die (Box F1). These long-term consequences to the individual can lead to consequences for the population (Box G1); although, population dynamics and abundance play a role in determining how many individuals would need to suffer long-term consequences before there was an effect on the population.

Long-term consequences to individuals can translate into consequences for populations dependent upon population abundance, structure, growth rate, and carry capacity. Carrying capacity describes the theoretical maximum number of animals of a particular species that the environment can support. When a population nears its carrying capacity, its growth is naturally limited by available resources and predator pressure. If one, or a few animals, in a population are removed or gather fewer resources, then other animals in the population can take advantage of the freed resources and potentially increase their health and lifetime reproductive success. Abundant populations that are near their carrying capacity (theoretical maximum abundance) that suffer consequences on a few individuals may not be affected overall. Populations that exist well below their carrying capacity may suffer greater consequences from any lasting consequences to even a few individuals. Population-level consequences can include a change in the population dynamics, a decrease in the growth rate, or a change in geographic distribution.

G.2 Conceptual Framework for Assessing Effects from Energy-Producing Activities

G.2.1 Stimuli

G.2.1.1 Magnitude of the Energy Stressor

Regulations do not provide threshold criteria to determine the significance of the potential effects from activities that involve the use of varying electromagnetic frequencies or lasers. Many organisms, primarily marine vertebrates, have been studied to determine their thresholds for detecting electromagnetic fields, as reviewed by Normandeau et al. (2011); however, there are no data on predictable responses to exposure above or below detection thresholds. The types of electromagnetic fields discussed are those from mine neutralization activities (magnetic influence minesweeping). High-energy and low-energy lasers were considered for analysis. Low-energy lasers (e.g., targeting systems, detection systems, laser light detection and ranging) do not pose a risk to organisms (Swope, 2010) and, therefore, will not be discussed further. Radar was also considered for analysis and was determined not to pose a risk to biological resources.

G.2.1.2 Location of the Energy Stressor

Evaluation of potential energy exposure risks considered the spatial overlap of the resource occurrence and electromagnetic field and high-energy laser use. Wherever appropriate, specific geographic areas of potential impact were identified and the relative location of the resource with respect to the source was considered. For example, the greatest potential electromagnetic energy exposure is at the source, where intensity is greatest and the greatest potential for high energy laser exposure is at the ocean's surface, where high-energy laser intensity is greatest. All light energy, including laser light, entering the ocean becomes absorbed and scattered at a rate that is dependent on the frequency of the light. For most laser applications, the energy is rapidly reduced as the light penetrates the ocean.

G.2.1.3 Behavior of the Organism

Evaluation of potential energy exposure risk considered the behavior of the organism, especially where the organism lives and feeds (e.g., surface, water column, seafloor). The analysis for electromagnetic devices considered those species with the ability to perceive or detect electromagnetic signals. The analysis for high-energy lasers and radar particularly considered those species known to occur at or above the surface of the ocean.

G.2.2 Immediate Response and Costs to the Individual

Many different types of organisms (e.g., some invertebrates, fishes, turtles, birds, mammals) are sensitive to electromagnetic fields (Normandeau et al., 2011). An organism that encounters a

disturbance in an electromagnetic field could respond by moving toward the source, moving away from it, or not responding at all. The types of electromagnetic devices used in the Proposed Action simulate the electromagnetic signature of a vessel passing through the water column, so the expected response would be similar to that of vessel movement. However, since there would be no actual strike potential, a physiological response would be unlikely in most cases. Recovery of an individual from encountering electromagnetic fields would be variable, but since the physiological response would likely be minimal, as reviewed by Normandeau et al. (2011), any recovery time would also be minimal.

Very little data are available to analyze potential impacts on organisms from exposure to high energy lasers. For all but the highest-energy lasers, the greatest laser-related concern for marine species is damage to an organism's ability to see.

G.2.3 Long-Term Consequences to the Individual and Population

Long-term consequences are considered in terms of a resource's existing population level, growth and mortality rates, other stressors on the resource from the Proposed Action, cumulative impacts on the resource, and the ability of the population to recover from or adapt to impacts. Impacts of multiple or repeated stressors on individuals are cumulative.

G.3 Conceptual Framework for Assessing Effects from Physical Disturbance or Strike

G.3.1 Stimuli

G.3.1.1 Size and Weight of the Objects

To determine the likelihood of a strike and the potential impacts on an organism or habitat that would result from a physical strike, the size and weight of the striking object relative to the organism or habitat must be considered. For example, most small organisms and early life stages would simply be displaced by the movement generated by a large object moving through, or falling into, the water, whereas a larger organism could potentially be struck by an object since it may not be displaced by the movement of the water. The weight of the object is also a factor that would determine the severity of a strike. A strike by a heavy object would be more severe than a strike by a low-weight object (e.g., a decelerator/parachute, flare end cap, or chaff canister).

G.3.1.2 Location and Speed of the Objects

Evaluation of potential physical disturbance or strike risk considered the spatial overlap of the resource occurrence and potential striking objects. Analysis of impacts from physical disturbance or strike stressors focuses on proposed activities that may cause an organism or habitat to be struck by an object moving through the air (e.g., aircraft), water (e.g., vessels, in-water devices, towed devices), or dropped into the water (e.g., non-explosive practice munitions and seafloor devices). The area of operation, vertical distribution, and density of these items also play central roles in the likelihood of impact. Wherever appropriate, specific geographic areas of potential impact are identified. Analysis of potential physical disturbance or strike risk also considered the speed of vessels as a measure of intensity. Some vessels move slowly, while others are capable of high speeds.

G.3.1.3 Buoyancy of the Objects

Evaluation of potential physical disturbance or strike risk in the ocean considered the buoyancy of targets or expended materials during operation, which will determine whether the object will be encountered at the surface, within the water column, or on the seafloor.

G.3.1.4 Behavior of the Organism

Evaluation of potential physical disturbance or strike risk considered where organisms occur and if they occur in the same geographic area and vertical distribution as those objects that pose strike risks.

G.3.2 Immediate Response and Costs to the Individual

Before being struck, some organisms would sense a pressure wave through the water and respond by remaining in place, moving away from the object, or moving toward it. An organism displaced a small distance by movements from an object falling into the water nearby would likely continue on with no response. However, others could be disturbed and may exhibit a generalized stress response. If the object actually hits the organism, direct injury in addition to stress may result. The function of the stress response in vertebrates is to rapidly raise the blood sugar level to prepare the organism to flee or fight. This generally adaptive physiological response can become a liability if the stressor persists and the organism cannot return to its baseline physiological state.

Most organisms would respond to sudden physical approach or contact by darting quickly away from the stimulus. Other species may respond by freezing in place or seeking refuge. In any case, the individual must stop whatever it was doing and divert its physiological and cognitive attention to responding to the stressor. The energy costs of reacting to a stressor depend on the specific situation, but in all cases the caloric requirements of stress reactions reduce the amount of energy available to the individual for other functions such as predator avoidance, reproduction, growth, and metabolism.

The ability of an organism to return to what it was doing following a physical strike (or near miss resulting in a stress response) is a function of fitness, genetic, and environmental factors. Some organisms are more tolerant of environmental or human-caused stressors than others and become acclimated more easily. Within a species, the rate at which an individual recovers from a physical disturbance or strike may be influenced by its age, sex, reproductive state, and general condition. An organism that has reacted to a sudden disturbance by swimming at burst speed would tire after some time; its blood hormone and sugar levels may not return to normal for 24 hours. During the recovery period, the organism may not be able to attain burst speeds and could be more vulnerable to predators. If the individual were not able to regain a steady state following exposure to a physical stressor, it may suffer depressed immune function and even death.

G.3.3 Long-Term Consequences to the Population

Long-term consequences are considered in terms of a resource's existing population level, growth and mortality rates, other stressors on the resource from the Proposed Action, cumulative impacts on the resource, and the ability of the population to recover from or adapt to impacts. Impacts of multiple or repeated stressors on individuals are cumulative.

G.4 Conceptual Framework for Assessing Effects from Entanglement

G.4.1 Stimuli

G.4.1.1 Physical Properties of the Objects

For an organism to become entangled in military expended materials, the materials must have certain properties, such as the ability to form loops and a high breaking strength. Some items could have a relatively low breaking strength on their own, but that breaking strength could be increased if multiple loops were wrapped around an entangled organism.

G.4.1.2 Physical Features of the Resource

The physical makeup of the organism itself is also considered when evaluating the risk of entanglement. Some species, by their size or physical features, are more susceptible to entanglement than others. For example, more rigid bodies with protruding snouts (e.g., hammerhead shark) or large, rigid fins (e.g., humpback whale) would have an increased risk of entanglement when compared to species with smoother, streamlined bodies such as lamprey or eels.

G.4.1.3 Location of the Objects

Evaluation of potential entanglement risk considered the spatial overlap of the resource occurrence and military expended materials. Distribution and density of expended items play a central role in the likelihood of impact. Wherever appropriate, specific geographic areas of potential impact are identified.

G.4.1.4 Buoyancy of Objects

Evaluation of potential entanglement risk considered the buoyancy of military expended materials to determine whether the object will be encountered within the water column (including the surface) or on the seafloor. Less buoyant materials, such as torpedo guidance wires, sink rapidly to the seafloor. More buoyant materials include less dense items (e.g., decelerators/parachutes) that are weighted and would sink slowly to the seafloor and could be entrained in currents.

G.4.1.5 Behavior of the Organism

Evaluation of potential entanglement risk considered the general behavior of the organism, including where the organism typically occurs (e.g., surface, water column, seafloor). A defense response by some large whales (when encountering rope) is to spin, thereby entangling themselves further in the “object.” This makes selecting for non-looping and lower breaking strength in objects such as ropes very important. The analysis particularly considered those species known to become entangled in nonmilitary expended materials (e.g., “marine debris”) such as fishing lines, nets, rope, and other derelict fishing gear that often entangle marine organisms.

G.4.2 Immediate Response and Costs to the Individual

The potential impacts of entanglement on a given organism depend on the species and size of the organism. Species that have protruding snouts, fins, or appendages are more likely to become entangled than smooth-bodied organisms. Also, items could get entangled by an organism's mouth, if caught on teeth or baleen, with the rest of the item trailing alongside the organism. Materials similar to fishing gear, which is designed to entangle an organism, would be expected to have a greater entanglement potential than other materials. An entangled organism would likely try to free itself of the entangling object and in the process may become even more entangled, possibly leading to a stress response. The net result of being entangled by an object could be disruption of the normal behavior, injury due to lacerations, and other sublethal or lethal impacts.

G.4.3 Long-Term Consequences to the Individual and Population

Consequences of entanglement could range from an organism successfully freeing itself from the object or remaining entangled indefinitely, possibly resulting in lacerations and other sublethal or lethal impacts. Stress responses or infection from lacerations could lead to latent mortality. The analysis will focus on reasonably foreseeable long-term consequences of the direct impact, particularly those that could impact the fitness of an individual. Changes in an individual’s growth, survival, annual

reproductive success, or lifetime reproductive success could have population-level impacts if enough individuals are impacted. This population-level impact would vary among species and taxonomic groups.

G.5 Conceptual Framework for Assessing Effects from Ingestion

G.5.1 Stimuli

G.5.1.1 Size of the Objects

To assess the ingestion risk from military expended materials, this analysis considered the size of the object relative to the animal's ability to swallow it. Some items are too large to be ingested (e.g., non-explosive practice bombs and most targets) and impacts from these items are not discussed further. However, these items may potentially break down into smaller ingestible pieces over time. Items that are of ingestible size when they are introduced into the environment are carried forward for analysis within each resource section where applicable.

G.5.1.2 Location of the Objects

Evaluation of potential ingestion risk considered the spatial overlap of the resource occurrence and military expended materials. The distribution and density of expended items play a central role in the likelihood of impact. Wherever appropriate, specific geographic areas of potential impact were identified.

G.5.1.3 Buoyancy of the Objects

Evaluation of potential ingestion risk considered the buoyancy of military expended materials to determine whether the object will be encountered within the water column (including the surface) or on the seafloor. Less buoyant materials, such as solid metal materials (e.g., projectiles or munitions fragments), sink rapidly to the seafloor. More buoyant materials include less dense items (e.g., target fragments and decelerators/parachutes) that may be caught in currents and gyres or entangled in floating kelp. These materials can remain in the water column for an indefinite period of time before sinking. However, decelerators/parachutes are weighted and would generally sink, unless that sinking is suspended, in the scenario described here.

G.5.1.4 Feeding Behavior

Evaluation of potential ingestion risk considered the feeding behavior of the organism, including where (e.g., surface, water column, seafloor) and how (e.g., filter feeding) the organism feeds and what it feeds on. The analysis particularly considered those species known to ingest nonfood items (e.g., plastic or metal items).

G.5.2 Immediate Response and Costs to the Individual

Potential impacts of ingesting foreign objects on a given organism depend on the species and size of the organism. Species that normally eat spiny hard-bodied invertebrates would be expected to have tougher mouths and guts than those that normally feed on softer prey. Materials similar in size and shape to the normal diet of an organism may be more likely to be ingested without causing harm to the animal; however, some general assumptions were made. Relatively small objects with smooth edges, such as shells or small-caliber projectiles, might pass through the digestive tract without causing harm. A small sharp-edged item may cause the individual immediate physical distress by tearing or cutting the mouth, throat, or stomach. If the object is rigid and large (relative to the individual's mouth and throat), it may block the throat or obstruct digestive processes. An object may even be enclosed by a cyst in the gut

lining. The net result of ingesting large foreign objects is disruption of the normal feeding behavior, which could be sublethal or lethal.

G.5.3 Long-Term Consequences to the Individual and Population

The consequences of ingesting nonfood items could be nutrient deficiency, bioaccumulation, uptake of toxic chemicals, compaction, and mortality. The analysis focused on reasonably foreseeable long-term consequences of the direct impact, particularly those that could impact the fitness of an individual. Changes in an individual's growth, survival, annual reproductive success, or lifetime reproductive success could have population-level impacts if enough individuals were impacted. This population-level impact would vary among species and taxonomic groups.

G.6 Conceptual Framework for Assessing Effects from Secondary Stressors

This conceptual framework describes the potential effects to marine species exposed to stressors indirectly through impacts on habitat and prey availability (e.g., sediment or water quality, and physical disturbance). Stressors from United States Department of the Navy training and testing activities could pose indirect impacts on marine biological resources via indirect effects to habitat or to prey. These include indirect impacts from (1) explosives, explosives byproducts, and unexploded munitions; (2) metals; (3) chemicals; and (4) transmission of disease and parasites. The methods used to determine secondary stressors on marine resources are presented below. Once a category of primary stressor has been analyzed to determine how a marine biological resource is impacted, an analysis follows of how a secondary stressor is potentially impacting a marine resource. After the secondary stressors are identified, a determination on the significance of the secondary impact is made. The same criteria to determine the level of significance for primary impacts are used for secondary stressors. In addition, it is possible for a significant primary impact to produce a beneficial indirect impact. For example, sinking exercises could generate a significant impact on the seafloor and surrounding habitats, while causing a potential beneficial secondary impact by creating hard-bottom habitat for invertebrates, producing a food source for fishes, and creating structural refuges for other biological resources.

G.6.1 Secondary Stressors

G.6.1.1 Impacts on Habitat

Primary impacts defined in each marine resource section were used to develop a conceptual model to predict the potential secondary stressors on each habitat or resource. This conceptual model incorporated factors such as the co-occurrence of stressors in space and time, the impacts or assessment endpoints of individual stressors (e.g., habitat alteration, changes in animal behavior or physiology, injury, mortality, or changes in human use), and the duration and intensity of the impacts of individual stressors. For example, a secondary stressor from a munitions strike could be habitat degradation. The primary impact or stressor is the actual strike on the habitat such as the seafloor, with the introduction of military expended materials, munitions, and fragments inducing further habitat degradation.

Secondary stressors can also induce additive impacts on habitats. These types of impacts are also determined by summing the individual stressors with identical and quantifiable assessment endpoints. For example, if one stressor disturbed 0.25 square nautical miles (NM^2) of benthic habitat, a second stressor disturbed 0.5 NM^2, and all other stressors did not disturb benthic habitat, then the total benthic habitat disturbed would be 0.75 NM^2. For stressors with identical but not quantifiable assessment endpoints, potential additive impacts were qualitatively evaluated using available scientific knowledge

and best professional judgment. Other habitat impacts such as underwater detonations were assessed by size of charge (net explosive weight), charge radius, height above the seafloor, substrate types in the area, and equations linking all these factors. The analysis also considered that impacts of underwater explosions vary with the bottom substrate type and that the secondary impacts would also be variable among substrate types.

G.6.1.2 Impacts on Prey Availability

Assessing the impacts of secondary stressors on prey availability falls into two main areas over different temporal scales: the cost to an individual over a relatively short amount of time (short-term) and the cost to an individual or population over a longer period of time (long-term).

G.6.2 Immediate Response and Costs to the Individual

After a primary impact was identified, an analysis of secondary stressors on that resource was initiated. This analysis examined whether indirect impacts would occur after the initial (primary) impact and at what temporal scale that secondary stressor would affect the resource (short-term or long-term). An assessment was then made as to whether the secondary stressor would impact an individual or a population. For example, an underwater explosion could impact a single resource such as a fish or multiple other species in the food web (e.g., prey species such as plankton). The analysis also took into consideration whether the primary impact affected more than an individual or single species. For example, a prey species that would be directly injured or killed by an explosive blast could draw in predators or scavengers from the surrounding waters that would feed on those organisms, and in turn could be more directly susceptible to being injured or killed by subsequent explosions. For purposes of this analysis, indirect impacts on a resource did not require trophic transfer (e.g., bioaccumulation) in order to be observed. It is important to note that the terms “indirect” and “secondary” describe how the impact may occur in an organism or its ecosystem and does not imply reduced severity of environmental consequences.

G.6.3 Long-Term Consequences to the Individual and Population

Long-term consequences of secondary stressors on an individual or population are often difficult to determine. Once a primary impact is identified, the severity of that impact helps to determine the temporal scale at which the secondary stressor can be measured. For most marine resources, the abundance of prey species near a detonation point would be diminished for a short period (weeks to months) before being repopulated by animals from adjacent waters. In some extreme cases, recovery of the habitat or prey resources could occur over a relatively long time frame (months to years). It is important to note that indirect impacts often differ among resources, spatial, and temporal scales.

REFERENCES

Berlett, B. S., and E. R. Stadtman. (1997). Protein oxidation in aging, disease, and oxidative stress. *The Journal of Biological Chemistry, 272*(33), 20313–20316.

Crum, L., and Y. Mao. (1996). Acoustically enhanced bubble growth at low frequencies and its implications for human diver and marine mammal safety. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 99*(5), 2898–2907.

Crum, L., M. Bailey, J. Guan, P. Hilmo, S. Kargl, and T. Matula. (2005). Monitoring bubble growth in supersaturated blood and tissue *ex vivo* and the relevance to marine mammal bioeffects. *Acoustics Research Letters Online, 6*(3), 214–220.

Fahlman, A., P. L. Tyack, P. J. O. Miller, and P. H. Kvadsheim. (2014). How man-made interference might cause gas bubble emboli in deep diving whales. *Frontiers in Physiology, 5*(13), 1–6.

Henderson, D., E. C. Bielefeld, K. C. Harris, and B. H. Hu. (2006). The role of oxidative stress in noise-induced hearing loss. *Ear & Hearing, 27*, 1–19.

Hennessy, M. B., J. P. Heybach, J. Vernikos, and S. Levine. (1979). Plasma corticosterone concentrations sensitively reflect levels of stimulus intensity in the rat. *Physiology and Behavior, 22*, 821–825.

Houser, D. S., L. A. Dankiewicz-Talmadge, T. K. Stockard, and P. J. Ponganis. (2009). Investigation of the potential for vascular bubble formation in a repetitively diving dolphin. *The Journal of Experimental Biology, 213*, 52–62.

Kujawa, S. G., and M. C. Liberman. (2009). Adding insult to injury: Cochlear nerve degeneration after "temporary" noise-induced hearing loss. *Journal of Neuroscience, 29*(45), 14077–14085.

Normandeau, E., T. Tricas, and A. Gill. (2011). *Effects of EMFs from Undersea Power Cables on Elasmobranchs and Other Marine Species*. Camarillo, CA: U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Regulation, and Enforcement, Pacific Outer Continental Shelf Region.

Reeder, D. M., and K. M. Kramer. (2005). Stress in free-ranging mammals: Integrating physiology, ecology, and natural history. *Journal of Mammalogy, 86*(2), 225–235.

Sies, H. (1997). Physiological society symposium: Impaired endothelial and smooth muscle cell function in oxidative stress: Oxidants and antioxidants. *Experimental Physiology, 82*, 291–295.

Slabbekoorn, H., and E. A. Ripmeester. (2007). Birdsong and anthropogenic noise: Implications and applications for conservation. *Molecular Ecology, 17*(1), 72–83.

St. Aubin, D. J., and L. A. Dierauf. (2001). Stress and Marine Mammals. In L. A. Dierauf & F. M. D. Gulland (Eds.), *Marine Mammal Medicine* (2nd ed., pp. 253–269). Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.

Swope, B. (2010). *Laser System Usage in the Marine Environment: Applications and Environmental Considerations*. San Diego, CA: Space and Naval Warfare Systems Command Center Pacific.

Touyz, R. M. (2004). Reactive oxygen species, vascular oxidative stress, and redox signaling in hypertension: What is the clinical significance? *Hypertension, 44*, 248–252.

Appendix H: Acoustic and Explosive Concepts

Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/ Overseas Environmental Impact Statement Mariana Islands Training and Testing

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPENDIX H ACOUSTIC AND EXPLOSIVE CONCEPTS H-1

H.1 Terminology H-1

H.1.1 Sound H-1
H.1.2 Signal versus Noise H-1
H.1.3 Frequency and Wavelength H-2
H.1.4 Sound Amplitude H-2
H.1.5 Impulsive versus Non-Impulsive Sounds H-3
H.1.6 Acoustic Impedance H-3
H.1.7 Duty Cycle H-3
H.1.8 Resonance H-3

H.2 Sound Metrics H-4

H.2.1 Pressure H-4
H.2.2 Sound Pressure Level H-4
H.2.3 Sound Exposure Level H-5
H.2.4 Particle motion H-7
H.2.5 Impulse H-7

H.3 Predicting How Sound Travels H-7

H.3.1 Speed of Sound H-8
H.3.2 Source Directivity H-9
H.3.3 Transmission Loss H-9
H.3.3.1 Geometrical Spreading Loss H-10
H.3.3.2 Absorption H-11
H.3.3.3 Refraction H-11
H.3.3.4 Reflection and Multipath Propagation H-12
H.3.3.5 Diffraction, Scattering, and Reverberation H-13
H.3.3.6 Surface and Bottom Effects H-13
H.3.3.7 Air-Water Interface H-14

H.4 Auditory Perception H-15

H.5 Explosives H-17

H.5.1 Explosions in Air H-18
H.5.1.1 Fragmentation H-19

H.5.2 Explosions in Water H-19

List of Figures

Figure H-1: Various Sound Pressure Metrics for a Hypothetical (a) Pure Tone (Non-Impulsive) and (b) Impulsive Sound..... H-4
Figure H-2: Summation of Acoustic Energy from a Hypothetical, Intermittently Pinging, Stationary Sound Source H-6
Figure H-3: Cumulative Sound Exposure Level under Realistic Conditions with a Moving, Intermittently Pinging Sound Source H-7
Figure H-4: Sound Velocity Profile (Sound Speed) Is Related to Temperature, Salinity, and Hydrostatic Pressure of Seawater..... H-9
Figure H-5: Graphical Representation of the Inverse Square Relationship in Spherical Spreading H-10
Figure H-6: Sound Propagation Showing Multipath Propagation and Conditions for Surface Duct H-12
Figure H-7: Characteristics of Sound Transmission through the Air-Water Interface..... H-15
Figure H-8: A-weighting for Human Hearing of Sounds in Air (OSHA). The Numbers along the Curve Indicate How a Received Sound Level Would Be Adjusted at that Frequency..... H-17
Figure H-9: Impulse Shown as a Function of Pressure over Duration at a Specific Location H-18

List of Tables

There are no tables in this appendix.

Appendix H Acoustic and Explosive Concepts

This section introduces basic principles and terminology for acoustics and explosives to help the reader understand the analyses presented in this Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS)/Overseas EIS (OEIS). This section briefly explains the transmission of sound and explosive energy; introduces some of the basic mathematical formulas used to describe propagation; and defines acoustical terms, abbreviations, and units of measurement. The difference between transmission of sound in water and in air is also discussed. Finally, it discusses methods used to analyze what animals may hear.

A number of other sources provide a more extensive background on acoustics and explosives than presented in this overview and are recommended for further inquiry. These include, but are not limited to

- *Marine Mammals and Noise* (Richardson et al., 1995) for a general overview
- *Principles of Underwater Sound* (Urick, 1983), *Fundamentals of Acoustical Oceanography* (Medwin & Clay, 1998), and *Principles of Marine Bioacoustics* (Au & Hastings, 2008) for comprehensive explanations of underwater acoustics

H.1 Terminology

The following terms are used in this document when discussing sound and the attributes of a sound source.

H.1.1 Sound

Sound is produced when an elastic medium (such as air or water) is set into motion, typically by a vibrating object within the medium. As the object vibrates, its motion is transmitted to adjacent "particles" of the medium. The motion of these particles is transmitted to adjacent particles, and so on. The result is a mechanical disturbance (the "sound wave") that moves away from the source and propagates at a medium-dependent speed (the "sound speed"). As the sound wave travels through the medium, the individual particles of the medium oscillate about their original positions but do not actually move with the sound wave. As the particles of the medium move back and forth, they create small changes about the original values of the medium density, pressure, and temperature.

Sound may be described by both physical and subjective attributes. Physical attributes, such as sound amplitude and frequency, may be directly measured. Subjective (or sensory) attributes like loudness depend on an animal's perception of sound. Physical attributes of a sound at a particular point are usually obtained by measuring pressure changes as sound waves pass.

H.1.2 Signal versus Noise

When sound is purposely created to convey information, communicate, or obtain information about the environment, it is often referred to as a signal. Examples of sounds that could be considered signals are sonar pings, marine mammal vocalizations and echolocation clicks, tones used in hearing experiments, and small sonobuoy explosions used for submarine detection.

Noise is undesired sound (American National Standards Institute, 1994). Sounds produced by naval aircraft and vessel propulsion are considered noise because they represent possible inefficiencies and increased detectability. Whether a sound is perceived as noise often depends on the receiver (i.e., the animal or system that detects the sound). For example, small explosives and sonar used to generate

sounds that can locate an enemy submarine produce signals that are useful to Sailors engaged in anti-submarine warfare, but are assumed to be noise when detected by marine mammals.

The combination of all sounds at a particular location, whether these sources are located near or far, is ambient noise (American National Standards Institute, 1994). Ambient noise includes natural sources, such as sound from crashing waves, rain, and animals (e.g., snapping shrimp), and anthropogenic sources, such as seismic surveys and vessel noise.

H.1.3 Frequency and Wavelength

Frequency is the physical attribute most closely associated with the subjective attribute "pitch"; the higher the frequency, the higher the pitch. Frequency is defined by the number of oscillations in the sound pressure or particle motion per second. One hertz (Hz) is equal to one oscillation per second, and one kilohertz (kHz) is equal to 1,000 oscillations per second. Human hearing generally spans the frequency range from 20 Hz to 20 kHz. The frequency range of a sound is called its bandwidth.

Pure tones have energy at a constant, single frequency. Complex tones contain energy at multiple, discrete frequencies, rather than a single frequency. A harmonic of a sound at a particular frequency is a multiple of that frequency (e.g., harmonic frequencies of a 2 kHz tone are 4 kHz, 6 kHz, 8 kHz, etc.). A source operating at a nominal frequency may emit several harmonic frequencies, but at lower amplitudes. Some sources may also emit subharmonics; however, these are typically many orders of magnitude less powerful than at the center frequency. Sounds with large bandwidth ("broadband" sounds) have energy spread across many frequencies.

In this document, sounds are generally described as either low- (less than 1 kHz), mid- (1 kHz–10 kHz), high- (10 kHz–100 kHz), or very high- (greater than 100 kHz) frequency. Hearing ranges of marine animals (e.g., fish, birds, sea turtles, and marine mammals) are quite varied and are species-dependent. For example, some fish can hear sounds below 100 Hz and some species of marine mammals have hearing capabilities that extend above 100 kHz. Acoustic impact analyses must therefore focus not only on the sound amplitude (i.e., pressure or particle motion, see Section H.1.4, Sound Amplitude), but on the sound frequency and the hearing capabilities of the species being considered.

The wavelength of a sound is the distance between wave peaks. Wavelength decreases as frequency increases. The frequency multiplied by the wavelength equals the speed of sound in a medium, as shown in this equation:

$$\text{Frequency } (s^{-1}) \times \text{wavelength (m)} = \text{sound speed (m/s)}$$

The approximate speed of sound in sea water is 1500 m/s and in air is 340 m/s, although speed varies depending on environmental conditions (e.g., pressure, temperature, and, in the case of sea water, salinity; see Section H.3.1 (Speed of Sound).

H.1.4 Sound Amplitude

Sound amplitude is the physical attribute most closely associated with the subjective attribute loudness. Amplitude is related to the amount that the medium particles oscillate about their original positions and can be thought of as the "strength" of a sound (as the amplitude increases, the loudness also increases). As the sound wave travels, the particles of the medium oscillate but do not actually travel with the wave. The result is a mechanical disturbance (i.e., the sound wave) that propagates away from the sound source.

Sound amplitude is typically characterized by measuring the acoustic pressure or particle motion (see Section H.2, Sound Metrics).

H.1.5 Impulsive versus Non-Impulsive Sounds

Although no standard definitions exist, sounds may be broadly categorized as impulsive or non-impulsive. Impulsive sounds have short durations, rapid rise-times, broad frequency content, and high peak sound pressures. Impulsive sounds are often produced by processes involving a rapid release of energy or mechanical impacts (Hamernik & Hsueh, 1991). Explosions, air guns, weapon firing, and impact pile driving are examples of impulsive sound sources analyzed in this document. In contrast, sonars, vessel operation, vibratory pile driving, and underwater transducers lack the characteristics of impulsive sources and are thus examples of non-impulsive sound sources. Non-impulsive sounds can be essentially continuous, such as machinery noise, or intermittent, such as sonar pings.

H.1.6 Acoustic Impedance

Acoustic impedance is a property of the propagation medium (air, water, or tissue) that can be simply described as the opposition to flow of a pressure wave. Acoustic impedance is a function of the density and speed of sound in a medium. Sound transmits more readily through materials of similar acoustic impedance, such as water and animal tissue. When sound waves encounter a medium with different acoustic impedance (for example, an air-water interface), they reflect and refract (see Sections H.3.3.3, Refraction; and H.3.3.4, Reflection and Multipath Propagation), creating more complex propagation conditions. For example, sound traveling in air (low impedance) encountering the water surface (high impedance) will be largely reflected, preventing most sound energy in the air from being transmitted into the water. The impedance difference at the tissue-air interface in animals with gas-containing organs also makes these areas susceptible to damage when exposed to the shock wave near an explosion, since the transmission from high-impedance to low-impedance can result in large motion at the boundary.

H.1.7 Duty Cycle

Duty cycle describes the portion of time that a sound source actually generates sound. It is defined as the percentage of time during which a sound is generated over a total operational time period. For example, if a sonar source produces a one-second ping once every 10 seconds, the duty cycle is 10 percent. Duty cycles vary among different acoustic sources; in general, a low duty cycle could be considered 20 percent or less and a high duty cycle 80 percent or higher.

H.1.8 Resonance

Resonance occurs when an object is vibrated at a frequency near its “natural frequency” or resonant frequency. The resonant frequency can be considered the preferred frequency at which an object will oscillate at a greater magnitude than when exposed to other frequencies. In this document, resonance is considered in relation to the size of an air bubble or air cavity in an animal that is exposed to high pressure waves and the potential for injury. The natural frequencies of dolphin and beluga lungs near the surface are about 36 Hz and 30 Hz, respectively (Finneran, 2003), the natural frequency of lungs of a large whale would be lower, while the natural frequency of small air bubbles would be much higher. Resonant frequencies would tend to increase as an animal dives, since the increased water pressure would compress an air-filled structure and reduce its size.

H.2 Sound Metrics

The sound metrics described here are used in this document to quantify exposure to a sound or explosion.

H.2.1 Pressure

Sound pressure is the incremental variation in a medium's static pressure as a sound wave travels through it. Sound pressure is typically expressed in units of pascals (Pa) (1 Pa = N/m^2 = 10 µbar = 1.45×10^{-4} psi), although explosive overpressure may also be described in pounds per square inch (psi).

Various sound pressure metrics are illustrated in Figure H-1 for (a) a non-impulsive sound (a pure tone in this illustration) and (b) an impulsive sound. As shown in Figure H-1, the non-impulsive sound has a relatively gradual rise in pressure from static pressure (the ambient pressure without the added sound), while the impulsive sound has a near-instantaneous rise to a high peak pressure. The peak pressure shown on both illustrations is the maximum absolute value of the instantaneous sound pressure during a specified time interval ("zero-to-peak" or "peak"), which accounts for the values of peak pressures below the static (ambient) pressure (American National Standards Institute, 2013). "Peak-to-peak" pressure is the difference between the maximum and minimum sound pressures. The root-mean-square (rms) value is often used to describe the average sound pressure level of sounds, and sound pressure levels provided in this EIS/OEIS are root-mean-square values unless otherwise specified. As the name suggests, this method takes the square root of the average squared sound pressure values over a time interval. The duration of this time interval can have a strong effect on the measured rms sound pressure for a given sound, especially where pressure levels vary significantly, as during an impulsive sound exposure. If the analysis duration includes a significant portion of the waveform after the sound pressure has returned to zero, the rms pressure would be relatively low. If the analysis duration includes only the highest pressures of the impulsive exposure, the rms value would be comparatively high. For this reason, it is important to specify the duration used to calculate the rms pressure for impulsive sounds.




Figure H-1: Various Sound Pressure Metrics for a Hypothetical (a) Pure Tone (Non-Impulsive) and (b) Impulsive Sound

H.2.2 Sound Pressure Level

The most common sound level metric is sound pressure level (SPL). Because many animals can detect very large pressure ranges and judge the relative loudness of sounds by the ratio of the sound pressures (a logarithmic behavior), SPL is described by taking the logarithm of the ratio of the sound pressure to a

reference pressure. Use of a logarithmic scale compresses the wide range of measured pressure values into a more useful scale.

Sound pressure levels are normally expressed in decibels. A decibel is 1/10 of a bel, a unit of level when the logarithm is to the base ten and the quantities concerned are proportional to power (American National Standards Institute, 2013). Sound pressure level in decibels is calculated as follows:

$$SPL = 20\log_{10}\left(\frac{P}{P_{ref}}\right)$$

where P is the sound pressure and P_{ref} is the reference pressure. Unless stated otherwise, the pressure P is the rms value of the pressure (American National Standards Institute, 2013). In some situations, SPL is calculated for the peak pressure rather than the rms pressure. On the occasions when rms pressure is not used, the pressure metric will be stated (e.g., peak SPL means an SPL calculated using the peak pressure rather than the rms pressure).

When a value is presented in decibels, it is important to also specify the value and units of the reference quantity. Normally the numeric value is given, followed by the text "re," meaning "with reference to," and the numeric value and unit of the reference quantity. For example, a pressure of 1 Pa, expressed in decibels with a reference of 1 micropascal (µPa), is written 120 dB re 1 µPa. The standard reference pressures are 1 µPa for water and 20 µPa for air. The reference pressure for air, 20 µPa, is the approximate lowest threshold of human hearing. It is important to note that because of the differences in reference units, the same sound pressures would result in different SPL values for each medium (the same sound pressure measured in water and in air would result in a higher SPL in water than in air, since the in-air reference is larger). Therefore, sound pressure levels in air and in water should never be directly compared.

H.2.3 Sound Exposure Level


Sound exposure level (SEL) can be thought of as a composite metric that represents both the SPL of a sound and its duration. Individual time-varying noise events (e.g., a series of sonar pings or an impulsive sound) have two main characteristics: (1) a sound pressure that changes throughout the event and (2) a period of time during which the source is exposed to the sound. SEL can be provided for a single exposure (i.e., a single sonar ping or single explosive detonation) or for an entire acoustic event (i.e., multiple sonar pings or multiple explosive detonations). Cumulative SEL provides a measure of the net exposure of the entire acoustic event, but it does not directly represent the sound level heard at any given time. SEL is determined by calculating the decibel level of the cumulative sum-of-squared pressures over the duration of a sound, with units of dB re 1 micropascal squared seconds (re 1 μPa^2-s) for sounds in water and dB re (20 micropascal) squared seconds [dB re (20 $\mu Pa)^2$-s] for sounds in air.

Some rules of thumb for SEL are as follows:

- The numeric value of SEL is equal to the SPL of a 1-second sound that has the same total energy as the exposure event. If the sound duration is 1 second, SPL and SEL have the same numeric value (but not the same reference quantities). For example, a 1 second sound with an SPL of 100 dB re 1 µPa has a SEL of 100 dB re 1 μPa^2-s.
- If the sound duration is constant but the SPL changes, SEL will change by the same number of decibels as the SPL.

- If the SPL is held constant and the duration (T) changes, SEL will change as a function of $10\log_{10}(T)$:
  - $10 \log_{10}(10) = 10$, so increasing duration by a factor of 10 raises SEL by 10 dB.
  - $10 \log_{10}(0.1) = -10$, so decreasing duration by a factor of 10 lowers SEL by 10 dB.
  - Since $10 \log_{10}(2) \approx 3$, so doubling the duration increases SEL by 3 dB.
  - $10 \log_{10}(1/2) \approx -3$, so halving the duration lowers SEL by 3 dB.

Figure H-2 illustrates the summation of energy for a succession of sonar pings. In this hypothetical case, each ping has the same duration and SPL. The SEL at a particular location from each individual ping is 100 dB re 1 μPa^2-s (red circles). The upper, blue curve shows the running total or cumulative SEL.




Note: EL = Exposure Level (i.e., Sound Exposure Level)

Figure H-2: Summation of Acoustic Energy from a Hypothetical, Intermittently Pinging, Stationary Sound Source

After the first ping, the cumulative SEL is 100 dB re 1 μPa^2-s. Since each ping has the same duration and SPL, receiving two pings is the same as receiving a single ping with twice the duration. The cumulative SEL from two pings is therefore 103 dB re 1 μPa^2-s. The cumulative SEL from four pings is 3 dB higher than the cumulative SEL from two pings, or 106 dB re 1 μPa^2-s. Each doubling of the number of pings increases the cumulative SEL by 3 dB.

Figure H-3 shows a more realistic example where the individual pings do not have the same SPL or SEL. These data were recorded from a stationary hydrophone as a sound source approached, passed, and moved away from the hydrophone. As the source approached the hydrophone, the received SPL from each ping increased, causing the SEL of each ping to increase. After the source passed the hydrophone, the received SPL and SEL from each ping decreased as the source moved farther away (downward trend of red line), although the cumulative SEL increased with each additional ping received (slight upward trend of blue line). The main contributions are from those pings with the highest individual SELs. Individual pings with SELs 10 dB or more below the ping with the highest level contribute little (less than 0.5 dB) to the total cumulative SEL. This is shown in Figure H-3, where only a small error is introduced by

summing the energy from the eight individual pings with SEL greater than 185 dB re 1 µPa^2-s (black line), as opposed to including all pings (blue line).



Note: EL = Exposure Level (i.e., Sound Exposure Level)

Figure H-3: Cumulative Sound Exposure Level under Realistic Conditions with a Moving, Intermittently Pinging Sound Source

H.2.4 Particle motion

The particles of a medium (e.g., water or air) oscillate around their original position as a sound wave passes. This motion is quantified using average displacement (m or dB re 1pm), velocity (m/s or dB re 1 nm/s^2), and acceleration (m/s^2 or dB re 1 µm/s^2) of the particles (Nedelec et al., 2016). Note that particle velocity is not the same as sound speed, which is how fast a sound wave moves through a medium. Particle motion is directional, whereas pressure measurement is not (Nedelec et al., 2016).

Far from a sound source and without any boundaries that could cause wave interference, particle velocity is directly proportional to sound pressure. Closer to a sound source, particle velocity begins to increase relative to sound pressure. Because this phenomenon is related to wavelength, it may be relevant only when very close to sound sources with extremely low frequencies.

H.2.5 Impulse

Impulse is a metric used to describe the pressure and time component of a pressure wave. Impulse is typically only considered for high energy exposures to impulsive sources, such as exposures close to explosives. Specifically, positive impulse is the time integral of the initial peak positive pressure with units of Pascal-seconds (Pa-s). Impulse is a measured quantity that is distinct from the term "impulsive," which is not a measurement term, but rather describes a type of sound (see Section H.1.5, Impulsive versus Non-Impulsive Sounds).

H.3 Predicting How Sound Travels

While the concept of a sound wave traveling from its source to a receptor is relatively simple, sound propagation is quite complex because of the simultaneous presence of numerous sound waves of


different frequencies and source levels, and other phenomena such as reflections of sound waves and subsequent constructive (additive) or destructive (cancelling) interferences between reflected and incident waves. Other factors such as refraction, diffraction, bottom types, and surface conditions also affect sound propagation. While simple examples are provided here for illustration, the Navy Acoustic Effects Model used to quantify acoustic exposures to marine mammals and sea turtles takes into account the influence of multiple factors to predict acoustic propagation (see technical report *Quantifying Acoustic Impacts on Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles: Methods and Analytical Approach for Phase III Training and Testing* (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2017a)).

H.3.1 Speed of Sound

The speed of sound is not affected by the SPL or frequency of the sound, but rather depends wholly on characteristics of the medium through which it is passing (e.g., the density and the compressibility). Sound travels faster through a medium that is harder to compress. For example, water is more difficult to compress than air, and sound travels approximately 340 m/s in air and 1,500 m/s in seawater.

The speed of sound in air is primarily influenced by temperature, relative humidity, and pressure, because these factors affect the density and compressibility of air. Generally, the speed of sound in air increases as air temperature increases.

The speed of sound in seawater also increases with increasing temperature and, to a lesser degree, with increasing hydrostatic pressure and salinity. Figure H-4 shows an example of how these attributes can change with depth. In seawater, temperature has the most important effect on sound speed for depths less than about 300 m. Below 1,500 m, the increasing hydrostatic pressure is the dominant factor because the water temperature is relatively constant. The variation of sound speed with depth in the ocean is called a sound velocity profile.



Source: Diogou (2014)

Figure H-4: Sound Velocity Profile (Sound Speed) Is Related to Temperature, Salinity, and Hydrostatic Pressure of Seawater

H.3.2 Source Directivity

Most sonar and other active acoustic sources do not radiate sound in all directions. Rather, they emit sounds over a limited range of angles, in order to focus sound energy on a specific area or object of interest. The specific angles are sometimes given as horizontal or vertical beam width. Some sources can be described qualitatively as "forward-looking," when sound energy is radiated in a limited direction in front of the source, or "downward-looking," when sound energy is directed toward the bottom.

H.3.3 Transmission Loss

As a sound wave passes through a medium, the sound level decreases with distance from the sound source. This phenomenon is known as transmission loss (TL). The transmission loss is used to relate the source SPL (SL), defined as the SPL produced by a sound source at a distance of one meter, and the received SPL (RL) at a particular location, as follows:

$$RL = SL - TL$$

The main contributors to transmission loss are as follows (Urick, 1983):

- Geometric spreading of the sound wave as it propagates away from the source
- Sound absorption (conversion of sound energy into heat)
- Scattering, diffraction, multipath interference, and boundary effects

H.3.3.1 Geometrical Spreading Loss

Spreading loss is a geometric effect representing regular weakening of a sound wave as it spreads out from a source. Spreading describes the reduction in sound pressure caused by the increase in surface area as the distance from a sound source increases. Spherical and cylindrical spreading are common types of spreading loss.

In the simple case of sound propagating from a point source without obstruction or reflection, the sound waves take on the shape of an expanding sphere. An example of spherical spreading loss is shown in Figure H-5. As spherical propagation continues, the sound energy is distributed over an ever-larger area following the inverse square law: the pressure of a sound wave decreases inversely with the square of the distance between the source and the receptor. For example, doubling the distance between the receptor and a sound source results in a reduction in the pressure of the sound to one-fourth of its initial value; tripling the distance results in one-ninth of the original pressure, and so on. Since the surface area of a sphere is $4\pi r^2$, where r is the sphere radius, the change in SPL with distance r from the source is proportional to the radius squared. This relationship is known as the spherical spreading law. The transmission loss for spherical spreading between two locations is:

$$TL = 20 \log_{10} (r_2/r_1)$$

where r_1 and r_2 are distances from the source. Spherical spreading results in a 6 dB reduction in SPL for each doubling of distance from the sound source. For example, calculated transmission loss for spherical spreading is 40 dB at 100 m and 46 dB at 200 m.




Figure H-5: Graphical Representation of the Inverse Square Relationship in Spherical Spreading

In cylindrical spreading, spherical waves expanding from the source are constrained by the water surface and the seafloor and take on a cylindrical shape. In this case the sound wave expands in the shape of a cylinder rather than a sphere, and the transmission loss is:

$$TL = 10\log_{10}(r_2/r_1)$$

Cylindrical spreading is an approximation of sound propagation in a water-filled channel with horizontal dimensions much larger than the depth. Cylindrical spreading predicts a 3 dB reduction in SPL for each doubling of distance from the source. For example, calculated transmission loss for cylindrical spreading is 30 dB at 1,000 m and 33 dB at 2,000 m.

The cylindrical and spherical spreading equations above represent two simple hypothetical cases. In reality, geometric spreading loss is more spherical near a source and more cylindrical with distance, and is better predicted using more complex models that account for environmental variables, such as the Navy Acoustic Effects Model [see technical report *Quantifying Acoustic Impacts on Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles: Methods and Analytical Approach for Phase III Training and Testing* (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2017a)].

However, when conducting simple spreading loss calculations in near shore environments, "practical spreading loss" can be applied, where:

$$TL = 15\log_{10}(r_2/r_1)$$

Practical spreading loss accounts for other realistic losses in the environment, such as absorption and scattering, which are not accounted for in geometrical spreading.

H.3.3.2 Absorption

Absorption is the conversion of acoustic energy to kinetic energy in the particles of the propagation medium (Urick, 1983). Absorption is directly related to sound frequency, with higher frequencies having higher rates of absorption. Absorption rates range from 0.07 dB/km for a 1 kHz sound to about 30 dB/km for a 100 kHz sound. Therefore, absorption is the cause of a significant amount of attenuation for high and very high frequency sound sources, reducing the distance over which these sources may be perceived compared to mid- and low-frequency sound sources with the same source level.


H.3.3.3 Refraction

When a sound wave propagating in a medium encounters a second medium with a different density (e.g., the air-water boundary), part of the incident sound will be reflected back into the first medium and part will be transmitted into the second medium (Kinsler et al., 1982). The propagation direction will change as the sound wave enters the second medium; this phenomenon is called refraction. Refraction may also occur within a single medium if the properties of the medium change enough to cause a variation in the sound speed. Refraction of sound resulting from spatial variations in the sound speed is one of the most important phenomena that affect sound propagation in water (Urick, 1983).

As discussed in Section H.3.1 (Speed of Sound), the sound speed in the ocean primarily depends on hydrostatic pressure (i.e., depth) and temperature. Although the actual variations in sound speed are small, the existence of sound speed gradients in the ocean has an enormous effect on the propagation of sound in the ocean. If one pictures sound as rays emanating from an underwater source, the propagation of these rays changes as a function of the sound speed profile in the water column. Specifically, the directions of the rays bend toward regions of slower sound speed. This phenomenon creates ducts in which sound becomes "trapped," allowing it to propagate with high efficiency for large

distances within certain depth boundaries. During winter months, the reduced sound speed at the surface due to cooling can create a surface duct that efficiently propagates sound such as commercial shipping noise (Figure H-6). Sources located within this surface duct can have their sounds trapped, but sources located below this layer would have their sounds refracted downward. The deep sound channel, or sound frequency and ranging (SOFAR) channel, is another duct that exists where sound speeds are slowest deeper in the water column (600–1,200 m depth at the mid-latitudes).

Similarly, the path of sound will bend toward regions of lower sound speed in air. Air temperature typically decreases with altitude, meaning sounds produced in air tend to bend skyward. When an atmospheric temperature inversion is present, air is cooler near the earth's surface. In inversion conditions, sound waves near the earth's surface will tend to refract downward.



Note: 1 kiloyard (kyd) = 0.9 km

Figure H-6: Sound Propagation Showing Multipath Propagation and Conditions for Surface Duct

H.3.3.4 Reflection and Multipath Propagation

In multipath propagation, sound may not only travel a direct path (with no reflection) from a source to a receiver, but also be reflected from the surface or bottom multiple times before reaching the receiver (Urick, 1983). Reflection is shown in Figure H-6 at the seafloor (bottom bounce) and at the water surface. At some distances, the reflected wave will be in phase with the direct wave (their waveforms add together) and at other distances the two waves will be out of phase (their waveforms cancel). The

existence of multiple sound paths, or rays, arriving at a single point can result in multipath interference, a condition that permits the addition and cancellation between sound waves, resulting in the fluctuation of sound levels over short distances.

Reflection plays an important role in the pressures observed at different locations in the water column. Near the bottom, the direct path pressure wave may sum with the bottom-reflected pressure wave, increasing the exposure. Near the surface, however, the surface-reflected pressure wave may destructively interfere with the direct path pressure wave, "cutting off" the wave and reducing exposure (called the Lloyd mirror effect). This can cause the sound level to decrease dramatically within the top few meters of the water column.

H.3.3.5 Diffraction, Scattering, and Reverberation

Diffraction, scattering, and reverberation are examples of what happens when sound waves interact with obstacles in the propagation path.

Diffraction may be thought of as the change of direction of a sound wave as it passes around an obstacle. Diffraction depends on the size of the obstacle and the sound frequency. The wavelength of the sound must be larger than the obstacle for notable diffraction to occur. If the obstacle is larger than the wavelength of sound, an acoustic shadow zone will exist behind the obstacle where the sound is unlikely to be detected. Common examples of diffraction include sound heard from a source around the corner of a building and sound propagating through a small gap in an otherwise closed door or window.

An obstacle or inhomogeneity (e.g., smoke, suspended particles, gas bubbles due to waves, and marine life) in the path of a sound wave causes scattering as these inhomogeneities reradiate incident sound in a variety of directions (Urick, 1983). Reverberation refers to the prolongation of a sound, after the source has stopped emitting, caused by multiple reflections at water boundaries (surface and bottom) and scattering.

H.3.3.6 Surface and Bottom Effects

Because the sea surface reflects and scatters sound, it has a major effect on the propagation of underwater sound in applications where either the source or receiver is at a shallow depth (Urick, 1983). If the sea surface is smooth, the reflected sound pressure is nearly equal to the incident sound pressure; however, if the sea surface is rough, the amplitude of the reflected sound wave will be reduced. Sound waves reflected from the sea surface experience a phase reversal. When the surface-reflected waves interact with the direct path waves near the surface, a destructive interference pattern is created in which the received pressure approaches zero.

The sea bottom is also a reflecting and scattering surface, similar to the sea surface. Sound interaction with the sea bottom is more complex, however, primarily because the acoustic properties of the sea bottom are more variable and the bottom is often layered into regions of differing density. As sound travels into the seafloor it reflects off of these different density layers in complex ways. For sources in contact with the bottom, such as during pile driving or bottom-placed explosives, a ground wave is produced that travels through the bottom sediment and may refract back into the water column.

For a hard bottom such as rock, the reflected wave will be approximately in phase with the incident wave. Thus, near the ocean bottom, the incident and reflected sound pressures may add together (constructive interference), resulting in an increased sound pressure near the sea bottom. Soft bottoms such as mud or sediment absorb sound waves and reduce the level in the water column overall.


H.3.3.7 Air-Water Interface

Sound from aerial sources such as aircraft and weapons firing may be transmitted into the water under certain conditions. The most studied of these sources are fixed-wing aircraft and helicopters, which create noise with most energy below 500 Hz. Noise levels in water are highest at the surface and are highly dependent on the altitude of the aircraft and the angle at which the aerial sound encounters the ocean surface. Transmission of the sound once it is in the water is identical to any other sound as described in the sections above.

Transmission of sound from a moving airborne source to a receptor underwater is influenced by numerous factors and has been addressed by Young (1973), Urick (1983), Richardson et al. (1995), Eller and Cavanagh (2000), Laney and Cavanagh (2000), and others. Sound is transmitted from an airborne source to a receptor underwater by four principal means: (1) a direct path, refracted upon passing through the air-water interface; (2) direct-refracted paths reflected from the bottom in shallow water; (3) evanescent transmission in which sound travels laterally close to the water surface; and (4) scattering from interface roughness due to wave motion.

When sound waves in air meet the water surface, the sound can either be transmitted across the air-water boundary or reflected off the water surface. When sound waves meet the water at a perpendicular angle (e.g., straight down from an in-air source to a flat water surface), the sound waves are both transmitted directly across the water surface in the same direction of travel and reflected 180° back toward the original direction of travel. This can create a localized condition at the water surface where the incident and reflected waves sum, doubling the in-air overpressure (+ 6 dB). As the incident angle of the in-air sound wave changes from perpendicular, this phenomenon is reduced, ultimately reaching the angle where sound waves are parallel to the water surface and there is no surface reflection.

The sound that enters the water is refracted due to the difference in sound velocity between air and water, as shown in Figure H-7. As the angle of the in-air incident wave moves away from perpendicular, the direction of travel of the underwater refracted waves becomes closer to parallel to the water surface. When the incident angle is reached where the underwater refracted sound wave is parallel to the water surface, all of the sound is reflected back into the air and no sound enters the water. This occurs at an angle of about 13–14°. As a result, most of the acoustic energy transmitted into the water through a relatively narrow cone extending vertically downward from the in-air source. The width of the footprint would be a function of the source altitude. Lesser amounts of sound may enter the water outside of this cone due to surface scattering (e.g., from water surface waves that can vary the angle of incidence over an area) and as evanescent waves that are only present very near the surface.



Source: Richardson et al. 1995

Figure H-7: Characteristics of Sound Transmission through the Air-Water Interface

If a sound wave is ideally transmitted into water (that is, with no surface transmission loss, such as due to foamy, wave conditions that could decrease sound entering the water), the sound pressure level underwater is calculated by changing the pressure reference unit from 20 µPa in air to 1 µPa in water. For a sound with the same pressure in air and water, this calculation results in a +26 dB sound pressure level in water compared to air. For this reason, sound pressure levels in water and sound pressure levels in air should never be directly compared.

H.4 Auditory Perception

Animals with an eardrum or similar structure, including mammals, birds, and reptiles, directly detect the pressure component of sound. Some marine fish also have specializations to detect pressure changes, although most invertebrates and many marine fish do not have anatomical structures that enable them to detect the pressure component of sound and are only sensitive to the particle motion component of sound. This difference in acoustic energy sensing mechanisms limits the range at which these animals can detect most sound sources analyzed in this document. This is because far from a sound source (i.e., in the far field), particle velocity and sound pressure are directly proportional. But close to a source (i.e., in the near field), particle velocity increases relative to sound pressure and may become more detectable to certain animals. As sound frequency increases, the wavelength becomes shorter, resulting in a smaller near field.

Because mammalian ears can detect large pressure ranges and humans judge the relative loudness of sounds by the ratio of the sound pressures (a logarithmic behavior), sound amplitude is described by the SPL, calculated by taking the logarithm of the ratio of the sound pressure to a reference pressure (see

Section H.2.2, Sound Pressure Level). Use of a logarithmic scale compresses the wide range of pressure values into a more usable numerical scale. On the decibel scale, the smallest audible sound in air (near total silence) to a human is 0 dB re 20 µPa. If the sound intensity increases by a factor of 10, the SPL would increase to 10 dB re 20 µPa. If the sound intensity increases by a factor of 100, the SPL would increase to 20 dB re 20 µPa, and if the sound intensity increases by a factor of 1000, the SPL would be 30 dB re 20 µPa. A quiet conversation has an SPL of about 50 dB re 20 µPa, while the threshold of pain is around 120–140 dB re 20 µPa.

As described in Section H.2.2 (Sound Pressure Level), SPLs under water differ from those in air because they rely on different reference pressures in their calculation; therefore, the two should never be directly compared.

While sound pressure and frequency are physical measure of the sound, loudness is a subjective attribute that varies with not only sound pressure but also other attributes of the sound, such as frequency. For example, a human listener would perceive a 60 dB re 20 µPa sound at 2 kHz to be louder than a 60 dB re 20 µPa sound at 50 Hz, even though the SPLs are identical. This effect is most noticeable at lower sound pressure levels; however, at very high sound pressure levels, the difference in perceived loudness at different frequencies becomes smaller.

To account for differences in hearing sensitivity at various frequencies, acoustic risk analyses commonly use auditory weighting functions—mathematical functions that adjust (or "weight") received sound levels across sound frequency based on how the listener's sensitivity or susceptibility to sound changes at different frequencies. For humans, the most common weighting function is called "A-weighting" (see Figure H-8). A-weighted sound levels are specified in units of "dBA" (A-weighted decibels). For example, if the unweighted received level of a 500 Hz tone at a human receiver was 90 dB re 20 µPa, the A-weighted sound level would be 90 dB – 3 dB = 87 dBA because the A-weighting function amplitude at 500 Hz is -3 dB. Many measurements of sound in air appear as A-weighted decibels in the literature because the intent of the authors is to assess noise impacts on humans.

The auditory weighting concept can be applied to other species. When used in analyzing the impacts of sound on an animal, auditory weighting functions adjust received sound levels to emphasize ranges of best hearing and de-emphasize ranges of less or no sensitivity. Auditory weighting functions were developed for marine mammals and sea turtles and are used to assess acoustic impacts. For more information on weighting functions and their derivation for this analysis see technical report *Criteria and Thresholds for U.S. Navy Acoustic and Explosive Effects Analysis (Phase III)* (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2017b).




Figure H-8: A-weighting for Human Hearing of Sounds in Air (OSHA). The Numbers along the Curve Indicate How a Received Sound Level Would Be Adjusted at that Frequency.

H.5 Explosives

Explosive materials used in Navy testing and training activities are either (1) "high explosives," sometimes referred to as HE, which means that the explosive material has a very fast rate of detonation (exceeding the speed of sound), or (2) low explosives, which exhibit a relatively slow burn, or deflagration, such as black powder. Because low explosives are typically used in small quantities and have less destructive power, the below discussion focuses on high explosives.

This rate of detonation of a high explosive is highly supersonic, producing a high pressure, steep instantaneous shock wave front travelling through the explosive material. This shock front is produced by the supersonic expansion of the explosive products, but as the shock front travels away from the immediate area of the detonation, it begins to behave as an acoustic wave front travelling at the speed of sound.

The near-instantaneous rise from ambient to an extremely high peak pressure is what makes the explosive shock wave potentially damaging. The area under this positive pressure duration is calculated as the positive impulse.

The positive pressure produced by an explosion is also referred to as the overpressure. As the shock front passes a location, the positive pressure exponentially decays, as shown in Figure H-9. As the shock front travels away from the detonation, the waveform is stretched – the peak pressure decreases while the positive duration increases. The reduction in peak pressure reduces the rate at which the positive impulse is received. Both the reduction in peak pressure and stretching of the positive impulse reduce

the potential for injury. In addition, absorption losses of higher frequencies over distance results in a softening of the shock front, such that the rise to peak pressure is no longer near-instantaneous.




Figure H-9: Impulse Shown as a Function of Pressure over Duration at a Specific Location

The peak pressure experienced by a receptor (i.e., an animal) is a function of the explosive material, the net explosive weight, and the distance from the charge. Net explosive weight is a way to classify and compare quantities of different explosive compounds. The net explosive weight for a charge is the energetic equivalent weight of trinitrotoluene (TNT). In general, shock wave effects near an explosive charge increase in proportion to the cube root of the explosive weight (Young, 1991). For example, shock wave impacts will double when the explosive charge weight is increased by a factor of eight (i.e., cube root of eight equals two). This relationship is known as the similarity principle, and the corresponding similitude equations allow for prediction of various explosive metrics for a given charge weight and material.

The similitude equations allow for a simple prediction of peak pressure in a uniform free field environment, and sources are provided below for using these equations for estimating explosive effects in air and in water. However, at longer distances or in more complex environments with boundaries and variations in the propagation medium, explosive propagation modeling is preferred.

H.5.1 Explosions in Air

Explosions in air produce an initial blast front that propagates away from the detonation. When pressure waves from an explosion in air meet the water surface, the pressure wave can be transmitted across the air-water boundary and reflected off the water surface. When pressure waves in air meet the water at a perpendicular angle (e.g., straight down from an in-air source to a flat water surface), the sound waves are both transmitted directly across the water surface in the same direction of travel and reflected 180° back toward the original direction of travel. For acoustic waves, this can create a localized condition at the water surface where the incident and reflected waves sum, doubling the in-air overpressure (+ 6 dB). For shock waves with high incident pressures travelling at supersonic speeds, the reflection from the water surface depends on the angle of incidence and the speed of the shock wave,

and the reflected shock wave pressure can be greater than the incident shock wave pressure (Kinney & Graham, 1985; U.S. Department of the Navy, 1975).

In certain explosive geometries, depending on the size of the explosive and its height of detonation, a combined shock wave, called a Mach stem, can be created by the summing of the direct and reflected shock waves at larger angles of incidence (Kinney & Graham, 1985). In instances where this specific geometry does not occur, only the direct path wave is experienced because there is no surface reflection (waves are parallel to or angled away from the water surface, such as would occur when an explosive is detonated at the water surface), or separate direct and reflected pressure waves may be experienced.

H.5.1.1 Fragmentation

Missiles, rockets, projectiles, and other cased weapons will produce casing fragments upon detonation. These fragments may be of variable size and are ejected at supersonic speed from the detonation. The casing fragments will be ejected at velocities much greater than debris from any target due to the proximity of the casing to the explosive material. Unlike detonations on land targets, detonations during Navy training and testing would not result in other propelled materials such as crater debris.

Fragment density can be simply assumed to follow an inverse-square law with distance, in which the possibility of fragment strike is reduced by the square of the distance from the original detonation point. The forces of gravity and drag will further reduce the likelihood of strike with increasing distance than is accounted for in the inverse-square relationship (Zaker, 1975). The possible area of strike risk at any given distance from the detonation point is limited to the surface area of produced fragments, with drag and gravity reducing the number of produced fragments that travel to greater distances.

H.5.2 Explosions in Water

At the instant of explosion underwater, gas byproducts are generated at high pressure and temperature, creating a bubble. The heat causes a certain amount of water to vaporize, adding to the volume of the bubble. This action immediately begins to force the water in contact with the blast front in an outward direction, creating an intense, supersonic pressure shock wave. As the high-pressure wave travels away from the source, it slows to the speed of sound and acts like an acoustic wave similar to other impulsive sources that lack a strong shock wave (e.g., air guns). Explosions have the greatest amount of energy in lower frequencies below 500 Hz, although energy is present in frequencies exceeding 10 kHz (Urick, 1983). The higher frequency components exhibit more attenuation with distance due to absorption (see Section H.3.3.2, Absorption).

The shock wave caused by an explosion in deeper water may be followed by several bubble pulses in which the explosive byproduct gases expand and contract, with correlated high and low pressure oscillations. These bubble pulses lack the steep pressure front of the initial explosive pulse, but the first bubble pulse may still contribute to the total energy released at frequencies below 100 Hz (Urick, 1983). Subsequent bubble pulses contribute little to the total energy released during the explosion (Urick, 1983). If the detonation occurs at or just below the surface, a portion of the explosive power is released into the air and a pulsating gas bubble is not formed.

The pressure waves from an explosive can constructively add or destructively cancel each other in ocean environments with multi-path propagation, as described for acoustic waves in Section H.3.3.3 (Refraction) and Section H.3.3.4 (Reflection and Multipath Propagation). The received impulse is affected by the depth of the charge and the depth of the receiving animal. Pressure waves from the

detonation may travel directly to the receiver or be reflected off the water surface before arriving at the receiver. If a charge is detonated closer to the surface or if an animal is closer to the surface, the time between the initial direct path arrival and the following surface-reflected tension wave arrival is reduced, resulting in a steep negative pressure cut-off of the initial direct path positive impulse exposure. Two animals at similar distances from a charge, therefore, may experience the same peak pressure but different levels of impulse at different depths.

REFERENCES

American National Standards Institute. (1994). *ANSI S1.1-1994 (R 2004) American National Standard Acoustical Terminology*. New York, NY: The Acoustical Society of America.

American National Standards Institute. (2013). *Acoustical Terminology*. Melville, NY: The Acoustical Society of America.

Au, W., and M. Hastings. (2008). *Principles of Marine Bioacoustics*. New York, NY: Springer-Verlag.

Diogou, N. (2014). *Talk About the Weather*. Retrieved from http://blogs.oregonstate.edu/bioacoustics/2014/10/21/talk-weather/.

Eller, A. I., and R. C. Cavanagh. (2000). *Subsonic Aircraft Noise at and Beneath the Ocean Surface: Estimation of Risk for Effects on Marine Mammals*. McLean, VA: United States Air Force Research Laboratory.

Finneran, J. J. (2003). Whole-lung resonance in a bottlenose dolphin (*Tursiops truncatus*) and white whale (*Delphinapterus leucas*). *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 114*(1), 529–535.

Hamernik, R. P., and K. D. Hsueh. (1991). Impulse noise: Some definitions, physical acoustics and other considerations. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 90*(1), 189–196.

Kinney, G. F., and K. J. Graham. (1985). *Explosive Shocks in Air* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Springer-Verlag.

Kinsler, L. E., A. R. Frey, A. B. Coppens, and J. V. Sanders. (1982). *Fundamentals of Acoustics* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.

Medwin, H., and C. Clay. (1998). *Fundamentals of Acoustical Oceanography*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Nedelec, S. L., J. Campbell, A. N. Radford, S. D. Simpson, and N. D. Merchant. (2016). Particle motion: The missing link in underwater acoustic ecology. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution, 7*(7), 836–842.

Richardson, W. J., C. R. Greene, Jr., C. I. Malme, and D. H. Thomson. (1995). *Marine Mammals and Noise*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

U.S. Department of the Air Force. (2000). *Supersonic Aircraft Noise At and Beneath the Ocean Surface: Estimation of Risk for Effects on Marine Mammals* (AFRL-HE-WP-TR-2000-0167). McLean, VA: United States Air Force Research Laboratory.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (1975). *Explosion Effects and Properties Part I – Explosion Effects in Air*. Silver Spring, MD: White Oak Laboratory, Naval Surface Weapons Center.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2017a). *Quantifying Acoustic Impacts on Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles: Methods and Analytical Approach for Phase III Training and Testing* (Technical Report prepared by Space and Naval Warfare Systems Center Pacific). San Diego, CA: Naval Undersea Warfare Center.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2017b). *Criteria and Thresholds for U.S. Navy Acoustic and Explosive Effects Analysis (Phase III)*. San Diego, CA: Space and Naval Warfare Systems Command, Pacific.

Urick, R. J. (1983). *Principles of Underwater Sound* (3rd ed.). Los Altos, CA: Peninsula Publishing.

Young, G. A. (1991). *Concise Methods for Predicting the Effects of Underwater Explosions on Marine Life*. Silver Spring, MD: Naval Surface Warfare Center.

Young, R. W. (1973). Sound pressure in water from a source in air and vice versa. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 53*(6), 1708–1716.

Zaker, T. A. (1975). *Fragment and Debris Hazards*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Defense Explosives Safety Board.

Appendix I: Geographic Mitigation Assessment

Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/ Overseas Environmental Impact Statement Mariana Islands Training and Testing

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPENDIX I GEOGRAPHIC MITIGATION ASSESSMENT I-1

I.1 Introduction I-1

I.2 Geographic Mitigation Development Process I-1

I.2.1 Identification by the Navy of Areas to Consider for Potential Geographic Mitigation I-2

I.2.2 Assessing Mitigation Effectiveness I-4

I.2.3 Assessing Practicality of Implementation I-4

I.3 Geographic Mitigation Assessment – Areas Proposed for Implementation I-4

I.3.1 Marpi Reef Geographic Mitigation Area I-5

I.3.1.1 Resources within the Marpi Reef Geographic Mitigation Area I-5

I.3.1.2 Navy Training and Testing Activities – Marpi Reef Geographic Mitigation Area I-9

I.3.1.3 Mitigation Assessment – Marpi Reef Geographic Mitigation Area I-10

I.3.2 Chalan Kanoa Reef Geographic Mitigation Area I-12

I.3.2.1 Resources within the Chalan Kanoa Reef Geographic Mitigation Area I-12

I.3.2.2 Navy Training and Testing Activities – Chalan Kanoa Reef I-17

I.3.2.3 Mitigation Assessment – Chalan Kanoa Reef Geographic Mitigation Area I-17

I.3.3 Agat Bay Nearshore Geographic Mitigation Area I-20

I.3.3.1 Resources within Agat Bay Nearshore Geographic Mitigation Area I-20

I.3.3.2 Navy Training and Testing Activities – Agat Bay Nearshore I-23

I.3.3.3 Mitigation Assessment – Agat Bay Nearshore Geographic Mitigation Area I-23

I.4 Geographic Mitigation Assessment – Areas Not Carried Forward for Implementation. I-25

I.4.1 West Mariana Ridge I-25

I.4.2 Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands Landward of the 3,500 Meter Isobath I-27

I.4.3 Earthjustice and on Behalf of Tinian Women Association, Guardians of Gani', PaganWatch, and Center for Biological Diversity I-30

I.4.3.1 Minke Whale Habitat I-31

I.4.3.2 Humpback Whale Calving Grounds I-32

I.4.3.3 Marine Mammal Biologically Sensitive Areas I-32

I.4.3.4 Sea Turtle Biologically Sensitive Areas I-32
I.4.4 Seafloor Habitat Less than 700 Meters Deep I-33
I.4.5 Various Areas Recommended by the Natural Resources Defense Council I-33
I.4.5.1 Sperm Whale Calving and Nursery Habitat Offshore of Agat Bay, Guam; and Breeding and Calving Habitat Offshore Apra Harbor, Guam I-34
I.4.5.2 Spinner Dolphin Resting Habitat at Bile Bay, Tumon Bay, Double Reef, and Cocos Island and Lagoon, Guam; and Tanapaq Lagoon, Saipan ... I-34
I.4.5.3 Breeding Habitat for Pygmy Killer Whale Population at Cocos Island and Lagoon, Guam I-34
I.4.5.4 Short-finned Pilot Whale Core Use Areas, West of Guam and Rota I-35
I.4.6 Prohibit Use of Air-Deployed Mid-Frequency Active Sonar Year Round – Proposed for All Three Mitigation Areas I-35
I.4.7 Prohibit Use of Low-Frequency Active Sonar from December through April – Proposed for All Three Mitigation Areas I-35
I.4.8 Implement Vessel Speed Restrictions in the Three Mitigation Areas I-36
I.4.9 Various and Anonymous Commenters – Generalized Geographic Avoidance I-36
I.5 Summary of Geographic Mitigation Areas I-37

List of Figures

Figure I-1: Navy-Identified Potential Geographic Mitigation Areas I-3
Figure I-2: Updated Marpi Reef Geographic Mitigation Area I-6
Figure I-3: Updated Chalan Kanoa Reef Geographic Mitigation Area I-13
Figure I-4: Updated Agat Bay Nearshore Geographic Mitigation Area I-21
Figure I-5: West Mariana Ridge Area Suggested as a Potential Mitigation Area I-26
Figure I-6: Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands Landward of the 3,500 Meter Isobath Suggested as a Potential Mitigation Area I-28
Figure I-7: Navy Geographic Mitigation Areas I-38

List of Tables

Table I-1: Navy-Identified Potential Geographic Mitigation Areas I-2
Table I-2: Marine Mammals Documented Within the Marpi Reef Geographic Mitigation Area I-7
Table I-3: Mitigation Within the Marpi Reef Geographic Mitigation Area I-11
Table I-4: Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles Documented Within the Chalan Kanoa Reef Geographic Mitigation Area I-14
Table I-5: Mitigation Within the Chalan Kanoa Reef Geographic Mitigation Area I-19
Table I-6: Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles Documented Within the Agat Bay Nearshore Geographic Mitigation Area I-20
Table I-7: Mitigation Within the Agat Bay Nearshore Geographic Mitigation Area I-25
Table I-8: Summary of Geographic Mitigation I-37

Appendix I Geographic Mitigation Assessment

I.1 Introduction

As described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), the United States (U.S.) Department of the Navy (Navy) will implement at-sea procedural mitigation, at-sea geographic mitigation, and terrestrial mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts on environmental and cultural resources from training and testing activities proposed in the Mariana Islands Training and Testing (MITT) Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS)/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (OEIS) Proposed Action. The purpose of this appendix is to present an assessment of the potential geographic mitigation (i.e., mitigation implemented seasonally or year round within defined at-sea mitigation areas) that the Navy considered to reduce or avoid impacts on marine mammals and sea turtles in the Study Area. The goals of developing geographic mitigation in this appendix are (1) in combination with procedural mitigation, to effect the least practicable adverse impact on marine mammal species or stocks and their habitat, and (2) to ensure that the Proposed Action does not jeopardize the continued existence of endangered or threatened species.

This appendix includes background information on the areas that the Navy is proposing as geographic mitigation areas, information on the marine mammals and sea turtles known to occur in each area, and an assessment of the effectiveness and practicality of implementing mitigation. A summary of the mitigation areas that the Navy proposes to implement under Alternative 1 or Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative) of the Proposed Action as a result of the assessments presented in this appendix is also included in Section 5.4 (At-Sea Mitigation Areas to be Implemented). The Navy will work collaboratively with the appropriate regulatory agencies to finalize its mitigation areas through the consultation and permitting processes and will coordinate with the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) to finalize the geographic mitigation analyzed in this appendix. Final mitigation measures will be documented in the Navy Record of Decision, NMFS Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA) Final Rule and Letter of Authorization, and the Endangered Species Act (ESA) Biological Opinions as applicable.

I.2 Geographic Mitigation Development Process

See Chapter 5 (Mitigation) for general information on the Navy's mitigation development process, including definitions of mitigation terminology, background information pertinent to the overall process, and information about the mitigation effectiveness and practicality criteria. This section presents information specific to assessing and developing geographic mitigation for marine mammals and sea turtles in the Study Area.

The Navy considered areas suggested by the public, governmental agencies, and non-governmental organizations during the public involvement process. The Navy also considered additional areas that were informed by Navy-funded studies.

NMFS has not identified Biologically Important Areas for marine mammals in the MITT Study Area (Ferguson et al., 2015b; Van Parijs et al., 2015). Data informing geographic mitigation area development and assessment included the operational information described in Section 5.2.4 (Practicality of Implementation), the best available science discussed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences), published literature, and marine species monitoring and density data. The Navy operational community (i.e., the aviation, surface, subsurface, and special warfare communities; the research and acquisition community; and training and testing experts), environmental planners, and scientific experts provided input on the effectiveness and practicality of mitigation.

The Navy used a comprehensive qualitative method to analyze potential geographic mitigation that considered a biological assessment of how a potential time and area limitation on Navy activities would benefit the species or stock and its habitat (e.g., Does a certain area support important biological functions? Would mitigation in that area result in an avoidance or reduction of impacts?) in the context of the stressors of concern in the specific area, and an operational assessment of the practicality of implementation (e.g., including an assessment of the specific importance of that area for training and testing).

I.2.1 Identification by the Navy of Areas to Consider for Potential Geographic Mitigation

Navy scientists derived the geographic boundaries and applicable timeframes (i.e., seasonal or year round) for potential areas based on a review of the best available science. The Navy evaluated marine mammal and sea turtle sighting and satellite tag data to identify locations where species appeared to concentrate, the timeframes of apparent concentrations, and documented behaviors from available reports and publications (Ampela et al., 2014; Fulling et al., 2011; Hill et al., 2015a; Hill et al., 2014; Hill et al., 2015b; Hill et al., 2016a; Hill et al., 2016b; Hill et al., 2017a; Hill et al., 2017b; Hill et al., 2018a; Hill et al., 2018b; Hill et al., 2018c; Hill et al., 2019; Hill et al., 2020; Jones & Van Houtan, 2014a; Jones & Van Houtan, 2014b; Jones et al., 2015; Jones & Martin, 2016; Klinck et al., 2015; Klinck et al., 2016; Ligon et al., 2011; Martien et al., 2014; Martin & Jones, 2016; Martin et al., 2018, 2019; Munger et al., 2014; Munger et al., 2015; National Marine Fisheries Service, 2018, 2019; Nieukirk et al., 2016; Norris et al., 2015; Norris et al., 2014; Norris et al., 2017; Oleson et al., 2015; Summers et al., 2017; Summers et al., 2018; Tetra Tech Inc., 2014; U.S. Department of the Navy, 2013, 2018a; Uyeyama, 2014; Yack et al., 2016). Initially, area boundaries were drawn generally with straight lines and simple shapes, with the goal that these areas would be relatively easy for operators to plot if they were carried forward for implementation. Based on additional sighting data received after publication of the Draft SEIS/OEIS and comments received on the Draft SEIS/OEIS, water depth was incorporated to redefine or partially redefine area boundaries, as discussed in detail below (National Marine Fisheries Service, 2019).

The Navy named each area considered according to a nearby geographic feature. A list of the areas identified by the Navy as potential mitigation areas and their applicable resource protection focus and timeframe is provided in Table I-1. A map showing the location of each area identified as a potential mitigation area is shown in Figure I-1.

Table I-1: Navy-Identified Potential Geographic Mitigation Areas

Habitat Considered	*Protection Focus*	*Applicable Timeframe*
Marpi Reef Area	Humpback whales	Seasonal (December–April)
	Marine mammals	Year round
Chalan Kanoa Reef Area	Humpback whales	Seasonal (December–April)
	Marine mammals and sea turtles	Year round
Agat Bay Nearshore Area	Spinner dolphins and sea turtles	Year round
North Guam Offshore Area[1]	Marine mammals	Year round
Ritidian Point Offshore Area[1]	Marine mammals	Year round
Tumon Bay Offshore Area[1]	Marine mammals	Year round

[1]The Navy reviewed the area and determined that it did not meet the Navy's criteria as a key area of biological importance for marine mammals or sea turtles. While sightings and transits of the area by some species were noted in review of available scientific research, there is currently no information on specific uses for biologically important life processes beyond normal species broad area occurrence (e.g., the area is not an exclusive feeding area, migration route, or breeding location).




Figure I-1: Navy-Identified Potential Geographic Mitigation Areas

I.2.2 Assessing Mitigation Effectiveness

The first step in assessing the potential geographic mitigation areas was to use the best available science to determine if implementing geographic mitigation would effectively help the Navy avoid or reduce potential impacts associated with the Proposed Action on marine mammals or sea turtles. This appendix focuses on avoiding or reducing potential impacts from the stressors that have the highest potential for injurious impacts on marine mammals and sea turtles. Therefore, the Navy focused its assessment on hull-mounted mid-frequency active sonar and in-water explosives. The Navy considered a geographic mitigation area to be biologically effective if it met the following criteria:

- **The mitigation area is a key area of biological importance:** The best available science suggests that the mitigation area is particularly important to one or more species of marine mammals or sea turtles for a biologically important life process (e.g., foraging, migration, reproduction); and
- **The mitigation will result in an avoidance or reduction of impacts:** Implementing the mitigation will likely avoid or reduce potential impacts on species, stocks, or populations of marine mammals or sea turtles based on data describing their seasonal occurrence and distribution, spatial density, and behaviors in the Study Area. Furthermore, implementing the mitigation would not shift or transfer adverse impacts from one species to another (e.g., to a more vulnerable or sensitive species).

While this appendix focuses on marine mammals and sea turtles, geographic mitigation may provide potential benefits to other marine resources known to occur in each area, such as marine invertebrates and fishes. Additional information on the Navy's mitigation effectiveness criteria is presented in Section 5.2.2 (At-Sea Mitigation Area Development).

I.2.3 Assessing Practicality of Implementation

In the next step of the mitigation assessment process, the Navy operational community conducted an extensive and comprehensive analysis to determine how and to what degree the implementation of geographic mitigation areas would impact planning, scheduling, and conducting safe training and testing activities as described under the Proposed Action. Conducting the proposed training and testing activities is necessary for the Navy to fulfill its Title 10 requirements, ensuring naval forces are ready to execute the range of military operations required by operational Commanders. The Navy considered a mitigation measure to be practical to implement if it met all criteria discussed in Section 5.2.4 (Practicality of Implementation) for safety, sustainability, and mission requirements.

I.3 Geographic Mitigation Assessment – Areas Proposed for Implementation

The Navy determined that three of the six potential geographic mitigation areas met the criteria presented in Section I.2.2 (Assessing Mitigation Effectiveness) and Section I.2.3 (Assessing Practicality of Implementation). These three areas (Marpi Reef Geographic Mitigation Area, Chalan Kanoa Reef Geographic Mitigation Area, and Agat Bay Nearshore Geographic Mitigation Area) are the three mitigation areas proposed for implementation and described in detail in this appendix. The three other potential mitigation areas (Ritidian Point Offshore Area, Tumon Bay Offshore Area, and North Guam Offshore Area) considered in this appendix did not meet the Navy's criteria because, based on the available data, the areas are not key areas of biological importance for any marine mammal or sea turtle species (i.e., there is no documented evidence of exclusive use for calving, feeding, breeding, or migration).

The following discussion of each of the three geographic mitigation areas includes a physical description of the area, details on how and why the area was identified, information on Navy training and testing activities potentially occurring in the area, and a mitigation assessment. The mitigation assessment uses information presented in Sections 3.4 (Marine Mammals) and 3.5 (Sea Turtles) to assess the effectiveness of geographic mitigation in reducing or avoiding impacts on these resources, and uses information presented in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) and Appendix A (Training and Testing Activities Descriptions) to assess practicality of implementation and impacts on the effectiveness of military readiness activities. The Navy considered both the potential benefit to resources and the practicality of implementing the mitigation when determining which areas to propose as geographic mitigation areas. Additional information on the three mitigation areas and the three potential mitigation areas is contained in the administrative record for this SEIS/OEIS.

I.3.1 Marpi Reef Geographic Mitigation Area

The Marpi Reef Geographic Mitigation Area is located approximately 11 kilometers (km) north of Saipan at its closest point and covers approximately 33 square kilometers (km^2). As shown in Figure I-2, this is an observed area of concentration and reproductive behavior for humpback whales based on sightings documented during a broad area line transect survey in 2007 (Fulling et al., 2011) and during non-systematic small boat surveys occurring from 2010 through spring of 2019 (HDR, 2011; HDR EOC, 2012; Hill et al., 2014; Hill et al., 2016b; Hill et al., 2017a; Hill et al., 2018b; Hill et al., 2018c; Hill et al., 2020; Ligon et al., 2011; National Marine Fisheries Service, 2019). Navy scientists reviewed these sighting data using a Geographic Information System, and a straight-line boundary was drawn to encompass the area of known concentration at Marpi Reef.

Based on additional data and comments received after publication of the Draft SEIS/OEIS, the straight-line boundary of the Marpi Reef Geographic Mitigation Area that had been presented in the Draft SEIS/OEIS was redefined as the 400 m isobath encompassing Marpi Reef (National Marine Fisheries Service, 2019). This updated Marpi Reef Geographic Mitigation Area encompasses sightings of humpback whale mother-calf pairs and whales exhibiting competitive behaviors associated with reproduction (Figure I-2). The depth range, extending to 400 m, is consistent with observations of mother-calf pairs and competitive behaviors at known humpback whale reproductive areas in Hawaii (Pack et al., 2017).

I.3.1.1 Resources within the Marpi Reef Geographic Mitigation Area

The Marpi Reef Geographic Mitigation Area was developed based on the seasonal presence of humpback whales; however, other biological resources have been observed or are expected to be present at Marpi Reef, including other marine mammals, sea turtles, invertebrates including corals, and fishes. Those resources are discussed in detail in the following sections of this SEIS/OEIS: Section 3.4 (Marine Mammals), Section 3.5 (Sea Turtles), Section 3.8 (Marine Invertebrates), and Section 3.9 (Fishes).

As shown in Table I-2, five marine mammal species have been documented in the Marpi Reef Geographic Mitigation Area either through sightings or satellite tag detections (Fulling et al., 2011; HDR, 2011; HDR EOC, 2012; Hill et al., 2014; Hill et al., 2016b; Hill et al., 2017a; Hill et al., 2018b; Hill et al., 2018c; Hill et al., 2020; Ligon et al., 2011). Species documented in the Marpi Reef Geographic Mitigation Area include humpback whale, spinner dolphin, bottlenose dolphin, short-finned pilot whale, and false killer whale. Sea turtles have not been reported in the Marpi Reef Geographic Mitigation Area.




Figure I-2: Updated Marpi Reef Geographic Mitigation Area

Table I-2: Marine Mammals Documented Within the Marpi Reef Geographic Mitigation Area

Common Name	2007	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2016	2017	2018
Humpback whale	S						S	S	S
Spinner dolphin	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
Bottlenose dolphin					S+T			S	S
Short-finned pilot whale					S+T	S+T	S+T	S	
False killer whale					T				

Notes: S = One or more sightings during a survey in the area; T = one or more satellite tag detections; S+T = one or more sightings and satellite tag detections in a given year; empty cells indicate no documented occurrence of the species in the given year; years not shown indicate that no surveys were conducted in the area in that year.

I.3.1.1.1 Marine Mammals

I.3.1.1.1.1 Humpback Whales

While all species of marine mammals described in this SEIS/OEIS could occur at Marpi Reef, the Marpi Reef Geographic Mitigation Area was specifically developed to avoid or reduce potential impacts on seasonally present humpback whales engaged in reproductive behaviors (e.g., breeding, birthing, and nursing).

Humpback whales have been observed during four surveys in the vicinity of Saipan, in relatively small numbers, with multiple sightings documented within the Marpi Reef Geographic Mitigation Area (Fulling et al., 2011; Hill et al., 2015a; Hill et al., 2014; Hill et al., 2015b; Hill et al., 2016b; Hill et al., 2017a; Hill et al., 2018b; Oleson & Hill, 2010a).

Humpback whales have occasionally been observed seasonally during winter and spring (December-April) throughout the Mariana Islands by local fisherman, dive-tour operators, and during marine mammal surveys (Hill et al., 2015a; Hill et al., 2016a; U.S. Department of the Navy, 2005; Uyeyama, 2014). Humpback whales have been sighted during surveys in the vicinity of Saipan in the months of February and March (Fulling et al., 2011; Hill et al., 2015a; Hill et al., 2016b; Hill et al., 2017a; Hill et al., 2018b). It remains unclear if humpback whales are simply transiting through the Study Area or use portions of the Study Area as a wintering location (Hill et al., 2016a). Given the species' absence in the waters off Saipan, Tinian, and Guam during any of the surveys that occurred between February 2010 and April 2014 (Hill et al., 2015a), their seasonal presence may be variable in the Mariana Islands even in the vicinity of Marpi Reef.

In the 2007 survey of the region, there were eight humpback whales observed in the Marpi Reef Geographic Mitigation Area, but no calves were observed (Fulling et al., 2011). The next surveys to encounter humpback whales in the Mariana Islands occurred from February 26, 2015 to March 8, 2015, when four mother-calf pairs and four other individual humpback whales were observed at Chalan Kanoa Reef (Hill et al., 2015a; Hill et al., 2016b). During the subsequent NMFS Mariana Archipelago Cetacean Survey two months later (May 8 to June 6, 2015), survey transects sampling all the Mariana Islands out to 50 NM from shore detected no humpback whales visually or acoustically in the Mariana Islands (Hill et al., 2018c; Oleson, 2017). Humpback whales were observed at Marpi Reef again the following year.

Eight humpback whales were sighted on March 2, 2016, including two mother-calf pairs, and on March 10, 2016, six humpback whales were sighted, also including two mother-calf pairs (Hill et al., 2017a). At Marpi Reef in 2017, a total of 21 humpback whales were sighted over two days of effort, but no calves were observed (Hill et al., 2018b). For the broader area around Saipan, humpback whales were encountered in the 2017 surveys off Marpi Reef, Chalan Kanoa Reef, or off the northwest side of Saipan between the two reefs. Sightings included mother-calf pairs, one accompanied by an escort, and other humpbacks in competitive groups (Hill et al., 2018b). Humpback whales engaged in reproductive activities or in the company of calves are generally found at or near the surface and therefore more readily observable from survey vessels, so it is unlikely that humpbacks were present and were unobserved.

In 2007 and in all subsequent surveys, all age classes of humpbacks have been observed in the Mariana Islands, including calves (Fulling et al., 2011; Hill et al., 2015a; Hill et al., 2016a; Hill et al., 2018b; Hill et al., 2018c). These surveys have documented behaviors (e.g., escorting, competitive groups) consistent with known humpback whale reproductive activities in other locations (Gabriele et al., 2017; Pack et al., 2017; U.S. Department of Commerce et al., 2015), and in 2018 NMFS confirmed that the waters around Saipan are a newly identified "breeding location" for humpback whales (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2018).

Based on a compendium of all observations, humpback whales have been sighted in the Study Area from January through March (Hill et al., 2018d; Hill et al., 2020; U.S. Department of the Navy, 2005; Uyeyama, 2014), and male humpback songs have been recorded from December through April (Hill et al., 2017a; Klinck et al., 2016; Munger et al., 2014; Norris et al., 2014; Oleson et al., 2015). Except for the potential presence of a few individual humpback whales at any time during the year or when migrating to or from summer feeding areas in the North Pacific, humpback whales will most likely occur in the vicinity of the Mariana Islands in relatively shallow waters during the December to April timeframe. For the purposes of establishing geographic mitigation and based on a conservative approach extending beyond the time periods for sightings in the Mariana Islands (Fulling et al., 2011; Hill et al., 2016a; Hill et al., 2017a; Hill et al., 2017b; Hill et al., 2018b; Hill et al., 2018c), humpback whales are assumed to be seasonally present from December through April in the Marpi Reef Geographic Mitigation Area.

I.3.1.1.1.2 Spinner Dolphins

In 2017, spinner dolphins were sighted at Marpi Reef in group sizes that ranged between 25 and 110 individuals (Hill et al., 2018b). Spinner dolphins have been the most commonly encountered marine mammal species in small boat surveys since 2010 (Hill et al., 2018b; Hill et al., 2018c). As shown in Table I-2, spinner dolphins have been sighted in every year that a survey of the Marpi Reef area has occurred, present in the months of at least February through September (Fulling et al., 2011; HDR, 2011; HDR EOC, 2012; Hill et al., 2014; Hill et al., 2016b; Hill et al., 2017a; Hill et al., 2018b; Ligon et al., 2011). Spinner dolphin behaviors observed most often at this location include milling or approaches to the survey boat to bow-ride (Hill et al., 2018b). The behaviors of these animals and their common occurrence throughout the Mariana Islands suggest that the Marpi Reef Geographic Mitigation Area is of no particular biological importance for this species.

I.3.1.1.1.3 Bottlenose Dolphins

Bottlenose dolphins were sighted in the Marpi Reef Geographic Mitigation Area in 2013, 2017, and 2018, in groups of two to eight individuals. A satellite tag was deployed on a bottlenose dolphin off

Aguijan in 2013, and that individual moved through the Marpi Reef Geographic Mitigation Area and continued north to waters south of Sarigan (Hill et al., 2014), which is a distance of approximately 200 km. This is consistent with findings from other bottlenose dolphin tagging efforts in the Mariana Islands (Hill et al., 2013b; Hill et al., 2014; Hill et al., 2015b; Hill et al., 2016b; Hill et al., 2017a; Hill et al., 2018b) indicating that bottlenose dolphins are wide-ranging across the Mariana Islands. During the 2017 encounter, it was noted the bottlenose dolphins were interacting with the humpback whales and short finned pilot whales that were also present at Marpi Reef (Hill et al., 2018b). The wide-ranging movements of these animals suggest that no specific islands or areas in the Mariana Islands are of any particular biological importance for this species.

I.3.1.1.1.4 Short-Finned Pilot Whales

Short-finned pilot whales were sighted and detected via satellite tag in the Marpi Reef Geographic Mitigation Area from 2013 through 2017 (Hill et al., 2013b; Hill et al., 2014; Hill et al., 2015b; Hill et al., 2016b; Hill et al., 2017a; Hill et al., 2018b). During the 2017 survey, a pod of approximately 35 short-finned pilot whales was observed interacting with bottlenose dolphins and humpback whales (Hill et al., 2018b). Satellite tag location data for short-finned pilot whales indicate that these animals also range widely across the Mariana Islands and that no specific islands or areas in the Mariana Islands are of any particular biological importance for this species.

I.3.1.1.1.5 False Killer Whales

False killer whales have not been sighted within the Marpi Reef Geographic Mitigation Area during any surveys. In 2013, satellite tags were deployed on four false killer whales off Rota in pods with a group size ranging from 15 to 17 individuals (Hill et al., 2013b). Only one of these four tagged individuals moved north and through the Marpi Reef Geographic Mitigation Area, but all four individuals traveled in excess of 200 NM from their initial tag detection locations off Rota (Hill et al., 2013b). The wide-ranging movements provided by these tag data indicate no particular islands or areas of importance for the species in the Mariana Islands.

I.3.1.1.2 Sea Turtles

Sea turtles could be present in the vicinity of the Marpi Reef area (Martin & Jones, 2016; Martin et al., 2016; Martin et al., 2018, 2019; U.S. Department of the Navy, 2018a). Sea turtles have not been sighted within the boundaries of the Marpi Reef Geographic Mitigation Area during any of the surveys conducted to date (HDR, 2011, 2012; HDR EOC, 2012; Hill et al., 2011; Hill et al., 2013a; Hill et al., 2014; Hill et al., 2015b; Hill et al., 2016b; Hill et al., 2017a; Hill et al., 2018b; Ligon et al., 2011; Martin et al., 2019; Oleson & Hill, 2010a) and have not transited through the area based on the satellite tag detections recorded since 2013 (Jones & Van Houtan, 2014b; Jones et al., 2015; Jones & Martin, 2016; Martin & Jones, 2016; Martin et al., 2016; Martin et al., 2018, 2019).

The available data indicate that the Marpi Reef Geographic Mitigation Area does not meet the Navy's criteria as a key area of biological importance for sea turtles.

I.3.1.2 Navy Training and Testing Activities – Marpi Reef Geographic Mitigation Area

The Marpi Reef Geographic Mitigation Area has historically been a low-use area for Navy training and testing activities. Explosive munitions have not been used in this area, nor has sonar use been reported in this area. However, transiting vessels could engage in training or testing activities within this area

using sonar or explosives while implementing procedural mitigation measures and following Standard Operating Procedures to ensure public safety.

I.3.1.3 Mitigation Assessment – Marpi Reef Geographic Mitigation Area

I.3.1.3.1 Biological Assessment – Marpi Reef

NMFS has concluded that the waters around Saipan are a newly identified "breeding location" for humpback whales (National Marine Fisheries Service, 2019; National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2018). Based on the non-systematic survey data described above indicating that humpback whales, including mother-calf pairs, are seasonally present on a non-annual basis in the Marpi Reef Geographic Mitigation Area, the area may be of biological importance to humpback whales for biologically important life processes associated with reproduction (e.g., breeding, birthing, and nursing) for part of the year. Marpi Reef is one of only two locations in the Study Area where reproductive activities have been repeatedly, although not always annually, observed. Additional data would help refine frequency of occurrence in terms of oceanographic variability, validate re-sightings of the same individuals as a percent of a humpback whale distinct population segment, and determine if actual residency time for mother-calf pairs at Marpi Reef is significant or not. This is different from others areas in the Pacific, such as Hawaii or the U.S. West Coast, where datasets of 30–40 years are available and where far larger numbers of animals engaged in biologically important life processes have been observed. However, in consideration of the scientific data that are available at this time for the Study Area the Navy considers that this area does meet its criteria as an area of biological importance for humpback whale reproductive behaviors. The data do not indicate that the Marpi Reef Geographic Mitigation Area is of any particular importance for other marine mammal species that may occur there.

As detailed in Section 3.4.2 (Environmental Consequences) of this SEIS/OEIS and based on the discussion above, the proposed Navy training and testing activities described in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) and Appendix A (Training and Testing Activities Descriptions) are not expected to result in long-term consequences to any marine species present in the Marpi Reef Geographic Mitigation Area. Geographic mitigation limiting training and testing activities would likely reduce or avoid potential impacts on marine mammals present in the Marpi Reef Geographic Mitigation Area in the event that naval forces conduct training or testing activities using hull-mounted mid-frequency active sonar or in-water explosives.

I.3.1.3.2 Practicality of Geographic Mitigation – Marpi Reef Geographic Mitigation Area

Access to a variety of bathymetric features, including shallow areas, is critical to support realistic Anti-Submarine Warfare training and testing activities using sonar. Areas with shallow depths are limited in the Mariana Archipelago; therefore, the Navy has determined that it would be imprudent to limit the use of sonar at the Marpi Reef Geographic Mitigation Area.

The Navy has access to established, nearshore training and testing areas for the use of explosive munitions; therefore, the Navy has determined that it would be practical to avoid using explosives in the Marpi Reef Geographic Mitigation Area.

I.3.1.3.3 Summary – Marpi Reef Geographic Mitigation Area

As a result of the assessment of the Marpi Reef Geographic Mitigation Area, the Navy is proposing to implement geographic mitigation, limit surface ship hull-mounted MF1 mid-frequency active sonar hours, and to report sonar use as described in Table I-3. Geographic mitigation would reduce or avoid impacts on any marine mammals or sea turtles present in the event mission requirements necessitate

using active sonar while conducting a training or testing activity. Given that Marpi Reef is an area for humpback whale reproductive behaviors, the Navy has limited MF1 sonar hours from 1 December to 30 April and developed special reporting requirements, similar to those employed in the Hawaiian Humpback Whale Sanctuary, specifically for the use of MF1 sonar, which will aid the Navy and NMFS in continuing to analyze potential impacts of training and testing in this area. The Navy must retain its ability to conduct active sonar in the limited shallow, nearshore waters of the MITT Study Area, including Marpi Reef, to ensure vessels can meet training and testing requirements for MF1 surface ship hull-mounted mid-frequency active sonar. The Navy must have the capability to train and test in a shallow water environment to accommodate future advances in sonar technology and anti-submarine warfare tactics.

Based on current operational projections and the availability of other similar, suitable training and testing locations in the Study Area, the Navy has determined that it would be practical to avoid using explosives in the Marpi Reef Geographic Mitigation Area year round under the Proposed Action. Such geographic mitigation would ensure that marine mammals are not exposed to explosives in this area, which is thought to be particularly important for humpback whale reproductive behaviors.

Table I-3: Mitigation Within the Marpi Reef Geographic Mitigation Area

Mitigation Area Description
Stressor or Activity • Surface ship hull-mounted mid-frequency active sonar (bin MF1) • In-water explosives
Identified Resource Protection Focus • Humpback whales; seasonally present (December – April) • Marine mammals; potentially present year round
Mitigation Area Requirements[1] • The Navy will conduct a maximum combined total of 20 hours of surface ship hull-mounted MF1 mid-frequency active sonar during training and testing from 1 December to 30 April within the Marpi Reef Mitigation Area and Chalan Kanoa Reef Mitigation Area. The Navy will report the total hours of active sonar (all bins, by bin) used in the Marpi Reef Mitigation Area and Chalan Kanoa Reef Mitigation Area from 1 December to 30 April in its annual training and testing activity reports submitted to NMFS. Should national security present a requirement to use surface ships hull-mounted MF-1 mid-frequency active sonar between 1 December to 30 April, the Navy will provide NMFS with advance notification of the activity. • The Navy will not use in-water explosives in the Marpi Reef Mitigation Area year-round. • The Navy will issue an annual seasonal awareness notification message to alert ships and aircraft operating in the Marpi Reef Mitigation Area to the possible presence of increased concentrations of humpback whales from 1 December through 30 April. To maintain safety of navigation and to avoid interactions with large whales during transits, the Navy will instruct vessels to remain vigilant to the presence of humpback whales, that when concentrated seasonally, may become vulnerable to vessel strikes. Platforms will use the information from the awareness notification messages to assist their visual observation of applicable mitigation zones during training and testing activities and to aid in the implementation of procedural mitigation.

[1] *Should* national security present a requirement to conduct training or testing prohibited by the mitigation requirements specified in this table, naval units will obtain permission from the appropriate designated Command authority prior to commencement of the activity. The Navy will provide NMFS with advance notification and include relevant information (e.g., sonar hours, explosives use) in its annual activity reports submitted to NMFS.

I.3.2 Chalan Kanoa Reef Geographic Mitigation Area

The Chalan Kanoa Reef[1] includes exposed fringing reef, reef flats exposed at low tide, nearshore shallow waters (less than 20 meters in depth), and a portion of Saipan Harbor. The area extends about 0.4 to approximately 12 km off the west coast of Saipan and covers approximately 102 km^2, as shown in Figure I-3. This area was developed to encompass the relative concentration of total marine mammal sightings and tag detections as observed and documented between 2007 and 2018, which included seasonal (in February and March) humpback whale sightings documented during non-systematic small boat surveys occurring in 2015 through March 2018 (Fulling et al., 2011; Hill et al., 2014; Hill et al., 2015b; Hill et al., 2016b; Hill et al., 2017a; Hill et al., 2018b; Hill et al., 2018c; Hill et al., 2020; Oleson & Hill, 2010a). Navy scientists reviewed the locations of sightings and tag detections using a Geographic Information System, and delineated a straight-line boundary to encompass the area of highest concentration at Chalan Kanoa Reef with a particular emphasis on including humpback whale sightings. As with the Marpi Reef Geographic Mitigation Area, based on additional data and comments received after publication of the Draft SEIS/OEIS, the boundary of the Chalan Kanoa Reef Geographic Mitigation Area was partially redefined using water depth; the offshore boundary of the mitigation area follows the 400 m isobath (National Marine Fisheries Service, 2019). The 400 m isobath was chosen as the boundary because all mother-calf pairs and all males exhibiting reproductive behaviors sighted during surveys occurred within it. The depth range, extending to 400 m, is consistent with observations of mother-calf pairs and competitive behaviors at known humpback whale reproductive areas in Hawaii (Pack et al., 2017).

I.3.2.1 Resources within the Chalan Kanoa Reef Geographic Mitigation Area

The Chalan Kanoa Reef Geographic Mitigation Area was developed based on the seasonal presence of humpback whales, observed behaviors associated with reproduction, and sightings and tag detections of other marine mammals and sea turtles. Other biological resources have been observed or are expected to be present at Chalan Kanoa Reef, including corals, other invertebrates, and fishes. These resources are discussed in detail in the following sections of this SEIS/OEIS: Section 3.4 (Marine Mammals), Section 3.5 (Sea Turtles), Section 3.8 (Marine Invertebrates), and Section 3.9 (Fishes). Seven marine mammal species have been sighted or detected via satellite tag in the area: humpback whale, spinner dolphin, bottlenose dolphin, short-finned pilot whale, false killer whale, rough-toothed dolphin, and pygmy killer whale (Table I-4). Sea turtles have also been sighted in the Chalan Kanoa Reef Geographic Mitigation Area, but not all observations identified the specific species. Based on sea turtle surveys conducted throughout the Mariana Islands, the most likely species observed were green sea turtles and hawksbill sea turtles (Hill et al., 2018b; Hill et al., 2019; Martin et al., 2016; Martin et al., 2019; U.S. Department of the Navy, 2014b).

[1] Chalan Kanoa Reef is also known as "CK Reef," "Double Reef," or "6-Mile Reef" (Hill et al., 2015a).




Figure I-3: Updated Chalan Kanoa Reef Geographic Mitigation Area

Table I-4: Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles Documented Within the Chalan Kanoa Reef Geographic Mitigation Area

Common Name	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Humpback whale						S	S	S	S
Spinner dolphin	S		S	S	S		S	S	S
Bottlenose dolphin				S+T	S+T	S		S	
Short-finned pilot whale				T	T		T		
False killer whale				T					
Rough-toothed dolphin				S+T					S
Pygmy killer whale						S			
Sea Turtle			S	S				S	S

Notes: S = One or more sightings during a survey in the area; T = one or more satellite tag detections; S+T = one or more sightings and satellite tag detections in a given year; empty cells indicate no documented occurrence of the species in the given year; years not shown indicate that no surveys were conducted in the area in that year.

I.3.2.1.1 Marine Mammals

Surveys and satellite tag data have documented the presence of seven marine mammal species in the Chalan Kanoa Reef Geographic Mitigation Area (Fulling et al., 2011; Hill et al., 2015a; Hill et al., 2014; Hill et al., 2015b; Hill et al., 2016b; Hill et al., 2017a; Hill et al., 2018b; Hill et al., 2019; Oleson & Hill, 2010a). However, the Navy assumes all species of marine mammals known to occur in the Mariana Islands could potentially be present, if only briefly, in the offshore portion of the Chalan Kanoa Reef Geographic Mitigation Area, because sighting and tagging data show multiple species have transited through or near the area (Hill et al., 2013b; Hill et al., 2015b; Hill et al., 2018b; Hill et al., 2019). It is unlikely marine mammals other than spinner dolphins would be present in the shallow waters landward of the fringing reef, in Saipan Harbor, or the channel leading to the harbor. Spinner dolphins have been sighted within these inshore areas, likely using them as resting areas, consistent with behavior documented in similar habitats (Hill et al., 2015b; Hill et al., 2017a; Hill et al., 2018b).

I.3.2.1.1.1 Humpback Whales

Humpback whales have been observed during four surveys in the vicinity of Saipan in relatively small numbers, and multiple sightings have been documented within the Chalan Kanoa Reef Geographic Mitigation Area in 2015 and 2017 (Fulling et al., 2011; Hill et al., 2015a; Hill et al., 2014; Hill et al., 2015b; Hill et al., 2016b; Hill et al., 2017a; Hill et al., 2018b; Oleson & Hill, 2010a). Four encounters with humpback whales during surveys in the vicinity of Saipan occurred in February and March (Fulling et al., 2011; Hill et al., 2015a; Hill et al., 2016b; Hill et al., 2017a; Hill et al., 2018b). Hill et al. (2016b; 2017b) proposed that humpback whales use the Mariana Islands as a wintering location, but given the species'

absence during surveys in the waters off Saipan, Tinian, and Guam in February 2010 and in April 2014 (Hill et al., 2015a), their seasonal presence may be variable in the Mariana Islands.

In 2015, during small boat surveys conducted over a nine-day period, a total of 12 humpback whales were encountered in the Chalan Kanoa Reef Geographic Mitigation Area, including four mother-calf pairs (Hill et al., 2015a). In 2016, two humpbacks, a single mother-calf pair, were sighted in the area. The mother that was detected and photographed in 2007 at Marpi Reef (Fulling et al., 2011) was identified in the Chalan Kanoa Reef Geographic Mitigation Area in 2016 by matching patterns observed on her flukes with those in the photographs (Hill et al., 2016b). In a 2017 survey, nine humpback whales, including two mother-calf pairs, were documented during three encounters in the Chalan Kanoa Reef Geographic Mitigation Area (Hill et al., 2018b). Three of the nine whales had been identified during previous surveys in the vicinity of the Chalan Kanoa Reef (Hill et al., 2018b). As detailed in the discussion of the Marpi Reef Geographic Mitigation Area (Section I.3.1.1.1.1, Humpback Whales), NMFS has confirmed that the waters around Saipan are a newly identified breeding location for humpback whales (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2018). For purposes of geographic mitigation and based on a conservative approach exceeding the time periods for sightings in the Mariana Islands (Fulling et al., 2011; Hill et al., 2015a; Hill et al., 2014; Hill et al., 2015b; Hill et al., 2016b; Hill et al., 2017a; Hill et al., 2018b; Oleson & Hill, 2010a), humpback whales are assumed to be seasonally present from December through April in the Chalan Kanoa Reef Geographic Mitigation Area.

I.3.2.1.1.2 Spinner Dolphins

Spinner dolphins are the most commonly encountered species in small boat surveys and have been sighted in the Chalan Kanoa Reef Geographic Mitigation Area during every survey that has been conducted in the area, except during the winters of 2011 and 2015 (HDR EOC, 2012; Hill et al., 2011; Hill et al., 2013a; Hill et al., 2014; Hill et al., 2015b; Hill et al., 2016b; Hill et al., 2017a; Hill et al., 2018b; Hill et al., 2019). During small boat surveys, group sizes in the Chalan Kanoa Reef Geographic Mitigation Area have ranged from as few as four individuals in a pod to as many as 124 in the largest group observed. Milling behavior and slow travel were the most commonly observed behaviors and indicate spinner dolphin resting behavior, as documented in other locations (Tyne et al., 2015).

I.3.2.1.1.3 Bottlenose Dolphins

Small groups of bottlenose dolphins were routinely sighted in the years 2013, 2015, and 2017 in the Chalan Kanoa Reef Geographic Mitigation Area. In 2013, there were two sightings of bottlenose dolphins on the same day, a pod of three and a pod of six (Hill et al., 2013b). In 2015, a single individual was sighted in the area (Hill et al., 2016b). In February 2017, a pod of four bottlenose dolphins was sighted, and in May a pod of six was observed in the Chalan Kanoa Reef Geographic Mitigation Area (Hill et al., 2018b). Satellite tags on two bottlenose dolphins deployed in the Marpi Reef area during 2017 documented the extensive travel by these animals (and likely their accompanying pods). The animals traveled from within the Chalan Kanoa Reef Geographic Mitigation Area, south to waters off Tinian, north past Saipan to Marpi Reef, and then farther north with a final tag detection approximately 85 km west of Farallon de Medinilla (FDM) (Hill et al., 2018b). Although these satellite tracking data are limited, they indicate that the Chalan Kanoa Reef Geographic Mitigation Area is only a small portion of the range these tagged individuals (and their accompanying pods) use in the Study Area.

I.3.2.1.1.4 Short-Finned Pilot Whales

Short-finned pilot whales have not been visually sighted in the Chalan Kanoa Reef Geographic Mitigation Area. However, individuals initially tagged off Guam, Rota, and Tinian with satellite tags were detected within the Chalan Kanoa Reef Geographic Mitigation Area in 2013, 2014, and 2016. The animals ranged widely in the Mariana Islands from waters south of Guam and north to at least as far as FDM (a straight-line distance of at least 350 km) (Hill et al., 2013b; Hill et al., 2014; Hill et al., 2017a). Through 2017, there have been 17 satellite tags deployed on short-finned pilot whales in the Mariana Islands; these individuals were in groups ranging in size from 15 to 48 animals (Hill et al., 2013b; Hill et al., 2014; Hill et al., 2017a). Although tagged animals tended to remain closer to Guam than to any other islands in the Marianas, several were tracked transiting north to Rota. Similarly, several animals tagged off of Rota were previously sighted off Guam. The median distance from shore for the eight animals tagged and tracked in 2014 was 17.1 km, and the median depth was 1,184 m (Hill et al., 2015b; Hill et al., 2017a). The wide-ranging movements of these animals suggest that no specific islands or areas in the Mariana Islands are of any particular biological importance for this species.

I.3.2.1.1.5 False Killer Whales

False killer whales have not been sighted within the Chalan Kanoa Reef Geographic Mitigation Area during any surveys. In 2013, satellite tags were deployed on four false killer whales off Rota in groups ranging in size from 15 to 17 individuals (Hill et al., 2013b). Two of the four tagged animals moved north and through the Chalan Kanoa Reef Geographic Mitigation Area, and all four individuals traveled in excess of 200 NM from their initial tag detection locations off Rota (Hill et al., 2013b). The wide-ranging movements of these animals suggest that no specific islands or areas in the Mariana Islands are of any particular biological importance for this species.

I.3.2.1.1.6 Rough-Toothed Dolphins

In 2013, a pod of four rough-toothed dolphins was sighted in the Chalan Kanoa Reef Geographic Mitigation Area (Hill et al., 2013b). Five days prior to the sighting, a satellite tag was deployed on a rough-toothed dolphin in a group of six individuals off Aguijan (Hill et al., 2013b). The tagged animal moved north from the deployment location over an 11-day period and transited through the Chalan Kanoa Reef Geographic Mitigation Area to waters north of Saipan, at which point the transmissions ended. In total, the animal covered a distance of approximately 65 km. It is not known whether the tagged animal remained with the five other dolphins. The distance traveled by this individual, and possibly the group, coupled with the lack of other occurrence data, suggests that the Chalan Kanoa Reef Geographic Mitigation Area is not of any particular importance for rough-toothed dolphins in the Mariana Islands.

I.3.2.1.1.7 Pygmy Killer Whales

In March 2015, a pod of six pygmy killer whales was sighted in the Chalan Kanoa Reef Geographic Mitigation Area interacting with two adult humpback whales (Hill et al., 2016b). The only other sighting of pygmy killer whales in the vicinity of Saipan was a 2011 encounter with a pod of 11 approximately 2 NM from the Marpi Reef Geographic Mitigation Area (Hill et al., 2011). The limited sighting data from the surveys at the Chalan Kanoa Reef indicate that the Chalan Kanoa Reef Geographic Mitigation Area is not of any particular importance for pygmy killer whales in the Mariana Islands.

I.3.2.1.2 Sea Turtles

All species of sea turtles could be present in the Chalan Kanoa Reef Geographic Mitigation Area; although as discussed in Section 3.5 (Sea Turtles), the species most likely to be present are green sea turtles and hawksbill sea turtles, based on documented sightings the Mariana Islands (Martin & Jones, 2016; Martin et al., 2016; Martin et al., 2018, 2019; Summers et al., 2017; U.S. Department of the Navy, 2018b). Loggerhead and leatherback sea turtles are known to pass through the Study Area during migration, and olive ridley sea turtles are expected to be rare throughout the year in all waters in the Study Area (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2018).

Sea turtle sightings shown in Figure I-3 were recorded during surveys conducted in the vicinity of the Chalan Kanoa Reef (not necessarily within the boundaries of the Chalan Kanoa Reef Geographic Mitigation Area) from 2009 through the spring of 2018 (HDR, 2011, 2012; HDR EOC, 2012; Hill et al., 2011; Hill et al., 2013a; Hill et al., 2014; Hill et al., 2015b; Hill et al., 2016b; Hill et al., 2017a; Hill et al., 2018b; Hill et al., 2019; Jones & Martin, 2016; Ligon et al., 2011; Martin & Jones, 2016; Martin et al., 2016; Martin et al., 2018; Oleson & Hill, 2010a; Summers et al., 2017; U.S. Department of the Navy, 2018a). The concentration of sightings of sea turtles (almost certainly all green and hawksbill sea turtles) in nearshore waters of the Chalan Kanoa Reef (Figure I-3) demonstrates that the area, including portions of the Chalan Kanoa Reef Geographic Mitigation Area, is used by sea turtles; however, the reef is not the only location where sea turtles are known to concentrate off Saipan. Summers et al. (2017) assessed population demographics and habitat-use for green and hawksbill sea turtles off Tinian, Saipan, and Rota using a mark-recapture study. They captured 493 green and 36 hawksbill turtles between August 2006 and February 2014 and noted long-term residency and high site fidelity among both species at the locations surveyed. Refer to Section 3.5 (Sea Turtles) and the Navy Marine Species Density Database Technical Report for the MITT Study Area (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2018a) for additional information regarding the general distribution of sea turtles in the Study Area, including in the vicinity of the Chalan Kanoa Reef Geographic Mitigation Area.

I.3.2.2 Navy Training and Testing Activities – Chalan Kanoa Reef

The Chalan Kanoa Reef has historically been a low-use area for Navy training and testing activities. Explosive munitions have not been used in this area, nor has sonar use been reported in this area. However, transiting vessels could engage in training or testing activities within this area using sonar or explosives while implementing procedural mitigation measures and following Standard Operating Procedures to ensure public safety.

I.3.2.3 Mitigation Assessment – Chalan Kanoa Reef Geographic Mitigation Area

I.3.2.3.1 Biological Assessment – Chalan Kanoa Reef

Based on sea turtle sightings in the area, the Navy assumes that sea turtles may use the Chalan Kanoa Reef Geographic Mitigation Area for foraging; however, the available data (Martin & Jones, 2016; Martin et al., 2016; Martin et al., 2018, 2019; Summers et al., 2017; U.S. Department of the Navy, 2018b) do not indicate that the Chalan Kanoa Reef Geographic Mitigation Area is a key area of biological importance for sea turtles. There is currently no information on specific uses of the area for a biologically important life process beyond species normal occurrence (e.g., the area is not an exclusive feeding area, migration route, or breeding location).

NMFS has concluded that the waters around Saipan are a newly identified “breeding location” for humpback whales (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2018). Based on the

non-systematic survey data described above indicating that humpback whales, including mother-calf pairs, are seasonally present in the Chalan Kanoa Reef area, the reef may be important to humpback whales for biologically important life processes associated with reproduction (e.g., birthing, nursing, and breeding) for part of the year. Chalan Kanoa Reef is one of only two locations in the study area where reproductive activities have been repeatedly, although not always annually, observed. Additional data would help refine frequency of occurrence in terms of oceanographic variability, validate re-sightings of the same individuals as a percent of a humpback whale distinct population segment, and determine if actual residency time for mother-calf pairs at Chalan Kanoa Reef is significant or not. This is different from others areas in the Pacific such as Hawaii or the U.S. West Coast, where datasets of 30–40 years are available and where far larger number of animals engaged in biologically important life process have been observed. However, in consideration of the scientific data that is available at this time for the MITT study area and in order to be conservative to the resource (i.e., over-protective), the Navy considers this area does meet its criteria as an area of biological importance for humpback whale reproductive behaviors. The data do not indicate that the Chalan Kanoa Reef Geographic Mitigation Area is of any particular importance for other marine mammal species that may occur there.

As detailed in Section 3.4.2 (Environmental Consequences) of this SEIS/OEIS and based on the discussion above, the proposed Navy training and testing activities as described in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) and Appendix A (Training and Testing Activities Descriptions) are not expected to result in long-term consequences to any marine resources present in the Chalan Kanoa Reef. Geographic mitigation would reduce or avoid impacts on any marine mammals present in the Chalan Kanoa Reef Geographic Mitigation Area in the event that naval forces conduct training or testing activities using hull-mounted mid-frequency active sonar or in-water explosives. While it was determined that the mitigation area did not meet the Navy's criteria as a key area of biological importance for sea turtles, this mitigation would also reduce or avoid impacts on any sea turtles present.

I.3.2.3.2 Practicality of Geographic Mitigation – Chalan Kanoa Reef

Access to a variety of bathymetric features, including shallow areas, is critical to support realistic Anti-Submarine Warfare training and testing activities using sonar. Areas with shallow depths are limited in the Mariana Archipelago; therefore, the Navy has determined that it would be imprudent to limit the use of sonar at the Chalan Kanoa Reef Geographic Mitigation Area.

The Navy has access to established, nearshore training and testing areas for the use of explosive munitions; therefore, the Navy has determined that it would be practical to avoid using explosives in the Chalan Kanoa Reef Geographic Mitigation Area.

I.3.2.3.3 Summary – Chalan Kanoa Reef

As a result of the assessment for the Chalan Kanoa Reef Geographic Mitigation Area, the Navy is proposing to implement the mitigation, limit surface ship hull-mounted MF1 mid-frequency active sonar hours, and reporting requirements described in Table I-5. Geographic mitigation would reduce or avoid impacts on any marine mammals or sea turtles present in the event mission requirements necessitate using active sonar while conducting a training or testing activity. Given that Chalan Kanoa Reef is an area for humpback whale reproductive behaviors, the Navy has limited MF1 sonar hours from 1 December to 30 April and developed special reporting requirements, similar to those employed in the Hawaiian Humpback Whale Sanctuary, specifically for the use of MF1 sonar, which will aid the Navy and NMFS in continuing to analyze potential impacts of training and testing in this area. The Navy must retain its

ability to conduct active sonar in the limited shallow, nearshore waters of the MITT Study Area, including Chalan Kanoa Reef, to ensure vessels can meet training and testing requirements for MF1 surface ship hull-mounted mid-frequency active sonar. The Navy must have the capability to train and test in a shallow water environment to accommodate future advances in sonar technology and anti-submarine warfare tactics.

Based on current operational projections and the availability of other similar, suitable training and testing locations in the Study Area, the Navy has determined that it would be practical to avoid using in-water explosives in the Chalan Kanoa Reef Geographic Mitigation Area year round under the Proposed Action. Such geographic mitigation would ensure that marine mammals are not exposed to explosives in this area, which is thought to be particularly important for humpback whale reproductive behaviors.

Table I-5: Mitigation Within the Chalan Kanoa Reef Geographic Mitigation Area

Mitigation Area Description
Stressor or Activity • Surface ship hull-mounted mid-frequency active sonar (bin MF1) • In-water explosives
Identified Resource Protection Focus • Humpback whales; seasonally present (December–April) • Marine mammals; potentially present year round • Sea turtles; present year round
Mitigation Area Requirements[1] • The Navy will conduct a maximum combined total of 20 hours of surface ship hull-mounted MF1 mid-frequency active sonar during training and testing from 1 December to 30 April within the Marpi Reef Mitigation Area and Chalan Kanoa Reef Mitigation Area. The Navy will report the total hours of active sonar (all bins, by bin) used in the Marpi Reef Mitigation Area and Chalan Kanoa Reef Mitigation Area from 1 December to 30 April in its annual training and testing activity reports submitted to NMFS. Should national security present a requirement to use MF1 surface ships hull-mounted mid-frequency active sonar between 1 December to 30 April, the Navy will provide NMFS with advance notification of the activity. • The Navy will not use in-water explosives in the Chalan Kanoa Reef Mitigation Area year-round. • The Navy will issue an annual seasonal awareness notification message to alert ships and aircraft operating in the Chalan Kanoa Reef Mitigation Area to the possible presence of increased concentrations of humpback whales from 1 December through 30 April. To maintain safety of navigation and to avoid interactions with large whales during transits, the Navy will instruct vessels to remain vigilant to the presence of humpback whales, that when concentrated seasonally, may become vulnerable to vessel strikes. Platforms will use the information from the awareness notification messages to assist their visual observation of applicable mitigation zones during training and testing activities and to aid in the implementation of procedural mitigation.

[1] *Should* national security present a requirement to conduct training or testing prohibited by the mitigation requirements specified in this table, naval units will obtain permission from the appropriate designated Command authority prior to commencement of the activity. The Navy will provide NMFS with advance notification and include relevant information (e.g., sonar hours, explosives use) in its annual activity reports submitted to NMFS.

I.3.3 Agat Bay Nearshore Geographic Mitigation Area

The Agat Bay Nearshore Geographic Mitigation Area (Figure I-4) encompasses the shoreline between Tipalao, Dadi Beach, and Agat on the west coast of Guam, with a boundary across the bay enclosing an area of approximately 5 km^2 in relatively shallow waters (less than 100 m) and extending out to 1.27 km from shore. The boundaries of the Agat Bay Nearshore Geographic Mitigation were defined by Navy scientists based on spinner dolphin sightings documented during small boat surveys from 2010 through 2018 (excluding 2016). Sea turtle sightings documented during surveys from 2007 through 2018 were also used to define the mitigation area (Fulling et al., 2011; HDR, 2011; HDR EOC, 2012; Hill et al., 2013a; Hill et al., 2014; Hill et al., 2015b; Hill et al., 2016b; Hill et al., 2017a; Hill et al., 2018b; Jones & Van Houtan, 2014b; Jones et al., 2015; Jones & Martin, 2016; Ligon et al., 2011; Martin & Jones, 2016; Martin et al., 2016; Martin et al., 2018, 2019; Oleson & Hill, 2010a).

I.3.3.1 Resources within Agat Bay Nearshore Geographic Mitigation Area

Biological resources within the Agat Bay Nearshore Geographic Mitigation Area include spinner dolphins, sea turtles, invertebrates including corals, and fishes. These resources and their occurrence in the Study Area are discussed in detail in this SEIS/OEIS in the following sections: Section 3.4 (Marine Mammals), Section 3.5 (Sea Turtles), Section 3.8 (Marine Invertebrates), and Section 3.9 (Fishes).

As shown in Table I-6, species documented as sighted or having a satellite tag detection[2] within the boundaries of the Agat Bay Nearshore Geographic Mitigation Area include spinner dolphin and sea turtles (as noted in the sections above, most likely green and hawksbill sea turtles).

Table I-6: Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles Documented Within the Agat Bay Nearshore Geographic Mitigation Area

Common Name	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2017	2018
Spinner dolphin	S	S	S	S				S
Sea Turtle	S	S	S	S+T	S+T	S+T	S	S

Notes: S = One or more sightings during a survey in the area; T = one or more satellite tag detections; S+T = one or more sightings and satellite tag detections in a given year; empty cells indicate no documented occurrence of the species in the given year; years not shown indicate that no surveys were conducted in the area in that year.

[2] There was one instance during an 11.4 day period in 2016 where a satellite-tracked pantropical spotted dolphin had one reported position just within the outer boundary of the Agat Bay Nearshore Geographic Mitigation Area (Hill et al., 2017a). However, given the uncertainty in the reported position due to the limited precision (error range) of even high-quality Argos satellite fixes, and in particular the reduced longitudinal precision, associated with the polar orbits used by the Argos satellites (Boyd & Brightsmith, 2013; Vincent et al., 2002), the reported position does not sufficiently demonstrate that the animal was in the Agat Bay Nearshore Geographic Mitigation Area. Given the wide-ranging use of offshore waters by the same animal as demonstrated by the remainder of the detections over the 11-day tracking period, the track of the animal between subsequent positions, and the lack of precision for the locations, pantropical spotted dolphins are not expected to be present in the Agat Bay Nearshore Geographic Mitigation Area.




Figure I-4: Updated Agat Bay Nearshore Geographic Mitigation Area

I.3.3.1.1 Marine Mammals

I.3.3.1.1.1 Spinner Dolphins

Spinner dolphins have been the most frequently encountered species during small boat reconnaissance surveys conducted in the Mariana Islands since 2010. Consistent with more intensive studies completed for the species in the Hawaiian Islands, island-associated spinner dolphins are expected to occur in shallow water resting areas (about 50 meters [m] deep or less) in the morning and throughout the middle of the day, moving into deep waters offshore during the night to feed (Heenehan et al., 2016b; Heenehan et al., 2017a; Hill et al., 2010; Norris & Dohl, 1980). As reported by Ligon et al. (2011), this behavior is consistent with reports from Guam residents and tour boat captains describing spinner dolphin nearshore resting areas at Agat Bay; the Merizo channel, tucked into the several small remote bays between Merizo and Facpi Point; Piti Bay; Hagatna; Tumon Bay; and Pugua Point.

Consistent with documented resting behavior, a large pod of resting spinner dolphins (average group size between 22 and 85 individuals) was encountered in Agat Bay in the morning on six consecutive survey days in 2010 (February 9–14) (Ligon et al., 2011; Oleson & Hill, 2010b). Groups larger than 25 have not been observed again in Agat Bay during the small boat surveys since these sightings in 2010 (HDR, 2011, 2012; HDR EOC, 2012; Hill et al., 2011; Hill et al., 2013a; Hill et al., 2013b; Hill et al., 2014; Hill et al., 2015b; Hill et al., 2016b; Hill et al., 2017a; Hill et al., 2018b; Jones & Van Houtan, 2014b; Jones et al., 2015; Jones & Martin, 2016; Ligon et al., 2011; Martin & Jones, 2016; Martin et al., 2016; Martin et al., 2018, 2019; Oleson & Hill, 2010a).

In February 2011, during two survey passes, a group of four spinner dolphins were observed resting in Agat Bay, but none were present in the area on subsequent survey days (HDR, 2011). No spinner dolphins were observed in two survey passes of Agat Bay in August–September 2011, although there were multiple sightings involving large pods of spinner dolphins present nearshore off Guam north of Apra Harbor, off Anderson, and south of Pati Point on the east side of Guam, as well as elsewhere in the Mariana Islands (Hill et al., 2011). In March 2012, a group of 20 spinner dolphins was present during one of two passes through Agat Bay (HDR EOC, 2012), and in June 2013 a group of 25 was present in the bay (Hill et al., 2013a). From 2014 through 2017, no spinner dolphins were observed in Agat Bay during seven surveys of the area (four passes in May 2014, one pass in 2015, and two passes in 2017) (Hill et al., 2018b). The Agat Bay area was not surveyed in 2016 (Hill et al., 2016b). A group of approximately 32 spinner dolphins was observed less than 1 km outside of Agat Bay in water less than 100 m deep in September 2018 (Martin et al., 2019).

In 2010, Agat Bay was described as the “bread and butter” of the Guam dolphin-watching industry given its proximity to various small boat harbors and the expected presence of spinner dolphins (Ligon et al., 2011). Concerns have been raised in Hawaii where daytime resting by spinner dolphins has been chronically disturbed by watching boats, kayaks, and swimmer traffic, resulting in spinner dolphins spending less time in essential resting habitats (Heenehan et al., 2016a; Heenehan et al., 2016b; Heenehan et al., 2017a; Heenehan et al., 2017b; Tyne et al., 2014; Tyne, 2015; Tyne et al., 2015; Tyne et al., 2017; Tyne et al., 2018). Ligon et al. (2011) reported being uncertain of the number of boats that interacted with the spinner dolphins in Agat Bay on a daily basis, but that some of the dolphin watch boats were known to make multiple viewing trips per day, and that during the survey they occasionally observed two to three boats grouped together in the area where the dolphins were regularly observed. Given the concern over similar tourism-related disturbance elsewhere, this impact may be why there

have not been reported routine sightings of spinner dolphins or pods larger than 25 during subsequent small boat surveys of Agat Bay since 2010.

I.3.3.1.2 Sea Turtles

Sea turtle sightings around Guam have increased steadily since 2000 (Jones et al., 2015; Martin et al., 2016; Martin et al., 2018). A summary of 32 years of in-water aerial surveys around Guam was compiled by Martin et al. (2016). Aerial surveys conducted by the Guam Division of Aquatic and Wildlife Resources indicated the year-round presence of a resident population in Guam's nearshore waters (Kolinski et al., 2001; Martin et al., 2016; National Marine Fisheries Service & U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 1998; Pultz et al., 1999). As presented in Section 3.5 (Sea Turtles), it is most likely that the species present would be green or hawksbill turtles (Jones & Van Houtan, 2014b; Jones et al., 2015; Martin et al., 2016; Martin et al., 2018). The summarized results of five decades of marine surveys around Guam indicate the entire west coast of Guam, including the Agat Bay Nearshore Geographic Mitigation Area, should be expected to have a relatively uniform density of sea turtles (Zone 6 in Martin et al. (2016)).

As described in Sections 3.5.1.2 (Habitat Use) and 3.5.1.3 (Dive Behavior), it is assumed that the shallow water area within Agat Bay Nearshore Geographic Mitigation Area would be used for foraging by sea turtles. There has been no known nesting at Dadi Beach, but there have been a relatively high number of documented sea turtle sightings in the water off Tipalao. There have been 47 sea turtles sighted in the Agat Bay Nearshore Geographic Mitigation Area between 2010 and 2017 (HDR, 2011, 2012; HDR EOC, 2012; Hill et al., 2011; Hill et al., 2013a; Hill et al., 2013b; Hill et al., 2014; Hill et al., 2015b; Hill et al., 2016b; Hill et al., 2017a; Hill et al., 2018b; Jones & Van Houtan, 2014b; Jones et al., 2015; Jones & Martin, 2016; Ligon et al., 2011; Martin & Jones, 2016; Martin et al., 2016; Martin et al., 2018; Oleson & Hill, 2010a). The distribution of sea turtle sightings is a result of the survey coverage, and Agat Bay should not be interpreted as the only area where sea turtles would be expected to be found in waters off Guam. The Agat Bay Nearshore Geographic Mitigation Area overlaps a portion of what was identified as a "core area" of based on the movements of tagged green sea turtles (Martin et al., 2018). Two tags that remained active after 189 days tracked the turtles' movements to the north from Agat, with one going to as far as Apra Harbor and the other to Pati Point on the north coast of Guam (Martin et al., 2016), indicating that green sea turtles move and forage widely around Guam.

I.3.3.2 Navy Training and Testing Activities – Agat Bay Nearshore

The Agat Bay Nearshore Area has historically been a low-use area for most types of Navy training and testing activities. Explosive munitions have not been used in this area nor has sonar use been reported in this area. However, transiting vessels could conduct training or testing activities within this area using sonar or explosives while implementing procedural mitigation measures and following Standard Operating Procedures to ensure public safety. Navy training and testing activities have been shut down or canceled in the vicinity of the mitigation area in the past due to the presence of marine mammals and civilian boat traffic.

I.3.3.3 Mitigation Assessment – Agat Bay Nearshore Geographic Mitigation Area

I.3.3.3.1 Biological Assessment – Agat Bay Nearshore

Spinner dolphins are known to use Agat Bay, including the Agat Bay Nearshore Geographic Mitigation Area, for resting behavior, and a relatively high number of sea turtles have been documented in the area off Tipalao. The available data on spinner dolphin occurrence and behaviors and the data on sea turtles indicate that the Agat Bay Nearshore Geographic Mitigation Area does meet the Navy's criteria as an

area of biological importance for spinner dolphins and sea turtles. As discussed in detail in Section 3.4.2.1.2 (Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducer Stressors) and Section 3.4.2.2.2 (Impacts from Explosive Stressors), marine mammals engaged in important behaviors, such as resting, may be more likely to ignore or tolerate a source of disturbance and continue their natural behavior patterns. Behavioral reactions, if occurring at all, are likely to be short term and low-to-moderate severity and unlikely to produce long-term consequences. The Navy has determined that impacts on spinner dolphins and sea turtles are likely to be avoided or reduced by prohibiting the use of MF1 surface ship hull-mounted mid-frequency active sonar and in-water explosives in the Agat Bay Nearshore Geographic Mitigation Area.

I.3.3.3.2 Practicality of Geographic Mitigation – Agat Bay Nearshore

Access to a variety of bathymetric features, including shallow areas, is critical to support realistic Anti-Submarine Warfare training and testing activities using sonar. However, due to multiple factors impacting its value for some training and testing activities, such as the very shallow depth of this area, and the proximity to shore and civilian boating activity, the Navy has determined that it would be appropriate and practical to restrict the use of MF1 surface ship hull-mounted mid-frequency active sonar.

As the Navy has access to established, nearshore training and testing areas for explosive munitions, the Navy has determined that it would be practical to avoid using in-water explosives in the Agat Bay Nearshore Geographic Mitigation Area year round.

I.3.3.3.3 Summary – Agat Bay Nearshore

As a result of the assessment for the Agat Bay Nearshore Geographic Mitigation Area, the Navy is proposing implementation of geographic mitigation as described in Table I-7. Based on current operational projections and the availability of other similar, suitable training and testing locations in the Study Area, the Navy has determined that it would be practical to avoid using surface ship hull-mounted mid-frequency active sonar and in-water explosives in the Agat Bay Nearshore Geographic Mitigation Area year round under the Proposed Action. Such geographic mitigation would ensure that spinner dolphins and sea turtles are not exposed to MF1 sonar and explosives in this area, which has the potential to disturb spinner dolphin resting behavior and sea turtle foraging behavior.

Table I-7: Mitigation Within the Agat Bay Nearshore Geographic Mitigation Area

Mitigation Area Description
Stressor or Activity • Surface ship hull-mounted mid-frequency active sonar (bin MF1) • In-water explosives
Identified Resource Protection Focus • Spinner dolphins; potentially present year round • Sea turtles; present year round
Mitigation Area Requirements[1,2] • The Navy will not use surface ship hull-mounted MF1 mid-frequency active sonar in the Agat Bay Nearshore Mitigation Area year-round. • The Navy will not use in-water explosives in the Agat Bay Nearshore Mitigation Area year-round.

[1] *Should* national security present a requirement to conduct training or testing prohibited by the mitigation requirements specified in this table, naval units will obtain permission from the appropriate designated Command authority prior to commencement of the activity. The Navy will provide NMFS with advance notification and include relevant information (e.g., sonar hours, explosives use) in its annual activity reports submitted to NMFS. The designated Command authority will base such authorization on the unique characteristics of the area from a military readiness perspective, taking into account the importance of the area for spinner dolphins and sea turtles and the need to avoid adverse impacts to the maximum extent practicable. Furthermore, the Command authority conducting the activity will provide specific direction to operational units on required mitigation prior to conducting training or testing using in-water explosives in this area.
[2] The designated Command authority will base authorization on the unique characteristics of the area from a military readiness perspective, taking into account the importance of the area for spinner dolphins and sea turtles and the need to avoid adverse impacts to the maximum extent practicable. Furthermore, the Command authority conducting the activity will provide specific direction to operational units on required mitigation prior to conducting training or testing using in-water explosives in this area.

I.4 Geographic Mitigation Assessment – Areas Not Carried Forward for Implementation

The Navy received scoping comments and comments on the Draft SEIS/OEIS suggesting areas for potential mitigation within the MITT Study Area. The comments and a brief description and assessment of the areas are presented in the following subsections.

I.4.1 West Mariana Ridge

The West Mariana Ridge was identified by the Governor of the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (CNMI) (Ralph D.L.G. Torres) as an area of potential geographic mitigation in a scoping comment on the 2017 Draft SEIS/OEIS Notice of Intent. The area was originally identified by the previous governor, Governor Eloy S. Inos, in a comment on the 2013 MITT Draft EIS/OEIS. The comment recommended that the Navy avoid conducting activities with sonar and explosives along the bathymetric feature known as the West Mariana Ridge.

The West Mariana Ridge (Figure I-5) consists of a seafloor ridge formed by a chain of conical seamounts extending northward to Japan, approximately parallel to the island chain that forms Guam and the CNMI. Coordinates or a map for the entire West Marina Ridge area were not provided in the scoping comment so, for the purposes of this assessment, the potential mitigation area was defined as an area centered approximately over the ridge that extends out to the 3,500 m isobath between approximately 13° north and 18° north latitude and would include (according to the comment letter) "some seamounts (including the Pathfinder, Arakane, and Suruga seamounts between 142° and 143° E) [that] rise to summits less than 50 m below sea level." As shown in Figure I-5, the area spans approximately 1,000 km north to south and covers an area of 69,800 km^2 within the Study Area, although the bathymetric feature defining this area continues to extend north of the Study Area, terminating in waters off Japan.




Figure I-5: West Mariana Ridge Area Suggested as a Potential Mitigation Area

The ridge is approximately 250 km west of Guam and, as stated in the comment by Governor Inos in 2013, "support[s] a rich diversity of coral reef and continental slope species," and "dense concentrations of biological productivity: high planktonic production, and large schools of small and predatory fishes including skipjack and other species of tuna." Also specifically mentioned in the comment were two beaked whale sightings, detections of short-finned pilot whales, and satellite tag detections of a false killer whale in the vicinity of the ridge. The comment letter indicated that "… multiple sightings of several cetacean species…supported the delineation of a geographic mitigation area and were evidence indicative of… a biologically important feature that should be protected."

The Navy recognizes that biological productivity is often associated with bathymetric features like ocean ridges and seamounts; however, productivity in such areas is often highly dependent on changeable conditions, including weather patterns, wind intensity and direction, localized currents and eddies, and the presence of nutrients in the water column.

Based on the distribution of marine mammals as known from visual surveys and satellite tag detections within the Study Area (Figure I-5), limiting Navy training and testing activities at the West Mariana Ridge and surrounding region to the 3,500 m isobath would not result in avoiding "high concentrations" of marine mammals (Fulling et al., 2011; Hill et al., 2014; Hill et al., 2015b; Hill et al., 2016b; Hill et al., 2017a; Hill et al., 2018b; Klinck et al., 2015; Klinck et al., 2016; Ligon et al., 2011; Munger et al., 2014; Munger et al., 2015; National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2015; Nieukirk et al., 2016; Norris et al., 2017; Oleson et al., 2015; Tetra Tech Inc., 2014; U.S. Department of the Navy, 2007, 2012, 2013, 2014a, 2018a; Yack et al., 2016). While marine mammals have been observed in the area of the West Mariana Ridge, the vast majority of marine mammal sightings and satellite tag detections have been recorded far to the east of the ridge (Figure I-5) (Fulling et al., 2011; Hill et al., 2018b). The available data do not indicate that the West Mariana Ridge or surrounding area is an area of key biological importance for marine mammals or other marine species, nor is it clear that limiting the use of sonar and explosives in the area would result in an avoidance or reduction of impacts. Therefore, the West Mariana Ridge area does not meet the Navy's criteria for effective geographic mitigation.

I.4.2 Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands Landward of the 3,500 Meter Isobath

This area was identified by the Governor of the CNMI (Ralph D.L.G. Torres) in a scoping comment on the 2017 Draft SEIS/OEIS Notice of Intent. The comment recommended that the Navy avoid conducting activities with sonar and explosives around the Islands of the CNMI landward of the 3,500 m isobath (Figure I-6). The comment was originally submitted by the previous governor, Governor Eloy S. Inos, as a comment on the 2013 MITT Draft EIS/OEIS.




Figure I-6: Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands Landward of the 3,500 Meter Isobath Suggested as a Potential Mitigation Area

The comment indicates there are island-associated populations of marine mammals present in the Study Area. The comment assumes there are island-associated populations in the Mariana Islands, because there have been a number of small and resident populations documented in the Hawaiian Islands (Baird et al., 2015). The comment offers that because "…insular populations of odontocetes are generally concentrated within the 3,500 m isobath…" around the Hawaiian Islands, then that same isobath should be used to define the boundary for a mitigation area in the Mariana Islands to mitigate "…the distinct risks posed to resident marine mammal populations, near island habitat…." The comment goes on to suggest that the results from small boat, nearshore surveys in the Mariana Islands are indicative of site fidelity (meaning the animals remain at or regularly return to those sites) for several species, including spinner dolphins, bottlenose dolphins, rough-toothed dolphins, and short-finned pilot whales in waters shallower than 3,500 m, as cited in Hill et al. (2011); Hill et al. (2014); Hill et al. (2018b) and similar to the findings from Hawaii (Baird et al., 2015). However, data from surveys conducted in the Study Area and cited in the comment, as well as other surveys (Fulling et al., 2011; Hill et al., 2013a; Hill et al., 2014; Hill et al., 2018b; Klinck et al., 2015; Norris et al., 2017; Oleson & Hill, 2010b) and data from satellite tags recording the movement of individual animals, indicate many of those same species utilize ocean areas beyond the 3,500 m isobath. Many of these species, including bottlenose dolphins, rough-toothed dolphins, pantropical spotted dolphins, false killer whales, and beaked whales have wide-ranging distributions in the Study Area.

Additionally, research from areas, including Hawaii, where training and testing activities occur more often and involve more concentrated use of sonar and explosives, such as at the Pacific Missile Range Facility, has documented the presence of numerous small and resident populations of marine mammals and long-term residency of individuals (Baird et al., 2015). These marine mammals have co-existed for decades alongside areas of concentrated Navy training and testing activity.

Furthermore, there are no indications from satellite tag data or photographic identification of marine mammals that there are any island-associated small or resident populations of marine mammals in the Mariana Islands (Ampela et al., 2014; HDR, 2011, 2012; HDR EOC, 2012; Hill et al., 2011; Hill et al., 2013a; Hill et al., 2015a; Hill et al., 2013b; Hill et al., 2014; Hill et al., 2015b; Hill et al., 2016b; Hill et al., 2017a; Hill et al., 2018b; Ligon et al., 2011). For additional information on the results from research and monitoring where the Navy has been training and testing for decades in the Mariana Islands, refer to Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015) of this SEIS/OEIS.

With regard to the practicality of geographic mitigation, the suggested mitigation area overlaps with all nearshore training and testing areas and completely encompasses FDM and R-7201. The suggested area overlaps with the northern part of W-517, most of W-13A, and a small part of W-13B. Essentially every training and testing activity in the Proposed Action may occur in the suggested mitigation area, and many of the Navy's activities would only occur in the suggested mitigation area.

W-517 is special use airspace and is important because it overlays a large, contiguous deep-ocean area that is relatively free of surface vessel traffic. W-517 altitude limits are from the surface to infinity and it supports GUNEX, CHAFFEX, MISSILEX, MINEX, SINKEX, BOMBEX, TORPEX, and Carrier training activities. W-517 is a laser certified open-ocean range. It is also used for surface vessel unit-level training.

FDM consists of the island land mass and the restricted airspace around it, R-7201. It contains a live-fire and inert bombing range and supports live-fire and inert engagements such as surface-to-ground and air-to-ground GUNEX, BOMBEX, MISSILEX, and Naval Surface Fire Support. FDM is an uncontrolled and

un-instrumented, laser-certified range with fixed targets, including boxes and truck frames in various configurations within the lightweight, inert-only zone.

The suggested geographic mitigation area encompasses all mine neutralization sites, all shorelines, all anchorages, and all drop zones. All proposed amphibious warfare training and expeditionary warfare activities can only occur in the suggested mitigation area.

In addition to the training and testing areas where sonar may be used (e.g., required in-port sonar testing in Apra Harbor, Operating Areas), the suggested mitigation area encompasses open-ocean areas and several transit corridors between operating areas where sonar may be used for unit-level training or testing. Requiring units to take circuitous transit routes between Operating Areas in order to complete their required unit-level training and testing outside the 3,500 m isobath would add a substantial burden in terms of lost time for productive events, time away from home, unnecessary wear on equipment, and excessive fuel usage.

The MIRC provides training and testing venues that support the operational readiness of the Navy, U.S. Marine Corps, U.S. Air Force, Guam Army National Guard, Guam Air National Guard, Army Reserves Marianas, U.S. Coast Guard, and other users based and deployed in the Western Pacific. The MIRC is characterized by a unique combination of attributes that make it a strategically important range complex for the Services. These attributes include

- location within U.S. territory;
- live-fire ranges on Guam and FDM;
- expansive airspace, surface sea space, and underwater sea space;
- authorized use of multiple types of live and inert ordnance on FDM;
- support for all Navy warfare areas and numerous other Service roles, missions, and tactical tasks;
- support to homeported Navy, Army, U.S. Coast Guard, and U.S. Air Force units based at military installations on Guam and CNMI;
- training support for deployed forces;
- Western Pacific Theater training venue for Special Warfare forces;
- ability to conduct Joint and combined force exercises; and
- rehearsal area for Western Pacific contingencies.

Geographic mitigation for explosives and sonar landward of the 3,500 m isobath would have a substantial impact on training and testing activities and largely negate the existence of the MIRC; it is unlikely that Naval forces would be able to meet required conditions of readiness, and it could impact readiness for the other services. Therefore, it would not be operationally practical to implement.

I.4.3 Earthjustice and on Behalf of Tinian Women Association, Guardians of Gani', PaganWatch, and Center for Biological Diversity

Scoping comments on five topics regarding marine species were submitted by Earthjustice and on behalf of the Tinian Women Association, Guardians of Gani', PaganWatch, and Center for Biological Diversity in response to the Notice of Intent for this SEIS/OEIS. The basis for the mitigation as stated by the Earthjustice letter was that the MITT activities "…threaten serious harm to marine mammals," citing to the current authorization of MMPA takes of marine mammals in the Study Area. There have been two previous sets of analyses of impacts on marine mammals by NMFS and the Navy, including two previous Letters of Authorization pursuant to the MMPA, and two Biological Opinions pursuant to the ESA for Navy activities in the Study Area. To date, there has been no empirical evidence suggesting, and NMFS

has made no findings of, "serious harm" as suggested in the comment. The Navy models "take" as defined under the MMPA[3]; the Navy does not model instances of "serious harm," and the vast majority of the takes modeled for this Proposed Action are temporary behavioral reactions. Species-specific comments provided in the Earthjustice letter are provided in the following subsections.

I.4.3.1 Minke Whale Habitat

The commenter suggested geographic mitigation for minke whale habitat. Minke whales have been detected acoustically in the Mariana Islands (Fulling et al., 2011; Klinck et al., 2015; Klinck et al., 2016; Norris et al., 2012; Norris et al., 2017; Oleson & Hill, 2010b), and this body of research has been considered and integrated into this SEIS/OEIS (see Section 3.4.1.12, Minke Whale [*Balaenoptera acutorostrata*] and supporting documents) (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2018a). As the cited research indicates, minke whales are one of the most abundant species of baleen whales worldwide (Norris et al., 2017). The purpose of the research was to reliably estimate minke whale abundance in the survey area based on passive acoustic detections of "calling" minke whales (Norris et al., 2017). The acoustic detections of minke whales in the area do not indicate the Mariana Islands are in any way unique or represent key areas of biological importance. While the authors state "There are also advantages to using passive acoustic methods for identifying important habitat for species of marine mammals with low densities," that statement is in the context of survey detection, not with regard to determination of specific areas of importance. Methods for estimating density from acoustic detections are currently being developed and numerous assumptions are associated with the calculations. Norris et al. (2017) mention "several caveats, biases, uncertainties and potential violations of the assumptions," which make clear the "preliminary" nature of "some obvious and interesting patterns" in the distribution of acoustic detections (Norris et al., 2017). Basically, those patterns were that all 30 individual minke whales detected acoustically during the 2007 survey (Fulling et al., 2011) were located to the south and east of the Mariana Islands within an area of approximately 156,600 km^2. Such a large area lacks precision to identify particularly key important areas and is much too large to be practical for geographic mitigation. In addition to Norris et al. (2017) noting the requirement for more detailed analyses of the current data, these results were collected from only a single season (January to April 2007), so it remains unknown if the minke whale detections were associated with static features such as water depth and bathymetry slope or were associated with dynamic ocean conditions present during that particular survey. Given the temporally dynamic redistributions of marine mammals in response to both seasonal variation and longer-term climate change affecting ocean conditions (Becker et al., 2017; Forney et al., 2015; Ramp et al., 2015; Risch et al., 2014; Silber et al., 2017), and that species such as minke whales migrate from low-productivity tropical waters in the summer (Jefferson et al., 2015; Perrin & Brownell, 2009), it is possible that minke whales may not have a fixed distribution within the MITT Study Area. Therefore, establishing a mitigation area based on the results from a single survey would not be scientifically valid and does not meet the Navy's criteria for a geographic mitigation area (see Section I.2.2, Assessing Mitigation Effectiveness). There is no evidence delineating a specific area that is particularly important for any biologically important life process (e.g., foraging, migration, reproduction), and there is no empirical evidence of significant impacts on the minke whale population

[3] Take, as defined under the MMPA, means "to harass, hunt, capture, or kill, or attempt to harass, hunt, capture, or kill any marine mammal" (16 United States Code 1362)

in the Study Area resulting from military readiness activities. Therefore, mitigation would not result in an avoidance or reduction of impacts on the minke whale population and their habitat.

I.4.3.2 Humpback Whale Calving Grounds

Earthjustice commented: "The SEIS must examine the impacts of MITT activities on humpback whale calving grounds, particularly given the potential the affected whales come from the endangered Western North Pacific humpback population. See Hill et al. (2017)." As noted in this SEIS/OEIS in Section 3.4.1.11 (Humpback Whale [*Megaptera novaeangliae]*), the Navy-funded surveys and research have resulted in the documentation of recorded mother-calf pairs, competitive groups, and 35 additional photo-identified non-calf whales (Fulling et al., 2011; Hill et al., 2015a; Hill et al., 2015b; Hill et al., 2016a; Hill et al., 2016b; Hill et al., 2017a; Hill et al., 2018b; Hill et al., 2018c), so it is possible that humpback whale calving is occurring somewhere (as yet unknown) in the Mariana Islands (National Marine Fisheries Service, 2018), but the literature and the commenter provide no details on where a hypothetical calving ground mitigation area would be specifically located. The Navy has proposed two areas off Saipan (Section I.3.1, Marpi Reef Geographic Mitigation Area; and Section I.3.2, Chalan Kanoa Reef Geographic Mitigation Area) as geographic mitigation areas that were based largely on the aggregated sightings of humpback whales engaged in reproductive behaviors, though calving itself has not been observed.

I.4.3.3 Marine Mammal Biologically Sensitive Areas

Earthjustice requested that consideration should be given to "…severely limit training and testing activities in biologically sensitive areas" specific to marine mammals. The Navy interpreted this to mean Biologically Important Areas (BIAs) as have been identified for marine mammals in other geographic areas of the Pacific (Ferguson et al., 2015a; Van Parijs et al., 2015). In the Mariana Islands, no BIAs have been identified. No critical habitat has been designated for ESA-listed marine mammals within the Study Area. However, in lieu of BIAs or critical habitat, the Navy has compiled and assessed existing data from the Study Area and proposed three mitigation areas in this appendix based upon that data. As detailed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of this SEIS/OEIS, the Navy, in consultation with NMFS, has implemented mitigation measures to reduce or avoid impacting marine species and their habitat in general. If in the future there is a location identified as a BIA, then the Navy, in consultation with NMFS, will undertake analysis of that location as described in Section 5.2 (Mitigation Development Process) to consider implementation of geographic mitigation measures as part of the adaptive management process.

I.4.3.4 Sea Turtle Biologically Sensitive Areas

Earthjustice requested that consideration should be given to "…severely limit training and testing activities in biologically sensitive areas" and restrictions on MITT activities "…in areas identified as containing high densities of imperiled sea turtles." The Navy has funded much of the research providing information on sea turtles in the Mariana Islands (Hill et al., 2014; Hill et al., 2018b; Jones & Van Houtan, 2014b; Jones et al., 2015; Jones & Martin, 2016; Martin et al., 2016; Martin et al., 2018; Summers et al., 2017; Summers et al., 2018) and has considered those references and others in the analysis presented in this SEIS/OEIS. Sea turtle sightings around Guam have increased steadily since 2000 (Martin & Jones, 2016; Martin et al., 2016; Martin et al., 2018), which does not suggest ongoing Navy training and testing activities are resulting in negative effects on sea turtle populations in the area Martin et al. (2018). While sea turtle nesting areas on land can be considered sensitive areas in need of protection from certain activities, the Navy already actively manages nesting areas at onshore locations like Spanish Steps and Haupto on Guam, and currently implements mitigation measures associated with training and

testing activities in other locations where sea turtle nesting may occur (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2015). The Navy has also proposed two geographic mitigation areas (see Section 1.3.2, Chalan Kanoa Reef Geographic Mitigation Area; and Section I.3.3, Agat Bay Nearshore Geographic Mitigation Area) that are locations where sea turtles have been routinely sighted during surveys. As detailed in Section 3.5.2 (Environmental Consequences) and in consideration of the mitigation measures that would be implemented as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), long-term consequences to individual sea turtle or sea turtle populations are not expected as a result of the proposed training and testing activities.

I.4.4 Seafloor Habitat Less than 700 Meters Deep

The NMFS Habitat Conservation Division recommended that the Navy avoid all areas where the seafloor is less than 700 m deep, including offshore banks, shoals, and seamounts, because the use of expended materials in depths shallower than 700 m would impact seafloor Essential Fish Habitat. This area would include approximately 7,500 km^2 of the sea space around the Mariana Islands.

As detailed in Section 3.1 (Sediments and Water Quality) and Section 3.9 (Fishes), the evidence indicates that effects to seafloor habitat would be minimal and localized where expended materials are in direct contact with the seafloor. This is expected to result in small proximate changes or otherwise minimal impact on the environment and insignificant changes in ecological functions (67 Federal Register 2354). The Navy considers an impact minimal if:

- the intensity of the impact at the specific site being affected is low,
- the spatial extent of the impact relative to the availability of the habitat type affected is small,
- the sensitivity/vulnerability of the habitat to the impact is low,
- the habitat functions that may be altered by the impact (e.g., shelter from predators) are negligible, and
- the timing of the impact relative to when the species or life stage needs the habitat is not critical

Adverse effects to Essential Fish Habitat under the Magnuson-Stevens Act are evaluated by the lost value to the management unit species, and appropriate mitigation or offsets produce outcomes that result in no more than minimal adverse effects to Essential Fish Habitat. The Navy completed an Essential Fish Habitat consultation with NMFS in 2014 for these ongoing training and testing activities. NMFS provided conservation recommendations to avoid, minimize, or offset adverse impacts. The Navy responded to NMFS' concerns, agreed to implement all practicable recommendations, and provided explanations for any disagreements as required by the Magnuson-Stevens Act. The Navy cannot practicably avoid discharging expended materials in all waters less than 700 m in depth, which encompass many training and testing areas that are specifically designed for these types of activities and are required to be near shore for accessibility (e.g., small arms ranges). In addition, the Navy currently implements mitigation for seafloor resources as described in Section 5.4.1 (Mitigation Areas for Seafloor Resources), which should also avoid or reduce impacts on sensitive seafloor habitat.

I.4.5 Various Areas Recommended by the Natural Resources Defense Council

The Natural Resources Defense Council recommended in a comment on the Draft SEIS/OEIS that the Navy consider several additional habitat areas that were not discussed as potential geographic mitigation areas in Appendix I of the Draft SEIS/OEIS.

- Sperm whale calving and nursery habitat offshore of Agat Bay, Guam; and breeding and calving habitat offshore of Apra Harbor, Guam

- Spinner dolphin resting habitat at Bile Bay, Tumon Bay, Double Reef, and Cocos Island and Lagoon, Guam; and Tanapaq Lagoon, Saipan
- Breeding habitat for a possibly resident pygmy killer whale population at Cocos Island and Lagoon, Guam
- Short-finned pilot whale core use areas, west of Guam and Rota

I.4.5.1 Sperm Whale Calving and Nursery Habitat Offshore of Agat Bay, Guam; and Breeding and Calving Habitat Offshore Apra Harbor, Guam

The recommendation that the Navy consider an area off Agat Bay as a breeding and nursery area seems to be largely based on two Associated Press File photographs, taken opportunistically by a local photographer, showing a group of three adult sperm whales and a calf during an encounter from a commercial dive boat on June 15, 2001, "… about four miles off the coast of the Agat Marina in Guam" (Bangs, 2001). The Navy is not aware of any subsequent sperm whale calf sighting reported since 2001. During the Navy-funded 2010–2018 small boat surveys in the Mariana Islands, a total of seven sperm whales were detected over four encounters (in 2010, 2013, 2016, and 2018) in a median depth of approximately 1,200 m and median distance from shore of approximately 12 km (Hill et al., 2017a; Hill et al., 2018c; Hill et al., 2018d; Hill et al., 2019). Sightings and acoustic monitoring detections recorded since 2007 indicate that sperm whales range widely in the Study Area with no known areas of concentration in the Mariana Islands. Sperm whales are highly nomadic, mobile predators, and the available data do not support areas offshore of Agat Bay or Apra Harbor as important reproductive areas for sperm whales in the Study Area. See Section 3.4.1.31.2 (Geographic Range and Distribution) for more information.

I.4.5.2 Spinner Dolphin Resting Habitat at Bile Bay, Tumon Bay, Double Reef, and Cocos Island and Lagoon, Guam; and Tanapaq Lagoon, Saipan

Previously reported spinner dolphin high-use areas nearshore at Guam include Bile Bay, Tumon Bay, Double Reef, north Agat Bay, and off Merizo (Cocos Lagoon area), where these animals congregate during the day to rest (Amesbury et al., 2001; Eldredge, 1991). More recently, high-use areas have included Agat Bay; the Merizo channel, tucked into the several small remote bays between Merizo and Facpi Point; Piti Bay; Hagatna; Tumon Bay; and Pugua Point (Ligon et al., 2011). During the Navy-funded 2010–2018 small boat surveys in the Mariana Islands, there have been 157 encounters with pods of spinner dolphins (Hill et al., 2019). The approximate distance from shore for these encounters was 1 km, indicative of their preference for nearshore habitat and prevalence in the Study Area (Hill et al., 2017a; Hill et al., 2018b; Hill et al., 2019). As described in Section I.3.3 (Agat Bay Nearshore Geographic Mitigation Area), the nearshore area of Agat Bay meets the Navy's criteria as an area of biological importance and practicality for implementation, and has been proposed as a geographic mitigation area for spinner dolphin resting behavior. The numerous other locations around Guam and other islands where resting behavior has been observed or has the potential to occur (i.e., the habitat is suitable) suggests that no single area is of particular biological importance. See Section 3.4.1.32.2 (Geographic Range and Distribution) for more information.

I.4.5.3 Breeding Habitat for Pygmy Killer Whale Population at Cocos Island and Lagoon, Guam

Like similar deep-water and deep-diving species, pygmy sperm whales are likely highly mobile in the marine environment with no known concentration areas in the Marianas Islands. There was only one pygmy killer whale sighting of a group of six animals during the 2007 systematic survey of the Study Area (Fulling et al., 2011). The sighting occurred near the Mariana Trench, south of Guam, where the bottom

depth was over 4,413 m. This is consistent with the known habitat preference of this species for deep, oceanic waters. However, in the Mariana Islands, pygmy killer whale sightings close to shore are not unexpected due to deep bathymetry surrounding most islands. There is no information on population range of pygmy killer whales off Guam (Hill et al., 2019). See Section 3.4.1.26.1 (Geographic Range and Distribution) for more information.

I.4.5.4 Short-finned Pilot Whale Core Use Areas, West of Guam and Rota

During the Navy-funded 2010–2018 small boat surveys in the Mariana Islands, short-finned pilot whale groups were encountered on 23 occasions in a median depth of approximately 720 m and median distance from shore of approximately 5 km, including one pod of 35 individuals off Marpi Reef north of Saipan (Hill et al., 2014; Hill et al., 2017a; Hill et al., 2018b; Hill et al., 2018d; Hill et al., 2019). Satellite tags deployed on 17 individuals between 2013 and 2018 suggest multiple areas are used frequently by short-finned pilot whales in the Marianas, including but not limited to areas west of Guam and Rota (Hill et al., 2018d; Hill et al., 2019). Satellite tags on short-finned pilot whales lasting from approximately 9–128 days, showed that individuals ranged from south at Tumon Bay off Guam to as far north as the waters west of Anatahan (Hill et al., 2019). These tag locations suggest multiple areas of frequent use by pilot whales in the Mariana Islands and that the areas west of Guam and Rota are not key areas of biological importance for pilot whales. See Section 3.4.1.30.2 (Geographic Range and Distribution) for more information.

I.4.6 Prohibit Use of Air-Deployed Mid-Frequency Active Sonar Year Round – Proposed for All Three Mitigation Areas

Behavioral response from air-deployed mid-frequency active sonar has only been documented for beaked whales and not for other marine mammal species. Furthermore, research on beaked whale behavioral responses to dipping sonar is ongoing with results that require further validation (e.g., variability in response with distance from the source, animal behavioral state at the time of exposure to sonar). Finally, the bathymetry of all three mitigation areas is much too shallow for beaked whale habitat. There is no evidence to suggest that prohibiting the use of mid-frequency dipping sonar in any of the mitigation areas would have any particular benefit to beaked whales. The Navy already implements mitigation measures for dipping sonar to reduce or avoid impacts on marine mammals (see Section 5.3.2.1, Active Sonar), and implementing a prohibition on dipping sonar does not meet the Navy criteria as a practical mitigation (see Section I.2.3, Assessing Practicality of Implementation).

I.4.7 Prohibit Use of Low-Frequency Active Sonar from December through April – Proposed for All Three Mitigation Areas

The Navy received a comment on prohibiting all low-frequency sonar in the Marpi Reef Geographic Mitigation Area and the Chalan Kanoa Reef Geographic Mitigation Area from December through April, the approximate timeframe when humpback whales, including mother-calf pairs, have been observed in the area. Humpback whales engaged in reproductive behaviors have not been observed in Agat Bay. At issue, as implied in the comment, is that humpback whales engaging in reproductive behaviors would be disturbed by low-frequency active sonar used during activities conducted in the vicinity of the mitigation areas. As discussed in Section 3.4.2.1.1.5 (Behavioral Reactions), studies found only short-term responses to low-frequency sound by some fin and humpback whales, including changes in vocal activity and avoidance of the source vessel, while other fin, humpback, and blue whales did not respond at all. When the source was in the path of migrating gray whales they changed course up to 2 km to avoid the sound, but when the source was outside their path, little response was observed (Clark & Fristrup, 2001; Croll et al., 2001; Fristrup et al., 2003; Miller et al., 2000; Nowacek et al., 2007).

The Navy has been conducting training and testing activities using sonar in the Study Area at similar levels of activity for decades and does not anticipate population-level impacts on humpback whales from the Proposed Action. Restrictions on the use of low-frequency active sonar would have a significant impact on the training and testing of current systems and the development of new systems. This would deny program managers the flexibility to rapidly field or develop necessary systems requiring training or testing in the area. Therefore, implementing additional mitigation areas beyond what is described in this section would not be practical (see Section I.2.3, Assessing Practicality of Implementation).

I.4.8 Implement Vessel Speed Restrictions in the Three Mitigation Areas

The Navy received multiple comments requesting that vessel speed restrictions be implemented in the three proposed geographic mitigation areas, specifically from December through April. Although not explicitly stated, the Navy assumes the requests are associated with the occurrence of humpback whales, including mother-calf pairs, in the Marpi Reef and Chalan Kanoa Reef areas. Humpback whale engaged in reproductive behaviors have not been observed in the Agat Bay Geographic Mitigation Area. As described in Section 5.3.4.1 (Vessel Movement), implementing mitigation to limit vessel speed restrictions in the Study Area would be incompatible with the practicality assessment criteria for safety, sustainability, and mission requirements.

I.4.9 Various and Anonymous Commenters – Generalized Geographic Avoidance

The Navy received comments suggesting that in the future the Navy should stop conducting training and testing activities in various generalized or notional locations in the Mariana Islands. The Navy considered all public comments received during the National Environmental Policy Act scoping process and comments subsequently received on the Draft SEIS/OEIS (see Section 3.4.6, Public Comments; Appendix K, Public Comment Responses). There were comments related to the general theme of geographic mitigation that are not addressed individually here. These comments fell into one of three categories: (1) they involved notional suggestions and provided no specific location where a mitigation might be implemented; (2) they lacked scientific basis in support of the recommendation; or (3) science did not support the recommendation by the commenter.

The Navy currently implements integrated at-sea procedural mitigation (see Section 5.3, At-Sea Procedural Mitigation to be Implemented) and at-sea mitigation areas for seafloor resources (see Section 5.4, At-Sea Mitigation Areas to be Implemented) wherever and whenever applicable activities occur, as detailed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of this SEIS/OEIS.

Scoping comments specific to a particular marine resource were summarized at the end of the applicable resource section in this SEIS/OEIS (see Section 3.4.6, Public Comments). The concerns raised were generally based on assumptions that significant harm or damage would occur to marine resources in the future if ongoing training and testing activities were to continue into the future, despite decades of ongoing activities with no evidence of the harm or damage. In addition, a more generalized presentation of the rationale for eliminating many non-specific geographic locations from consideration was also provided in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS in Section 5.3.4.1.6 (Limiting Access to Training and Testing Locations) and Section 5.3.4.1.7 (Avoiding Locations Based on Bathymetry and Environmental Conditions). The reasoning presented in those sections, which remains valid and applicable to this SEIS/OEIS, explained why the Navy cannot generally impose geographic limitations on ongoing training and testing activities. Reasons include (1) an increased safety risk to personnel, (2) an unacceptable impact on the effectiveness of training and testing activities that would affect military readiness, and

(3) impractical burden with regard to implementation. For more information on how mitigation measures were developed in general, see Section 5.2 (Mitigation Development Process) in this SEIS/OEIS.

With regard to assumptions that significant harm or damage would occur to marine resources if Navy training and testing were to continue, potential effects on marine mammals and sea turtles from sonar and other active acoustic sources and explosives were quantitatively analyzed using the Navy's acoustic effects model. The Navy's modeled takes, the majority of which are temporary behavioral reactions, are not modeled instances of "significant harm." As detailed in Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), the Navy's analysis, the previous analyses by NMFS, and the monitoring that has occurred have not indicated any significant harm or damage to marine resources as a result of Navy training and testing activities. The analysis from the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS predicted no mortality or serious injury to marine mammals or sea turtles, and to date none have been reported. Consistent with those results, no mortality or serious injury are predicted for training and testing activities proposed in this SEIS/OEIS. Additionally, as detailed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences), long-term consequences to other marine resources in the Mariana Islands are not expected.

I.5 Summary of Geographic Mitigation Areas

Based on the extensive review and analysis presented in this appendix, the Navy proposes to implement the mitigation areas summarized in Table I-8 and depicted in Figure I-7. The Navy has taken into account public comments received as well as reviewed available scientific information in making these determinations. The mitigation areas were developed because they met the biological effectiveness criteria when balanced against the operational practicality criteria. The Navy finds that implementing these geographic mitigations would, in combination with procedural mitigation, effect the least practicable adverse impact on marine mammal species or stocks and their habitat.

Table I-8: Summary of Geographic Mitigation

Area Name	Stressors Limited	Timeframe for Measures
Marpi Reef Geographic Mitigation Area	MF1 Sonar	Seasonal: December–April Cap of 20 hours for Marpi Reef and Chalan Kanoa Reef geographic mitigation areas; special reporting
	Explosives	Year-round prohibition
Chalan Kanoa Reef Geographic Mitigation Area	MF1 Sonar	Seasonal: December–April Cap of 20 hours for Marpi Reef and Chalan Kanoa Reef geographic mitigation areas; special reporting
	Explosives	Year-round prohibition
Agat Bay Nearshore Geographic Mitigation Area	MF1 Sonar and Explosives	Year-round prohibition




Figure I-7: Navy Geographic Mitigation Areas

REFERENCES

Amesbury, S., R. Bonito, R. K. C. Chang, L. Kirkendale, C. Meyer, G. Paulay, R. Ritson-Williams, and T. Rongo. (2001). *Marine Biodiversity Resource Survey and Baseline Reef Monitoring Survey of the Haputo Ecological Reserve Area, COMNAVMARIANAS*. Mangilao, GU: University of Guam.

Ampela, K., J. Chadbourne, M. Deakos, D. Fertl, J. Latusek-Nabholz, D. Spontak, and R. Uyeyama. (2014). *Summary Report: Compilation of Visual Survey Effort and Sightings for Marine Species Monitoring in the Mariana Islands Range Complex*. Appendix A: Comprehensive Exercise and Marine Species Monitoring Report for the U.S. Navy's Mariana Islands Range Complex 2010–2014.

Baird, R. W., D. Cholewiak, D. L. Webster, G. S. Schorr, S. D. Mahaffy, C. Curtice, J. Harrison, and S. M. Van Parijs. (2015). Biologically Important Areas for Cetaceans within U.S. Waters—Hawaii region. In S. M. Van Parijs, C. Curtice, & M. C. Ferguson (Eds.), *Biologically Important Areas for Cetaceans Within U.S. Waters* (Vol. 41, pp. 54–64). Olympia, WA: Cascadia Research Collective.

Bangs, C. (2001). A sperm whale calf swims next to its mother and a pod of sperm whales, about four miles off the coast of the Agat Marina in Guam in 2001. Guam Variety News.

Becker, E. A., K. A. Forney, B. J. Thayre, A. J. Debich, G. S. Campbell, K. Whitaker, A. B. Douglas, A. Gilles, R. Hoopes, and J. A. Hildebrand. (2017). Habitat-Based Density Models for Three Cetacean Species off Southern California Illustrate Pronounced Seasonal Differences. *Frontiers in Marine Science, 4*(121), 1–14.

Boyd, J. D., and D. J. Brightsmith. (2013). Error properties of Argos satellite telemetry locations using least squares and Kalman filtering. *PLoS ONE, 8*(5), e63051.

Clark, C. W., and K. M. Fristrup. (2001). Baleen whale responses to low-frequency human-made underwater sounds. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 110*(5), 2751.

Croll, D. A., C. W. Clark, J. Calambokidis, W. T. Ellison, and B. R. Tershy. (2001). Effect of anthropogenic low-frequency noise on the foraging ecology of *Balaenoptera* whales. *Animal Conservation, 4*, 13–27.

Eldredge, L. G. (1991). Annotated checklist of the marine mammals of Micronesia. *Micronesica, 24*(2), 217–230.

Ferguson, M. C., C. Curtice, J. Harrison, and S. M. Van Parijs. (2015a). Biologically important areas for cetaceans within U.S. waters – Overview and rationale. *Aquatic Mammals (Special Issue), 41*(1), 2–16.

Ferguson, M. C., J. M. Waite, C. Curtice, J. T. Clarke, and J. Harrison. (2015b). Biologically important areas for cetaceans within U.S. waters – Aleutian Islands and Bering Sea region. In S. M. Van Parijs, C. Curtice, & M. C. Ferguson (Eds.), *Biologically Important Areas for cetaceans within U.S. waters* (Vol. Aquatic Mammals (Special Issue) 41, pp. 79–93).

Forney, K. A., E. A. Becker, D. G. Foley, J. Barlow, and E. M. Oleson. (2015). Habitat-based models of cetacean density and distribution in the central North Pacific. *Endangered Species Research, 27*, 1–20.

Fristrup, K. M., L. T. Hatch, and C. W. Clark. (2003). Variation in humpback whale (*Megaptera novaeangliae*) song length in relation to low-frequency sound broadcasts. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 113*(6), 3411–3424.

Fulling, G. L., P. H. Thorson, and J. Rivers. (2011). Distribution and Abundance Estimates for Cetaceans in the Waters off Guam and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. *Pacific Science, 65*(3), 321–343.

Gabriele, C. M., J. L. Neilson, J. M. Straley, C. S. Baker, J. A. Cedarleaf, and J. F. Saracco. (2017). Natural history, population dynamics, and habitat use of humpback whales over 30 years on an Alaska feeding ground. *Ecosphere, 8*(1), e01641.

HDR. (2011). *Guam Marine Species Monitoring Survey: Vessel-Based Monitoring Surveys Winter 2011*. Mariana Islands, Guam: U.S. Navy Marine Species Monitoring Program.

HDR. (2012). *Summary Report: Compilation of Visual Survey Effort and Sightings for Marine Species Monitoring in the Hawaii Range Complex, 2005–2012*. Pearl Harbor, HI: U.S. Pacific Fleet.

HDR EOC. (2012). *Guam and Saipan Marine Species Monitoring Winter-Spring Survey, March 2012*. Pearl Harbor, HI: Naval Facilities Engineering Command.

Heenehan, H. L., D. W. Johnston, S. M. Van Parijs, L. Bejder, and J. A. Tyne. (2016a). *Acoustic response of Hawaiian spinner dolphins to human disturbances.* Paper presented at the Meetings on Acoustics. Dublin, Ireland.

Heenehan, H. L., J. A. Tyne, L. Bejder, S. M. Van Parijs, and D. W. Johnston. (2016b). Passive acoustic monitoring of coastally associated Hawaiian spinner dolphins, *Stenella longirostris*, ground-truthed through visual surveys. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 140*(1), 206.

Heenehan, H. L., S. M. Van Parijs, L. Bejder, J. A. Tyne, and D. W. Johnston. (2017a). Using acoustics to prioritize management decisions to protect coastal dolphins: A case study using Hawaiian spinner dolphins. *Marine Policy, 75*, 84–90.

Heenehan, H. L., S. M. Van Parijs, L. Bejder, J. A. Tyne, B. L. Southall, H. Southall, and D. W. Johnston. (2017b). Natural and anthropogenic events influence the soundscapes of four bays on Hawaii Island. *Marine Pollution Bulletin, 124*(1), 9–20.

Hill, M., E. Oleson, and K. Andrews. (2010). *New Island-Associated stocks for Hawaiian Spinner Dolphins (Stenella longirostris longirostris): Rationale and New Stock Boundaries*. Honolulu, HI: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's Pacific Islands Fisheries Science Center.

Hill, M., A. D. Ligon, M. H. Deakos, U. Adam, E. Norris, and E. M. Oleson. (2011). *Cetacean Surveys of Guam and CNMI Waters: August–September, 2011* (MIRC Survey Report FY2011). Honolulu, HI: Pacific Islands Fisheries Science Center.

Hill, M., A. Ligon, M. Deakos, A. Ü, A. Milette-Winfree, and E. Oleson. (2013a). *Cetacean Surveys of Guam and CNMI Waters: May–July, 2012: Including Individual Photo-Identification of Pilot Whales, Spinner Dolphins and Bottlenose Dolphins (2010–2012)* (PIFSC Data Report). Pearl Harbor, HI: U.S. Pacific Fleet Environmental Readiness Office.

Hill, M., A. Ligon, A. Ü, and A. Bradford. (2015a). *Humpback Whales in the Marianas*. Honolulu, HI: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Pacific Islands Fisheries Science Center.

Hill, M. C., A. D. Ligon, M. H. Deakos, A. C. U, and E. M. Oleson. (2013b). *Cetacean Surveys of Guam and SNMI Waters: June–July 2013*. Pearl Harbor, HI: U.S. Pacific Fleet Environmental Readiness Office.

Hill, M. C., A. D. Ligon, M. H. Deakos, A. C. Ü, A. Milette-Winfree, A. R. Bendlin, and E. M. Oleson. (2014). *Cetacean Surveys in the Waters of the Southern Mariana Archipelago (February 2010–April 2014)*. Honolulu, HI: U.S. Pacific Fleet Environmental Readiness Office.

Hill, M. C., E. M. Oleson, A. D. Ligon, K. K. Martien, F. I. Archer, S. Baumann-Pickering, A. R. Bendlin, L. Dolar, K. P. B. Merkens, A. Milette-Winfree, P. A. Morin, A. Rice, K. M. Robertson, J. S. Trickey, A. C. Ü, A. Van Cise, and S. M. Woodman. (2015b). *Cetacean Monitoring in the Mariana Islands Range Complex, 2014*. Honolulu, HI: U.S. Pacific Fleet.

Hill, M. C., A. L. Bradford, A. D. Ligon, A. C. U, J. Rivers, R. K. Uyeyama, R. L. Brownell, Jr., and E. M. Oleson. (2016a). *Are Humpback Whales (Megaptera novaeangliae) Breeding and Calving in the Mariana Islands?* Cambridge, United Kingdom: International Whaling Commission.

Hill, M. C., E. M. Oleson, S. Baumann-Pickering, A. M. VanCise, A. D. Ligon, A. R. Bendlin, A. C. Ü, J. S. Trickey, and A. L. Bradford. (2016b). *Cetacean Monitoring in the Mariana Islands Range Complex, 2015*. Honolulu, HI: U.S. Pacific Fleet Environmental Readiness Office.

Hill, M. C., A. R. Bendlin, A. C. Ü, K. M. Yano, A. L. Bradford, A. D. Ligon, and E. M. Oleson. (2017a). *Cetacean Monitoring in the Mariana Islands Range Complex, 2016* (PIFSC Data Report DR-17-002). Honolulu, HI: U.S. Pacific Fleet Environmental Readiness Office.

Hill, M. C., A. L. Bradford, A. D. Ligon, A. C. Ü, C. S. Baker, D. Dietrich-Steel, J. Rivers, R. K. Uyeyama, and E. M. Oleson. (2017b). *Discovery of a Western North Pacific Humpback Whale (Megaptera novaeangliae) Wintering Area in the Mariana Archipelago (Poster)*. Paper presented at the Society for Marine Mammalogy Conference. Halifax, Nova Scotia.

Hill, M. C., A. R. Bendlin, A. M. Van Cise, A. Milette-Winfree, A. D. Ligon, A. C. Ü, M. H. Deakos, and E. M. Oleson. (2018a). Short-finned pilot whales (*Globicephala macrorhynchus*) of the Mariana Archipelago: Individual affiliations, movements, and spatial use. *Marine Mammal Science* (Online version of record before inclusion in an issue), 1–28.

Hill, M. C., A. L. Bradford, A. D. Ligon, A. C. Ü, and E. M. Oleson. (2018b). *Cetacean Monitoring in the Mariana Islands Range Complex, 2017* (PIFSC Data Report DR-18-002). Honolulu, HI: Pacific Islands Fisheries Science Center.

Hill, M. C., E. M. Oleson, A. L. Bradford, K. K. Martien, D. Steel, and C. S. Baker. (2018c). *Draft Pacific Islands Fisheries Science Center Mariana Archipelago Cetacean Surveys: A Review of Available Data and Analyses Through March 2018*. (PIFSC Data Report DR-18-xxx). Pearl Harbor, HI: U.S. Pacific Fleet Environmental Readiness Office.

Hill, M. C., E. M. Oleson, A. L. Bradford, K. K. Martien, D. Steel, and C. S. Baker. (2018d). *Pacific Islands Fisheries Science Center Mariana Archipelago Cetacean Surveys: A review of available data and analyses through February 2018*. Pearl Harbor, HI: Prepared for the U.S. Pacific Fleet Environmental Readiness Office.

Hill, M. C., A. D. Ligon, A. C. Ü, and E. M. Oleson. (2019). *Cetacean Monitoring in the Mariana Islands Range Complex, August-September 2018.* (Prepared for the U.S. Pacific Fleet Environmental Readiness Office). Honolulu, HI.

Hill, M. C., A. L. Bradford, D. Steel, C. S. Baker, A. D. Ligon, A. C. Ü, J. M. V. Acebes, O. A. Filatova, S. Hakala, N. Kobayashi, Y. Morimoto, H. Okabe, R. Okamoto, J. Rivers, T. Sato, O. V. Titova, R. K. Uyeyama, and E. M. Oleson. (2020). Found: A missing breeding ground for endangered western North Pacific humpback whales in the Mariana Archipelago. *Endangered Species Research, 41*, 91–103.

Jefferson, T. A., M. A. Webber, and R. L. Pitman. (2015). *Marine Mammals of the World: A Comprehensive Guide to Their Identification* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, MA: Academic Press.

Jones, T. J., and K. S. Van Houtan. (2014a). *Sea Turtle Tagging in the Mariana Islands Range Complex (MIRC) Interim Report*. Honolulu, HI: Pacific Islands Fisheries Science Center.

Jones, T. T., and K. S. Van Houtan. (2014b). *Sea Turtle Tagging in the Mariana Islands Range Complex (MIRC) Annual Progress Report*. Honolulu, HI: Pacific Islands Fisheries Science Center.

Jones, T. T., S. L. Martin, and K. S. Van Houtan. (2015). *Sea Turtle Tagging in the Mariana Islands Range Complex (MIRC) Progress Report*. Honolulu, HI: Pacific Islands Fisheries Science Center.

Jones, T. T., and S. L. Martin. (2016). *Sea Turtle Tagging in the Mariana Islands Training and Testing (MITT) Study Area*. Silver Spring, MD: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Fisheries Marine Turtle Biology and Assessment Program Protected Species Division.

Klinck, H., S. L. Nieukirk, S. Fregosi, K. Klinck, D. K. Mellinger, S. Lastuka, G. B. Shilling, and J. C. Luby. (2015). *Cetacean Studies on the Mariana Islands Range Complex in September-November 2014: Passive Acoustic Monitoring of Marine Mammals Using Gliders. Final Report*. Honolulu, HI: HDR Inc.

Klinck, H., S. L. Nieukirk, S. Fregosi, K. Klinck, D. K. Mellinger, S. Lastuka, G. B. Shilling, and J. C. Luby. (2016). *Final Report Cetacean Studies on the Mariana Islands Range Complex in March–April 2015: Passive Acoustic Monitoring of Marine Mammals Using Gliders* (Submitted to Naval Facilities Engineering Command (NAVFAC) Pacific, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii). Honolulu, HI: HDR Inc.

Kolinski, S. P., D. M. Parker, L. I. Ilo, and J. K. Ruak. (2001). An assessment of the sea turtles and their marine and terrestrial habitats at Saipan, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. *Micronesica, 34*(1), 55–72.

Ligon, A. D., M. H. Deakos, and C. U. Adam. (2011). *Small-boat cetacean surveys off Guam and Saipan, Mariana Islands, February - March 2010*. Honolulu, HI: Pacific Island Fisheries Science Center.

Martien, K. K., M. C. Hill, A. M. Van Cise, K. M. Robertson, S. M. Woodman, L. Dollar, V. L. Pease, and E. M. Oleson. (2014). *Genetic Diversity and Population Structure in Four Species of Cetaceans Around the Mariana Islands* (NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SWFSC-536). La Jolla, CA: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service, Southwest Fisheries Science Center.

Martin, S. L., and T. T. Jones. (2016). *Sea Turtle Tagging in the Mariana Islands Training and Testing (MITT) Study Area, 15 December 2016* (NMFS-PIC-16-008). Honolulu, HI: Pacific Islands Fisheries Science Center.

Martin, S. L., K. S. Van Houtan, T. T. Jones, C. F. Aguon, J. T. Gutierrez, R. B. Tibbatts, S. B. Wusstig, and J. D. Bass. (2016). Five decades of marine megafauna surveys from Micronesia. *Frontiers in Marine Science, 2*(116), 1–13.

Martin, S. L., A. R. Gaos, and T. T. Jones. (2018). *Sea Turtle Tagging in the Mariana Islands Training and Testing (MITT) Study Area*. Honolulu, HI: Pacific Islands Fisheries Science Center.

Martin, S. L., A. R. Gaos, and T. T. Jones. (2019). *Sea Turtle Tagging in the Mariana Islands Training and Testing (MITT) Study Area*. Honolulu, HI: National Marine Fisheries Service, Pacific Islands Fisheries Science Center.

Miller, P. J. O., N. Biassoni, A. Samuels, and P. L. Tyack. (2000). Whale songs lengthen in response to sonar. *Nature, 405*(6789), 903.

Munger, L. M., M. O. Lammers, and W. W. L. Au. (2014). *Passive Acoustic Monitoring for Cetaceans within the Marianas Islands Range Complex. Preliminary Report*. Pearl Harbor, HI: Naval Facilities Engineering Command Pacific.

Munger, L. M., M. O. Lammers, J. N. Oswald, T. M. Yack, and W. W. L. Au. (2015). *Passive Acoustic Monitoring of Cetaceans within the Mariana Islands Range Complex Using Ecological Acoustic Recorders. Final Report*. Pearl Harbor, HI: Naval Facilities Engineering Command Pacific.

National Marine Fisheries Service, and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. (1998). *Recovery Plan for U.S. Pacific Populations of the East Pacific Green Turtle (Chelonia mydas)*. Silver Spring, MD: National Marine Fisheries Service.

National Marine Fisheries Service. (2018). *#MIhumpbacks: Humpback Whales of the Mariana Islands*. Honolulu, HI: Pacific Islands Fisheries Science Center.

National Marine Fisheries Service (2019). [Email from Stephanie Egger (NMFS) to Chip Johnson (Navy Pacific Fleet) regarding marine mammal sightings data in the Mariana Islands in 2018-2019].

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. (2015). Takes of marine mammals incidental to specified activities; U.S. Navy training and testing activities in the Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area. *Federal Register, 80*(148), 46112–46171.

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. (2018). *#MIhumpbacks: Humpback Whales of the Mariana Islands*. Retrieved from https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/feature-story/mihumpbacks-humpback-whales-mariana-islands.

Nieukirk, S. L., S. Fregosi, D. K. Mellinger, and H. Klinck. (2016). A complex baleen whale call recorded in the Mariana Trench Marine National Monument. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 140*(3), EL274.

Norris, K. S., and T. P. Dohl. (1980). Behavior of the Hawaiian spinner dolphin, *Stenella longirostris*. *Fishery Bulletin, 77*(4), 821–849.

Norris, T., T. Yack, E. Ferguson, and K. Dunleavy. (2015). *A Comparison of Acoustic Based Line-Transect Density Estimates for Sperm Whales and Minke Whales in the Northern Marianas Islands.* Paper presented at the 7th International Workshop on [Detection, Classification, Localization, and Density Estimation] of Marine Mammals using Passive Acoustics. La Jolla, CA.

Norris, T. F., J. Oswald, T. Yack, E. Ferguson, C. Hom-Weaver, K. Dunleavy, S. Coates, and T. Dominello. (2012). *An Analysis of Acoustic Data from the Mariana Islands Sea Turtle and Cetacean Survey (MISTCS)*. Encinitas, CA: Bio-Waves, Inc.

Norris, T. F., J. Oswald, T. Yack, E. Ferguson, C. Hom-Weaver, K. Dunleavy, S. Coates, and T. Dominello. (2014). *An Analysis of Acoustic Data from the Mariana Islands Sea Turtle and Cetacean Survey (MISTCS) March 2014 Revision*. Encinitas, CA: Bio-Waves, Inc.

Norris, T. F., K. J. Dunleavy, T. M. Yack, and E. L. Ferguson. (2017). Estimation of minke whale abundance from an acoustic line transect survey of the Mariana Islands. *Marine Mammal Science, 33*(2), 574–592.

Nowacek, D., L. H. Thorne, D. Johnston, and P. Tyack. (2007). Responses of cetaceans to anthropogenic noise. *Mammal Review, 37*(2), 81–115.

Oleson, E. (2017). *Mariana Archipelago Cetacean Survey (MACS) 2015 Cruise Report*. Honolulu, HI: National Marine Fisheries Service, Pacific Islands Fisheries Science Center.

Oleson, E. M., and M. C. Hill. (2010a). *2010 Report to PACFLT: Report to Cetacean Surveys in Guam, CNMI, and the High-seas*. Honolulu, HI: National Marine Fisheries Service, Pacific Islands Fisheries Science Center.

Oleson, E. M., and M. C. Hill. (2010b). *2010 Report to PACFLT: Report of Cetacean Surveys in Guam, CNMI, and the High-seas & Follow up on 2009 Main Hawaiian Islands Cetacean Survey*. Honolulu, HI: Pacific Islands Fisheries Science Center.

Oleson, E. M., S. Baumann-Pickering, A. Širović, K. P. Merkens, L. M. Munger, J. S. Trickey, and P. Fisher-Pool. (2015). *Analysis of long-term acoustic datasets for baleen whales and beaked whales within the Mariana Islands Range Complex (MIRC) for 2010 to 2013* (Pacific Islands Fisheries Science Center Data Report DR-15-002). Honolulu, HI: Pacific Islands Fisheries Science Center.

Pack, A. A., L. M. Herman, A. S. Craig, S. S. Spitz, J. O. Waterman, E. Y. K. Herman, M. H. Deakos, S. Hakala, and C. Lowe. (2017). Habitat preferences by individual humpback whale mothers in the Hawaiian breeding grounds vary with the age and size of their calves. *Animal Behaviour, 133*, 131–144.

Perrin, W. F., and R. L. Brownell, Jr. (2009). Minke whales, *Balaenoptera acutorostrata* and *B. bonaerensis*. In W. F. Perrin, B. Wursig, & J. G. M. Thewissen (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Marine Mammals* (2nd ed., pp. 733–735). Cambridge, MA: Academic Press.

Pultz, S., D. O. O'Daniel, S. Krueger, and H. McSharry. (1999). Marine Turtle Survey on Tinian, Mariana Islands. *Micronesica, 31*(2), 85–94.

Ramp, C., J. Delarue, P. J. Palsboll, R. Sears, and P. S. Hammond. (2015). Adapting to a warmer ocean—Seasonal shift of baleen whale movements over three decades. *PLoS ONE, 10*(3), e0121374.

Risch, D., M. Castellote, C. W. Clark, G. E. Davis, P. J. Dugan, L. E. W. Hodge, A. Kumar, K. Lucke, M. D. K., S. L. Nieukirk, C. M. Popescu, C. Ramp, A. J. Read, A. N. Rice, M. A. Silva, U. Siebert, K. M. Stafford, H. Verdaat, and S. M. Van Parijs. (2014). Seasonal migrations of North Atlantic minke whales: Novel insights from large-scale passive acoustic monitoring networks. *Movement Ecology, 2*, 1–17.

Silber, G. K., M. D. Lettrich, P. O. Thomas, J. D. Baker, M. Baumgartner, E. A. Becker, P. Boveng, D. M. Dick, J. Fiechter, J. Forcada, K. A. Forney, R. B. Griffis, J. A. Hare, A. J. Hobday, D. Howell, K. L. Laidre, N. Mantua, L. Quakenbush, J. A. Santora, K. M. Stafford, P. Spencer, C. Stock, W. Sydeman, K. Van Houtan, and R. S. Waples. (2017). Projecting Marine Mammal Distribution in a Changing Climate. *Frontiers in Marine Science, 4*, 14.

Summers, T. M., T. T. Jones, S. L. Martin, J. R. Hapdei, J. K. Ruak, and C. A. Lepczyk. (2017). Demography of marine turtles in the nearshore environments of the Northern Mariana Islands. *Pacific Science, 71*(3), 269–286.

Summers, T. M., S. L. Martin, J. R. Hapdei, J. K. Ruak, and T. T. Jones. (2018). Endangered green turtles (*Chelonia mydas*) of the Northern Mariana Islands: Nesting ecology, poaching, and climate concerns. *Frontiers in Marine Science, 4*(428), 1–15.

Tetra Tech Inc. (2014). *Marine Mammal Survey Report in Support of the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands Joint Military Training Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement. Final (Version 3)*. Oakland, CA: TEC-AECOM Pacific Joint Venture

Tyne, J. A., K. H. Pollock, D. W. Johnston, and L. Bejder. (2014). Abundance and survival rates of the Hawaii Island associated spinner dolphin (*Stenella longirostris*) stock. *PLoS ONE, 9*(1), e86132.

Tyne, J. A. (2015). *A scientific foundation for informed management decisions: Quantifying the abundance, important habitat and cumulative exposure of the Hawaii Island spinner dolphin (Stenella longirostris) stock to human activities.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation in Philosophy). Murdoch University, Murdoch, Australia. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/311608220_A_scientific_foundation_for_informed_management_decisions_Quantifying_the_abundance_important_habitat_and_cumulative_exposure_of_the_Hawaii_Island_spinner_dolphin_Stenella_longirostris_stock_to_human_.

Tyne, J. A., D. W. Johnston, R. Rankin, N. R. Loneragan, L. Bejder, and A. Punt. (2015). The importance of spinner dolphin (*Stenella longirostris*) resting habitat: Implications for management. *Journal of Applied Ecology, 52*(3), 621–630.

Tyne, J. A., D. W. Johnston, F. Christiansen, and L. Bejder. (2017). Temporally and spatially partitioned behaviours of spinner dolphins: Implications for resilience to human disturbance. *Royal Society Open Science, 4*(1), 160626.

Tyne, J. A., F. Christiansen, H. L. Heenehan, D. W. Johnston, and L. Bejder. (2018). Chronic exposure of Hawaii Island spinner dolphins (*Stenella longirostris*) to human activities. *Royal Society Open Science, 5*, e171506.

U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and Office of National Marine Sanctuaries. (2015). *Hawaiian Islands Humpback Whale National Marine Sanctuary Draft Management Plan/Draft Environmental Impact Statement*. Silver Spring, MD: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2005). *Marine Resources Assessment for the Marianas Operating Area (Final Report)*. Pearl Harbor, HI: Commander, U.S. Pacific Fleet.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2007). *Marine Mammal and Sea Turtle Survey and Density Estimates for Guam and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands - Final Report*. Newport Beach, CA: Naval Facilities Engineering Command Pacific and Commander, U.S. Pacific Fleet.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2012). *2012 Annual Marine Species Monitoring Report for the Mariana Islands Range Complex*. Washington, DC: Office of Protected Resources.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2013). *Final Marine Resource Assessment for the Japan and Mariana Archipelagos*. San Diego, CA: Naval Facilities Engineering Command Pacific.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2014a). *Final Marine Mammal Survey Report in Support of the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands Joint Military Training Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (Version 3)*. Pearl Harbor, HI: Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Pacific.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2014b). *Final Sea Turtle Marine Resources Survey Report*. Pearl Harbor, HI: Tetra Tech Inc., Sea Engineering Inc., and AECOM Technical Services Inc.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2015). *Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement Guam and Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands Military Relocation (2012 Roadmap Adjustments)*. Washington, DC: Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Pacific.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2018a). *U.S. Navy Marine Species Density Database Phase III for the Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area* (Naval Facilities Engineering Command Pacific Technical Report). Pearl Harbor, HI: Naval Facilities Engineering Command Pacific.

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2018b). *2017 U.S. Navy Annual Marine Species Monitoring Report for the Pacific: A Multi-Range-Complex Monitoring Report For Hawaii-Southern California Training and Testing (HSTT), Mariana Islands Training and Testing (MITT), Northwest Training and Testing (NWTT), and the Gulf of Alaska Temporary Maritime Activities Area (GOA TMAA)*. Silver Spring, MD: National Marine Fisheries Service.

Uyeyama, R. (2014). *Compilation of Incidental Marine Mammal and Sea Turtle Sightings in the Mariana Islands Range Complex*. Pearl Harbor, HI: Commander, U.S. Pacific Fleet.

Van Parijs, S. M., C. Curtice, and M. C. E. Ferguson. (2015). Biologically important areas for cetaceans within U.S. Waters. *Aquatic Mammals (Special Issue), 41*(1), 128.

Vincent, C., B. J. McConnell, V. Ridoux, and M. A. Fedak. (2002). Assessment of Argos location accuracy from satellite tags deployed on captive grey seals. *Marine Mammal Science, 18*(1), 156–166.

Yack, T. M., T. F. Norris, and N. Novak. (2016). *Acoustic Based Habitat Models for Sperm Whales in the Mariana Islands Region*. Encinitas, CA: Bio-Waves, Inc.

Appendix J: Statistical Probability Analysis for Estimating Direct Strike Impact and Number of Potential Exposures from Military Expended Materials

Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/

Overseas Environmental Impact Statement

Mariana Islands Training and Testing

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPENDIX J STATISTICAL PROBABILITY ANALYSIS FOR ESTIMATING DIRECT STRIKE IMPACT AND NUMBER OF POTENTIAL EXPOSURES FROM MILITARY EXPENDED MATERIALS..... J-1

J.1 Direct Impact Analysis.....J-1

J.1.1 Parameters for Analysis.....J-3

J.1.2 Input Data.....J-4

J.1.3 Output Data.....J-4

List of Figures

There are no figures in this appendix.

List of Tables

Table J-1: Estimated Representative Marine Mammal Exposures from Direct Strike of a High-Energy Laser by Area and Alternative in a Single Year J-5

Table J-2: Estimated Representative Sea Turtle Exposures from Direct Strike of a High-Energy Laser by Area and Alternative in a Single Year J-5

Table J-3: Estimated Representative Marine Mammal Exposures from Direct Strike of Military Expended Materials by Area and Alternative in a Single Year.....J-5

Table J-4: Estimated Representative Sea Turtle Exposures from Direct Strike of Military Expended Materials by Area and Alternative in a Single Year J-5

This page intentionally left blank.

APPENDIX J Statistical Probability Analysis for Estimating Direct Strike Impact and Number of Potential Exposures from Military Expended Materials

This Appendix discusses the methods and results for calculating the probability of the direct strike of an animal by any military items from the proposed training and testing activities falling toward (or directed at) the sea surface. For the purposes of this section, military items include non-explosive practice munitions, sonobuoys, acoustic countermeasures, some targets, torpedoes, anchors, and high-energy lasers. Only marine mammals and sea turtles will be analyzed using these methods because animal densities are necessary to complete the calculations, and density estimates are currently only available for marine mammals and sea turtles within the Study Area. The analysis conducted here does not account for explosive munitions because impacts from explosives are analyzed within the Navy Acoustic Effects Model as described in *Quantifying Acoustic Impacts on Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles: Methods and Analytical Approach for Phase III Training and Testing* (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2017).

J.1 DIRECT IMPACT ANALYSIS

These calculations estimate the impact probability (P) and number of exposures (T) associated with direct impact of military items on marine animals on the sea surface within the training or testing area in which the activities are occurring (R = area of the Mariana Islands Range Complex). The statistical probability analysis is based on probability theory and modified Venn diagrams with rectangular "footprint" areas for the individual animal (A) and total impact (I) inscribed inside the training or testing area (R). The analysis is over-predictive and conservative, in that it assumes: (1) that all animals would be at or near the surface 100 percent of the time, when in fact, marine mammals spend the majority of their time underwater, and (2) that the animals are stationary, which does not account for any movement or potential avoidance of the training or testing activity.

1. A = length*width, where the individual animal's width (breadth) is assumed to be 20 percent of its length for marine mammals and 112 percent of its length for sea turtles. A is multiplied by the number of animals N_a in the training or testing area (i.e., product of the highest average seasonal animal density [D] and training or testing area [R]: $N_a = D*R$) to obtain the total animal footprint area ($A*N_a = A*D*R$) in the training or testing area. As a conservative scenario, the total animal footprint area is calculated for the species with the highest average seasonal density (pantropical spotted dolphins).
2. $I = N_{mun}$*length*diameter, where N_{mun} = total annual number of military items for each type, and "length" and "diameter" refer to the individual military equipment dimensions. For each type, the individual impact footprint area is multiplied by the total annual number of military items to obtain the type-specific impact footprint area ($I = N_{mun}$*length*diameter). Each training or testing activity uses one or more different types of military items, each with a specific number and dimensions, and several training and testing events occur in a given year. When integrating over the number of military items types for the given activity (and then over the number of events in a year), these calculations are repeated (accounting for differences in dimensions and numbers) for all military items types used, to obtain the type-specific impact footprint area (I). These impact footprint areas are summed over all military items types for the given activity, and then summed (integrated) over all events to obtain the total impact footprint area resulting from all events occurring in the training or testing area in a given year.

Though marine mammals and sea turtles are not randomly distributed in the environment, a random point calculation was chosen given the available information on an animal's or military item's spatial occurrence. Military items may be expended generally throughout the Study Area, depending on the activity and item type.

The analysis is expected to provide an overestimation of the probability of a strike for the following reasons: (1) it calculates the probability of a single military item (of all the items expended over the course of the year) hitting a single animal at its species' highest seasonal density, (2) it does not take into account the possibility that an animal may avoid military activities, (3) it does not take into account the possibility that an animal may not be at the water surface, (4) it does not take into account that most projectiles fired during training and testing activities are fired at targets, and so only a very small portion of those projectiles that miss the target would hit the water with their maximum velocity and force, and (5) it does not quantitatively take into account the Navy avoiding animals that are sighted through the implementation of mitigation measures (for consideration of mitigation during analysis see Sections 3.4, Marine Mammals; and 3.5, Sea Turtles).

The likelihood of an impact is calculated as the probability (P) that the animal footprint (A) and the impact footprint (I) will intersect within the training or testing area (R). This is calculated as the area ratio A/R or I/R, respectively. Note that A (referring to an **individual** animal footprint) and I (referring to the impact footprint resulting from the **total** number of military items N_{mun}) are the relevant quantities used in the following calculations of single-animal impact probability [P], which is then multiplied by the number of animals to obtain the number of exposures (T). The probability that the random point in the training or testing area is within both types of footprints (i.e., A and I) depends on the degree of overlap of A and I. The probability that I overlaps A is calculated by adding a buffer distance around A based on one-half of the impact area (i.e., 0.5*I), such that an impact (center) occurring anywhere within the combined (overlapping) area would impact the animal. Thus, if L_i and W_i are the length and width of the impact footprint such that $L_i*W_i = 0.5*I$ and $W_i/L_i = L_a/W_a$ (i.e., similar geometry between the animal footprint and impact footprint), and if L_a and W_a are the length and width (breadth) of the individual animal such that $L_a*W_a = A$ (= individual animal footprint area), then, assuming a purely static, rectangular scenario (Scenario 1), the total area $A_{tot} = (L_a + 2*L_i)*(W_a + 2*W_i)$, and the buffer area $A_{buffer} = A_{tot} - L_a*W_a$.

Four scenarios were examined with respect to defining and setting up the overlapping combined areas of A and I:

1. **Scenario 1**: Purely static, rectangular scenario. Impact is assumed to be static (i.e., direct impact effects only; non-dynamic; no explosions or scattering of military items after the initial impact). Hence the impact footprint area (I) is assumed to be rectangular and given by the product of military items length and width (multiplied by the number of military items).
   $A_{tot} = (L_a + 2*L_i)*(W_a + 2*W_i)$ and $A_{buffer} = A_{tot} - L_a*W_a$.
2. **Scenario 2**: Dynamic scenario with end-on collision, in which the length of the impact footprint (Li) is enhanced by Rn = 5 military items lengths to reflect forward momentum.
   $A_{tot} = (L_a + (1 + R_n)*L_i)*(W_a + 2*W_i)$ and $A_{buffer} = A_{tot} - L_a*W_a$.
3. **Scenario 3**: Dynamic scenario with broadside collision, in which the width of the impact footprint (W_i) is enhanced by R_n = 5 military items lengths to reflect forward momentum.
   $A_{tot} = (L_a + 2*W_i)*(W_a + (1 + R_n)*L_i)$ and $A_{buffer} = A_{tot} - L_a*W_a$.
4. **Scenario 4**: Purely static, radial scenario, in which the rectangular animal and impact footprints are replaced with circular footprints while conserving area. Define the radius (R_a) of the circular

individual animal footprint such that $\pi*R_a^2 = L_a*W_a$, and define the radius (R_i) of the circular impact footprint such that $\pi *R_i^2 = 0.5*L_i*W_i = 0.5*I$. Then $A_{tot} = \pi *(R_a + R_i)^2$ and $A_{buffer} = A_{tot} - \pi *R_a^2$ (where $\pi = 3.1415927$).

Static impacts (Scenarios 1 and 4) assume no additional aerial coverage effects of scattered military items beyond the initial impact. For dynamic impacts (Scenarios 2 and 3), the distance of any scattered military items must be considered by increasing the length (Scenario 2) or width (Scenario 3), depending on orientation (broadside versus end-on collision), of the impact footprint to account for the forward horizontal momentum of the falling object. Forward momentum typically accounts for five object lengths, resulting in a corresponding increase in impact area. Significantly different values may result from the static and dynamic orientation. Both of these types of collision conditions can be calculated each with 50 percent likelihood (i.e., equal weighting between Scenarios 2 and 3, to average these potentially different values).

Impact probability P is the probability of impacting one animal with the given number, type, and dimensions of all military items used in training or testing activities occurring in the area per year, and is given by the ratio of total area (A_{tot}) to training or testing area (R): $P = A_{tot}/R$. Number of exposures is $T = N*P = N*A_{tot}/R$, where N = number of animals in the training or testing area per year (given as the product of the animal density [D] and range size [R]). Thus, $N = D*R$ and hence $T = N*P = N*A_{tot}/R = D*A_{tot}$. Using this procedure, P and T were calculated for each of the four scenarios, for Endangered Species Act (ESA)-listed marine mammals and the marine mammal and sea turtle species with the highest average seasonal density (used as the annual density value) and for each military item type. The scenario-specific P and T values were averaged over the four scenarios (using equal weighting) to obtain a single scenario-averaged annual estimate of P and T. The potential number of exposures (t) are reported in Table J-1 through Table J-4.

J.1.1 PARAMETERS FOR ANALYSIS

Impact probabilities (P) and number of exposures (T) were estimated for the following parameters:

1. **Two action alternatives**: Alternative 1 and Alternative 2. Animal densities, animal dimensions, and military item dimensions are the same for the two action alternatives.
2. **The following types of non-explosive munitions or other items:**
    - **Small-caliber projectiles:** up to and including .50 caliber rounds
    - **Medium-caliber projectiles:** larger than .50 caliber rounds but smaller than 57 millimeters (mm) projectiles
    - **Large-caliber projectiles:** includes projectiles greater than or equal to a 57 mm projectile
    - **Missiles:** includes rockets and jet-propelled munitions
    - **Bombs:** Non-explosive practice bombs and mine shapes, ranging from 10 to 2,000 pounds
    - **Torpedoes:** includes all lightweight torpedoes
    - **Sonobuoys:** includes all sonobuoys
    - **Targets:** includes expended, airborne and surface, targets, as well as mine shapes
    - **Lightweight torpedo accessories:** includes all accessories that are dropped along with the torpedo (nose cap, air stabilizer, etc.)
    - **Anchors:** includes blocks used to anchor mine shapes to the seafloor
    - **Acoustic countermeasures:** includes aircraft and ship-deployed acoustic countermeasures

- **High-Energy Lasers:** includes high-energy laser weapons that are directed at a surface target
- **Expended Bathythermographs:** small sensor deployed from ships or aircraft

3. **Animal species of interest:** The five species of ESA-listed marine mammals and the non-ESA listed marine mammal species with the highest average month density (pantropical spotted dolphin). The sea turtle species with the highest average month density in the training and testing areas of interest (green sea turtles).

J.1.2 INPUT DATA

Input data for the direct strike analysis include animal species likely to be in the area and military items proposed for use under each of the two action alternatives. Animal species data include (1) species identification and status (i.e., threatened, endangered, or neither), (2) highest average seasonal density estimate for the species of interest, and (3) adult animal dimensions (length and width) for the species with the highest density. The animal's dimensions are used to calculate individual animal footprint areas (A = length*width), and animal densities are used to calculate the number of exposures (T) from the impact probability (P): T = N*P. Military items data include (1) military items category (e.g., projectile, bomb, rocket, target), (2) military items dimensions (length and width), and (3) total number of military items used annually.

Military items input data, specifically the quantity (e.g., numbers of bombs and rockets), are different in magnitude between the two action alternatives. All animal species input data, the military items' identification and category, and the military items' dimensions are the same for the two alternatives; only the quantities (i.e., total number of military items) are different.

J.1.3 OUTPUT DATA

Estimates of impact probability (P) and number of exposures (T) for a given species of interest were made with the maximum annual number of military items used for each of the two action alternatives. The calculations derived P and T from the highest annual number of military items used in the Study Area for the given alternative. Differences in P and T between the alternatives arise from different numbers of events (and therefore military items) for the two alternatives.

Results for marine mammals and sea turtles are presented in Tables J-1 through J-4.

Table J-1: Estimated Representative Marine Mammal Exposures from Direct Strike of a High-Energy Laser by Area and Alternative in a Single Year

Mariana Islands Range Complex		
	Alternative 1	**Alternative 2**
Humpback	0.000000	0.000000
Sei whale	0.000000	0.000000
Fin whale	0.000000	0.000000
Blue whale	0.000000	0.000000
Sperm whale	0.000001	0.000001
Pantropical Spotted Dolphin	0.000001	0.000001

Table J-2: Estimated Representative Sea Turtle Exposures from Direct Strike of a High-Energy Laser by Area and Alternative in a Single Year

Mariana Islands Range Complex		
	Alternative 1	**Alternative 2**
Green Sea Turtle	0.000025	0.000027

Table J-3: Estimated Representative Marine Mammal Exposures from Direct Strike of Military Expended Materials by Area and Alternative in a Single Year

Mariana Islands Range Complex		
	Alternative 1	**Alternative 2**
Humpback	0.000024	0.000028
Sei whale	0.000008	0.000009
Fin whale	0.000002	0.000002
Blue whale	0.000001	0.000002
Sperm whale	0.000030	0.000035
Pantropical spotted Dolphin	0.000560	0.000660

Table J-4: Estimated Representative Sea Turtle Exposures from Direct Strike of Military Expended Materials by Area and Alternative in a Single Year

Mariana Islands Range Complex		
	Alternative 1	**Alternative 2**
Green Sea Turtle	0.002620	0.003087

REFERENCES

U.S. Department of the Navy. (2017). *Quantifying Acoustic Impacts on Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles: Methods and Analytical Approach for Phase III Training and Testing* (Technical Report prepared by Space and Naval Warfare Systems Center Pacific). San Diego, CA: Naval Undersea Warfare Center.

Appendix K: Public Comment Responses

Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/ Overseas Environmental Impact Statement Mariana Islands Training and Testing

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPENDIX K PUBLIC COMMENT RESPONSES K-1

K.1 Introduction K-1

K.2 Public Comment Period for the Draft Supplemental Environmental/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement K-1

K.2.1 Commenters, Comments and Responses K-1

K.2.1.1 Comment Response Process K-1

K.2.1.2 Agency, Organization and Private Individual Comment Organization K-2

K.3 Comment Responses K-2

List of Figures

There are no figures in this appendix.

List of Tables

Table K-1: Response to Comments from Local Agencies – Elected Officials

Table K-2: Response to Comments from Federal Agencies

Table K-3: Response to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations

Table K-4: Response to Comments from Individuals

This page intentionally left blank.

APPENDIX K PUBLIC COMMENT RESPONSES

This appendix includes public comments on the Mariana Islands Training and Testing (MITT) Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS/OEIS) and the Navy's responses to those comments.

K.1 INTRODUCTION

The Navy would like to thank the elected officials, federal regulatory and local resource agencies, business and community leaders, organizations, and individuals for reviewing the MITT Draft SEIS/OEIS, attending the public meetings, and submitting comments. Public involvement is an essential aspect of the environmental impact review process.

K.2 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD FOR THE DRAFT SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL/OVERSEAS ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The Draft SEIS/OEIS public review and comment period began with issuance of the Notice of Public Meetings (84 Federal Register [FR] 677) on January 31, 2019, and the Notice of Availability (84 FR 1119) on February 1, 2019, in the *Federal Register*. A Notice of Rescheduled Public Meetings and Extension of Public Comment Period was published in the *Federal Register* (84 FR 8515) on March 8, 2019. A Notice of Extension of Public Comment Period was published in the *Federal Register* (84 FR 12239) on April 1, 2019. The public comment period began on February 1, 2019, and concluded on April 17, 2019. The Navy made significant efforts to notify the public by distributing letters, postcards, press releases, and newspaper display advertisements to maximize public participation (see Chapter 8, Public Involvement and Distribution).

The Notice of Public Meetings included a project description, dates and locations of the four public meetings, and commenting information. The public was able to learn more about the project, review the Draft SEIS/OEIS, and submit comments during the public comment period (Appendix B, Federal Register Notices). The Draft SEIS/OEIS was available on the project website for review. Printed copies of the Draft SEIS/OEIS were provided to five libraries in Guam and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. Navy representatives were available during the open house public meetings to provide information and answer questions. Comment sheets and a voice recorder were available to attendees. Commenters provided their input on the Draft SEIS/OEIS in letters submitted through mail, written comments received at the public meetings, and via the project website.

K.2.1 COMMENTERS, COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

This section contains four tables containing the Navy responses associated with the comments from local agencies and elected officials (Table K-1), federal agencies (Table K-2), nongovernmental organizations (Table K-3), and individuals (Table K-4).

K.2.1.1 Comment Response Process

The Navy considered and responded to all comments received on the Draft SEIS/OEIS, as detailed in this Final SEIS/OEIS. The Navy's responses to comments received during the public comment period are included in this Appendix. In accordance with 40 Code of Federal Regulations 1503.4, comments were assessed and responded to as follows:

- The Navy project team carefully reviewed all comments received. Each comment was assigned to a resource-specific specialist from the Navy's interdisciplinary team.

- Within each comment submittal, substantive comments were identified for consideration of possible updates to the SEIS/OEIS analysis. Generally, substantive comments included questions or comments related to the alternatives analysis and components of the Proposed Action; resource-specific methodology, analysis, or impact conclusions; or the use, adequacy, or accuracy of data used to support the analysis.
- The SEIS/OEIS analysis was updated as warranted.
- Responses to comments were developed based on the above-described comment review and SEIS/OEIS update process. Responses identify, as appropriate, sections of the SEIS/OEIS where revisions were made or details on where additional information is provided within the SEIS/OEIS.

K.2.1.2 Agency, Organization and Private Individual Comment Organization

Throughout the Draft SEIS/OEIS public comment period, a total of 317 unique comments were received. Comments were grouped into four categories (1) local agencies and elected officials, (2) federal agencies, (3) nongovernmental organizations, and (4) individuals. Comments are presented by category, followed by the name of the commenter and organization (if applicable), and the full text of each unique comment.

K.3 COMMENT RESPONSES

Responses to all comments received on the Draft SEIS/OEIS are included in this Appendix. Each table within this Appendix presents the Navy's response to each comment received. All comments received on the Draft SEIS/OEIS are part of the official project record. When applicable, the Navy's analyses were updated based on comments received.

Table K-1: Response to Comments from Local Agencies – Elected Officials

	Comment	Navy Response
Senator Sabina Perez, Office of Senator Perez (OSP), Guam Legislature		
OSP-01	Department of Health and Human Services manuscript was supplied (8 pages long) "Temporary and Permanent Noise-Induced Threshold Shifts: A Review of Basic and Clinical Observations"	Thank you for providing this reference. The Navy has reviewed and incorporated the best available science on the hearing sensitivity of marine species, which is more relevant to the analysis presented in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS than the submitted manuscript that reviewed basic and clinical observations on threshold shifts in humans.
Senator Therese Terlaje, Office of Senator Therese Terlaje (OST), Guam Legislature		
OST-01	**Introduction & Background** The following comments are submitted by Senator Therese Terlaje, Chairperson of the Committee on Health, Tourism, Historic Preservation, Land and Justice for the 35th Guam Legislature regarding the 2019 draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) to the 2015 Mariana Islands Training and Testing (MITT) Final EIS. Many fundamental concerns raised previously on the 2015 MITT and in the Scoping Period for the 2019 SEIS remain in the current Draft SEIS proposed here. Rather than a point-by-point analysis of the many sections of the SEIS, highlighted here again are the larger context issues that continue to remain significant to our people, environment and everyday livelihood in our region. While the 2019 MITT Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS provides key updates to the 2015 MITT FEIS/OEIS, the Navy states "proposed training and testing activities are similar to activities conducted in the Mariana Islands for decades" [https://www.mitt-eis.com; emphasis added]. The justification that these activities have been ongoing for decades does not legitimize these continued actions. While the Navy defines the MITT range as its "Study Area," I object to this way of being imagined, recognized and treated in the area of global geopolitics. As stated in previous comments submitted by this government, the Marianas is our regional living grounds, our	Public involvement is a fundamental aspect of the environmental analysis process, and the Navy welcomes and appreciates the public's participation. The Navy reviewed all comments received during the 45-day scoping period and considered all substantive comments in the preparation of the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Each resource section within this Supplemental EIS/OEIS presents a summary of the scoping comments and responses to the issues raised. In addition, the actual public comments received on the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS and the Navy's responses to those comments are provided in Appendix K (Public Comment Responses). To support the environmental impact analysis, the Navy needed to determine a geographic area within which impacts on resources from the Proposed Action and alternatives were analyzed. Under NEPA, the term "Study Area" is used to define the boundary of the area of analysis included in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Navy's analysis is focused on the Mariana Islands Training and Testing (MITT) EIS/OEIS Study Area (Study Area), which is defined as: (1) the Mariana Islands Range Complex, (2) additional areas on the high seas, and (3) a transit corridor between the Mariana Islands Range Complex and the Hawaii Range Complex. The supplement to the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS supports ongoing and future training and testing activities conducted at sea and on Farallon de Medinilla (FDM) within the Study Area beyond 2020. The activities

	Comment	Navy Response
	ancestral habitat for centuries before it ever became a study area for military testing and training, and it is our intent to maintain it as such for our generation now and in the future.	analyzed are largely a continuation of the activities previously analyzed. This Supplemental EIS/OEIS: (1) includes the analysis of activities at sea and on FDM necessary to meet readiness requirements beyond 2020 and into the reasonably foreseeable future; (2) includes any changes to those activities previously analyzed, and (3) reflects the most up-to-date compilation of training and testing activities deemed necessary to accomplish military readiness requirements.
OST-02	The hallmark of self-determination must be the safeguarding of a non-self-governing people's right to its own natural resources and the right to participate freely in any decision-making concerning those limited resources. It is also critically important in this time of climate change that Guam, a small island, be allowed to protect its existing resources that will increase the absorption of carbon dioxide, increase the protection of shores against rising tides, and maintain its biodiversity as a hope for the future wellness and economic independence of its community. Studies have found over 100 contaminated sites on Guam. Almost all of these are from U.S. military activity and dumping, and result in the people of Guam's continued exposure to many cancer-causing agents, including radiation from nuclear testing, Agent Orange, and polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs). One third of Guam that the U.S. military controls and uses for its continued activity, expansion, and nuclear storage, includes areas above the aquifer, adjacent to the fresh water lake, and along the coast, while designated cleanup sites are ignored. Guam has sought but been denied in U.S. compensation programs for radiation exposure despite high levels of cancer rates and findings by the Board on Radiation Effects Research (BRER) Committee that the people of Guam were exposed as downwinders of the U.S. nuclear testing in the Marshall Islands from 1945 to	The Navy recognizes the concern regarding past actions and takes environmental stewardship and our responsibility to the community very seriously. Many of the actions mentioned in the comment are not associated with the ongoing and proposed training and testing activities for this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, which occur at sea and on FDM. The analysis presented in Section 3.13 (Public Health and Safety) indicates that proposed training and testing activities would not impact public health and safety. The proposed Live-Fire Training Range Complex is not part of this Proposed Action. For more information about the proposed Live-Fire Training Range Complex, please visit www.guambuildupeis.us. Protecting marine life and marine habitats is important to the Navy. Using the latest science and technology, the Navy completed extensive analyses and computer-based modeling to determine impacts and develop science-based protective measures to reduce or avoid potential impacts on marine life. All potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Also, as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), the Navy implements, to the maximum extent practicable, procedural and geographic mitigation measures during its training and testing activities to reduce potential impacts on marine life. This Supplemental EIS/OEIS is the third Navy analysis and the third time NMFS has promulgated incidental take regulations pursuant to the MMPA relating to military readiness activities in the MITT Study Area (see 85 FR

	Comment	Navy Response
	1962. Similarly, the U.S. denies Agent Orange use on Guam during the war despite the accounts of military personnel admitting to staging, transporting, and spraying the herbicide on Guam. In addition to the establishment of the Mariana Islands Range Complex (MIRC) and the MITT ranges, the U.S. military is underway in its establishment of a Live-Fire Training Range Complex (LFTRC) on Guam near Ritidian/Litekyan, the site of a 3500-year-old ancient village. The Live-Fire Training Range requires the removal of approximately 187 acres of some of the last remaining primary limestone forests, and the habitat for several endangered species found only in Guam and within the CNMI. Pursuant to the 2015 MITT, the National Marine Fisheries Service permitted 12,580 detonations of various magnitudes per year for 5 years, 81,962 takings of 26 different marine mammal species (including whales and dolphins) per year for 5 years, damage or kill of over 6 square miles of endangered coral reefs plus an additional 20 square miles of coral reef around FDM through the use of highly explosive bombs, and that live fire or sonar activity be conducted 365 days a year for 5 years. This excessive authorization to take, or harm, mammals is unjustified and negatively impacts Guam's ability to preserve its environment, and to benefit from the diversity of species and the potential of these natural resources. The LFTRC expands the military footprint over a current wildlife refuge and cuts off public access to the people of Guam for 273 days out of the 365 days of the year. The building of U.S. military bases and infrastructure has placed a high demand for cliffside property best suitable for quarrying and mining of limestone. The history, the values, and prosperity of indigenous CHamorus are uniquely tied to the land, landscape and ecosystems of Guam.	5872). As indicated by this science-based analysis and monitoring results, and as the previous findings from NMFS have confirmed, with implementation of the Navy's protective mitigation measures, Navy training and testing activities would not have a significant impact on populations of marine mammals inhabiting the MITT Study Area. For details in this regard, see Section 3.4.2 (Environmental Consequences) and Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015). The U.S. Department of Defense takes concerns of the use of Agent Orange very seriously and keeps extensive records of all testing, storage and transport of the substance. The U.S. Department of Defense has searched the records, and there is no indication that Agent Orange was used, stored, or shipped through Guam. While the compound 2, 4-D is one of the components of Agent Orange, it was also part of the formula of commonly used herbicides that were widely applied throughout the United States until 1985. Joint Region Marianas is cooperating with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and the Government of Guam on sampling and testing efforts.

	Comment	Navy Response
	Undoubtedly, our land and water resources allow us to build a sustainable economy, health, cultural practices, and overall quality of life and provide our greatest insurance to withstand climate change, However, as outlined here, our lands and waters are increasingly blocked from access, and under threat of contamination and destruction of habitat. It should be made clear, the indigenous people of Guam have never freely agreed nor requested, voted, or negotiated that our land and waters be subjected to radiation, nuclear waste, PCBs, Agent Orange, Agent Purple, and other contamination; or that our fishing grounds and farmlands and ocean resources be taken away or restricted; or that homes be relocated; or that firing ranges be built over or adjacent to ancient villages and sacred burial grounds, all in support of U.S. military testing or military training.	
OST-03	**Concerns & Key points** 1. Cumulative Impacts - Per NEPA and CEQ regulations, "The range of actions that must be considered includes not only the project proposal but all connected and similar actions that could contribute to cumulative effects. Specifically, NEPA requires that all related actions be addressed in the same analysis (CEQ Publications, Cumulative Effects, https://ceq.doe.gov/publications/cumulative_effects.html; CEQ Considering Cumulative Effects Under the NEPA (Council on Environmental Quality, 1997). Comment: Given this, cumulative impacts/effects of the Proposed Action must also take into account past and current actions that include the cumulative effects of radiation, nuclear waste, PCBs, Agent Orange, Agent Purple, and other contamination; or that our fishing grounds and farmlands and ocean resources be taken away or restricted; or that homes be relocated; or that firing ranges be built over or adjacent to ancient villages and sacred burial grounds	The Navy used the best available science and conducted a comprehensive review of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable actions to develop a robust analysis of cumulative impacts (Chapter 4, Cumulative Impacts). As required under NEPA, the level and scope of the analysis are commensurate with the potential impacts of the action as reflected in the resource-specific discussions in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences). The Navy considered proposed and ongoing activities alongside other activities in the region whose impacts are truly meaningful to the analysis, as noted in the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) publication *Considering Cumulative Effects Under the National Environmental Policy Act*. Furthermore, the entire Supplemental EIS/OEIS provides the cumulative impacts analysis, not just Chapter 4. Chapter 3 provides the current effects of past and present impacts and environmental conditions that represent baseline environmental conditions; Chapter 3 also discusses the consequences or potential future impacts from Navy activities. Chapter 4 discusses other reasonably foreseeable activities to the extent they are known and the

	Comment	Navy Response
	– all of these in addition to the impact of global climate change in our region.	incremental impact of the Navy's proposal when added to past, present, and future impacts. Past actions involving contamination such as radiation and nuclear waste are beyond the geographic and temporal scope of the cumulative effects analysis. As noted above, Chapter 3 represents the baseline of the environment and considers the actions that have affected the resources in the past.
OST-04	2. Global climate change is outlined in Table 4.2-1: Past, Present, and Reasonably Foreseeable Actions: Predictions of long-term negative environmental impacts, some of which have begun to occur at present, due to climate change include sea level rise; changes in ocean surface temperature, acidity/alkalinity, and salinity; changing weather patterns with increases in the severity of storms and droughts; changes to local and regional ecosystems (including the potential loss of species); shrinking glaciers and sea ice; thawing permafrost; a longer growing season; and shifts in plant and animal ranges, fecundity, and productivity. A special report by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change discussed the long-term warming trend observed since pre-industrial times (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, 2018), and how higher than the global annual average temperatures are being experienced in many land regions and seasons, (4.0 Cumulative Impacts, page 4-20). Comment/question: Both Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 indicate "new at-sea activities," currently ongoing activities, an "increase in tempo of some training and testing activities, including additional Fleet exercises and associated unit-level activities." How do these actions contribute to long-term negative environmental impacts on our region, including rise in sea levels, changes in ocean surface temperature, acidity/alkalinity, and salinity, changing weather patterns with increases in the severity of storms and droughts;	The Navy's analysis shows greenhouse gas emissions would increase from the baseline by approximately 20 percent under Alternatives 1 and 2. Since greenhouse gases are relevant in a global scope, they are analyzed based on the extent to which they would contribute to climate change. Implementation of Alternative 2 would generate approximately 0.0133 percent of the U.S. annual greenhouse gas emissions, which is less than a 0.0025 percent increase from baseline contributions. This minor increase is not expected to significantly affect the global climate. Therefore, the analysis indicates the Proposed Action would not significantly contribute to long-term negative environmental impacts in the region. For more information about the analysis, please see Section 3.2 (Air Quality), Chapter 4 (Cumulative Impacts), and Chapter 6 (Additional Regulatory Considerations).

	Comment	Navy Response
	changes to local and regional ecosystems (including potential loss of species); and shifts in plant and animal ranges, fecundity, and productivity?	
OST-05	3. Seismic surveys/Use of sonar: Waters near the Study Area in the Territory of Guam and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. Seismic surveys are typically accomplished by towing a sound source, such as an airgun array that emits acoustic energy in timed intervals behind a research vessel. The transmitted acoustic energy is reflected and received by an array of hydrophones. This acoustic information is processed to provide information about geological structure below the seafloor. The oil and gas industry uses seismic surveys to search for new hydrocarbon deposits. Also, academic geologists use them to study plate tectonics and other topics. The underwater sound produced by these surveys could affect marine life, including marine mammals. For example, the potential exists to expose some animals to sound levels exceeding 180 decibels referenced to 1 micropascal root mean square, which would in turn potentially result in temporary or permanent loss of hearing (Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, 2011). Comment/question: What is the purpose of the Navy's proposed use of seismic surveys in the waters surrounding the Marianas? Does this relate to the military's plans for mining in our region? While the Navy may have authorizations and processes in place to cause temporary or permanent harm to the ocean environment and marine life, our people for generations historically and culturally, continue to value all aspects of oceanic marine life and ecosystems. This interconnectedness of land, ocean and air is what we depend on for our livelihood and way of being.	The Navy is not proposing to conduct seismic surveys in the waters surrounding the Mariana Islands in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Seismic surveys are included in Table 4.2-1 because the activity is considered in the cumulative effects analysis.

	Comment	Navy Response
OST-06	Additionally, I support the 14 concerns raised by the Guam Department of Agriculture in their submitted comments and in their testimony during an April 15th public hearing at the Guam Legislature on the impacts of the 2019 MITT on endangered species' and marine mammals' habitat, marine preserves, accessibility to fishermen and other recreational users, and a lack of updated and accessible data regarding marine mammal standings and takes (deaths) in the proposed study area. A biologist of the Fisheries Section of the Guam Department of Agriculture further stated, "sonar, vessel interactions, explosive detonation in the water, all of these have the potential to impact marine mammals. One of the concerns from the EIS is that for all of the marine mammals that are mentioned, I don't think there's a single one that has the most current information available listed with it. We have information on strandings, on sightings, on whales sighted giving birth that were not mentioned in the EIS anywhere. And I'm not certain where that information was gotten from, but all of this information that was provided to our federal partners as well as that we have available, was not mentioned in the EIS." He also stated, "We do have additional stranding records. We have additional records of marine mammals identified giving birth in the region. One of particular concern is the mention of the Agat offshore mine detonation site. That's almost precisely where we have photographic evidence of sperm whales giving birth which are both marine mammal and endangered species listed organisms. Though it's not listed anywhere in the EIS that incidents like that. Another area of concern is vessel strikes. Vessel strikes with marine mammals are addressed in the EIS but we have a greater incidence of vessel strikes with sea turtles on Guam. We've had at least five sea turtles killed by vessel strike in the last seven years on Guam that we've been able to identify. It's difficult to identify the vessel	The Navy reviewed the best available scientific data and information on marine mammals available at the time the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS was completed and incorporated relevant information into the analysis of impacts on marine mammals in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Peer-reviewed scientific publications are considered to be the most reliable and accurate sources of data and information and were used throughout this Supplemental EIS/OEIS to support the analysis and conclusions. Well-respected and historically vetted government reports (e.g., marine mammals stock assessment reports) were also used to support the analysis. Any newly published data and information relevant to the analysis of potential impacts on marine mammals that has become available since the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS was completed was incorporated into the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS. In addition, Section 3.4.2.1.1.6 (Stranding) has been expanded to include additional information about strandings of beaked whales in the Mariana Islands and the Navy's support of efforts to better understand the causes of marine mammal strandings. The Center for Naval Analysis (CNA) recently conducted a statistical study of correlation of beaked whale strandings around the Mariana Islands with the use of U.S. Navy sonar, finding that insufficient evidence of a correlation exists. The CNA study used the complete record of all U.S. Navy sonar use between 2007 and 2019, including major training events, joint exercises, and unit level training/testing. The analysis also included the complete beaked whale stranding record for the Mariana Islands through 2019. Following the methods in Simonis et al. (2020), the CNA analysis found insufficient evidence of a correlation between sonar use and beaked whale strandings when considering the complete sonar use record. The CNA finding is in contrast to the finding in Simonis et al. (2020), which depicted a significant correlation between beaked whale strandings and Navy sonar use. However, the Simonis et al. (2020) result relied on substantially incomplete or inaccurate assumptions about U.S. Navy sonar use around the Mariana Islands. CNA also conducted statistical analyses specific to each island where beaked whale strandings have been observed in the

	Comment	Navy Response
	that did strike the turtle. Nearly all of these occurred in inner Apra Harbor which is pretty much closed to all activity except military vessel activities. So the implication is that it could be military vessel strikes that are causing the sea turtle mortality.	Mariana Islands, similarly finding insufficient evidence of a correlation to sonar use. Additional information on the findings of the CNA analysis are presented in Section 3.4.2.1.1.6 (Stranding) in Chapter 3.4 (Marine Mammals). As described in Section 5.1.2.2.1 (Marine Species Research and Monitoring Programs), for this Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy agreed to several additional research and monitoring initiatives designed to help advance the understanding of beaked whales and strandings in the MITT Study Area. The Navy will co-fund the Pacific Marine Assessment Program for Protected Species (PACMAPPS) Mariana Islands survey in spring-summer 2021 and future studies starting in 2022 to help document beaked whale occurrence, abundance, and distribution in the Mariana Islands. The Navy will also fund additional stranding response and necropsy analyses for the Pacific Islands region, and research on a framework to improve statistical stranding analysis. Collaboratively with NMFS, the Navy will fund and organize an expert panel to provide recommendations on scientific data gaps and uncertainties for further protective measure consideration to minimize potential impacts of Navy training and testing activities on beaked whales in the Mariana Islands. Recently published information by NMFS indicates that the Mariana Islands is a calving area for humpback whales. In consideration of this, the Navy has proposed in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS geographic mitigation areas at Marpi Reef and Chalan Kanoa Reef off Saipan (see Appendix I, Geographic Mitigation Assessment). The Navy has included mention of the two Associated Press File photographs of a sperm whale calf seen off Agat Marina on June 15, 2001, in the Final MITT EIS/OEIS. This one occurrence, 19 years ago, is the only known occurrence of a sperm whale calf in the Mariana Islands and therefore does not indicate that the waters off Guam or the Mariana Islands are a sperm whale calving location. While it is possible that several species of marine mammals could occur at the Agat

	Comment	Navy Response
		Bay Mine Neutralization Site, the Navy's procedural mitigation measures involving observing for marine mammals and sea turtles prior to conducting activities using explosives at the site reduces the likelihood of potential impacts on marine species. Please refer to Chapter 5 (Mitigation) for additional information on the Navy's procedural mitigation measures. This Supplemental EIS/OEIS includes an analysis of potential impacts on sea turtles from physical disturbance and strike stressors (Section 3.5.2.4.1, Impacts from Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors Under Alternative 1; and Section 3.5.2.4.2, Impacts from Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors Under Alternative 2 [Preferred Alternative]). The Navy is also consulting with NMFS under the ESA regarding the use of vessels and in-water devices, military expended materials, and seafloor devices. During the Navy's consultation process with NMFS, the Navy analyzed the potential for ship strikes to occur, with special emphasis on Apra Harbor (where most ship movements occur). Although considered extremely rare, a ship strike of a sea turtle cannot be wholly discounted and would result in take, as defined under the ESA. Accordingly, the Navy has requested authorization pursuant with the ESA and has updated the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS with measures to reduce the takes resulting from ship strikes. The Navy's analysis of other physical disturbances and strike stressors determined these activities would not adversely affect sea turtles.
OST-07	Another area in the EIS is mentioned… a large area to southeast of Guam Whiskey 517 is an area it was mentioned. It was very closely related to some offshore fishing banks where we documented a fair amount of fishing activity. In the last two years those banks have been off-limits about 120 days, an average for the last two years which is about a third of the year for activity and primarily for fishing activity. Now they do fall just outside the range that is delineated but we've had fishermen report that when they get down to the banks there are military vessels that are telling them to	As stated in the comment, it is correct that, with the exception of a portion of White Tuna Banks, these important fishing banks are outside W-517. The Navy does not restrict access to Galvez Bank or Santa Rosa Reef. Mariners near Galvez Bank or Santa Rosa Reef may be warned of their proximity to W-517 or asked not to enter W-517 as a precautionary measure. When certain activities are planned, the Navy publishes notices to mariners for public safety and to help water users plan accordingly to avoid temporarily restricted areas. As specified in Title 33 CFR Subpart 72.01, Notices to Mariners, the U.S. Coast Guard issues information to the public concerning maritime navigation. When notices to mariners are

	Comment	Navy Response
	not enter while activities are going on even though they're outside the area." [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qDmKc1hr8w4]	issued, the restriction is not necessarily for a full 24-hour period because many training activities last less than a full day. Additionally, nautical charts issued by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration include these federally designated zones and areas. Operators of recreational and commercial vessels have a duty to abide by maritime regulations administered by the U.S. Coast Guard. The Navy will continue to communicate closures to the public and fishing community, including using Facebook. The Navy will continue to work with the fishing community to improve communication.
OST-08	4. Per Resource-Specific Cumulative Impacts: By CEQ guidance (Council on Environmental Quality, 1997), the following cumulative impacts analysis focuses on impacts that are "truly meaningful." The level of analysis for each resource is commensurate with the intensity of the impacts identified in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) and the level to which impacts from the Proposed Action are expected to mingle with impacts from existing activities. A full analysis of potential cumulative impacts is provided for marine mammals, sea turtles, and marine invertebrates. The rationale is also provided for an abbreviated analysis of the following resources: sediments and water quality, air quality, marine habitats, marine birds, marine vegetation, fishes, cultural resources, terrestrial species and habitats, socioeconomic resources, and public health and safety. Comment: Let the record show that the focus on "impacts that are truly meaningful" by the CEQ privileges the missions of the DoD and is not truly meaningful and commensurate with the historical and cultural experience of war in the region of the indigenous Chamoru people.	See above response (OST-03) regarding the cumulative impact analysis. Each biological resource section includes an analysis of secondary stressors and their potential impacts on a biological resource. Within these secondary stressor analyses in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS, discussions of the fate and transport of specific chemicals with references to chemical properties of munitions and munitions constituents are included. Marine debris is also addressed in the cumulative chapter and as part of the affected environment discussions within each biological resource section. In addition, munitions, munitions constituents, and other substances and materials are discussed in more detail in Section 3.1 (Sediments and Water Quality). This Supplemental EIS/OEIS, as well as the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, include discussion of the fate and transport of specific chemicals with references to chemical properties of munitions and munitions constituents.
OST-09	Additionally, I support the concerns of the Guam Coastal Management Program of the Bureau of Statistics and Plans in their submitted comments and in their testimony during an April 15th	The Navy submitted a Consistency Determination (CD) to the Bureau of Statistics and Plans (BSP) in December 2019 addressing proposed military training and testing activities that may affect Guam's coastal zone and coastal uses. The consistency determination was prepared in accordance

	Comment	Navy Response
	public hearing at the Guam Legislature on the impacts of detonations of the 2019 MITT on the coastal zones of Guam. The administrator for the Guam Coastal Management Program stated, "we want to ensure that military expended material will not pose contamination threats as material breaks down. This is not only a direct impact as the detonation occurs but any particles that may be consumed by organisms that can affect the food chain. We're not looking at just the moment but what could happen after the activity takes place. We are concerned about any kind of seafloor detonations within our coastal zone and this doesn't matter if there's no corals on hard bottom or substrates. With or without the presence of coral we know that the hard bottom substrate is an important area where coral polyps can settle and we want to be sure that that habitat is protected." [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qDmKc1hr8w4	with Guam's Procedures Guide for Achieving Federal Consistency with the Guam Coastal Management Program (Bureau of Statistics and Plans May 2011). BSP's response to the Navy's CD (dated March 6, 2020) can be found in Appendix C (Agency Correspondence). The Navy is in discussions with BSP in order resolve any differences and reach an agreement regarding the Navy's compliance with Guam's Coastal Management Program to the maximum extent practicable. The outcome of these discussions will be included in the ROD. The Navy has engaged with the Guam Coastal Management Program throughout the development of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, including meeting with staff during the scoping phase and notifying the program director when the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS was made available for public review and comment. The Navy has engaged with the Guam Coastal Management Program throughout the development of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, including meeting with staff during the scoping phase and notifying the program director when the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS was made available for public review and comment. This Supplemental EIS/OEIS describes actions that disturb benthic habitats occurring in designated/discrete areas (e.g., designated Apra Harbor underwater detonation sites). Overall as described in Section 3.3 (Marine Habitats) and Section 3.7 (Marine Vegetation) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Proposed Action would affect marine habitat structure in the Study Area, but underwater detonation activities would occur in areas that have been previously disturbed, and most impacts would be localized. The Proposed Action is not expected to result in detectable changes to seagrass growth, survival, or propagation; and is not expected to result in population-level impacts. The Navy's standard operating procedures will benefit seagrass in the Study Area by minimizing potential disturbances in areas with seagrass.

	Comment	Navy Response
OST-10	5. Per sections on Sediments and Water Quality, Air Quality, the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, indicated that training and testing activities under each alternative could result in local, short- and long-term changes in sediment and water quality. However, chemical, physical, or biological changes remained within standards, regulations, and guidelines. The short-term impacts arose from explosions and the byproducts of explosions and combusted propellants. The analysis in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS determined that it was unlikely that these short-term impacts would overlap in time and space with other future actions that produce similar constituents. Therefore, the short- term impacts did not contribute to cumulative impacts [emphasis added]. The long-term impacts arose from unexploded ordnance, non-combusted propellant, metals, and other materials. Long-term impacts of each alternative are cumulative with other actions that cause increases in similar constituents. However, the contribution of Alternative 1 or Alternative 2 in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS to long-term cumulative impacts was determined to be negligible [emphasis added] because of the following: - Most training and testing activities are widely dispersed in space and time. - Where activities are concentrated (i.e., Farallon de Medinilla [FDM]), marine habitat conditions observed over multiple years through dive studies indicate that ecological services that maintain water quality have not been inhibited at FDM. - Most components of expended materials are inert or corrode slowly. - Numerically, most of the metals expended are small- and medium-caliber projectiles, metals of concern comprise a small portion of the alloys used in expended materials, and metal corrosion is a slow process that allows for dilution.	Both this Supplemental EIS/OEIS and the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS include an analysis of potential impacts from metals and contaminants as a result of military training and testing activities on marine resources. This analysis is presented in Section 3.1.2.2 (Metals), Section 3.4.2.7 (Secondary Stressors), Section 3.5.2.7 (Secondary Stressors), Section 3.7.2.3 (Secondary Stressors), Section 3.8.2.7 (Secondary Stressors), and Section 3.9.2.7 (Secondary Stressors). Based on the analysis presented in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS and the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, the Navy concluded that all levels of metals, chemicals, and other byproducts would be either below detectable levels or at levels below existing standards, regulations, and guidelines. This Supplemental EIS/OEIS, as well as the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, include discussion of the fate and transport of specific chemicals with references to chemical properties of munitions and munitions constituents. In summary, the Navy's analysis concludes that no federal or local guidelines would be exceeded because of the following reasons: (1) rapid and natural degradation of substances (e.g., munitions constituents and other chemicals), and (2) localized concentrations where impact would occur. These conclusions are based on evidence gathered on other military ranges in similar environments (e.g., Vieques), as well as legacy dump site studies conducted off the coast of Oahu. These studies are summarized in Section 3.1 (Sediments and Water Quality). Although binding to sediments is one possible outcome (e.g., for PCBs), other chemical pollutants behave differently. For example, when metals are exposed to seawater, they begin to slowly corrode, a process that creates a layer of corroded material between the seawater and uncorroded metal. This layer of corrosion removes the metal from direct exposure to the corrosiveness of seawater, a process that further slows movement of the metals into the adjacent sediments and water column. This is particularly true for aluminum. Elevated levels of metals in

	Comment	Navy Response
	- Most of the components are subject to a variety of physical, chemical, and biological processes that render them benign. - Potential areas of impacts would be limited to small zones immediately adjacent to the explosive, metals, or chemicals other than explosives. Under this SEIS/OEIS, the contribution of proposed changes in training and testing activities under Alternative 1 or Alternative 2 would still be negligible based on the reasons presented above. While all of the additional projects since 2015 may be measurable and result in long-term and widespread changes in environmental conditions (e.g., nutrient loading, turbidity, salinity, or pH), any changes in sediment and water quality would be subject to applicable standards and guidelines. Given that impacts on water quality as a result of the proposed training and testing activities would be *considered negligible*, the incremental contribution to cumulative impacts on water quality would also be *negligible* [emphasis added]. Regarding Air Quality, the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS indicated that training and testing activities conducted under each alternative resulted in increased criteria pollutant emissions and hazardous air pollutant emissions throughout the Study Area. Sources of the emissions included vessels and aircraft and, to a lesser extent, munitions. Potential impacts included localized and temporarily elevated pollutant concentrations; *however, recovery occurs quickly as emissions disperse* [emphasis added]. The analysis in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS concluded that the impacts of Alternatives 1 or 2 were cumulative with other actions that involve criteria air pollutant and hazardous air pollutant emissions. However, the incremental contributions, from implementing activities in accordance with the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS Record of Decision (ROD), to cumulative impacts were low for the following reasons:	sediments would be restricted to a small zone around the metal, and any release to the overlying water column would be diluted and influenced by mixing and diffusion. There are studies regarding bioaccumulation in the Mariana Archipelago that were used in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and this Supplemental EIS (see Section 3.1.2.2, Metals). There are also several studies in other jurisdictions cited in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS concerning metals deposition in the marine environment in waters off of military training ranges (see Section 3.1.3.2.3, Impacts from Metals). The Navy reviewed these quantitative analyses of military munitions over a period of decades. This Supplemental EIS/OEIS discusses multiple studies off of Vieques Island in Puerto Rico, Pamlico Sound in North Carolina, and a Canadian military site (Canadian Forces Maritime Experimental and Test Ranges near Nanoose Bay, British Columbia) for lead and lithium (see Section 3.1.1.1.4, Farallon de Medinilla). Information on impacts on sediments and water quality from munitions at two additional sites, one in Hawaii and one in the Potomac River in Maryland, where military munitions have resided for decades, have been added to the section. This Supplemental EIS/OEIS also includes information that suggests that the majority of concerns regarding bioaccumulation are associated with urban coastal environments with specific point source and non-point source contributors of pollutants. The studies concerning military sites suggest that metals exposed to seawater are of less concern because of decreased bioavailability. The Navy applies federal and state water quality standards where applicable. Residual concentrations of contaminants resulting from Navy training and testing activities are provided in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. In the 2010 Mariana Island Range Complex (MIRC) EIS/OEIS, it was noted that, "The CNMI Senate requested the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) on February 19, 2008 to conduct a public health assessment on FDM of toxic substances released by bombs and the

	Comment	Navy Response
	- Most training and testing activities-related emissions are projected to occur at distances greater than 3 nautical miles (NM) from shore. - Few stationary offshore air pollutant emission sources exist within the Study Area, and few are expected in the foreseeable future. - International regulations by the International Maritime Organization required commercial shipping vessels to switch to lower-sulfur fuel near U.S. and international coasts beginning in 2012 (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration 2011). - The Department of Defense released the Operational Energy Strategy: Implementation Plan, which reduced demand, diversified energy sources, and integrated energy consideration into planning (Department of Defense 2012). Since then, the Navy has released the 2016 Operational Energy Strategy, which builds on the successes of the 2012 Operational Energy Strategy (U.S. Department of Defense, 2016). Under this 2019 draft SEIS/OEIS, the contribution of proposed increases in training and testing activities under Alternative 1 or Alternative 2 would still result in negligible additional impacts [emphasis added] based on the reasons presented above. In addition, the International Maritime Organization is set to impose a new 0.5 percent sulfur cap on marine fuel emissions (International Maritime Organization, 2017). Construction-related activities associated with the additional other projects in the area could generate increased air emissions; however, air quality in the region would remain below *de minimis* levels due to the quick dispersive nature of emissions. Based on the analysis presented in Section 3.2 (Air Quality) of this SEIS/OEIS and the reasons summarized above, the incremental contribution of Alternatives 1 or 2 to cumulative impacts on air quality would be *negligible* [emphasis added].	bioaccumulation of these toxins in consumable pelagic fish." The Agency, in its letter to the CNMI Senate on September 24, 2008, concluded that, "pelagic fish caught in the open water are not likely to contain high levels of explosive residues from the neighboring FDM bombing range and will not pose a public hazard to people who eat them." The conclusion is supported by the Agency's "Preliminary Assessment of Pelagic Fish Caught in the Open Pacific" (ATSDR 2008). Please refer to Section 3.8.2.7 (Secondary Stressors) of the Invertebrates Section of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS (Section 3.8) for the analysis of potential indirect impacts on marine invertebrates, including the topic of bioaccumulation. As stated in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, indirect impacts of explosives and unexploded ordnance on marine invertebrates via water are likely to be negligible and not detectable because most explosives and explosive degradation products have very low solubility in sea water, have low concentration of byproducts, are slowly delivered into the water column, and are readily diluted to non-harmful concentrations. The Navy analyzed the potential impacts on air quality; the results of the analysis are presented in Section 3.2 (Air Quality) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Military training and testing activities would result in minor, local emissions of air pollutants. However, these emissions would not impact public health. Changes to air quality from air pollutants are not expected to be detectable. This conclusion is consistent with the analysis and findings presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. The analysis shows greenhouse gas emissions would increase from the baseline by approximately 20 percent under Alternatives 1 and 2. Since greenhouse gases are relevant in a global scope, they are analyzed based on the extent to which they would contribute to climate change. Implementation of Alternative 2 would generate approximately 0.0133 percent of the U.S. annual greenhouse gas emissions, which is less than a 0.0025 percent increase from baseline contributions. This minor increase

	Comment	Navy Response
	In addition to the cumulative effects of criteria and hazardous air pollutants, greenhouse gas emissions would increase under the Proposed Action. Greenhouse gases contribute to climate change, which are felt on a global scale, rather than having localized affects. Although the Proposed Action would result in an increase in greenhouse gas emissions, the Secretary of the Navy has released energy goals that aim to reduce the overall impact that the department has on climate change. Some of those goals involve using alternative energy sources for 50 percent of total consumption needs by 2020, having 50 percent of Navy and Marine Corps installations be net-zero emissions by 2020, and reducing petroleum use in the commercial fleet by 50 percent. These activities would more than offset the small increase in greenhouse gas emissions that would result from the implementation of Alternative 1 or 2. Comment: The negligible short-term and long-term cumulative impacts outlined are dismissive of many of the unresolved issues that our islands continue face, especially with regard to high rates of rare cancers, skin disorders, respiratory issues and heart disease. There is a kind of injustice in having to read through actions and impacts deemed negligible and minimal given that we have seen and continue to see the cumulative ill-impacts of military actions on our environment, in effect, on the livelihood of our people.	is not expected to significantly affect the global climate. Therefore, the analysis indicates the Proposed Action would not significantly contribute to long-term negative environmental impacts in the region. For more information about the analysis, please see Section 3.2 (Air Quality), Chapter 4 (Cumulative Impacts), and Chapter 6 (Additional Regulatory Considerations). The Navy is committed to protecting marine life by employing mitigation measures when training or testing using active sonar or explosives; working with regulatory agencies; and furthering our understanding of marine mammals through research and monitoring. As part of their compliance with the MMPA and ESA the Navy conducts extensive monitoring and data collection. Within the Study Area, the Navy has sponsored several monitoring projects to better understand marine mammal and sea turtle distribution and habitat use, and to assess the presence of corals and ESA-listed species at FDM. The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring Program website provides access to reports, documentation, data, and updates on current monitoring projects. Information on current monitoring projects, technical reports, conference presentations, and data are available at www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us. Additional information is also available in Section 5.1.2.2 (Monitoring, Research, and Reporting Initiatives) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The diseases mentioned by the comment, such as rare cancers, skin disorders, respiratory issues, and heart disease, have not been linked to military training and testing activities.
OST-11	Additionally, I support the 12 concerns raised by the Guam Environmental Protection Agency in their submitted comments and in their testimony during an April 15th public hearing at the Guam Legislature regarding the lack of data on cumulative impacts of the 2015 MITT on the environment on Guam, the lack of details in how the 2019 MITT intends to meet all of the requirements of Guam	As discussed in Section 5.1.2.2 (Monitoring, Research, and Reporting Initiatives), the Navy developed its reporting requirements in conjunction with NMFS to be consistent with mission requirements and balance the usefulness of the information to be collected with the practicality of collecting it. The Navy's training and testing activity reports and incident

	Comment	Navy Response
	Environmental Protection Agency rules and regulations during the permitting process, and the lack of discussion regarding the environmental impact of previously used ammunition and/or degradation products on the marine ecosystem in the proposed study area. The administrator of the Guam EPA's Environmental Monitoring and Analytical Services stated, "At minimum, a yearly report should be produced summarizing all activities identified in the MITT. There is no current mechanism to evaluate if the activities and quantities identified in the MITT are met or exceeded. Report should also address any impacts to stressor types." Additionally, he states, "Neither the 2015 MITT nor the 2019 Supplemental MITT have a discussion on the rational for an increase from a 10 lbs. underwater mine charge to the new standard of a 20 lbs. charge for the listed mine detonation activities. What is the justification for the increase? This needs to be further explained and justified." [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qDmKc1hr8w4]	reports are designed to verify implementation of mitigation; comply with current permits, authorizations, and consultation requirements; and improve future environmental analyses. The Navy reports to NMFS if mitigation was implemented during sinking exercises (e.g., number of times explosive detonations were delayed due to marine mammal sightings). For major training exercises, the Navy's annual training and testing activity reports include information on each individual marine mammal sighting related to mitigation implementation. In the unlikely event that a vessel strike of a marine mammal should occur, the Navy would provide NMFS with relevant information pertaining to the incident, including but not limited to vessel speed. Additional reporting would be ineffective for the reasons detailed in Section 5.6.7 (Reporting Requirements). The Navy is obligated under the ESA and MMPA to provide information on any incidents involving ESA-listed species. Therefore, the Navy will continue to submit the appropriate reports to NMFS immediately, or as soon as operational security considerations allow, if it observes an incident that is or may be attributable to Navy activities, including (1) a vessel strike of a marine mammal or sea turtle during training or testing; (2) a stranded, injured, or dead marine mammal or sea turtle during training or testing; or (3) an injured or dead marine mammal, sea turtle, or ESA-listed fish species during post-explosive activity monitoring. The proposed training and testing activities in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS are needed to achieve and maintain military readiness within the Study Area. This includes the use of underwater mine charges up to 20 pounds (lb.) at the Agat underwater detonation site. Certain mine neutralization measures require the use of larger charges to ensure the efficacy of the technique and procedures trained to. While occurrence of this event will be infrequent, the capability to conduct this type of event was included in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and is reanalyzed in this supplement. Underwater detonation activities at Apra Harbor and Piti would remain a

	Comment	Navy Response
		charge of 10 lb. The increase to 20 lb. at the Agat underwater detonation site was included in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and had not changed in the 2019 Supplemental Draft EIS/OEIS. This Supplemental EIS/OEIS furthers the Navy and other military services' execution of their roles and responsibilities under 10 U.S.C. section 5062.
OST-12	6. Per Marine Habitats, the 2019 MITT Supplemental and 2015 MITT Final EIS cite continued detonations at existing underwater detonation areas such as Piti, Agat and Outer Apra Harbor. Comment/question: How long have these areas been deemed underwater detonation areas? What permits continue to authorize the use of these areas as such? When do these permits expire? What are the plans for clean-up of these sites? When can we anticipate full restoration such that marine habitat and ecosystems will be able to flourish once again? What is needed for full restoration to be possible?	The Navy has been conducting training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and this supplement to the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS supports the continuation of that training and testing. Proposed training and testing activities are needed to achieve and maintain military readiness within the Study Area. In this regard, this Supplemental EIS/OEIS furthers the Navy and other military services' execution of their roles and responsibilities under 10 U.S.C. section 5062. Underwater detonation areas are permanently designated safety zones, danger zones, and restricted areas. These areas were designated in accordance with 33 CFR part 165 or 33 CFR part 334. The designation does not expire, and the Navy intends to continue use of the detonation areas to support its mission. The Navy is permitted to conduct underwater detonation activities in accordance with their MMPA and ESA compliance. As discussed above, public notice is provided prior to certain training activities occurring, such as underwater detonations. Restoration of underwater detonation areas is not required as these areas are repeatedly disturbed for this use. Most impacts would be localized, limiting the total area impacted. Soft-bottom substrates of disturbed areas would be expected to recover their previous structure, with the fastest recovery occurring in areas with high waves and tidal energies. Recovery at the Outer Apra Harbor Underwater Detonation site would be expected to be prolonged due to lower tidal and wave energy in the area. Additional information is available in Section 3.3 (Marine Habitats) of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and this Supplemental EIS/OEIS.
OST-13	7. Regarding cumulative effects of all Department of Defense actions in the Mariana Islands, including CNMI Joint Military Training EIS – The CNMI Joint Military Training EIS would establish a	For clarification, the Navy prepared a Supplemental EIS/OEIS, which is not the same as a revised EIS/OEIS. The Mariana Islands Training and Testing

	Comment	Navy Response
	series of live-fire and maneuver ranges and training areas within the CNMI and include amphibious operations on Tinian. The proposed action for the CNMI Joint Military Training EIS is to expand existing ranges and training areas and construct new ranges and training areas within the CNMI. The resources evaluated that could contribute to cumulative impacts include geology and soils, water resources, air quality, noise, airspace, land and submerged land use, recreation, terrestrial biology, marine biology, cultural resources, visual resources, transportation, utilities, socioeconomics and environmental justice, hazardous materials and waste, and public health and safety. The Navy is drafting a revised EIS that would reduce impacts on resources as a result of the proposed action. The analysis of cumulative impacts contained in this chapter addresses cumulative effects of all Department of Defense actions on the Mariana Islands, including the CNMI Joint Military Training EIS. Comment/question: Cumulative impacts for the proposed action, as well as all DoD actions in the Mariana Islands should already be configured in the impact analysis on and for these resources. This is how cumulative impact must be analyzed given that our islands are constantly subjected to DoD proposed actions. Will the revised EIS that would reduce impacts on resources as a result of the proposed action be published in the Final EIS, and will the people of Guam be able to comment on this?	Supplemental EIS/OEIS is a separate action from the CNMI Joint Military Training (CJMT) EIS/OEIS. Chapter 4 (Cumulative Impacts) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS includes the analysis of cumulative impacts for each resource addressed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences). Other proposed Department of Defense actions in Guam and the CNMI, including the CJMT EIS/OEIS, are included in the cumulative impacts analysis. See above response (OST-03) regarding the cumulative impact analysis. As part of the NEPA process, the Navy considered and responded to all public comments received on the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS in Appendix K (Public Comment Responses) of the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Any substantive public comments the Navy receives on the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS would be reviewed and addressed in the Record of Decision.
OST-14	8. Regarding cumulative impact on reduced fishing access, recreational fishing, commercial fishing and transport between the Mariana Islands from the restricted areas – Access to certain areas of the Study Area around islands and in the open ocean is temporarily restricted during potentially hazardous training and testing activities to ensure the safety of the public and military personnel. Danger zones may result from other Department of	The health and safety of the public is of utmost importance to the Navy. The Navy trains and conducts tests in a manner that is compatible with civilian activities. The Navy is not proposing a change to the ocean areas currently used by both the Navy and the public in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Restrictions on accessing areas of co-use would continue to be relatively infrequent and short-term, while other fishing and tourism sites in the Study Area would continue to be available to the public.

	Comment	Navy Response
	Defense actions in Guam and the Mariana Islands such as the Guam and Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands Military Relocation and CNMI Joint Military Training. These other actions would occur mainly on land and around Tinian. As a result of the training and testing activities associated with this SEIS/OEIS, areas within 3 NM of FDM are permanently restricted to maintain public safety. Even when hazardous activities are not occurring at FDM, the potential occurrence of unexploded ordnance in waters surrounding the island is a constant threat to public safety. Transiting between Guam, Saipan, Tinian, or other islands located to the south of FDM and the Islands Unit (Northern Mariana Islands) would potentially be impacted by limiting access to the 12 NM danger zone around FDM. Considering that an average of 3.8 trips per year has occurred over the past 30 years (as stated in Section 3.12.3, Public Scoping Comments), the probability of military activities interfering with trips to the Islands Unit is low. Furthermore, the military will announce when FDM is not in use in addition to notifying mariners of planned activities at FDM, which will enable mariners to better plan trips to the Islands Unit. Further analysis can be found for recreational and commercial fishing and transport in Section 4.4.12 (Socioeconomic Resources). Comment/question: We have grave concerns of any language that indicates potential threat, temporary restriction, impacts of possible results from danger caused by DoD actions. That approximately 120 military actions (3.8 trips per year has occurred over the past 30 years) have occurred without true consent of the people of the Mariana Islands for the past 30 years is more than enough interference, especially to the people of the NMI. That permanent restriction in the 3 NM area surrounding FDM is considered a cumulative impact is incorrect and misleading. It should be stated upfront that this is a DIRECT IMPACT: “Even when hazardous activities are not occurring at FDM, the potential	Section 3.13 (Public Health and Safety) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS includes a discussion of the direct impact of waters around FDM within 3 nautical miles (NM) from shore being permanently closed for safety reasons due to the potential presence of unexploded ordnance. FDM and the nearshore waters are leased to the United States for military purposes specifically for use as a live-fire naval gunfire and air warfare air strike training range. As such, FDM and its nearshore areas have been an off-limits area to all personnel both civilian and military due to unexploded ordnance concerns. The agreement between the CNMI and the United States states in Article 12 of the lease: “c. Farallon de Medinilla: Public access to Farallon de Medinilla Island and the waters of the Commonwealth immediately adjacent thereto shall be permanently restricted for safety reasons.” FDM and nearshore areas, including the fringing reef, will remain a restricted area, which prohibits the entry of all personnel, civilian, and military from the island without specific permission from Commander, Joint Region Marianas. The military understands that fishing is an important socioeconomic and cultural resource for the people of the CNMI and will continue to work with the fishing community as appropriate to enable safe access to fishing areas around FDM. However, access within 3 NM of FDM would remain restricted at all times to ensure public safety. The military recognizes the importance of fishing sites such as White Tuna Banks and other nearby fishing sites near W-517 and will continue to work with local fishers to minimize restrictions on access to fishing sites around the Mariana Islands.

	Comment	Navy Response
	occurrence of unexploded ordnance in waters surrounding the island is a constant threat to public safety." Finally, any actions resulting in reduced access to fishing, recreational fishing, commercial fishing and/or permanent access to areas of transport between and around the Mariana Islands adds to our already limited access resources; thus we are not able to approve of this inaccessibility or permanent restrictions. For more explanation, refer to Introduction & Background section of this Comment and to comments from the Guam Department of Agriculture in the Seismic survey/Use of Sonar section of this Comment.	
OST-15	9. Regarding cumulative impact on historic sites on Guam, the 2019 MITT draft SEIS indicates that "no additional submerged cultural resources have been identified around Guam. As such, the information presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS is still valid and the most current." Over 540 cultural resources associated with Guam are considered eligible for or listed in the National Register of Historic Places including 8 individual resources listed in the National Historic of Historic Places, 6 listed in the Guam Register of Historic Places only, and 348 pre-contact sites, 3 multicomponent sites, 117 historic archaeological sites, 18 buildings, and 66 structures. The training constraints map identifies 13 No Training areas (eight on Guam and five on Tinian) and 35 Limited Training areas (20 on Guam and 15 on Tinian), refined from the previous Military Operations Area constraints map boundaries (U.S. Department of Defense 2009). Limited Training areas are defined as pedestrian traffic areas with vehicular access limited to designated roadways and/or the use of rubber-tired vehicles. No pyrotechnics,	The Navy has reviewed and incorporated the best available data for cultural resources, including underwater cultural heritage and maritime archeology that are listed or eligible for listing under the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA). The Navy has included a new figure in Section 3.11 (Cultural Resources) that includes general locations of known submerged resources (wrecks, obstructions, or occurrences) in the waters around Guam, Tinian, Saipan, and Rota. The Navy conducted data collection efforts with CNMI to retrieve additional information regarding known submerged resources which has been incorporated into this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Navy is required to complete independent statutory obligations under both NEPA and NHPA. The Navy has prepared this Supplemental EIS/OEIS for compliance with NEPA and continues to actively consult and develop a new long-term PA for the MITT undertaking. The Parties have executed interim bridge PAs which incorporate all of the terms and mitigations of the 2009 PA. The bridge PAs took effect after the expiration of the 2009 MITT PA and serve as a continuation of the Department of Defense's compliance under Section 106 of the NHPA for MITT activities. The Bridge PA with the CNMI HPO expires September 10, 2020, while the Bridge PA

	Comment	Navy Response
	demolition, or digging is allowed without prior consultation with the appropriate Historic Preservation Office. Comment/questions: I share the concerns of the Guam State Historic Preservation Officer, Guam Preservation Trust, and Guam Historic Preservation Review Board in their submitted comments and in their testimony during an April 15th public hearing at the Guam Legislature that the list of cultural resources referenced in the SEIS does not fully incorporate all the cultural resources that may be impacted. The Guam SHPO in her submitted comments mentioned that there are 119 submerged resources rather than the 84 stated in the 2015 MITT EIS. She further stated that a systematic submerged resource survey around Guam must be conducted prior to any authorization of proposed activity. Guam SHPO also noted that in the 4 years since the 2015 EIS was implemented, more cultural resources have been located, excavated, and recorded that are eligible and/or listed in the National Register of Historic Places. A systematic literature review and resurvey of areas surveyed 20 or more years ago will result in many more than the 540 cultural resources listed in the 2015 MITT. Additionally, the 2009 MIRC Programmatic Agreement expires in December 2019. What document will be used in the interim before a new agreement is negotiated, and will any of the activities be held in abeyance until an agreement is executed?Action in the Final EIS/OEIS and the ROD should outline the revisions towards this effort.	with Guam, expires June 30, 2020. The programmatic agreements will include stipulations to avoid, minimize, and mitigate adverse effects on historic properties. The Navy avoids submerged resources and limits training and testing activities in areas where submerged resources or other obstructions are detected. Consistent with Section 106 of the NHPA, the Navy made a "reasonable and good faith effort" to identify historic properties.
OST-16	10. Should there be no other opportunity following the Draft SEIS/OEIS for public comment, let the record show that I am requesting Avoidance and No Adverse Impacts and that the Proposed Action in the Final EIS/OEIS and the ROD should outline the revisions towards this effort	Thank you for your comments. Chapter 4 (Cumulative Impacts) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS includes the analysis of cumulative impacts for each resource addressed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences). See above response (OST-03) regarding the cumulative impact analysis.

	Comment	Navy Response
	Conclusion We are faced with these processes said to protect our environment and livelihood, and yet are based on references and resources over 20 years old, and data and research that does not show the whole picture. Let the science and these processes show the true cumulative impacts of past military activities, including PCB's, depleted uranium, Agent Orange, radiation exposure in addition to the harmful and threatening impacts of the proposed actions on our community. Guam's regulatory agencies – Department of Agriculture, Coastal Management Program of Bureau of Statistics and Plans, Guam Environmental Protection Agency, and the State Historic Preservation Officer have all expressed and outlined significant concerns with the proposed actions in the 2019 MITT draft SEIS and their potential impacts on Guam's natural and cultural resources. Until the cumulative impacts can accurately represent the experience of injustice and irreversible harm on the people, lands, air and oceans, I urge that the issuance of federal regulatory permits and authorizations under the Marine Mammal Protection Act and Endangered Species Act to support military readiness requirements within the MITT Study Area beyond 2020 be permanently ceased and that the No Action Alternative be chosen. Thank you for the opportunity to submit comments for the 2019 MITT Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Si Yu'os Ma'åse'	
Senator Kelly Marsh (Taitano), Office of Senator Kelly Marsh (OSM) (Taitano), Guam Legislature		
OSM-01	We strongly oppose the proposed bifurcation of the Programmatic Agreement for the Marianas Testing and Training (MITT).	The MIRC Programmatic Agreement expired in December 2019. In anticipation of this, the Navy initiated a NHPA Section 106 consultation in January 2019 with an eye toward developing new updated Programmatic Agreements. The Navy has held five consultation meetings open to

	Comment	Navy Response
	Regarding the MITT, the Department of Defense addressed Guam and the Northern Mariana Islands together in its SEIS-OEIS as it is clear that our environmental, cultural, and historical resources are tightly intertwined. It is imperative this remains the case in the current proposal, as a separation of MITT undertakings and actions in the Marianas would be both inappropriate and offer a fractured view of significant impacts of military testing and training exercises in Guam and the NMI. Leaders and tasked experts have a responsibility to ensure that undertakings and actions such as those proposed in the MITT SEIS-OEIS are taking our communities' health, well-being, and environment into due consideration. In order to best protect our community and our islands, leaders, tasked experts, and the community at large need to understand all military and other undertakings and actions in their entirety. Ample evidence already informs us of adverse consequences due to short-sightedness when this is not the case. Anything that interrupts the understanding and assessing undertakings and actions in their entirety has the potential to allow for consequences that can irreparably harm our communities and island environments which is exactly what bifurcating our Programmatic Agreement has the potential to do by limiting the degree to which each community is aware of, or is called to meet or respond to, particular undertakings and actions. Our archipelago has a lengthy cultural, historical, and familial history of connections spanning generations and millennia. Our environments are likewise connected. What impacts the Northern Mariana Islands, impacts Guåhan. What impacts Guåhan, impacts the Northern Mariana Islands.	consulting and interested parties on Guam and eight throughout the CNMI. Additionally, site visits, and working group sessions with the SHPOs and the National Park Service have taken place. The Navy is required to comply with NHPA Section 106 to support its undertaking. A Programmatic Agreement is one of several methods of ensuring compliance under Section 106 but is most appropriate for undertakings that involve routine and redundant activities where a federal agency plans to resolve potential adverse effects to historic properties through avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation. An interim Programmatic Agreement for Guam that follows the exact terms of the 2009 MIRC Programmatic Agreement has been executed and is intended to "bridge" the expiration of the current Programmatic Agreement with the execution of the new Programmatic Agreement being developed. With regard to the CNMI, Cultural Resources staff at JRM have already taken action to conduct NHPA Section 106 consultation on individual training events following the expiration of the 2009 MIRC Programmatic Agreement to ensure compliance as the Navy continues the consultation process. The Navy is required to complete independent statutory obligations under both NEPA and NHPA. Thus, the Navy has prepared this Supplemental EIS/OEIS and is looking forward to the continued Section 106 process under the NHPA with the Guam Historic Preservation Officer. The Navy fully recognizes the ancestral ties and cultural overlap between Guam and the CNMI. For that reason, the NHPA Section 106 consultation has been a fluid process incorporating comments and input across both the Guam and CNMI jurisdictions. There are several reasons separate Programmatic Agreements are being developed. For example, the Mariana Islands Range Complex crosses jurisdictional boundaries, Guam and the CNMI have different historic properties of concern, and there are varying opinions on mitigation measures.

	Comment	Navy Response
	While bifurcation of the Programmatic Agreement is being promoted to us as simplifying matters, it could be argued that, in particular ways, separating the Programmatic Agreement into two distinct agreements complicates issues and the handling of them. Certainly, to do so allows for the potential for our communities to be at a disadvantage by not being allowed to view and assess in our own minds and according to our own cultural, historical, and other perspectives, the cumulative and connected effects of undertakings and actions. Some have called this a strategy, akin to divide and conquer. We do not support such tactics.	
John Paul Manuel, Office of Senator Amanda Shelton (OSS), Guam Legislator		
OSS-01	The use of sonar, according to the EIS itself, affects the behavior of marine mammals including beaked cetaceans who are particularly vulnerable. There has been an increase in beached whales in the Marianas and when I questioned the Marine mammal biologists at your Q&A at UOG, she did say while most of the beachings could not be attributed to sonar, that examinations of most of the beachings had inconclusive results. So, in essence, there is not enough data to conclusively assertain the cause of this increase in beachings. This should be a topic that merits further study.	Section 3.4.2.1.1.6 (Stranding) further discusses the best available information about strandings of beaked whales in the Mariana Islands and the Navy's support of efforts to better understand the causes of marine mammal strandings. The Center for Naval Analysis (CNA) recently conducted a statistical study of correlation of beaked whale strandings around the Mariana Islands with the use of U.S. Navy sonar, finding that insufficient evidence of a correlation exists. The CNA study used the complete record of all U.S. Navy sonar use between 2007 and 2019, including major training events, joint exercises, and unit level training/testing. The analysis also included the complete beaked whale stranding record for the Mariana Islands through 2019. Following the methods in Simonis et al. (2020), the CNA analysis found insufficient evidence of a correlation between sonar use and beaked whale strandings when considering the complete sonar use record. The CNA finding is in contrast to the finding in Simonis et al. (2020), which depicted a significant correlation between beaked whale strandings and Navy sonar use. However, the Simonis et al. (2020) result relied on substantially incomplete or inaccurate assumptions about U.S. Navy sonar use around

	Comment	Navy Response
		the Mariana Islands. CNA also conducted statistical analyses specific to each island where beaked whale strandings have been observed in the Mariana Islands, similarly finding insufficient evidence of a correlation to sonar use. Additional information on the findings of the CNA analysis are presented in Section 3.4.2.1.1.6 (Stranding) in Chapter 3.4 (Marine Mammals). As described in Section 5.1.2.2.1 (Marine Species Research and Monitoring Programs), for this Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy agreed to several additional research and monitoring initiatives designed to help advance the understanding of beaked whales and strandings in the MITT Study Area. The Navy will co-fund the Pacific Marine Assessment Program for Protected Species (PACMAPPS) Mariana Islands survey in spring-summer 2021 and future studies starting in 2022 to help document beaked whale occurrence, abundance, and distribution in the Mariana Islands. The Navy will also fund additional stranding response and necropsy analyses for the Pacific Islands region, and research on a framework to improve statistical stranding analysis. Collaboratively with NMFS, the Navy will fund and organize an expert panel to provide recommendations on scientific data gaps and uncertainties for further protective measure consideration to minimize potential impacts of Navy training and testing activities on beaked whales in the Mariana Islands. Section 3.0.1.1.1 (Marine Species Monitoring and Research Programs) provides an overview of U.S. Navy-supported research on marine species. These programs support coordinated science, technology, research, and development focused on understanding the effects of sound on marine mammals, including physiological, behavioral, ecological, and population-level impacts. Additional information on these programs and other ocean resources-oriented initiatives can be found at the Department of the Navy's Energy, Environment, and Climate Change website (https://navysustainability.dodlive.mil).
Representative Sheila Babauta (RB), 21st CNMI Legislature		

	Comment	Navy Response
RB-01	I am writing as a Representative for Precinct 4 in the 21st Commonwealth Northern Mariana Islands Legislature, and as a concerned citizen of the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. The comments and questions below are in response to the Mariana Islands Training & Testing (MITT) Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (EIS/OEIS). The proposed expansion of the military's training and testing area in the Mariana Islands is massive and one can only be concerned about the negative consequences of the activities to occur. While I understand the importance of military readiness to protect the security of the United States, I must also express my worry of the negative impact such activities will have on our people's health, environment, culture, infrastructure, safety, historic sites, and natural resources. Which brings me to ask the following questions: 1. Has the Navy considered alternative locations to conduct such military readiness training? If so, what was the outcome? If not, why? 2. Has the Navy been offered alternative locations with similar environments for proposed training activities?	The Navy is not proposing any geographic expansion of the training and testing area in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, and the Study Area has not changed since the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Proposed activities are similar to those conducted in the Study Area for decades. Proposed training and testing activities are needed to achieve and maintain military readiness within the Study Area. The Navy conducts training and testing throughout the world, with similar training and testing activities occurring in Hawaii, Southern California, the Pacific Northwest, and the Gulf of Alaska. The Study Area supports the Navy's 7th Fleet, the largest of the Navy's forward deployed fleets. Training and testing activities in the Mariana Islands are vital to the continued readiness of military personnel. Without access to the training areas within the Study Area, forward-deployed military units on Guam and Japan would be unable to train and maintain the skills needed to respond to crises. Alternatives carried forward were developed to meet the Navy's purpose and need and to ensure it can fulfill its obligation under Title 10 of the U.S. Code. See Section 2.4 (Action Alternatives Development) for more detailed information on the development of alternatives and rationale on why alternative training and testing locations are not feasible.
RB-02	3. Has the Navy considered the negative impact the proposed activities will have on our culture? If so, what professionals did they consult with and what was the outcome?	The Navy used the best available data in the analysis of impacts on socioeconomics, presented in Section 3.12 (Socioeconomic Resources and Environmental Justice). This Supplemental EIS/OEIS has been revised to include a section discussing cultural/traditional practices and beliefs (Section 3.11.1.3, Cultural/Traditional Practices and Beliefs). The analysis includes the importance of fishing as a socioeconomic and cultural resource for the people of the CNMI. The Navy does not propose a change to the ocean areas currently used by both the Navy and the public. Restrictions on accessing areas of co-use would continue to be infrequent and short-term, while other fishing sites in the Study Area would continue

	Comment	Navy Response
		to be available to the public. The military understands that fishing and tourism is an important socioeconomic and cultural resource for the people of the CNMI and will continue to work with the fishing and boating community to enable safe access in areas of co-use. The military is committed to continuing to work with the local community on issues that potentially affect the public, including access to fishing sites that are important to the culture. The Navy continues to actively consult and develop a new long-term PA for the MITT undertaking, the Parties have executed interim bridge PAs which incorporate all of the terms and mitigations of the 2009 PA. The bridge PAs took effect after the expiration of the 2009 MITT PA and serve as a continuation of the Department of Defense's compliance under Section 106 of the NHPA for MITT activities. The Bridge PA with the CNMI HPO expires September 10, 2020, while the Bridge PA with Guam, expires June 30, 2020.
RB-03	4. What chemical components will the population be exposed to from each and every type of ordnance? 5. How will each chemical component affect the population's health now and in the future?	Section 3.1 (Sediments and Water Quality) provides details on munitions and munitions constituents, chemicals, and metals that would be introduced into the marine environment resulting from training and testing activities analyzed in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. In summary, the Navy's analysis concludes that no federal or local guidelines would be exceeded and any releases would be *de minimis* because of (1) rapid and natural degradation of substances (e.g., munitions constituents and other chemicals), and (2) localized concentrations where impact would occur. These conclusions are based on evidence gathered on other military ranges in similar environments (e.g., Vieques), as well as legacy dump site studies conducted off the coast of Oahu. These studies are summarized in Section 3.1 (Sediments and Water Quality). Both this Supplemental EIS/OEIS and the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS include an analysis of potential impacts from metals and contaminants as a result of military training and testing activities on marine resources. This analysis is presented in Section 3.1.2.2 (Metals), Section 3.4.2.7 (Secondary Stressors), Section 3.5.2.7 (Secondary Stressors), Section 3.7.2.3 (Secondary Stressors), Section 3.8.2.7 (Secondary Stressors), and Section

	Comment	Navy Response
		3.9.2.7 (Secondary Stressors). Based on the analysis presented in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS and the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, the Navy concluded that all levels of metals, chemicals, and other byproducts would be either below detectable levels or at levels below existing standards, regulations, and guidelines.
RB-04	6. How long will all proposed training activity take place in the Mariana Islands?	The Navy has been conducting training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades and this supplement to the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS supports the continuation of training and testing conducted at sea and on FDM beyond 2020. The MMPA authorization for this Supplemental EIS/OEIS would be valid for seven years.
RB-05	7. How will the Navy ensure misfires and errant ordnance do not harm the local population, tourists, and other civilians? 8. Will the military compensate families if accidental deaths were to occur?	The health and safety of the public is of utmost importance to the Navy. The Navy trains and conducts tests in a manner that is compatible with civilian activities. Various means are used to communicate information to the public about areas restricted to public or commercial activities and are described in Section 3.13 (Public Health and Safety). As specified in Title 33 CFR Subpart 72.01, Notices to Mariners, the U.S. Coast Guard issues information to the public concerning maritime navigation. Additionally, nautical charts issued by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration include these federally designated zones and areas. Operators of recreational and commercial vessels have a duty to abide by maritime regulations administered by the U.S. Coast Guard. Waters around FDM within 3 NM from shore are permanently closed for safety reasons due to the potential presence of unexploded ordnance. In the unlikely event accidental death or injury were to occur, individuals may bring a claim for compensation under the Federal Tort Claims Act (28 U.S.C. section 1346).
RB-06	9. Will the military compensate the CNMI for economic losses due to damages?	In the event an individual feels they have suffered an economic loss, individuals may bring a claim for compensation under the Federal Tort Claims Act (28 U.S.C. section 1346). Damages to the CNMI-leased land are addressed through the lease document between the United States and the CNMI.

	Comment	Navy Response
RB-07	10. How will the military ensure no damages are done to the existing historic sites? What sites are considered historic? And what data was used to identify these sites?	As described in Section 2.3.3 (Standard Operating Procedures) and Chapter 5 (Mitigation), the Navy implements measures to avoid cultural resources and mitigate impacts during its training and testing activities to the maximum extent possible. As defined by the National Historic Preservation Act, historic property or historic resource means any prehistoric or historic district, site, building, structure, or object included in, or eligible for inclusion on the National Register, including artifacts, records, and material remains related to such a property or resource. To be eligible for inclusion on the National Register, a property or majority of properties in a district must be 50 years old or older and meet other criteria for evaluation. The cultural resources analysis is presented in Section 3.11 (Cultural Resources) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS; the section includes references to the best available data used to describe historic sites identified since the publication of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.
RB-08	Although research and data collection is not frequent in the Mariana Islands, the Navy "continues to use the most current and best available science and analytical methods." So, I ask: 1. Where has the Navy collected and stored data regarding the Mariana Islands and the 13 environmental resource areas: air quality, sediments and water quality, marine vegetation, marine invertebrates, marine habitats, fishes, marine mammals, sea turtles, marine birds, terrestrial species on FDM, cultural resources, socioeconomics, public health and safety, and cumulative impacts? And is this data readily available for the CNMI?	All potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Navy analyzed potential impacts on sediments and water quality, air quality, marine habitats, marine mammals, sea turtles, marine birds, marine vegetation, marine invertebrates, fish, terrestrial species and habitats, cultural resources, socioeconomic resources and environmental justice, public health and safety, and cumulative impacts (Chapter 4). Each resource section includes a list of references which are included as part of the Administrative Record. References and data cited in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS may be made available upon request. Due to copyright restrictions of some scientific journals, reports, and articles, the Navy is unable to maintain a publicly accessible repository of all references cited in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Additionally, raw data is not consistently available for all resources, and some data must be held in trust for the protection of the resource.

	Comment	Navy Response
		As per CEQ regulations, the Navy uses a number of sources of best available science and data in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, including external references (noted in each section of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS), technical documents (available at www.mitt-eis.com), and ongoing consultation processes with other agencies (NMFS and USFWS). Data is drawn and managed from multiple sources, including from the public during the NEPA process. Best available peer-reviewed science and data can come from sources such as academia, consultations with other resource agencies, industry, and the public. For Navy-funded and managed studies, the Navy will continue to communicate and coordinate with the CNMI government on future collaboration and information sharing. As noted in Section 3.0.1.1 (Navy Compiled and Generated Data) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy invests extensively in basic and applied research. Within the Study Area, the Navy has sponsored several monitoring projects to better understand marine mammal (*Small Vessel Visual Surveys*) and sea turtle distribution (*Sea Turtle Tagging in the Mariana Islands Range Complex*) and habitat use, and to assess the presence of corals and ESA-listed species at FDM. The Navy has conducted a humpback whale survey around FDM in early 2020. Additional information on studies is available on the U.S. Navy Marine Species Monitoring Program website at www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us. The Marine Mammal Commission (MMC, 2017) periodically collects information on Federal Agency funding for marine mammal monitoring and research. Their most recently published report in 2017 covering Fiscal Year 2015 documented that the Navy spent $35.2 million on this topic.
RB-09	2. Has the military considered launching a research center in the CNMI? If so, what does the proposed center require and what timeline is in place?	Establishing a research center in the CNMI is beyond the scope of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS.

	Comment	Navy Response
RB-10	3. Will the military continue to track and re-evaluate the impact of all proposed military training activities in the Mariana Islands?	The Navy conducts extensive monitoring and data collection programs as part of their compliance with the MMPA and ESA. The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring Program website provides access to reports, documentation, data, and updates on current monitoring projects. Information on current monitoring projects, technical reports, conference presentations, and data are available at www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us. Information gathered through the Monitoring Program is documented in annual reports, shared with NMFS, and considered in the adaptive management process. As part of the process for the reissuance of regulatory permits and authorizations under the MMPA and the ESA, the Navy will continue to analyze the impacts of at-sea training and testing activities and incorporate new, relevant information and the best available science. In addition, while outside the current scope of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the military satisfies Sikes Act obligations through the development and implementation of the Joint Region Marianas Integrated Natural Resource Management Plan (INRMP). The purpose of the INRMP is not to measure impacts of military training and testing activities, but to utilize adaptive management to maintain long-term ecosystem health and minimize impacts on natural resources consistent with the operational requirements of the DoD's mission. The 2019 Joint Region Marianas INRMP includes monitoring programs throughout the Mariana Islands. The CNMI Department of Lands and Natural Resources, Division of Fish and Wildlife is a signatory and participating member to the 2019 Joint Region Marianas INRMP, which details natural resource management and monitoring programs. The Navy will continue to improve coordination and collaboration with the CNMI as part of the INRMP project development and implementation. The Navy will also continue to coordinate in accordance with the Integrated Cultural Resources Management Plan.

	Comment	Navy Response
		The Navy will continue to follow mitigation and monitoring requirements as specified in the NMFS and USFWS Biological Opinions and MMPA compliance. These measures and requirements are presented in Chapter 5 (Mitigation). Mitigation measures in the NMFS Biological Opinion will be reflected in the Record of Decision.
RB-11	4. If the negative impact is greater than anticipated from the EIS/OEIS, will the military halt all operations? Why or why not? What procedures are in place?	Based on future readiness requirements, the Navy has proposed in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS the levels of activity necessary to fulfil those requirements and has then analyzed those activities for compliance. It is important to note that the Navy is then bound by the limits of its expected types and levels of activities. If a need arises that exceeds those predicted activities, then training and testing activities are scheduled and monitored so that levels allowed for in consultation and/or permitting documents are not exceeded. Pursuant to 40 CFR section 1502.9(c), the Navy would prepare a supplement to the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS if it makes substantial changes in the Proposed Action that are relevant to environmental concerns (40 CFR section 1502.9(c)(1)(i)), or there are significant new circumstances or information relevant to environmental concerns and bearing on the Proposed Action or its impacts (40 CFR section 1502.9(c)(1)(ii)). In addition, the Navy is bound by provisions in the ESA to reinitiate consultation if certain "triggers" are met. These triggers are specified in 50 CFR Section 402.16 and include the following: (1) the amount or extent of taking specified in the incidental take statement is exceeded, (2) new information reveals effects of the action that may not have been previously considered, (3) the identified action is subsequently modified in a manner that causes an effect to listed species, or (4) a new species is listed or critical habitat designated that may be affected by the identified action. Additional triggers specific to species may be included in a Biological Opinion.
RB-12	5. Has the military partnered with Federal and/or Local Agencies to ensure data accuracy? And to ensure there is no impact to ongoing grant funded projects?	The Navy regularly partners with federal and local agencies to ensure the best available data are used in impact analyses. For example, the Navy partners with local, state, and federal agencies, universities, research institutions, federal laboratories, and private researchers as part of its Marine Species Monitoring Program. Additionally, the U.S. Fish and

	Comment	Navy Response
		Wildlife Service, NMFS, Guam Division of Aquatic and Wildlife Resources, and the CNMI Division of Fish and Wildlife are cooperating with the Navy on INRMP implementation. The Navy will continue to improve coordination and collaboration with the CNMI as part of the INRMP project development and implementation. The Navy is not aware of any impacts on ongoing grant funded projects.
RB-13	For a proposed project of this size, community outreach is essential for valuable input and to address concerns and questions. The Navy failed to provide adequate information in the local language and adequate time to read and comprehend such material. 1. How did the military decide the best approach to communicate with the community in the Marianas Islands? 2. Did the military survey the population to ensure the stakeholders were able to comprehend the EIS/OEIS material in one language? Were efforts made to assess language barriers among the local population? 3. How did the military compute the adequate timeline in which to conduct outreach and set deadlines? What considerations were taken into place given our distance from the U.S. mainland and natural disaster experiences (e.g., Super Typhoon Yutu, Typhoon Soudelour)? In closing, the expansion of military presence in the Mariana Islands has caused apprehension among the local population. The Navy must continue to communicate with the public and ensure the true understanding of the proposed activities. There is a fear of the cumulative impacts of all military activities in the Marianas region as we are certain there will be negative impacts and irreparable damages to our quality of life now and in the future, for ourselves and for generations to come.	Based on CEQ regulations and experience gained from the 2010 MIRC EIS/OEIS and the 2015 MITT EIS/OEIS, the Navy designed a public involvement program to both meet NEPA requirements and cultures of the local communities. The Navy understands that English is an official language of the CNMI. The Navy acknowledges that the information presented in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS is by necessity very complex; however, the Navy attempts to explain challenging concepts, methods, and the results of the analysis as clearly as possible and developed public informational materials for lay audiences. The Navy prepared project brochures, videos, a website, and posters, using layperson terms to enhance public understanding of the information presented in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Based on the demographics of the CNMI, a project fact sheet was also translated into Chamorro. The informational materials, including the translated fact sheet, were made available at all four public meetings and on the project website www.mitt-eis.com. The Navy held four open house public meetings, one each on Tinian (Tinian Public Library, March 14, 2019), Rota (Mayor's Conference Hall, March 15, 2019), Saipan (Kanoa Resort, March 18, 2019), and Guam (University of Guam, March 19, 2019). The public meetings were an opportunity for the public to ask questions of Navy leadership, scientists, and other experts about the analysis documented in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Navy encouraged the public to attend these meetings and broadly notified the public through the media, including paid newspaper

	Comment	Navy Response
	Please include our office in the EIS/OEIS mailing list to receive notifications and updates.	advertisements and news releases, and direct mail, including letters, postcards, and emails. A voice recorder was provided for any member of the public who wanted to provide an oral comment in a language other than English. The Navy has received feedback from attendees that the open-house format is more conducive to promoting public understanding and constructive dialogue. Open house meetings allow a greater number of individuals to directly engage and interact with Navy team members and ask questions about this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, as well as provide comments on the document. To better accommodate stakeholders and the public, the Navy provided 75 days to review and comment on the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, which is 30 days longer than the minimum required time for review. Due to the effects of Typhoon Wutip, Navy officials postponed the public meetings originally scheduled for February 26 and 27, 2019. The Navy held the rescheduled meetings on March 18 and 19, 2019, in Saipan and Guam respectively. The Navy also added meetings on Tinian (March 14, 2019) and Rota (March 15, 2019). Public notice of the rescheduled public meetings was published multiple days in the Marianas Variety, Pacific Daily News, and Saipan Tribune. The Navy issued a press release and mailed over 500 postcards to individuals and organizations. The Navy recognizes the importance and value of continued outreach and engagement and commits to continue working with CNMI and Guam stakeholders to identify opportunities to improve communication, transparency, and trust. For example, the Navy has established the CNMI Joint Region Marianas Coordination Office (CJCO) in Saipan. The Office of Representative Sheila J. Babauta is on the project mailing list.
Janice Castro, Director, CNMI Bureau of Environmental and Coastal Quality - Division of Coastal Resources Management (DCRM)		
DCRM-01	The Commonwealth of the Northern Marinas Islands (CNMI) Division of Coastal Resources Management (DCRM) has reviewed portions of the draft supplement to the 2015 Final Marianas Islands	The Navy has used the best available science to consider the direct and cumulative impacts on endangered species, nesting seabirds, and

	Comment	Navy Response
	Training and Testing (MITT) Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)/ Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (OEIS). CNMI Public Law 3-47, entitled the "Coastal Resources Management Act," grants DCRM regulatory authority towards activities within its jurisdictional territory that can impact the coastal resources of the CNMI. DCRM's mission is to protect and enhance the CNMI's coastal resources for residents and visitors through effective and adaptive resource management, interagency collaboration, and stakeholder engagement, in a manner that builds and sustains community resilience and well-being. Pursuant to the requirements of Section 307 of the federal Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972, as amended, and its implementing regulations found at 15 CFR 930, federal actions which may have reasonably foreseeable effects on uses or resources of the coastal zone must be undertaken in a manner which is consistent with the CRM enforceable polices as approved by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. DCRM is firm in its belief that the Technical Agreement reserves for the Commonwealth at the very least, limited jurisdiction. The Technical Agreement reserved for the Commonwealth certain rights (e.g. planning and coordination efforts regarding infrastructure and utilities, shoreline access for fishermen, recreational access to beach areas, etc.), the Commonwealth maintains its jurisdiction over the coasts and shorelines, broadly defined by law, for the safety and benefit of the general public. To that extent, we believe it mutually beneficial to establish better methods of communication and information-sharing. As outlined further in this comment, DCRM has concerns regarding the scope, extent of data sharing and lack of updated data, and the process itself that has been implemented for this MITT draft SEIS review.	nearshore reefs sedimentation. The Navy's analysis of mass movement and erosion on FDM includes historical photograph analyses and direct observations during dive surveys conducted off FDM since 1999. Additionally, the Navy will investigate methods to baseline current physical conditions on FDM and to monitor those conditions over time.This information pertaining to potential mass movement and erosion on FDM is included in Section 3.1.3.1.5.3 (Farallon de Medinilla Specific Impacts) in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and Section 3.1.1.4 (Farallon de Medinilla) in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. In 2017, the Navy funded additional coral reef surveys in the nearshore areas of FDM. The results are available at: https://apps.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/1069450.pdf. The 2017 survey found little evidence that training has affected coral communities at FDM. Only three relatively new ordnance items were observed, but no blast pits, craters, or significant areas of coral breakage were observed. The ordnance observed during the 2017 survey was almost exclusively old and encrusted in marine life, and was not having any discernable impact on surrounding communities. The Navy updated the MITT Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS to include the results of the 2017 survey as presented in Carilli et al (2018). The report information has been added to Section 3.1 (Sediments and Water Quality) and Section 3.8 (Marine Invertebrates). Specific text on impacts on Farallon de Medinilla is available in Section 3.1.3.1.5.3 (Farallon de Medinilla Specific Impacts) in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, and Section 3.1 (Sediments and Water Quality) and Section 3.8 (Marine Invertebrates) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. In consideration on minimizing any potential erosion of the western cliffs of FDM from military training activities, the Navy relocated targets used by surface firing towards the island to locations on the plateau.

	Comment	Navy Response
	DSEIS/OEIS Scope DCRM provided scoping comments on the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS on September 15, 2017. The agency maintains its concerns as stated in the scoping document regarding the environmental implications of MITT activities conducted on Farallon de Medinilla (FDM) and at sea, as well as those that have occurred over time and those associated with emerging technologies. The scope of the draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) and any subsequent updates should include rigorous assessment of environmental effects identified in DCRM's initial scoping comments to support meaningful analysis of the impacts and possible mitigation of these impacts. In summary, direct, indirect, and cumulative effects analysis in the SEIS should at minimum address the following using best available scientific data and clear impacts criteria: • Direct and cumulative mass wasting and sedimentation as a result of bombing activities on Farallon de Medinilla and the secondary impacts on endangered species, nesting seabirds, and nearshore reefs;	Section 3.6 (Marine Birds) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS includes a statistical analysis of 17 years of monthly and quarterly bird counts of the three booby species that nest on FDM. The results of this analysis were also included in Section 3.6.2.6 (Rookery Locations and Breeding Activities within the Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area) of the 2015 Final EIS/OEIS. In the previous NEPA document, this statistical analysis was not yet published. In this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the same information is included in the analysis, but now cites the published article (see Camp, R., C. Leopold, K. Brinck, and F. Juola, 2016). The Navy submitted a Consistency Determination to the CNMI Division of Coastal Resources Management (DCRM) in December 2019 addressing proposed military training and testing activities that may affect the CNMI's coastal zone and coastal uses. DCRM's response to the Navy's CD (dated March 9, 2020) can be found in Appendix C (Agency Correspondence). The Navy is in discussions with DCRM in order resolve any differences and reach an agreement regarding the Navy's compliance with CNMI's Coastal Management Program to the maximum extent practicable. The outcome of these discussions will be included in the ROD. The Navy has engaged with the DCRM throughout the development of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, including meeting with staff during the scoping phase and providing notification when the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS was made available for public review and comment.
DCRM-02	• Direct and cumulative impacts from military-expended materials and other marine debris on water quality and marine biota including but not limited to analysis of the timing, duration, and concentration of toxic inputs (both point and non-point source), the residence times of the constituents, effects of deposition, bio-accumulation of metals and other chemical pollutants in individual organisms and on up the food chain, and potential risks stemming from unexploded ordnance;	Each biological resource section includes an analysis of secondary stressors and their potential impacts on a biological resource. Within these secondary stressor analyses in the Final SEIS, discussions of the fate and transport of specific chemicals with references to chemical properties of munitions and munitions constituents, are included. The Navy would also like to note that marine debris is addressed in the cumulative impacts chapter, and as part of the affected environment discussions within each

	Comment	Navy Response
		biological resource section. In summary, the Navy's analysis concludes that no federal or local guidelines would be exceeded and any releases would be *de minimis* because of the following reasons: (1) rapid and natural degradation of substances (e.g., munitions constituents and other chemicals), and (2) localized concentrations where impact would occur. These conclusions are based on evidence gathered on other military ranges in similar environments (e.g., Vieques), as well as legacy dump site studies conducted off the coast of Oahu. These studies are summarized in Section 3.1 (Sediments and Water Quality). Both this Supplemental EIS/OEIS and the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS include an analysis of potential impacts from munitions, munitions constituents, metals, and other contaminants as a result of military training and testing activities on marine resources (see secondary stressor analyses in, Section 3.3, Marine Habitats; Section 3.4, Marine Mammals; Section 3.5, Sea Turtles; Section 3.7, Marine Vegetation; Section 3.8, Marine Invertebrates; and Section 3.9, Fishes). Based on the analysis presented in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS and the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, the Navy concluded that all levels of metals, chemicals, and other byproducts would be either below detectable levels or at levels below existing standards, regulations, and guidelines. These conclusions are presented in Section 3.1 (Sediments and Water Quality). Section 3.1 has been updated in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS to include discussion on standards, regulations, and guidelines. The results of the environmental analysis indicate that proposed training and testing activities would not impact public health or have population-level impacts on any marine resources. There are studies regarding bioaccumulation in the Mariana Archipelago that were used in the EIS, and the Navy applies federal and state water quality standards where applicable to assess potential bioaccumulation risk. Residual concentrations of contaminants resulting from Navy training and testing activities are provided in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. In the

	Comment	Navy Response
		2010 Mariana Island Range Complex (MIRC) EIS/OEIS, it was noted that, "The CNMI Senate requested the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) on February 19, 2008 to conduct a public health assessment on FDM of toxic substances released by bombs and the bioaccumulation of these toxins in consumable pelagic fish." The Agency, in its letter to the CNMI Senate on September 24, 2008, concluded that, "pelagic fish caught in the open water are not likely to contain high levels of explosive residues from the neighboring FDM bombing range and will not pose a public hazard to people who eat them." The conclusion is supported by the Agency's "Preliminary Assessment of Pelagic Fish Caught in the Open Pacific" (ATSDR, 2008). This Supplemental EIS/OEIS also includes information that suggests that the majority of concerns regarding bioaccumulation are associated with urban coastal environments with specific point source and non-point source contributors of pollutants. The studies concerning military sites suggest that metals exposed to seawater are of less concern because of decreased bioavailability. Studies cited in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS concerning metals deposition in the marine environment in waters off of military training ranges include multiple studies off of Vieques Island in Puerto Rico, Pamlico Sound in North Carolina, and a Canadian military site (Canadian Forces Maritime Experimental and Test Ranges near Nanoose Bay, British Columbia) for lead and lithium. Information on impacts on sediments and water quality from munitions at two additional sites, one in Hawaii and one in the Potomac River in Maryland, where military munitions have resided for decades have been added to the section.
DCRM-03	• Direct and cumulative impacts from active sonar and explosive tests on marine mammals;	The potential effects of sonar and explosives on marine mammals are quantitatively estimated using the Navy's Acoustic Effects Model (see the Technical Report, *Quantifying Acoustic Impacts on Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles: Methods and Analytical Approach for Phase III Training and Testing*, available on the project website for details on the quantitative

	Comment	Navy Response
		methodology). Predicted effects from sonar on marine mammals are presented by species in Section 3.4.2.1.2.3 (Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers Under the Action Alternatives) and from explosives in Section 3.4.2.2.2.3 (Impacts from Explosive Stressors Under the Action Alternatives). No mortality or direct injury to any marine mammal is predicted. Behavioral responses by marine mammal species are predicted by the acoustic effects model. Research cited in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS and the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS indicates behavioral responses by marine mammals exposed to underwater sound vary from no response to an immediate change in behavior, such as a change in swimming direction. Behavioral changes are temporary and not necessarily repeated, and animals frequently return to and continue their prior behavior after the initial interruption. Information on strandings in general and strandings associated with Navy training and testing activities is provided in the 2017 technical report, "*Marine Mammal Strandings Associated with United States Navy Sonar Activities*." NMFS, as the regulator, maintains the authoritative National Stranding Database.
DCRM-04	• Direct and cumulative impacts on seagrass, coral reef and other invertebrate, sea turtle, and fish populations and habitats;	The Navy used the best available data to analyze the potential effects of the Proposed Action on seagrass, coral reefs and other invertebrates, sea turtles, fish, and habitats. The analyses are presented in Section 3.3 (Marine Habitats), Section 3.5 (Sea Turtles), Section 3.7 (Marine Vegetation), Section 3.8 (Marine Invertebrates), Section 3.9 (Fishes), and Chapter 4 (Cumulative Impacts). As discussed in Sections 3.8 (Marine Invertebrates), recent surveys conducted by the Navy (Carilli et al., 2018) at FDM found that coral fauna are healthy and robust and the nearshore physical environment and basic habitat types at FDM remained unchanged. These conclusions are based on: (1) a limited amount of physical damage, (2) very low levels of partial mortality and disease (less than 1 percent of all species observed), (3) absence of excessive mucus production, (4) good coral recruitment, and (5) complete recovery by 2012 of the 2007 bleaching event. Smith and Marx (2016) also concluded that the health, abundance, and biomass of

	Comment	Navy Response
		fishes, corals, and other marine resources at FDM are comparable to or superior to those in similar habitats at other locations within the Mariana Archipelago. The Navy funded additional reef surveys in the nearshore areas of FDM in 2017. The results are available at: https://apps.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/1069450.pdf. The 2017 survey found little evidence that training has affected coral reef communities at FDM. Only three relatively new ordnance items were observed, but no blast pits, craters, or significant areas of coral breakage were observed. The ordnance observed during the 2017 survey was almost exclusively old, encrusted in marine life, and was not having any discernable impact on surrounding communities.
DCRM-05	• Direct and cumulative impacts on cultural resources and the loss of traditional access and use of Farallon de Medinilla;	The Navy used the best available data to analyze the potential effects of the Proposed Action on cultural resources in Section 3.11 (Cultural Resources). FDM and waters within 3 NM of FDM have been prohibited for decades (as noted in Article 12 of the 1983 lease agreement) to ensure the safety of the public during military activities conducted on the island and due to the presence of unexploded ordnance in nearshore waters around the island. The Navy complies with all rules and regulations under the NHPA and takes great care to respect all historic properties. Consultations are ongoing under the NHPA Section 106 process to develop the terms for updating the Guam and CNMI Programmatic Agreements. The Programmatic Agreements will include stipulations to avoid, minimize, and mitigate adverse effects on historic properties.
DCRM-06	• Direct and cumulative impacts of restricted areas on recreational and commercial fishing and transport between islands, including but not limited to public access, tourism and an analysis of impacts that would result from fishermen forced to seek alternate work areas;	The Navy used the best available data to analyze the potential effects of the Proposed Action on commercial and recreational fishing in Section 3.12 (Socioeconomic Resources and Environmental Justice). The Navy is not proposing a change to any restricted ocean areas currently used by the Navy since the 2010 MIRC Final EIS/OEIS (Section 2.1.1, MIRC Overview) and the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (Section 2.1.1, Mariana Islands Range Complex). In this Supplemental EIS/OEIS there are no new restrictions to public access of fishing areas. The Navy is committed to continuing to work

	Comment	Navy Response
		with the local community on issues that potentially affect the public, including access to fishing sites. The Navy regards the safety of fishermen and other boaters as a top priority. The Navy would not restrict the freedom of movement between islands. However, the permanent restriction at FDM is in accordance with Article 12(c) of the January 1986 lease, which specifically states, "Public access to Farallon de Medinilla Island and the waters of the Commonwealth immediately adjacent thereto shall be permanently restricted for safety reasons."
DCRM-07	• Direct and cumulative impacts on terrestrial lands, habitats, and species of the CNMI resulting from activities conducted both at sea and on Farallon de Medinilla;	The Navy is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities. Both this Supplemental EIS/OEIS and the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS Section 3.6 (Birds) address potential impacts on seabirds that nest and visit FDM. Section 3.10 (Terrestrial Species and Habitats) addresses wildlife and plant communities and ESA-listed species known to occur on the island (Micronesian megapodes and Mariana fruit bats). In addition, the 2019 Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan (INRMP) includes additional information on biological resources on FDM and nearshore waters surrounding waters of the island. In 2015, the Navy and USFWS completed consultation for potential impacts of military training activities on FDM. The 2015 Biological Opinion determined that these activities would adversely affect ESA-listed species on FDM, and included non-discretionary measures to reduce the effect of take resulting from training activities. Activities analyzed in the Navy's Supplemental EIS/OEIS do not warrant reinitiation of Section 7(a)(2) consultation with USFWS, and the measures agreed to between the Navy and USFWS in 2015 are carried forward in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS.
DCRM-08	• Direct and cumulative environmental justice implications of continued expanded training and testing in and near the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands and the	This Supplemental EIS/OEIS fully complies with Executive Order 12898 (Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations) as demonstrated by the analysis in Section 3.12 (Socioeconomic Resources and Environmental Justice). This section

	Comment	Navy Response
	relationship of this proposal to other related training and testing expansions proposed in this region; and	includes an analysis of impacts of proposed activities on socioeconomic resources and whether the Proposed Action would result in a disproportionate effect on minority or low-income populations. While increases in certain training and testing activities under Alternatives 1 and 2 may result in impacts on socioeconomic resources, such as accessibility to areas of co-use, these impacts are expected to be negligible. Traditional fishers in the CNMI and Guam would not be disproportionately impacted by training and testing activities because traditional fishing practices often occur in the same general areas as commercial and recreational fishing, which are typically closer to shore and far from the majority of military activities. The analysis of potential impacts on environmental justice is limited primarily to traditional fishing practices, because, with the exception of training activities at FDM, the vast majority of training and testing activities occur at sea, where potential impacts on socioeconomic resources are primarily associated with commercial, recreational, and tourism activities that take place in the marine environment, including fishing. As described in Section 3.12.1.4 (Environmental Justice), fishing for subsistence purposes is not easily distinguishable from fishing for recreation or commercial purposes in the small boat fishing communities of the CNMI. The results of surveys cited in Section 3.12.1.4 (Environmental Justice) show that fishers may accomplish all three purposes on a single fishing trip, and fishers who use their own catch as a regular source of food are not necessarily part of a minority or low-income population as described under the Executive Order 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations.
DCRM-09	• Cumulative impacts resulting from all Department of Defense activities in the Marianas region, including how ongoing military readiness activities in the MITT Study Area raise the profile of the US Pacific Islands as areas of strategic importance and heighten the risk of pre-emptive or retaliatory strikes from enemies.	The Navy used the best available science and conducted a comprehensive review of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable actions to develop a robust analysis of cumulative impacts (Chapter 4, Cumulative Impacts). As required under NEPA, the level and scope of the analysis are commensurate with the potential impacts of the action as reflected in the resource-specific discussions in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and

	Comment	Navy Response
		Environmental Consequences). The Navy considered proposed and ongoing activities alongside with other activities in the region whose impacts are truly meaningful to the analysis. Furthermore, the entire Supplemental EIS/OEIS provides the cumulative impacts analysis, not just Chapter 4. Chapter 3 provides the current effects of past and present impacts and environmental conditions that represent the baseline of the environment as it is; Chapter 3 also discusses the consequences or potential future impacts from Navy activities. Chapter 4 discusses other reasonably foreseeable activities, including Department of Defense activities in the Marianas regions, to the extent they are known and the incremental impact of the Navy's proposal when added to past, present, and future impacts. Considering that minimal or no impacts from training and testing are anticipated on multiple marine resources that directly or indirectly affect marine mammals, sea turtles, and marine invertebrates, the contribution from Navy training and testing activities to cumulative impacts on marine animals is expected to be negligible. In addition, the Navy is consulting with NMFS under the ESA for potential effects (including cumulative effects) on marine mammals, sea turtles, fish, and coral and received a Biological Opinion. Mitigation measures and monitoring requirements specified in the Biological Opinion are presented in Chapter 5 (Mitigation). The mission of the U.S. Department of Defense is to provide the military forces needed to deter war and to protect the security of the United States, which includes Guam and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. The Mariana Islands have provided an ideal location in the Indo-Asia-Pacific region for the military to maintain a global and strategic presence, and the military strives to reduce its effects on the islands while ensuring the United States and its territories are protected and safe.

	Comment	Navy Response
DCRM-10	Despite DCRM's requests that these impacts be considered thoroughly in the scoping comments we provided, we find data gaps and conclusory analysis plagues the Draft SEIS/OEIS, leaving the impression that these comments were not fully considered in the scoping process. An addendum to any subsequent revisions or to the final report should include where scoping concerns – and, for the final, comments on the draft – have been addressed to further support the review process.	As per CEQ regulations, the Navy uses a number of sources of best available science and data in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, including external references (noted in each section of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS), technical documents (available on the MITT project website), and ongoing consultation processes with other agencies (NMFS and USFWS). Data is drawn and managed from multiple sources, including from the public during the NEPA process. Best available peer-reviewed science and data can come from sources such as academia, consultations with other resource agencies, industry, and the public. Public involvement is a fundamental aspect of the environmental analysis process, and the Navy welcomes and appreciates the public's participation. The Navy reviewed all comments received during the 45-day scoping period and considered all substantive comments in the preparation of the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Each resource section within this Supplemental EIS/OEIS presents a summary of the scoping comments and responses to the issues raised. In addition, the actual public comments and responses are provided in this appendix (Public Comment Responses).
DCRM-11	***Data Availability and Updates*** The MITT-EIS.com website provides five "2019 Supporting EIS/OEIS Supporting Technical Documents": (i) Criteria and Thresholds for U.S. Navy Acoustic and Explosive Effects Analysis (Phase III), June 2017, (ii) Dive Distribution and Group Size Parameters for Marine Species Occurring in the U.S. Navy's Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area (March, 2018), (iii) Marine Mammal Strandings Associated with U.S. Navy Sonar Activities (June, 2017), U.S. Navy Marine Species Density Database Phase III for the Mariana Islands Training and Testing Area (July, 2018), and (v) Quantifying Acoustic Impacts on Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles: Methods and Analytical Approach for Phase III Training and Testing, (August, 2018). Firstly, it is disconcerting that after several requests to provide data and studies in advance that such reports were not	As per CEQ regulations, the Navy uses a number of sources of best available science and data, including external references from academia, industry, and the public (noted in each section of EIS/OEIS); technical documents (available on the MITT project website); and ongoing consultation processes with other agencies (NMFS and USFWS). The Navy strives to share technical information and data with the public and resource agencies. Technical reports are posted on the MITT project website at www.mitt-eis.com. For Navy-funded and managed marine research and monitoring studies, the public can access reports, documentation, data, and updates on current monitoring projects via the U.S. Navy Marine Species Monitoring Program website at www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us.

	Comment	Navy Response
	provided as a courtesy to CNMI natural resource managers when they were finalized to support timely review and meaningful engagement in the development of these reports and criteria. Instead, by releasing these reports along with the voluminous draft SEIS/OEIS, insufficient time has been time provided to assess the methods or data supplementing this report, let alone to conduct reviews of other data from non-DOD studies and institutions which would likely be helpful in supporting further discussion regarding effects analysis and related statements made in these reports. In fact, these five documents are not the entire suite of newly cited and relied upon publications, and in practice, it is challenging for small government agencies without professional journal subscriptions to find and access the reports that are being relied on. These shortcomings should be remedied in future reports. At minimum, reports supporting this draft SEIS/OEIS should be summarized and sections where data was used to support effects analysis should be clearly outlined to support review of this updated analysis. It would be helpful in the revised or updated draft SEIS/OEIS to also indicate where assessment of impacts of "new technologies" are covered by new analysis provided, or to explain how DOD plans to monitor and assess these impacts if no analysis has been done. Where updated local data is available to support this analysis, it should be shared to support this review process, ideally when that data is collected. DCRM and our partner agencies have repeatedly requested data sharing and monitoring access to further address concerns regarding impacts of current and proposed DOD activities – most recently at last year's scoping meeting when partners were informed that the pending SEIS would be focused on obtaining reauthorization of existing Endangered Species Act (ESA) and Marine Mammal Protections Act (MMPA) authorizations. In general, environmental impact assessment reports in our region would be more effective at enabling technical	The Navy will continue to communicate and coordinate with the CNMI government on future collaboration and information sharing. Additionally, the Navy conducts extensive monitoring and data collection programs as part of its compliance with the MMPA and ESA, including in the waters around the Mariana Islands. In 2017, two surveys (one in winter and one in summer) were conducted off Saipan, Tinian, and Guam to obtain data that improves the knowledge of marine mammal populations, movement patterns, and habitat use. The Navy also works with other agencies and local governments to study, monitor, and protect endangered green and hawksbill sea turtles. State-of-the-art scientific methods and technologies are used to monitor and track sea turtles in the Mariana Islands to learn more and have a better understanding of their population levels, home ranges, and habitat use. The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring Program website provides access to reports, documentation, data, and updates on current monitoring projects. Information on current monitoring projects, technical reports, conference presentations and data are available at www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us. In addition, while outside the current scope of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the military satisfies Sikes Act obligations through the development and implementation of the Joint Region Marianas INRMP. The 2019 Joint Region Marianas INRMP includes monitoring programs throughout the Mariana Islands. The CNMI Department of Lands and Natural Resources, Division of Fish and Wildlife is a signatory and participating member to the 2019 Joint Region Marianas INRMP, which details natural resource management and monitoring programs. The 2019 Joint Region Marianas INRMP details natural resource management and monitoring programs, including projects for ESA-listed corals, which either improve the understanding of these species in the wild or are designed to protect species and their habitat without infringing on the DoD's military mission.

	Comment	Navy Response
	review if data were provided as studies were published and if all studies could be linked to as PDFs in the report contents to support accessibility of primary documentation. To this day, raw data and primary reports being relied upon for environmental analysis are not made readily available nor are monitoring activities coordinated, making review of impacts of current activities and proposed future actions challenging. Lack of data availability and timely sharing of updated data when it is collected appears to be contrary to the DOD's NEPA implementation guidance which states that "[c]lose and harmonious planning relations with local and regional agencies and planning commissions … for cooperation and resolution of mutual land use and environmental-related problems should be established" (32.CFR.775.10). For this and other DOD proposals, DCRM would like to reiterate the request for early information sharing to provide technical staff sufficient time to review and comment on data collection methods and data that is collected. Incorporating local resource managers in study development and report review would greatly enhance the credibility of the methods being applied in existing and updated effects analysis. Lack of updated data used in the MITT draft SEIS/OEIS is also disconcerting. As discussed below, although new activities and substantial changes in the "tempo" of activities authorized under the 2015 MITT Record of Decision (ROD) are proposed, little new information appears to be analyzed, presenting procedural and substantive concerns. To assist CNMI agencies to identify and review new information, DCRM requests that DOD provide all new studies, reports, and other related data analysis and raw data used in the 2019 SEIS/OEIS as well as a list of these materials and what substantive issues they were relied upon in the supplemental analysis conducted for this proposal. Although we understand	Programs specific to coral and FDM (subject to annual funding availability) include: • Marine Habitat Mapping (benthic habitat mapping) [Naval Base Guam, Andersen Air Force Base, Farallon de Medinilla] • Fish, Coral, and Marine Surveys (visual surveys) [Farallon de Medinilla] • Assess ESA-Listed Scleractinian Corals (visual surveys and condition assessment for ESA-corals) [Farallon de Medinilla] The Navy will continue to improve coordination and collaboration with the CNMI as part of the INRMP project development and implementation. The programs mentioned above help ensure current environmental conditions are monitored regularly. Any new information or data from the Navy's monitoring programs and INRMP will be incorporated into the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS as appropriate. As per CEQ regulations, the Navy uses a number of sources of best available science and data, including external references (noted in each section of EIS/OEIS), technical documents (available on the MITT project website), and ongoing consultation processes with other agencies (NMFS and USFWS). Data is drawn and managed from multiple sources/points, including from the public during the NEPA process. Data are available in tables in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS and technical reports on the website. Best available peer-reviewed science/data can come from sources such as academia, other resource agencies, industry, and the public. For Navy-funded and managed studies, the Navy will continue to communicate and coordinate with the CNMI government on future collaboration and information sharing.

	Comment	Navy Response
	discussion of new technologies is privileged information, some demonstration that new impacts of these technologies have been meaningfully considered could also be included in supporting data sharing.	
DCRM-12	***Procedural Concerns*** The additional of new technology for training and testing under the MITT has not been meaningfully discussed with CNMI reviewing agencies, raising both substantive and procedural concerns. It is unclear whether the direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts have been considered. As the Department of Defense's procedures for implementing the National Environmental Policy Act details, the "fact that a proposed action is of a classified nature does not relieve the proponent of the action from complying with NEPA and the CEQ regulations. Therefore, environmental documents shall be prepared, safeguarded, and disseminated in accordance with the requirements applicable to classified information" and that "[e]ven though the classified EA/EIS does not undergo general public review and comment, it must still be part of the information package to be considered by the decisionmaker for the proposed action" (32 CFR 775.5). It appears some additional information confirming the consideration of the impacts of these new technologies would be warranted. Moreover, the proposed increase in use of explosive ordnance and the use of "new technologies" envisioned in this draft SEIS/OEIS appears to be substantial, especially when details regarding what those technologies are remains unknown. DOD's NEPA guidance further states that a "substantial change in a continuing activity (such as a substantial change in tempo, area of use, or in methodology/ equipment) which has the potential for significant environmental impacts should be considered a proposal for a new action and be documented accordingly" (32 CFR 775.6(c)(2)). Thus, it is unclear, given the addition of new technology and significant	Pursuant to 40 CFR section 1502.9(c), a supplemental EIS is prepared when the agency makes substantial changes in the proposed action that are relevant to environmental concerns (40 CFR section 1502.9(c)(1)(i)); or there are significant new circumstances or information relevant to environmental concerns and bearing on the proposed action or its impacts (40 CFR section 1502.9(c)(1)(ii)). An agency may also supplement a final EIS when the agency determines that the purpose of NEPA will be furthered by doing so (40 CFR section 1502(c)(2)). Pursuant to CEQ regulations, the Navy prepared the supplement to the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS to consider future activities conducted at sea and on FDM, and updated training and testing requirements; incorporated new information from an updated acoustic effects model and updated marine mammal density data; and incorporated evolving and emergent best available science. This Supplemental EIS/OEIS also supports any reissuance of federal regulatory permits and authorizations under the MMPA and the ESA using the best available science and analytical methods to assess potential environmental impacts. Section 2.3.1 (Changes to Proposed Activities) describes activities that changed and were therefore analyzed in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. New training activities include the use of new technology which must be tested and evaluated before use during deployment. As shown in Table 2.5-1, the only new training activity proposed is Surface Ship Object Detection. As shown in Table 2.5-2, proposed new testing activities (inclusive of new technology) include Radar and Other System Testing and Simulant Testing and may include the use of military or commercial radar, communication systems or simulators, or high-energy lasers. These activities and associated systems have already been tested by the Navy in other locations, but not the MITT Study Area. They are new to the Study Area

	Comment	Navy Response
	increase in use of explosive ordnance detailed in chart 2.5, why a new DEIS/OEIS has not been prepared to address this action. Should the DOD determine this approach is prudent, DCRM encourages that you work with our office and our agency partners to ensure that issue scoping is conducted and information is shared in advance of the official notice and comment period to support CNMI's ability to review and comment on these activities.	and therefore have been analyzed for environmental impacts in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. These changes to proposed training and testing activities are part of the overall Navy program and are not unique to the MIRC. Appendix A (Training and Testing Activities Descriptions) provides detailed data sheets describing each training and testing activity. Section 2.3.1.1 (New Technologies and Capabilities) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS provides additional information on new technology and capabilities.
DCRM-13	***Substantive Concerns*** <u>Significance of Effects at FDM</u> Significance of effects at FDM has primarily focused on coral impacts, although impacts to water quality and public access also remain concerns for DCRM. It appears that the "significance" of effects to coral around FDM has been qualitatively assessed based on surveys from two sets of researchers affiliated with the Navy's Space and Naval Warfare Systems Center Pacific (SSC Pacific). The "Smith and Marx" surveys were conducted between 1999-2012, and the most recent "Carilli et al" survey was conducted in 2017. Although the Carilli et al study was referenced in this draft SEIS/OEIS, this report and supporting data are not included in the 2019 SEIS/OEIS documents, making location of the file itself challenging. DCRM once again requests that supporting reports prepared for the MITT and other DOD build-up activities be provided when they are finalized to support meaningful review, and to this end we request copies of all of the Smith and Marx and Carilli surveys and associated raw data. Moreover, especially given the "discovery" of three new Acropora species, DCRM views the 2017 survey efforts as a missed opportunity for locally coordinated monitoring and assessment activities around FDM – a request for coordination that has been made repeatedly by local resource managers and still remains unaddressed. Collected data should be shared with CNMI to further inform discussion of monitoring protocols and impact analysis which are ongoing through this NEPA	See above response DCRM-04 (to the CNMI Bureau of Environmental and Coastal Quality, Division of Coastal Resources Management) regarding FDM and coral surveys. The Navy does not routinely allow independent, third-party access to live-fire ranges due to safety concerns. For Navy-funded and managed studies, the Navy will continue to communicate and coordinate with the CNMI government on future collaboration and information sharing. For instance, in Fiscal Year 2020, the Navy authorized and included a CNMI biologist to observe (on at least three occasions) FDM sea turtle surveys.

	Comment	Navy Response
	process as well as Integrated Natural Resources Management Planning dialogs. Without having access to these raw data and annual reports – and ideally access to the submerged lands around FDM itself for our own monitoring – it is difficult to find the significance assessment relating to impacts to coastal resources to be credible. This is especially true due to conclusory statements made in these studies, which were apparently qualitative in nature and lacking a "control" for comparison of effects in an area that is not experiencing active bombing practice. The Carilli et al. 2018 report distributed from the Navy Marine Species Monitoring resource library identifies 101 occurrences of exploded and unexploded ordnance on the sea floor within the 2017 survey area in Appendix E. That table lists over 4300 photographs, which again, would be helpful data to share with resource management agencies. In discussing "in-water effects of training" Carilli et al. note that "[t]wo bombs were classified as 'fresh' because they had little marine growth on them [and] all other items were classified as 'old', suggesting they had been submerged for at least several months and in some bases probable many years" and also that a "number of large ordnance items (750 and 2,000 pound bombs) which had been repeatedly sighted during past surveys were no longer at the same locations where they had been observed in the past [and] the divers speculated that these items had moved downslope due to wave and/or earthquake events". Despite noting that large bombs both intact and in pieces are being deposited around the island, and evidence that these bombs are shifting on the sea floor, the paper concludes that there was "overall little evidence of any adverse impacts to coral from training activities" although this conclusion seems primarily based in the qualitative observation that all corals within the study area were	

	Comment	Navy Response
	actually under stress. With over 77% of corals surveyed in this study showing signs of bleaching, additional stress from physical impacts of bombs bouncing from land and then sliding down the sea floor as well as indirect impacts from increasing erosion and sedimentation from the adjacent island are surely significant cumulatively and warrant at least a serious assessment of possible monitoring, mitigation, restoration, and compensation alternatives. To remedy observed shortcomings in data sharing and coastal resources effects analysis, DCRM urges the DOD to share all relevant raw data and analysis reports and invite DCRM and other resource managers in CNMI to join in the development and implementation of monitoring protocols at FDM. Additional studies to provide localized data to assess impacts to water quality and public access should also be considered in subsequent monitoring and re-permitting dialogs. In drafting environmental impact statements, clear use of the significance criteria being used would also be most helpful in supporting review of these statements. Robust monitoring should be ensured to provide data to assess whether current mitigation measures are sufficient and document changes relative to local and global events as they occur.	
DCRM-14	It also appears that the 2017 survey had relatively little coverage of the submerged lands adjacent to Impact Area 3, which would seem to be necessary due to the newly listed coral species that could occur in this area. Quarterly surveys of the full area of potential deposition of ordnance around FDM would seem reasonable given the high frequency of range use and the considerable ramp up in the "tempo" of the use of large explosive ordnance being proposed. More regular survey frequencies could also provide training opportunities to reclaim, disarm, and remove bombs from the terrestrial and marine environment to further reduce concerns regarding direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts of these activities.	See above responses to DCRM-01 and DCRM-04 (to the CNMI Bureau of Environmental and Coastal Quality, Division of Coastal Resources Management) regarding the 2017 Carilli et al. (2018) surveys. The Navy continues to monitor general ecological conditions on FDM through the use of aerial images and routine surveys. The Navy has an Operational Range Clearance plan (2013) for land-based areas of FDM, which includes provisions for vegetation management and removal/disposal of materials that may present an explosive risk. Clearance of the range occurs every 2–4 years, depending on the type of ordnance targeted for removal or destruction.

	Comment	Navy Response
DCRM-15	Significance of Water Quality Effects As the draft SEIS/OEIS outlines, explosives and explosive byproducts in addition to other materials expended during the proposed training and testing would "not exceed regulatory thresholds and guidelines" for sediment and water quality. Because it is unclear what guidelines are being referenced here, and what baseline and current data is being used to quantify existing levels of heavy metal load in the jurisdictional waters of FDM, further clarification is requested. Additional details regarding qualitative and/or quantitative criteria being used to assess the "significance" of in-water effects would enable CNMI to better understand the effects analysis supporting claims that existing and proposed increases of explosive ordnance is not having significant effects on coastal resources of concern. An updated or final EIS/OEIS should clearly identify what water pollutants of concern have been tested for on land and in the waters surrounding FDM and provide clear evidence that the ordnance being deposited from training activities does not pose direct, indirect, or cumulative risks to water quality and associated human uses of these coastal resources.	The Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS has been updated to include Table 3.1-1 within Section 3.1 (Sediments and Water Quality) which includes water quality standards, criteria, and applicable water use areas for waters surrounding Guam and islands within the CNMI. Specifically for waters surrounding CNMI, the Navy references Chapter 65-130 Part 400, which provides water quality standards for water use areas in nearshore waters of the CNMI. Table 3.1-1 lists each standard with specific criteria in CNMI's regulations and applicability to each water use area. The water quality standards include criteria for microbiological concentrations (Enterococci, and *E. coli*), pH, nutrients (nitrate-nitrogen, total nitrogen, orthophosphate, ammonia), dissolved oxygen, total filterable suspended solids, salinity, temperature, turbidity, radioactive materials, oil and petroleum products, toxic pollutants, and other general considerations. The military readiness activities that generate stressors to water quality do not occur in the water use areas; rather, they occur outside of the CNMI coastal zone and are analyzed in the context of their potential to induce reasonably foreseeable effects into Class "AA" or Class "A" water use areas. The Navy does not believe that testing for water quality pollutants of concern is warranted in waters surrounding FDM. Based on the multi-year dive surveys discussed within Section 3.1 (Sediments and Water Quality), there are no indications of adverse impacts on fish, shellfish, or wildlife within the coastal waters surrounding FDM, with the dive surveys showing healthy ecosystem functions and wildlife abundance within these waters. While no quantitative sampling for metals in training areas have been completed, there are a number of studies conducted in marine training and testing locations that have attempted to measure metal content where military activities occur. In one study, the water was sampled for lead, manganese, nickel, vanadium, and zinc at a shallow bombing range in Pamlico Sound (state waters of North Carolina) immediately following a training event with non-explosive practice bombs. All water quality

	Comment	Navy Response
		parameters tested, except nickel, were within the state limits. The nickel concentration was significantly higher than the state criterion, although the concentration did not differ significantly from the control site located outside the bombing range. The results suggest that bombing activities were not responsible for the elevated nickel concentrations (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2010). A recent study conducted by the U.S. Marine Corps sampled sediments and water quality for 26 different constituents related to munitions at several U.S. Marine Corps water-based training ranges. Metals included lead and magnesium. These areas were also used for bombing practice. No munitions constituents were detected above screening values used at the U.S. Marine Corps water ranges (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2010). A study by Pait et al. (2010) of previous Navy training areas at Vieques, Puerto Rico, found generally low concentrations of metals in marine sediments. Areas in which live ammunition and loaded weapons were used ("live-fire areas") were also included in the analysis.
DCRM-16	When discussing cumulative impacts, the 2019 DEIS references the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS analysis, stating that training and testing activities under each alternative could result in local, short- and long-term changes in sediment and water quality, but that "chemical, physical, or biological changes remained within standards, regulations, and guidelines" (DEIS, 4-22). It would be very helpful to have some additional discussion regarding what those "changes", how they are being detected and monitored, and how it is clear that applicable standards are not being and will not be exceeded. The DEIS goes on to rely on 2015 MITT analysis that, for short-term impacts "from explosions and the byproducts of explosions and combusted propellants" it would be "unlikely that these short-term impacts would overlap in time and space with other future actions that produce similar constituents" and "[t]herefore, the short-term impacts did not contribute to cumulative impacts" (DEIS 4-22). This is an unreasonable omission	See above responses to DCRM-01, DCRM-02, DCRM-09, and DCRM-15 (to the CNMI Bureau of Environmental and Coastal Quality, Division of Coastal Resources Management) regarding cumulative impact analysis, water quality and sediments, and FDM. The Navy used the best available science and conducted a comprehensive review of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable actions to develop a robust analysis of cumulative impacts (Chapter 4, Cumulative Impacts). As required under NEPA, the level and scope of the analysis are commensurate with the potential impacts of the action as reflected in the resource-specific discussions in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences). The Navy considered proposed and ongoing activities alongside other activities in the region whose impacts are truly meaningful to the analysis. Furthermore, the entire Supplemental EIS/OEIS provides the cumulative impacts analysis, not just Chapter 4. Chapter 3 provides the current effects of past and present impacts and

	Comment	Navy Response
	from this environmental impact analysis that may lead to substantially flawed understanding of impacts and necessary mitigation actions. Cumulative effects analysis should most certainly consider the combine direct and indirect impacts of the currently sanctioned and proposed additional use of munitions on FDM and within the waters of MITT range complex. As previously noted in scoping comments, the revised or final report should include direct and cumulative impacts from military-expended materials and other marine debris on water quality and marine biota including but not limited to analysis of the timing, duration, and concentration of toxic inputs (both point and non-point source), the residence times of the constituents, effects of deposition, bio-accumulation of metals and other chemical pollutants in individual organisms and on up the food chain, and potential risks stemming from unexploded ordnance. This assessment should be conducted for the proposed seven-year extension of currently sanctioned activities at 2015 MITT ROD levels and at leaves of proposed alternatives 1 and 2 to provide for more meaningful analysis of impacts within the MITT range for the duration of the currently proposed action.	environmental conditions that represent the baseline of the environment as it is; Chapter 3 also discusses the consequences or potential future impacts from Navy activities. Chapter 4 discusses other reasonably foreseeable activities to the extent they are known and the incremental impact of the Navy's proposal when added to past, present, and future impacts.
DCRM-17	When discussing long-term impacts, the DEIS notes that, similar to the 2015 Final EIS/OEIS long-term cumulative impacts would be "negligible" because: • Most training and testing activities are widely dispersed in space and time. • Where activities are concentrated (i.e., Farallon de Medinilla [FDM]), marine habitat conditions observed over multiple years through dive studies indicate that ecological services that maintain water quality have not been inhibited at FDM. • Most components of expended materials are inert or corrode slowly.	See above responses to DCRM-03, DCRM-14, and DCRM-15 (responses to the CNMI Bureau of Environmental and Coastal Quality, Division of Coastal Resources Management) regarding water quality and sediments (see Section 3.1, Sediments and Water Quality), FDM, operational range clearance, and sonar. Section 3.6 (Birds) and Section 3.10 (Terrestrial Species and Habitats) include comparisons of how munitions use would change under the Navy's Proposed Action compared to baseline activities. The comparisons are provided in the context of number of munition items, net explosive weight, and number of activities. Chapter 2 provides a summary of the total hours of sonar use.

	Comment	Navy Response
	• Numerically, most of the metals expended are small-and medium-caliber projectiles, metals of concern comprise a small portion of the alloys used in expended materials, and metal corrosion is a slow process that allows for dilution. • Most of the components are subject to a variety of physical, chemical, and biological processes that render them benign. • Potential areas of impacts would be limited to small zones immediately adjacent to the explosive, metals, or chemicals other than explosives. (DEIS, 4-23). To be at least minimally responsive to initial scoping requests, answers to the following questions should be provided: • How many total tons of munitions and hours of sonar are being proposed for the timeline of the current proposal, which we understand to be though the next MMPA / ESA permitting period which has been extended from five to seven years? • What studies have been conducted around FDM to demonstrate current water quality and water quality before compared to after explosive munitions use? What parameters have been tested for and at what frequency? Please provide copies of these studies to DCRM. • Which components of expended materials are inert, which corrode slowly, and which are listed as known pollutants of concern? What would the total volume of these materials left on shore and in the marine environment be if the current 2015 MITT ROD is extended and under Alternative 1 and 2? What best practices are in place on other DOD ranges to ensure these materials do not pose risks to people and the environment? Are there mitigating actions that could be taken to further reduce risks of large ordnance "bouncing" from land into the marine environment? • What are current heavy metal loads in sediment and waters surrounding FDM? How does this compare to more remote	• Section 3.0 (Introduction) includes several tables that provide details on the munitions and sonar proposed as part of the Proposed Action. Table 3.0-2 presents the source class categories of sonar and the units proposed under Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 (the Preferred Alternative). The 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS units are also presented in the table for comparison. Table 3.0-18 presents the different military expended material and the area of potential impact (acre). The table presents the acres within the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and Alternative 1 and 2 of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. According to Table 3.0-18, the surface area of the ocean bottom that could be impacted by the use of military expended materials as proposed in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS would decrease from the amount analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. • In response to DCRM's comment requesting studies conducted around FDM to compare current water quality and water quality before and after explosive munitions use, along with parameters tested (and frequency), the Navy has updated Section 3.1 (Sediments and Water Quality) with additional information. Although no quantitative sampling for metals in training areas have been completed, there are a number of studies conducted in marine training and testing locations that have attempted to measure metal content where military activities occur. In one study, the water was sampled for lead, manganese, nickel, vanadium, and zinc at a shallow bombing range in Pamlico Sound (state waters of North Carolina) immediately following a training event with non-explosive practice bombs. All water quality parameters tested, except nickel, were within the state limits. The nickel concentration was significantly higher than the state criterion, although the concentration did not differ significantly from the control site located outside the bombing range. The results suggest that bombing activities were not responsible for the elevated nickel concentrations (U.S. Department of the Navy,

	Comment	Navy Response
	islands of the CNMI that have not been being used for live fire training since the 1970s? How quickly do these metals corrode in our island environment? What best practices are in place on other DOD ranges to reclaim lead projectiles or otherwise ensure that heavy metals are not left in the terrestrial or marine environment? • What are the components of the ordnance being used that would be rendered "benign" through physical, chemical, and biological processes? What are these processes and how long do they take? What components are not rendered "benign" through these processes? • How have the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects on the "small zones immediately adjacent to the explosive, metals, or chemicals other than explosives" been assessed for the impact zones on FDM? Without robust data to support analysis regarding these questions, it is indefensible to state that the cumulative impacts of the proposed 2019 SEIS/OEIS and future extensions of this proposal for the "foreseeable future" will not have significant impacts on the water quality, sediments, and surrounding coastal resources of FDM and the lands and waters of the CNMI. If information regarding water quality is lacking, data should be gathered, and DCRM would welcome the opportunity to join and support data collection, analysis, and further monitoring efforts.	2010). A recent study conducted by the U.S. Marine Corps sampled sediments and water quality for 26 different constituents related to munitions at several U.S. Marine Corps water-based training ranges. Metals included lead and magnesium. These areas were also used for bombing practice. No munitions constituents were detected above screening values used at the U.S. Marine Corps water ranges (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2010). A study by Pait et al. (2010) of previous Navy training areas at Vieques, Puerto Rico, found generally low concentrations of metals in marine sediments. Areas in which live ammunition and loaded weapons were used ("live-fire areas") were also included in the analysis. • Other than targeting restrictions (i.e., limiting certain ordnance types to specific impact areas on FDM), there are no additional mitigative actions to reduce risks of large ordnance skipping off the surface into the marine environment. These "bounces," however, are reported in the form of after-action reports to JRM. • As stated in Section 3.1.1.1.4 (Farallon de Medinilla), range condition assessments are conducted at all operational ranges within the Mariana Islands Range Complex in accordance with Department of Defense (DoD) Instruction 4715.14, Operational Range Assessments; and the Chief of Naval Operations Range Sustainability Environmental Program Analysis Policy. The Navy is committed to surveying the FDM coral reef environment every five years, as well as performing the routine clearance of unexploded ordnance and other range debris from the FDM impact areas. No comparison studies between nearshore waters of FDM and other islands within the CNMI not used for military training activities have been conducted. The Navy does not believe these studies are warranted, based on conclusions reached in other quantitative sampling conducted in in-water ranges, as well as observations of reef health reported in multi-year dive surveys surrounding FDM.

	Comment	Navy Response
		• Direct, indirect, and cumulative effects analysis of localized impacts within waters surrounding FDM has been conducted qualitatively, based on the best available science (for FDM, this includes multi-year dive survey reports; for military ranges in general, see quantitative sampling discussions included above that have occurred within other in-water ranges).
DCRM-18	Significance of Effects to Public Access The DEIS/OEIS reports that "[a]ccess to waters around FDM between 3 and 12 NM was restricted for an average of 160days per year (peak of 201 in the year 2012)" and "[a]ccess to waters within 3 NM of FDM is restricted at all times to ensure public safety during military activities using explosive munitions" (DEIS 3.12-17). Although the DOD acknowledges that "[t]raining and testing activities have the potential to temporarily limit access to areas of the ocean, which has the potential to impact traditional fishing practice in the Study Area" (DEIS 4.48) these potential effects are not well detailed in the draft DEIS/OEIS. Disconcertingly, the 2019 report states that as "a result of the training and testing activities associated with this SEIS/OEIS, areas within 3 NM of FDM are permanently restricted to maintain public safety. Even when hazardous activities are not occurring at FDM, the potential occurrence of unexploded ordnance in waters surrounding the island is a constant threat to public safety" (DEIS 4-49). If this is the case, the DOD should take steps to ensure dangerous ordnance on land and in the water is regularly controlled to reduce threats to all people within the training area. This is especially true as the DOD is a temporary 58ease of this land and has no legal authority to "permanently" restrict access. It is unclear how this SEIS/OEIS can credibly assess direct and cumulative impacts on public access, cultural resources, and the loss of traditional access and use of Farallon de Medinilla, but the treatment of these impacts in the current draft is dismissive and insufficient. Training and testing activities should not be allowed to pose "constant threats to public	The Navy is committed to continuing to work with the local community on issues that potentially affect the public, including access to fishing sites while ensuring public safety at all times. The military actively promotes compatible use of ocean areas by minimizing public access restrictions and limiting the extent and duration of necessary closures. To clarify information presented in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, range access would not always be restricted when a range is in use; therefore, no change has been made to the document. Range access is dependent on the nature and type of activity being conducted. The Navy does not propose a change to the ocean areas currently used by both the Navy and the public. Restrictions on accessing areas of co-use would continue to be infrequent and short-term, while other fishing sites in the Study Area would continue to be available to the public. The Navy recognizes that limited or no access to productive fishing areas would impact fishers. While the analysis concludes that impacts could occur, the Navy does not anticipate significant impacts on commercial and recreational fishing in the Study Area, as described in both this Supplemental EIS/OEIS and the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, given the availability of other fishing areas in the CNMI. The Navy regards the safety of fishermen and other boaters as a top priority. The Navy would not restrict the freedom of movement between islands. However, the permanent restriction at FDM is in accordance with Article 12© of the January 1986 lease, which specifically states, "Public access to Farallon de Medinilla Island and the waters of the

	Comment	Navy Response
	safety" and the DOD should take necessary actions to ensure training areas do not become permanent waste lands.	Commonwealth immediately adjacent thereto shall be permanently restricted for safety reasons." Various means are used to communicate information to the public about areas restricted to public or commercial activities and are described in Section 3.13 (Public Health and Safety). As specified in Title 33 CFR Subpart 72.01, Notices to Mariners, the U.S. Coast Guard issues information to the public concerning maritime navigation. When notices to mariners are issued, the restriction is not necessarily for a full 24-hour period because many training activities last less than a full day. Additionally, nautical charts issued by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration include these federally designated zones and areas. Operators of recreational and commercial vessels have a duty to abide by maritime regulations administered by the U.S. Coast Guard. The Navy will continue to communicate closures to the public and fishing community, including using a public Facebook page. As discussed above, the Navy has an Operational Range Clearance plan (2013) for FDM, which includes clearance of the range every 2–5 years, depending on the type of ordnance targeted for removal or destruction. In compliance with the terms of the 1983 lease, the United States would remove unexploded ordnance and exploded ordnance fragments from FDM to the extent practicable before returning to the CNMI.
DCRM-19	<u>Questions Regarding Proposed "Increase in Tempo"</u> The current MITT proposal seeks a significant increase in use of munitions at FDM in addition to use of "new technologies" throughout the nearly one million nautical mile "MITT range" that is our exclusive economic zone. It would be helpful if the final EIS/OEIS clarify why substantial increases in the amount of munitions – for example, 1,000 Naval Surface Fine Support Exercise Landbased Targets authorized annually under the 2015 Record of Decision to 4,200 being proposed now. What do these increases in "tempo" mean for activities within the MITT range area and how long is this increase anticipated to continue for? What is the total	Section 2.3.1 (Changes to Proposed Activities) describes those activities that changed and were therefore analyzed in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As shown in Table 2.5-1, the only new training activity proposed is Surface Ship Object Detection. As shown in Table 2.5-2, proposed new testing activities include Radar and Other System Testing and Simulant Testing. These activities and associated systems have already been tested by the Navy in other locations, but not the Study Area. They are new to the Study Area and therefore have been analyzed for environmental impacts in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. These changes to proposed training and testing activities are part of the overall Navy program and are not unique to the

	Comment	Navy Response
	number of bombs and explosive potential sanctioned under the 2015 ROD and how is this proposal different? How many more tons of payload would proposed increases amount to? What if any alternatives were considered to this "solution" to accomplish training needs while also preserving the physical integrity of FDM and its surrounding waters? ***Conclusion*** To summarize, we request additional coordination with our office and more effective outreach to garner community engagement on the environmental and socioeconomic impacts to the study area. Where data and analysis are lacking, studies should be done working with CNMI resource management agencies to build trust and ensure we are answering research questions that should be resolved, rigorously assessing impacts, and ensuring mitigating actions are taken should significant impacts be identified. DCRM is appreciative of the opportunity to comment on the Draft Supplemental EIS/ OEIS and we thank you for your consideration. If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me at jcastro@dcrm.gov.mp.	MIRC. Appendix A (Training and Testing Activities Descriptions) provides detailed data sheets describing each training and testing activity. The tempo and types of training and testing activities have fluctuated because of the introduction of new technologies (such as unmanned vehicles and new sensors), the evolving nature of international events, advances in warfighting doctrine and procedures, and changes in force structure, such as the organization of ships, submarines, aircraft, weapons, and Sailors. Such developments influence the frequency, duration, intensity, and location of required training and testing activities. On FDM, the ordnance numbers and types differ from what was proposed in the 2015 MITT EIS/OEIS; however, these changes do not exceed what was analyzed in terms of frequency of use or net explosive weight in the 2015 Biological Opinion provided to the Navy by USFWS for the continued use of FDM as a live-fire range. Section 3.6 (Birds) and Section 3.10 (Terrestrial Species and Habitats) discuss the changes in detail, as well as their potential impacts on biological resources on FDM.
Lynda Bordallo Aguon, Guam State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO)		
SHPO-01	a. Table of Contents, page ix, 3.11 Cultural Resources, 3.11.1.1 Guam. After Guam, add Mariana Islands, i.e., Guam, Mariana Islands.	Text within the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS will be revised to Section 3.11.1.1 (Guam, Mariana Islands).
SHPO-02	b. What recent literature was reviewed to indicate that no additional submerged cultural resources have been identified around Guam? Our review indicate there are 119 submerged resources rather than the 84 stated in the Final EIS.	Consistent with Section 106 of the NHPA, the Navy made a "reasonable and good faith effort" to identify historic properties. Literature reviewed is cited in the references section of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS and 2015 Final MITT EIS/OEIS. Chapter 3.11 (Cultural Resources) has been updated to include a map of known wrecks, obstructions, or occurrences with the U.S. Territorial Waters.
SHPO-03	A systematic submerged resource survey around Guam must be conducted before any MITT activities occur.	Consistent with Section 106 of the NHPA, the Navy made a "reasonable and good faith effort" to identify historic properties. The Draft

	Comment	Navy Response
		Supplemental EIS/OEIS relies on the best available science and no new cultural resource surveys are required or planned.
SHPO-04	c. Page 3.11.1, 3.11. l.2.1 Farallon de Medinilla. What recent literature was reviewed to indicate that no additional submerged cultural resources, land-based archaeological site, or isolated non-modern artifacts have been identified around or on Farallon de Medinilla? Please provide copies of the literature to the Guam Public Library. See last paragraph under d.	Literature reviewed is cited in the references section of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS and 2015 Final MITT EIS/OEIS. The Navy conducted a review of literature and no new submerged resources have been identified, and there is no new literature on FDM.
SHPO-05	d. Page 3.11.6, 3.11.3 Public Scoping Comments. The Lead Agency (U.S. Department of the Navy) must conduct more community outreach and public meetings when consulting with the indigenous people of the Mariana Islands. The 2009 Mariana Islands Range Complex (MIRC) Programmatic Agreement is mentioned in numerous sections in the EIS/SEIS -and more importantly, is expiring December 2019. What document will be used in the interim before a new Programmatic Agreement is negotiated, and will any of the activities be held in abeyance until such time an agreement is executed? Yes, the MIRC Programmatic Agreement was negotiated with the Guam SHPO and CNMI SHPO, but public participation was lacking and there was not one consulting party that communicated the interest and concerns of the public. The lead agency did not seek or consider the views of the public as required in the process.	The Navy is required to complete independent statutory obligations under both NEPA and NHPA. Thus, the Navy has prepared this Supplemental EIS/OEIS and continued compliance with NHPA under the Section 106 process. The MIRC Programmatic Agreement expired in December 2019. In anticipation of this, the Navy initiated a NHPA Section 106 consultation in January 2019 with an eye toward developing new updated Programmatic Agreements. The Navy has held five consultation meetings open to consulting and interested parties on Guam and eight throughout the CNMI. Additionally, site visits, and working group sessions with the SHPOs and the National Park Service have taken place. The Navy is required to comply with NHPA Section 106 to support its undertaking. A Programmatic Agreement is one of several methods of ensuring compliance under Section 106 but is most appropriate for undertakings that involve routine and redundant activities where a federal agency plans to resolve potential adverse effects to historic properties through avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation. An interim Programmatic Agreement for Guam that follows the exact terms of the 2009 MIRC Programmatic Agreement has been executed and is intended to "bridge" the expiration of the current Programmatic Agreement with the execution of the new Programmatic Agreement being developed. With regard to the CNMI, Cultural Resources staff at Joint Region Marianas have already taken action to conduct NHPA Section 106 consultation on individual training events following the expiration of the 2009 MIRC Programmatic

	Comment	Navy Response
		Agreement to ensure compliance as the Navy continues the consultation process.
SHPO-06	As stated in the last paragraph, a preliminary archaeological field survey of FDM was conducted in 1996 and reported no archaeological sites or isolated non-modem artifacts were observed (Welch 2010). This report does not support the knowledge that pre-contact Chamorros have known this island and gave it the name No 'os (a variation of Noos, J. Garrido). Fritz, during the German Administration, visited the island and noted that Medinilla contained "remains which suggested that the island was formerly inhabited or visited by Chamorros, presumably in the pre-contact period."(1989:11)." (Russell 1998).	The NHPA Section 106 process has received input regarding surveys for cultural resources on and in the waters surrounding FDM. The Navy has consulted at length with the CNMI State Historic Preservation Officer on the feasibility of conducting surveys at FDM and is confident that a mutually beneficial outcome will be incorporated in the development of the new Programmatic Agreement.
SHPO-07	Lastly, it is important to note, that in a space of almost 4 years from the time the 2015 EIS was implement to the 2019 Supplemental EIS, more cultural resources have been located, excavated, and recorded that are eligible and or listed in the National Register of Historic Places. A systematic literature review and resurveys of areas surveyed 20 or more years ago will result in a figure way beyond the 540 mentioned in the 2015 EIS. Thank you for the opportunity to comment. Si Yu'os Ma'cise'.	Consistent with Section 106 of the NHPA, the Navy made a "reasonable and good faith effort" to identify historic properties. Literature reviewed as part of the analysis is presented in the references section of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS and the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Chapter 3.11 (Cultural Resources) has been updated to include a map of known wrecks, obstructions, or occurrences with the U.S. Territorial Waters. Locations of submerged sites included data that was compiled from records through the CNMI HPO.
Ralph DLG. Torres, Governor of the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (Gov CNMI)		
Gov CNMI-01	The Office of the Governor for the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (CNMI) presents the following comments on the 2019 Mariana Islands Training and Testing (MITT) Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement / Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS/OEIS). Given the fact that the CNMI is still recovering from the damage caused by Super Typhoon Yutu, the limited review period for this extensive document is quite administratively challenging. As such, this review is focused primarily on procedural points and substantive questions	The Navy has been conducting training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades and this supplement to the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS supports the continuation of that training and testing. The activities analyzed in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS are largely a continuation of the ongoing training and testing activities that were analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, 2010 MIRC EIS/OEIS, and 1999 Mariana EIS/OEIS. Proposed training and testing activities are needed to achieve and maintain military readiness within the Study Area. In this regard, this Supplemental EIS/OEIS

	Comment	Navy Response
	as they relate to sustainable development principles including the scope, duration, and underlying assumptions upon which discussion of effects on the CNMI' s resources have been premised. We apologize in advance if the answers to the questions posed here are present within the 1,452 pages of Volumes 1 and 2 in addition to the numerous supporting technical documents, however, clarification on the following points would be especially helpful for the CNMI as we work to plan for socio-economic and ecological resilience for the Northern Mariana Islands. We hope these comments will also help improve the discussion of impacts, significant effects, and appropriate mitigation measures of this action. **Questions Regarding Scope and Duration** The Executive Summary notes that the "Supplemental EIS (SEIS)/OEIS considers ongoing and future activities conducted at sea and on Farallon de Medinilla (FDM), updated training and testing requirements, incorporates new information from an updated acoustic effects model, updates, marine mammal density data, and incorporates evolving and emergent best available science"(ES-1) however, it is unclear from this document the extent and duration of the activities being proposed and how these activities differ from those identified in the 2015 MITT Record of Decision (ROD). A simple chart detailing differences from the 2015 ROD and any proposed changes under proposed alternatives in the 2019 SEIS/OEIS in the Executive Summary would make the review of this voluminous document more accessible to experts and the general public alike and encourage public participation in this process as is the stated intent of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Instead, the matrices provided in Tables 2.5 and 2 .7 as well as Appendix F demonstrate that numerous changes may or may not result in additional stressors by training activity and resource type,	furthers the Navy and other military services' execution of their roles and responsibilities under 10 U.S.C. section 5062. This Supplemental EIS/OEIS: (1) includes the analysis of activities at sea and on FDM necessary to meet readiness requirements beyond 2020 and into the reasonably foreseeable future; (2) includes any changes to those activities previously analyzed; and (3) reflects the most up-to-date compilation of training and testing activities deemed necessary to accomplish military readiness requirements. The tempo and types of training and testing activities have fluctuated because of the introduction of new technologies (such as such as unmanned vehicles and new sensors), the evolving nature of international events, advances in warfighting doctrine and procedures, and changes in force structure, such as the organization of ships, submarines, aircraft, weapons, and Sailors. Such developments influence the frequency, duration, intensity, and location of required training and testing activities. The Navy routinely predicts the activities it will be conducting years in the future and analyzes the activities for environmental and regulatory compliance. This Supplemental EIS/OEIS supports the issuance of federal regulatory permits and authorizations under the MMPA and the ESA. The MMPA authorization for this Supplemental EIS/OEIS would be valid for seven years. It is important to note that the Navy is then bound by the limits of its expected types and levels of activities to comply with the permits and authorizations. If a need arises that exceeds those predicted activities, the Navy would be required to conduct additional environmental analyses. The Navy strives to create an accessible document for the public to review. To provide greater clarity, the Navy summarized ongoing training and testing activities analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and the proposed activities analyzed in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS (Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2 in Chapter 2 [Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives]). These tables are color coded to reflect activities by alternative that are proposed to decrease, increase, or stay the same (no change) in

	Comment	Navy Response
	but the extent of these changes is nebulous at best, and activities have to be cross-referenced to Appendix A to get a general sense of what actions are actually being proposed. Some refinement here would improve readability and accessibility of this information to reviewers. Similarly, rather than providing a clear statement of the proposed change in scope and duration of activities, the Executive Summary notes that in this draft SEIS/OEIS the Navy: • analyzes at-sea and FDM activities necessary to meet readiness requirements beyond 2020 and into the reasonably foreseeable future, including any changes to those activities previously analyzed, and reflects the most up-to-date compilation of training and testing activities deemed necessary to accomplish military readiness requirements; • adjusts types and tempo (increases or decreases) of training and testing events from the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS to the level needed to meet readiness requirements beyond 2020 and into the reasonably foreseeable future; • presents the results of the evaluation of relevant new information, which has been incorporated into revised analyses where appropriate (each resource area analyzed within the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS has been evaluated to determine the need for reanalysis within this SEIS/OEIS); • updates the environmental impact analyses in the previous documents to account for changes to tempo of activity, renaming or combining related types of activities, acknowledging discontinuation of some activities assessed in 2015, and assessing new activities, such as those involving high energy lasers, to enable the Navy to adopt new technology and new capabilities; • updates environmental analyses with the best available science and most current acoustic analysis methods to evaluate the	comparison to the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. A footnote has been added to Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2 to better define ongoing activities.

	Comment	Navy Response
	potential effects of training and testing on the marine environment; and • supports reauthorization of incidental takes of marine mammals under the MMPA and incidental takes of threatened and endangered marine species under the ESA. To assist with community review of this proposal, it would be very helpful if the updated or final SEIS/OEIS be refined to provide a clear description of the proposed changes in activities that are necessary to meet readiness requirements as well as a time-bound range specifying what is meant by the repeated use of the phrase "beyond 2020 and into the reasonably foreseeable future". Understanding the scope and duration of these proposed activities as well as a clear statement of the difference between the scope and duration reflected in the current proposed action and the 2015 ROD would support meaningful public review of this proposal as well as CNMI' s long-term sustainable development planning efforts.	
Gov CNMI-02	**Procedural Concerns and Suggestions** There are legitimate procedural concerns with this SEIS/OEIS review process. One of our chief concerns is regarding community engagement. The Council on Environmental Quality's Environmental Justice Guidance Under the National Environmental Policy Act (CEQ EJ Guidance) states that "each Federal agency must provide opportunities for effective community participation in the NEPA process, including identifying potential effects and mitigation measures in consultation with affected communities and improving the accessibility of public meetings, crucial documents, and notices." Specifically, CEQ's EJ Guidance also advises that "[a]gencies should develop effective public participation strategies. Agencies should, as appropriate, acknowledge and seek to overcome linguistic, cultural, institutional, geographic, and other	The Navy recognizes the importance of public participation in the development of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. This Supplemental EIS/OEIS complies with NEPA, CEQ requirements, and Navy instructions for implementing NEPA. The paragraphs below discuss the enhanced outreach efforts completed as part of the NEPA process. The enhanced outreach efforts were inclusive of public participation strategies suggested in the CEQ's environmental justice guidance and are described below. The Navy acknowledges that the information presented in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS is, by necessity, very complex. This Supplemental EIS/OEIS contains a rigorous scientific analysis of the potential impacts of the Navy's proposal, and thoroughly explains the scientific analysis and findings. The Navy attempts to explain challenging concepts, methods, and the results of the analysis as clearly as possible and developed public informational materials for lay audiences. The Navy prepared project

	Comment	Navy Response
	barriers to meaningful participation, and should incorporate active outreach to affected groups." We do not believe the U.S. Navy satisfied its responsibility to provide opportunities for effective community participation in the NEPA process. It is acknowledged that public involvement may have been a challenge in part because the public hearings scheduled for the end of February had to be moved to the end of March due to typhoon activity and travel schedules. However, providing two weeks for comment development after the public meeting is an incredibly short time for stakeholders to review and develop substantive comments when considering the length of the SEIS document and its supporting materials. Given the low tum-out at the public meeting on Saipan, which was attended primarily by state agency representatives and non-profit groups monitoring proposed build -up activities, it seems more could be done to ensure meaningful participation within the NEPA process for this and future Department of Defense actions. There are also procedural concerns with the SEIS/OEIS documents. As stated in the CEQ's EJ Guidance, an agency's community engagement includes making the documents accessible to the community and reviewers. This includes not only making the documents physically accessible but comprehensible to the community and reviewers. The CNMI does not believe the U.S. Navy satisfied this requirement. Critical documents being used to support statements of fact and significance analysis within the SEIS/OEIS are not readily available for cross-referencing. Much of the analysis also refers back to analysis within the 2015 MITT, often without citations to specific pages, making third party review cumbersome. The U.S. Navy's actions, or inactions in the provided example, has made the Draft SEIS/OEIS largely inaccessible to the public and the CNMI government.	brochures, videos, a website, and posters, using layperson terms to enhance public understanding of the information presented in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Based on the demographics of the CNMI, a project fact sheet was also translated into Chamorro. The informational materials, including the translated fact sheet, were made available at all four public meetings and on the project website (www.mitt-eis.com). The Navy held four open house public meetings, one each on Tinian (Tinian Public Library, March 14, 2019), Rota (Mayor's Conference Hall, March 15, 2019), Saipan (Kanoa Resort, March 18, 2019), and Guam (University of Guam, March 19, 2019). The public meetings were an opportunity for the public to ask questions of Navy leadership, scientists, and other experts about the analysis documented in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Navy encouraged the public to attend these meetings and broadly notified the public through the media, including paid newspaper advertisements and news releases, and direct mail, including letters, postcards, and emails. A voice recorder was provided for any member of the public who wanted to provide an oral comment in a language other than English. The Navy has received feedback from attendees that the open-house format is more conducive to promoting public understanding and constructive dialogue. Open house meetings allow a greater number of individuals to directly engage and interact with Navy team members and ask questions about this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, as well as provide comments on the document. Although the Navy took cultural and religious holidays into account when planning the dates and locations for public meetings, those considerations had to be balanced with the deadlines and schedules of the large number of federal and local agency stakeholders, as well as the overall schedule of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. To better accommodate stakeholders and the public, the Navy provided 75 days to review and comment on the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, which is 30 days longer than the minimum required time for review.

	Comment	Navy Response
	For this document and most definitely for the future, the U.S. Navy must provide better opportunities for effective community participation. Small steps such as posting meeting notices at public meeting spaces and holding public hearings at community venues such as schools can greatly improve community engagement. The CNMI urges the U.S. Navy to work closely with the Office of the Governor's Civil Military Liaison Office to ensure an engagement strategy is developed and implemented to support more meaningful public involvement in the NEPA process moving forward. Discussing review timelines with the Office of the Governor would also help avoid review periods during cultural and religious holidays that may affect availability of the public as well as reduce conflicts with government deadlines such as grant reporting and budget submissions which also hampers review efforts at the state level. These simple actions, actions the U.S. Navy failed to take for this SEIS/OEIS, will support its responsibility of providing effective community engagement.	During the week of the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS public meetings in March 2019, the Navy participated in TV and radio interviews and briefed elected officials. The Navy appreciates input received from local government agencies and communities on how it can improve public notification and outreach efforts. The Navy recognizes the importance and value of continued communication and engagement with local governments, resource agencies, and the public and took steps to engage stakeholders during the public review and comment period for the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Navy met with local elected officials, resource agency representatives, and the public in Guam, Saipan, Tinian, and Rota to discuss the Proposed Action and answer questions for improved dialogue, understanding, and transparency. The Navy will engage the Governor's Civil Military Liaison Office in future outreach planning efforts.
Gov CNMI-03	**Questions Regarding Effects Criteria and Unsupported Factual Statements** *Defining Significance and Mitigating Effects* In addition to requiring public engagement, NEPA directs the proposing agency to provide sufficient information to support meaningful review of the significance of impacts. The U.S. Navy publishes guidance describing the Navy's policies, requirements, and procedures for complying with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the Council on Environmental Quality's (CEQ) implementing regulations. (OPNAVINST 5090.1B). For major Federal actions, it addresses the determination of significance and identifies procedures for categorical exclusions, environmental assessments, and environmental impact statements. This guidance further outlines the Navy's commitments to "effectively operate world-	This Supplemental EIS/OEIS to the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS supports the continuation of training and testing conducted at sea and on FDM beyond 2020. As previously mentioned, this Supplemental EIS/OEIS supports the issuance of federal regulatory permits and authorizations under the MMPA and the ESA. The MMPA authorization for this Supplemental EIS/OEIS would be valid for seven years. NEPA encourages the use of relevant data and analyses from other impact assessments. Training and testing activities conducted within other Navy study areas, such as Hawaii and Southern California, are the same or very similar to activities being conducted in the Study Area. The Navy has studied and continues to study its environmental impacts in these areas for over two decades, and relevant studies exist. If there is a lack of data in the Study Area, it is acceptable to use the best available scientific data as

	Comment	Navy Response
	wide in an environmentally responsible manner, both ashore and afloat." (OPNAVINST 5090.1C). In discussing processes, applicable laws, and terminology, this guidance notes that '"significantly,' as used in NEPA and E.O. 12114, requires consideration of both context and intensity of the environmental effects of an action" and that the "[a]ction's proponents should also consider the following factors in evaluating an action's significance: a. the geographic extent of the action; b. the duration of the action's effects, and c. the risk of environmental impacts." (OPNAVINST 5090.1C 5-1.3.34). CEQ further instructs that an environmental impact statement "shall provide full and fair discussion of significant environmental impacts and shall inform decision makers and the public of the reasonable alternatives which would avoid or minimize adverse impacts or enhance the quality of the human environment." (40 CFR § 1502). To properly frame discussion of potential effects of this activity, some clarification of the projected timeline for activities over the 984,601 square nautical mile MITT range extending "beyond 2020 and into the reasonably foreseeable future" would be helpful. The "human environment" is in fact broadly defined under NEPA, with CEQ directing that the term "shall be interpreted comprehensively to include the natural and physical environment and the relationship of people with that environment." (40 CFR § 1508). Therefore, when discussing the significance of potential impacts and possible mitigation measures, it is essential that this dialog be framed within a relevant local context, with appropriate deference to regional conditions and the views of the community most likely to be affected by the proposed activities. Although the summaries of scoping comments indicate community concerns regarding the potential significance of effects of ongoing training and testing activities ranging from ocean navigability to water quality to marine animal harassment , in numerous instances which	appropriate to determine potential impacts. Therefore, it is acceptable to use data from Hawaii and Southern California, as the same or similar activities are conducted in a similar environment to the Marianas. The Navy uses local jurisdictional data to supplement the impact analyses, for example monitoring and site-specific analysis, such as coral and sea turtle surveys. Additionally, the Navy conducts extensive monitoring and data collection programs as part of their compliance with the MMPA and ESA, including in the waters around the Mariana Islands. The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring Program website provides access to reports, documentation, data, and updates on current monitoring projects. Information on current monitoring projects, technical reports, conference presentations, and data are available at www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us. In addition, while outside the current scope of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the military satisfies Sikes Act obligations through the development and implementation of the Joint Region Marianas INRMP. The 2019 Joint Region Marianas INRMP includes monitoring programs throughout the Mariana Islands. The CNMI Department of Lands and Natural Resources, Division of Fish and Wildlife is a signatory and participating member to the 2019 Joint Region Marianas INRMP which details natural resource management and monitoring programs. The Navy will continue to improve coordination and collaboration with the CNMI as part of the INRMP project development and implementation. The programs mentioned above help ensure current environmental conditions are monitored regularly. Any new, relevant information or data from the Navy's monitoring programs or the INRMP was incorporated into the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS as appropriate.

	Comment	Navy Response
	are discussed in more detail as they pertain to the sustainable development of CNMI in this letter, it appears these questions and comments are often summarily dismissed citing "lack of data" or conclusively treated as non-issues based on reliance on studies or environment impact analysis from other jurisdictions or older surveys funded by the Department of Defense with limited peer review by third-party reviewers. We do not think this is proper. We also think it is not proper for the U.S. Navy to rely as it does on prior findings from other jurisdictions or old RODs. The present 2019 MITT draft SEIS/OEIS appears to include updated discussions regarding the significance of effects of some activities and that discussion of impacts in Section 3 relies heavily on other Department of Defense (DoD) Findings of No Significant Impacts (FONSI) from other jurisdictions or from prior records of decision in the Marianas. If studies are not available to support place-based analysis of impacts, we believe it more appropriate to establish and implement robust monitoring programs. Such programs would ensure that data reflecting current conditions as well as potential and actual effects of MITT activities to the "human environment," including information on socio-economic effects, can be collected and analyzed to continue to inform decision-making through ongoing NEPA review processes for this and related actions. Wherever possible it is recommended that such programs should be established in coordination with the CNMI's resource management agencies and community members with subject matter expertise to build transparency and trust in these assessments to support ongoing environmental assessment and decision-making. Sharing of data collected for impact monitoring purposes and future effects analysis should be regularly shared with the CNMI to further inform adaptive management dialogs and ensure that stakeholders receive updates in a timely manner.	

	Comment	Navy Response
Gov CNMI-04	*Significant Impacts to Public Access and Use Adjacent to Farallon de Medinilla (FDM)* The 2015 Record of Decision noted that the "[p]otential for reduced accessibility may result in impacts on commercial and recreational fishing, subsistence use, or tourism when area of co-use are temporarily inaccessible to ensure public safety during military training and testing activities." The 2015 ROD went on to declare that the "military will continue to collaborate with local communities to enhance existing means of communication with the public that are intended to reduce the potential effects of limiting accessibility" but concluded that "[i]mpacts on socioeconomic resources from physical disturbance and strike, airborne acoustics, and secondary stressors are not anticipated." As highlighted in the SEIS/OEIS scoping comments, potential ramp-up in live fire activities prompting implementation of a "danger zone" around FDM remains an issue of concern. The 2015 MITT FEIS/OEIS noted that the twelve nautical mile "danger zone" around Farallon de Medinilla "does not affect the continued implementation of the current restricted access as indicated in the lease agreement; therefore, no trespassing is permitted on the island or nearshore waters and reef at any time" and that "public access to Farallon de Medinilla will remain strictly prohibited and there are no commercial or recreational activities on or near the island." The current draft SEIS/OIES further states that "because dangerous military activities are conducted on FDM and up to 12 nautical miles around the island, restricted airspace has been established " during times of military use, and notes that civilian vessels may access the area up to the 3 nautical mile radius around the island when activities are not ongoing. As scoping comments and comments on prior MITT analyses has indicates, this amounts to a significant spatial restriction for community members of the	The Navy regards the safety of fishermen and other boaters as a top priority. The Navy is also aware that the 12 nautical miles (NM) restricted airspace and pending designation of the matching danger zone may affect access to fishing sites and create inconveniences for fishermen and boaters. The Navy understands that fishing is an important socioeconomic and cultural resource for the people of the CNMI and will continue to work with the fishing community to enable safe access to fishing areas around FDM. The designation (via rule making) of the 12 NM danger zone by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers under 33 CFR Part 334 is necessary to ensure public safety. The intent of the 12 NM danger zone is to ensure safety for the public when certain activities are taking place at FDM. A change in training did not drive the creation of the 12 NM danger zone. It is important to note that the area between 3 NM and 12 NM is not a permanent closure. While the number of proposed activities would increase under Alternatives 1 and 2, the increase may not result in a proportional increase in the number of days the 12 NM danger zone would be temporarily closed. Only the 3 NM area surrounding FDM would continue to be permanently closed. The increase in the number of activities could translate to an increase in closure time for one day but not necessarily additional days. While some areas within the 12 NM danger zone would not be accessible for safety reasons during certain activities, access would only be limited temporarily and not for all activities occurring at FDM. The Navy currently issues notices to mariners out to 12 NM around FDM. As specified in Title 33 CFR Subpart 72.01, Notices to Mariners, the U.S. Coast Guard issues information to the public concerning maritime navigation. When notices to mariners are issued, the restriction is not necessarily for a full 24-hour period because many training activities last less than a full day. Additionally, nautical charts issued by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration include these federally designated zones and areas. Operators of recreational and commercial

	Comment	Navy Response
	CNMI especially for fishermen and captains of small transiting vessels. We believe that mitigation measures need to be developed in terms of impacts to fishing, navigation, and associated economic actives in the Northern Islands. It is worth noting that although the CNMI's 1976 Covenant provides for the lease of Farallon de Medinilla island "and the waters immediately adjacent thereto" (Section 802) for fifty years with an option to renew for an additional fifty years (Section 803), extending the restricted area around Farallon de Medinilla (FDM) to twelve nautical miles appears to go beyond the intent of the phrase "immediately adjacent" waters. This expansive danger zone has been raised as a concern by residents of and visitors to the Northern Mariana Islands as this is a significant area to have to circumnavigate, especially for small craft making their way up the chain for subsistence fishing or to travel to and from their homes in the islands north and south of Farallon de Medinilla. Additional discussion regarding public access and impacts to navigation due to the proposed danger zone should include updated socio-economic use data from ongoing resettlement and ecotourism efforts concentrated in the Northern Islands. It would be helpful if the revised SEIS/OEIS could clearly state the general duration of time that the island of FDM would be impassible for small craft to support more rigorous analysis of impacts and potentially appropriate mitigation strategies.	vessels have a duty to abide by maritime regulations administered by the U.S. Coast Guard. The Navy will continue to communicate closures to the public and fishing community, including using Facebook.
Gov CNMI-05	*Clarifying Effects through Discussion of Use and Duration* While the CNMI understands that the U.S. military must train personnel and test new technologies to defend the United States, it is unclear why changed tempo and expanded activities are only appropriate within the Marianas chain as the scope of the proposed action indicates, and why the increased use of explosive ordnance is necessary to support training needs which were already supposedly satisfied by the 2015 ROD. It is also challenging to	The Mariana Islands are strategically significant to the U.S. military services for accomplishing their missions. For decades, the Mariana Islands have provided an ideal location in the Indo-Asia-Pacific region for the military to maintain a global and strategic presence. The Mariana Islands are the only training area within the Western Pacific that is a territory of the United States where military personnel who are homeported, deployed to, or returning from regions in the Western Pacific and the Indian Ocean may

	Comment	Navy Response
	review effects of actions that are only generally described. Further, although we appreciate the importance of national security necessitating the lack of detail regarding "new technologies," we still believe that this is an issue that could be discussed in more detail in order to enhance the CNMI government's understanding of the actual actions being proposed through this authorization process. Even if actions cannot be fully divulged, potential impacts should be rigorously addressed and supported with relevant, current data. Since 2015, increased commercial, recreational, and cultural activities have focused development interests in the Northern Mariana Islands such that it is unclear how the statement that "there are no commercial or recreational activities on or near the island" can be made. The CNMI encourages the U.S. Navy to provide clear documentation in the updated or final SEIS/OEIS the socio-economic analysis upon which this statement is based. Such analysis may also support identification of mitigation opportunities beyond the limited areas of the Marpi Reef and Chalan Kanoa Reef area identified in the current draft SEIS/OEIS. Additionally, clear statements in the executive summary and supporting fact sheets regarding proposed duration of activities - and in particular, the extent of anticipated airspace restriction for the 12 nautical mile "danger zone" around FDM and proposed increases in total tonnage of explosive materials now being proposed in Alternatives 1 and 2 in this SEIS - would help clarify impacts and more appropriately frame mitigation dialogs. As MITT activities constitute a "continuing action", analysis of a "no change in training" alternative that only extends the MMPA/ESA permit authorizations as previously discussed with the CNMI would also appear to be more realistic and responsive to NEPA's call to provide	conduct all levels of training, from basic to advanced, including integrated and joint events and exercises. As stated above, the Navy routinely predicts the training and testing activities it will be conducting years in the future based on evolving requirements or to anticipate necessary readiness levels due to emergent world events. Some activities may increase while others may decrease based on these predictions. The increase in certain activities, such as anti-air MISSILEX, which may use explosives (and therefore increase the net explosive weight of total munitions use on FDM) are based on updated readiness requirements described in Chapter 2 of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. These activity increases will result in small increases in the total net explosive weight expended on the island. The potential impacts of these increases are discussed and analyzed in Section 3.10.2.1.1 (Impacts from Acoustic Stressors under Alternative 1). Section 2.3.1 (Changes to Proposed Activities) describes those activities that changed and were therefore analyzed in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As shown in Table 2.5-1, the only new training activity proposed is Surface Ship Object Detection. As shown in Table 2.5-2, proposed new testing activities (inclusive of new technology) include Radar and Other System Testing and Simulant Testing and may include the use of military or commercial radar, communication systems or simulators, or high-energy lasers. These activities and associated systems have already been tested by the Navy in other locations but not in the MITT Study Area. They are new to the Study Area and therefore have been analyzed for environmental impacts in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. These changes to proposed training and testing activities are part of the overall Navy program and are not unique to the MIRC. Appendix A (Training and Testing Activities Descriptions) provides detailed data sheets describing each training and testing activity. Section 2.3.1.1 (New Technologies and Capabilities) of this

	Comment	Navy Response
	a no action alternative as opposed to the currently assessed sole no action alternative to end all MITT activities.	Supplemental EIS/OEIS provides additional information on new technology and capabilities. Regarding increased commercial, recreational, and cultural activities in the CNMI, specifically FDM, public access to FDM and within 3 NM of FDM is restricted. The Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS clarifies that there are no commercial or recreational activities allowed within 3 NM and on FDM. Current and proposed training activities would not change the way commercial or recreational ships operate within the Study Area and would not impact tourism related to cruise ships. The Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS has been updated to include tourism and transit activities within the Study Area. Regarding providing a "continuing action" No Action Alternative, the Navy applied a scenario where no authorizations or permits are issued and the Navy's training and testing activities do not take place. The resulting environmental effects from this scenario were compared with the effects of the Proposed Action (refer to Section 2.4.2.1, No Action Alternative). This approach supports NMFS' regulatory process by presenting the scenario where no authorization would be issued. Additionally, this approach responds to comments submitted at various stages of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and the scoping phase of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Section 2.4.1 (Alternatives Eliminated from Further Consideration) has been expanded to include a Continuing Action Alternative. This alternative includes no change to the training and testing activities as approved in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and the Navy consulting with NMFS under the MMPA. The Navy determined this alternative did not meet the purpose of and need for the Proposed Action. Table 2.5-1 and Table 2.5-2 of the MITT Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS compare the Proposed Action to the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS activities.
Gov CNMI-06	**Questions Regarding Socioeconomic Assessment and Environmental Justice** In discussing potential socioeconomic impacts of the MITT activities, it appears that the value of and potential impacts to	Comments regarding socioeconomic impacts are responded to below following response to comments on coral reefs around FDM.

	Comment	Navy Response
	subsistence fishing were not rigorously assessed. In Section 3.12.1.2.2, the DEIS notes that "Hospital and Beavers (2014) concluded that the CNMI small boat fisheries are a complex mix of subsistence, cultural, recreational, and quasi-commercial fishing practices and validated the socioeconomic importance of fishing to the people of the CNMI." (DEIS, 3.12- 9). The DEIS discusses "ambiguous" trends in commercial fisheries landings between 2010 - 2015 and notes that, since the 1950s, it is estimated that commercial and non-commercial landings have declined by 39-73 percent; such decline due to both increasing fishing pressures as well as a decline in the health and extent of coral reefs. It goes on to note that: > Some activities, such as those occurring at FDM, have the potential to affect coral reefs and, by extension, the coral reef fishery. Surveys conducted by Smith and Marx (2016) indicate that the health, abundance, and biomass of reef fish populations in the vicinity of FDM are comparable or superior to populations at other locations in the CNMI, likely due to the de facto protection from fishing that results from restricting access to the area around FDM (Thompson et al., 2017). The authors conclude that training and testing activities are having little to no negative impact on the reef fish fishery. Having a de facto protected area around FDM may benefit the reef fish fishery in the CNMI, beyond the restricted area around FDM; however, restricting access to nearshore areas (within 3 NM) around FDM where target species occur limits the ability for fishers to gain access to potentially productive fishing sites (DEIS, 3.12-9-10). It is disconcerting to see such far-reaching conclusions being made based on very limited qualitative data. To address potential effects of increased training at FDM, the United States Environmental	As discussed in Section 3.8 (Marine Invertebrates), recent surveys conducted by the Navy (Carilli et al., 2018) at FDM found that coral fauna are healthy and robust and the nearshore physical environment and basic habitat types at FDM remained unchanged. These conclusions are based on (1) a limited amount of physical damage, (2) very low levels of partial mortality and disease (less than 1 percent of all species observed), (3) absence of excessive mucus production, (4) good coral recruitment, and (5) complete recovery by 2012 of the 2007 bleaching event. Smith and Marx (2016) also concluded that the health, abundance, and biomass of fishes, corals, and other marine resources at FDM are comparable to or superior to those in similar habitats at other locations within the Mariana Archipelago. In addition, the Navy funded additional reef surveys in the nearshore areas of FDM in 2017. The results are available at: https://apps.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/1069450.pdf. The 2017 survey found little evidence that training has affected coral reef communities at FDM. Only three relatively new ordnance items were observed. No blast pits, craters, or significant areas of coral breakage were observed. The ordnance observed during the 2017 survey was almost exclusively old, encrusted in marine life, and not having any discernable impact on surrounding communities. The Navy has reviewed and incorporated the best available science to support the impact analysis and conclusions for the coral reef communities at FDM. Dive details (such as the duration of the dives) are not necessary if surveys and data are representative of the area. Coral surveys performed at FDM were completed in accordance with the 2015 Biological Opinion issued by NMFS. The Navy consulted with NMFS regarding potential effects on coral, as required under the Endangered Species Act. Mitigation measures and monitoring requirements specified in the Biological Opinion, such as survey and reporting requirements for ESA-listed coral, are

	Comment	Navy Response
	Protection Agency recommended that the Navy commit to annual dive surveys to continue to monitor the marine resources and the coral barnacle infestation at FDM and that the results of these surveys be made available to government agencies and the public in the 2015 FEIS/OEIS. Relying on the 1999-2012 Smith and Marx surveys, the Navy responded that preservation effects "clearly outweigh the minor impacts of training" and stated "the next dive survey of FDM will be conducted no later than 2018" (2015 ROD, pg. 17). In 2017, one set of coral reef surveys were conducted at Farallon de Medinilla from September 27 to October 1 by the Space and Naval Warfare Systems Center Pacific (SSC Pacific), Scientific Diving Services (SDS) "to satisfy requirements of the Mariana Islands Training and Testing Area Biological Opinion (MITT BO) issued by the National Marine Fisheries Service in 2015." (Carilli et al., 2018). As the resulting paper reported , 50 transects were established around FDM in <20 meters of water depth to (i) quantify and abundance and location around the island of Endangered Species Act (ESA)-listed corals, quantify coral reef health (percent cover of living coral, coral species, coral composition, and coral condition), and compile observations of ordnance impacts, and (ii) record incidental observations of any other ESA-listed species encountered while fulfilling those primary objectives. That study indicates that ESA-listed corals are "present, but rare, in waters of <20m depth around FDM" and that "potentially new (undocumented in scientific literature) species of Acropora corals were recorded". This finding alone should warrant additional studies of coral in this area. In addition to lacking control survey sites, gaps in survey methodology and reporting include lacking details such as dive duration and area covered. The report notes that commonly encountered ordnance on these dive surveys included rifle shells,	presented in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) and further detailed in the NMFS Biological Opinion. Because FDM is an active range, it is not feasible to allow non-military personnel, including CNMI resource management agency representatives, on the island due to safety and special explosive ordnance disposal certification requirements. In addition, pursuant to 40 CFR 1502.6, the Navy will make available any underlying documents to the public upon request. Documents would be provided without charge to the extent practicable as some references require purchased access to the source sites. The Navy-funded dive surveys, most recently published in 2018, are the best available science for determining the condition of reefs and water quality in waters surrounding FDM. The 1999–2004 surveys were completed by a Navy contractor and representatives from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, NMFS, and the CNMI. All surveys since 2004 have been performed by Naval Facilities Engineering Command and Expeditionary Warfare Center's Scientific Diving Services. Direct ordnance impacts upon the submerged physical environment, which were clearly attributable to training activities, were detected in dive surveys conducted in 2007, 2008, 2010, and 2012. Indirect impacts, such as ordnance that skipped or eroded off the island and rock and ordnance fragments blasted off the island, were detected every year. However, natural phenomena such as typhoons, tropical storms, large wave events, tsunamis/micro-tsunamis, and earthquakes are the primary disturbances, which shape and modify FDM's physical environment between the intertidal zone and depths of 30 m. During the 2004 survey the dive survey team (which included representatives of stakeholder agencies cited above and a Navy contractor) noted changes to the submerged lands relative to observations made between 1999 and 2003. These physical changes included (1) new boulder/rock slides, (2) submerged rock areas off the southern tip of FDM

	Comment	Navy Response
	MK 76 25lb, MK 82 500lb, M 117 750 lbs, MK 83 l000lb, and MK 84 2000lb ordnance (Id., pg. 12), and details 101 occurrences of these materials in Appendix E, of which 3% re assessed to be "recent" occurrences. However, lacking additional spatial details regarding area covered, it is unclear how representative these samples are. Although dive details - including date, site location, depth, photo numbers, and start time of the 16 dives conducted in 2017 are listed in Appendix B, dive end times are not included so it is unclear for how long divers were in the water. Based on a single additional survey between 2015 and today, and ignoring observed bleaching, invasive species outbreaks, and deposition of ordnance, the draft SEIS/OEIS states that the "nearshore physical environment and basic habitat types at FDM have remained unchanged over the 13 years of survey activity." (DEIS, 3.8.1). Conclusory statements in this supposedly scientific study and resulting analysis are especially problematic. The study further documents that there are "severe coral bleaching events underway at FDM during the surveys, caused by regional anomalously warm sea surface temperatures " with on average 77.4% of corals surveyed exhibiting some form of bleaching. Because coral bleaching is caused by heat stress combined with existing stressors including nonpoint source pollution, lacking a control study, it is not scientifically defensible to conclude that this bleaching occurred only due to regional sea temperatures and that there is "little overall evidence of any adverse impacts to coral from training, including the use of high-explosive bombs" given the known causal relationship between changes in water quality and sedimentation that are known to be associated with active live fire activities on the adjacent land mass and coral stress. It is unclear how this report "quantitatively" concludes that no impacts are occurring due to training activities or otherwise around	that appeared to have been peeled back to expose bright yellow-orange patches of underlying rock, and (3) cracked and broken coral colonies. The 2004 report (released in 2005) stated: "Examination of photographs from 1944 indicate that changes in the geologic structure of the island by erosion and mass wasting…have been going on for decades." No newly submerged cliff blocks were observed between 2005 and 2012. The detonation of live ordnance and the impact of inert ordnance both act to fracture rock and make the island more susceptible to the impacts of earthquakes, typhoons, and other natural erosional forces. Small to moderate sized (generally <30 cm) new rock fragments have been observed yearly. Many, if not most of these, are clearly the result of training activities. However, the number and size of these items and the locations in which they occur have not resulted in any significant changes to the topography or significant adverse impacts on marine biological resources. The 2019 Joint Region Marianas INRMP includes monitoring programs throughout the Mariana Islands, including specific management goals associated with coral surveys (subject to annual funding). The CNMI Department of Lands and Natural Resources, Division of Fish and Wildlife is a signatory and participating member to the 2019 Joint Region Marianas INRMP that details natural resource management and monitoring programs. The reference to Thompson et al., 2017 was removed in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS per the comment. Both this Supplemental EIS/OEIS and the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS include an analysis of potential impacts from metals and contaminants as a result of military training and testing activities on marine resources. This analysis is presented in Section 3.1.2.2 (Metals), Section 3.4.2.7 (Secondary Stressors), Section 3.5.2.7 (Secondary Stressors), Section 3.7.2.3 (Secondary Stressors), Section 3.8.2.7 (Secondary Stressors), and Section

	Comment	Navy Response
	FDM, nor can it be concluded that recorded ordnance is not affecting water quality without additional studies. Conclusory statements that are based on limited observations - the most recent of which occurred during a global bleaching event - should not be relied upon to asset there are "no significant impacts" from direct, indirect, and cumulative effects of ongoing and proposed increases in use of explosive munitions. To provide meaningful data collection and analysis, periodic surveys should be conducted - ideally at least on a biannual if not quarterly basis over time periods that would reflect conditions before and after training activities on FDM. If monitoring is not being conducted by non-military contractors at minimum it would be optimal if CNMI resource management agencies could be involved in these data collection and analysis efforts. Moreover, as noted above, it seems myopic to dismiss concerns from community members and local resource managers regarding the potential significance of impacts to coral and related fishing and fish habitats based on the DoD-funded surveys performed by consultants from the "U.S. Navy- Space and Naval Warfare Systems Center Pacific Energy and Environmental Science Group." These surveys appear to have qualitatively determined, without reference sites or other controls, that, despite the fact that the U.S. military's use of FDM as a bombing range since 1971 has caused "the loss of vegetation over the past decades [that] has accelerated erosion of soils and limestone weathering on the island," this sedimentation is not significantly affecting species or water quality. (Smith & Marx, 2016, Carilli et al., 2018). Ideally, effects analysis would include quantitative data collection at FDM and an appropriate reference site where live fire activities are not being conducted. Given the importance of maintaining water quality and corals that support fish habitat and ecosystem functions overall, at minimum updated monitoring data should be collected, shared, and analyzed to	3.9.2.7 (Secondary Stressors). Based on the analysis presented in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS and the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, the Navy concluded that all levels of metals, chemicals, and other byproducts would be either below detectable levels or at levels below existing standards, regulations, and guidelines.

	Comment	Navy Response
	support meaningful review of direct, indirect, and cumulative effects over time.	
Gov CNMI-07	Similarly, although the Hospital and Beavers survey did note that "86% of those surveyed consider pelagic fish they catch to be an important source of food", and concluded that "[t]hese findings validate the importance of fishing in terms of building and maintaining social and community networks, perpetuating fishing traditions, and providing fish to local communities as a source of food security" it is also insufficient to base the entirety of the socio-economic assessment of potential impacts to fishing of the SEIS/OEIS on an "empirical snapshot" based on cost-earning surveys of the small boat fishing fleet in CNMI conducted in 2011 with 112 responding fishermen. (Hospital & Beavers, 2014). Additional analysis regarding the socioeconomic impacts of restricted fishing and loss of access to traditional fishing areas with acknowledged high abundance of species as well as altered navigational patterns should be provided in the FEIS/OEIS. Statements of fact should also be clearly referenced so reviewers can visit primary references to understand the data substantiating claims and the context within which such claims have been made. If data gaps exist, it is suggested that these be identified and addressed through monitoring activities to enable ongoing adaptive management discussions to support the accomplishment of the Navy's stated need for training and interest in ensuring environmentally responsible operations. Scoping comments requested assessment of direct and cumulative impacts on recreational and commercial fishing as well as transport between islands (see DEIS 3-12). It appears instead of conducting data collection and analysis in this regard, this SEIS/OEIS restates old and "ambiguous" commercial fishing data without meaningful assessment of potentially significant impacts. In Section 3.12.1.2.2 the report notes that restricting nearshore access around FDM	The Navy understands that fishing and tourism is an important socioeconomic and cultural resource for the people of the CNMI and will continue to work with the fishing community to enable safe access to fishing areas around FDM. The Navy is committed to continuing to work with the local community on issues that potentially affect the public, including access to fishing sites. The analysis presented in Section 3.12 (Socioeconomic Resources and Environmental Justice) of the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS uses the best available data. The quantity and value of fisheries landings in the CNMI from 2010 through 2015 are shown in Figure 3.12-2. The data from the NMFS Pacific Islands Fisheries Science Center show that both value and amount fluctuated over that timespan with no clear trend. These data have been updated for the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS with the most recent available fisheries landings data. To supplement the results from the Hospital and Beavers (2014) survey of CNMI fishers, the Navy incorporated information from the following references on fisheries in the CNMI into the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS: • Ayers, A. L. (2018). The Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands fishing community profile: 2017 update. • Grace-McCaskey, C. 2014. Examining the potential of using secondary data to better understand human-reef relationships across the Pacific. Pacific Islands Fish. Sci. Cent., Natl. Mar. Fish. Serv., NOAA, Honolulu, HI 96818-5007. Pacific Islands Fish. Sci. Cent. Admin. Rep. H-14-01, 69 p. • MacDuff, S. & Roberto, R. (2012). Chapter 3: Commonwealth of Northern Mariana Islands Fishery Ecosystem Report. In: M. Sabater (Ed.), WPRFMC 2012. Archipelagic Fishery Ecosystem Annual Report.

	Comment	Navy Response
	"limits ability of fishers to gain access to potentially productive fishing sites" but does not appear to actually analyze the extent of these impacts in the context of changed tempo of the proposed activities or discussion of current data, instead relying on the Hospital and Beavers cost-earning survey that was conducted in 2011. Although concerns about potential effects of expanding training and testing activities throughout the MITT study area have been raised, necessitating analysis of these effects throughout the whole study area, the report appears to dismiss these concerns by relying on one "ambiguous" study focused on the small boat fishery within the nearshore range and simply stating "no data" is available for the transit corridor to establish the significance of these impacts and, furthermore, that these restrictions are justified to ensure public safety. While ensuring public safety is an indisputable priority, this does not alleviate the requirement to conduct analysis of additional socio-economic impacts due to environmental effects. In the absence of good data to support effects analysis, opportunities should be leveraged to collect that data, especially for actions which cover a wide range of training and testing activities that will extend through 2020 and the "reasonably foreseeable future". As the Council on Environmental Quality's NEPA Guidance at 40 CFR § 1502.22(a) directs, when an agency is evaluating reasonably foreseeable significant adverse effects on the human environment in an environmental impact statement and there is incomplete or unavailable information, if the incomplete information relevant to reasonably foreseeable significant adverse impacts is essential to a reasoned choice among alternatives and the overall costs of obtaining it are not exorbitant, the agency shall include the information in the environmental impact statement. Understanding the socioeconomic impacts of the proposed actions, especially upon the most economically vulnerable members of the CNMI	Honolulu, Hawaii Western Pacific Regional Fishery Management Council. • Western Pacific Regional Fishery Management Council. (2019). Annual Stock Assessment and Fishery Evaluation Report for the Mariana Archipelago Fishery Ecosystem Plan 2018. Remington, T., Sabater, M., Ishizaki, A., Spalding, S. (Eds.) Western Pacific Regional Fishery Management Council. Honolulu, Hawaii 96813 USA. 276 pp. + Appendices. The Hospital and Beavers (2014) survey results provide insight into the socioeconomic characteristics of fishing and fisheries in the CNMI. The Hospital and Beavers (2014) report presents quantitative data summarizing socioeconomic characteristics of fishing and the concerns of fishers in the CNMI, including concerns over impacts from military activities. While the survey relies on the responses from 112 fishers, it is fairly comprehensive with 64 questions, reports on the three primary fisheries in the region, and includes data on fishing off Saipan, Tinian, and Rota. A companion survey conducted in 2011 off Guam involving the same fisheries reported similar results from 147 respondents, supporting the feedback received from CNMI fishers as regionally relevant (Hospital and Beavers, 2012). Section 3.12.2.1 (Accessibility [to the Ocean and Airspace]) explains that proposed changes in the training and testing activities conducted in the Study Area would not change the conclusions regarding accessibility as presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and that those conclusions remain valid. As a metric for assessing impacts on accessibility, the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS presents data on the number of Notices to Mariners and the number of days of access restrictions. Both datasets show fluctuations in Notices to Mariners and days of access restrictions from 2010 through 2017 (see Figures 3.12-3 and 3.12-4), and, given a lack

	Comment	Navy Response
	community that rely on subsistence fishing is essential to making informed decisions about the proposed action as well as mitigation measures that may be necessary to offset the impacts of this action. A simple survey of fisherman and residents of the Northern Islands to obtain current information about these potential impacts would not be cost prohibitive and would provide important data to decision makers in this regard. Lacking this data, it is more likely than not that a twelve-mile hazard zone at FDM would have significant impacts to fishing communities and transiting inhabitants of the Northern Islands. Therefore, data from a survey should be collected and included in the FEIS that provides additional analysis regarding impacts and discussion of appropriate mitigation measures. This survey could also assess the desirability of mitigation measures such as the installation of emergency communications equipment on subsistence fishing boats that will have to travel further from FDM during periods of posted activities as well as potentially providing mooring on neighboring islands so these vessels can safely anchor should these activities continue during prolonged periods during the fishing season. To further reduce impacts to fishing and travel, the FEIS could consider limiting activities to periods of time when fewer residents and fishing vessels travel north in the winter months. Meaningful assessment of impacts and possible mitigation measures would help ensure better outcomes from this NEPA analysis. Likewise, limited discussion of potential impacts to tourism in the CNMI does not appear to consider growing economic investment and activities in the Northern Islands. Instead, the DEIS concludes that "even though trends in tourism are positive, the existing conditions, as presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, and the results of analysis on impacts on tourism remain valid" and	of data on direct impacts on fishers, are used as a proxy for predicting that impacts on fishers would be similar to impacts in preceding years. The Navy is not aware of any data or published information on how closures around FDM have directly impacted fishers. However, the Navy recognizes that limited or no access to productive fishing areas would impact fishers and is committed to increasing engagement with the CNMI and Guam fishing communities. While the analysis concludes that impacts could occur, the Navy does not anticipate significant impacts on commercial and recreational fishing in the Study Area, as described in both this Supplemental EIS/OEIS and the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, given the availability of other fishing areas in the CNMI. As the Governor's Office is aware, fishing within 3 NM of FDM has been prohibited for decades (as noted in Article 12 of the 1983 lease agreement) to ensure the safety of the public during military activities conducted on the island and the presence of unexploded ordnance in nearshore waters around the island. The Navy is also unaware of any commercial, recreational, or subsistence fishing that occurs in the transit corridor extending between the Study Area and Hawaii. Current and proposed training activities within the transit corridor would not change the way cruise ships operate within the Study Area and not impact tourism related to cruise ships. The Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS has been updated to include tourism and transit activities within the Study Area. This Supplemental EIS/OEIS fully complies with Executive Order 12898. Environmental justice is analyzed in Section 3.12 (Socioeconomic Resources and Environmental Justice) and Executive Order 12898 is listed as one of the environmental compliance requirements considered in preparing this Supplemental EIS/OEIS (Table 6.1-1). Section 3.12 (Socioeconomic Resources and Environmental Justice) includes an analysis

	Comment	Navy Response
	furthermore that it is "assumed there is no tourism activity within the transit corridor due to the distance from land and because the majority of tourism activities occur in nearshore waters." (DEIS 3.12-11 - 12). In the past two years, several cruise ships and eco-tourism expeditions have focused activities on the Northern Islands and deep-sea fishing expeditions have increased. These growing economic opportunities are significant to the CNMI, and, like impacts to fishing communities, disturbance of these new industries could have significant impacts to the growing economy of the Northern Islands. Therefore, the FEIS/OEIS should gather updated data that is currently available or that would be forthcoming with minimal additional effort through impact-specific information requests to the Northern Islands Mayor's Office and relevant state resource management agencies to assess the current tourism and transit activities in this area and provide meaningful analysis of the data that is collected. Additionally, the FEIS should include a meaningful analysis of likely significant environmental justice impacts of the proposed activity. In Section 3.12.1.4, the SEIS/OEIS states that "[t]he U.S. Environmental Protection Agency defines environmental justice as the 'fair treatment' and 'meaningful involvement ' of all people regardless of race, color, national origin, or income with respect to the development, implementation, and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations, and policies" and goes on to discuss 2010 census data reflecting that "approximately 3 percent of the working age population in the CNMI reported participating in a subsistence activity in the year 2010." (DEIS 3.12- 12 - 13). While engagement is an important component of environmental justice considerations, this inappropriately narrow framing of the scope of environmental justice considerations ignores the mandates of Executive Order 12898, which directs federal agencies	of impacts of proposed activities on socioeconomic resources and whether the Proposed Action would result in a disproportionate effect on minority or low-income populations. While impacts on certain resources, such as accessibility to fishing sites, may increase under Alternatives 1 and 2, impacts are not expected to be substantial. Traditional fishers in Guam and the CNMI would not be disproportionately impacted by training and testing activities because traditional fishing practices likely occur in the same general areas as recreational fishing, which are close to shore and far from the majority of military activities. The analysis of potential impacts on environmental justice is limited primarily to traditional fishing practices because, with the exception of training activities at FDM, the vast majority of proposed activities occur at sea, where potential socioeconomic impacts are limited to commercial, recreational, and tourism activities that take place in the marine environment, including fishing. As described in Section 3.12.1.4 (Environmental Justice), fishing for subsistence is not easily distinguishable from recreational or commercial fishing in the small boat fishing communities of the CNMI, even for a single fishing trip, and fishers who use their own catch as a regular source of food are not necessarily minority or low-income. This Supplemental EIS/OEIS does not propose a change to the ocean areas currently used by both the Navy and the public. Restrictions on accessing areas of co-use would continue to be infrequent and short-term, while other fishing sites in the Study Area would continue to be available to the public.

	Comment	Navy Response
	to identify and address the disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of their actions on minority and low-income populations to the greatest extent practicable (59 FR 7629, Feb. 16, 1994). According to the same 2010 Census, the majority of CNMI residents can be considered minority and low-income. As such, the Navy has an obligation to conduct detailed assessment of impacts to health and the environment in terms of potentially disproportionate exposure risks associated with direct, indirect, and cumulative effects of proposed and ongoing and training and testing activities. Furthermore, discounting engagement of the employed workforce in cultural fishing practices overlooks a large segment of the subsistence and commercial fishing population, many of whom rely on pelagic fish from areas within the MITT activity area. Given the considerable amount of remaining unexploded ordnance and the risk that proposed activities may result in additional deposits of unexploded munitions as well as exploded ordnance and other debris, robust discussion of economic impacts and potential health effects as well as mitigation plans to reduce the environmental and associated socio-economic impacts of these activities especially on discrete and insular minorities should be meaningfully addressed in the discussion of environmental justice considerations in the updated FEIS/OEIS.	
Gov CNMI-08	**Questions Regarding Responsiveness to Scoping Questions** As the Council on Environmental Quality outlines, scoping aims in part to support identification of significant issues to be analyzed in depth in the environmental impact statement. (40 C.F.R. § 1501.7). Public scoping comments summarized in Chapter 8 of the draft SEIS/OEIS include concerns regarding lack of data addressing potential impacts around Farallon de Medinilla (FDM) and suggestions that a range of alternatives be considered including time or seasonal restrictions, restrictions in biologically sensitive areas, reduced training and testing tempo, and mitigated	Public involvement is a fundamental aspect of the environmental analysis process, and the Navy welcomes and appreciates the public's participation. The Navy reviewed all comments received during the 45-day scoping period and considered all substantive comments in the preparation of the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Each resource section within this Supplemental EIS/OEIS presents a summary of the scoping comments and responses to the issues raised. In addition, the actual public comments received on the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS and the Navy's

	Comment	Navy Response
	alternatives (SEIS 8-18). Concerns regarding disruptions to economically important fishing areas and potential contamination in the local food supply as well as socioeconomic impacts of increased transit times due to area restrictions were also raised. (SEIS 8-19). Although each chapter includes a subsection on public scoping comments, because the comments themselves are only summarized, it is unclear if or how these scoping comments were meaningfully addressed in the draft EIS/OEIS. It would be helpful if comments and responses could be included in an appendix to reflect the Navy's thorough consideration of the issues raised. In terms of readability and responsiveness to scoping comments, it would be helpful if the final SEIS/OEIS includes the actual comments received and the direct responses instead of simply summarizing comments, which can be confusing to members of the public and leave them unsure as to whether their comments were received and responded to. Responses to scoping comments and the environmental analysis of the proposal itself should also be sensitive to regional conditions. For example, in responding to public concerns regarding potential impacts on marine species from copper and lead which will be introduced into seawater and sediments due to Navy training and testing activities, the report responds that "[f]ishes may be exposed by contact with the metal, contact with contaminants in the sediment or water, and ingestion of contaminated sediments. Concentrations of metals in sea water are orders of magnitude lower than concentrations in marine sediments. It is extremely unlikely that fishes would be indirectly impacted by toxic metals via the water." (SEIS/OEIS 3.9-62). Additionally, discussing impacts to sediments and water quality, the report notes that "[w]hile no quantitative sampling for metals in training areas have been completed," based on other studies the report concludes that "[i]t	responses to those comments are provided in Appendix K (Public Comment Responses). This Supplemental EIS/OEIS, as well as the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, include discussion of the fate and transport of specific chemicals with references to chemical properties of munitions and munitions constituents. Elevated levels of metals in sediments would be restricted to a small zone around the metal, and any release to the overlying water column would be diluted and influenced by mixing and diffusion. There are studies regarding bioaccumulation in the Mariana Archipelago that were used in the EIS, and the Navy applies federal and state water quality standards where applicable to assess potential bioaccumulation risk. Residual concentrations of contaminants resulting from Navy training and testing activities are provided in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. In the 2010 Mariana Island Range Complex (MIRC) EIS/OEIS, it was noted that, "The CNMI Senate requested the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) on February 19, 2008 to conduct a public health assessment on FDM of toxic substances released by bombs and the bioaccumulation of these toxins in consumable pelagic fish." The Agency, in its letter to the CNMI Senate on September 24, 2008, concluded that, "pelagic fish caught in the open water are not likely to contain high levels of explosive residues from the neighboring FDM bombing range and will not pose a public hazard to people who eat them." The conclusion is supported by the Agency's "Preliminary Assessment of Pelagic Fish Caught in the Open Pacific" (ATSDR 2008). There are also several studies in other jurisdictions cited in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS concerning metals deposition in the marine environment in waters off of military training ranges. The Navy reviewed these quantitative analyses of military munitions over a period of decades. This Supplemental EIS/OEIS discusses multiple studies off of Vieques Island in Puerto Rico, Pamlico Sound in North Carolina, and a Canadian military site (Canadian Forces Maritime Experimental and Test Ranges near Nanoose Bay, British Columbia) for lead and lithium (see Section 3.1.1.1.4, Farallon de Medinilla, in Section

	Comment	Navy Response
	is unlikely that metals in sediments or the water column from military training activities would exceed federal thresholds in the Study Area." Qualitative assessment alone does not seem to meaningfully respond to commenter concerns regarding heavy metal accumulation in fish and potential impacts to people, the economy, and the environment. Additional quantitative assessment regarding heavy metal loading in food fish and fish consumption trends would appear to be warranted in this highly fish dependent region. It is suggested that data be provided to fill this gap. Moreover, it is recommended that the monitoring plan for the MITT and related activities include collection of baseline data to show existing levels of heavy metals in water and sediment adjacent to live fire use areas and control areas where such activities are not being conducted and that these studies continue at regular intervals for the duration of these exercises in order to address the public's legitimate concerns regarding risks of heavy metal contamination of water, sediment, and fish stocks, as well as socio-economic effects of these potential impacts.	3.1, Water and Sediment Quality). Information regarding impacts on sediments and water quality from munitions at two additional sites, one in Hawaii and one in the Potomac River in Maryland, where military munitions have resided for decades have been added to the section. This Supplemental EIS/OEIS also includes information that suggests the majority of concerns regarding bioaccumulation are associated with urban coastal environments with specific point source and non-point source contributors of pollutants. The studies concerning military sites suggest that metals exposed to seawater are of less concern because of decreased bioavailability.
Gov CNMI-09	**Conclusion** In summary, overall, additional coordination and outreach to the public as well as more meaningful data collection and analysis regarding environmental and socio-economic impacts would be helpful in framing discussions regarding the significance of effects and possible mitigation measures. As champions of environmental stewardship, the U.S. Navy has an opportunity to support the CNMI in filling data gaps to enable informed resource management decisions as a mitigating outcome that would advance the purposes of the proposed ongoing training and testing activities in the region. To fill data gaps regarding subsistence fish consumption or economic uses that may be impacted by travel restrictions around FDM or baseline environmental conditions relating to water quality and soil contamination or robust distribution data for marine mammals, the CNMI encourages the Navy to work closely with the	The results of the Navy's monitoring are posted annually and are available on the Navy's public website www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us. The Navy will continue to work with local partners in Guam and the CNMI to engage in collaborative research efforts. Many of these efforts are part of the larger collaborative effort with NOAA Fisheries, Guam Division of Aquatic and Wildlife Resources, CNMI Department of Lands and Natural Resources, Naval Base Guam, and the U.S. Pacific Fleet Environmental Readiness Office. The most recent collaborative research effort was sea turtle tagging in the Mariana Islands Range Complex (Martin, S. L., A. R. Gaos, and T. T. Jones. [2019]). Research funding is allocated via the Integrated Comprehensive Monitoring Program (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2010, 2013a), which provides the overarching framework for coordination of the Navy's marine species research and monitoring efforts and serves as a planning tool to focus Navy monitoring priorities pursuant

	Comment	Navy Response
	CNMI's resource management agencies to collect and analyze data. This information will provide numerous benefits to the CNMI as we work to identify a path towards sustainable long-term growth. Similarly, ongoing community engagement and information sharing about proposed actions from the Department of Defense (DoD) will help provide transparency and build community engagement and trust through the NEPA process. This process is only as good as the data going into it and the community engagement being initiated to support meaningful review and feedback, and the CNMI appreciates the DoD's ongoing commitment to investing in positive growth outcomes in our region. Thank you for this opportunity to provide feedback and for your consideration of the CNMI' s comments and suggestions.	to ESA and MMPA requirements. The purpose of the Integrated Comprehensive Monitoring Program is to coordinate monitoring efforts across all regions and to allocate the most appropriate level and type of monitoring effort for each range complex based on a set of standardized objectives, regional expertise, and resource availability. Although the Integrated Comprehensive Monitoring Program does not identify specific field work or individual projects, it is designed to provide a flexible, scalable, and adaptable framework using adaptive management and strategic planning processes that periodically assess progress and reevaluate objectives.
Mayor Edwin P. Aldan, Tinian Mayor's Office (TMO)		
TMO-01	I submit these comments on behalf of the people Tinian and Aguiguan, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (CNMI). I want to also thank the Navy for extending the scoping period so that the community can have additional time to review the Supplemental EIS. First, I want to reiterate our position that the MITT and the CNMI Joint Military Training (CJMT) EIS are all part of one concerted effort to expand military training activities in Guam and the CNMI as a result of the Marine's Asia Pacific Realignment. As such, the environmental impacts of the MITT and the CJMT should be analyzed under one EIS to determine the true cumulative impacts that these proposed activities will have on the land, air, sea and the people of the Commonwealth.	The Navy has been conducting training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and this supplement to the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS analyzes and supports the continuation of that training and testing. This Supplemental EIS/OEIS: (1) includes the analysis of activities at sea and on FDM necessary to meet readiness requirements beyond 2020 and into the reasonably foreseeable future, (2) includes any changes to those activities previously analyzed, and (3) reflects the most up-to-date compilation of training and testing activities deemed necessary to accomplish military readiness requirements. The training and testing activities included in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS within the Study Area are not dependent on other DoD activities. It is important to note that proposed military actions are not dependent on each other for their justification. For example, activities proposed under this Supplemental EIS/OEIS and ongoing training and testing activities within the Study Area under the 2015 Final MITT EIS/OEIS would proceed regardless of whether other proposed actions are taken, such as the training proposed in the CNMI Joint Military Training EIS/OEIS. According

	Comment	Navy Response
		to CEQ regulations, training and testing activities in the Study Area may logically be viewed in isolation because they have independent utility, as they are ongoing activities. In addition, courts have upheld federal agencies' decisions to organize and plan their actions in a reasonable or rational manner. Cumulative impacts of these independent actions are analyzed in Chapter 4 (Cumulative Impacts) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS.
TMO-02	We take this opportunity to reiterate our concerns regarding the expansiveness and the nature of the proposed activities' impacts on the overall balance of the marine eco-system which surround the CNMI. Specifically, the impacts on not only the species within the MITT Study Area listed under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) such as the hammerhead shark, the oceanic whitetip shark and the giant manta ray, but the overall supply of fish stock in the Commonwealth water. The 2019 Supplemental EIS (hereinafter SEIS) indicates that the species of concern do not have substantive protections under the SEIS and states that the species listed are "declining because of the impacts from fishing and habitat degradation." However, there is no study cited to which speaks to how long-term exposure to these types of activities will impact the survivability of species already identified as either threatened or species of concern.	The Navy uses the best available science to support the impact analysis and conclusions. As described in Section 3.9.1.3 (Endangered Species Act Species), information on threats to ESA-listed species have not changed since the publication of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS; and the information and analysis remains valid. Regulatory agencies like NMFS typically study long-term effects and publish five-year reviews for many of the ESA-listed fish species. For example, the most recent status review for scalloped hammerhead sharks was by Miller et al. (2014) and was cited in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. In addition, the Navy's consultation with NMFS includes the analysis of potential effects to the three ESA-listed fish species within the Action Area (the area considered for analysis in an ESA consultation).
TMO-03	The study has included an extensive listing of federally managed fish species within the study area to include bottom fish, reef fish, and pelagic fish. The SEIS points to modifications to the quantify and type of acoustic and explosive stressors under the proposed alternatives. The studies cited to demonstrate the potential impact to fish, specifically catfish, herring and rainbow trout, and those kept in a fish tank. We find these studies to be insufficient to give a real indication as to how the nature of these activities will impact the fish species within the study area. For example, it is unclear how the study can conclude that sonar signals would result only in the limited probability of a masking effect when the SEIS cites the	Regarding acoustic stressors and fish, although the ANSI Sound Exposure Guideline technical report does not propose specific criteria/thresholds for masking from sonar exposure, it is understood that masking occurs where masking noise exceeds the absolute hearing threshold of an animal and that an animal must be able to hear a particular sound source for masking to occur. Discussion is shown on page 3.9-21: "The ANSI Sound Exposure Guideline technical report (Popper et al., 2014) highlights a lack of data that exists for masking by sonar but suggests that the narrow bandwidth and intermittent nature of most sonar signals would result in only a limited probability of any masking effects. In addition, most sonars (mid-, high-,

	Comment	Navy Response
	ANSI Sound Exposure Guideline technical report which states that data is lacking to support a clear statement of impact. What is clear in the SEIS is that it should be anticipated that fish will experience hearing loss, masking, physiological stress, and behavioral reactions on levels that cannot be qualitatively quantified raising serious concerns of the long-term cumulative impact on the fish stock within the study area. Besides sonar testing, the proposed activities include the use of explosives both in the water or near the surface water. The SEIS anticipates a ten percent mortality rate from in-water explosion for fishes with a swim bladder. The SEIS states that there have been few studies of the impact of underwater explosives on early life stages of fish and that explosive energy poses the greatest potential threat for injury and mortality in marine fishes. The study cites that there are no direct measurements as to hearing loss, limited research in masking effects, physiological stress, and behavioral reactions but generally concludes that there would be no significant or negligible impact on the population. Moreover, the SEIS suggest that the implementation of mitigation to avoid potential impacts on ESA species and the fact that most scheduled training and testing activities would occur more than 3NM from shore will help avoid potential impacts on fishes that shelter and feed on the reefs. Given what the SEIS states that there is limited available qualitative data on the long-term impacts of the nature of these activities, it is unclear how it can be stated that there would be no significant cumulative impact or if there are impacts, due to the above-mentioned stressors, such impacts would be negligible. The assumption that by conducting an activity 3NM from shore assumes that these activities are conducted in an environment similar to that of an aquarium where the flow of sediments, acoustic stressors, metals and other foreign debris such as parachutes that	and very high-frequency) are above the hearing range of most marine fish species, eliminating the possibility of masking for these species. In most cases, the probability of masking would further decrease with increasing distance from the sound source." With respect to the commenter's concerns regarding the long-term cumulative impact on fish stocks within the Study Area, most Navy training and testing activities involving the use of sonar and explosives would be dispersed in space and time, therefore limiting the potential overlap of these activities with fishes. It is acknowledged in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS that some individual fish may be impacted by these activities but again, due to the limited use over a widely dispersed Study Area, these individual impacts would not be anticipated to lead to long-term consequences for populations or stocks of fish in the area. As described under Section 3.9.2.1.1 (Background), although there are numerous publications on the effects of human-generated sound on fishes, it is not possible to conduct studies on all 34,000 marine and freshwater species (including species of concern and ESA-listed fish due to their protected status). In addition, it is not always possible to test these impacts in open ocean environments due to research facility testing and resource limitations or under realistic Navy testing and training scenarios across the variable environments in which these activities occur. Instead, the Navy must rely on all forms of best available science during the development of its environmental impact analyses. This includes using studies conducted on surrogate species (i.e., species within the same defined hearing groups as those that occur in a particular Study Area or with other similar physiological traits), in laboratories, or using surrogate acoustic sources (both impulsive and non-impulsive). For example, although the specific effects of human-generated sound on ESA-listed sharks and manta rays in the Study Area are not available, effects on "fishes without a swim bladder" (i.e., fishes in the same hearing group) are

	Comment	Navy Response
	will sink down to the ocean floor, will be contained within a certain area. The facts and logic simply do not support this supposition.	available and are used in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS analysis to support the Navy's conclusions. In cases where impacts on surrogate species are not available, reactions or impacts observed in more sensitive species/hearing groups are utilized as a baseline of understanding in the overall analysis. In response to the comment regarding the 10 percent mortality rates, please note that this is existing data reported by O'Keeffe (1984) to be considered in the overall analysis. This example data is meant to allow the reader to better understand how ranges to mortality may vary depending on specific variables such as the net explosive weight of the charge, the depth of the explosion, and the weight of the fish. Estimated ranges to effect are provided in Section 3.9.2.2.2.2 (Impact Ranges for Explosives) and specifically in Tables 3.9-8 and 3.9-9. Similar to the response to the above comment, although there are few studies available on the direct impacts of explosives on species that occur in the Study Area, surrogate studies are utilized to better estimate and understand potential impacts. In most cases where explosive data is not available, other studies that utilize impulsive sources (such as pile driving or air guns) can be used instead. Based on best available science and surrogate information as described in Section 3.9.2.2.1 (Background), it is acknowledged that some individual fish, and even some schools, may be injured or behaviorally disturbed by explosive activities. However, due to the dispersed nature of explosive activities, it is not anticipated that overall impacts on the stocks would occur. In addition, mitigation measures would prevent the use of explosives within a specified distance of shallow-water coral reefs, live hard bottom, and artificial reefs (except within designated training areas) to help the Navy avoid potential impacts on fishes in these habitats.
TMO-04	The point is, we the people of Tinian heavily rely on the waters both near shore and off shore, not only to feed our families but for economic self-sustainability. The MITT training areas are critical to our food security and economic self-sustainability. Although the SEIS provides additional information on the nature of the impact	Section 3.12 (Socioeconomic Resources and Environmental Justice) contains information on fishing and fisheries in the CNMI. The section has been updated in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS to include the latest available information on the status of fisheries and fishing in the CNMI, including information from the Western Pacific Regional Fishery

	Comment	Navy Response
	that these activities will have on the fish, the general conclusions drawn with regards to the cumulative impacts are not supported by the narrative which generally states that there is currently not enough study or information that is available to sustain the claim that there will be no adverse impact or that if there are impacts, they will be negligible.	Management Council annual stock assessment report (WPRFMC, 2019. Annual Stock Assessment and Fishery Evaluation Report for the Mariana Archipelago Fishery Ecosystem Plan 2018. Remington, T., Sabater, M., Ishizaki, A., Spalding, S. (Eds.) Western Pacific Regional Fishery Management Council. Honolulu, Hawaii 96813 USA. 276 pp. + Appendices).
TMO-05	I want to also reiterate the concerns which have previously been expressed by the Municipality with regards to underwater testing activities using sonars and explosives as it relates to marine mammals. A recent article published in the Pacific Daily News reported a beaked whale off the waters of Agat on Jan 17, 2019. The whale's stranding coincided with the Navy's anti-submarine warfare training. According to the same article, the first documented incident of a beaked whale washing ashore in Micronesia was in the Marshall Islands in 1975. The next stranding was not until 2007 in Piti, 35 years later. And just within these last 10 years whale stranding went from 1 in 35 years, to 6 in 10 years which some has linked to the increase in military activities in our oceans. In the Canary Islands, where it used to be a hotspot for mass stranding, there have been no mass stranding since a ban on sonar was imposed by the Spanish government.	Although records of marine mammal strandings exist as far back as 1878 in Guam, reporting of marine mammal strandings across the Mariana Islands has likely only become consistent in recent years, similar to other regions, whereas sonar use has occurred in the area around the Mariana Islands for decades. While exact causes of strandings are uncertain, scientists have identified potential contributing factors for strandings including age, illness, or disease; ingestion of marine debris/plastics; contaminant load; and manmade sources. A small number of strandings have been associated with the use of U.S. Navy sonar; none of these have occurred in the Study Area. Information on strandings associated with Navy training and testing activities is provided in the 2017 technical report, "Marine Mammal Strandings Associated with United States Navy Sonar Activities." NMFS, as the regulator, maintains the authoritative National Stranding Database. The Navy is committed to protecting marine life by implementing mitigation measures when training or testing using active sonar or explosives, working with regulatory agencies, and furthering our understanding of marine mammals through research and monitoring. Section 3.4.2.1.1.6 (Stranding) further discusses the best available information about strandings of beaked whales in the Mariana Islands and the Navy's support of efforts to better understanding the causes of marine mammal strandings. Section 3.0.1.1.1 (Marine Species Monitoring and Research Programs) provides an overview of U.S. Navy-supported research on marine species. These programs support coordinated science, technology, research, and

	Comment	Navy Response
		development focused on understanding the effects of sound on marine mammals, including physiological, behavioral, ecological, and population-level impacts. Additional information on these programs and other ocean resources-oriented initiatives can be found at the Department of the Navy's Energy, Environment, and Climate Change website (https://navysustainability.dodlive.mil).
TMO-06	What is becoming evident is that stranding has increased with the increase of military training activities in our waters. As previously submitted, the Cetacean Monitoring in the Marianas Range Complex, 2016 confirms a total of 42 cetacean groups in our waters. While the report indicates that "it is not yet possible to determine how many animals may be impacted by explosive or sonar exercises in the region annually and we are unable to make any evaluation of exposure to cetacean species," reports from different parts of the world indicate a direct correlation between stranding and sonar testing. Given the increased number of stranding just in Guam coinciding with increased military testing and training activities in the Marianas, there are serious concerns as to the long- term cumulative impact on the overall health mammals and of the marine eco-system.	The overall use of sonar and other transducers for training and testing activities would be similar to what is currently conducted (see Table 3.0-2 of the MITT Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS for details). The Navy will continue to implement mitigation measures to avoid or reduce potential impacts on marine species. Information about the quantitative analysis is described in detail in the 2018 technical report Quantifying Acoustic Impacts on Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles: Methods and Analytical Approach for Phase III Training and Testing. The Navy's acoustic and explosive effects analysis looks at multiple factors such as marine mammal abundance across the study area in each season, the levels of sound that may cause certain effects, and the Navy's proposed time and space use of noise-producing activities. This analysis uses estimates of marine mammal presence and density based on best available science as described in the technical report titled U.S. Navy Marine Species Density Database Phase III for the Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area (July 2018). Both of these technical reports are available at www.mitt-eis.com. As discussed in this Supplemental Draft EIS/OEIS in Sections 3.4.2.1 (Acoustic Stressors) and 3.4.2.2 (Explosives Stressors), a few instances of behavioral impacts per year would not cause long-term consequences for individuals or populations. Although records of marine mammal strandings exist as far back as 1878 in Guam, reporting of marine mammal strandings across the Mariana Islands has likely only become consistent in recent years, similar to other regions, whereas sonar use has occurred in the area around the Mariana Islands for decades. While exact causes of strandings are uncertain, scientists have

	Comment	Navy Response
		identified potential contributing factors for strandings, including age, illness, or disease; ingestion of marine debris/plastics; contaminant load; and manmade sources. A small number of strandings have been associated with the use of U.S. Navy sonar; none of these have occurred in the Study Area. Information on strandings associated with Navy training and testing activities is provided in the 2017 technical report, "Marine Mammal Strandings Associated with United States Navy Sonar Activities." The Center for Naval Analysis (CNA) recently conducted a statistical study of correlation of beaked whale strandings around the Mariana Islands with the use of U.S. Navy sonar, finding that insufficient evidence of a correlation exists. The CNA study used the complete record of all U.S. Navy sonar use between 2007 and 2019, including major training events, joint exercises, and unit level training/testing. The analysis also included the complete beaked whale stranding record for the Mariana Islands through 2019. Following the methods in Simonis et al. (2020), the CNA analysis found insufficient evidence of a correlation between sonar use and beaked whale strandings when considering the complete sonar use record. The CNA finding is in contrast to the finding in Simonis et al. (2020), which depicted a significant correlation between beaked whale strandings and Navy sonar use. However, the Simonis et al. (2020) result relied on substantially incomplete or inaccurate assumptions about U.S. Navy sonar use around the Mariana Islands. CNA also conducted statistical analyses specific to each island where beaked whale strandings have been observed in the Mariana Islands, similarly finding insufficient evidence of a correlation to sonar use. Additional information on the findings of the CNA analysis are presented in Section 3.4.2.1.1.6 (Stranding) in Chapter 3.4 (Marine Mammals). Section 3.4.2.1.1.6 (Stranding) further discusses the best available information about strandings in the Mariana Islands and the Navy's support of efforts to better understand the causes of marine

	Comment	Navy Response
		of marine mammal strandings. NMFS, as the regulator, maintains the authoritative National Stranding Database. As described in Section 5.1.2.2.1 (Marine Species Research and Monitoring Programs), for this Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy agreed to several additional research and monitoring initiatives designed to help advance the understanding of beaked whales and strandings in the MITT Study Area. The Navy will co-fund the Pacific Marine Assessment Program for Protected Species (PACMAPPS) Mariana Islands survey in spring-summer 2021 and future studies starting in 2022 to help document beaked whale occurrence, abundance, and distribution in the Mariana Islands. The Navy will also fund additional stranding response and necropsy analyses for the Pacific Islands region, and research on a framework to improve statistical stranding analysis. Collaboratively with NMFS, the Navy will fund and organize an expert panel to provide recommendations on scientific data gaps and uncertainties for further protective measure consideration to minimize potential impacts of Navy training and testing activities on beaked whales in the Mariana Islands.
TMO-07	It is the Municipality's understanding that the reason for the supplemental study of the 2015 MITT EIS/OEIS is to update the 2015 analysis to provide "revised acoustic effects criteria and updated species densities" and to provide "new scientific research," and that the proposed activities within the MITT Study Area include the use of active sonar and explosives of the coast of Guam and the CNMI throughout the in-water areas around the MIRC, the transit corridor between the MIRC and the Hawaii Range Complex. In the 2015 MITT EIS/OEIS, the Navy states that its primary purpose was to comply with the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA) and the Endangered Species Act. However, in reviewing the SEIS, there are concerns of new or increased activities on Tinian. While the SEIS states that the Navy is	The Navy analyzed land-based activities on Guam, Saipan, Tinian, and Rota in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS; the Navy did not reanalyze land-based activities in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS because no changes are proposed to those land-based activities. In this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy analyzes only the training and testing activities conducted at sea and on FDM within the Study Area. Locations of the proposed activities are included in the Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) tables, and additional details are available in Appendix A (Training and Testing Activities Descriptions). Table 2.5-1 of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS has been updated to reflect that there would be no increase in amphibious assault training. In addition, text has been added to clarify that proposed increases in Personnel Insertion/Extractions, Parachute Insertions, and Intelligence, Surveillance, Reconnaissance would

	Comment	Navy Response
	not "proposing any changes to those land-based activities on Guam, Saipan, Tinian, and Rota, the Navy will continue to rely on the 2015 MITT Final EIS," Table 2.5-1 indicates of potential location of new or increased training activities which includes the possibility of these new or increased activities on Saipan, Tinian, or Rota. The table indicates increases in amphibious assault trainings on Tinian, increases in personnel insertion/extractions on Tinian and Rota, increases in parachute insertion trainings on Tinian and Rota; and new intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance trainings on Saipan, Tinian, and Rota. Per Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2, several new or increased training or testing activities, are designated to take place at "Mariana Littorals," "Mariana Island Anchorages," or simply in the Study Area or the MIRC without further specification. The Municipality did not anticipate having to be consider the implications of additional trainings in light of other ongoing proposals by DOD under this SEIS. Moreover, the fact that the new and or increased training activities are just slithered into this SEIS without specifying what or where these new trainings are, other that they are within the Study Area or the MIRC, without any public input is disconcerting and we are therefore requesting additional information and further specification.	not occur on land (Tinian, Rota or Guam). Proposed increases in those activities would only occur offshore within the MIRC.
Christopher Tenorio, Commonwealth Ports Authority (CPA)		
CPA-01	The Commonwealth Ports Authority hereby submits the following four comments regarding the MITT draft supplemental EIS/OBIS: **1. Airspace Clarification Requested** The 2019 MITT Supplemental EIS seems to be consistent with the 2015 MITT Final EIS as to the proposed restricted airspace. However, in Section 3.13.1.2, the following is stated:	No changes in airspace are being proposed as part of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Information referenced under Section 3.13.2.1.2 (Airspace) are associated with the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. The Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS has been revised to clarify text and note that no changes in airspace are proposed.

	Comment	Navy Response
	"General information on airspace within the Study Area can be found in the 2015 Mitt Final EIS/OBIS (Section 3.13.2.1.2, Airspace); however, there have been changes to special use airspace within the Study Area in order to enhance safety. Changes include the addition of one new restricted area and new warning areas (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2015)." Is this statement referring to changes made based on the 2015 MITT Final EIS - in other words, the changes in airspace that are in place today? Or is the 2019 MITT Supplemental EIS proposing new airspace changes beyond R-7201, R-7201A, W-llA, W-llB, W-12, W-13A, W-13B, W- 13C, and W-517?	
CPA-02	Also, CPA understands the following minimum distances within the Study Area from land apply to certain training activities: • Air Warfare > 12 NM from land • Anti-Submarine > 3 NM from land • Electronic Warfare > 12 NM from land • Surface Warfare > 12 NM from land • BOMBEX > 50 NM from land • Torpedo Exercise > 3 NM from land • MISSLEX > 50 NM from land • GUNEX Ship > 12 NM from land • SINKEX > 50 NM from land • GUNEX Boat (medium caliber) > 12 NM from land • GUNEX Boat (small caliber) > 3 NM from land • Small Boat Attack (non-blanks) > 3 NM from land • Submarine Sonar Maintenance > 3 NM from land • Surface Ship Sonar Maintenance > 3 NM from land • Air-to-Surface Missile Test > 50 NM from land • Anti-Submarine Warfare Test > 3NM from land • Electronic Warfare Test > 3 NM from land	The Navy will continue to adhere and honor the minimum training distances as identified for training and testing activities listed in Table 2.5-1 and 2.5-2 and Appendix A (Training and Testing Activities Descriptions). Due to operational requirements, the Navy is unable to increase these minimum distances from Saipan, Tinian, and Rota. The distances cited in the comment letter are correct with the exceptions of Electronic Warfare, Submarine Sonar Maintenance, and Surface Ship Sonar Maintenance. Specifically: a) Electronic Warfare. Table 2.5-1 contains four range activities under this heading, and have been assessed for potential environmental impacts with the following locations/distances: i. Electronic Warfare Operations (EW Ops) may be conducted anywhere appropriate within the "Study Area." ii. Counter Targeting Flare Exercise (FLAREX) – Aircraft activities may be conducted within the "Study Area > 12 NM from land." iii. Counter Targeting Chaff Exercise (CHAFEX) – Ship activities may be conducted within the "Study Area > 12 NM from land."

	Comment	Navy Response
	Remembering its responsibilities to manage the ports of the Commonwealth and to those who use those ports, CPA expects these distances to be honored. CPA encourages the Navy to increase these minimum distances away from Saipan, Tinian, and Rota to further protect our ports, their users, and our community from the impacts of these activities.	iv. CHAFFEX – Aircraft activities may be conducted within the "Study Area > 12 NM from land." b) Submarine Sonar Maintenance. Table 2.5-1 contains one range activity under this heading and has been assessed for potential environmental impacts with the following locations/distances: i. Submarine Sonar Maintenance may be conducted within the "Study Area > 12 NM from land; Inner Apra Harbor and channel; Transit Corridor" c) Surface Ship Sonar Maintenance. Table 2.5-1 contains one range activity under this heading and has been assessed for potential environmental impacts with the following locations/distances: i. Surface Ship Sonar Maintenance may be conducted within the "Study Area > 12 NM from land; Inner Apra Harbor and channel; Transit Corridor"
CPA-03	**2. No Additional Use of CPA Airports** At p. 3.12-23, the 2019 Supplemental EIS states: "Therefore, no impacts to tourism would be anticipated because ... military aircraft generally depart from Andersen Air Force Base ..." The draft does not state that CPA's airports will not be used or rule out that possibility. CPA would object to any use of its airports by the Navy in support of testing or training activities contemplated under the 2019 MITT Supplemental EIS beyond those uses already allowed under the terms of existing agreements between the United States and CPA/the CNMI and CPA's FAA Airport Sponsor Assurances. CPA requests that the Navy confirm that it does not intend to use and will not use CPA's airports in relation to the testing and training activities contemplated under the 2019 Supplemental EIS unless it is in compliance with these existing agreements. CPA further requests that the Navy confirm that: (1) any such use by the Navy	The Navy will continue to abide by all agreements with the CNMI Commonwealth Ports Authority. The Navy does not intend to change the use CPA's airports as part of the Proposed Action for this Supplemental EIS/OEIS.

	Comment	Navy Response
	will be no greater than that contemplated under the 2015 MITT Final EIS; and (2) that any such use will be coordinated with CPA according to the policies and procedures of CPA. Further, if the Navy does intend to utilize CPA's airports in relation to the testing and training activities contemplated under the 2019 MITT Supplemental EIS, CPA requests that the Navy specify such intended use in the updated or final version of the 2019 MITT Supplemental EIS.	
CPA-04	Last, on page 2-38 of the draft, at "Unmanned Aerial Training and Certification," Table 2.5-1 lists that this training activity will occur at "MIRC airfields." It then indicates a footnote, but it leads to no note or other definition of what is meant by "MIRC airfields." CPA requests that the Navy clarify this reference.	The Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS has revised the note associated with "Unmanned Aerial Training and Certification" in Table 2.5-1, to define MIRC airfields as Orote Point Airfield, Guam; Northwest Airfield, Guam; North Airfield, Tinian.
CPA-05	**3. Communications with CPA** The 2019 MITT Supplemental EIS makes efforts to discuss outreach activities by and on behalf of the Navy to communicate to the public regarding upcoming and ongoing Navy testing or training activities in the Study Area. CPA encourages the Navy to further its efforts in such outreach to improve communications on Navy activities contemplated under the 2019 MITT Supplemental EIS. CPA encourages the Navy to work with CPA on improving such communications so that the information on the activities, and the closure of any warning areas, may be readily available and delivered to the users of CPA' s ports.	Public safety is important to the Navy. Various means are used to communicate information to the public about areas restricted to public or commercial activities and are described in Section 3.13 (Public Health and Safety). As specified in Title 33 CFR Subpart 72.01, Notices to Mariners, the U.S. Coast Guard issues information to the public concerning maritime navigation. Additionally, nautical charts issued by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration include these federally designated zones and areas. Operators of recreational and commercial vessels have a duty to abide by maritime regulations administered by the U.S. Coast Guard. Waters around FDM within 3 NM from shore are permanently closed for safety reasons due to the potential presence of unexploded ordnance. When necessary, the military also requests that the Federal Aviation Administration issue a Notice to Airmen to make the public aware of upcoming military activities requiring the exclusive use of airspace. The Navy has coordinated with the CNMI Emergency Management Office and Office of Homeland when closures of sea or air space are in effect and the Navy has added the CNMI Commonwealth Ports Authority to the Safety Notification List. The Navy will continue to coordinate with the CNMI

	Comment	Navy Response
		Commonwealth Ports Authority and the Mayor's offices when major training events are scheduled.
CPA-06	**4. Potential Increased Activities on Saipan, Tinian, and Rota** The 2019 MITT Supplemental EIS states: "As the Navy is not proposing any changes to those land-based activities on Guam, Saipan, Tinian, and Rota, the Navy will continue to rely on the 2015 MITT Final EIS." But in its Table 2.5-1, the potential location of new or increased training activities includes the possibility of these new or increased activities on Saipan, Tinian, or Rota, including: • Increases in amphibious assault training on Tinian; • Increases in personnel insertion/extraction on Tinian and Rota; • Increases in parachute insertion training on Tinian and Rota; and • New intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance training on Saipan, Tinian, and Rota. Further, several new or increased training or testing activities, per Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2, are designated to take place at "Mariana Littorals," "Mariana Island Anchorages," or simply in the Study Area or the MIRC without further specification. CPA requests that the Navy specify whether new or increased testing and/or training activities contemplated by the 2019 Supplemental EIS will occur on or along the shoreline of Saipan, Tinian, or Rota.	The Navy analyzed land-based activities on Guam, Saipan, Tinian, and Rota in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS; the Navy did not reanalyze land-based activities in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS because no changes are proposed to those land-based activities. Training and testing activities proposed to increase within this Supplemental EIS/OEIS are summarized in Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2 in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Locations of the proposed activities are included in these tables, and additional details are available in Appendix A (Training and Testing Activities Descriptions). Table 2.5-1 of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS has been updated to reflect that there would be no increase in amphibious assault training. In addition, text has been added to clarify that proposed increases in Personnel Insertion/Extractions, Parachute Insertions, and Intelligence, Surveillance, Reconnaissance would not occur on land (Tinian, Rota or Guam). Proposed increases in those activities would only occur offshore within the MIRC.
Senator Kelly Marsh (Taitano), Office of Senator Kelly Marsh (Taitano) (OSM)		

	Comment	Navy Response
OSM-01	As chairwoman of the Committee on Heritage, it is imperative to ensure Guam's natural resources and cultural heritage remain protected and not further diluted or adversely impacted. It is also important to ensure that the military lives up to their commitments to One Guam, Green Guam, a Net Negative Footprint, and being culturally sensitive. The Indigenous CHamoru people of Guåhan and the Indigenous Chamorro and Refaluwásch peoples in and the Northern Marianas are inextricably connected socially, culturally, and otherwise to their environments and the plants and animals that share the islands, the waters, and the air with them. Place names, oral narratives, and certain cultural traditions inform us of these special connections. They tell us how the universe was created; our roles within society; the core values that are important; why species look and behave as they do; why our landscape exists as it does; opportune times to fish, hunt, and gather; which foods are appropriate when and for whom; the many ways that we are connected throughout the archipelago; and more. CHamorus/Chamorros and Refaluwásch are also inseparably connected to their homelands through their ancestors. Their ancestors tread, voyaged, fished, hunted, planted, and gathered resources throughout the archipelago. Nearly every island within the archipelago was inhabited, and perhaps all were places of important resources. Their ancestors have been buried within the archipelago for numerous generations—ancestors who never leave and remain connected to their homeland islands to this day. Further, an almost countless number of places on the land and in the sea are imbued with special meanings and powers. For these many reasons, the Mariana Islands are special and sacred.	This Supplemental EIS/OEIS fully complies with NEPA, includes extensive studies and analysis, and, using the best available science, exceeds the required hard look at impacts on the human and natural environment. The Navy is committed to protecting the environment while training and conducting testing. A comprehensive analysis of potential effects on environmental resources from Navy training and testing activities is presented in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS. These resources include water quality and sediment quality, marine habitats, marine mammals, fish, sea turtles, birds, socioeconomics, cultural resources, and invertebrates. While some impacts would occur from training and testing activities, the analysis concludes that impacts would be minimal and would not have a significant impact on the environment. Also, as described in Section 2.3.3 (Standard Operating Procedures) and Chapter 5 (Mitigation), the Navy implements, to the maximum extent possible, mitigation measures during its training and testing activities. The Navy has been conducting training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades and this supplement to the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS supports the continuation of that training and testing. This Supplemental EIS/OEIS (1) includes the analysis of activities at sea and on FDM necessary to meet readiness requirements beyond 2020 and into the reasonably foreseeable future, (2) includes any changes to those activities previously analyzed, and (3) reflects the most up-to-date compilation of training and testing activities deemed necessary to accomplish military readiness requirements. The Navy is required to complete independent statutory obligations under NEPA, MMPA, ESA, MSA and NHPA. Thus, the Navy has prepared this Supplemental EIS/OEIS and is consulting with NMFS under the MMPA, ESA, and MSA, and conducting a Section 106 consultations with the CNMI HPO and Guam HPO. Mitigation, monitoring, or conservation

	Comment	Navy Response
	The health and well-being of the CHamoru/Chamorro and Refaluwásch cultures and their cultural identities are reliant upon keeping our environments and the plants and animals that live within them healthy; upon having unimpeded access to our air, waters, and lands; and upon providing appropriate respect to powerful and sacred places. Destruction of places (land or sea) important to CHamoru/Chamorro and Refaluwásch peoples, testing or training activities that do not provide appropriate respect of their powerful and sacred spaces, takes (harassment, harms, injuries, or kills) to the plants and animals adversely impact not only not only the plants, animals, and environments themselves but the very culture and cultural identity of CHamoru/Chamorro and Refaluwásch. When was the last time we saw a fanihi (fruitbat) in our skies? When was the last time we saw a Marianas Eight-spot butterfly? When was the last time we saw ko'ko' or a slew of other types of native birds in our skies or nesting on the ground? When was the last time we caught and ate a large palakse' or went hunting for small clams with our family? The loss of each of those and other such activities, which used to be so common, is a loss of who we are as a community and who we want to be. I stand against testing and training that causes substantive and irreversible adverse impacts to our special plants, animals, and environments which thus challenge the continuation of the CHamoru/Chamorro and Refaluwásch cultures and cultural identities, as well as the identities of our larger diverse island communities. Potential for many types of such harms are noted within the MITT SEIS-OEIS (e.g., Table ES.6-1). A wide variety of species of plants and	requirements are presented in Chapter 5 (Mitigation). Mitigation measures in the NMFS Biological Opinion will be reflected in the Record of Decision.

	Comment	Navy Response
	animals and our cultural, community, and economic activities have the potential to be negatively impacted. These include (but are not limited to)—our marine life, including fishes and sea turtles, among others. Other potential impacts are noted for commercial and recreational fishing, traditional fishing practices, and tourism. They will be impacted by such things as explosions, being hit by debris or a vessel, becoming entangled, or ingesting something harmful impacts that have and do happen as noted by experts at Guam's environmental agencies. I call for the assessment of such potential harms to the plants, animals, environments, and cultural resources to more fully reflect CHamoru/Chamorro and Refaluwásch cultural perspectives and standards. I further call for the significance of the impact of MITT undertakings and activities to be also be determined by examining their impact the continuation of their culture, cultural practices, and cultural identity.	
GEPA-01	The Guam Environmental Protection Agency is submitting the following comments for the document, the 2019 Mariana Islands Training and Testing Supplemental EIS/OEIS (MITT). Several comments pertain to the 2015 Mariana Islands Training and Testing EIS/OEIS (2015 MITT), and the rest to the 2019 MITT Supplemental, as we feel these issues have not been specifically addressed in either document. 1. The Navy does a respectable job of notifying the local regulatory agencies of upcoming underwater Mine Detonation activities within Outer Apra Harbor and Agat Bay. But the public nor the regulatory agencies ever receive any form of feedback/after action reports on outcome of these activities. Specifically, if any environmental damages occurred. Guam EPA request that some form of report be produce outlining these activities and highlight any issues regarding	As discussed in Section 5.1.2.2 (Monitoring, Research, and Reporting Initiatives), the Navy developed its reporting requirements in conjunction with NMFS to be consistent with mission requirements and balance the usefulness of the information to be collected with the practicality of collecting it. The Navy's training and testing activity reports and incident reports are designed to verify implementation of mitigation; comply with current permits, authorizations, and consultation requirements; and improve future environmental analyses. The Navy reports to NMFS if mitigation was implemented during sinking exercises (e.g., number of times explosive detonations were delayed due to marine mammal sightings). For major training exercises, the Navy's annual training and testing activity reports include information on each individual marine mammal sighting related to mitigation implementation. In the unlikely event that a vessel strike of a marine mammal should occur, the Navy would provide NMFS with relevant information pertaining to the incident, including but not limited to vessel speed. Additional reporting would be

	Comment	Navy Response
	water quality, fish kills, protected species sightings, and marine debris be made available to the public and local agencies.	ineffective for the reasons detailed in Section 5.6.7 (Reporting Requirements). The Navy is obligated under the ESA and MMPA to provide information on any incidents involving ESA-listed species. Therefore, the Navy will continue to submit the appropriate reports to NMFS immediately, or as soon as operational security considerations allow, if it observes an incident that is or may be attributable to Navy activities, including (1) a vessel strike of a marine mammal or sea turtle during training or testing; (2) a stranded, injured, or dead marine mammal or sea turtle during training or testing; or (3) an injured or dead marine mammal, sea turtle, or ESA-listed fish species during post-explosive activity monitoring.
GEPA-02	2. In the past, pre-coordination meetings on Mine Detonation activities were conducted with the local regulatory agencies. Guam EPA requests to make these meetings standard operating procedures, at a minimum of bi-annual basis.	Following receipt of notices to mariners, the Guam EPA is welcome to observe the underwater detonation training events and following the completion of the event may survey the area after it has been cleared. Guam EPA is also welcome to contact the Navy to request meetings as needed.
GEPA-03	3. At a minimum, a yearly report should be produced summarizing all activities identified in the MITT. There is no current mechanism to evaluate if the activities and quantities identified in the MITT are met or exceeded. Report should also address any impacts to stressor types.	See response GEPA-01 (to W.S. Leon Guerrero, Guam Environmental Protection Agency), regarding monitoring and reporting.
GEPA-04	4. Neither the 2015 MITT nor the 2019 Supplemental MITT have a discussion on the rational for an increase from a I0 lbs. underwater mine charge to the new standard of a 20 lbs. charge for the listed mine detonation activities. What is the justification for the increase? This needs to be further explained and justified.	The proposed training and testing activities in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS are needed to achieve and maintain military readiness within the Study Area. This includes the use of underwater mine charges up to 20 lb. at the Agat underwater detonation site. Underwater detonation activities at Apra Harbor and Piti would remain a charge of 10 lb. The increase to 20 lb. at the Agat underwater detonation site was included in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and has not changed in the 2019 Supplemental Draft EIS/OEIS. This Supplemental EIS/OEIS furthers the Navy and other military services' execution of their roles and responsibilities under 10 U.S.C. section 5062.

	Comment	Navy Response
GEPA-05	5. In the 2015 MITT, page 3.1-18, Section 3.1.3, it states that Amphibious assaults and raids sediment plumes are temporary and since no military material s are expended, "...no further analysis of this training activity is provided ...." In previous training assaults on Guam, it has been observed that physical damages (corals crushed or turned over) from these training activities occurred. Further discussion on this activity and a review of the potential impacts and mitigation needs to occur.	Due to the accidental grounding of the French Navy Landing Craft that occurred on May 12, 2017, the Navy has implemented additional standard operating procedures for amphibious assault and raid activities. The Navy requires the following standard operating procedures for amphibious landings at Reserve Craft Beach: (1) Concept of Operations for the event and for notification/coordination with Naval Base Guam Operations Officer, (2) Presence of craft master who will coordinate planned routes with Mariana Islands Range Complex Ops and Naval Base Guam, (3) Presence of a beach master (observers) to assist in approach to shore and restore beach to original condition, and (4) Distribution of the Reserve Craft Beach Training Aid to all vessel Captains participating in any training event in the vicinity of Reserve Craft Beach. The Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS has been updated to include the additional standard operating procedures outlined above.
GEPA-06	6. Neither the 2015 MITT nor the 2019 Supplemental MITT have a discussion in the Cumulative Impacts section that describes the total cumulative impacts that the individual activities impact would have on the environment. For instance, the 2015 MITT states that the impact from two vessel sinking's a year are minimal. But there is no discussion on what the impact would be for a 5-year period where a total of 10 vessels would be sunk. The document continues to state that for Preferred Alternative, 237 tons of metal would be release into the MITT range complex. This is a 1 .3% increase over the "No Action" alternative. Expand this out for a 5-year period, this would equate to 6.5o/o increase and 1, 185 tons of metal. At what point does this become significant. There really is no temporal discussion of the additive impact of any stressors to the environment.	For the MITT Study Area, the substrate would be primarily clays and silts. As described and analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, SINKEX activities would not occur in the same location. Under the Navy's preferred alternative (Alternative 2), the seafloor footprint for SINKEX would be less than what was analyzed in 2015. In addition, regulations involving SINKEX require that activities take place more than 50 miles from the coast and in waters at least 6,000 ft. deep (40 CFR section 229.2). The vessel hulk would create a hard substrate, which could act as an anchoring point for marine life in the open ocean where the predominant habitat is soft bottom.
GEPA-07	7. In the 2019 Supplemental MITT, Section 3. 1 .2.4 Other Materials section, explains that detonations, explosions, and other activities may result in dispersant of glass, carbon fibers, plastics, rubber, steel, iron, concrete, etc. There is no discussion if any effort to clean	Other military expended materials, such as marine markers and flares, chaff, unrecovered towed and stationary targets, sonobuoys, fiber-optic cables, and miscellaneous plastic and rubber components of other expended objects are expected to sink to the seafloor and become buried

	Comment	Navy Response
	up the marine debris as a result of the MITT activities are done or completed. There needs to be a discussion on this topic.	in sediments. Materials that sink and settle on the ocean bottom in very deep water make it impractical to recover. However, depending on the environmental conditions, including the availability of oxygen in sediments and water temperature at the seafloor, and the type of material (e.g., metal or plastic), expended material may degrade relatively quickly or persist in the environment indefinitely. Plastic and other persistent materials could incrementally contribute to marine "garbage patches" or other areas with accumulated debris but still have only minimal impact compared to other sources of debris. The Navy has standard operation procedures in place to reduce the amount of military expended materials, including recovering targets and associated parachutes to the maximum extent practical.
GEPA-08	8. In the 2019 Supplemental MITT, Section 3.1.3 Public Scoping Comments states that Guam does not maintain screening standards for metals in sediments of water, and sites USEPA thresholds. Update Reference to Suggested Parameters for Bulk Sediment Analyses and Elutriate Analyses under Permit information Requirements regarding Section 401 Water Quality Certification and the Pacific Basin Environmental Screening Levels. Every effort should be made to use site specific values.	Both this Supplemental EIS/OEIS and the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS include an analysis of potential impacts from metals and contaminants as a result of military training and testing activities on marine resources; however, this Supplemental EIS/OEIS includes updated information to better inform the analysis. For example, this Supplemental EIS/OEIS has been updated to include Table 3.1-1 within Section 3.1 (Sediments and Water Quality), which includes water quality standards, criteria, and applicable water use areas for waters surrounding Guam and islands within the CNMI. Specifically, for waters surrounding Guam, the Navy references Title 22 Division II Chapter 5 Section 102 of the Guam Administrative Code (22 GAR Section 5102) defines marine waters as all coastal waters off shore, including estuarine waters, lagoons, bays, brackish areas, wetlands, and other inland waters that are subject to the ebb and flow of tides. Table 3.1-1 lists each standard with specific criteria in Guam's regulations and applicability to each water use area. The water quality standards include criteria for microbiological concentrations (Enterococci, and *E. coli*), pH, nutrients (nitrate-nitrogen, total nitrogen, orthophosphate, ammonia), dissolved oxygen, total filterable suspended solids, salinity, temperature, turbidity, radioactive materials, oil and petroleum products, toxic

	Comment	Navy Response
		pollutants, and other general considerations. The military readiness activities that generate stressors to water quality do not occur in the water use areas; rather, they occur outside of the Guam coastal zone and are analyzed in the context of their potential to induce reasonably foreseeable effects into Class "AA" or Class "A" water use areas. While no quantitative sampling for metals in training areas have been completed, there are a number of studies conducted in marine training and testing locations that have attempted to measure metal content where military activities occur. In one study, the water was sampled for lead, manganese, nickel, vanadium, and zinc at a shallow bombing range in Pamlico Sound (state waters of North Carolina) immediately following a training event with non-explosive practice bombs. All water quality parameters tested, except nickel, were within the state limits. The nickel concentration was significantly higher than the state criterion, although the concentration did not differ significantly from the control site located outside the bombing range. The results suggest that bombing activities were not responsible for the elevated nickel concentrations (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2010). A recent study conducted by the U.S. Marine Corps sampled sediments and water quality for 26 different constituents related to munitions at several U.S. Marine Corps water-based training ranges. Metals included lead and magnesium. These areas were also used for bombing practice. No munitions constituents were detected above screening values used at the U.S. Marine Corps water ranges (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2010). A study by Pait et al. (2010) of previous Navy training areas at Vieques, Puerto Rico, found generally low concentrations of metals in marine sediments. Areas in which live ammunition and loaded weapons were used ("live-fire areas") were also included in the analysis. Information from the National Coastal Condition Assessment report (IV), which evaluated waters and sediments around Guam based on data from 2003 to 2006, was also cited for background information.

	Comment	Navy Response
GEPA-09	9. In the 2019 Supplemental MITT, Section 5.1.2.2.1. l Adaptive Management states that the adaptive management process is to help the Navy have better knowledge on ecological systems. The process involves technical review meetings and ongoing discussions between the Navy, NMFS, the Marine Mammal Commission, and other experts in the scientific community. This process makes no mention of local stakeholders or other local natural resources managers like Guam EPA, Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Statistics and Plans, etc. Section should be revised to include all local Agency and Departments.	The Navy is fully engaged with NMFS through an adaptive management program that allows the Navy and NMFS to reevaluate impacts on marine resources using new scientific findings. The adaptive management group only includes Navy and NMFS (Headquarters Marine Mammal Protection Act and Endangered Species Act) staff. The adaptive management program is an internal opportunity for Navy and NMFS to jointly review the preceding year's monitoring for a given range complex in the Pacific (including the Mariana Islands Range Complex) and see if monitoring priorities need adjusting. The results of the Navy's monitoring are posted annually and are available on the Navy's public website www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us.
GEPA-10	10. In the 2019 Supplemental MITT, Section 5.1.2.2.3 Incident Reports states that the Navy will submit annual reports to National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) that include any incidents that may affect shallow water coral reefs. They will also be reporting on any effects to Endangered Species Act (ESA) listed species. Do these ESA-listed species include the new ESA-listed corals? There needs to be a discussion on this topic.	Section 3.8.1.3 (Endangered Species Act-Listed Species) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS includes the three coral species (*Acropora globiceps*, *A. retusa*, and *Seriatopora aculeata*) listed under the ESA occur in the Study Area. The Navy analyzed potential impacts on these species from proposed training and testing activities and will continue to comply with the Biological Opinion issued by NMFS.
GEPA-11	11. Any and all construction that is related to either the 2015 MITT or the 2019 Supplemental MITT must be permitted by the Guam Environmental Protection Agency (GEPA), and must therefore meet all relevant requirements of GEPA regulations. These include, but are not limited to, clearing and grading requirements as specified in the Guam Soil Erosion and Sediment Control Regulations (22 GAR Chapters 10 and 45) and the 2006 CNMI and Guam Stormwater Management Manual, as adopted through Executive Order 2012-02; groundwater development and protection require1nents as specified under the Water Resource Development and Operating Regulations (22 GAR Chapter 7), the Underground Injection Control Regulations (22 GAR Chapter 9), and the Guan1Water Quality Standards (22GAR Chapter 5); wastewater disposal requirements as specified under the Individual Wastewater Disposal Systems	The Navy analyzed land-based activities on Guam, Saipan, Tinian, and Rota in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS; the Navy did not reanalyze land-based activities in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS because no changes are proposed to those land-based activities. Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2 in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) present the current and proposed training and testing activities. The Proposed Action does not include construction activities.

	Comment	Navy Response
	Regulations (22 GAR Chapter 12), the Connection to Sewer Regulations (22 GAR Chapter 25), and the Guam Water Quality Standards (22 GAR Chapter 5); requirements pertaining to the design, construction, and operation as contained in the Guam Safe Drinking Water Regulations (22 GAR Chapter 6) the Water Resource Development and Operating Regulations, Part II: Guidelines for Water Works Development (22 GAR Chapter 7), and the Water and Wastewater Operator Certification Regulations (22 GAR Chapter 11	
GEPA-12	12. The 2019 MITT Supplemental states there have been no new information since the 2015 MITT. But the 2015 MITT identifies specific data gaps about the environmental impact of previously used ammunition and/or the degradation products on the marine ecosystems in that area. There needs to be a discussion on this topic.	See response GEPA-08 (to W.S. Leon Guerrero, Guam Environmental Protection Agency), regarding sediment and water quality.
Anthony T. Benavente, Secretary, CNMI Department of Lands and Natural Resources (CNMI DLNR)		
CNMI DLNR-01	The Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands' (CNMI) Department of Lands and Natural Resources (DLNR) appreciates having the opportunity to share its concerns on the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (DSEIS) on the Marianas Islands Training Testing (MITT) Activities proposed by United States Department of the Navy. Due to time constraints this review focuses on questions and comments regarding general concerns and suggested improvements for mitigation of anticipated impacts associated with the expanded timeline and scope of activities proposed in Preferred Alternatives 1 and 2 of the DSEIS. We lacked sufficient time to fully assess the background information and reports associated with this document. We also met with MITT representatives on March 18th' 2019. Several issues, including requests for background information, were brought up that required follow-up. We have yet to receive the promised information. DLNR submitted extensive comments during the previous MITT comment period in 2013. We were not satisfied with	The Navy provided background studies and reports to the CNMI Bureau of Military Affairs in early 2020. The Navy uses the best available science to support the impact analysis and conclusions. The most recent survey report is Carilli J, Smith SE, Marx Jr. D, Bolick L. 2018. Farallon de Medinilla 2017 Coral Reef Survey Report. This report has been added to the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Data cited in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS is also available by request. In addition, while outside the current scope of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the military satisfies their Sikes Act obligations through the development and implementation of the Joint Region Marianas Integrated Natural Resource Management Plan (INRMP). The 2019 Joint Region Marianas INRMP includes monitoring programs throughout the Mariana Islands. The CNMI Department of Lands and Natural Resources, Division of Fish and Wildlife is a signatory and participating member to the 2019 Joint Region Marianas INRMP, which details natural resource management and monitoring programs. The Navy will continue to coordinate with the CNMI as part of

	Comment	Navy Response
	how our comments were addressed in the previous Record of Decision. We therefore have limited faith in this process. DLNR remains concerned regarding the significance criteria used in the DSEIS as well as the overall validity and credibility of the assessment of risk to marine and terrestrial environments and cultural and socioeconomic conditions, as well as compliance with the requirements of NEPA to ensure adequate identification and mitigation of significant impacts. The uses of terms like "slightly" are meaningless; these should be changed to percentage or some other measurable term. The DSEIS also repeatedly down-plays benefits of the No Action Alternative by the use of "not measurably improve" when previous statements indicate this is false. For example, without disturbance, birds on Farallon de Medinilla would change distribution and likely abundance; the DSEIS states that it would not measurably improve distribution and abundance. **General concerns.** Proposed activities will have significant impacts on the ecological, cultural, and socioeconomic resources of the CNMI and its surrounding waters. Some impacts, such as the degradation of landscapes, restriction of access to resource users, and the diminishment of cultural value are impossible to monitor, measure, mitigate, and recover. DLNR is particularly concerned about the cumulative impact of military build-up and training activities (including the MITT, MIRC, CJMT, Divert, etc.) will have in its jurisdiction. As a reminder, DLNR has management jurisdiction of the 0-3 nautical miles (nm) from the shoreline of the islands, as well as oversight over impacts to habitats and species of the CNMI. Any activities within 12nm should still be coordinated DLNR. This document mentions nothing regarding following CNMI laws, regulations, and permitting processes. General concerns for the MITT DSEIS include:	the INRMP implementation, which allows for data sharing between the Navy, Guam and the CNMI. The Navy has reviewed and incorporated the best available science to support the impact analysis and conclusions for the coral reef communities. The Navy is consulting with NMFS under the ESA and received a Biological Opinion. Mitigation measures and monitoring requirements specified in the Biological Opinion are presented in Chapter 5 (Mitigation). The Navy used the best available science and conducted a comprehensive review of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable actions to develop a robust analysis of cumulative impacts (Chapter 4, Cumulative Impacts). As required under NEPA, the level and scope of the analysis are commensurate with the potential impacts of the action as reflected in the resource-specific discussions in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences). The Navy considered proposed and ongoing activities alongside with other activities in the region whose impacts are truly meaningful to the analysis. Furthermore, the entire Supplemental EIS/OEIS provides the cumulative impacts analysis, not just Chapter 4. Chapter 3 provides the current effects of past and present impacts and environmental conditions that represent the baseline of the environment as it is; Chapter 3 also discusses the consequences or potential future impacts from Navy activities. Chapter 4 discusses other reasonably foreseeable activities to the extent they are known and the incremental impact of the Navy's proposal when added to past, present, and future impacts.

	Comment	Navy Response
CNMI DLNR-02	DLNR and DFW, and our CNMI agency partners are rarely afforded the opportunity to conduct independent, third-party monitoring of the impact of ongoing military training activities, particularly those at sea and on remote northern islands in the archipelago. Studies relied on for the claim that live fire training on Farallon de Medinilla (FDM) do not appear to have been updated since 2016 and those annual surveys were limited in scope and appear to be lacking in scientifically rigorous data collection and analysis. There is also a lack of plant surveys. Active or 'live fire' areas do not preclude independent surveys as demonstrated by other military bases.	The Navy does not routinely allow independent, third-party access to live-fire ranges due to safety concerns. For Navy-funded and managed studies, the Navy will continue to communicate and coordinate with the CNMI government on future collaboration and information sharing. For instance, in Fiscal Year 2020, the Navy has authorized a CNMI biologist to observe FDM sea turtle surveys. The Navy has used the best available science that is reasonably attainable for the island used as a live-fire range. Plant communities are broadly described within Section 3.10 (Terrestrial Species and Habitats), along with an analysis of changes in the vegetation successional state as derived from recent and historical imagery. Focus surveys for plants on FDM is not feasible for a variety of safety reasons.
CNMI DLNR-03	Few data collected by Department of Defense (DOD) and its contractors in monitoring and mitigation activities associated with prior and ongoing training activities in the region are shared with DLNR despite repeated requests for sharing of raw data that is collected. Lack of data sharing and physical restrictions around FDM are preventing the CNMI from monitoring or measuring the impact of military activities in its territorial waters and terrestrial habitats. DLNR and DFW are also prevented from being able to model or predict the likely impact of DOD training activities in its jurisdiction.	The Navy does not routinely allow independent, third-party access to live-fire ranges due to safety concerns. For Navy-funded and managed studies, the Navy will continue to communicate and coordinate with the CNMI government on future collaboration and information sharing. As per CEQ regulations, the Navy uses in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS a number of sources of best available science and data, including external references (noted in each section of EIS/OEIS), technical documents (available on the MITT project website), and ongoing consultation processes with other agencies (NMFS and USFWS). Data is drawn and managed from multiple sources/points, including from the public during the NEPA process. Data are available in tables in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS and technical reports on the MITT project website. Best available peer-reviewed science/data can come from sources such as academia, consultations with other resource agencies, industry, and the public.
CNMI DLNR-04	DLNR and DFW are rarely invited to collaborate with DOD on the design, execution, and scientific review of monitoring activities. Recommendations that have been made in the Integrated Resource Management Planning process have not been implemented, and if monitoring is occurring, data has not been shared or included in the DSEIS.	Because FDM is an active range, it is not feasible to allow non-military personnel, including CNMI resource management agency representatives, on the island due to safety and special explosive ordnance disposal certification requirements. For Navy-funded and managed studies, the Navy will continue to communicate and coordinate with the CNMI government on future collaboration and information sharing. In addition,

	Comment	Navy Response
		pursuant to 40 C.F.R. 1502.6, the Navy will make available any underlying documents to the public upon request. Documents would be provided without charge to the extent practicable as some references require purchased access to the source sites. The Navy is committed to monitoring natural resources as described in the Final 2019 JRM INRMP. The INRMP, signed by CNMI Department of Lands and Natural Resources, Division of Fish and Wildlife, includes implementation procedures (Chapter 13). Monitoring efforts, as prescribed by the 2015 Biological Opinion, are ongoing (megapodes, habitat, fruit bats), and data is incorporated into the INRMP and the USFWS annual report.
CNMI DLNR-05	Military activities are stated as number of events per year but lack the spatial and temporal information to assess the actual impacts of the proposed activity. Without this information cumulative impact of training activities (ecological, cultural and/or socioeconomic) cannot be predicted or monitored. Additive/consecutive activities would instill a level of chronic environmental risk. There is no data to substantiate DOD claims regarding significance of impacts. The DSEIS ignores the environmental impacts of increased bombing activities in waters surrounding Farallon de Medinilla, specifically within the 3 nm permanent Restricted Area (R-7201). There is a strong likelihood that aberrant ordnance will adversely affect the surrounding coral reef and associated fauna (fish, sea turtles, and marine mammals) and in fact impacts to benthic habitat were observed in the Smith & Marx reports summarizing the surveys that were last conducted in 2012. When it is updated the revised EIS should provide an ordnance-specific probability estimation of land versus sea detonation based on known target success of the specific weapons applied as well as anticipated impacts of "new technologies" that will be used under this proposal.	The Navy's training and testing activities are based on emergent needs; as such, a conservative approach of analyzing the number of events per year was used to determine potential impacts. In addition, the Navy fully analyzed cumulative impacts through the regulatory processes for the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA) and Endangered Species Act (ESA), administered by the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). The Navy used the best available science and conducted a comprehensive review of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable actions to develop a robust analysis of cumulative impacts (Chapter 4, Cumulative Impacts). As required under NEPA, the level and scope of the analysis are commensurate with the potential impacts of the action as reflected in the resource-specific discussions in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences). The Navy considered proposed and ongoing activities alongside other activities in the region whose impacts are truly meaningful to the analysis. Furthermore, the entire Supplemental EIS/OEIS provides the cumulative impacts analysis, not just Chapter 4. Chapter 3 provides the current effects of past and present impacts and environmental conditions that represent the baseline of the environment as it is; Chapter 3 also discusses the consequences or potential future

	Comment	Navy Response
		impacts from Navy activities. Chapter 4 discusses other reasonably foreseeable activities to the extent they are known and the incremental impact of the Navy's proposal when added to past, present, and future impacts. In the section 7 ESA consultations between the Navy and NMFS pertaining to military training activities occurring on FDM, the Navy estimated miss rates for different ordnance classifications. These rates are included in Table 60 of the 2017 NMFS Biological Opinion. Based on these miss rates, potential impacts on nearshore habitats were analyzed accordingly. NMFS used these estimations to base effects determinations on potential colonies of ESA-listed *Acropora globiceps*. In support of the Navy's preferred alternative (Alternative 2) described in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy and NMFS entered into consultation pursuant with section 7 of the ESA. During this consultation, the Navy and NMFS used the same methods to estimate miss rates and impact footprints in the nearshore environments. Based on this analysis, revising the impact conclusions included in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS was not warranted in relation to nearshore impacts on coralline environments, including species-specific effects on ESA-listed species. FDM will continue to be operated in accordance with the terms and conditions specified in the 2015 Biological Opinion (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2015). The impact assessment for nearshore waters surrounding FDM does consider long-term negative impacts. The Navy, based on multi-year dive surveys conducted since 1999, with the most recent dive survey available from 2017, agrees that nearshore impacts can occur from errant ordnance targeted at FDM; however, these impacts are short-term and localized, with no evidence of coral reef impacts from sedimentation and associated fauna. The Navy is consulting with NMFS on the impact of training activities on ESA-listed corals at FDM and will implement terms and conditions of the NMFS BO.

	Comment	Navy Response
CNMI DLNR-06	There are few detailed maps showing coral habitat for Farallon de Medinilla (contrast Section 3.3-11 to the maps provided for Tinian in Section 3.3-12). Military-funded surveys have been performed on Farallon de Medinilla in the past, and data from these surveys should be incorporated on the standard series of maps.	The Navy has added an updated map for habitats around FDM to the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS, which includes coral cover from the latest coral reef surveys.
CNMI DLNR-07	The real ecological impact of proposed activities will be observed and described by DOD affiliated observers. Such observers have the potential to underreport or report with bias the impact of activities. The proposal does not provide for independent assessment of the impact of proposed military activities.	Whenever possible, the Navy will continue to work with local partners in Guam and the CNMI to engage in collaborative research efforts. This collaboration is limited, however, by safety and liability concerns, restricting access by third parties to live-fire ranges. Because FDM is an active range, it is not feasible to allow non-military personnel, including CNMI resource management agency representatives, on the island or within the restricted area of 3 NM due to safety and special explosive ordnance disposal certification requirements. The Navy provides survey information to CNMI resource management agencies as it becomes available and coordinates the best method for providing access to that data. In addition, pursuant to 40 CFR 1502.6, the Navy will make available any underlying documents to the public upon request. Documents would be provided without charge to the extent practicable as some references require purchased access to the source sites. For Navy-funded and managed studies, the Navy will continue to communicate and coordinate with the CNMI government on future collaboration and information sharing.
CNMI DLNR-08	Subsurface activities, including sonar use, and ordnance detonation on or near seamounts will have significant impacts on marine habitats and animal populations, including cetaceans, fish, and marine invertebrates.	The Navy is aware of the mapped seamounts in the Study Area. Mitigation measures associated with the use of sonar and explosives are presented in Section 5.3 (At-Sea Procedural Mitigation to be Implemented) and implemented as appropriate wherever the military trains and tests, including in areas where seamounts may be present. Mitigation areas for sea floor resources are presented in Section 5.4.1 (Mitigation Areas for Seafloor Resources). Chapter 5 (Mitigation) presents details of all mitigation measures, including listing the resource protection focus.
CNMI DLNR-09	There is limited knowledge of population structure of marine mammal and their spatial/habitat use for the CNMI and are used by MITT. We strongly suggest additional research be conducted to	The Navy has funded numerous marine mammal and sea turtle surveys in the Study Area, including in the CNMI. Additional surveys are ongoing, and the Navy plans to continue supporting marine species surveys in the future

	Comment	Navy Response
	better inform future assessments. The raw data should be made available to resource agencies immediately, followed by actively sharing any products/papers produced. If security clearances or guidelines are needed the military should collaborate with CNMI to ensure this occurs.	(often conducted by NOAA personnel). The Navy's marine species monitoring program website, www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us, is available to the public and provides post-survey monitoring reports with tables listing species sighted during the respective surveys. As per CEQ regulations, the Navy uses a number of sources of best available science and data in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, including external references (noted in tables in each section of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS), technical documents (available on the MITT project website), and ongoing consultation processes with other agencies (NMFS and USFWS). Data is drawn and managed from multiple sources/points, including from the public during the NEPA process. Data are available in tables in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS and technical reports on the MITT project website. Best available peer-reviewed science/data can come from sources such as academia, consultations with other resource agencies, industry, and the public. For Navy-funded and managed studies, the Navy will continue to communicate and coordinate with the CNMI government on future collaboration and information sharing.
CNMI DLNR-10	The proposed activities will increase debris and entanglement issues; we recommend beach and ocean clean-up effort be conducted and the collection of materials post-activities. For example, all products and materials from parachute insertions should be collected during or just after the activity.	The Navy strives to recover materials used in training and testing, including parachutes, to the maximum extent practicable. Parachutes used as part of insertion activities are recovered by trainees following insertion. Some items are not intended to be recovered, cannot practicably and safely be recovered, and would therefore remain in the marine environment (see Table 3.0-18). The vast majority of this material would sink and is expected to remain in place on the seafloor, and therefore would not migrate to the nearshore habitat areas. This Supplemental EIS/OEIS includes an analysis of military expended material, including parachutes as part of the stressor analysis within this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Navy supports coastal cleanup efforts in the Tinian Military Lease Area to protect sea turtle nesting habitat.

	Comment	Navy Response
CNMI DLNR-11	We are concerned about the increase in higher explosive rate bins, which have greater environmental impacts and do not believe the increase in bins E8-10 are off-set by the lower occurrence of bins El 1-12 (Table 2.4.3.2) All detonations (underwater or subsurface) have the potential to harm marine species and habitat. Thus, we are concerned by the increased occurrence proposed within MITT alternates, particularly Alternative 2.	As part of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and 2015 MMPA Letter of Authorization, NMFS authorized the Navy to use impulsive sources (i.e., explosives). Similar to non-impulsive sources, the Navy sorted explosive sources into bins based on the net explosive weight of the explosive. After analyzing the level of explosive activities conducted during Phase II, the Navy identified that some explosive sources were incorrectly classed into bins with greater net explosive weights than actually is present in the munition. The Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS analysis specifically looked at the potential impacts from the use of explosives, considering each bin and the number and location of activities associated with each bin (see Section 2.4.3.2, Explosives Use). Figures 2.4-2 and Figure 2.4-3 present a comparison of the proposed annual explosives use for this Supplemental EIS/OEIS and the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. As stated in Section 5.5.2.2.1 (Methods for Analyzing Impacts from Explosives) of the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the derivation of the explosive injury criteria is provided in the technical report titled Criteria and Thresholds for U.S. Navy Acoustic and Explosive Effects Analysis (Phase III). This report was provided as supporting documentation to the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS.
CNMI DLNR-12	The use of unmanned vehicles for training offers an excellent opportunity to collect research data while training personnel. We strongly recommend working with researchers from government and state agencies as well as university professors to design scientifically rigorous studies, collect data in a meaningful way, and share raw data. Again, if security clearances or guidelines are needed, the military should collaborate to ensure this occurs.	The use of unmanned vehicles to satisfy training readiness requirements and collaboration is not feasible. The request for data sharing is addressed above.
CNMI DLNR-13	Behavioral changes in marine species are looked at as a negligible effect within the EIS, which is inappropriate. Behavioral changes are energetically costly, and can change access to food resources, predation rates and cause added stress in an already stressed environment; thus, behavioral changes can cause population effect and should be viewed as significant.	The Navy analyzed the potential for marine species to be affected by proposed testing and training activities, including the potential for behavioral responses. The analysis and consultation with NMFS indicated that temporally and spatially isolated explosions do not rise to the level of "harassment" under the MMPA for military readiness activities. The Navy

	Comment	Navy Response
		has been monitoring detonations since the 1990s and has not observed the types of reactions noted in the comment. TTS and all other higher order impacts are assessed for all training and testing events that involve the use of explosives or explosive ordnance. All Navy monitoring projects, reports and publications are available on the marine species monitoring webpage www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us. The Navy will continue to submit the appropriate reports on incidents involving ESA-listed species to NMFS immediately or as soon as operational security considerations allow. Reports will be made if the Navy observes the following that could be attributable to Navy activities: (1) a vessel strike of a marine mammal or sea turtle during training or testing; (2) a stranded, injured, or dead marine mammal or sea turtle during training or testing; or (3) an injured or dead marine mammal, sea turtle, or ESA-listed fish species during post-explosive event monitoring. Behavioral responses by marine mammals and sea turtles are predicted by the Navy's acoustic effects model. Research cited in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS and in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS indicates that behavioral responses by marine mammals exposed to underwater sound vary from no response to an immediate change in behavior (e.g., change in swimming direction). Behavioral changes are temporary and not necessarily repeated. Unlike noise associated with commercial shipping, for example, sound sources used by the military do not continuously produce sound. Given the range of possible responses and variability in the type and severity of behavioral responses observed in marine mammals, potential long-term or population level impacts are speculative. The Navy has addressed recent research on possible long-term effects in Section 3.4.2.1.1.7 (Long-Term Consequences) in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS and in Section 3.4.3.1.3 (Long-Term Consequences to the Individual and the Population) in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. The Navy funds research on marine mammal responses to underwater sound, including sonar (e.g., Goldbogen et al. 2013), and has funded marine

	Comment	Navy Response
		mammal surveys in the MITT Study Area (e.g., Fulling et al. 2011). For additional discussion on the potential effects of stressors on marine mammals, refer to Sections 3.4.1.7 (General Threats), 3.4.2.1.1.3 (Physiological Stress), and 3.4.2.1.1.5 (Behavioral Reactions).
CNMI DLNR-14	New endangered species have been listed within the CNMI since the 2015 MITT. Have impacts to these species been assessed?	The Navy has reviewed and incorporated the best available science on endangered species, including newly listed species, in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS (Sections 3.4, Marine Mammals; 3.5, Sea Turtles; 3.6, Marine Birds; 3.8, Marine Invertebrates; and 3.9, Fishes).
CNMI DLNR-15	It is unclear when/if Alternative 2 activities would be implemented and why the additional munitions use is needed.	The Navy updated the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS to reflect Alternative 2 as the Preferred Alternative. Alternative 2 allows for the greatest flexibility for the Navy to maintain readiness when considering potential changes in the national security environment, fluctuations in training and deployment schedules, and anticipated in-theater demands. Alternative 2 was used to inform the MMP and ESA consultations; however, the final decision on an alternative will be completed within the ROD. The alternatives carried forward were developed to meet the Navy's purpose and need and to ensure it can fulfill its obligation under Title 10 of the U.S. Code. See Section 2.4 (Action Alternatives Development) for more detailed information on the development of alternatives.
	DSEIS did not consider a "no change in current training levels" alternative. This is a major issue with this EIS. It offers a "no training" alternative, but even this involves a substantial change from current practices, and any reasonable person is going to understand that the military needs to conduct some level of training to maintain readiness. A "no change from current" alternative should have been presented; instead they only offered no training (which we know is a non-starter) vs. two increase in training alternatives.	In previous environmental impact analyses for at-sea training and testing activities in the MIRC, a "no change in current training and testing levels," or "the status quo," was presented as the No Action Alternative. However, as per guidance from NMFS to support their regulatory process, this Supplemental EIS/OEIS presents the No Action Alternative as a scenario where no authorizations or permits are issued and the Navy's training and testing activities do not take place. However, Section 2.4.1 (Alternatives Eliminated from Further Consideration) in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS has been expanded to include a Continuing Action Alternative. This alternative includes no change to the training and testing activities as approved in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and consultation with NMFS under the MMPA. The Navy determined this alternative did not meet the purpose of and need for the Proposed Action or its obligation under Title

	Comment	Navy Response
		10 of the U.S. Code, and therefore was not carried forward for detailed analysis. In the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy presents information on proposed training and testing activities as compared to current ongoing (baseline) activities. Please see Section 2.3 (Proposed Activities) and Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2 for more detail about proposed changes in training and testing activities compared to current levels.
CNMI DLNR-16	Figures 2.4-2 and 2.4-3 illustrate the current and proposed annual use of underwater explosives. However, the DSEIS does not provide a similar comparison for the use of explosives in the air. This oversight needs to be addressed.	Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2 in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) present the current and proposed training and testing activities. The tables present the difference in the number of events and ordnance per year included in Alternative 1 and 2 of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS and the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Explosives that are detonated 10 m above the surface of the water are not considered for modeling because the explosion does not result in underwater noise where marine mammals are present. Given marine mammals do not spend considerable time in air, there is no need to consider in-air detonations in the modeling (NAEMO), and a comparison similar to Figures 2.4-2 and 2.4-3 is not available.
CNMI DLNR-17	**Marine Mammals.** Numerous species of marine mammals (26+ spp., 5 Endangered) utilize the nearshore and offshore waters of the CNMI. Although most activities will be performed in excess of 12 run off shore, there are some concerns about the impact of acoustic activities and submarine explosives on local populations. These include: • The DSEIS has good descriptions of existing threats to species, but they should be used as a baseline for the assessment of added stress of Navy activities, not as permission or an excuse to conduct current activities or a justification that the additional impacts of these activities will have no significant effects.	Discussion of existing threats on marine mammals, for example Section 3.4.1.7 (General Threats), as well as threats to other marine species are a component of the affected environment and are described to put the proposed Navy training and testing activities in context. The Navy acknowledges in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS that the proposed training and testing activities have the potential to affect marine species. The Navy's acoustic effects model predicts impacts from acoustic stressors (e.g., sonar) on marine mammals and sea turtles. While stressors from Navy activities would contribute to other natural and anthropogenic stressors encountered regularly by marine species in the affected environment (e.g., commercial vessel traffic, fisheries, natural fluctuations in prey availability), their impact would be minimal in comparison. For

	Comment	Navy Response
	• In general, the DSEIS documents that increased activity in an area negatively affect marine mammals. Whether it is based on explosives, noise, sonar, or the vessel itself does not matter as the net effect is the same. Marine mammals demonstrated stronger responses in areas of lower traffic like the MITT area (Bejder et al. 2006). These impacts should be properly documented and mitigated. Mitigation measures might include changes in timing of activities to avoid seasonal presence of species, or creation of additional areas where activities are reduce/restricted due to high wildlife densities.	example, Navy vessel traffic is much lower than commercial and recreational vessel traffic entering and leaving Guam. The Navy developed two geographic mitigation areas off of Saipan and a third off of Guam (see Appendix I, Geographic Mitigation Assessment) as areas where the use of explosives is prohibited and the use of sonar requires additional reporting. The Navy developed these mitigation areas to further avoid or reduce potential impacts on marine mammals and sea turtles from explosives.
CNMI DLNR-17	• Genetic studies should be funded to conduct stock assessments within the MITT area to further assess, monitor, and mitigate impacts.	The Navy provides funding for marine mammal and sea turtles surveys in the Study Area. The results of these surveys become available either through government reports or scientific publications. The National Marine Fisheries Service is frequently involved in Navy-funded surveys, has access to these results, and is the organization responsible for conducting marine mammal stock assessments.
CNMI DLNR-18	• What is the area of impacts modeling (0-12nm or for whole EEZ)? It appears the whole EEZ is not being assessed, just l 2nm, and if that is the case, the EIS needs to assess direct, indirect, and cumulative effects throughout the whole nearly 1,000,000 nm range.	Modeling areas are not limited to 12 NM from shore and include areas throughout the U.S. EEZ as well as beyond the EEZ.
CNMI DLNR-19	• The DSEIS states activities present a low risk of entanglement however a drifting parachute would pose a significant risk to marine mammals, which may ingest or feed in proximity to the object and become entangled. Subsurface sink rates are unknown. The larger un-weighted parachutes are of particularly concern for covering bottom substrate, sea turtles, and marine mammals.	As described in Section 2.3.3 (Standard Operating Procedures) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, during activities that involve recoverable targets, such as aerial drones, the military recovers the target and any associated decelerators/parachutes to the maximum extent practical consistent with personnel and equipment safety. This standard operating procedure benefits biological resources, including marine mammals, sea turtles, seafloor resources, by reducing the potential for physical disturbance and strike, entanglement, or ingestion of applicable targets and any associated decelerators/parachutes. Section 3.4 (Marine Mammals) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS includes analysis of entanglement stressors to marine mammals.

	Comment	Navy Response
CNMI DLNR-20	• With all of the surveys conducted, why are there not better density and distribution maps? More information should be collected on these surveys.	Spatially explicit density estimates require a substantial amount of sighting data collected from systematic surveys. While there have been numerous non-systematic small boat surveys around the islands, the 2007 comprehensive systematic marine mammal and sea turtle survey of waters off Guam and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands has been the only survey to date having sighting rates or numbers that were high enough to calculate densities for marine mammals in the area. In addition to visual survey data, a habitat model based on acoustic data collected during the 2007 survey was developed for sperm whales, and that has provided spatially explicit density predictions for this species. The Navy will continue to fund marine mammal surveys in the Marianas, and future surveys and research may identify key information of biological importance to further inform density and distribution maps. Based on the analysis presented in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS and using the best available data, surveys or additional research are not required in order for the Navy to comply with NEPA.
CNMI DLNR-21	• Use of sonar, underwater explosives, and other acoustic devices will have an adverse impact on whales and dolphins, especially residential Culver's beaked whales which have shown mortality, injury, and evasion in response to Navy acoustic activities. Robust distribution studies should be conducted to identify areas where activities can be conducted that will not impact feeding, breeding, and migratory routes.	Information about the quantitative analysis is described in detail in the 2018 technical report *Quantifying Acoustic Impacts on Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles: Methods and Analytical Approach for Phase III Training and Testing*. The Navy's acoustic and explosive effects analysis looks at multiple factors such as marine mammal abundance across the study area in each season, the levels of sound that may cause certain effects, and the Navy's proposed time and space use of noise-producing activities. As discussed in this Supplemental Draft EIS/OEIS in Sections 3.4.2.1 (Acoustic Stressors) and 3.4.2.2 (Explosive Stressors), a few instances of take per year are not enough to cause long-term consequences for individuals. Regarding additional studies on the distribution of marine species, the Navy is fully engaged with NMFS through an adaptive management program that allows the Navy and NMFS to reevaluate impacts on marine resources using new scientific findings and to focus research funding where it is most needed. The results from Navy-funded research are

	Comment	Navy Response
		posted annually and are available on the Navy's public website www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us. The Navy will also continue to communicate and coordinate with the CNMI government on future collaboration and information sharing as has been occurring. As presented in Appendix I (Acoustics and Explosives Primer) of the 2015 Final MITT EIS/OEIS, the Navy has already used Navy-funded monitoring results to identify areas that can be avoided to avoid or reduce impacts on marine species, such as breeding humpback whales, and will integrate new and emergent data as appropriate in the future.
CNMI DLNR-22	• Despite numerous examples of harassment given in the DSEIS, it states that it is not possible to ascertain the true significance of the majority of the observed reactions (3.4-97-98). Regardless of whether the experimental design mimics Navy activities, studies show "harassment" and "take" with sonar sound and vessels. Therefore, there is no basis to say impacts are no significant. • The DSEIS notes numerous examples of know sonar effects but discounts or minimizes known responses. There are also contradictions within the report; for example in one area states "no significant behavioural responses" despite the previous section clearly stating that "sonar use during exercises involving the U.S. Navy has been identified as a contributing cause or factor in five specific mass stranding events: Greece in 1996; the Bahamas in March 2000; Madeira Island, Portugal in 2000; the Canary Islands in 2002, and Spain in 2006 (Cox et al., 2006; Fernandez, 2006; U.S. Department of the Navy, 2017c)" (3.4-86).	As discussed in Section 3.4.2.1.2.1 (Methods for Analyzing Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers), although it was not possible to ascertain the true significance of the majority of the observed reactions in the research used to derive the behavioral response functions, the Navy assumed that most reactions that lasted for the duration of the sound exposure or longer were significant. Potential impacts on marine mammals from sonar sources, which are part of the Proposed Action, are analyzed in Section 3.4.2.1 (Acoustic Stressors). The behavioral response functions were used in the analysis of impacts in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS to estimate the number of significant behavioral responses due to exposure to sonar sounds. It is not clear if all of these estimated responses would rise to the level of take under military readiness; however, the Navy applies for Level B take under MMPA for all of these estimated behavioral impacts. The statement "no significant behavioral responses" is in reference only to observations made "during monitoring of actual training exercises." While exact causes of strandings are uncertain, scientists have identified potential contributing factors for strandings including age, illness, or disease; ingestion of marine debris/plastics; contaminant load; and manmade sources. A small number of strandings have been associated with the use of U.S. Navy sonar; none of these have occurred in the Study Area. Information on strandings associated with Navy training and testing

	Comment	Navy Response
		activities is provided in the 2017 technical report, "Marine Mammal Strandings Associated with United States Navy Sonar Activities." NMFS, as the regulator, maintains the authoritative National Stranding Database. The Center for Naval Analysis (CNA) recently conducted a statistical study of correlation of beaked whale strandings around the Mariana Islands with the use of U.S. Navy sonar, finding that insufficient evidence of a correlation exists. The CNA study used the complete record of all U.S. Navy sonar use between 2007 and 2019, including major training events, joint exercises, and unit level training/testing. The analysis also included the complete beaked whale stranding record for the Mariana Islands through 2019. Following the methods in Simonis et al. (2020), the CNA analysis found insufficient evidence of a correlation between sonar use and beaked whale strandings when considering the complete sonar use record. The CNA finding is in contrast to the finding in Simonis et al. (2020), which depicted a significant correlation between beaked whale strandings and Navy sonar use. However, the Simonis et al. (2020) result relied on substantially incomplete or inaccurate assumptions about U.S. Navy sonar use around the Mariana Islands. CNA also conducted statistical analyses specific to each island where beaked whale strandings have been observed in the Mariana Islands, similarly finding insufficient evidence of a correlation to sonar use. Additional information on the findings of the CNA analysis are presented in Section 3.4.2.1.1.6 (Stranding) in Chapter 3.4 (Marine Mammals). As described in Section 5.1.2.2.1 (Marine Species Research and Monitoring Programs), for this Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy agreed to several additional research and monitoring initiatives designed to help advance the understanding of beaked whales and strandings in the MITT Study Area. The Navy will co-fund the Pacific Marine Assessment Program for Protected Species (PACMAPPS) Mariana Islands survey in spring-summer 2021 and future studies starting in 2022 to help document beaked whale occurrence, abundance, and distribution in the Mariana Islands. The Navy will also fund additional stranding response and

	Comment	Navy Response
		necropsy analyses for the Pacific Islands region, and research on a framework to improve statistical stranding analysis. Collaboratively with NMFS, the Navy will fund and organize an expert panel to provide recommendations on scientific data gaps and uncertainties for further protective measure consideration to minimize potential impacts of Navy training and testing activities on beaked whales in the Mariana Islands.
CNMI DLNR-22	• Please clarify what "potentially significant behavioural responses" means in Table 3.4. How is the assessed?	Based on the context of the comment, we assume the commenter is referring to Table 3.4-10. In this context, potentially significant means that the behavioral response from an individual marine mammal can vary from avoidance of the sound source to halting a biologically significant behavior such as feeding.
CNMI DLNR-23	• Please clarify figures 3.4-11 through 62 as they are not well explained and they do not indicate the number of "takes" which would be helpful. Also Figures 3.4-13, 17, 23, 24, etc. have panels representing more than 100%. Updates should ensure figures used are clear and that totals are properly calculated to further support assessment and impact mitigation.	The estimated number of impacts were included on the lower bar plot. Some figures had activity types or regions that added up to greater than 100 percent due to rounding errors. Updates to enhance readability were included in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS.
CNMI DLNR-24	• The only marine mammal species, Kogia whales, to experience permanent threshold shifts are the same species that have longer dive durations than the 30-minute wait period proposed as mitigation if a whale is spotted. In areas with pygmy and dwarf sperm whales, mitigation times should meet or exceed the average dive time for these sensitive species.	The Navy determined that a 30-min. wait period is the maximum practical wait time to implement during activities involving vessels and aircraft that are not typically fuel constrained. This allows the activities to continue meeting their intended objectives for the reasons described in Section 5.2.4.2 (Factors Affecting Practicality) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS.
CNMI DLNR-25	**Sea Turtles.** • Chapter 3.0.1.22 mentions that the effects on sea turtles were assessed by fish experts. This data/information should be reviewed by sea turtle experts.	The text cited from Section 3.0.1.2 (Navy's Quantitative Analysis to Determine Impacts on Sea Turtles and Marine Mammals) is a typo and has been corrected. The data/information has been reviewed by sea turtle subject matter experts.
CNMI DLNR-26	• We are concerned about the increase in small joint coordinated ASW and increases in insertion/extraction activities as increased use of beach and nearshore waters have a high likelihood of impacting sea turtles. Increased beach use is a concern for nesting sea turtles. As was discussed in the prior	The Navy is not proposing to change land-based activities, except at FDM. There would be no increase in the use of beaches under the Proposed Action. Small joint coordinated ASW in Table 2.5-1 was not previously called out in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, because components of the exercise were covered under several unit-level activities. However, the training activity is now listed individually in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS.

	Comment	Navy Response
	MITT comments from CNMI, compaction of sandy beaches should be avoided to protect turtle nesting habitats. • We oppose any use of vehicles on the beach as it negatively affects sea turtles. If vehicle use on beaches is deemed necessary, then nightly surveys for nesting sea turtles should be conducted year-round to identify and mark nests. These nests should be marked with GPS and monitored with a buffer placed around them, and should be avoided until after hatching.	Table 2.5-1 of the MITT Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS has been updated to reflect that there would be no increase in amphibious assault training. The Navy is implementing conservation measures in the USFWS Pacific Islands Fish and Wildlife Office's 2015 Biological Opinion.
CNMI DLNR-27	• We are concerned about the level of nearshore, beach, and littoral explosions as these impact sea turtles and sea turtle habitat. Studies have shown that sea turtles use nearshore waters for foraging and reproduction making them vulnerable to disturbance in this area. • How many near shore explosives will be used? This area has higher densities of sea turtles increasing the risk of injury and mortalities as well as increasing habitat damage.	The Navy does not conduct nor is proposing to conduct nearshore, beach, and littoral explosions in the CNMI.
CNMI DLNR-28	• Peak Pressure and SEL Based Ranges to TTS and PTS for Sea Turtles Exposed to Explosives often exceed observable distances. Mitigation measures should be re-assessed.	The mitigation zones for explosives extend beyond the average ranges to mortality, PTS, and TTS for sea turtles for the largest bin used in each activity. As described throughout Chapter 5 (Mitigation), the Navy's mitigation zones developed for this Supplemental EIS/OEIS are based on the largest areas within which it is practical for the Navy to implement mitigation during training and testing within the Study Area. Increasing the mitigation zone sizes would be impractical for the reasons described for each mitigation category (see Chapter 5, Mitigation).
CNMI DLNR-29	• The DSEIS, assuming only land strikes of ordnance, ignores the potential impact of aberrant ordnance on pelagic sea turtles around Farallon de Medinilla. Green (threatened), hawksbill (endangered), loggerhead (endangered), olive Ridley (threatened), and leatherback sea turtles (endangered) utilize nearshore habitats and reef sites as a refuge from predators and for grazing and reproduction. The sparse available habitat for such activities across the CNMI underscores the ecological significance of each island unit. Although the DSEIS indicates a	The Navy recognizes that sea turtles, particularly green sea turtles, use the surrounding shelf habitats of FDM for resting and foraging. Further, the Navy's Supplemental EIS/OEIS does consider errant targeting within impact areas on FDM. It should be noted that mitigation measures in Section 5.5.1 (Farallon de Medinilla) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS specific to targeting restrictions are expected to reduce the potential for errant munitions to impact sea turtles. The Navy is consulting with NMFS for ESA-listed species and will implement conservation measures.

	Comment	Navy Response
	lower abundance of sea turtles around Farallon de Medinilla relative to other islands, this does not preclude Farallon de Medinilla's importance as critical habitat, nor establish that impacts to this habitat range would be less than significant.	
CNMI DLNR-30	• The DSEIS states a low risk of entanglement however a drifting parachute would pose a significant risk to sea turtles, which may ingest or feed in proximity to the object and become entangled. Subsurface sink rates are unknown. The larger un-weighted parachutes are of particularly concern for covering bottom substrate, sea turtles, and marine mammals.	The Navy acknowledges the risk for sea turtles to become entangled, particularly while at the surface. The potential for a sea turtle to encounter an expended decelerator/parachute at the surface or in the water column is extremely low, and is even less probable at the seafloor, given the general improbability of a sea turtle being near the deployed decelerator/parachute, as well as the general behavior of sea turtles. As described in Section 2.3.3 (Standard Operating Procedures) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, during activities that involve recoverable targets (e.g., aerial drones), the military recovers the target and any associated decelerators/parachutes to the maximum extent practical consistent with personnel and equipment safety.
CNMI DLNR-31	• Active low frequency acoustic sources such as the active sonar used by anti-submarine warfare sonars associated with the Littoral Combat Ship, the impact of non-explosive munitions, large vessel ship-radiated noise, and explosive devices emanating frequencies in the range of 300-400 Hz would impact the hearing of sea turtles. If their hearing is compromised, then their ability to navigate and detect predators (the latter is probably the more salient function of hearing in sea turtles) would be negatively affected. This is a significant impact that should be addressed, and mitigation should be proposed.	As described throughout Chapter 5 (Mitigation), the Navy will implement mitigation measures to avoid or reduce potential impacts from active sonar, explosives, and physical disturbance and strike stressors (e.g., vessel movement, non-explosive practice munitions) on sea turtles. For example, procedural mitigation measures for sonar and explosives include a power down or shut down (i.e., power off) of applicable active sonar sources and ceasing detonations when a sea turtle is observed in a mitigation zone. The mitigation zones for active sonar extend beyond the ranges to PTS and TTS for sea turtles. The mitigation zones for explosives extend beyond the average ranges to PTS, and beyond or into a portion of the average ranges to TTS for sea turtles. Therefore, mitigation will help avoid or reduce the potential for exposure to these effects for sea turtles. The Navy is consulting with NMFS as required by section 7(a)(2) of the ESA regarding active sonar, explosives, and physical disturbance and strike stressors on sea turtles. Analyses of potential impacts on sea turtles from

	Comment	Navy Response
		all relevant stressors were included in the Navy's biological assessment and are included in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS.
CNMI DLNR-32	• Activities such as ship movement, munitions use, and the use of active low frequency acoustical devices in areas where marine downwelling gathers and aligns buoyant material (including dispersed food resources in surface waters) would affect sea turtles that congregate at these convergences in their pelagic stage. These areas should be avoided.	While marine downwelling events can loosely combine materials floating on the surface in convergence zones including planktonic prey, these events are often short-lived in both time and space and would not consistently combine sea turtle prey or be in locations where sea turtles typically occur. Most military training and testing activities using munitions and sonar and other transducers occur at least 3 NM and often farther then 12 NM from shore (with the exception of activities at FDM) reducing the potential for sea turtles to be present where military training and testing activities occur. As noted above, the occurrence in space and time of oceanographic convergence zones is difficult to predict, and no particular area, even an area with somewhat persistent downwelling, could be considered biologically important for a particular behavior (e.g., foraging), as described in Appendix I (Geographic Mitigation Areas).
CNMI DLNR-33	• Proposed monitoring and surveillance of sea turtle nesting activity (including nest locations) is insufficient to identify fresh nests and body pits. Daily monitoring before and constant monitoring during military exercises and beach use are required to adequately reduce impact of amphibious training activities. Monitoring by an independent (i.e. not employed or contracted by the Department of Defense) party specially trained in sea turtle nest location is necessary to provide objective and non-biased assessments of the effect of military activities on sea turtle nesting success and behavior.	The Navy analyzed land-based activities on Guam, Saipan, Tinian, and Rota in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS; the Navy did not reanalyze land-based activities in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS because no changes are proposed to those land-based activities. The Navy is continuing to implement the standard operating procedures and mitigation/conservation measures included in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and the USFWS Pacific Islands Fish and Wildlife Office's 2015 Biological Opinion.
CNMI DLNR-33	**Sediment and water quality/habitat impacts.** • In Table ES.6-1it states "Qualitative observations of nearshore waters of Farallon de Medinilla during multi-year dive surveys included observations of generally good water quality. There was little evidence of military impacts on benthic sediments and substrates observed during the dive surveys, and, where noted, impacts were localized and shown to recover during subsequent dive surveys". Are these observations from an	In 2017, the Navy funded additional surveys in the nearshore areas of FDM. Surveys were conducted by Space and Naval Warfare Systems Center Pacific, Scientific Diving Services. The results are available at: https://apps.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/1069450.pdf. The 2017 survey found little evidence that training has affected coral communities at FDM. Only three relatively new ordnance items were observed, but no blast pits, craters, or significant areas of coral breakage were observed. The ordnance observed during the 2017 survey was almost exclusively old and

	Comment	Navy Response
	independent scientific study? What were the baselines? Please provide raw data to DLNR.	encrusted in marine life, and was not having any discernable impact on surrounding communities. The Navy updated the MITT Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS to include the results of the 2017 survey as presented in Carilli et al (2018). The report information has been added to Section 3.1 (Sediments and Water Quality) and Section 3.8 (Marine Invertebrates). Specific text on impacts on Farallon de Medinilla is available in Section 3.1.3.1.5.3 (Farallon de Medinilla Specific Impacts) in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, and Section 3.1 (Sediments and Water Quality) and Section 3.8 (Marine Invertebrates) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. This Supplemental EIS/OEIS and 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS also include information from surveys conducted prior to 2017. Surveys performed by Naval Facilities Engineering Command and the Navy's Expeditionary Warfare Center's Scientific Diving Services between 1997 and 2012 (Smith and Marx, 2016) documented direct ordnance impacts on the submerged physical environment, which were clearly attributable to training activities and detected in dive surveys conducted in 2007, 2008, 2010, and 2012. Indirect impacts, such as ordnance that skipped or eroded off the island and rock and ordnance fragments going off the island, were detected every year. However, natural phenomena such as typhoons, tropical storms, large wave events, tsunamis/micro-tsunamis and earthquakes are the primary disturbances, which shape and modify FDM's physical environment between the intertidal zone and depths of 30 m.
CNMI DLNR-34	• The increased level of bombing and disturbance of soil on Farallon de Medinilla poses a significant risk to surrounding corals and other sessile invertebrates. The DSEIS focuses on the in-water impacts of explosives and potential contamination from ordnance, which will have local and short-term negative impacts. Increased bombing will significantly disrupt soil and increase sedimentary load on surrounding reefs. Long-term cumulative effects should be meaningfully assessed and addressed.	FDM will continue to be operated in accordance with the terms and conditions specified in the 2015 Biological Opinion (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2015). The impact assessment for nearshore waters surrounding FDM does consider long-term negative impacts. The Navy, based on multi-year dive surveys conducted since 1999, with the most recent dive survey available from 2017, agrees that nearshore impacts can occur from errant ordnance targeted at FDM; however, these impacts are short-term and localized, with no evidence of coral reef impacts from sedimentation. The Navy is consulting with NMFS on the impact of training activities on ESA-

	Comment	Navy Response
		listed corals at FDM and will implement terms and conditions of the NMFS BO.
CNMI DLNR-35	• With increased sediment loading into near-shore waters, water and substrate quality will decrease. Without proper flushing, sediments will accumulate and be re- suspended with every storm or increased wave and wind activity. Suspended sediments affect light attenuation, effectively decreasing the amount of sunlight needed by photosynthesizing organisms such as corals and algae.	See response CNMI DLNR-34 (response to Anthony T. Benavente, Secretary CNMI Department of Lands and Natural Resources), regarding multi-year surveys conducted around FDM and survey findings regarding sediments, water quality and corals.
CNMI DLNR-36	• Aberrant ordnance around Farallon de Medinilla will decimate surrounding corals and cause mortality of sea turtles, marine mammals, and fish, and it will damage critical fish habitat. Existing stressors only compounds the significance of these effects. How will these impacts be meaningfully mitigated?	The Navy agrees that impacts may occur from errant ordnance on sea turtles, marine mammals, fish, and important fish habitat. However, the evidence suggests, based on multi-year dive surveys conducted since 1999, with the most recent dive survey available from 2017, that impacts on habitat are short term and localized, with no evidence of coral reef impacts from sedimentation, and direct impacts on individuals are unlikely. The Navy is consulting with NMFS, and any updated measures previously included in the 2015 MITT Final EIS have been included in the=is Supplemental Final EIS/OEIS.
CNMI DLNR-37	• The statement: "The impact of vessels and in-water devices on marine habitats would remain inconsequential because (1) vessel and in-water activities that could come into contact with marine substrates would be located in previously disturbed areas (i.e., nearshore shallow waters), (2) military expended materials could be colonized by benthic organisms, and (3) seafloor devices would be used in previously disturbed areas and therefore would not be expected to affect marine substrates" (ES-9) is inaccurate as expended materials may be toxic and contain heavy metals, and there is cumulative damage by disrupting bottom substrates.	Both this Supplemental EIS/OEIS and the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS include an analysis of potential impacts from metals and contaminants as a result of military training and testing activities on marine resources. This analysis is presented in Section 3.1.2.2 (Metals), Section 3.4.2.7 (Secondary Stressors), Section 3.5.2.7 (Secondary Stressors), Section 3.7.2.3 (Secondary Stressors), Section 3.8.2.7 (Secondary Stressors), and Section 3.9.2.7 (Secondary Stressors). Based on the analysis presented in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS and the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, the Navy concluded that all levels of metals, chemicals, and other byproducts would be either below detectable levels or at levels below existing standards, regulations, and guidelines.
CNMI DLNR-38	• The number of mooring/anchoring stations should be minimized to the maximum number of vessels that use the area; this will minimize the damage to bottom substrate (e.g. coral) by anchors and anchor chains. We suggest installing a	As described in Section 5.4.1 (Mitigation Areas for Seafloor Resources), the Navy implements mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts on seafloor resources, including shallow-water coral reefs, live hard bottom, artificial reefs, and shipwrecks. Precision anchoring activities are

	Comment	Navy Response
	minimum number of mooring locations instead of setting anchors in different location. The military must also work with DLNR to obtain the proper permits to conduct these activities within the 3 nm boundary.	conducted in designated locations near ports over unconsolidated sediments that are lacking vegetation, which minimizes the potential for new areas or sensitive seafloor resources, such as seagrass beds, to experience disturbance.
CNMI DLNR-39	• We are concerned about the increased damage to seagrass beds as it affects in-water abundance of sea turtles. Seagrass re-growth may take up to 10 years. Thus, these areas should be mapped and all activities should be avoided in seagrass beds, just as hard substrates (coral) should be mapped and avoided.	This Supplemental EIS/OEIS describes actions that disturb benthic habitats occurring in designated/discrete areas (e.g., designated Apra Harbor underwater detonation sites). Overall as described in Section 3.7 (Marine Vegetation) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Proposed Action is not expected to result in detectable changes to seagrass growth, survival, or propagation, and is not expected to result in population-level impacts. The Navy's standard operating procedures will benefit seagrass in the Study Area by minimizing potential disturbances in areas with seagrass. For example, precision anchoring activities are conducted in designated locations near ports over unconsolidated sediments that are lacking vegetation, which minimizes the potential for seagrass to experience disturbance. Large amphibious vehicle beach landings and departures are scheduled at high tide, and vehicles stay fully on cushion or hover when over shallow reefs to avoid corals, hard bottom, and other substrate that could potentially damage equipment, as described in Section 5.1.8 (Amphibious Assault and Amphibious Raid Procedures) of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.
CNMI DLNR-40	• The DSEIS states there is a low risk of entanglement however it does not address the affects a drifting parachute would pose to coral and bottom substrate. These effects need to be addressed and mitigated.	This Supplemental EIS/OEIS and the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS considered the potential for entanglement of coral heads and colonies by military expended materials. Both the section 7 ESA consultations in 2015 and reinitiated in 2017 between the Navy and NMFS concluded that entanglement of corals is a remote possibility, and if it occurred, would damage corals. The likelihood of entanglement is sufficiently low for NMFS to conclude that entanglement risk for ESA-listed corals is discountable (unlikely to occur). As described in Section 2.3.3 (Standard Operating Procedures) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, during activities that involve recoverable targets (e.g., aerial drones), the military recovers the target and any associated decelerators/parachutes to the maximum extent practical consistent with personnel and equipment safety. This standard

	Comment	Navy Response
		operating procedure benefits biological resources (e.g., seafloor resources) by reducing the potential for physical disturbance and strike, entanglement, or ingestion of applicable targets and any associated decelerators/parachutes.
CNMI DLNR-41	• Increased terrestrial bombing increases the risk of wildfires on the island, which would kill or destroy vital habitat for tree- and forest-nesting birds such as the Micronesian megapode and red-footed booby. Mitigation strategies should be in place to detect and extinguish wild fires to protect island wildlife. Denuded soils should be stabilized and revegetated, and no-strike areas should be replanted with native plants to further support viable habitat areas.	This Supplemental EIS/OEIS discusses targeting restrictions in both Section 3.6 (Marine Birds) and Section 3.10 (Terrestrial Species and Habitats) that are designed to limit the potential for wildland fires ignited by munitions use on FDM. Placement of firefighting infrastructure and assets on FDM is not practical. Rather, the Navy's targeting and munitions type restrictions limit the potential for wildland fires. Example munitions restrictions were also discussed in the Navy's 2015 Final EIS/OEIS. White phosphorous, live cluster weapons/scatterable munitions, fuel air explosives, incendiary and smoke devices, or bombs greater than 2,000 pounds are not authorized for use on FDM. Red phosphorous is used in spotting charges only, and is not a main constituent of any munitions used on FDM. It should be noted that high explosive ordnance is only authorized for Impact Area 2 and Impact Area 3. These locations are south of Impact Area 1 (inert ordnance only used here) and the northern Special Use Area. Radiant heat emitted from high explosives detonated within Impact Areas 2 and 3 are not expected to impact rookeries on cliffs or northern forests of the island.
CNMI DLNR-42	• Soft bottom substrate such as sea grass is important for sea turtles and fish. Continued disturbance of any habitat should be minimized in its effect.	This Supplemental EIS/OEIS describes actions that disturb benthic habitats occurring in designated/discrete areas (e.g., designated Apra Harbor underwater detonation sites) and activities that may occur in deeper water habitats spread out over the Study Area. Additionally, activities that have a greater potential to impact the seafloor, such as amphibious assaults, are conducted at high tide to limit such interactions. Precision anchoring activities are conducted in designated locations near ports over unconsolidated sediments that are lacking vegetation, which minimizes the potential for seagrass to experience disturbance.
CNMI DLNR-43	• The use of high explosives will result in the deposition of heavy metal on the surface of Farallon de Medinilla. Heavy metal residues will be adsorbed into soil, bioaccumulated in low trophic-level organisms (including microorganisms, plants, and	This Supplemental EIS/OEIS, as well as the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, include discussion of the fate and transport of specific chemicals with references to chemical properties of munitions and munitions constituents. In summary, the Navy's analysis concludes that no federal or

	Comment	Navy Response
	soil-dwelling animals), and ingested by ground-feeding birds such as the Micronesian megapode and white-throated ground dove. These significant impacts should be assessed, monitored, and mitigated. • Heavy metals will also be washed into the ocean in precipitation and erosion events and bioaccumulated in fish that are ingested by white-tailed tropicbirds, red-tailed tropicbirds, brown noddies, black noddies, red-footed boobies, brown boobies, masked boobies, sooty terns, and great frigate birds. These heavy metals are toxic in relatively small concentrations. These significant impacts should be assessed, monitored, and mitigated.	local guidelines would be exceeded because of the following reasons: (1) rapid and natural degradation of substances (e.g., munitions constituents and other chemicals), and (2) localized concentrations where impact would occur. These conclusions are based on evidence gathered on other military ranges in similar environments (e.g., Vieques), as well as legacy dump site studies conducted off the coast of Oahu. These studies are summarized in Section 3.1 (Sediments and Water Quality). The Navy continues to monitor general ecological conditions on FDM through the use of aerial images and routine surveys. The Navy has an Operational Range Clearance plan (2013) for FDM, which includes provisions for vegetation management and removal/disposal of materials that may present an explosive risk. Clearance of the range occurs every 2–4 years, depending on the type of ordnance targeted for removal or destruction.
CNMI DLNR-44	**Birds.** • We are concerned about the increase in larger explosives/missiles as shrapnel poses a threat to the surrounding wildlife and increased disturbance, such as flushing from nests, can increase predation rates even if the adult is away from the nest a short time. Airplane flyovers pose a similar risk. Without a control-treatment design, you cannot determine if F-16 flyovers have an effect. • The decline in masked and red-footed boobies cannot be determined as natural fluctuations in the population without new data and regularly schedule surveys to assess current trends. Thus, the use of this reasoning to support continued military activity is flawed and baseless. Observed impacts should be meaningfully addressed.	The Navy agrees that low altitude flyovers of FDM may illicit short-term responses exhibited by nesting and roosting seabirds. Further, the Navy recognizes the potential for follow-on effects, such as predation of nests and chicks from temporary flushing. Section 3.6 (Marine Birds) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS includes a statistical analysis of 17 years of monthly and quarterly bird counts of the three booby species that nest on FDM. The results of this analysis were also included in Section 3.6.2.6 (Rookery Locations and Breeding Activities within the Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area) of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. In the previous NEPA document, this statistical analysis was not yet published. In this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the same information is included in the analysis, but the published article is now cited (see: Camp, R., C. Leopold, K. Brinck, and F. Juola. (2016). *Farallon de Medinilla Seabird and Tinian Moorhen Analyses*. Hilo, HI: Hawaii Cooperative Studies Unit University of Hawaii at Hilo). It should be noted that the three booby species are easily seen (and therefore counted) reducing uncertainty in the survey effort. The results of the statistical analysis do not show any significant changes in population trends for the three booby species. The Navy concluded that increased

	Comment	Navy Response
		numbers of activities on FDM would not adversely impact seabird populations because no new bombing areas would be used. In other words, the same restrictions listed and described in COMNAVMARINST 3500.4A would be carried forward under all alternatives.
CNMI DLNR-45	• Are the surveys going to continue? Are you using adaptive management to refine monitoring approaches? We encourage the use of independent researchers to conduct surveys. Ideally, you would have independent scientists collecting the data, but at minimum raw data should be shared with CNMI resource managers immediately, have proper vetting, and independent analysis needed.	The Navy is continuing surveys on FDM. Adaptive management is an important component to the Navy's stewardship of ranges, and the Navy would consider changes to FDM use if these suggestions were supported by data. As per CEQ regulations, the Navy uses a number of sources of best available science and data, including external references from academia, industry, and the public (noted in each section of the EIS/OEIS); technical documents (available on the MITT project website); and ongoing consultation processes with other agencies (NMFS and USFWS). The Navy strives to share technical information and data with the public and resource agencies. Technical reports are posted on the MITT project website at www.mitt-eis.com. For Navy-funded and managed marine research and monitoring studies, the public can access reports, documentation, data, and updates on current monitoring projects via the U.S. Navy Marine Species Monitoring Program website at www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us. The Navy will continue to communicate and coordinate with the CNMI government on future collaboration and information sharing.
CNMI DLNR-46	• When summarizing impacts to marine sea birds the DSEIS states that "[p]eriodic helicopter-based surveys of Farallon de Medinilla have occurred since 1998 (monthly up to 2009, and quarterly thereafter through September 2016) for marine birds nesting on the island. Because of a lack of commercial helicopter transit services, surveys have not been conducted since 2016" (ES-14). Commercial helicopter transit services are currently available on Saipan; however, this long-standing approach may not be the most appropriate way to conduct bird nesting surveys. Evidence suggests that acute, high decibel	The Navy appreciates the suggestion that UAV could be used as a platform for conducting bird surveys over FDM. The Navy is committed to exploring safe, cost-effective, and current best practices for conducting surveys.

	Comment	Navy Response
	sounds (65-85 dBA) impact sea birds (see A. L. Brown, Measuring the effect of aircraft noise on Sea birds, Environment International Vol. 16, pp 587-592, 1990). Conversely, the Ornithological Council Guidelines to the Use of Wild Birds in Research, 2018 Supplement notes that small unmanned aircraft may be used to effectively survey marine birds, marine mammals, and sea turtles and notes this approach has been incorporated into the Department of the Interior's Office of Aviation Services. Robust surveys that reflect best practices should be employed to monitor the extent of current activities and assess the potential for future significant negative impacts from proposed increases in live fire activities on land and at sea.	
CNMI DLNR-47	• A 22-60% increase in the amount of net explosive weight is not negligible. (3.6.2.4.3). It is unclear why this increase is needed and what mitigation is being proposed to reduce the significance of impacts to the environment and the animals that will be further affected.	Based on this comment, the Navy should point out a possible misinterpretation of the data presented in Table 3.6-3. The increases would not range from 22 to 60 percent over what was analyzed previously. The increases would range from 0.22 percent to 0.61 percent. Having stated this, the Navy recognizes that some ordnance will increase on FDM, however, the ordnance will be used within the same impact locations (targeting restrictions) and under the same munitions-type restrictions as included in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (e.g., no ordnance over 2,000 lb.). Therefore, the Navy believes that existing restrictions and mitigation measures on FDM are sufficient to reduce impacts of military use on FDM to the maximum extent practical.
CNMI DLNR-48	• Even if debris "does not resemble prey items", there is ample evidence that marine birds may ingest it. Thus, all debris poses a risk. Studies also show some debris absorb toxins and heavy metals, and can be harmful to the tissues when ingested (Fukuoka et al., 2016; Teuten et al., 2007). Mitigation measures should include collecting debris at-sea and on land and reducing the amount of debris released into the environment as much as possible.	The Navy recognizes the risk of ingestion for birds of expended military materials, and has analyzed the risk in both the 2015 Final EIS/OEIS and in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Collecting debris on land does occur in accordance with the Navy's Operational Range Clearance Plan (2013) for FDM, which includes provisions for vegetation management and removal/disposal of materials that may present an explosive risk. Clearance of the range occurs every 2–4 years, depending on the type of ordnance targeted for removal or destruction. This action will remove some materials that may potentially be ingestible on land.

	Comment	Navy Response
CNMI DLNR-49	• Four Micronesian megapod deaths per year is a significant portion of the 10-42 individuals surveyed. Increased munitions and large caliber projectiles devices should require reinitiation of Section 7 consultations and require the Navy to consult DLNR regarding CNMI permits.	The Navy will not reinitiate section 7 ESA Consultation with the USFWS because, despite changes in ordnance use on FDM, the Navy will still meet the existing take provisions, and the terms and conditions in the USFWS Pacific Islands Fish and Wildlife Office's 2015 Biological Opinion will continue to be implemented. Mitigation measures described in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS (e.g., targeting restrictions, munitions-type restrictions) reduce potential impacts on Micronesian megapodes to the maximum extent practical.
CNMI DLNR-50	• Page 3.6-10: While Farallon de Medinilla activities may not put Great Frigatebird or Masked Booby at risk regionally, these are relatively rare in the CNMI and must be conserved here if they are to persist as part of our natural heritage. The argument "they're common somewhere else" should not be use.	Conclusions presented for the Great Frigatebird and the Masked Booby are in the context of Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA), with specific language identified in 50 CFR Part 21 for determining populations and impacts on populations.
CNMI DLNR-51	• DSEIS cannot say there are no significant declines in bird populations on Farallon de Medinilla as surveys are lacking and have not been done since 2016.	The Navy is using the best available science to support the conclusions that there are no significant declines. This Supplemental EIS/OEIS has been updated with the published citation (published since the release of the Navy's 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS). When surveys resume, and if the additional data from those surveys warrant a revision of conclusions in future analyses previously made in the 2015 Final EIS/OEIS and in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will do so in accordance with 50 CFR Part 21, as well as Sikes Act provisions that require updates to natural resource inventories on lands covered in the most recent Joint Region Marianas Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan.
CNMI DLNR-52	• Section 5.5: The DSEIS does not consider seasonal restrictions as a terrestrial mitigation measure. Any reduction in activities, even if not a complete ban, during breeding season can have tremendous mitigation value. On page 5-63, it says that seasonal or timing restrictions would be impractical, but offer no explanation or justification as to why.	The Navy will not implement seasonal restrictions on FDM because of the impairment of readiness training levels. Coupled with weather restrictions, seasonal restrictions would limit the ability to maintain military readiness. The Navy, however, has engaged with resource and regulatory agencies in the ESA context (e.g., section 7 ESA consultations between the Navy and USFWS), Sikes Act context (e.g., working with CNMI DLNR and other local resource agencies in the development of the JRM INRMP). The Navy is continuing to implement the standard operating procedures and mitigation measures included in the Navy's 2015 Final MITT EIS/OEIS and

	Comment	Navy Response
		the USFWS Pacific Islands Fish and Wildlife Office's 2015 Biological Opinion.
CNMI DLNR-53	**Fish.** The DSEIS states that most activities will be in deeper waters and therefore will have a low risk to fish. This is likely accurate in deeper, offshore waters (>25 nm). The DSEIS assessment is speculative regarding impacts to fish <25 nm from Farallon de Medinilla and Tinian. • Increased bombing of Farallon de Medinilla will impact local reef and bottom fish species that inhabit the surrounding shallow and deep-water reefs. Direct impact of reef sites by aberrant ordnance will mortally wound fish in proximity to detonation and be a significant stressor outward for hundreds of meters. • Increased bombing on Farallon de Medinilla will impact five pomacentrid species of fish, and the Napoleon wrasse (Cheilinus undulatus), that have been proposed for listing under the Endangered Species Act. Increased use of 2000 pound bombs on Farallon de Medinilla increases the potential for impact on surrounding reef fish. • Increased bombing activity will impact the genetic continuity of reef fish populations in the Mariana Archipelago. Bombs reaching the nearshore will kill reef fish, remove multiple year classes, and homogenize coral reef structure. These significant impacts should be assessed, monitored, and mitigated. • A decrease in the functional diversity of the reef surrounding Farallon de Medinilla will decrease grazing by herbivorous fish would likely increase algal production and outcompeting of corals. These significant impacts should be assessed, monitored, and mitigated. • No information (past or current) on reef fish populations or densities from Farallon de Medinilla, including reef fish habitat,	The Navy shares your concerns regarding the well-being of biological resources around Farallon de Medinilla (FDM). Section 3.8 (Marine Invertebrates) and Section 3.9 (Fishes) conclude impacts from land activities on FDM are not expected to result in significant impacts on corals and fishes, respectively. Although aberrant ordnances are possible, they would be infrequent and would not result in population-level impacts, changes in functional diversity, or changes to the genetic continuity of fishes in the surrounding areas. As stated in Section 3.9.1.3 (Endangered Species Act Species) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the scalloped hammerhead shark (*Sphyrna lewini*), oceanic whitetip shark (*Carcharhinus longimanus*), and giant manta ray (*Manta birostris*) are the only ESA-listed fish species in the Study Area, and the Navy will consult with the National Marine Fisheries Service under section 7 for ESA-listed fish species. There are currently no fish species in the Study Area that are proposed for listing under the ESA. While there are proposed increases in the use of some smaller-sized munitions on FDM, the Navy is not proposing an increase in bombing activity. The total amount of explosive munitions used on FDM would continue to be governed by the 2015 Biological Opinion. As discussed in Sections 3.8 (Marine Invertebrates) and 3.9 (Fishes) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, recent surveys conducted by the Navy (Carilli et al., 2018) at FDM found that coral fauna are healthy and robust and the nearshore physical environment and basic habitat types at FDM remained unchanged. The Navy updated the MITT Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS to include the results of the 2017 survey as presented in Carilli et al. (2018). The report information has been added to Section 3.1 (Sediments and Water Quality) and Section 3.8 (Marine Invertebrates). Specific text on impacts on Farallon de Medinilla is available in Section 3.1.3.1.5.3 (Farallon

	Comment	Navy Response
	are available to allow for an assessment of probable impacts from aberrant ordnance within the nearshore (<3 nm) waters of Farallon de Medinilla. Additional data should be collected and shared with CNMI to support meaningful assessment of impacts and discussion of appropriate mitigation measures.	de Medinilla Specific Impacts) in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, and Section 3.1 (Sediments and Water Quality) and Section 3.8 (Marine Invertebrates) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. In the absence of information, the Navy uses the best available science and data in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS to assess potential impacts. Although aberrant ordnances are possible, they would be infrequent and would not result in population-level impacts, changes in functional diversity, or changes to the genetic continuity of fishes in the surrounding areas. For Navy-funded and managed studies, the Navy will continue to communicate and coordinate with the CNMI government on future collaboration and information sharing.
CNMI DLNR-54	**Marine invasive species.** Increased shipping activity and associated fouling and ballast-water organisms has the potential will introduce marine organisms to nearshore habitats and pelagic waters. Once introduced, marine species are nearly impossible to eradicate, and the consequences of introductions are impossible to predict. In fact, in 2012 invasive barnacles were reported surrounding FDM and we lack current surveys to assess the damage. Additional concerns regarding invasive threats from ballast water and increased ship traffic should also be assessed and addressed.	The U.S. Navy recognizes the importance of biosecurity, ecological integrity, and resiliency of island ecosystems to the potential introduction of invasive species to the Mariana Islands associated with military training and testing. The Navy has a number of policies in place to prevent, interdict, and control invasive species introductions in both terrestrial and marine environments. Specific federal and Navy policies for marine invasive species can be found at: Public Law 104-332, National Invasive Species Act of 1996; Executive Order 13112 (Invasive Species) and amended by Executive Order 13751 (Safeguarding the Nation from the Impacts of Invasive Species; and OPNAVINST 5090.1E Chapter 35-3.19. (Ship and Ballast Water), 5090.1E Chapter 35-3.1 (Environmentally Sound Ships), and 5090.1E Chapter 12-3.9 (Invasive Species). As part of the INRMP, the Navy will implement marine management recommendations identified in the biosecurity plan for Micronesia and Hawaii.
CNMI DLNR-55	**Data and mitigation measures.** We recommend that the following items be provided by DOD to enable the Commonwealth to independently and objectively predict, monitor, and evaluate the impact of military activities proposed in this EIS.	As per CEQ regulations, the Navy uses a number of sources of best available science and data in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, including external references (noted in each section of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS), technical documents (available on the MITT project website), and ongoing consultation processes with other agencies (NMFS and USFWS). Data is drawn and managed from multiple sources/points, including from the

	Comment	Navy Response
	• Provide a summary of the number of species on this list that have been impacted (both Type A and type B "take") by DOD training activities in the region in the last 20 years.	public during the NEPA process. Best available peer-reviewed science/data can come from sources such as academia, consultations with other resource agencies, industry, and the public. For Navy-funded and managed studies, the Navy will continue to communicate and coordinate with the CNMI government on future collaboration and information sharing. The Navy conducts marine species monitoring at Navy ranges. Monitoring reports and a number of other supporting documents can be found at www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us.
CNMI DLNR-56	• Provide funds for CNMI or an independent third-party contractor to perform ecosystem inventories and abundance estimates for wildlife on Farallon de Medinilla (including surrounding waters and the coral reef west of the island). • Involve DFW staff in the planning of surveys and pre- and post-survey scientific review. • Provide funds for CNMI to employ a Biologist, who is dedicated to reviewing DOD documents such as subsequent EISs, monitoring impact of military activities, and liaising with DOD, CNMI political officials, and third parties about conservation issues of mutual interest. • Provide data on all surveys performed around Farallon de Medinilla for marine invertebrates, reef fishes, marine mammals and sea turtles. Provide access to Farallon de Medinilla' s waters for DFW to perform independent surveys of fish, invertebrates and wildlife. • Fund a study that would satellite tag species of marine mammals (especially Culver's beaked whale) and sea turtles to measure movement and behavioral response of animals to military activities. • Funding should be provided for independent research into the movement and at-sea habitat use for green sea turtle (Chelonia mydas), hawksbill sea turtle (Eretmochelys imbricatata), loggerhead sea turtle (Caretta caretta), olive Ridley sea turtle	The Navy does not routinely allow independent, third-party access to live-fire ranges due to safety concerns. Because FDM is an active range, it is extremely difficult to allow non-military personnel on the island or within the restricted area of 3 NM due to safety and special explosive ordnance disposal certification requirements. As per CEQ regulations, the Navy uses a number of sources of best available science and data, including external references from academia, industry, and the public (noted in each section of EIS/OEIS); technical documents (available on the MITT project website); and ongoing consultation processes with other agencies (NMFS and USFWS). The Navy strives to share technical information and data with the public and resource agencies. Technical reports are posted on the MITT project website at www.mitt-eis.com. For Navy-funded and managed marine research and monitoring studies, the public can access reports, documentation, data, and updates on current monitoring projects via the U.S. Navy Marine Species Monitoring Program website at www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us. The Navy will continue to communicate and coordinate with the CNMI government on future collaboration and information sharing. Research funding is allocated via the Integrated Comprehensive Monitoring Program (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2010, 2013a), which provides the overarching framework for coordination of the Navy's marine

	Comment	Navy Response
	(Lepidochelys olivacea), and leatherback sea turtle (Dermochelys coriacea).	species research and monitoring efforts and serves as a planning tool to focus Navy monitoring priorities pursuant to ESA and MMPA requirements. The purpose of the Integrated Comprehensive Monitoring Program is to coordinate monitoring efforts across all regions and to allocate the most appropriate level and type of monitoring effort for each range complex based on a set of standardized objectives, regional expertise, and resource availability. Although the Integrated Comprehensive Monitoring Program does not identify specific field work or individual projects, it is designed to provide a flexible, scalable, and adaptable framework using adaptive management and strategic planning processes that periodically assess progress and reevaluate objectives. The adaptive management is anticipated to continue between the Navy, NMFS, and the Marine Mammal Commission through technical review meetings and ongoing discussions. The Navy is unable to directly provide funds as requested; however, the Navy will continue to work with local partners in Guam and the CNMI to engage in collaborative research efforts. Many of these activities are part of the larger collaborative effort with NOAA Fisheries, Guam Division of Aquatic and Wildlife Resources, CNMI Department of Lands and Natural Resources, Naval Base Guam, and the U.S. Pacific Fleet Environmental Readiness Office. The most recent collaborative research effort was sea turtle tagging in the Mariana Islands Range Complex (Martin, S. L., A. R. Gaos, and T. T. Jones. [2019]). In addition, the U.S. Department of Defense Office of Economic Adjustment helps local communities adapt to Department of Defense program changes, expansions and cutbacks, as well as incompatibilities between military operations and local development. The Office of Economic Adjustment is the appropriate agency to contact regarding funding inquiries.

	Comment	Navy Response
CNMI DLNR-56	• Studies should be conducted to identify density 'hotspot', ideally in real-time, so that Navy activities can avoid these areas. Some advances have been made for in Dynamic Ocean Management that the Navy should consider implementing for mitigation purposes.	As described in Appendix I (Geographic Mitigation Assessment), the Navy used the best available science, such as recently published monitoring studies and survey data on the occurrence, movement patterns, and distribution of marine mammals in the Mariana Islands to develop mitigation areas to avoid or reduce potential impacts on marine mammals and sea turtles in key areas of biological or ecological importance (see Appendix I, Geographic Mitigation Assessment). Based on the analysis presented in Appendix I, additional mitigation areas do not meet the requirements for biological importance for a particular species or practicality of implementation such that the Navy would be able to achieve mission requirements. The Navy is aware of advances being made in dynamic ocean management (Becker et al., 2016; Maxwell et al., 2015). The ability to use near real-time oceanographic data (e.g., sea surface temperature) to predict the presence of marine species in real time is a promising management tool; however, the method is not yet well established as a proven predictor of marine mammal occurrence. The Navy uses the same or similar marine mammal survey data in their density estimates that have been used in the development of dynamic ocean management models. Refer to the Navy's Marine Species Density Technical Report to see how the Navy derived densities for marine mammals and sea turtles in the MITT Study Area (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2018). Becker, E. A., K. A. Forney, P. C. Fiedler, J. Barlow, S. J. Chivers, C. A. Edwards, A. M. Moore, and J. V. Redfern. (2016). Moving Towards Dynamic Ocean Management: How Well Do Modeled Ocean Products Predict Species Distributions? Remote Sensing, 8(2), 149. Maxwell, S. M., Hazen, E. L., Lewison, R. L., Dunn, D. C., Bailey, H., Bograd, S. J., ... & Benson, S. (2015). Dynamic ocean management: Defining and

	Comment	Navy Response
		conceptualizing real-time management of the ocean. Marine Policy, 58, 42-50. U.S. Department of the Navy. (2018). U.S. Navy Marine Species Density Database Phase III for the Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area (Naval Facilities Engineering Command Pacific Technical Report). Pearl Harbor, HI: Naval Facilities Engineering Command Pacific.
CNMI DLNR-57	• In the absence of robust data regarding marine mammals and endangered sea turtle distribution, the Navy proposes two geographic mitigation areas at the Marpi Reef and Chalan Kanoa Reef. It would be prudent to continue marine mammal and turtle monitoring activities in partnership with the CNMI to develop BIAs or other appropriate management measures.	Through its marine species research and monitoring programs, the Navy is one of the nation's largest sponsors of scientific research on and monitoring of marine species. The Navy will continue to conduct monitoring projects to meet the objectives of its Integrated Comprehensive Monitoring Program and may partner with the CNMI, as requested, if appropriate.
CNMI DLNR-58	• Ensure that current and future Commonwealth laws and regulations governing the use of designated CNMI Conservation Areas be respected. Ensure that training plans are revised if boundaries of legally designated Conservation Areas change, or if new Conservation Areas are established, and that training activities are coordinated with CNMI in advance with opportunities for state agencies to monitor areas before and after exercises at minimum.	The Navy respects Commonwealth laws and regulations governing the use of legally designated Conservation Areas. These areas are documented in Table 6.1-2 and Figures 6.1-1 and 6.1-2 of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. The Navy does not train in areas near legally designated Conservation Areas. If boundaries of existing Conservation Areas change, or if new Conservation Areas are established, the Navy would notify the CNMI of planned training activities.
CNMI DLNR-59	• Improve communication and collaboration with CNMI-DLNR on research and monitoring activities related to DOD training described in the MITT. Improvements should include collaborative projects, funding for independent research and monitoring from CNMI-DLNR, regular data and information sharing, and consultation prior to training activities that are likely to impact CNMI's natural resources.	The Navy is not able to directly provide funds as requested; however, the Navy will continue to work with local partners in the CNMI to engage in collaborative research efforts. For Navy-funded and managed studies, the Navy will continue to communicate and coordinate with the CNMI government on future collaboration and information sharing.
CNMI DLNR-60	• Provide funds for CNMI to sample, monitor, and research the effects of the release, environmental persistence, and bioaccumulation of explosive and toxic residues left by propellant and ordnance use on and in the waters surrounding Farallon de Medinilla.	The Navy is unable to directly provide funds as requested; however, the Navy will continue to work with local partners in the CNMI to engage in collaborative research efforts. See above response CNMI DLNR-56 (to Anthony T. Benavente, Secretary

	Comment	Navy Response
		CNMI Department of Lands and Natural Resources), regarding funding and access to FDM or waters surrounding FDM.
CNMI DLNR-61	• Provide alternatives and actions to mitigate sub-lethal effects.	The Navy will implement procedural mitigation measures to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine mammals wherever and whenever applicable acoustic, explosive, and physical disturbance and strike stressors are used in the Study Area. The Navy's mitigation measures will help avoid or reduce a range of potential impact levels, including sub-lethal effects such as PTS, TTS, and behavioral impacts.
CNMI DLNR-62	• Mitigation measures involving Navy Divers should include observation/mitigation for all ESA species (see Table 5.3-11: Procedural Mitigation for Explosive Mine Neutralization Activities Involving Navy Divers as example).	The Navy worked cooperatively with NMFS during the ESA consultation process to increase mitigation for ESA-listed species during Explosive Mine Neutralization Activities Involving Navy Divers, as suggested by the commenter. Mitigation measures and monitoring requirements for endangered species are presented in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Any additional measures required by the ESA Biological Opinion will be reflected in the Record of Decision.
CNMI DLNR-63	• The Navy is basing its decision not to consider Minke whale mitigation area on the fact that there is limited data available regarding their range in the Marianas. "In addition to Norris et al. (2017) noting the requirement for more detailed analyses of the current data, these results were collected from only a single season (January to April 2007), so it remains unknown if the minke whale detections were associated with static features such as water depth and bathymetry slope or were associated with dynamic ocean conditions present during that particular survey. Given the temporally dynamic redistributions of marine mammals in response to both seasonal variation and longer-term climate change affecting ocean conditions (Becker et al., 2017; Forney et al., 2015; Ramp et al., 2015; Risch et al., 2014; Silber et al., 2017), and that species such as minke whales migrate from low-productivity tropical waters in the summer (Jefferson et al., 2015; Perrin & Brownell, 2009), it is possible that minke whales may not have a fixed distribution within the	The best available science suggests that the mitigation areas proposed by the Navy are particularly important to one or more species of marine mammals or sea turtles for a biologically important life process (e.g., foraging, migration, reproduction). Based on the analysis presented in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS and using the best available data, surveys or additional research are not required for the Navy to comply with NEPA. The Navy conducts extensive monitoring and data collection programs as part of their compliance with the MMPA and ESA, including in the waters around the Mariana Islands. In 2007 the Navy funded the first large-scale marine mammal survey in the offshore waters of the Mariana archipelago. This was followed by the Navy and National Marine Fisheries Service establishing a marine mammal monitoring program in the Mariana Islands and in 2014 establishing a sea turtle tagging program in the Mariana Islands. The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring Program website provides access to reports, documentation, data, and updates on current monitoring projects. Information on current monitoring projects, technical

	Comment	Navy Response
	MITT Study Area" (1-33). Marine mammal and sea turtle surveys be conducted that address both spatial and temporal use of the area to better mitigate the Navy's activities The CNMI Department of Land & Natural Resources Division of Fish & Wildlife appreciates the opportunity to review and to provide comment on the EIS on the Marianas Islands Training Testing Activities, United States Department of the Navy. We hope that you will give considerable and favorable attention to our comments, and we ask for an open and ongoing exchange of information and a vigorous discussion of your future plans and their implications for our Commonwealth.	reports, conference presentations and data are available at www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us. In addition, while outside the current scope of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the military satisfies Sikes Act obligations through the development and implementation of the Joint Region Marianas INRMP. The 2019 Joint Region Marianas INRMP includes monitoring programs throughout the Mariana Islands. The CNMI Department of Lands and Natural Resources, Division of Fish and Wildlife is a signatory and participating member to the 2019 Joint Region Marianas INRMP that details natural resource management and monitoring programs. The Navy will continue to improve coordination and collaboration with the CNMI as part of the INRMP project development and implementation. The programs mentioned above help ensure current environmental conditions are monitored regularly. Any new information or data from the Navy's monitoring programs and INRMP will be incorporated into the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS as appropriate.
Rita Chong-Dela Cruz, CNMI Historic Preservation Office (CNMI HPO)		
CNMI HPO-01	Staff of the CNMI Division of Historic Preservation (HPO) have reviewed the 2019 Mariana Islands Training and Testing (MITT) Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (EIS/OEIS). Per this review, CNMI HPO has several comments regarding the identification of cultural resources outlined in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS. While some of these comments have been discussed with NAVFAC personnel directly, CNMI HPO feels it is important for these comments to be placed on the record at this time. CNMI HPO further recognizes that activities such as the identification of additional cultural resources may be worked out through the ongoing Section I06 consultation related to the renegotiation of the 2009 Programmatic Agreement that fulfills National Historic Preservation Act requirements for MITT activities. It should also be noted that CNMI HPO is satisfied	Consultation regarding the identification of historic properties, including traditional cultural properties, and the effects of the undertaking on the historic properties within the Area of Potential Effect has been conducted and solidified in the 2009 MIRC Programmatic Agreement (PA). FDM was included in the consultation. All cultural resources reports have been shared with and reviewed by the appropriate stakeholders. The need for FDM cultural surveys, both terrestrial and submerged, is part of ongoing Section 106 consultation and will be addressed as appropriate in any new Programmatic Agreement. The Navy is required to complete independent statutory obligations under both NEPA and NHPA. Thus, the Navy has prepared this Supplemental EIS/OEIS and continued compliance with NHPA under the Section 106 process.

	Comment	Navy Response
	with the mitigation strategy of avoiding the areas of known submerged cultural resources and the additional mitigations negotiated through the programmatic agreement. Our comments, therefore, relate primarily to the identification and documentation of cultural resources, as a comprehensive knowledge of cultural resources with accurate geospatial data is necessary for the proposed mitigation to be effective. With this in mind, our comments are as follows: **1) Terrestrial cultural resources on Farallon de Medinilla (FDM) have not been adequately identified** It is stated in section 3.11.1.2.1 of the 2019 MITT Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS (Page 3.11-1) that "no additional ... land-based archaeological sites, or isolated-non-modern artifacts have been identified around or on Farallon de Medinilla." It is further stated that, because no additional resources have been identified, the information pertaining to the cultural resources of FDM in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS remains valid. It is stated in section 3.11.2.2.1 in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OBIS (Page 3.11-15) that a preliminary archaeological field survey of FDM was conducted in 1996, which did not locate cultural resources on FDM. A similar statement is made in Paragraph 5 of page 3.11-6 of the 2019 Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, which states that, based on the 1996 survey, "there are no known cultural resources on FDM." It is the opinion of CNMI HPO that the 1996 archaeological survey conducted by David Welch did not provide sufficient coverage of FDM to confidently assess the presence or absence of cultural resources on FDM. It is therefore impossible at this time to adequately assess the potential impacts of MITT activities to cultural resources on FDM.	

	Comment	Navy Response
	This opinion is supported by the report of the 1996 survey. It is stated on Page 6 of that report that the planned survey strategy for FDM included three phases: a preliminary reconnaissance survey, an intensive survey, and a sample survey of selected areas. Only the first of these three proposed phases was completed. It is stated on Page 7 of the report that vegetation in some areas was so dense that it "precluded a careful check" of the area, and that the survey was cut short by an incoming typhoon. In the conclusion on Page 8 it is stated that > While the preliminary reconnaissance survey failed to tum up any evidence of prehistoric or early historic human activity on the island, the extent of the survey was far too limited to confirm that such evidence is not present or very unlikely to be present. The expected scarcity of any archaeological remains necessitates a more intensive survey to confirm their presence or absence and the past and potential future impacts of the military use of the island ... without this information, it is difficult to evaluate ... what impact military training on the island has had and may continue to have on the island's cultural resource base. It is then suggested that the additional phases of survey necessary to properly assess the presence of cultural resources on FDM and potential effects of military activity on those resources would take an additional two to three days of work. Given that Welch wrote in the report that the 1996 survey was in adequate to confirm the presence or absence of terrestrial cultural resources on FDM or to understand the impacts of military activity on potential cultural resources, it is misleading to imply, as is done in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OBIS and in the 2019 MITT Draft Supplemental EIS/OBIS, that no cultural resources are present on	

	Comment	Navy Response
	FDM and that, therefore, MITT activities at FDM have no potential to affect cultural resources. Given also that Welch estimated only two to three additional days of survey would be required to adequately assess the presence or absence of cultural resources on FDM, it is the opinion of CNMI HPO that it would not be an undue burden to complete the full, three-phase program of archaeological survey on FDM as suggested in 1996. This would best be coordinated with other on-the-ground activities that regularly take place on FDM in order to mitigate the safety concerns associated with operations on FDM. **2) Submerged cultural resources in the waters around FDM have not been adequately identified** It is stated in section 3.11.1.2.1 of the 2019 MITT Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS (Page 3.11-1) that "no additional submerged cultural resources ... have been identified around or on [FDM]." It is further stated that, because no additional resources have been identified, the information pertaining to the submerged cultural resources of FDM in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS remains valid. However, in section 3.11.2.2. l of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (Page 3.11-15), the submerged cultural resources in the waters around FDM are not discussed. This is in direct contrast to the sections on Saipan, Tinian, and Rota, all of which include subsections on submerged cultural resources. Therefore, while the 2019 MITT Supplemental EIS/OEIS states that the information on submerged cultural resources presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS "is still valid and the most current," there is no indication in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS that any effort was made to ascertain if submerged cultural resources are present in the waters around FDM. The 2010 MIRC Final EIS/OEIS (also referred to as the	

	Comment	Navy Response
	2010 MITT Final EIS/OEIS) similarly indicates in its assessment of FDM on pages 3. 13-30 and 3.13-31 that only the terrestrial cultural resources of FDM have been assessed, making no reference to submerged cultural resources. It is further clear in reviewing "Submerged Cultural Resources Assessment of Micronesia" (Carrell et al. 1991) -the main source used to identify the submerged cultural resources of Saipan, Tinian, and Rota in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS -that no surveys for submerged cultural resources in the waters around FDM were conducted to support the production of that report. CNMI HPO is unaware of any additional surveys for submerged cultural resources around FDM that have been conducted since the 1991 assessment. It is, therefore, impossible at this time to assess the presence or absence of submerged cultural resources in the waters around FDM, as it is apparent no effort has ever been made to identify submerged cultural resources in those waters. It is, subsequently, impossible to determine what effect, if any, MITT activities at FDM may have on potential submerged cultural resources in those waters. If submerged cultural resources are present in the waters around FDM, however, activities there would have the potential to affect such resources, as it is stated on page 3.12-10 of the 2019 MITT Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS that activities occurring at FDM "have the potential to affect coral reefs," in those same waters. CNMI HPO understands that the restriction of those waters within 3 nautical miles (NM) around FDM make survey for submerged cultural resources difficult. However, we note that in Paragraph 4 of page 4.3-260 of the 2019 MITT Supplemental EIS/OEIS it is stated in relation to marine mammals that "in-water surveys of marine resources within the 3NM danger zone surrounding FDM have been conducted for more than a decade." As it is clearly possible for	

	Comment	Navy Response
	underwater survey to be conducted within the 3NM danger zone, it is our opinion that it would not be an undue burden to conduct a survey to confirm the presence or absence of submerged cultural resources in those waters to allow the effects of MITT activities on any potential resources to be properly analyzed.	
CNMI HPO-02	**3) Some submerged cultural resources are identified from sources that do not provide geospatial data** In section 3.11.1.2.2 of the 2019 MITT Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS (Page 3.11-1), it is stated that several previously unidentified submerged cultural resources have been identified in the nearshore waters off Unai Chulu and Unai Babui on Tinian since the publication of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. However, the source cited for these resources does not provide geospatial data for these resources, only basic descriptions. As is stated repeatedly throughout the 2019 MITT Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the primary mitigation for submerged cultural resources is to avoid the locations of known submerged cultural resources. Without precise data on the location of resources, this mitigation cannot be effective. It is not indicated in the 2019 MITT Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS if any effort was made to obtain geospatial data for these resources from the authors of the source that is cited. If no such effort has been made, the authors should be contacted and the locations of these newly documented resources should be added to the appropriate Navy databases so that they may be avoided. CNMI HPO understands that these comments come at a late stage in the development of this document, which is an inopportune time to request for additional archaeological survey. We further understand that activities related to the identification and protection of historic properties are ongoing through Section 106 consultation, and we intend to pursue more comprehensive identification of historic properties through that process. However,	The Navy has updated Figure 3.11-1 to reflect new submerged cultural resources identified off Unai Chulu and Unai Babui on Tinian since the publishing of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and included the figure in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Navy has also updated Figure 5.4-2 in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) to reflect the new submerged cultural resources.

	Comment	Navy Response
	as we believe that comprehensive identification of cultural resources is necessary for the mitigation described in the EIS/OEIS to be effective, we feel it is important to raise these issues now. We would also like to note that CNMI HPO is happy to work with NAVFAC personnel to identify additional reports or other information about historic properties to better inform the analysis of MITT activities and ensure this important mission can continue to be carried out without damage to significant cultural resources. We intend to pursue this collaboration through the ongoing Section 106 consultation and under the terms of the programmatic agreement going forward.	
Senator Clynton E. Ridgell, Office of Senator Clynton E. Ridgell (OSR)		
OSR-01	Please include the following comments, questions, and concerns as part of the Public Comment Record for the Mariana Islands Training and Testing (MITT) Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS)/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (OEIS). • Why are rockets, missiles, and medium-caliber projectiles increasing in use (P. 3-28) from what was previously projected in the 2015 Mariana Islands Training and Testing EIS/OEIS? *Note that the use of rockets and medium projectiles are anticipated to have more than doubled in use.	The Navy has been conducting training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades and this supplement to the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS supports the continuation of that training and testing. The activities analyzed in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS are largely a continuation of the ongoing training and testing activities that were analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, 2010 MIRC EIS/OEIS, and 1999 Mariana EIS/OEIS. This Supplemental EIS/OEIS (1) includes the analysis of activities at sea and on Farallon de Medinilla (FDM) necessary to meet readiness requirements beyond 2020 and into the reasonably foreseeable future, (2) includes any changes to those activities previously analyzed, and (3) reflects the most up-to-date compilation of training and testing activities deemed necessary to accomplish military readiness requirements. The Navy predicts the activities it will be conducting years in the future to be analyzed for environmental and regulatory compliance. It is important to note that the Navy is then bound by the limits of its expected types and levels of activities. If a need arises that exceeds those predicted activities, the Navy would be required to conduct additional environmental analysis. Pursuant to 40 CFR section 1502.9(c), the Navy would prepare a supplement to the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS if it makes substantial

	Comment	Navy Response
		changes in the Proposed Action that are relevant to environmental concerns (40 CFR section 1502.9(c)(1)(i)), or there are significant new circumstances or information relevant to environmental concerns and bearing on the Proposed Action or its impacts (40 CFR section 1502.9(c)(1)(ii)).
OSR-02	• The EIS says that unexploded ordinance is not part of military expended materials (P. 3.3-6), but the Executive Summary mentions marine mammals may encounter unexploded ordinance (P. ES-11). Why is there this inconsistency?	The inconsistencies noted in the Executive Summary and text within the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS have been revised in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS.
OSR-03	• Because there is not enough data on the conservation status of the dwarf and pygmy sperm whales, we would like to request for more data to be collected and more research to be done before these activities have the potential to permanently damage these species.	In this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy took a hard look at the potential impacts of the Proposed Action on marine mammals using the best available science. Based on the analysis presented in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS and using the best available data, surveys or additional research are not required to comply with NEPA. The Navy's quantitative analysis process for analyzing impacts from active sonar and explosives has been reviewed by independent scientists and approved by NMFS. The Navy also worked collaboratively with NMFS to develop mitigation measures using input from the military operators, the best available science, predicted activity impact footprints, and marine species monitoring and density data. The Navy has implemented and will continue to implement procedural mitigation measures designed to reduce or avoid impacts on sea turtles and marine mammals in the Study Area (see Chapter 5, Mitigation). At this time, these procedural mitigation measures represent the most practicable methods for protecting sea turtles and marine mammals while allowing the Navy to complete its training and testing mission.
OSR-04	• Is there an expected decrease in sonar activity which is causing the temporary and permanent shifts and damages to have decreased in marine mammals from the previous study? Please explain the anticipated decrease in permanent shifts and damages to marine mammals in contrast to the 2015 MITT EIS. Is there an expected decrease in sonar activity?	The overall use of sonar and other transducers for training and testing activities would be similar to what is currently conducted (see Table 2-3 and Figure 2-4 of the MITT Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS for details). Depending on the species, densities may or may not have changed from Phase II to Phase III. The overall differences in estimated impacts are a combination of the following variables: an improved estimate of auditory

	Comment	Navy Response
		weighting in Phase III vs. Phase II; implementation of new behavioral response criteria in PIII based on additional behavioral response data, including recent data; and a generally lower proposed activity level for most sonar bins (see Table 2-3 which compares bin use in Phase II vs Phase III). Any or all of these factors combined could lead to changes (i.e., decreases) in impacts, such as permanent threshold shift, since the 2015 Final MITT EIS/OEIS (Phase II). Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-1 in Chapter 2 of the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS compares the number of events from the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS to the current draft for Alternatives 1 and 2. Overall, activities have increased, decreased, or stayed the same since Phase II.
OSR-05	• Earlier this year, Guam experienced a beaching of a beaked whale at the Naval Base, and beachings have happened often on Guam. The EIS states that research is not conclusive that beaching is caused by sonar, but a study done by Quiros, et al. (2019) https://royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/10.1098/rspb.2018.2533 shows the connection. What is being done to protect marine mammals from beaching?	The potential for sonar and explosives use during naval training and testing activities to potentially contribute to strandings is discussed in Sections 3.4.2.1.1.6 (Stranding) and 3.4.2.2.1.6 (Stranding), respectively. In addition, the technical report cited in the Draft and this Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS titled Marine Mammal Strandings Associated with U.S. Navy Sonar Activities (available at https://mitt-eis.com) summarizes (1) stranding events associated with U.S. Navy sonar activities and (2) strandings speculated but not linked to U.S. Navy sonar activities. This report also discusses other natural and anthropogenic factors that have been shown to contribute to strandings. The Navy's analysis of impacts on beaked whales took into account their greater sensitivity to disturbance relative to other marine mammals, as demonstrated by the data used to develop the behavioral response criteria for beaked whales [see the technical report titled *Criteria and Thresholds for U.S. Navy Acoustic and Explosive Effects Analysis (Phase III)* available at https://mitt-eis.com]. This Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS further discusses the above Cuvier's beaked whale strandings relative to sonar use in the Study Area in Section 3.4.2.1.1.6 (Stranding) under Environmental Consequences due to Acoustic Stressors in the Marine Mammal section

	Comment	Navy Response
		(Section 3.4). This additional information does not change the conclusions of the analysis of potential impacts on Cuvier's beaked whales described in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As described in Section 5.1.2.2.1 (Marine Species Research and Monitoring Programs), for this Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy agreed to several additional research and monitoring initiatives designed to help advance the understanding of beaked whales and strandings in the MITT Study Area. The Navy will co-fund the Pacific Marine Assessment Program for Protected Species (PACMAPPS) Mariana Islands survey in spring-summer 2021 and future studies starting in 2022 to help document beaked whale occurrence, abundance, and distribution in the Mariana Islands. The Navy will also fund additional stranding response and necropsy analyses for the Pacific Islands region, and research on a framework to improve statistical stranding analysis. Collaboratively with NMFS, the Navy will fund and organize an expert panel to provide recommendations on scientific data gaps and uncertainties for further protective measure consideration to minimize potential impacts of Navy training and testing activities on beaked whales in the Mariana Islands.
OSR-06	• As an endangered species, there are very strict regulations for the protection of the Green Sea Turtle and the prevention of a permanent threshold shift as predicted to happen to the Green Sea Turtle. These threshold shifts can impact the animal's ability to find mates or other animals of the same species. Please explain what other measures the U.S. Navy will implement to comply with these regulations.	As described throughout Chapter 5 (Mitigation), the Navy will implement mitigation measures to avoid or reduce potential impacts from acoustic stressors and explosives on sea turtles. Procedural mitigation measures for sonar and explosives include a power down or shut down (i.e., power off) of applicable active sonar sources and ceasing detonations when a sea turtle is observed in a mitigation zone. The mitigation zones for active sonar extend beyond the ranges to PTS and TTS for sea turtles. The mitigation zones for explosives extend beyond the average ranges to PTS, and beyond or into a portion of the average ranges to TTS for sea turtles. Therefore, mitigation will help avoid or reduce the potential for exposure to these effects for sea turtles.

	Comment	Navy Response
		The Navy is consulting with NMFS as required by Section 7(a)(2) of the ESA regarding potential impacts on sea turtles. Analyses of potential impacts on sea turtles from all relevant stressors were included in the Navy's biological assessment and are included in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS.
OSR-07	• The prediction of injury from these projects is listed as zero for all species. How certain are these predictions, despite the risk factors mentioned? Should there be any deviation in methodology for an increase in activity, what is the next realistic prediction of injury that may result from these projects?	For all modeled species (sea turtles and marine mammals), no injuries are estimated by the quantitative analysis. Section 3.0.4.7 (Conceptual Framework for Assessing Effects from Acoustic and Explosive Activities) in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS provides additional information on injury and the framework used to analyze this potential impact. The Navy's analysis incorporates conservative assumptions to account for uncertainty and therefore likely overestimates potential impacts. In this instance where the predicted impact is zero, the Navy has a high confidence that the quantitative analysis results are accurate because of the conservative analysis approach taken. For example, using source classification bins (as discussed in Section 3.0.4.1, Acoustic Stressors, of the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS) ensures a conservative approach to all impact estimates, as all sources within a given class are modeled as the most impactful source (highest source level, longest duty cycle [i.e., the proportion of time signals are emitted in a given period of time], or largest net explosive weight) within that bin. The Navy analyzed the maximum number of activities that would occur under the Proposed Action as Alternative 2. The analysis included an assessment of unanticipated emergent world events that would require increased readiness levels above those included in Alternative 1. Therefore, the finding of zero non-auditory injurious impacts on marine mammals and sea turtles does represent the best and only realistic prediction of injury for the maximum level of activities that would occur under the Proposed Action.
OSR-08	• The mitigation practices are generally educating the federal employees and watching training sites for the presence of species and stopping training if an animal is seen. How will the lookouts notify and how soon will training stop if a lookout sees an animal? What happens to animals that the lookouts do not	The Navy will implement mitigation measures to avoid or reduce potential impacts from acoustic, explosive, and physical disturbance and strike stressors during training and testing activities on marine mammals, sea turtles, and ESA-listed fish. Procedural mitigation requirements are detailed in Section 2.3.2.2 (Procedural Mitigation to be Implemented) of the Navy's Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Procedural mitigation generally

	Comment	Navy Response
	see? How effective are these lookouts at seeing animals underwater?	involves (1) the use of one or more trained Lookouts to diligently observe for specific biological resources within a mitigation zone, (2) requirements for Lookouts to immediately communicate sightings of specific biological resources to the appropriate watch station for information dissemination, and (3) requirements for the watch station to implement mitigation until a pre-activity commencement or during-activity recommencement condition has been met. The Navy's analysis assumes that Lookouts will not be 100 percent effective at detecting all individual marine mammals and sea turtles within the mitigation zones for each activity due to the inherent limitations of observing marine species and because the likelihood of sighting individual animals is largely dependent on observation conditions (e.g., time of day, sea state, mitigation zone size, observation platform) and animal behavior (e.g., the amount of time an animal spends at the surface of the water). The Navy developed a new mitigation for the Proposed Action that requires additional platforms already participating in the activity to support observing the mitigation zone before, during, and after the activity while performing their regular duties. There are typically multiple platforms in the vicinity of activities that use explosives; therefore, when available, having additional personnel support observations of the mitigation zone will help increase the likelihood of detecting marine mammals and sea turtles prior to and during these activities. The quantitative analysis assumes that only animals sighted at the water surface would be protected by the applied mitigation; however, in practice, mitigation also protects all unobserved (below the surface) animals in the vicinity, including other species, when marine mammals or sea turtles are observed at the surface. The analysis, therefore, does not capture the protection afforded to all marine species that may be near or within the mitigation zone. Section 3.4 (Marine Mammals) and Section 3.5 (Sea Turtles) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS thoroughly discuss the potential impacts of all Navy training and testing activities on marine species.

	Comment	Navy Response
OSR-09	In response to the U.S. Navy's recently disclosed plans to expand the Surface Danger Zone to Point A - 13° 34' 57" N; 144° 49' 53" E; Point B – 13° 35' 49" N; 144° 47' 59" E; Point C – 13° 34' 57" N; 144° 47'; Point D – 13° 34' 48" N; 144° 49' 50" E; datum: NAD-83, I hereby submit additional comments for discussion on both the January 2019 publication of the MITT EIS/OEIS as well as for the expansion of the Surface Danger Zone as listed below. • Given the lack of information available to us regarding the impacts of the proposed activity on the endangered species within the boundaries of the danger zone, further analysis is required to determine potential impacts to the green sea turtle, the hawksbill sea turtle, and scalloped hammerhead sharks. I urge the U.S. Navy to conduct research with appropriate agents of the government and of the public to relay the potential impacts of disturbance to the endangered species caused by the proposed activities. • Expansion of the Surface Danger Zone will prevent access to traditional fishing grounds. These are used for bottom fishing, trolling and spear fishing. This will have a direct impact on our fishing and diving community and respective industries among residents and visitors alike. • The MITT-FEIS states that no forest clearance will occur as a result of the Finegayan Small Arms Firing Range. Are there any proposals that would contradict what is stated in the MITT-FEIS with respect to forest clearance at this site? • The proposed Surface Danger Zone will affect the Haputo Ecological Reserve Area. I am opposed to the possibility and probability of any proposed activities that will negatively compromise the state of any of our natural reserves or sacred and historical sites due to pollution or contamination caused by military activity.	The Surface Danger Zone is not part of the MITT Supplemental EIS/OEIS Proposed Action, and therefore comments on the Surface Danger Zone are beyond the scope of the MITT Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The military is committed to continuing to work with the local community on issues that potentially affect the public, including access to fishing sites while ensuring public safety at all times. The military actively promotes compatible use of ocean areas by minimizing public access restrictions and limiting the extent and duration of necessary closures. The Navy does not propose a change to the ocean areas currently used by both the Navy and the public. Restrictions on accessing areas of co-use would continue to be infrequent and short-term, while other fishing sites in the Study Area would continue to be available to the public.

	Comment	Navy Response
	• Existing documents do not state clearly what construction activity will be required to expand the SDZ. Further clarification is needed to determine how much construction activity will be required for this proposal and any environmental impacts caused by construction activity. • The Federal Public Notice indicates that the proposed action does not have the potential to cause effects to historic properties listed on the National Register of Historic Places; however, the site in question is located exactly between two locally-registered historic sites: Hila'an Beach and Haputo Beach as listed on the Guam Historic Resources Division's Register Listing. The application also does not specify how often this range will be in use and how much access will be limited to these ancient and sacred historical sites that are regularly visited by the CHamoru people. I urge further consultation with the Guam Department of Parks and Recreation's Historic Resources Division for review and comment. • According to the 2015 EIS, there are two pre-contact CHamoru sites listed in the Naval Base Telecommunications; 21 pre-contact sites eligible; and one World War II site eligible for being added to historical site registries. What, if any, impact will the proposed military activities have on any one of these sites?	
OSR-10	• The MITT-FEIS mentions fishing aggregating devices are being used outside of the danger zone so as not to disturb the fishing industry on Guam. What types of fishing aggregating devices are being used, and do they disturb any other form of aquatic life?	Fishing aggregating devices are not under the jurisdiction of the Navy and are deployed by local agencies such as the Guam Department of Fish and Wildlife. Please contact your local fishing agency for information about fish aggregating devices.
OSR-11	• The MITT-FEIS states that the military training activities do not occur in intact limestone forest areas where species of partulids or native snails live. What entity has made this determination, and how can this be confirmed? Data should be provided regarding any and all species determined to exist in the proposed area and how their habitats will be impacted.	Training and testing activities within this Supplemental EIS/OEIS are proposed to occur at sea and on FDM. Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2 in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) present the current and proposed training and testing activities. The 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS analyzed land-based activities on Guam, Saipan, Tinian, and Rota; the Navy did not reanalyze land-based activities in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS

	Comment	Navy Response
	• According to the MITT-FEIS, the plant communities at Finegayan are limestone forests, coconut forests, and disturbed/weed community. Local coconut resources are dwindling due to the presence of invasive species. Does the firing range and its proposed surface danger zone further negatively impact the presence and propagation of our coconut trees or any other endemic or native plants and trees? • There is insufficient information in the MITT-EIS regarding flood hazards and floodplain values. Please consult with proper agents to make a further determination. • Erosion purported to be similar to that of normal wave actions during stormy conditions. Erosion due to natural occurrences can and should not be compared to erosion that is caused by human activity; furthermore, efforts to mitigate naturally-occurring erosion suggest that even natural erosion can have a lasting, damaging effect on the environment. I believe that the comparison of this man-made erosion to natural, environmental causes is not in accordance with scientific fact and should be further studied and evaluated. • Accretion of inorganic matter is inevitable with the pollution that will occur when munitions are fired over and into the ocean; furthermore, the amount of inorganic matter that will be polluting the area will lead to the accretion of organic matter in an abundance not conducive to the survival of the ecosystem. There is insufficient information in the • Danger zone extends over important fishing and diving areas and will have an effect on tourists and residents as recognized by the Joint Guam Program Office. How often will these activities restrict access, and what is the economic impact of this loss of recreational activities in the area? • There are already many areas that have been restricted by the U.S. government from landowners for recreational, personal, and/ or business use. Is private land and their usefulness being	because there are no changes proposed to those land-based activities. Land-based training will continue to be conducted in accordance with the terms and conditions specified in the 2015 Biological Opinion (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2015). The firing range and Surface Danger Zone is not part of the MITT Supplemental EIS/OEIS Proposed Action, and therefore comments on the Surface Danger Zone are beyond the scope of the MITT Supplemental EIS/OEIS.

	Comment	Navy Response
	considered for increased land acquisition for training purposes that primarily benefit the US military? • The MITT-FEIS lacks information on the impacts to affected property owners. A public hearing should be conducted with any/ all private property owners in attendance whose properties may be affected by the expansion of the danger zone. • Concerns regarding water supply are general to those of increased construction activities. There is already concern over the dwindling fresh water supply on island and its availability to residents. Does the expansion of the Surface Danger Zone involve increased construction activities that will have an adverse reaction to our water supply? • Existing documents do not provide a specific timeline for proposed activities and frequency of use of the area -this information is vital to the impediment on the local and visiting fishing and diving communities. I am also interested to know if any activity has already commenced in this area, and if so, I would like to know under what authority these activities may have been granted permission for use. Existing documents also do not explain the need for the SDZ to expand out to 2.36 nautical miles over the ocean. Is this the standard for small arms fire? Will there be weapons used at the firing range that have a farther range than the current weapons that are used there? What are the weapons that will be used at the Finegayan range? I remain cautious and concerned that the MITT EIS/OEIS documents which consist of almost 1,500 pages contains either insufficient information or information that is inconsistent with the 2015 MITT EIS as well as the findings produced by other sources, including local government officials.	

	Comment	Navy Response
Cristian "CJ" Cayanan, Guam Department of Agriculture's Division of Aquatic and Wildlife Resources (DAWR)		
DAWR-01	Green sea turtles in the Study Area have been uplisted to endangered as of 2016. See attached file. [The commenter's "attached file" was an excerpt from the Federal Register, of which the first page is shown below.]	The Central West Pacific DPS and the Central South Pacific DPS are both listed as endangered. The Central North Pacific DPS and East Indian-West Pacific DPS are listed as threatened. The Navy has added clarifications to the Final Supplemental to ensure that the listing status for DPS that may occur within the Study Area are clear to the reader (Section 3.5, Sea Turtles).
Senator Sabina Flores Perez, Office of Senator Sabina Flores Perez (OSP), 35th Guam Legislature		
OSP-01	I strongly urge that all Marianas Islands Testing and Training activities be halted for the multiple reasons outlined below: 1) The U.S. military has not sufficiently determined the cumulative effects of all undertakings since the military's presence began on Guam. a) Cumulative effects include past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions. The U.S. military has a long list of undertakings and activities before and after the U.S. Pacific Re-alignment Plan was initiated. With respect to the 2015 MITT, local regulatory agencies and other stakeholders have not been publicly informed of the impacts (2019 Guam EPA MITT SEIS comments). "**For marine mammals, sea turtles, and marine invertebrates Alternatives 1 or 2 would contribute to and increase cumulative impacts, but the relative contribution would be negligible compared to other non-Navy actions.** Cumulative effects on socioeconomic resources may have short-term impacts on accessibility to public services, fishing sites, and tourism resources, but they are not expected to have long-term negative impacts on these resources or the economy of Guam and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. No new information or	The Navy used the best available science and conducted a comprehensive review of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable actions to develop a robust analysis of cumulative impacts (Chapter 4, Cumulative Impacts). As required under NEPA, the level and scope of the analysis are commensurate with the potential impacts of the action as reflected in the resource-specific discussions in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences). The Navy considered proposed and ongoing activities alongside with other activities in the region whose impacts are truly meaningful to the analysis. Furthermore, the entire Supplemental EIS/OEIS provides the cumulative impacts analysis, not just Chapter 4. Chapter 3 provides the current effects of past and present impacts and environmental conditions that represent the baseline of the environment as it is; Chapter 3 also discusses the consequences or potential future impacts from Navy activities. Chapter 4 discusses other reasonably foreseeable activities to the extent they are known and the incremental impact of the Navy's proposal when added to past, present, and future impacts. Considering that minimal or no impacts from training and testing are anticipated on multiple marine resources that directly or indirectly affect marine mammals, sea turtles, and marine invertebrates, the contribution from Navy training and testing activities to cumulative impacts on marine animals is expected to be negligible. In addition, the Navy is consulting with NMFS under the ESA for potential effects (including cumulative

	Comment	Navy Response
	circumstances are significant enough to warrant further cumulative impact review." (Draft EIS, Volume 1, 2019) • What is the basis of the section in bold above? • The information provided is inadequate, and fails to provide the public with crucial information necessary to make informed comments.	effects) on marine mammals, sea turtles, and coral and received a Biological Opinion. Mitigation measures and monitoring requirements specified in the Biological Opinion are presented in Chapter 5 (Mitigation).
OSP-02	b) Cumulative effects are the total effects, both direct and indirect, on a given resource, ecosystem, and human community of all actions. In the MITT SEIS, cumulative impacts of the following indirect effects have not been assessed. 3.7.2.3 Secondary Stressors "Stressors from Navy training and testing activities could pose secondary or indirect impacts on marine vegetation via habitat, sediment, or water quality. Potential impacts on marine vegetation exposed to secondary stressors could occur indirectly through sediments and water quality. Components of these stressors that could pose indirect impacts include (1) explosives and byproducts; (2) metals; (3) chemicals; and (4) other materials such as targets, chaff, and plastics." 3.4.2.1.1.6 Stranding "Sonar use during exercises involving the U.S. Navy has been identified as a contributing cause or factor in five specific mass stranding events: Greece in 1996; the Bahamas in March 2000; Madeira Island, Portugal in 2000; the Canary Islands in 2002, and	The general threats on marine mammals described in Section 3.4.1.7 (General Threats) all contribute to some degree to cumulative impacts on marine mammals. The magnitude of each contribution is dependent on multiple wide-ranging factors including, but not limited to, the species and its vulnerabilities, the species population or stock, the location of the population (e.g., nearshore vs. offshore or Atlantic vs. Pacific ocean), fishing co-occurrence, abundance of prey, health of predator populations, adaptability to habitat or climate changes. The purpose of the section is to make the reader aware of the various stressors or threats that marine mammals encounter worldwide and to put Navy training and testing activities and associated stressors in context.

	Comment	Navy Response
	Spain in 2006 (Cox et al., 2006; Fernandez, 2006; U.S. Department of the Navy, 2017c). These five mass strandings resulted in about 40 known cetacean deaths consisting mostly of beaked whales and with close linkages to mid- frequency active sonar activity. In these circumstances, exposure to non-impulsive acoustic energy was considered a possible indirect cause of death of the marine mammals (Cox et al., 2006). Strandings of other marine mammal species have not been as closely linked to sonar exposure, but rather, have typically been attributed to natural or other anthropogenic factors." 3.4.1.7 General Threats "Marine mammal populations can be influenced by various natural factors as well as human activities. There can be direct effects from disease, hunting, and whale watching, or indirect effects such as through reduced prey availability or lowered reproductive success of individuals. Research presented in Twiss and Reeves (1999) and National Marine Fisheries Service (2011a, 2011b, 2011c, 2011d) provides a general discussion of marine mammal conservation and the threats they face. As detailed in National Marine Fisheries Service (2011e), investigations of stranded marine mammals are undertaken to monitor threats to marine mammals (Simeone et al., 2015). Investigations into the cause of death for stranded animals can also provide indications of the general threats to marine mammals in a given location (Bradford & Forney, 2017; Carretta et al., 2017b;	

	Comment	Navy Response
	Helker et al., 2017). The causes for strandings include infectious disease, parasite infestation, climate change reducing prey availability and leading to starvation, pollution exposure, trauma (e.g., injuries from ship strikes or fishery entanglements), sound (human-generated or natural), harmful algal blooms and associated biotoxins, tectonic events such as underwater earthquakes, and ingestion of or interaction with marine debris (for more information see NMFS Marine Mammal Stranding Response Fact Sheet (National Marine Fisheries Service, 2016d). Since 1963, Guam Department of Agriculture Division of Aquatic and Wildlife Resources has conducted aerial surveys twice every month (weather permitting) of the coastal margin around Guam at a distance of approximately 200–300 meters (m) offshore of the outer reef margin (Martin et al., 2016). Therefore, the Navy assumes any animals stranded on Guam are likely to have been identified; see also Mobley (2007). For a general discussion of strandings and their causes as well as strandings in association with U.S. Navy activity, see the technical report titled Strandings Associated with U.S. Navy Activity (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2017c)." G.6.3 Long-Term Consequences to the Individual and Population "Long-term consequences of secondary stressors on an individual or population are often difficult to determine. Once a primary impact is identified, the severity of that impact helps to determine the	

	Comment	Navy Response
	temporal scale at which the secondary stressor can be measured. For most marine resources, the abundance of prey species near a detonation point would be diminished for a short period (weeks to months) before being repopulated by animals from adjacent waters. In some extreme cases, recovery of the habitat or prey resources could occur over a relatively long time- frame (months to years). It is important to note that indirect impacts often differ among resources, spatial, and temporal scales." • Cumulative impacts are not being considered. These effects must be assessed and shared with the public, so the community can have an opportunity to provide meaningful and informed input on the SEIS. An assessment of cumulative effects should include military-induced and natural or other anthropogenic factors.	
OSP-03	c) Cumulative effects need to be analyzed in terms of the resource, as environmental effects are often evaluated only from the perspective of the proposed action. Analyzing cumulative effects thus requires focusing on the resource, ecosystem, and human community and understanding how the resource is susceptible to effects.	See above responses OSP-01 and OSP-02 (to Senator Sabina Flores Perez) regarding cumulative effects.
OSP-04	d) Cumulative effects are rarely aligned with political and administrative boundaries. Cumulative effects of migratory animals, spawning events of fishes and other marine species, fishing practices need to be assessed from a transboundary and Mariana Island archipelago perspective. The cumulative effects on the distribution of nutrients via upwellings and major ocean currents, atmospheric	See above responses OSP-01 and OSP-02 (to Senator Sabina Flores Perez) regarding cumulative effects.

	Comment	Navy Response
	deposition and oceanic distribution of pollutants has not been determined.	
OSP-05	a) Significant adverse impacts may result from accumulation of similar effects, or the synergistic interaction of different effects. The following needs to be addressed: • Are the changes in the use of sonar in combination with increased use of explosives causing additive or synergistic effects? • Specifically, how is the military dealing with the use of midfrequency active sonar (MFAS) and the stranding's of Cuvier's Beaked Whales, which occur after MFAS use? • How is the current use of MFAS in training, impacting migratory or local populations of beaked whales?	Information about the quantitative analysis is described in detail in the 2018 technical report titled *Quantifying Acoustic Impacts on Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles: Methods and Analytical Approach for Phase III Training and Testing*. The Navy's acoustic and explosive effects analysis looks at multiple factors such as marine mammal abundance across the study area in each season, the levels of sound that may cause certain effects, and the Navy's proposed time and space use of noise producing activities. As discussed in Sections 3.4.2.1 (Acoustic Stressors) and 3.4.2.2 (Explosive Stressors), a few instances of takes per year do not constitute long-term consequences for individuals. Stranding of marine mammals due to proposed activities is very unlikely. The Center for Naval Analysis (CNA) recently conducted a statistical study of correlation of beaked whale strandings around the Mariana Islands with the use of U.S. Navy sonar, finding that insufficient evidence of a correlation exists. The CNA study used the complete record of all U.S. Navy sonar use between 2007 and 2019, including major training events, joint exercises, and unit level training/testing. The analysis also included the complete beaked whale stranding record for the Mariana Islands through 2019. Following the methods in Simonis et al. (2020), the CNA analysis found insufficient evidence of a correlation between sonar use and beaked whale strandings when considering the complete sonar use record. The CNA finding is in contrast to the finding in Simonis et al. (2020), which depicted a significant correlation between beaked whale strandings and Navy sonar use. However, the Simonis et al. (2020) result relied on substantially incomplete or inaccurate assumptions about U.S. Navy sonar use around the Mariana Islands. CNA also conducted statistical analyses specific to each island where beaked whale strandings have been observed in the Mariana Islands, similarly finding insufficient evidence of a correlation to sonar use. Additional information on the findings of the CNA

	Comment	Navy Response
		analysis are presented in Section 3.4.2.1.1.6 (Stranding) in Chapter 3.4 (Marine Mammals). Information about the quantitative analysis is described in detail in the 2018 technical report titled Quantifying Acoustic Impacts on Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles: Methods and Analytical Approach for Phase III Training and Testing. The Navy's acoustic and explosive effects analysis looks at multiple factors such as marine mammal abundance across the study area in each season, the levels of sound that may cause certain effects, and the Navy's proposed time and space use of noise producing activities. As discussed in Sections 3.4.2.1 (Acoustic Stressors) and 3.4.2.2 (Explosive Stressors), a few instances of takes per year do not constitute long-term consequences for individuals. Stranding of marine mammals due to proposed activities is very unlikely. The Navy is committed to protecting marine life by implementing mitigation measures when training or testing using active sonar or explosives; working with regulatory agencies; and furthering our understanding of marine mammals through research and monitoring. Section 3.4.2.1.1.6 (Stranding) further discusses the best available information about strandings of beaked whales in the Mariana Islands and the Navy's support of efforts to better understand the causes of marine mammal strandings. Section 3.0.1.1.1 (Marine Species Monitoring and Research Programs) provides an overview of U.S. Navy-supported research on marine species. These programs support coordinated science, technology, research, and development focused on understanding the effects of sound on marine mammals, including physiological, behavioral, ecological, and population-level impacts. Additional information on these programs and other ocean resources-oriented initiatives can be found at the Department of the Navy's Energy, Environment, and Climate Change website (https://navysustainability.dodlive.mil).

	Comment	Navy Response
		The Navy's analysis of impacts on beaked whales took into account their greater sensitivity to disturbance relative to other marine mammals, as demonstrated by the data used to develop the behavioral response criteria for beaked whales [see the technical report titled Criteria and Thresholds for U.S. Navy Acoustic and Explosive Effects Analysis (Phase III) available at https://mitt-eis.com]. Impacts to beaked whales due to sonar are described in Section 3.4.2.1.2.3 (Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers under the Action Alternatives). No long-term consequences to any beaked whale species are expected. As described in Section 5.1.2.2.1 (Marine Species Research and Monitoring Programs), for this Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy agreed to several additional research and monitoring initiatives designed to help advance the understanding of beaked whales and strandings in the MITT Study Area. The Navy will co-fund the Pacific Marine Assessment Program for Protected Species (PACMAPPS) Mariana Islands survey in spring-summer 2021 and future studies starting in 2022 to help document beaked whale occurrence, abundance, and distribution in the Mariana Islands. The Navy will also fund additional stranding response and necropsy analyses for the Pacific Islands region, and research on a framework to improve statistical stranding analysis. Collaboratively with NMFS, the Navy will fund and organize an expert panel to provide recommendations on scientific data gaps and uncertainties for further protective measure consideration to minimize potential impacts of Navy training and testing activities on beaked whales in the Mariana Islands.
OSP-06	e) There may be adverse impacts that last beyond the life of the proposed action that causes the effects. The SEIS needs to study and incorporate these impacts, and share such information, so the public can provide informed input. f) There must be included analyses of the capacity of each affected resource, ecosystem, and human community to	See above responses OSP-01 and OSP-02 (Senator Sabina Flores Perez) regarding cumulative effects.

	Comment	Navy Response
	accommodate additional effects, based on the resource's own time and space parameters. The most effective approach to conducting a cumulative analysis focuses on what is needed to ensure long-term productivity and sustainability of the resource.	
OSP-07	2) Mitigations are not sufficient for current and proposed MITT activities. b) "Two factors are considered when quantifying the effectiveness of mitigation: (1) the extent to which the type of mitigation proposed for a sound-producing activity (e.g., gunnery exercise) allows for observation of the mitigation zone prior to and during the activity; and (2) the sightability of each species that may be present in the mitigation zone, which is determined by species-specific characteristics and the viewing platform." (SEIS 3.1.1.2.4.1) • What types of observations methods are used? • Is it sensitive enough to engage mitigation procedures?	The Navy would implement procedural mitigation measures to avoid or reduce potential impacts on marine species wherever and whenever applicable acoustic, explosive, and physical disturbance and strike stressors are used in the Study Area. Procedural mitigation measures generally involve (1) the use of one or more trained Lookouts to observe for specific biological resources within a mitigation zone, (2) requirements for Lookouts to immediately communicate sightings of specific biological resources to the appropriate watch station for information dissemination, and (3) requirements for the watch station to implement mitigation until a pre-activity commencement or during-activity recommencement condition has been met. Procedural mitigation measures primarily involve Lookouts observing for marine mammals and sea turtles. For some activities, Lookouts may also be required to observe for additional biological resources, such as ESA-listed fish species or jellyfish aggregations that can be an indicator of potential sea turtle presence. To consider the benefits of procedural mitigation measures on marine mammals and sea turtles within the MMPA and ESA impact estimates, the Navy conservatively factored mitigation effectiveness into its quantitative analysis process, as described in the technical report titled *Quantifying Acoustic Impacts on Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles: Methods and Analytical Approach for Phase III Training and Testing*.
OSP-08	c) The Biological Opinions submitted in 2015 should be reassessed to offer sufficient mitigation options considering the addition of high-energy laser use in the current supplemental EIS.	The Navy has used and analyzed the potential impacts of high-energy lasers in other Study Areas in the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. It is highly improbable that the use of high-energy lasers would strike a marine mammal. As described in Section 3.4.2.3 (Energy Stressors), impacts on marine mammals from high-energy lasers are not expected to occur given

	Comment	Navy Response
	"The 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS covered the use of low-energy lasers in Section 3.0.5.2.2.3 (Lasers), but high-energy laser weapons were not part of the Proposed Action in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. The use of high-energy lasers represents a new sub-stressor as part of an existing activity in this SEIS/OEIS. As discussed in this SEIS/OEIS, Section 3.0.4.3.2.2 (High-Energy Lasers), high-energy lasers are designed to disable surface targets, rendering them immobile. The primary concern is the potential for a marine mammal to be struck with the laser beam at or near the water's surface, where extended exposure could result in injury or death." (Draft EIS, Volume 2, 2019) • Are High-Energy Lasers a new technology used by the U.S. Military? • In which other training locations have High-Energy Lasers been used? • What impacts and concerns have resulted from the use of High-Energy Lasers? • What mitigation standards or procedures are offered for the use of High-Energy Lasers? • What current and future cumulative effects will the use of High-Energy Lasers have on marine, terrestrial, and atmospheric conditions of the archipelago, both in part and as a whole? Such effects should also include consideration of the use of High- Energy Lasers in conjunction with other technologically advanced weapon systems.	the short ranges involved in the activities involving high-energy lasers, the aim point being a surface target, the inherent precision of the weapon and its targeting system, the very limited depth to which energy can penetrate the water's surface, and the fact that marine mammals spend up to 90 percent of their time underwater. The Navy follows all standard operating procedures for safely operating high-energy lasers for public health and safety; however, due to the highly improbable chance for interactions with marine mammals, mitigation measures for this activity are not warranted. The Navy is consulting with NMFS under the ESA for potential effects on ESA listed species. Mitigation measures and monitoring requirements for endangered species are presented in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Any additional measures required by the ESA Biological Opinion will be reflected in the Record of Decision.
OSP-09	d) Studying the effects of marine mammals and sea turtles in situ introduces impacts that influence the outcome of the studies. For instance, density determinations using intrusive technology such as sonar and other means could falsely lower density results. The SEIS should adjust its analyses to appropriately accommodate for this.	Active sonar is not used to conduct marine mammal surveys. The line transect surveys conducted by researchers are primarily visually based surveys (either by air or from a vessel) factoring in a correction for marine mammals that could not be seen because they were below the surface. In addition, some vessel-based marine mammal surveys use passive acoustic monitoring, which employs a hydrophone to listen for marine mammal

	Comment	Navy Response
		vocalizations. Using passive acoustic monitoring can detect the presence of a marine mammal when it is not at the surface, but no sound is emitted by the hydrophone. Density estimates require a substantial amount of sighting data collected from multiple systematic surveys. The results of surveys are reported in government reports and peer reviewed scientific publications to help validate their quality and accuracy and represent the best available scientific data for estimating densities.
OSP-10	3) Historic properties, including those on submerged lands and sunken ships, have not been fully identified and therefore effects have not been determined. Additionally, cumulative effects, as described on item #1, on historic properties, has not been determined. Current and proposed actions pertaining to multiple detonations, sonar, and other detailed and unlisted activities threaten the existence, and knowledge of the existence, of unidentified historic properties. The public deserves information about this potential destructive action, and should be afforded an opportunity to provide informed comment.	The Navy considered cultural resources within the Study Area and potential impacts on cultural resources associated with the proposed activities as documented in Section 3.11 (Cultural Resources) of the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS and the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. As described in Section 2.3.3 (Standard Operating Procedures), the Navy implements standard operating procedures that benefit cultural resources, such as conducting underwater detonation training only in designated locations away from popular dive sites, such as wrecks. Additionally, as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), the Navy implements mitigation within Seafloor Resource Mitigation Areas throughout the Study Area to avoid potential impacts on shipwrecks from explosive and physical disturbance and strike stressors.
OSP-11	4) Cumulative effects regarding public access to ancestral lands, traditional fishing grounds, native forests for the continued practice of traditional medicine, including lack of access due to marine preserves and military ecological preserves at Haputo and Orote peninsula, has not been determined. Given the absence of such information, the public has not been given an opportunity to provide informed input on a potentially destructive action.	Use of Haputo and Orote peninsula is not proposed in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Training and testing activities are proposed to occur at sea and on FDM within the Study Area. Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2 in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) present the current and proposed training and testing activities.
OSP-12	5) The fragmentation of the Programmatic Agreement process from the Record of Decision is a burden to the community. The process is confusing to a layperson, and has been inadequately explained to the public. Deadlines for document review and feedback are unreasonably short. It is disingenuous to claim to seek community involvement, but then burden the public with dense, lengthy technical documentation and a short comment period. The	The Navy is required to complete independent statutory obligations under both NEPA and NHPA. Thus, the Navy has prepared this Supplemental EIS/OEIS and is pursuing continued compliance with NHPA under the Section 106 process. The Navy recognizes the importance of public participation in the development of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS and exceeded requirements for providing public notification, project information, and the opportunity

	Comment	Navy Response
	feedback process should be extended further, considering the extreme length and significant impact of the MITT SEIS, and proper community outreach and education should be conducted to properly facilitate public input.	for the public to submit comments on the analysis. This Supplemental EIS/OEIS complies with NEPA, CEQ requirements, and Navy instructions for implementing NEPA. The MIRC Programmatic Agreement expired in December 2019. In anticipation of this, the Navy initiated a NHPA Section 106 consultation in January 2019 with an eye toward developing new updated Programmatic Agreements. The Navy has held five consultation meetings open to consulting and interested parties on Guam and eight throughout the CNMI. Additionally, site visits, and working group sessions with the SHPOs and the National Park Service have taken place. The Navy is required to comply with NHPA Section 106 to support its undertaking. A Programmatic Agreement is one of several methods of ensuring compliance under Section 106 but is most appropriate for undertakings that involve routine and redundant activities where a federal agency plans to resolve potential adverse effects to historic properties through avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation. An interim Programmatic Agreement for Guam that follows the exact terms of the 2009 MIRC Programmatic Agreement has been executed and is intended to "bridge" the expiration of the current Programmatic Agreement with the execution of the new Programmatic Agreement being developed.With regard to the CNMI, Cultural Resources staff at JRM have already taken action to conduct NHPA Section 106 consultation on individual training events following the expiration of the 2009 MIRC Programmatic Agreement to ensure compliance as the Navy continues the consultation process. The Navy acknowledges that the information presented in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS is by necessity very complex; however, the Navy attempts to explain challenging concepts, methods, and the results of the analysis as clearly as possible and developed public informational materials for lay audiences. The Navy prepared project brochures, videos, a website, and posters, using layperson terms to enhance public

	Comment	Navy Response
		understanding of the information presented in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Based on the demographics of the CNMI, a project fact sheet was also translated into Chamorro. The informational materials, including the translated fact sheet, were made available at all four public meetings and on the project website www.mitt-eis.com. The Navy held four open house public meetings, one each on Tinian (Tinian Public Library, March 14, 2019), Rota (Mayor's Conference Hall, March 15, 2019), Saipan (Kanoa Resort, March 18, 2019), and Guam (University of Guam, March 19, 2019). The public meetings were an opportunity for the public to ask questions of Navy leadership, scientists, and other experts about the analysis documented in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Navy encouraged the public to attend these meetings and broadly notified the public through the media, including paid newspaper advertisements and news releases, and direct mail, including letters, postcards, and emails. A voice recorder was provided for any member of the public who wanted to provide an oral comment in a language other than English. The Navy has received feedback from attendees that the open-house format is more conducive to promoting public understanding and constructive dialogue. Open house meetings allow a greater number of individuals to directly engage and interact with Navy team members and ask questions about this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, as well as provide comments on the document. When planning the dates and locations for public meetings, the Navy considered cultural and religious holidays whenever possible. To better accommodate stakeholders and the public, the Navy provided 75 days to review and comment on the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, which is 30 days longer than the minimum required time for review. The Navy appreciates input received from local government agencies and communities on how it can improve public notification and outreach efforts.

	Comment	Navy Response
OSP-13	Author Manuscript attached to comment. HHS Public Access Author manuscript Otol Neurotol. Author manuscript; available in PMC 2017 September 01 Temporary and Permanent Noise-Induced Threshold Shifts: A Review of Basic and Clinical Observations	The Navy has reviewed and incorporated the best available science on the hearing sensitivity of marine species, which is more relevant to the analysis presented in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS than the submitted manuscript that reviewed basic and clinical observations on threshold shifts in humans.
Nathaniel Martin Guam Department of Agriculture/Fisheries (GDAF)		
GDAF-01	1) Have concerns about the closing of Fishing, recreation grounds - need to have notice (advanced), example W517, Communication has been made, but folks still not getting info in a timely manner, recommend using various resources to inform public, explore other types. 2) Need to keep Guam DOAg/Fisheries informed and given ample time to respond to Detonation activities in aquatic env., DOAg is required to document environmental impact during activities.	It is important to note that Galvez Bank and Santa Rosa Reef are not within W-517, and only a portion of White Tuna Banks is within W-517. The Navy does not restrict access to Galvez Bank or Santa Rosa Reef. Mariners near Galvez Bank or Santa Rosa Reef may be warned of their proximity to W-517 or asked not to enter W-517 as a precautionary measure. When certain activities are planned, the military publishes notices to mariners for public safety and to help water users plan accordingly to avoid temporarily restricted areas. As specified in Title 33 CFR Subpart 72.01, Notices to Mariners, the U.S. Coast Guard issues information to the public concerning maritime navigation. When notices to mariners are issued, the restriction is not necessarily for a full 24-hour period because many training activities last less than a full day. Additionally, nautical charts issued by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration include these federally designated zones and areas. Operators of recreational and commercial vessels have a duty to abide by maritime regulations administered by the U.S. Coast Guard. The Navy will continue to communicate closures to the public and fishing community, including using Facebook. As discussed in Section 5.1.2.2 (Monitoring, Research, and Reporting Initiatives), the Navy developed its reporting requirements in conjunction with NMFS to be consistent with mission requirements and balance the usefulness of the information to be collected with the practicality of collecting it. The Navy's training and testing activity reports and incident reports are designed to verify implementation of mitigation; comply with current permits, authorizations, and consultation requirements; and improve future environmental analyses. The Navy reports to NMFS if mitigation was implemented during sinking exercises (e.g., number of times explosive detonations were delayed due to marine mammal

	Comment	Navy Response
		sightings). For major training exercises, the Navy's annual training and testing activity reports include information on each individual marine mammal sighting related to mitigation implementation. In the unlikely event that a vessel strike of a marine mammal should occur, the Navy would provide NMFS with relevant information pertaining to the incident, including but not limited to vessel speed. Additional reporting would be ineffective for the reasons detailed in Section 5.6.7 (Reporting Requirements). The Navy is obligated under the ESA and MMPA to provide information on any incidents involving ESA-listed species. Therefore, the Navy will continue to submit the appropriate reports to NMFS immediately, or as soon as operational security considerations allow, if it observes an incident that is or may be attributable to Navy activities, including (1) a vessel strike of a marine mammal or sea turtle during training or testing; (2) a stranded, injured, or dead marine mammal or sea turtle during training or testing; or (3) an injured or dead marine mammal, sea turtle, or ESA-listed fish species during post-explosive activity monitoring.
Tyrone J. Taitano, Acting Director, Guam Bureau of Statistics and Plans, Government of Guam (BSP Guam)		
BSP Guam-01	Pursuant to the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (U.S. P.L. 92-583), as amended by U.S. P.L. 94-370, 15 CFR Part 930 (CZMA), federal activities that may have an effect on coastal uses or resources are subject to the federal consistency review process. The CZMA requires all proposed federal activities that could affect any land or water use in Guam, or any of Guam's natural resources to be submitted for review for consistency with the enforceable policies of Guam Coastal Management Program (GCMP) of the Bureau of Statistics and Plans (BSP). This letter is provided to you to assist in ensuring compliance with the federal consistency requirements of the CZMA for the proposed at-sea training and testing activities under the U.S. Navy: Press Release 19-012: Marianas Islands Training and Testing Draft SEIS/OEIS.	The Navy submitted a Consistency Determination (CD) to the Bureau of Statistics and Plans (BSP) in December 2019 addressing proposed military training and testing activities that may affect Guam's coastal zone and coastal uses. The consistency determination was prepared in accordance with Guam's Procedures Guide for Achieving Federal Consistency with the Guam Coastal Management Program (Bureau of Statistics and Plans May 2011). BSP's response to the Navy's CD (dated March 6, 2020) can be found in Appendix C (Agency Correspondence). The Navy is in discussions with BSP in order resolve any differences and reach an agreement regarding the Navy's compliance with Guam's Coastal Management Program to the maximum extent practicable. The outcome of these discussions will be included in the ROD.

	Comment	Navy Response
	Under the CZMA, the GCMP's purpose is to enhance and maintain the long-term productivity of the coastal environment while meeting the current and future needs of the residents of Guam and the United States. The GCMP is a networked agency program implementing Guam's policies to guide the use, protection, and development of land and ocean resources within Guam's coastal zone. Guam Executive Order 78-37 serves as the means of Coastal Management Program's inter- agency coordination with local authorities to carry out coastal zone management objectives and policies. The GCMP is responsible for conducting federal consistency reviews for federal agency activities, activities requiring a federal license or permit, federal assistance to local governments, and outer continental shelf exploration, development, and production activities. Under the CZMA, the entire island of Guam and all of its offshore islands and territorial waters constitute the coastal zone as specified in 15 CFR 930.l l (e), 16 U.S.C. 1453(1), and the Submerged Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1301 et seq.). Therefore, any federal activity that may affect land or water use, and is conducted in Guam and/or its included islands and waters, is subject to federal consistency review by the GCMP and its networked agencies. Under this approach, consistency review of a federal action is coordinated by the GCMP, which serves as the lead coastal agency, pursuant to Section 306(d) (6) of the CZM. For any federal agency proposing to conduct a subject activity in Guam, the first phase of the review process is intended to be initiated by the federal agency/entity itself, per Subpart C of the CZMA. Under Subpart C, the federal agency is required to be aware that its activity is subject to review; and then it must begin the process by contacting the GCMP and submitting an application and	The Navy has engaged with the Guam Coastal Management Program throughout the development of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, including meeting with staff during the scoping phase and notifying the program director when the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS was made available for public review and comment.

	Comment	Navy Response
	determination documents to the GCMP. The United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) is a "Federal agency" for the purposes of the CZMA (15 CFR § 930.l l (j)). Federal activities subject to review under Subpart C of the CZMA are any activities, use, or development projects which could foreseeably affect the coastal zone; its use, access, or natural resources, and which are performed by a federal agency, or are performed by a contractor who has been contracted to carry out work for a federal agency (15 CFR § 930.31). Whenever "a Federal agency makes a proposal for action initiating an activity or series of activities when coastal effects are reasonably foreseeable" the Federal agency must submit a federal consistency "determination" to BSP GCMP for review (15 CFR §§ 930.3 l (a) and 930.34(a)(l)). Specifically, any proposed rule or rule change that affects the use of a coastal zone is subject to federal consistency review under the CZMA. "'Federal agency activity' means any functions performed by or on behalf of a Federal agency in the exercise of its statutory responsibilities. The term 'Federal agency activity' includes a range of activities where a Federal agency makes a proposal for action initiating an activity or series of activities when coastal effects are reasonably foreseeable, e.g....a proposed rulemaking that alters uses of the coastal zone..." (15 CFR 930.3 l (a)). (Emphasis added). The GCMP understands that the supplement to the 2015 Final Mariana Islands Training and Testing Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS/OEIS) is currently undergoing Public Notice (See Federal Press Release, Permit File Number: 19-012 Issued February 04, 2019). The Proposed Action under the SEIS consist of conduct at-sea training and testing activities within the Study Area. These activities	

	Comment	Navy Response
	include the use of active sonar and explosives while employing marine species mitigation measures. The purpose of the Proposed Action, which remains the same as the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, is to maintain a ready force to ensure the military can accomplish its mission to maintain, train, and equip combat-ready forces. Federal agencies must submit one of the two types of "Determination" documents; either a "Consistency Determination" or a "Negative Determination" to the GCMP (15 CFR §§ 930.34 and 930.35). This submission is required even if the federal agency finds that the proposed federal activity would have no effect on Guam's coastal zone access, use, or resources; so long as the activity is a listed activity or is similar to activities for which consistency determinations have been prepared in the past. The CZMA requires notice to the public of the proposed activity. This public notice requirement is one of the core mandates of the CZMA. See 15 CFR §§ 930.2 and 930.42. It is intended to allow the residents of Guam to be aware of any federal activities which may affect their land and water access, use, or recreational activities in Guam. The public notice required under the CZMA is issued by the GCMP, and is distinct from the public notice requirement imposed on USACE pursuant to 33 CFR § 334.4(b). To date, the GCMP has not received a federal consistency application or any determination documents from The US Navy for the MITT. Currently, the GCMP has no record of any federal consistency coordination between the US Navy and the GCMP concerning this MITT proposal. Early coordination between the GCMP and any federal agency conducting a subject activity affecting Guam's coastal zone is one of the key requirements of the CZMA. Coordination between the federal agency and the GCMP should begin "at an early stage in the	

	Comment	Navy Response
	development of the proposed activity," (15 CFR § 930.36(a); and the application and determination documents should be submitted "at the earliest practicable time in the planning or reassessment of the activity," and "at least 90 days before final approval of the Federal agency activity" (15 CFR § 930.36(b)). The GCMP would like to invite the U S Navy to coordinate with the GCMP and submit a federal consistency application and determination documentation to the GCMP for the MITT proposal, in cooperation with the U.S. Navy. A federal consistency application and consistency documents must be submitted to the GCMP for review of this activity. "A consistency determination should be prepared following development of sufficient information to reasonably determine the consistency of the activity with the management program, but before the Federal agency reaches a significant point of decision-making in its review process, i.e., while the Federal agency has the ability to modify the activity" (15 CFR § 930.36(b)). Cognizant of the exemplary coordination and cooperation that the US Navy has continued to demonstrate. We would like to take this opportunity to thank you in advance for your collaboration and professionalism in supporting GCMP and our resource networked agencies in conducting our mandated federal consistency reviews for federal activities. I sincerely appreciate your assistance, and look forward to receiving the required federal consistency determination and supporting documents for review. Thank you for your cooperation and consideration. Si Yu'os Ma'ase'.	

	Comment	Navy Response
Miguel C. Bordallo, Guam Waterworks Authority (GWA)		
GWA-01	The Guam Waterworks Authority has reviewed the 2019 Draft Mariana Islands Training and Testing (MITT) Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement. The GWA has undertaken review of the proposed planned military activity to ensure protection of the Northern Guam Lens Aquifer and wastewater discharge into Guam's waters. Land based training located on Guam was covered under the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS under the existing Mariana Island Range Complex (MIRC). This Supplemental EIS/OEIS considers activities conducted at sea and on Farallon de Medinilla (FDM). This supplemental EIS/OEIS incorporated new models, information, data and science as required by the Council on Environmental Quality Regulations. However, there are no changes made to land based activities proposed on Guam. The proposed activities listed in this draft MITT Supplemental EIS/OEIS will not have an impact to the ability for GWA to provide safe drinking water to its customers and ensure that wastewater discharge is conducted in appropriate manner.	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.
Guam Department of Agriculture (DoAg), John C. Borja, Acting Chief *General Comments*		
DoAg-01	As the local state agency mandated to monitor and protect Guam's biological resources, the Guam Department of Agriculture (DoAg) submits the following general comments to be addressed in the Final MITT Environmental Impact Statement and Record of Decision. In addition, attached to this letter, are specific comments from the MITT DEIS/OEIS in a comment matrix format. 1. First and foremost, Department of Navy (DoN) needs to provide a progressive, comprehensive plan for the recovery of native species on Military property in consultation and coordination with	While outside the current scope of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the military satisfies Sikes Act obligations through the development and implementation of the Joint Region Marianas Integrated Natural Resource Management Plan (INRMP). The purpose of the INRMP is not to measure impacts of military training and testing activities, but to utilize adaptive management to maintain long-term ecosystem health and minimize impacts on natural resources consistent with the operational requirements of the DoD's mission. The 2019 Joint Region Marianas INRMP includes monitoring programs throughout the Mariana Islands. The Guam Department of Agriculture, Division of Aquatic and Wildlife Resources

	Comment	Navy Response
	DoAg. Without the ability to reintroduce federally endangered species on DOD property the cumulative impacts of DOD actions are jeopardizing the DoAg's ability to recover Guam's native species on Refuge Overlay lands. Furthermore, DOD's failure to coordinate with DoAg as required by the Sikes Act of 1960 [16 U.S.C. et seq.; 74 stat. 1052], as amended, and recognize the DoAg's ability to assist DOD in meeting their Section 7 requirements under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 [16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.: 87 Stat. 884], as amended, results in a waste of taxpayers' dollars. The DoAg further emphasizes the need to be consulted and notified in matters that may impact the natural resources of Guam. 2. Secondly, the Final EIS needs to outline how DON will address long-standing issues regarding timely access for the DoAg Division of Aquatic and Wildlife Resources (DAWR) staff to all DOD lands to monitor and manage Guam's natural resources. The DoAg-DAWR staff could complete monitoring of resources under annual federal funded grant objectives, without cost, or at a much lower cost to DoN that is currently being contracted and assist with meeting Sikes Act coordination obligations. The current access requirements for DoAg-DAWR staff are cumbersome and prevent timely coordination as opposed to those procedures for federal employees and contractors.	(Guam DAWR) is a signatory and participating member to the 2019 Joint Region Marianas INRMP, which details natural resource management and monitoring programs. The Navy will continue to improve coordination and collaboration with Guam DAWR as part of the INRMP project development and implementation.
DoAg-02	3. The Final MITT DEIS needs to address another long-standing issue that is DOD's failure to comply with local laws. The MITT activities and study area include the Piti Marine Preserve Area that extends to the 600-foot contour. Any take of non-pelagic fishes with in this area is a violation of Guam law.	The Navy's Piti Floating Mine Neutralization site is for floating (i.e., at the water surface) mine detonation training events and would not affect non-pelagic fish such as bottom-fish. As can be seen in NOAA nautical chart 81048 and Figure 2.2-1 in the MITT DEIS, water depth at this site is approximately 356 fathoms or 2,136 feet. Therefore, the Piti is outside of the Piti Marine Preserve Area.
DoAg-03	4. The Final MITT DEIS must mitigate the cumulative impacts to recreational fishing in the oceanic areas that will be impacted by the proposed action. Recreational fishing includes sustenance and small-scale commercial fishing. The NEPA documents for other	The Navy used the best available science and conducted a comprehensive review of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable actions to develop a robust analysis of cumulative impacts (Chapter 4, Cumulative Impacts). As required under NEPA, the level and scope of the analysis are

	Comment	Navy Response
	proposed military activities indicate the closure of important fishing areas such as Ritidian and Pati Point. The additional loss of key recreational fishing areas proposed in the Draft MITT EIA is unacceptable and irreplaceable.	commensurate with the potential impacts of the action as reflected in the resource-specific discussions in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences). The Navy considered proposed and ongoing activities alongside with other activities in the region whose impacts are truly meaningful to the analysis. Furthermore, the entire Supplemental EIS/OEIS provides the cumulative impacts analysis, not just Chapter 4. Chapter 3 provides the current effects of past and present impacts and environmental conditions that represent the baseline of the environment as it is; Chapter 3 also discusses the consequences or potential future impacts from Navy activities. Chapter 4 discusses other reasonably foreseeable activities, including Department of Defense activities in the Marianas regions, to the extent they are known and the incremental impact of the Navy's proposal when added to past, present, and future impacts. The Navy used the best available data to analyze the potential effects of the Proposed Action on commercial and recreational fishing in Section 3.12 (Socioeconomic Resources and Environmental Justice). The Navy is not proposing a change to any restricted ocean areas currently used by the Navy since the 2010 MIRC Final EIS/OEIS (Section 2.1.1, MIRC Overview) and the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (Section 2.1.1, Mariana Islands Range Complex). In this Supplemental EIS/OEIS there are no new restrictions to public access of fishing areas and the Navy is not proposing to close any additional fishing areas. The Navy is committed to continuing to work with the local community on issues that potentially affect the public, including access to fishing sites.
DoAg-04	5. Other boaters, including divers and other recreational users, also frequent many areas within the MITT study area. There is no clear indication of how extensive closures will be - do events last for an hour, or a day, or a week? The Final EIS and ROD need to minimize closure of areas regularly used by recreational boaters and fishers and identify clearly the space and time of the closures.	The Navy is committed to continuing to work with the local community on issues that potentially affect the public, including access to fishing sites while ensuring public safety at all times. The military actively promotes compatible use of ocean areas by minimizing public access restrictions and limiting the extent and duration of necessary closures. To clarify information presented in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, range access would not always be restricted when a range is in use; therefore, no

	Comment	Navy Response
	6. When notices to mariners is sent out, DOD should insure that notices are sent out to all media source outlets, to inform the public of Surface-Danger -Zone activities as the actions are implemented. 7. Prior to training exercises, the DoN and USCG issue NOTMARs and NOTAMs to announce an exercise and to notify the public of potential hazards in the exercise area. DoN must ensure these notices are adequately distributed to the public and with a much larger area proposed in the MITT distribution must be assessed for adequacy.	change has been made to the document. Range access is dependent on the nature and type of activity being conducted. The Navy does not propose a change to the ocean areas currently used by both the Navy and the public. Restrictions on accessing areas of co-use would continue to be infrequent and short-term, while other fishing sites in the Study Area would continue to be available to the public. The Navy recognizes that limited or no access to productive fishing areas would impact fishers. While the analysis concludes that impacts could occur, the Navy does not anticipate significant impacts on commercial and recreational fishing in the Study Area, as described in both this Supplemental EIS/OEIS and the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, given the availability of other fishing areas in the CNMI. Various means are used to communicate information to the public about areas restricted to public or commercial activities and are described in Section 3.13 (Public Health and Safety). As specified in Title 33 CFR Subpart 72.01, Notices to Mariners, the U.S. Coast Guard issues information to the public concerning maritime navigation. When notices to mariners are issued, the restriction is not necessarily for a full 24-hour period because many training activities last less than a full day. Additionally, nautical charts issued by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration include these federally designated zones and areas. Operators of recreational and commercial vessels have a duty to abide by maritime regulations administered by the U.S. Coast Guard. The Navy will continue to communicate closures to the public and fishing community, including using a public Facebook page.
DoAg-08	8. The ROD must clearly indicate how the Micronesia Biosecurity Plan will be implemented, including funding mechanisms, to prevent the spread of invasive alien species (IAS) throughout the region. For example, 100% inspection rates for brown tree-snake (BTS) at ports of exit from Guam and entry points to other regional areas are necessary to ensure BTS does not impact bird, bat and lizard populations on other	The U.S. Navy recognizes the importance of biosecurity, ecological integrity, and resiliency of island ecosystems to the potential introduction of invasive species to the Mariana Islands associated with military training and testing. The Navy has a number of policies in place to prevent, interdict, and control invasive species introductions in both terrestrial and marine environments. Specific federal and Navy policies for marine

	Comment	Navy Response
	islands. These populations are necessary for the recovery of Guam's native ecosystem. 9. Although there are currently BTS inspections of cargo and vessels from Guam, there is a potential for the system to be overwhelmed by the increase in tempo of activities. The MITT DEIS also needs to be mindful of other IAS that Guam could infect CNMI with that would be devastating to endangered wildlife and Its habitats, i.e., little fire ant and coconut rhinoceros beetle.	invasive species can be found at: Public Law 104-332, National Invasive Species Act of 1996; Executive Order 13112 (Invasive Species) and amended by Executive Order 13751 (Safeguarding the Nation from the Impacts of Invasive Species; and OPNAVINST 5090.1E Chapter 35-3.19. (Ship and Ballast Water), 5090.1E Chapter 35-3.1 (Environmentally Sound Ships), and 5090.1E Chapter 12-3.9 (Invasive Species). The Navy currently operates under the recommendations of the 2015 Regional Biosecurity Plan for Micronesia and Hawaii. The DoD-specific recommendations are part of the plan. Recommendations in the plan are currently being updated. As part of the INRMP, the Navy will implement marine management recommendations identified in the biosecurity plan for Micronesia and Hawaii.
DoAg-10	10. Consistent monitoring of behavior and distribution of Mariana fruit bat/island swiftlet/common moorhen/megapode (and other terrestrial species of regional concern) must be conducted prior to and after MITT related activities in-order-to evaluate the impact of activities, particularly on species of greatest conservation need. Appropriate measures must be incorporated to reduce impacts to terrestrial species, as well as measures to avoid impacting species that aggregate when feeding in open water ocean. Impacts to aggregations of individuals in the expanded areas of MITT activities may impact species on a population level.	The Navy is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities. Both this Supplemental EIS/OEIS and the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS Section 3.6 (Birds) address potential impacts on seabirds that nest and visit FDM. Section 3.10 (Terrestrial Species and Habitats) addresses wildlife and plant communities and ESA-listed species known to occur on the island (Micronesian megapodes and Mariana fruit bats). In addition, the 2019 Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan (INRMP) includes additional information on biological resources on FDM and nearshore waters surrounding waters of the island. In 2015, the Navy and USFWS completed consultation for potential impacts of military training activities on FDM. The 2015 Biological Opinion determined that these activities would adversely affect ESA-listed species on FDM, and included non-discretionary measures to reduce the effect of take resulting from training activities. Activities analyzed in the Navy's Supplemental EIS/OEIS do not warrant reinitiation of Section 7(a)(2) consultation with USFWS, and the measures agreed to between the Navy and USFWS in 2015 are carried forward in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS.

	Comment	Navy Response
DoAg-11	11. The assessment of potential effects to marine animals and habitat from underwater detonations needs more clarification and analysis. Habitat mapping needs to be more detailed, the Cetacean species that utilize the area proposed for the MITT need to be identified, as well as the impacts such activity will have on these species. The analysis also needs to include the impacts to sea turtles. The presence of ESA-listed sperm whales is well documented within three to five miles offshore in the Agat area. Effects to this species and the mitigation for these actions are not addressed in the MITT DEIS. The increased boat activity greatly increases the potential for boat strike of sperm whales. Navy lookouts undergo extensive training in order to qualify as a watch stander. It seems the use of these watch standers been how successful & should be measured.	Recognizing the importance of the Mariana Islands to marine mammals, the Navy has proposed three geographic mitigation areas in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Appendix I (Geographic Mitigation Assessment) includes information about areas considered and evaluated to be potential mitigation areas. Each area was assessed based on two criteria: (1) is the area a key area of biological importance for one or more marine mammal species or sea turtle species for an important life process, and (2) would the mitigation result in an avoidance or reduction of impacts. In addition, implementation of the area as a mitigation area must be practical and allow the Navy to carry out its mission requirements. The Navy used the best available scientific data on vulnerable or sensitive species, such as humpback whales, to identify the three proposed geographic mitigation areas that met the two criteria. Updates to the appendix have been made in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS based on the Navy's ESA and MMPA consultations with NMFS. In addition, the Navy developed its reporting requirements in conjunction with NMFS as discussed in Section 5.1.2.2 (Monitoring, Research, and Reporting Initiatives). Section 3.4.1.31.2 (Geographic Range and Distribution) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS provides details on sperm whale sitings. Section 5.3.4.1 (Vessel Movement) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS provides procedural measures to avoid or reduce the potential for vessel strikes of marine mammals and sea turtles. It is important to note that, within the Study Area, the Navy has sponsored several monitoring projects to better understand marine mammal and sea turtle distribution and habitat use, and to assess the presence of corals and ESA-listed species at FDM. Additional information is available on the U.S. Navy Marine Species Monitoring Program website (https://www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/). The Navy will also continue to support marine mammal surveys in waters surrounding Guam and the CNMI to better quantify the abundance and distribution of marine

	Comment	Navy Response
		mammals and to increase scientific understanding of marine mammal behavior in the Study Area. Future monitoring efforts would be coordinated with NMFS. In the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy took a hard look at the potential impacts of the Proposed Action on marine mammals and sea turtles using the best available science. The Navy's quantitative analysis process for analyzing impacts from active sonar and explosives has been reviewed by external scientists and approved by NMFS. The Navy also worked collaboratively with NMFS to develop mitigation measures using input from military operators, the best available science, predicted activity impact footprints, and marine species monitoring and density data.
DoAg-12	10. DoAg is concerned about the impact of landing craft exercises on the dolphins that reside in Agat Bay. The DoN contended unavoidable impacts. The Navy recognizes the common occurrence of spinner dolphins within Agat Bay and has developed mitigation measures in consultation with NMFS under provisions of the MMPA. Beachmasters are shore-based observers with binoculars whose sole purpose is to ensure safety of craft including avoidance of marine and terrestrial animals. Beachmasters were to work with environmental monitors and the natural resource managers. These measures have been utilized - how successful have they been and how has that success been measured?	The Navy has not conducted any type of approved beach landings in Agat Bay. However, there are Navy activities that are conducted in the water and have been analyzed in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Section 5.4.2 (Mitigation Areas for Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles) addresses spinner dolphins and the Agat Bay Nearshore Mitigation Area.
DoAg-13	11. The MITT DEIS must address impacts to the existing community of resource users and the need to mitigate economic impacts by avoiding near shore populations and their habitats. The training activities themselves present additional challenges that may alter the landscape far beyond the closure period. The potential loss of marine life, whether through injury, mortality or simply scaring them out of the area, presents significant economic issues for tour operators who rely on a healthy population of marine animals for their tours. The underwater detonations, for example, could lead to the relocation of Agat Bay's resident dolphin pod, disrupting the	The Navy understands that fishing and tourism is an important socioeconomic and cultural resource for the people of the CNMI and will continue to work with the fishing community. The Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS has been updated to include tourism and transit activities within the Study Area. The Navy is not proposing a change to the ocean areas currently used by both the Navy and the public in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Restrictions on accessing areas of co-use would continue to be relatively infrequent

	Comment	Navy Response
	dolphin-watch boats and other tours. The Navy recognizes the common occurrence of spinner dolphins within Agat Bay and has developed mitigation measures in consultation with NMFS under provisions of the MMPA, however more effort needs to be made to minimize impacts through avoidance and relocation of activities to areas of less impact.	and short term, while other fishing and tourism sites in the Study Area would continue to be available to the public. The analysis indicates there are no mortalities expected and there have been none from Navy activities having been conducted in the past. As discussed in the EIS/OEIS, there are no impacts that would impact populations of marine mammals and therefore no impacts to tour operators who rely on a healthy population of marine animals for their tours. With regard to the nearshore areas of Agat Bay, explosives are not used in shallow water areas where spinners have historically been viewed by whale watch vessels.
DoAg-14	12. It is probable that sea turtles would be affected by landing-craft training activities. The Navy agreed that landing craft training activities could potentially affect sea turtles within the MIRC. The Navy consulted with NMFS and USFWS Pacific Islands Field Office under provisions of Section 7 of the ESA to avoid, minimize and offset potential impacts associated with MIRC training on sea turtle nesting activity and activity in near shore and open ocean marine environments. How have these activities impacted sea turtles? What measures would be used to protect sea turtles in MITT. The use of LCACs and other equipment on sandy beaches can negatively impact sea turtle nesting and hatching success. Consultation with the local resource agency in addition to the Navy surveys can help avoid possible interactions.	The Navy is not proposing to change land-based activities, except at FDM. There would be no increase in the use of beaches under the Proposed Action. Table 2.5-1 of the MITT Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS has been updated to reflect that there would be no increase in amphibious assault training. The Navy is implementing conservation measures as required in the USFWS Pacific Islands Fish and Wildlife Office's 2015 Biological Opinion.
DoAg-15	13. The Final MITT DEIS must clarify impacts and identify necessary mitigation for fish mortality associated with soft bottom detonation operations in Apra Harbor. How have these activities in the MIRC impacted soft bottom habitat for species of ecological as well as fishery resource importance? Fish mortality associated with training activities within the MIRC are discussed in EIS, Section 3.9 (Fish and Essential Fish Habitat) but no mitigation is proposed to address this issue.	The Navy does not monitor for fish kills during underwater detonations; however, the Guam EPA is notified of all activities and is welcome to observe events.

	Comment	Navy Response
DoAg-16	DoAg requests more effort made to either find alternatives that will cause fewer impacts, or to provide environmental and compensatory mitigation to offset impacts to the open ocean and near shore marine environments and the species that inhabit them. The Final MITT DEIS should include (similar to the MIRC) a Range Monitoring Plan, reporting requirements, adaptive management, etc. Components of the monitoring and mitigation plans should be in cooperation with NMFS, USFWS and DoAg-DAWR. Monitoring and mitigation will be used both as: I) a planning tool to focus Navy monitoring priorities (pursuant to ESA/MMPA requirements) across Navy Range Complexes and Exercises; and 2) an adaptive management tool, through the consolidation and analysis of the Navy's monitoring and watch stander (lookout) data, as well as new information from other Navy programs (e.g., research and development), and newly published non-Navy information. Thank you for the opportunity and consideration of DoAg's comments on the Draft EIS. We look forward to reviewing a more complete analysis of impacts in the final EIS that clearly identifies and addresses the potential impacts associated with the MITT activities and includes viable options for avoidance and mitigation.	Based on the analysis presented in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS and use of best available data, additional monitoring or tagging is not required in order for the Navy to comply with NEPA. However, it is important to note that, within the Study Area, the Navy has sponsored several monitoring projects to better understand marine mammal and sea turtle distribution and habitat use. Additional information is available on the U.S. Navy Marine Species Monitoring Program website (https://www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/). The Navy will also continue to support marine mammal surveys in waters surrounding Guam and the CNMI to better quantify the abundance and distribution of marine mammals and to increase scientific understanding of marine mammal behavior in the Study Area. Future monitoring efforts would be coordinated with NMFS. In the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy took a hard look at the potential impacts of the Proposed Action on marine mammals and sea turtles using the best available science. The Navy's quantitative analysis process for analyzing impacts from active sonar and explosives has been reviewed by external scientists and approved by NMFS. The Navy also worked collaboratively with NMFS to develop mitigation measures using input from military operators, the best available science, predicted activity impact footprints, and marine species monitoring and density data. The NMFS Pacific Islands Regional Office and Science Center coordinates responses to marine mammal strandings through the National Marine Mammal Health and Stranding Response Program. The Navy does not anticipate that any marine mammal strandings would result from Navy activities in the Study Area. Since the inception of current monitoring protocols over a decade ago, no marine mammals have been reported distressed or injured in association with Navy training and testing activities. The Center for Naval Analysis (CNA) recently conducted a statistical study of correlation of beaked whale strandings around the Mariana Islands with the use of U.S. Navy sonar, finding that insufficient

	Comment	Navy Response
		evidence of a correlation exists. The CNA study used the complete record of all U.S. Navy sonar use between 2007 and 2019, including major training events, joint exercises, and unit level training/testing. The analysis also included the complete beaked whale stranding record for the Mariana Islands through 2019. Following the methods in Simonis et al. (2020), the CNA analysis found insufficient evidence of a correlation between sonar use and beaked whale strandings when considering the complete sonar use record. The CNA finding is in contrast to the finding in Simonis et al. (2020), which depicted a significant correlation between beaked whale strandings and Navy sonar use. However, the Simonis et al. (2020) result relied on substantially incomplete or inaccurate assumptions about U.S. Navy sonar use around the Mariana Islands. CNA also conducted statistical analyses specific to each island where beaked whale strandings have been observed in the Mariana Islands, similarly finding insufficient evidence of a correlation to sonar use. Additional information on the findings of the CNA analysis are presented in Section 3.4.2.1.1.6 (Stranding) in Chapter 3.4 (Marine Mammals). As described in Section 5.1.2.2.1 (Marine Species Research and Monitoring Programs), for this Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy agreed to several additional research and monitoring initiatives designed to help advance the understanding of beaked whales and strandings in the MITT Study Area. The Navy will co-fund the Pacific Marine Assessment Program for Protected Species (PACMAPPS) Mariana Islands survey in spring-summer 2021 and future studies starting in 2022 to help document beaked whale occurrence, abundance, and distribution in the Mariana Islands. The Navy will also fund additional stranding response and necropsy analyses for the Pacific Islands region, and research on a framework to improve statistical stranding analysis. Collaboratively with NMFS, the Navy will fund and organize an expert panel to provide recommendations on scientific data gaps and uncertainties for further

	Comment	Navy Response
		protective measure consideration to minimize potential impacts of Navy training and testing activities on beaked whales in the Mariana Islands. Although the Integrated Comprehensive Monitoring Program does not identify specific field work or individual projects, it is designed to provide a flexible, scalable, and adaptable framework using adaptive management and strategic planning processes that periodically assess progress and reevaluate objectives. The adaptive management is anticipated to continue between the Navy, NMFS, and the Marine Mammal Commission through technical review meetings and ongoing discussions.
Guam Department of Agriculture (DoAg), John C. Borja, Acting Chief *Specific Comments*		
DoAg-01	**ES 6.1 Cumulative Impacts (ES-22)** There are many dangers for the survival for marine mammals and sea turtles. Because of the negligence and disregard to marine habitats, sea life continues to be in danger. The EIS should focus on how to minimize the impacts from the proposed activities rather be contempt that the activities proposed should be fine because others are already causing impacts to sea turtles and other sea life.	As described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), the Navy implements, to the maximum extent practical, procedural and geographic mitigation measures during its training and testing activities to avoid or reduce potential impacts on marine life. This science-based analysis indicates, with implementation of the Navy's protective mitigation measures, there is not a significant impact on marine species.
DoAg-02	**ES 7.3 Cumulative Measures Considered but Eliminated (ES-23)** During the scheduled Public Scoping meetings, the DoN and their contractor preparing the MITT EIS fails to provide guidance to those in attendance on process of submitting a measurable, nor do they provide the evaluation process for comments being submitted.	Public Comment form Navy provided to attendees at the meetings included tips on providing substantive comments. Navy does not prevent the public from submitting mitigation measures they deem important for the Navy to consider. However, Navy would evaluate any recommended mitigation measures per the criteria outlined in Appendix I of the Draft and Final SEIS/OEIS.

	Comment	Navy Response
DoAg-03	**ES 7.4 Monitoring (ES-23)** DoN fails to recognize local environmental laws (many that are reflective to federal laws but site specific for the territory). DoN submits reports to NMFS, but fails to identify local agencies (GEPA, GDAWR, GCZMP).	The Navy consulted with NMFS under MMPA, ESA (for marine species) and Magnuson-Steven's Act (MSA), with USFWS under ESA (for terrestrial species), and with local agencies under CZMA and NHPA.As discussed in Section 5.1.2.2 (Monitoring, Research, and Reporting Initiatives), the Navy developed its reporting requirements in conjunction with NMFS to be consistent with mission requirements and balance the usefulness of the information to be collected with the practicality of collecting it. The Navy's training and testing activity reports and incident reports are designed to verify implementation of mitigation; comply with current permits, authorizations, and consultation requirements; and improve future environmental analyses. Navy's monitoring reports are available on the U.S. Navy Marine Species Monitoring Program website (https://www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/). The Navy is obligated under the ESA and MMPA to provide information on any incidents involving ESA-listed species. Therefore, the Navy will continue to submit the appropriate reports to NMFS immediately, or as soon as operational security considerations allow, if it observes an incident that is or may be attributable to Navy activities, including (1) a vessel strike of a marine mammal or sea turtle during training or testing; (2) a stranded, injured, or dead marine mammal or sea turtle during training or testing; or (3) an injured or dead marine mammal, sea turtle, or ESA-listed fish species during post-explosive activity monitoring.

	Comment	Navy Response
DoAg-04	**ES 7.6.1 Consistency with Other Federal, State, and Local Plans, Policies and Regulations (ES-24)** GDAWR has been involved in the process at the Public Meeting held at Univ. of Guam. There has not been any other roundtable discussions or dialogue between DoN and GDAWR about marine protected species and critical habitats, that occurs within the scope of the proposed activity site. FEIS should be more specific and honest when describing consistency with statutory obligations.	While outside the current scope of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the military satisfies Sikes Act obligations through the development and implementation of the Joint Region Marianas Integrated Natural Resource Management Plan (INRMP). The purpose of the INRMP is not to measure impacts of military training and testing activities, but to utilize adaptive management to maintain long-term ecosystem health and minimize impacts on natural resources consistent with the operational requirements of the DoD's mission. Guam DAWR is a signatory and participating member to the 2019 Joint Region Marianas INRMP, which details natural resource management and monitoring programs. The Navy will continue to improve coordination and collaboration with Guam DAWR as part of the INRMP project development and implementation. Roundtable discussions or dialogue between the Navy and Guam DAWR about marine protected species and critical habitats within the Navy's training and testing areas in Guam could be conducted through the INRMP coordination.
DoAg-05	**Section 1.1 Introduction (p. 1.1 – 1.2)** As stated in the Exec. Summary the Navy will continue to consult with regulatory agencies. NMFS has been identified, but no inclusions with local regulatory agency.	The Navy consulted with NMFS under MMPA, ESA (for marine species) and MSA, with USFWS under ESA (for terrestrial species), and with local agencies under CZMA and NHPA
DoAg-06	**Section 1.1 Introduction (p. 1.1 – 1.2)** Several EIS and Supplemental EIS are mentioned in this Draft MITT EIS/OEIS. Yet, there is no acknowledgement in the document with the TOTAL IMPACT to the environment from the various activities mentioned. Guam and CNMI both are limited with natural resources. The continuous stress on these resources with military activities on-going in the islands will need to be monitored and mitigated.	The Navy conducted a comprehensive review of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable actions to develop a robust analysis of cumulative impacts (Chapter 4, Cumulative Impacts). As required under NEPA, the level and scope of the analysis are commensurate with the potential impacts of the action as reflected in the resource-specific discussions in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences). The Navy considered proposed and ongoing activities alongside with other activities in the region whose impacts are truly meaningful to the analysis. Furthermore, the entire Supplemental EIS/OEIS provides the cumulative impacts analysis, not just Chapter 4. Chapter 3 provides the current effects of past and present impacts and environmental conditions that represent the baseline of the environment as it is; Chapter 3 also discusses the

	Comment	Navy Response
		consequences or potential future impacts from Navy activities. Chapter 4 discusses other reasonably foreseeable activities, including Department of Defense activities in the Marianas, to the extent they are known and the incremental impact of the Navy's proposal when added to past, present, and future impacts.
DoAg-07	**Section 1.2 The Navy's Environmental Compliance and At-sea Policy (p. 1-3)** Agreements usually require technical reports. Have any reports been submitted to NOAA? Have these reports shared with local regulatory agencies?	As discussed in Section 1.2 (The Navy's Environmental Compliance and At-Sea Policy), in 2005, the Navy and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration reached an agreement on a coordinated programmatic strategy for assessing certain environmental effects of military readiness activities at sea. The Navy's At-Sea Policy is located at https://navysustainability.dodlive.mil/files/2010/04/At_Sea_Policy_Memo.pdf. In compliance with the MMPA Permit, Navy submits annual monitoring reports to NMFS. These reports are available on the U.S. Navy Marine Species Monitoring Program website (https://www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/).
DoAg-08	**Section 2.3.2.2.3 (p. 2-1)** Draft MITT EIS/OEIS has mentioned mitigation measures for environmental and cultural resources. Yet, there is no mentioning thus far who they (the Navy) is consulting with regarding cultural resources in the document. Only NMFS has been identified as a consulting agency to the resources.	The MIRC Programmatic Agreement expired in December 2019. In anticipation of this, the Navy initiated a NHPA Section 106 consultation in January 2019 with an eye toward developing new updated Programmatic Agreements. The Navy has held five consultation meetings open to consulting and interested parties on Guam and eight throughout the CNMI. Additionally, site visits, and working group sessions with the SHPOs and the National Park Service have taken place. The Navy is required to comply with NHPA Section 106 to support its undertaking. A Programmatic Agreement is one of several methods of ensuring compliance under Section 106 but is most appropriate for undertakings that involve routine and redundant activities where a federal agency plans to resolve potential adverse effects to historic properties through avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation.

	Comment	Navy Response
DoAg-09	**Table 2.5-1 & 2.5-2 Current and Proposed Training Activities (p. 2-26 to 2-43)** In relation to environmental and cultural resources, what are the outcomes of the on-going 2015 MITT EIS/OEIS activities? And, is there a report available for the local agencies and general public to read?	For marine mammals, the Navy's Marine Species Monitoring Program website provides access to reports, documentation, data, and updates on current monitoring projects. Information on current monitoring projects, technical reports, conference presentations, and data are available at www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us. Additional information is also available in Section 5.1.2.2 (Monitoring, Research, and Reporting Initiatives) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. While monitoring reports are internal Navy documents, MITT activities are subject to training constraints and Cultural Resources Managers have not reported any effects on historic properties.
DoAg-10	**Section 3.0.1 Overall approach to analysis (p. 3-1)** Has this been done? If so, what is the result of the study?	Yes, this has been done and the SEIS/OEIS assesses potential impacts based on the methods used and listed in 3.0.1. Therefore, the result of the study is the SEIS/OEIS.
DoAg-11	**Section 3.0.1 Overall approach to analysis (p. 3-1)** What changes in the activity was made from 2015 MITT to current proposal?	Refer to Chapter 2 (Description of the Proposed Action and Alternatives) specifically Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2. These tables include a color-coded legend that identify what activities have increased, decreased, or stayed the same in comparison to the 2015 activities.
DoAg-12	**Section 3.0.1 Overall approach to analysis (p. 3-1)** What studies have occurred during (or since) 2015 MITT to help identify new methods to analyze resources affected by stressors?	As part of the development of the SEIS/OEIS, existing information and data was reviewed and new federal and state regulations and standards relevant to resource-specific management or protection were identified. If there were any changes since the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS it was noted and appropriate references were cited. The SEIS/OEIS includes a complete list of references cited.
DoAg-13	**Section 3.0.1.1.1 Marine species monitoring and research program (p. 3-2)** DoAg-DAWR has been monitoring marine mammals and sea turtles for several decades, this includes stranding events. No efforts were made by DoN to consult and/or collaborate with the state agency.	Navy's stranding data came from NMFS who is the authoritative source of stranding data. The Navy strives to share technical information and data with the public and resource agencies. Technical reports are posted on the MITT project website at www.mitt-eis.com. For Navy-funded and managed marine research and monitoring studies, reports, documentation, data, and updates on current monitoring projects can be accessed via the U.S. Navy Marine Species Monitoring Program website at

	Comment	Navy Response
		www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us. Please see the Navy's technical report on marine mammal strandings (Marine Mammal Strandings Associated with U.S. Navy Sonar Activities, 2017 – Available on the project website: https://mitt-eis.com/) for more information. In addition, Section 3.4.2.1.1.6 (Stranding) has been expanded to include additional information about strandings of beaked whales in the Mariana Islands and the Navy's support of efforts to better understand the causes of marine mammal strandings. The Navy regularly partners with federal and local agencies to ensure the best available data are used in impact analyses. For example, the Navy partners with local, state, and federal agencies, universities, research institutions, federal laboratories, and private researchers as part of its Marine Species Monitoring Program. Additionally, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, NMFS, Guam Division of Aquatic and Wildlife Resources, and the CNMI Division of Fish and Wildlife are cooperating with the Navy on INRMP implementation.
DoAg-14	**Section 3.3.2.2.1 Impacts from Physical Disturbance and Strike Disturbance Under Alternative 1 (p. 3.3-5)** What test/study is being conducted to determine if this statement is true? Is the quantity of training exercises factored in for this statement?	This Supplemental EIS/OEIS includes an analysis of potential impacts on marine habitats from physical disturbance and strike stressors (Section 3.3.2.2.1, Impacts from Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors Under Alternative 1; and Section 3.5.2.4.2, Impacts from Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors Under Alternative 2 [Preferred Alternative]). The number of training exercises is considered as part of the analysis.
DoAg-15	**Section 3.4.1.7.6 Hunting (p. 3.4-11)** Irrelevant topic in this area. Whaling (whale hunting) occurs in other areas outside of the MIIT area.	Although whale hunting occurs outside of the MITT Study Area, some of the same species and populations of migrating marine mammals have been impacted by commercial whaling. Additional text has been added to the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS to make this clear. Additionally, with the resumption of commercial whaling by Japan in 2019, this section has been expanded in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS to reflect that change occurring subsequent to the release of the Draft EIS/OEIS.

	Comment	Navy Response
DoAg-16	**Section 3.4.1.7.10 Marine Debris (p. 3.4-4)** There's no true saying where marine debris originates. Most marine debris (bottles, fishing gear, etc.) found near Guam's waters are written in a foreign language. Regardless, the debris left behind from the MITT exercises will need to be removed from MIIT area.	Marine debris discussed in Section 3.4.1.7.10 is provided as one of the general threats to marine mammal population. Military expended materials, such as marine markers and flares, chaff, unrecovered towed and stationary targets, sonobuoys, fiber-optic cables, and miscellaneous plastic and rubber components of other expended objects are expected to sink to the seafloor and become buried in sediments. Materials that sink and settle on the ocean bottom in very deep water make it impractical to recover. However, depending on the environmental conditions, including the availability of oxygen in sediments and water temperature at the seafloor, and the type of material (e.g., metal or plastic), expended material may degrade relatively quickly or persist in the environment indefinitely. Plastic and other persistent materials could incrementally contribute to marine “garbage patches” or other areas with accumulated debris but still have only minimal impact compared to other sources of debris. The Navy has standard operation procedures in place to reduce the amount of military expended materials, including recovering targets and associated parachutes to the maximum extent practical.
DoAg-17	**Section 3.4.1.7 General threats** Commercial industries, bycatch, other fisheries interactions, and hunting are irrelevant topics of discussions. None of these general threats occur on Mariana Islands waters. It is important that Navy's contractor engages collaboration with local resource agencies.	Commercial Industries discussed in Section 3.4.1.7.2 is provided as one of the general threats to marine mammal population. The Navy will continue to communicate and coordinate with the Guam government agencies on future collaboration and information sharing.
DoAg-18	**Section 3.4.2.1.1.5 Behavioral Reactions (p. 3.4-78)** Studies used for Behavioral Reactions to Vessels are from colder temperature waters compared to ocean water temperatures found in the MITT area. Sound in colder temperature waters move much more slowly as compared to warmer temperature waters. Navy should have conducted a study within the MITT areas to make a better, and acceptable determination.	For all stressors, including behavioral reactions to vessels, the Navy makes determinations based on the best available science. See Section¿3.4.2.1.1.5 (Behavioral Reactions)¿in the FSEIS/OEIS for the analysis of marine mammal behavioral reactions to vessel noise, including a summary of the best available science on this topic. The commenter asserts that sound travels much faster in warm water than in cold water where studies of marine mammal reactions to vessels have been conducted, and that the speed of sound could influence animal reactions. This is incorrect in that the speed of sound in seawater increases by less

	Comment	Navy Response
		than 10% between the poles and tropics. Research on vessel reactions cover a wide range of environmental conditions, and there is no evidence that the speed of sound affects how marine mammals react to vessels. See Appendix H (Acoustic and Explosive Concepts) for background information on how sound travels underwater.
DoAg-19	**Section 3.5.2 Environmental Consequences (p. 3.5-11)** Physical disturbance and strike could be potentially result in adverse effects on sea turtles from training and testing activities within the Study Area. Sea turtle mortality in Guam waters has resulted from vessel strikes.	This Supplemental EIS/OEIS includes an analysis of potential impacts on sea turtles from physical disturbance and strike stressors (Section 3.5.2.4.1, Impacts from Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors Under Alternative 1; and Section 3.5.2.4.2, Impacts from Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors Under Alternative 2 [Preferred Alternative]). The Navy is also consulting with NMFS under the ESA regarding the use of vessels and in-water devices, military expended materials, and seafloor devices. Although considered extremely rare, a ship strike of a sea turtle cannot be wholly discounted and would result in take, as defined under the ESA. Accordingly, the Navy has requested authorization pursuant with the ESA and has updated the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS with measures to reduce the takes resulting from ship strikes. The Navy's analysis of other physical disturbances and strike stressors determined these activities would not adversely affect sea turtles.
DoAg-20	**Section 3.5.2.1.2.1 Accounting for Mitigation (p. 3.5-18)** How effective was sea turtle sightings during previous MITT exercises to trigger power down or shut down? How is this procedural mitigation used during night trainings? Is this information available in a report?	The Navy is committed to protecting marine life by employing mitigation measures when training or testing using active sonar or explosives; working with regulatory agencies; and furthering our understanding of marine mammals through research and monitoring. As part of their compliance with the MMPA and ESA the Navy conducts extensive monitoring and data collection. Within the Study Area, the Navy has sponsored several monitoring projects to better understand marine mammal and sea turtle distribution and habitat use, and to assess the presence of corals and ESA-listed species at FDM. The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring Program website provides access to reports, documentation, data, and updates on current monitoring projects. Information on current monitoring projects, technical reports, conference

	Comment	Navy Response
		presentations, and data are available at www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us. Additional information is also available in Section 5.1.2.2 (Monitoring, Research, and Reporting Initiatives) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS.
DoAg-21	**Section 3.5.2.2.2.1 Accounting for Mitigation (p. 3.5-33)** Is the use of explosives only for daytime hours during the exercise? If explosive use is during night hours, how is sea turtles detected? What mitigation is taken?	As described in Section 5.2.1 (At-Sea Procedural Mitigation Development), after sunset and prior to sunrise, Lookouts and other Navy watch personnel employ night visual search techniques, which could include the use of night vision devices. However, for safety of personnel, the Navy generally does not schedule explosive activities to occur at night.
DoAg-22	**Section 3.6.1 Affected Environment (p. 3.6-1)** Migratory and resident seabirds are found in Apra Harbor, Piti and Agat (all within MITT Study Area on Guam).	Comment noted.
DoAg-23	**Section 3.6.1.3 Flight Altitudes (p. 3.6-2)** Examples used are irrelevant, as they should include species of more relevance with in the MITT study area. Not all seabirds behave similarly.	Based on the analysis presented in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS and using the best available data regarding flight altitudes for marine birds, additional data is not required in order for the Navy to comply with NEPA.
DoAg-24	**Section 3.6.1.6 General Threats (p. 3.5-5)** Little fire ant should also be addressed to prevent accidental introduction on FDM.	The little fire ant is addressed in the Micronesia and Hawaii Biosecurity Plan. Specific federal and Navy policies for marine invasive species can be found at: Public Law 104-332, National Invasive Species Act of 1996; Executive Order 13112 (Invasive Species) and amended by Executive Order 13751 (Safeguarding the Nation from the Impacts of Invasive Species; and OPNAVINST 5090.1E Chapter 35-3.19. (Ship and Ballast Water), 5090.1E Chapter 35-3.1 (Environmentally Sound Ships), and 5090.1E Chapter 12-3.9 (Invasive Species). As part of the INRMP, the Navy will implement marine management recommendations identified in the Micronesia and Hawaii Biosecurity Plan.

	Comment	Navy Response
DoAg-25	**Section 3.6.2 Population-level Impact Analysis (p. 3.6-10)** Mitigation for Navy should include funding for translocation of great frigatebirds from the 10,000 pairs in the Hawaiian Islands to the Mariana Islands to compensate the loss of individuals occurring on FDM from military exercises.	As stated in the Draft SEIS/OEIS language commented on, the effects of military activities on FDM would not represent a significant adverse impact on the population of the great frigatebird, therefore, mitigation is not warranted.
DoAg-26	**Section 3.6.2 Population-level Impact Analysis (p. 3.6-10)** Mitigation for Navy should include funding for translocation of masked booby from the 2,500 pairs in the Hawaiian Islands to the Mariana Islands to compensate the loss of individuals occurring on FDM from military exercises.	As stated in the Draft SEIS/OEIS language commented on, the effects of military activities on FDM would not represent a significant adverse impact on the population of the masked booby, therefore, mitigation is not warranted.
DoAg-27	**Section 3.6.2.1.3.1 Impacts from Aircraft Noise Stressors Under Alternative 1 (p. 3.6-14)** Visual stressors should also be addressed. During daytime exercises, marine birds (at rookery) will be exposed by visual stressors from aircrafts, resulting to disturbance.	An analysis for rookeries on Guam was included in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS for land-based training events and in-air training activities close to Guam's shoreline. Please see Table 3.6-5 (Known Rookery/Nesting Locations on Department of Defense Owned or Leased Lands within the Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area) and Figure 3.6-3 (Known Breeding Locations for Seabirds on Military Lands on Guam) in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS for a discussion of known rookery locations within DoD-owned lands on Guam. This information was added to the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS in response to comments made from your agency on the Draft EIS/OEIS/ The Navy's analysis of rookeries was conducted in the context of the DoD's obligations under the Migratory Birds Treaty Act (MBTA). Under the MBTA regulations applicable to military readiness activities (50 C.F.R. Part 21), any stressors introduced during training and testing activities would not result in a significant adverse effect on migratory bird populations. While this determination is applicable to all seabirds and shorebirds that occur in the Study Area, the Navy carried out a focused analysis for seabirds known to breed within the Study Area, particularly for breeding seabirds on FDM. For the Navy's Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy's analysis focused on rookeries on FDM because there was no change in land-based training activities or other activities that would impact rookery sites on Guam.

	Comment	Navy Response
DoAg-28	**Section 3.8.1.3 Endangered Species Act-Listed Species (p. 3.8-2)** Mitigation should include to avoid areas where the 3 listed coral species occurs in the Study Area.	Navy consulted with NMFS on ESA species. Mitigation from the ESA consultations will be implemented.
DoAg-29	**Section 3.8.3 Public Scoping Comments (p. 3.8-17)** Marianas Trench occurs in open ocean areas within the MITT Study Area. EIS should address cumulative impacts from military expended materials as marine debris to inverts found in the Mariana Trench.	The Navy used the best available science and conducted a comprehensive review of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable actions to develop a robust analysis of cumulative impacts (Chapter 4, Cumulative Impacts) within the entire MITT Study Area including potential impacts on marine invertebrates (refer to Section 4.4.8.3 [Impacts of Other Actions]).
DoAg-30	**Section 3.10.1.3.1 Micronesian megapode (p. 3.10-4)** Data used is outdated. There should have been an updated survey prior the drafting of the MITT EIS/OEIS. Status could change from 2013, as megapodes are opportunistic species. More so, since CNMI has been through numerous typhoon events in after 2013.	Both this Supplemental EIS/OEIS and the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS Section 3.6 (Birds) address potential impacts on seabirds that nest and visit FDM. Section 3.10 (Terrestrial Species and Habitats) addresses wildlife and plant communities and ESA-listed species known to occur on the island (Micronesian megapodes and Mariana fruit bats). In addition, the 2019 Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan (INRMP) includes additional information on biological resources on FDM and nearshore waters surrounding waters of the island. In 2015, the Navy and USFWS completed consultation for potential impacts of military training activities on FDM. The 2015 Biological Opinion determined that these activities would adversely affect ESA-listed species on FDM, and included non-discretionary measures to reduce the effect of take resulting from training activities. Activities analyzed in the Navy's Supplemental EIS/OEIS do not warrant reinitiation of Section 7(a)(2) consultation with USFWS, and the measures agreed to between the Navy and USFWS in 2015 are carried forward in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS.

	Comment	Navy Response
DoAg-31	**Section 3.10.1.3.2 Mammals (p. 3.10-4)** The last surveys conducted in FDM occurred in 2007. Fruit bat monitoring in FDM is needed, as the species are opportunistic. Fruit bat in FDM may occur, especially after storm event passing through the Mariana Islands.	See Response to DoAg – 30. The Navy will continue to implement the terms and conditions of the 2015 MITT USFWS BO associated with monitoring and surveys of the Mariana Fruit bat.
DoAg-32	**Section 3.10.2.1.1 Impacts from Acoustic Stressors (p. 3.10-8)** MITT EIS/OEIS should also include impacts to visual stressors from fixed-winged aircrafts.	Please refer to the response for DoAg – 27.
DoAg-33	**Section 3.10.2.4 Secondary Stressors (p. 3.10-15)** In regards to potential introduction of invasive species, MITT EIS should address other invasive species such as the Little fire ant.	See response DoAg – 24 regarding the little fire ant.
DoAg-34	**Section 3.10.3.1.1.2 Alternative 1 – Acoustic Stressors – Terrestrial Species and Habitat (p. 3.10-53)** Fruitbats and megapodes in FDM will be impacted; mitigation is needed to address both species	Navy will continue to implement the terms and conditions of the 2015 MITT USFWS BO to minimize the impacts of military activities on the megapodes and Mariana fruit bats.
DoAg-35	**Section 3.9.2.2.1.1 Injury (p. 3.9-40)** Injury of fish is not limited to organ, hearing and buoyancy systems. Mortality has been observed after underwater detonations on Guam involving damage of hard integument, such as found on boxfish and cowfish.	Comment noted. Section 3.9.2.2.1.1 (Injury) has been updated to include additional information regarding potential effects related to in-water explosions.
DoAg-36	**Table 5.3-10 Procedural Mitigation Description (p. 5-43)** Hammerhead sharks need to be added to resources being protected. Sightings of hammerheads on Guam are most frequent in Apra Harbor and around the entrance. Both Agat and Piti detonation zones are within sighting areas.	As described in Section 5.3.3.8 (Explosive Mine Neutralization Activities Involving Navy Divers), the Navy worked cooperatively with NMFS to develop mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts on ESA-listed fish species, including scalloped hammerhead sharks and giant manta rays, during explosive mine neutralization activities involving Navy divers.

	Comment	Navy Response
DoAg-37	**Section 3.4.1.4 Habitat Use (p. 3.4-4)** Seasonal migration and breeding are important factors in the spatial and temporal distribution of marine mammals in the study area as well. These are documented by both local and federal resource agencies	Comment noted.
DoAg-38	**Section 3.4.1.7.3 Bycatch (p. 3.4-8)** Entanglement generally involves longline fishing or purse seining. Neither activity occurs within Guam's local or federal EEZs	Bycatch as discussed in Section 3.4.1.7.3 is provided as one of the general threats to marine mammal population.
DoAg-39	**Section 3.4.1.9.2 Bryde's whale geographic range and distribution (p. 3.4-17)** Bryde's whale have been seen 3 times in the months of July and August near Guam, and a dead individual washed up on Guam's west coast in August, 2014	Comment noted.
DoAg-40	**Section 3.4.1.17.5 Cuvier's Beaked whale species specific threats (p. 3.4-28)** Several strandings are not mentioned in the recap. This information is available from local and federal resource agencies.	Please see the Navy's technical report on marine mammal strandings (Marine Mammal Strandings Associated with U.S. Navy Sonar Activities, 2017 – Available on the project website: https://mitt-eis.com/) for more information. In addition, Section 3.4.2.1.1.6 (Stranding) has been expanded to include additional information about strandings of beaked whales in the Mariana Islands and the Navy's support of efforts to better understand the causes of marine mammal strandings.
DoAg-41	**Section 3.4.1.18.5 Dwarf Sperm whale species specific threats (p. 3.4-29)** Entanglement generally involves longline fishing or purse seining. Neither activity occurs within Guam's local or federal EEZs	Comment noted. Entanglement information is provided as one of the general species-specific threats to marine mammal population.
DoAg-42	**Section 3.4.5 ESA Determination (p. 3.4 – 259)** Sperm whales have been documented pupping off of the coast of Agat, and have been seen with young along the same coast in subsequent years.	Comment noted. Navy consulted with NMFS on the effects of the Proposed Action on ESA-listed marine mammals, which include sperm whales.

	Comment	Navy Response
DoAg-43	**Section 3.5.1.5 Sea Turtles (p. 3.5-5)** There have been 5 turtle deaths by vessel strike in Apra Harbor since 2011. Increased vessel traffic must be mentioned as a threat as well.	Both the Supplemental EIS/OEIS and the 2015 MITT FEIS/OEIS recognizes that vessel strike occurs in Apra Harbor. This Supplemental EIS/OEIS has been updated with more information from the Section 7 ESA consultation between the Navy and NMFS regarding potential strike risk resulting from Navy activities and in a cumulative context, for non-military (e.g., commercial, private) vessels transiting in and out of Apra Harbor. The vessel strikes mentioned in this comment (the 5 vessel strikes in Apra Harbor) are not likely attributable to Navy activities because no vessel strikes were reported by the Navy, and the majority of vessel traffic is comprised of civilian vessels. Because vessel strike by military vessels cannot be wholly discounted, the Navy and NMFS consultation on this stressor type and has included procedural mitigation to avoid or reduce the potential for vessel strike of sea turtles to occur in the MITT Study Area (see Section 5.3.4, Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors.
DoAg-44	**Number of days per year affected by military (p. 3.12-18)** In 2016, around 140 days, in 2017, 120 days, in 2018, 82 days. An average of around 90 days per year since 2010	Comment noted. NOTMAR data has been updated in the FSEIS/OEIS.

Table K-2: Response to Comments from Federal Agencies

	Comment	Navy Response
U.S. Department of the Interior (DOI), Janet Whitlock, Regional Environmental Officer		
DOI-01	The Department of the Interior (Department) has reviewed the Draft Mariana Islands Training and Testing (MITT) Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS/OEIS). The Department offers the following comments for use in the development of the final SEIS/OEIS for this project. **General Comments** The distinctions among the 2015 MITT EIS, the 2010 Mariana Islands Range Complex (MIRC), and other Department of Defense trainings and activities planned for the area are not clear. The Department recommends that the final SEIS/OEIS include a summary of the types of activities proposed, where they would occur specifically, what documents cover each undertaking, and where to find those documents. This summary should also note the current status of each undertaking and their associated NEPA and NHPA documents.	The Navy has been conducting training and testing activities in the Mariana Islands Training and Testing (MITT) Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)/Overseas EIS (OEIS) Study Area (Study Area) for decades, and this Supplement to the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS supports the continuation of that training and testing. The activities analyzed in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS are largely a continuation of the ongoing training and testing activities that were analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, 2010 Mariana Islands Range Complex (MIRC) EIS/OEIS, and 1999 Mariana EIS/OEIS. This Supplemental EIS/OEIS (1) includes the analysis of activities at sea and on FDM necessary to meet readiness requirements beyond 2020 and into the reasonably foreseeable future, (2) includes any changes to those activities previously analyzed, and (3) reflects the most up-to-date compilation of training and testing activities deemed necessary to accomplish military readiness requirements. Table 2.5-1 and Table 2.5-2 of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS summarize the types of activities proposed. Locations of the proposed activities are included in the tables, and additional details are available in Appendix A (Training and Testing Activities Descriptions). As noted in Chapter 1 (Purpose and Need), the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS analyzed training and testing activities conducted at existing MIRC land-based training areas located on Guam, Saipan, Tinian, and Rota. The Navy is not proposing any changes to those land-based activities; therefore, the Navy will continue to rely on the analysis presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS for these activities. The Navy will use the impact analysis documented in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS to comply with NEPA, support regulatory consultations, request a letter of authorization under the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA), and request incidental take statements under the Endangered Species Act (ESA). Please refer

	Comment	Navy Response
		to Section 1.2 (The Navy's Environmental Compliance and At-Sea Policy) for further discussion and explanation. As part of the Section 106 Consultation process, the Navy is preparing tables that will detail the specific locations where activities included in this undertaking are planned to occur. The intent is to include these tables in the Guam and CNMI Programmatic Agreements currently under development.
DOI-02	The final SEIS/OEIS should also provide a clear explanation of the evolution from the MIRC (used in reference to both the original study area and the EIS) to the MITT (which expanded the study area but still references the original MIRC Study Area). We note that the official MITT- EIS.com website calls the 2010 MIRC EIS/OEIS the "2010 MITT EIS/OEIS" even though the official documents are titled MIRC, not MITT. This re-naming of documents is confusing, especially because the draft MITT SEIS was released at the same time as consultation is underway to update the 2009 Programmatic Agreement (PA) associated with the 2010 MIRC EIS, and subsequently the 2015 MITT EIS, on the basis that the activities proposed in 2015 were consistent with those evaluated in 2009. The new PA is being developed based on the 2015 MITT EIS and not the information in the draft SEIS/OEIS, because the draft SEIS/OEIS is only for at-sea activities. This distinction is not intuitive given that there are submerged resources in the at-sea training areas, which we note below in our comments on Chapter 3.11.	The Navy is currently in the third phase of implementing a programmatic approach for analyzing certain environmental effects of military training and testing activities both on land and at sea. The Phase I analysis is documented in the 2010 MIRC EIS/OEIS for the MIRC Study Area. The Navy has corrected the reference to the "2010 MITT EIS/OEIS" on the website. The Navy expanded the Study Area in the Phase II analysis to include established military land, air, and sea areas of the MIRC; in-water areas around the MIRC; and the transit corridor between the MIRC and the Navy's Hawaii Range Complex. The Study Area for Phase II was renamed as the MITT Study Area. The Study Area did not change in Phase III. The activities analyzed in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS are largely a continuation of the ongoing training and testing activities that were analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, 2010 MIRC EIS/OEIS, and 1999 Mariana EIS/OEIS. Section 1.2 (The Navy's Environmental Compliance and At-Sea Policy) discusses the Navy's past environmental compliance. The MIRC Programmatic Agreement expired in December 2019. In anticipation of this, the Navy initiated a NHPA Section 106 consultation in January 2019 with an eye toward developing new updated Programmatic Agreements. The Navy has held five consultation meetings open to consulting and interested parties on Guam and eight throughout the CNMI. Additionally, site visits, and working group sessions with the SHPOs and the National Park Service have taken place. The Navy is required to comply with NHPA Section 106 to support its

	Comment	Navy Response
		undertaking. A Programmatic Agreement is one of several methods of ensuring compliance under Section 106 but is most appropriate for undertakings that involve routine and redundant activities where a federal agency plans to resolve potential adverse effects to historic properties through avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation.
DOI-03	The draft SEIS/OEIS refers to the 2015 MITT EIS, noting that terrestrial impacts, except on Farallon de Medinilla Island (FDM), are addressed in the 2015 Final EIS and would not change. Therefore, the draft SEIS/OEIS is to cover changes in at-sea activities and recent knowledge since 2015 related to impacted resources. The information and comments provided by the Department of the Interior covers the known status of resources as well as the sources of impacts from training. We have limited our comments to select chapters most relevant to our responsibilities in the Mariana Islands. Below, the Department offers additional sources of information that should be considered and referenced in the Final SEIS/OEIS and note them in the appropriate chapter comments.	The Navy is formally consulting with NMFS concerning potential impacts of proposed training and testing activities on marine mammals protected under the MMPA, and on ESA-listed species known to occur in the Study Area. The Navy has updated the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS based on section 7 consultation and MMPA rule-making process and will incorporate all reasonable and prudent measures and terms and conditions set forth in the Biological Opinion into the Record of Decision.
DOI-04	**Summary of NPS Resources Relevant to the MITT DSEIS** The Agat and Asan Units of War in the Pacific National Historical Park on Guam cover more than 1,000 acres of submerged land that comprises more than half of the total area of the parks combined seven units. Coral reefs and their associated habitats and highly diverse marine species are a major feature of the park. Deeper waters traversed by coastal and pelagic species are also found in the Agat and Asan units of the Park. Common to the NPS managed waters both in Agat and in Asan are resident populations of spinner dolphins Stenella longirostris. Other marine mammal species of the Odontocetes (toothed whales and dolphins) and Mysticetes (baleen whales) pass through park waters. Two species listed	Summary of NPS resources relevant to the MITT Supplemental EIS/OEIS noted.

	Comment	Navy Response
	pursuant to the Endangered Species Act, the green sea turtle (Chelonia mydas) and hawksbill sea turtle (Eretmochelys imbricata), as well as hammerhead sharks (Sphyrna lewini), manta rays (Manta birostris) and threatened coral species including Acropora globiceps also occur in the park. The giant humphead wrasse (Cheilinus undulatus) is frequently seen in the park and more rarely the large bumphead parrotfish (Bulbometapon muricatum), which are both considered "species of concern" by the National Marine Fisheries Service. These areas of the park are utilized each day by scores of recreational SCUBA divers and snorkelers and multiple dolphin watching tourist vessels. The American Memorial Park in Garapan, Saipan, does not extend into coastal waters beyond the mean high tide mark. However, it provides access to visitors and residents to heavily used marine recreational areas and has recorded nesting of green sea turtles.	
DOI-05	**Chapter 3.4 Marine Mammals** The DSEIS provides excellent information on marine mammals in the MITT Study Area. However, much is unknown about training impacts on each species, as evidenced by the many new scientific studies on these mammals producing new information every year. The DSEIS application of knowledge about other dolphin species in other Pacific areas to evaluating impacts on the dolphins in the MITT area may not be appropriate. We recommend that you conduct research and documentation of the residency of populations of spinner dolphins (Stenella longirostris) on Guam and impacts of the training to them. These populations may particularly be impacted by the mine explosion training in areas at Agat and Asan. We recommend that you provide better information on the impacts of the explosions on these	The Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS included detailed information on spinner dolphins in Section 3.4.1.32 (Spinner Dolphin [*Stenella longirostris*]). The Navy's analysis of impacts on spinner dolphins considered the potential impacts of training on spinner dolphins in Section 3.4.2 (Environmental Consequences) and Section 3.4.4 (Summary of Potential Impacts on Marine Mammals). Based on the analysis presented in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS and using the best available data, surveys or additional research are not required in order for the Navy to comply with NEPA. No mortalities of any marine mammals are predicted. Activities using underwater explosives, including mine countermeasure activities at the Agat Bay and Apra Harbor sites, were modeled to estimate impacts on marine mammals from explosives. The Agat Bay Mine Neutralization Site is located in deep water far offshore of Agat Bay and not in the nearshore and shallow water locations where spinner dolphins frequently engage in resting behavior. Mitigation measures specifically for mine countermeasure activities are presented in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), Section

	Comment	Navy Response
	populations and before implementing that training at those sites. We recognize and support that an area frequented by the Agat spinner dolphins is identified as a mitigation area (mostly in NPS managed waters) because of their presence (see Chapter 5).	5.3.3.7 (Explosive Mine Countermeasure and Neutralization Activities). Asan is not identified as an underwater detonation area. The Navy is consulting with NMFS under the MMPA and ESA for potential effects on protected species. Mitigation measures specified in the Final Rule and Biological Opinion will be reflected in the Record of Decision.
DOI-06	We question the assessment of training impacts, especially of active sonar to beaked whales. We believe the strandings of beaked whales linked to active sonar, noted on page 3.4-86, particularly in the Canary Islands, has led to termination of active sonar use in training there. Although the numbers of beaked whale strandings, included ones in our Agat Unit, have been low in the MITT area, they often appear to be associated with Navy training exercises. It seems logical that even if many beaked whales were injured or killed due to active sonar training in the large MITT Study Area, only a very small percentage would strand on reefs in the Study Area. The following reference is informative and should be reviewed and noted in the Final SEIS: Faerber, M.M. and R.W. Baird. 2010. Does a lack of observed beaked whale strandings in military exercise areas mean no impacts have occurred? A comparison of strandings and detection probabilities in the Canary and main Hawaiian Islands. Marine Mammal Science 26(3):602-613. The permanent threshold shifts (PTS) which damage hearing are noted to apply to pygmy sperm whales and dwarf sperm whales (Kogia spp.) found in the MITT Study Area. We are concerned that this may also affect the beaked whales that are also deep divers. Page 3.4-129 notes that beaked whales are impacted by sound up to 50 kilometers away and that they avoid sound sources by 10 kilometers (page 3.4-132). For the final SEIS/OEIS, the Department recommends that the impact assessments consider whether they would be so	Cuvier's beaked whale strandings in the Study Area are summarized in Section 3.4.1.17.5 (Species-specific Threats) in the background information on Cuvier's beaked whales. The Navy's analysis of impacts on beaked whales took into account their greater sensitivity to disturbance relative to other marine mammals, as demonstrated by the data used to develop the behavioral response criteria for beaked whales (see the technical report titled Criteria and Thresholds for U.S. Navy Acoustic and Explosive Effects Analysis (Phase III) available at https://mitt-eis.com). In addition, nitrogen decompression—commonly known as "the bends"—is discussed in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS in Section 3.4.2.1.1.1 (Marine Mammals - Injury - Nitrogen Decompression). This section discusses the background of potential impacts on marine mammals—and specifically beaked whales—from acoustic stressors, such as sonar, and outlines the literature currently available with regards to this potential impact. This Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS includes additional information on Cuvier's beaked whale strandings relative to sonar use in the Study Area in Section 3.4.2.1.1.6 (Stranding) under Environmental Consequences due to Acoustic Stressors in the Marine Mammal section (Section 3.4). This additional information does not change the conclusions of the analysis of potential impacts on Cuvier's beaked whales described in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The issue of Navy sonar causing mortality to beaked whales is complex for a species known to be susceptible to behavioral reactions to any anthropogenic sound including, for example, commercial shipping vessels. With the Pacific Islands Fisheries Science Center (PIFSC) and Guam Division of Aquatic and Wildlife Resources (DAWR) data, the Navy conducted an independent review of the beaked whale strandings between August 2007 and December 2019. During that 13-year time period there were nine beaked whale stranding events, the

	Comment	Navy Response
	startled by explosions or active sonar causing them to rush from great depths to the surface at dangerous speed causing injury from gas expansion in their blood and whether repeated impacts causing temporary threshold shifts (TTS) could lead to PTS.	majority of which were identified as Cuvier's beaked whales. There were 7 years across the 13-year period in which no beaked whale strandings occurred and 2 years in which two strandings occurred within a given year. From 2007 to 2019, 18 of 23 (or 78 percent) of multi-national Navy events using sonar in the MITT Study Area did not co-occur with any beaked whale strandings. 56% (5 of 9) of the beaked whale strandings occurred without any Navy sonar use prior, therefore, some factors other than Navy sonar may be influencing these strandings. It should also be noted that the PIFSC conducted necropsies on three of the beaked whales that stranded after sonar use (two in March 2011 and one in March 2015). The results did not show evidence of gas bubble disease (gas emboli and fat emboli were not observed), which can occur during a rapid ascent to the surface and has been suggested as a response by beaked whales to sonar. Based on the above information, the Navy does not predict that any beaked whales would be injured under this Proposed Action. The Center for Naval Analysis (CNA) also recently conducted a statistical study of correlation of beaked whale strandings around the Mariana Islands with the use of U.S. Navy sonar, finding that insufficient evidence of a correlation exists. The CNA study used the complete record of all U.S. Navy sonar use between 2007 and 2019, including major training events, joint exercises, and unit level training/testing. The analysis also included the complete beaked whale stranding record for the Mariana Islands through 2019. Following the methods in Simonis et al. (2020), the CNA analysis found insufficient evidence of a correlation between sonar use and beaked whale strandings when considering the complete sonar use record. The CNA finding is in contrast to the finding in Simonis et al. (2020), which depicted a significant correlation between beaked whale strandings and Navy sonar use. However, the Simonis et al. (2020) result relied on substantially incomplete or inaccurate assumptions about U.S. Navy sonar use around the Mariana Islands. CNA also conducted statistical analyses specific to each island where beaked whale strandings have been observed in the Mariana Islands, similarly finding insufficient evidence of a correlation to sonar

	Comment	Navy Response
		use. Additional information on the findings of the CNA analysis are presented in Section 3.4.2.1.1.6 (Stranding) in Chapter 3.4 (Marine Mammals). As described in Section 5.1.2.2.1 (Marine Species Research and Monitoring Programs), for this Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy agreed to several additional research and monitoring initiatives designed to help advance the understanding of beaked whales and strandings in the MITT Study Area. The Navy will co-fund the Pacific Marine Assessment Program for Protected Species (PACMAPPS) Mariana Islands survey in spring-summer 2021 and future studies starting in 2022 to help document beaked whale occurrence, abundance, and distribution in the Mariana Islands. The Navy will also fund additional stranding response and necropsy analyses for the Pacific Islands region, and research on a framework to improve statistical stranding analysis. Collaboratively with NMFS, the Navy will fund and organize an expert panel to provide recommendations on scientific data gaps and uncertainties for further protective measure consideration to minimize potential impacts of Navy training and testing activities on beaked whales in the Mariana Islands. Given its proximity to eastern Asia, Navy vessels equipped with sonar have likely been transiting and at times conducting individual and group training events with sonar in the MITT Study Area since modern hull-mounted active sonars became standard on Navy surface ships in the mid-1960s. Furthermore, the greater number of Navy ships and subsequent improvements to passive acoustic detection technology meant that it is likely that there was more active sonar use from the 1960s through the late 1980s than what is currently proposed in the current Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Navy has reviewed Faerber and Baird (2010) as part of past projects, including in a comment on the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, and concluded that their study is highly speculative, relying on a geographic comparison between Hawaii and the Canary Islands rather than actual stranding data to suggest that sonar is impacting beaked whales in the Hawaiian Islands. The paper is not relevant to the MITT Study Area. For a more comprehensive

	Comment	Navy Response
		analysis of beaked whale strandings associated with Navy sonar, the Navy recommends reviewing Filadelfo et al. (2009). Filadelfo, R., J. Mintz, E. Michlovich, A. D'Amico, P.L. Tyack, and D.R. Ketten. 2009. Correlating Military Sonar Use with Beaked Whale Mass Strandings: What Do the Historic Data Show? Aquatic Mammals 35(4):435-444. The quantitative analysis of impacts, fully described in the report titled *Quantitative Analysis for Estimating Acoustic and Explosive Impacts to Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles* (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2018a), available at www.mitt-eis.com, predicts that no beaked whales are likely to suffer PTS as a result of the Proposed Action. As described in Section 3.4.2.1.1.2 (Hearing Loss), the definition of TTS precludes PTS.
DOI-07	**Chapter 3.11 Cultural Resources** There is considerable literature available on submerged cultural resources in addition to the few references listed in this section. As noted earlier, submerged resources located in the MITT Study Area are at risk during at-sea activities. Because the draft SEIS clearly states that avoidance is the primary mitigation measure, the list of reference documents and maps of the sites should be comprehensive and updated to ensure that Navy decisions are based on all available information. We are also aware that a NOAA research vessel Okeanos Explorer located submerged wrecks of USAAF B-29s from World War II off Tinian North Field and provided live video of the wrecks on public internet in 2016. Documentation exists of numerous Japanese and American aircraft down in the waters offshore of the Mariana Islands, in such locations as Agat Bay of Guam, especially in June and July 1944 during World War II.	In the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, the Navy considered Carrell, Toni, ed. *Micronesia Submerged Cultural Resources Assessment*. National Park Service. Santa Fe, 1991. The Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS has been updated to include the recommended citations: Carrell, Toni, ed. *Maritime History and Archaeology of the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands*. Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. Saipan, 2009. The citation, Lotz, Dave. Patrol Area 14. Xlibris. Bloomington, 2018, was reviewed and is not applicable to this Supplemental EIS/OEIS analysis. While the latitude and longitude of submarine location at the time of the sinkings are included in the report, the actual location of the ship sunk is not documented or available.

	Comment	Navy Response
	At a minimum, the following documents should be reviewed, considered, and referenced in the Final SEIS: Carrell, Toni, ed. *Micronesia Submerged Cultural Resources Assessment.* National Park Service. Santa Fe, 1991. Carrell, Toni, ed. *Maritime History and Archaeology of the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands*. Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. Saipan, 2009. Lotz, Dave. *Patrol Area 14.* Xlibris. Bloomington, 2018. Appendix 2 lists the Japanese ships sunk by U.S Navy submarines in the waters of the Mariana Islands with the locations of the sinkings.	
DOI-08	**Chapter 4. Cumulative Impacts** Table 4.2-1 does not provide a comprehensive listing of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable actions. For example, known similar actions, such as increases in ocean liner tourism and evaluated as cumulative impacts. The final SEIS/OEIS should include updated and expanded information so that a thorough cumulative impact analysis can be conducted. Also, it is not clear why "Wastewater System for Saipan" is located in Guam (page 4-16). The Department recommends that this be corrected in the final SEIS/OEIS.	In accordance with CEQ guidance, the cumulative impacts analysis focused on impacts that are truly meaningful in the context of impacts associated with the Navy's Proposed Action. This was accomplished by reviewing the direct and indirect impacts on each resource that would occur under each alternative. Key factors considered were the current status and sensitivity of the resource and the intensity, duration, and spatial extent of the impacts of each potential stressor. In general, long-term and widespread impacts were considered more likely to contribute to cumulative impacts than short-term and localized impacts. Impacts on a resource considered to be negligible were not considered further in the analysis. The level of analysis for each resource was commensurate with the intensity of the impacts identified in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences). The Navy analyzed maritime traffic in Section 4.4.4.3.3 (Maritime Traffic and Vessel Strikes) and updated Table 4.2-1 in Chapter 4 (Cumulative Impacts) to include Maritime Traffic, which is inclusive of ocean liners and is evaluated in the cumulative effects analysis. The location of the wastewater system for Saipan has been corrected in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS.

	Comment	Navy Response
DOI-08	**Chapter 5. Mitigation** It is not clear if mitigation is proposed for damages to resources caused by the training activities. A possible mitigation action by the Navy would be to restrict fishing and development impacts in the Navy side of Sasa Bay, where the Guam Government marine protected area covers the east side of the bay and stops at Navy waters at the west half of the bay. It seems that this critical pupping ground for threatened hammerhead sharks, nursery area for many fishes, largest mangrove forest, and largest mud flat area in the Mariana Islands should be recognized and conserved by the Navy, as it is by the Government of Guam.	The Navy understands the concern about the military's use of Sasa Bay. At this time, Sasa Bay is not proposed as a mitigation area in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, and the military is not prohibited from conducting testing and training activities in or near Sasa Bay. Restricting fishing or development impacts is not within the jurisdiction of the Navy. As described in Section 2.3.3.2 (Sea Space and Airspace Deconfliction), the Navy minimizes conflicts within areas used for commercial and recreational fishing, subsistence use, and tourism. For example, during applicable seasons around the islands of Guam and the CNMI, the Navy works collaboratively with local communities to deconflict sea space used for fishing to the maximum extent practicable, such as avoiding known fishery infrastructures (e.g., fish aggregating devices) and high-use fishing areas.
DOI-09	The mitigation area proposed in this draft SEIS/OEIS in Agat Bay, because of the resident spinner dolphins, might not be adequately large. Habitat needed by these dolphins should be assessed and the mitigation area re-designed to include this. Also a mitigation nearshore area in leeward Guam from Piti to Tanguisson may be needed as well for another population of this species. On page 5-11, please define what is meant by saying mitigation zones do not apply to "deminimus" explosions. Does this imply small explosions such as 2.5 pounds of explosives versus 20 pounds or more can be allowed in the dolphin mitigation areas?	The size and dimensions of the Agat Bay Nearshore Mitigation Area were based on observations of spinner dolphins showing resting behavior in Agat Bay from 2010 through 2013, as described in Section I.3.3 (Proposed Geographic Mitigation Area—Agat Bay Nearshore) and is being coordinated with NMFS. "*De minimis*" explosives refer to explosives with a net explosives weight of 0.1 pound or less. Quantitative modeling in multiple locations has validated that these sources have a very small zone of influence (see Section 3.0.4.2.1.1, Explosions in Water). Regardless, no explosives, even *de minimis* charges, are expected to be used in the Agat Bay Nearshore Mitigation Area.
DOI-10	The use of lookouts to detect marine mammals and turtles is not effective enough to protect the animals from sonar and explosives harm. The likelihood of detecting especially deep diving and difficult to see smaller cetaceans is low and decreases with wave activity and darkness, even though training is conducted in rough seas and after dark. As noted earlier, beaked whales react to sounds up to 50 kilometers away, impacts likely would be beyond surface observers' sight. Falcone et al. (2017) (Page 3.4-280 reference) showed that beaked whales react to hull-mounted and helicopter	The Navy's analysis does indicate, and the Navy does not expect, that Lookouts would be 100 percent effective at detecting all species of marine mammals for every activity because of the inherent limitations of observing marine species. Using shipboard Lookouts as a means to detect marine species in the vicinity of a vessel has been an additional and effective means to avoid or reduce impacts to marine mammals from Navy training and testing for over a decade. The likelihood of sighting individual animals is largely dependent on observation conditions, such as time of day, sea state, mitigation zone size, or observation platform location. In addition to Lookouts, the Navy also employs other at-sea

	Comment	Navy Response
	deployed mid-frequency active sonar (MFAS), even 100 kilometers away.	mitigation measures, such as monitoring for marine mammals acoustically when possible, establishing mitigation zones for marine species, implementing geographic mitigation measures, and navigating safely. The Navy used the best available science to develop the behavioral response functions in consultation with NMFS. The Navy's current beaked whale behavioral risk function (BRF) acknowledges and incorporates the increased sensitivity observed in beaked whales during both behavioral response studies and during actual Navy training and testing events. The article cited in the comment (Falcone, 2017) was not available at the time the behavioral response functions were developed. The new information and data presented in the article were thoroughly reviewed when they became available and further considered in discussions following presentation in October 2017 at a scientific conference. The Navy will incorporate these findings into the Navy's future behavioral response functions as appropriate. However, the Navy's current beaked whale BRF covers the responses observed in the new article since the beaked whale risk function is more sensitive than the other risk functions at lower received levels. Thus far, no new information has been published or otherwise conveyed that would fundamentally change the assessment of impacts or conclusions of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS.
DOI-11	It is our understanding that Navy sonar operators are able to detect submerged cetaceans and even determine their species. We recommend that training operations include a protocol to use such sonar lookouts to prevent damage to marine mammals during training.	As described in Section 5.2.1 (At-Sea Procedural Mitigation Development), the Navy's passive acoustic devices (e.g., remote acoustic sensors, expendable sonobuoys, passive acoustic sensors on submarines) can complement visual observations for marine mammals when passive acoustic assets are already participating in an activity. The passive acoustic devices can detect vocalizing marine mammals within the frequency bands already being monitored by Navy personnel. Marine mammal detections from passive acoustic devices can alert Lookouts to possible marine mammal presence in the vicinity. Lookouts can use the information from passive acoustic detections to assist their visual observations of the mitigation zone. Based on the number and type of passive acoustic devices that are typically used, passive acoustic detections do not

	Comment	Navy Response
		provide range or bearing to a detected animal in order to determine its location or confirm its presence in a mitigation zone. Therefore, it is not practical for the Navy to implement mitigation in response to passive acoustic detections alone (i.e., without a visual sighting of an animal within the mitigation zone). Additional information about passive acoustic devices is provided in Section 5.6.3 (Active and Passive Acoustic Monitoring Devices).
DOI-12	We suggest that a comparison be provided in the final SEIS/OEIS of mitigation and limits of similar specific military training activities applied in Hawaii and California to the proposal for the MITT Study Area. If activities and species "take" limits are more restrictive in those other training areas than they are in the MITT Study Area, please consider more restrictions in the MITT Study Area.	The Navy's procedural mitigation measures are generally consistent with those implemented in other Navy at-sea training and testing study areas, including Atlantic Fleet Training and Testing and Hawaii-Southern California Training and Testing. There are specific requirements based on activity types and species occurrence in the MITT Study Area. The Navy develops mitigation areas independently for each Study Area based on each area's unique biology and the operational requirements for each Proposed Action; however, the mitigation area development, assessment criteria, and processes are consistent across Study Areas.
DOI-13	We recommend determination of a Biological Interest Area for marine mammals in the MITT Study Area, to better direct future mitigation.	The Navy worked collaboratively with NMFS to develop mitigation measures using input from the military operators, the best available science, predicted activity impact footprints, and marine species monitoring and density data. The Navy has implemented and will continue to implement procedural mitigation measures designed to reduce or avoid impacts on marine mammals in the Study Area (see Chapter 5, Mitigation). At this time, these procedural mitigation measures represent the most practicable methods for protecting marine mammals while allowing the Navy to complete its training and testing mission. Appendix I (Geographic Mitigation Assessment) includes information about areas considered and evaluated to be potential mitigation areas. Each area was assessed based on two criteria: (1) if the area is a key area of biological importance for one or more marine mammal species or sea turtle species for an important life process, and (2) if the mitigation would result in an avoidance or reduction of impacts. In addition, implementation of a mitigation area must be practical and allow the Navy to carry out its mission requirements. The Navy

	Comment	Navy Response
		used the best available scientific data on vulnerable or sensitive species, such as humpback whales, to identify the three geographic mitigation areas that met the two criteria. Updates to the appendix have been made in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS based on the Navy's ESA and MMPA consultations with NMFS. The Navy determined that implementing mitigation beyond what is described in Section 5.3 (At-Sea Procedural Mitigation to be Implemented) and Section 5.4 (At-Sea Mitigation Areas to be Implemented) would be impractical due to implications for safety, sustainability, and mission requirements for the reasons described in Appendix I (Geographic Mitigation Assessment) and Chapter 5 (Mitigation). NMFS described their process for designating an area as a biologically important area (BIA) for a marine mammal species in Fergusson et al. (2015). Ferguson, M. C., C. Curtice, J. Harrison, and S. M. Van Parijs. (2015). Biologically important areas for cetaceans within U.S. waters – Overview and rationale. Aquatic Mammals (Special Issue), 41(1), 2–16.
DOI-14	**Appendix A: Training and Testing Activities Descriptions** • Page A-70, for mine neutralization, E4 explosive bins are listed for use in "Mariana littorals". For the final SEIS/OEIS, please clarify whether E4 explosive bins – as well as the limpet mine explosions on page A-69 - will be used in places frequented by the spinner dolphins in Agat Bay and Asan Bay.	To clarify, explosives are not proposed for use in the nearshore waters of Agat Bay or in Asan Bay where spinner dolphins may engage in resting behavior. The sections referenced are correct, and there is a difference between the nearshore and shallow water location where spinner dolphins frequently engage in resting behavior, and the long-established Agat Bay Mine Neutralization Site located in deep water far offshore of Agat Bay. Additionally, the reference to nearshore littorals in the context of submarine activities (wherein waters less than 600 ft. are considered "shallow") also refers to deeper waters than those serving as resting places for spinner dolphins. All the activities mentioned in the comment were appropriately described in the document and analyzed based on where they have been and are proposed in the future, as well as where spinner dolphins, engaged in resting behavior, are known to occur.
DOI-15	• Page A-80, for mine neutralization EOD, E5 and E6 explosive bins are listed for Bays/Estuaries at Agat Bay, Piti, and Apra Harbor. The final SEIS/OEIS should clarify	NMFS has not determined that there are any small and resident populations of spinner dolphins in the Mariana Islands (as they have in Hawaii, for example). The process NMFS uses to identify a resident population and the geographic

	Comment	Navy Response
	whether this will also impact resident dolphin habitat areas.	area used by the resident population is described in Ferguson et al. (2015). As described in Section 3.4.2.1.2.3 (Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers Under the Action Alternatives), the monitoring results predict few minor to moderate TTS or behavioral reactions to spinner dolphins. An individual dolphin experiencing this level of impact over the course of a year is unlikely to experience significant effects or long-term consequences. In addition to procedural mitigation, the Navy will not use surface ship hull-mounted MF1 mid-frequency active sonar or explosives during training and testing in the Agat Bay Nearshore Mitigation Area, where spinner dolphins have been observed resting. Long-term consequences for the species or habitat therefore would not be expected.
DOI-16	• Page A-82, for submarine mine exercise, high frequency sonar is proposed at "nearshore littorals." The final SEIS/OEIS should clarify that this activity should not be done in Guam spinner dolphin areas.	In the context of submarine training activities, shallow waters are those less than 600 ft. Therefore, this activity would not take place in Guam spinner dolphin resting areas.
DOI-17	• Page A-86, for underwater demolition qualification and certification, up to 20 pound explosive charges are listed for Agat Bay and 10 pound charges at Piti and Apra Harbor. The Agat and Piti sites may be frequented by the resident spinner dolphins and dolphin tour boats and fishermen. Larger explosions there would not be appropriate. This should be analyzed and addressed in the final SEIS/OEIS.	The Agat Bay Mine Neutralization Site is far offshore and is not the resting habitat of spinner dolphins that may enter the Agat Bay nearshore area; therefore, there would not be a potential for overlap of explosive activities at the Agat Bay Mine Neutralization Site with spinner dolphin resting or tour boat operations. The Apra Harbor and Piti sites have been used for demolition qualification and certification training for decades without incident. As presented in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), procedural mitigation measures will help avoid or reduce potential impacts on marine mammals, including spinner dolphins, during activities that use explosives. In addition, the Navy developed mitigation areas to further avoid potential impacts from explosives on spinner dolphins in important resting areas, as described in Appendix I (Geographic Mitigation Assessment).
DOI-18	**Appendix I: Geographic Mitigation Assessment** As more information is discovered on areas and seasons critical to marine mammals and other protected organisms,	Marine Protected Areas in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands and the Guam Marine Preserves are presented in Figures 6.1-1 and 6.1-2 of the 2015 Final MITT EIS/OEIS. Table 6.1-2 (Marine Protected Areas within the

	Comment	Navy Response
	and on sites of submerged historical resources such as World War II wrecks, we recommend that mitigation areas and limits on damaging training actions be applied by the Navy during training exercises before another SEIS is needed. We support and are pleased to see the innovation of the Marpi Reef Mitigation Area in recognition of the recently documented humpback whale breeding area. For the final SEIS/OEIS, please show on maps and describe the designated Marine Protected Areas in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands and the Guam Marine Preserves as not available for impacts of MITT activities. Likewise, federally designated areas on Guam that include the two Navy Ecological Preserves and the War in the Pacific National Historical Park are not available for damaging MITT activities. Those areas should not be offered as mitigation for MITT activities, as those protections already exist, but they should be recognized as areas to exclude from training. Although training may be allowed in the Marianas Trench Marine National Monument, its location should be provided for reference. Future scientific studies of Monument resources may lead to need for specific mitigation sites there. Thank you for the opportunity to participate in this review. The National Park Service is pleased to continue working with the Department of Navy to ensure the protection and preservation of resources in the areas proposed for training and testing.	Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area) describes the different Marine Protected Areas, regulations applicable to the Navy, anticipated training and testing activities, and potential impacts. The Navy has no plans to train or conduct tests at the War in the Pacific National Historical Park on Guam. Information on mitigation areas is included in Section 5.4 (At-Sea Mitigation Areas to be Implemented) and Appendix I (Geographic Mitigation Assessment). As described in Appendix I (Geographic Mitigation Assessment), the Navy developed new mitigation for the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS to include a restriction on the number of hours of surface ship hull-mounted MF1 mid-frequency active sonar used from December 1 to April 30 within the Marpi Reef Mitigation Area and Chalan Kanoa Reef Mitigation Area. The use of in-water explosives is also prohibited in these mitigation areas. The Navy is fully engaged with NMFS through an adaptive management program that allows the Navy and NMFS to reevaluate impacts on marine resources using new scientific findings.
United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)/Marianas Trench Marine National Monument, Pamela Repp, Acting Superintendent		
USFWS-01	Thank you for allowing us the opportunity to comment on the 2019 Draft Mariana Islands Training and Testing (MITT) Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (EIS/OEIS). Please find our	Thank you for your comments. The Navy uses the best available science when analyzing impacts and developing conclusions. While some recent surveys (2015 and 2016) have discovered new

	Comment	Navy Response
	comments below. **General Comment** There was no mention made of the hydrothermal vents or the hydrothermal vent communities in the EIS/OEIS. Details should be provided on the location of these areas, their unique geological and chemical processes, and the marine life associated with these features, as well as the expected impacts of military operations and training on these unique features and biological communities. **Environmental Effects, Marine Habitats** The EIS/OEIS should recognize the unique nature of the hydrothermal vent community and the impacts that military operations can have on the unique marine habitat surrounding these vents. Use of explosives, vessels and in-water devices, military expended materials and seafloor devices associated with training and testing activities could have a significant impact on this unique marine habitat that is found only in this region.**.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) Resources of Concern Relevant to the MITT DSEIS**he Marianas Trench Marine National Monument (the Monument) contains approximately 95,216 square miles of submerged lands and waters. The Monument includes three parts: the Islands Unit, the Mariana Arch of Fire National Wildlife Refuge (NWR), and the Mariana Trench National Wildlife Refuge. The Monument contains a unique hydrothermal vent system that supports a community of organisms that live in extremely hot and highly acidic waters, and rely on chemosynthesis instead of photosynthesis to survive. Within the Monument are threatened and endangered marine mammals, a high abundance of reef fish, over 300 species of corals, and threatened green and	deep-sea vents in the Marianas Trench, very limited information exists regarding the biota and geological features of the vents. As stated in Section 3.8.2.4 (Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, most marine invertebrate populations, including hydrothermal vent communities, extend across wide areas containing hundreds or thousands of discrete patches of suitable habitat. Such widespread populations are difficult to evaluate in terms of Navy training and testing activities that occur intermittently and in relatively small patches in the Study Area. In addition, there would be no bottom detonations, no vessel impacts, and no in-water devices on vents. Therefore, based on the best available science, the Navy believes that it is unlikely that training and testing activities would have an impact on vent communities because of the wide dispersion of activities throughout the Study Area.

	Comment	Navy Response
	hawksbill sea turtles. Unlike other reefs across the Pacific, the northernmost Mariana reefs provide unique volcanic habitats that support marine biological communities requiring basalt. Maug Crater represents one of only a handful of places on Earth where photosynthetic and chemosynthetic communities of life are known to come together. These reefs and waters are among the most biologically diverse in the Western Pacific and include the greatest diversity of seamount and hydrothermal vent life yet discovered. The Monument also includes numerous geological formations and chemical processes that are of scientific interest, and likely many that have yet to be discovered. The largest active mud volcanoes on Earth are located in the Arch of Fire NWR. The Champagne vent, located at the Eifuku submarine volcano, produces almost pure liquid carbon dioxide, one of only two known sites in the world. The world's only known pool of liquid sulfur is located at the Daikoku submarine volcano. The only other known location of molten sulfur is on Io, one of Jupiter's moons	
USFWS-02	The statement "military expended materials could be colonized by benthic organisms" needs to be clarified and supported. Surveys of deep-sea regions have shown that military expended materials can last a long time with little colonization by benthic organisms. The discovery of a World War II B-29 Super fortress in the Monument is one example of how military hardware can survive in the deep ocean for decades. Further, explanation is needed to detail the impacts of expended material in the deep-sea environment, the length of time they survive in deep ocean environments, the settlement rates of benthic organisms on various materials, and the impact they have on deep-sea marine habitats and species.	The statement "military expended materials could be colonized by benthic organisms" is not in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Information in Section 3.8.3.3 (Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors) in the 2015 Final MITT EIS/OEIS states that benthic invertebrates (such as crabs, clams, and polychaete worms) within the disturbed area (i.e., nearshore) could be displaced, injured, or killed during amphibious operations. Benthic invertebrates inhabiting these areas are adapted to a highly variable environment and are expected to rapidly recolonize disturbed areas by immigration and larval recruitment. The Navy used the best available data to analyze potential impacts from training and testing activities on marine resources. As described in Section 3.8 (Marine Habitats), Section 3.8.2 (Environmental Consequences), as well as in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, there is no evidence that Navy training and testing activities would have a significant

	Comment	Navy Response
	Environmental Effects, Marine Invertebrates The EIS/OEIS should recognize the unique nature of the hydrothermal vent community and the impacts that military operations can have on the rare invertebrate life surrounding the vents. Use of explosives, vessels and in- water devices, military expended materials and seafloor devices, associated with training and testing activities could have a significant impact on these species as they are unique populations and subpopulations found only in this region.	impact on benthic species in the deep-sea environment. Section 3.8.3.3.2.2 (Military Expended Materials Other than Ordnance) of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS analyzed a "worst case" scenario for impacts associated with potential strike to benthic invertebrates from a ship hulk landing on the seafloor. The analysis concluded that, as the vessel hulk settles on the seafloor, all marine invertebrates within the footprint of the hulk would be impacted by strike or burial, and invertebrates a short distance beyond the footprint of the hulk would be disturbed. However, habitat-forming invertebrates such as deep sea corals are likely absent where sinking exercises are planned because this activity occurs in depths greater than the range of corals and most other habitat-forming invertebrates (approximately 10,000 ft. [3,048 m]) and typically over soft bottom habitat where these species do not occur. It is likely that the largest expended materials, such as ship hulks, would persist in deep sea environments for decades. Since many of these deep-sea habitats are comprised of soft bottom, the added structure from the expended material would provide habitat for many colonizing invertebrates and fishes.
USFWS-03	Figure 2.1-1: Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area should be amended to include the Marianas Trench Marine National Monument.	The Marianas Trench Marine National Monument (MTMNM) has been added on to Figure 2.1-1 in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS.
USFWS-04	**Marine Debris** Military expended materials including explosives, seafloor devices, cables, wires, and decelerators/parachutes can cause damage to benthic marine life and can harm geological features such as vents and mud volcanoes. The impact of this debris on deep-sea communities, especially those associated with hydrothermal vents, is currently unknown and therefore should be avoided.	See above response USFWS-03 regarding impacts from military expended materials.
USFWS-05	**Summary** Given the purposes for which the Monument was established, the Service recommends that military training	The training and testing activities within the MITT Study Area are not expected to have significant effects on resources designated for special protection under the MTMNM designation. However, when operations do occur in this area,

	Comment	Navy Response
	activities avoid significant impacts to habitat and marine life in the Monument. This area is a key area of biological importance to multiple species of deep-sea marine life, including hydrothermal vent associated organisms. Limiting activities in this area, especially activities that result in benthic military debris, will avoid affecting these communities and the unique benthic processes to which they are dependent. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the EIS/OEIS.	mitigation measures followed during military activities and exercises within the Monument ensure that the activities are consistent "so far as is reasonable and practicable" with the Proclamation.
National Park Service (NPS), David Lotz, Cultural Resource Manager		
NPS-01	Please provide our office three printed copies of the complete DEIS.	A copy of the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS were delivered to the National Park Service following receipt of the request.
Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Connell Dunning, Acting Manager, Environmental Review Section Connell Dunning, Acting Manager Environmental Review Section		
EPA-01	The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has reviewed the subject Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations (40 CFR Parts 1500-1508), and our NEPA review authority under Section 309 of the Clean Air Act. EPA provided comments on the 2015 Mariana Islands Training and Testing (MITT) Final Environmental Impact Statement on June 18, 2015. We noted the large increase in explosive munitions proposed for use on Farallon de Medinilla (FDM), which had the potential to greatly increase erosion and sedimentation impacts to the surrounding coral reefs[1]. This supplement to the 2015 MITT Final EIS considers ongoing and future activities conducted at sea and on FDM, incorporating new information and updated training and testing requirements for these locations.	Information noted.

	Comment	Navy Response
	The actions proposed in this draft Supplemental EIS (DSEIS) would result in a further increase, beyond increases already proposed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS, of munitions use at FDM. The DSEIS states that proposed increases in munition use include increases of Naval Surface Fire Support Exercise Land- based Targets from 1,000 to 4,200 annually; an increase in Missile Exercises from 85 explosive missiles to 115; and increases of explosive grenades/mortars for Direct Action from 600 to 1,000. The DSEIS states that ordnance increases on FDM would be less than 1 percent over the 2015 levels analyzed, and that there is no appreciable change on the impact conclusions presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS, which concluded coral fauna around FDM was healthy and robust.	
EPA-02	*Clarify most recent dive survey* In our comments on the 2015 MITT Final EIS, we commented on using observations of existing coral health as a predicter of future impacts from the large increase in munitions proposed, and noted that the 2012 dive survey, which identified a coral barnacle infestation, concluded that such an infestation could indicate the corals are "highly impacted by other stressors". We also recommended the Navy commit to annual dive surveys to continue to monitor the marine resources around FDM. We note that the most recent dive survey, conducted at FDM in September and October 2017, no longer detected the coral barnacle infestation identified in 2012 but showed corals around FDM undergoing a severe bleaching event. The DSEIS does not indicate whether the higher levels of munitions, approved in the July 2015 MITT Record of Decision, were immediately put into effect in subsequent training years. Therefore, it is not known whether the most recent dive surveys were performed after the large increases in munitions. *Recommendation:* EPA recommends	The Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS includes the most up-to-date dive survey information. As discussed in Section 3.8 (Marine Invertebrates), recent surveys conducted by the Navy (Smith and Marx, 2016) at FDM found that coral fauna are healthy and robust, and the nearshore physical environment and basic habitat types at FDM remained unchanged. These conclusions are based on (1) a limited amount of physical damage, (2) very low levels of partial mortality and disease (less than 1 percent of all species observed), (3) absence of excessive mucus production, (4) good coral recruitment, and (5) complete recovery by 2012 from the 2007 bleaching event. Smith and Marx (2016) also concluded that the health, abundance, and biomass of fishes, corals, and other marine resources at FDM are comparable to or superior to those in similar habitats at other locations within the Mariana Archipelago. In addition, the Navy funded additional reef surveys in the nearshore areas of FDM in 2017. The results are available at https://apps.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/1069450.pdf. The 2017 survey found little evidence that training has affected coral reef communities at FDM. Only three relatively recent ordnance items were observed, but no blast pits, craters, or significant areas of coral breakage were observed. The ordnance observed during the 2017 survey was almost exclusively old, encrusted in marine

	Comment	Navy Response
	that the FSEIS confirm whether or not the most recent dive surveys (September and October 2017) are reflective of the increases in munitions proposed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS.	life, and was not having any discernable impact on surrounding communities. The 2017 survey is reflective of ongoing training activities at FDM as approved under the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS.
EPA-03	*Increase frequency of dive surveys to monitor coral health* While the survey associates the elevated water temperatures (heat stress) in the Marianas archipelago with bleaching events, the DSEIS acknowledges that the proposed action would also impact corals and other marine invertebrates (p. 3.8-16). It states that erosion as a result of training activities at FDM may contribute to deposition of soils into the nearshore areas of FDM, causing increased turbidity. Evidence of training-related erosion, such as ordnance skipping or eroding off of FDM, and rock and ordnance fragments blasted off of the island, were detected in every dive survey year (Vol l, p. 3.1-4). The resulting turbidity can impact corals and invertebrate communities on hard-bottom areas by reducing the amount of light that reaches these organisms and by clogging siphons for filter-feeding organisms. Reef-building corals are sensitive to water clarity because they host symbiotic algae that require sunlight to live (Vol 2, p. 3.8-15-16). The DSEIS also notes that sedimentation, pollutants, or other stressors have been associated with bleaching of corals, with several studies suggesting a direct link between declining water quality from increased runoff and sedimentation and coral reef health and bleaching (Vol 2, p. 8). The DSEIS concludes, however, that the sedimentation that may result from military use of FDM is not sufficient to adversely impact water quality and coral communities (Vol 2, p. 3.8-17). This conclusion is not supported in the DSEIS and appears to be based on a summary of dive surveys from 1997 through 2012 (as discussed in Smith and Marx, 2016). Further, since the 2017 dive survey documented severe coral bleaching, it is possible that the incremental increases in	The 2019 Joint Region Marianas Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan (INRMP) includes monitoring programs throughout the Mariana Islands. The 2019 Joint Region Marianas INRMP details natural resource management and monitoring programs, including projects for ESA-listed corals, that either improve the understanding of these species in the wild or are designed to protect species and their habitat without infringing on the Department of Defense's (DoD's) military mission. Programs specific to coral and Farallon de Medinilla (FDM) (subject to annual funding availability) include Marine Habitat Mapping (benthic habitat mapping) [Naval Base Guam, Andersen Air Force Base, Farallon de Medinilla]. • Fish, Coral, and Marine Surveys (visual surveys) [Farallon de Medinilla]. • Assess ESA-Listed Scleractinian Corals (visual surveys and condition assessment for ESA-corals) [Farallon de Medinilla]. Coral reef habitat surveys occur around FDM once every five years, per the terms and conditions of the 2017 NMFS BO. The Navy is consulting with NMFS for potential effects of the Proposed Action on ESA-listed corals and will implement terms and conditions of the new BO as they relate to coral reef habitat surveys around FDM. The Navy shall, no less than once every five years, survey coral reef habitat around FDM within 30 m of water depth. These surveys shall be structured to confirm presence or absence and abundance of ESA-listed corals and to assess general trends in coral reef species composition, percent coral coverage, and condition (e.g., disease, predators, extent of breakage).

	Comment	Navy Response
	erosion and sedimentation from increased military training contributes to the multiple stressors on corals. *Recommendations:* EPA continues to recommend monitoring/dive surveys more frequently than every 5 years to monitor the health of the resources possibly affected by the proposed project and to advance the science regarding the effects of multiple stressors on coral resources. Robust monitoring data is needed to help capture changes, such as bleaching and recovery/mortality episodes and changes in species composition and to provide data to support whether the protective measures identified are sufficient. As the DSEIS indicates, "coral reef surveys provide an indication if the waters surrounding FDM (designated Class A) are degrading in quality, as evidenced by coral health" (Vol l, p. 3.1-3).	
EPA-04	*Clarify how sediment and water quality impacts are assessed* The DSEIS states that explosives and explosives byproducts, metals, chemicals, and other materials expended during training and testing described in this SEIS would not exceed regulatory thresholds and guidelines established for measuring impacts on sediment and water quality; however, these thresholds and guidelines are not identified in the DSEIS. *Recommendations* In the FSEIS, identify the specific regulatory thresholds and guidelines used to assess impacts to sediment and water quality. Effective October 22, 2018, EPA no longer includes ratings in our comment letters. Information about this change and EPA' s continued roles and responsibilities in the review of federal actions can be found on our website at: https://www.epa.gov/nepa/epa-review-process-under-section-309-clean-air-act.	Regulatory thresholds referred to in Section 3.1 (Sediments and Water Quality) of the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS have been added to the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Since the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy has updated Section 3.1 (Sediments and Water Quality) to include detailed water quality standards and classifications for both Guam and CNMI. Guam's water quality standards and classifications are sourced from Title 22 Division II Chapter 5 Section 102 of the Guam Administrative Code. CNMI's water quality standards and classifications are sourced from Chapter 65-130 Part 200 of the Northern Mariana Islands Administrative Code. Please see the newly added section in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 3.1.1.1.1 (Water Quality Criteria and Screening Levels in Waters Surrounding Guam and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands). Given a lack of recent sediment and water quality data for the Study Area (with the exception of nearshore sediments and waters surrounding FDM assessed by Smith and Marx, 2016 and Carilli et al., 2018a, 2018b), qualitative observations from other equally or more heavily used military ordnance sites in Hawaii; Vieques, Puerto Rico; and the Potomac River, Maryland, are used as a proxy to

	Comment	Navy Response
	EPA appreciates the opportunity to review this DEIS. When the FEIS is released for public review, please send one electronic copy to the address above (mail code: ENF-4-2).	assess potential impacts on sediments and water quality in the Study Area. Information on impacts on sediments and water quality from munitions at two additional sites, one in Hawaii and one in the Potomac River, Maryland, where military munitions have resided for decades, have been added to the section. Information from the National Coastal Condition Assessment report (IV), which evaluated waters and sediments around Guam based on data from 2003 to 2006, was also cited for background information.
Marine Mammal Commission (MMC)		
MMC-01	The DSEIS addresses the impacts on marine mammals from conducting training and testing activities in the MITT study area and is associated with the letter of authorization (LOA) application that the Navy submitted to the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). The Navy previously analyzed the various impacts, first under the Tactical Training Theater Assessment and Planning DEISs (TAP I) and second under Phase II DEISs. Background The Navy's MITT study area in the Pacific Ocean encompasses the waters around Guam and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, throughout the Mariana Islands Range Complex (MIRC), and in the transit corridor between MIRC and the Hawaii Range Complex. The proposed activities would involve the use of low-, mid-, high- and very high-frequency active sonar, weapons systems, explosive and non-explosive practice munitions and ordnance, high-explosive underwater detonations, expended materials, vibratory and impact hammers, airguns, electromagnetic devices, high-energy lasers, vessels, underwater vehicles, and aircraft. Under the No Action Alternative, the Navy would not conduct training or testing activities. Alternative 1, the Preferred Alternative, includes a representative number of training and	The proposed activities in the Study Area do not include vibratory hammers, impact hammers or airguns.

	Comment	Navy Response
	testing activities, and Alternative 2 includes the maximum number of training and testing activities. In addition to some time-area closures, mitigation measures would include visual monitoring to implement delay and shut-down procedures.	
MMC-02	Density estimates The Commission had recommended in previous letters regarding Navy Phase II activities that the Navy incorporate more refined data in its extrapolated density estimates, including for cetaceans in regions or seasons that have not been surveyed or for which data are scant. For Phase III activities in the Atlantic Fleet Training and Testing (AFTT) study area and Hawaii-Southern California Training and Testing (HSTT) study area, the Navy used more refined density estimation methods for cetaceans and accounted for uncertainty in those densities and the group size estimates4 that seeded its animat modeling. Department of the Navy (2018a) indicated that uncertainty in group size estimates for MITT was based on either Poisson or lognormal distributions but remained silent on whether uncertainty was incorporated in the density estimate and what, if any, distribution was used. Rather Department of the Navy (2018a) merely noted that a compound Poisson-gamma distribution was used for incorporating uncertainty in density estimates for AFTT and a lognormal distribution was used for densities associated with HSTT. The Commission assumes that the Navy did not incorporate uncertainty in the density estimates for MITT as otherwise it would have been specified in Department of the Navy (2018a). Since much of the MITT density data are based on survey data from either the Hawaiian Islands or Equatorial Pacific Ocean and the remaining data that originated from MITT are	Regarding the marine mammal density data, the comment characterizes "the remaining data" used in the analysis as being less than ideal because it was, "…collected during surveys that were conducted in a Beaufort sea state (BSS) of 4 or higher …" citing to Fulling et al. (2010). It is not correct that the remaining data are only from the survey reported on in Fulling et al. (2010); note citations to Norris et al. (2017) and Yack et al. (2016). In addition to density data, other data sources were also considered in evaluating any seasonal patterns and local distribution of marine mammals observed in the Study Area, such as (Deakos et al., 2016; HDR, 2011, 2012; HDR EOC, 2012; Hill et al., 2016a; Hill et al., 2016b; Hill et al., 2017a; Hill et al., 2017b; Hill et al., 2018a; Hill et al., 2018b; Hill et al., 2018c; Klinck et al., 2015; Klinck et al., 2016; Ligon et al., 2011; Martin et al., 2016; Mobley, 2007; Norris et al., 2015; Norris et al., 2017; Oleson, 2017; Oleson & Hill, 2010; Oleson et al., 2015; Tetra Tech Inc., 2014; Uyeyama, 2014). Uncertainty was incorporated into the density estimates used for modeling. The commenter is referred to the technical report titled "*Quantifying Acoustic Impacts on Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles: Methods and Analytical Approach for Phase III Training and Testing*" (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2018) for clarification on the use of uncertainty in density estimates. See specifically Section 4.2 titled "Marine Species Distribution Builder," page 4-6, where details are provided on how statistical uncertainty surrounding density estimates was incorporated into the modeling for the Study Area as has been done for all other recent Navy/NMFS analyses of training and testing at sea.

	Comment	Navy Response
	less than ideal because they were collected during surveys that were conducted in a Beaufort sea state (BSS) of 4 or higher[5] (Fulling et al. 2010), it would have been prudent for the Navy to incorporate uncertainty in all of its density estimates. Department of the Navy (2018b) included coefficients of variation (CVs) for the various datasets; those could have been used to inform the relevant standard deviations and underlying distributions. The Commission recommends that the Navy clarify whether and how it incorporated uncertainty in its density estimates for its animat modeling specific to MITT and if uncertainty was not incorporated, re-estimate the numbers of marine mammal takes based on the uncertainty inherent in the density estimates provided in Department of the Navy (2018b).	
MMC-03	Criteria and thresholds *Thresholds in general*—As stated in letters related to "NMFS's Technical guidance for assessing the effects of anthropogenic sound on marine mammal hearing: Underwater acoustic thresholds for onset of permanent and temporary threshold shifts" (PTS and TTS, respectively; NMFS 2016), the Commission supports the weighting functions and associated thresholds as stipulated in Finneran (2016), which are the same as those used for Navy Phase III activities (Department of the Navy 2017). Although several more recent studies provide additional information on behavioral audiograms (Branstetter et al. 2017, Kastelein et al. 2017b) and TTS (Kastelein et al. 2017a, 2017c), only Branstetter et al. (2017) was discussed within the DSEIS. The Commission appreciates that developing weighting functions and associated thresholds is an extensive process and that the Navy cannot amend them with each new published dataset. However, the	The Navy and NMFS thoroughly reviewed new information available since the development of the Phase III weighting functions and determined that no new research would fundamentally change the assessment of impacts or conclusions. As noted by the commenter, Branstetter et al. (2017) was discussed in the DSEIS/OEIS. Specifically, Section 3.4.1.6 (Hearing and Vocalization) of the DSEIS/OEIS stated, "The mid-frequency cetacean composite audiogram is consistent with recently published behavioral audiograms of killer whales (Branstetter et al (2017))." Additionally, this FEIS/OEIS affirms that the harbor porpoise hearing and threshold shift studies conducted by Kastelein et al., cited in the Commission's comment, are consistent with the criteria used to assess auditory impacts to high-frequency cetaceans. This information can be found in Section 3.4.1.6 (Hearing and Vocalization) and Section 3.4.2.1.1.2 (Hearing Loss). New research will be quantitatively incorporated into future auditory criteria, as appropriate.

	Comment	Navy Response
	Navy should discuss within the final SEIS, whether those newer data corroborate the current weighting functions and associated thresholds.	
MMC-04	*Behavior thresholds for non-impulsive sources*— To further define its behavior thresholds for non- impulsive sources, the Navy developed multiple Bayesian biphasic dose response functions (Bayesian BRFs) for Phase III activities. The Bayesian BRFs were a generalization of the monophasic functions previously developed and applied to behavioral response data (see Department of the Navy 2017 for specifics). The biphasic portions of the functions are intended to describe both level- and context-based responses as proposed in Ellison et al. (2011). At higher amplitudes, a level-based response relates the received sound level to the probability of a behavioral response; whereas, at lower amplitudes, sound can cue the presence, proximity, and approach of a sound source and stimulate a context-based response based on factors other than received sound level. The Bayesian BRFs are reasonable and a much-needed improvement on the two dose response functions (BRFs) that the Navy had used both for TAP I and Phase II activities. The Commission is concerned, however, that following the development of the BRFs, the Navy then implemented various cut-off distances beyond which it considered the potential for significant behavioral responses to be unlikely (Table C.4 in Department of the Navy 2017). The Navy indicated it was likely that the context of the exposure is more important than the amplitude at large distances (Department of the Navy 2017)—that is, the context-based response dominates the level-based response. The Commission agrees but contends that, although the distance between the animal and the sound source is an important	The consideration of proximity (cut-off distances) was part of the criteria developed in consultation with NMFS and was applied within the Navy's acoustic effects model. Cut-off distances were used to better reflect the take potential for military readiness activities as defined in the MMPA. As stated in Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.2.1.2.1 (Methods for Analyzing Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers), the derivation of the behavioral response functions and associated cut-off distances is provided in the technical report titled *Criteria and Thresholds for U.S. Navy Acoustic and Explosive Effects Analysis (Phase III)*. Briefly, much of the data used to derive the behavioral response functions was from nearby scaled sources, thereby potentially confounding results since it is difficult to tell whether the focal marine mammal is reacting to the sound level or the proximity of the source and/or vessel amongst other potentially confounding contextual factors that are unlike actual Navy events for which the behavioral risk function (BRF's) are being derived. To account for these non-applicable contextual factors, all available data on marine mammal reactions to actual Navy activities and sound sources (or other large-scale activities such as seismic surveys when information on proximity to sonar sources is not available for a given species group, e.g., harbor porpoises) were reviewed to find the farthest distance to which significant behavioral reactions were observed. These distances were rounded up to the nearest 5 or 10 km interval, and for moderate to large scale activities using multiple or louder sonar sources, these distances were greatly increased --- doubled in most cases. The Navy's BRF's applied within these distances is currently the best-known method for providing the public and regulators with a more realistic estimate (but still conservative where some uncertainties exist) of impacts and potential takes. The Commission specifically refers to the research on blue whales exposed to sonar in Goldbogen et al. (2013). It should be noted that all of the blue whale responses described by Goldbogen et al. (2013) occurred within 2 km of the

	Comment	Navy Response
	contextual factor, such factors have already been included in the Bayesian BRFs. Including additional cut-off distances contradicts the data underlying those functions and negates the intent of the functions themselves. In addition, the cut-off distances were based on scant acoustic data from a single species each for beaked whales and mysticetes and tag data from Risso's dolphins. Interestingly, Risso's dolphins tens of kilometers from the source exhibited similar responses to those that were within hundreds of meters of the source (Southall et al. 2014). That is, the dolphins did not exhibit any clear, overt behavioral response to either the real mid-frequency (MF) source or the scaled MF source at either distance, and the scaled MF source had to be shut down from full power when the dolphins entered the 200-m shut-down zone. The Commission remains unconvinced of the appropriateness of the cut-off distances. Moreover, depending on the activity and species, the cut-off distances could effectively eliminate a large portion of the estimated numbers of takes. For sonar bin MF1 (the most powerful mid-frequency active sonars), the estimated numbers of takes would be reduced to zero for odontocetes beginning where the probability of response is 40 percent and for beaked whales where the probability of response is 45 percent (Table 3.4-12 in the DSEIS). For mysticetes, takes would be eliminated for MF1 sources at a received level of 154 dB re 1 µPa equating to a probability of response of 17 percent. While that percentage may seem inconsequential, the received level is in fact greater than the level at which actual context-based behavioral responses were observed for feeding blue whales (see Figure 3 in Goldbogen et al. 2013). The Navy attempted to assuage the Commission's concerns in	sound source, well short of the 10 km cut-off that is conservatively applied in the mysticete behavioral criteria. Additionally, the Commission refers to observations of Risso's dolphins during the Behavioral Response Studies in Southern California. In the 2013 study, the researchers observed no clearly evident changes in behavior of Risso's dolphins exposed to actual or simulated Navy sonar at various distances. These observations suggest that the cut-off distances may be very conservative for some species.

	Comment	Navy Response
	its response to comments regarding the AFTT DEIS by asserting that the use of the Bayesian BRFs in conjunction with the cut-off distances is currently the best-known method for providing the public and regulators with a more realistic (but still conservative where some uncertainties exist) estimate of impacts and potential takes. Use of the cut-off distances is neither conservative nor realistic and effectively discounts the underlying data, including Goldbogen et al. (2013), upon which the BRFs are based. For all these reasons, the Commission recommends that the Navy refrain from using cut-off distances in conjunction with the Bayesian BRFs and re- estimate the numbers of marine mammal takes based solely on the Bayesian BRFs. Use of cut-off distances could be perceived as an attempt to reduce the numbers of takes, which is discussed in a subsequent section of this letter.	
MMC-05	Behavior threshold for explosives—The Navy assumed a behavior threshold 5 dB lower than the TTS thresholds for each functional hearing group for explosives. That value was derived from observed onset behavioral responses of captive bottlenose dolphins during non-impulsive TTS testing (Schlundt et al. 2000). The justification for the threshold itself is questionable, but more concerning is that the Navy continues to believe that marine mammals do not exhibit behavioral responses to single detonations (Department of the Navy 2017). The Navy has asserted that the most likely behavioral response would be a brief alerting or orienting response and significant behavioral reactions would not be expected to occur if no further detonations followed. Although there are no data to substantiate that assertion, the Navy notes that the same reasoning was used in previous ship shock trial final rules in 1998, 2001, and 2008. Without such data, there is no reason to continue to ascribe validity to assumptions made 10 to 20 years ago. Larger single	As stated in Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.2.2.2.1 (Methods for Analyzing Impacts from Explosives), the derivation of the explosive injury criteria is provided in the technical report titled *Criteria and Thresholds for U.S. Navy Acoustic and Explosive Effects Analysis (Phase III)*. This report was provided as supporting documentation to this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Marine mammals may be exposed to isolated impulses in their natural environment (e.g., lightning). There is no evidence to support the assertion that animals have significant behavioral responses (rising to the level of "harassment" under the MMPA definition for military readiness activities) to temporally and spatially isolated explosions, regardless of charge size. Still, the analysis conservatively assumes that any modeled instance of temporally or spatially separated detonations occurring in a single 24-hour period would result in harassment under the MMPA for military readiness activities. Further, the criteria do not preclude the consideration of animals being behaviorally disturbed during single explosions if they are exposed above the TTS threshold, which is only 5 dB higher than the behavioral harassment threshold. The range to effect for TTS would be correlated to the size of the explosive.

	Comment	Navy Response
	detonations (such as explosive torpedo testing) would be expected to elicit 'significant behavioral responses'. The Navy provided no evidence that an animal would exhibit a significant behavioral response to two 5-lb charges detonated within a few minutes of each other but would not exhibit a similar response for a single detonation of 50 lbs., let alone detonations of more than 500 lbs. In response to the Commission's comments on the AFTT and HSTT DEISs, the Navy indicated that there is no evidence to support that animals have significant behavioral reactions to temporally and spatially isolated explosions and that they had been monitoring detonations since the 1990s and have not observed those types of reactions. The Commission is unaware of the Navy having personnel on station to monitor marine mammal responses during large single detonations due to human safety concerns. For some activities (i.e., missiles launched from a ship), the target area isn't cleared prior to the exercise and personnel are 28 to 139 km from the target site. In other instances (i.e., missiles launched and bombs dropped from aircraft), the lookout is tasked primarily with clearing the mitigation zone and realistically only observes for animals in the central portion of that zone immediately prior to the activity commencing. Lookouts are not responsible for documenting an animal's behavioral response to the activity, they are responsible for minimizing serious injuries and mortalities to any observed animal. Additionally, the Commission is unaware of the Navy conducting post-activity monitoring to document injuries or mortalities, let alone behavioral responses, for the majority of these types of activities. The Commission continues to believe the Navy has not provided adequate justification for ignoring the possibility that single underwater detonations can cause a	The Navy has been monitoring detonations since the 1990s and has not observed these types of reactions. To clarify, this monitoring has occurred under the monitoring plans developed specifically for shock trials, the detonations with the largest net explosive weight conducted by the Navy (no shock trials are proposed in this Study Area). Temporary threshold shifts (TTS) and all other higher-order impacts are assessed for all training and testing activities that involve the use of explosives or explosive ordnance. All Navy monitoring projects, reports, and publications are available on the Marine Species Monitoring website (https://www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/). The Navy proposes to continue to conduct post-detonation monitoring where practical to implement, as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation). To provide information on incidents involving ESA-listed species, the Navy will continue to submit the appropriate reports to NMFS immediately, or as soon as operational security considerations allow, if it observes an incident that is or may be attributable to Navy activities, including (1) a vessel strike of a marine mammal or sea turtle during training or testing, (2) a stranded, injured, or dead marine mammal or sea turtle during training or testing, or (3) an injured or dead marine mammal, sea turtle, or ESA-listed fish species during post-explosive activity monitoring.

	Comment	Navy Response
	behavioral response and therefore again recommends that the Navy estimate and ultimately request authorization for behavior takes of marine mammals during all explosive activities, including those that involve single detonations.	
MMC-06	*Mortality and injury thresholds for explosives*—The Commission notes that the constants and exponents associated with the impulse metrics for both onset mortality and onset slight lung injury have been amended from those used in TAP I and Phase II activities. The Navy did not explain why the constants and exponents have changed while the underlying data remain the same. The modifications yield smaller zones in some instances and larger zones in other instances. These results are counterintuitive since the Navy presumably amended the impulse metrics to account for lung compression with depth, thus the zones would be expected to be smaller rather than larger the deeper the animal dives. The Commission provided similar comments in its letters regarding both the AFTT and HSTT DEISs. However, the Navy did not provide in either final EIS an explanation regarding the constants and exponents nor did it specify the assumptions made. The Navy merely directed the Commission to Department of the Navy (2017)—the document from which the Commission's comments originated. Therefore, the Commission again recommends that the Navy in its final SEIS (1) explain why the constants and exponents for onset mortality and onset slight lung injury thresholds for Phase III have been amended, (2) ensure that the modified equations are correct, and (3) specify any additional assumptions that were made.	The Navy is aware that MMC previously expressed concern on this topic. The Navy reiterates that the derivation of the explosive injury equations is provided in the technical report titled *Criteria and Thresholds for U.S. Navy Acoustic and Explosive Effects Analysis (Phase III)*. Detailed technical information can be more adequately addressed in depth within a technical report in lieu of the SEIS. This technical report is incorporated into the analysis conducted in the EIS, as stated in Section 3.4.2.2.2.1 (Methods for Analyzing Impacts from Explosives). This technical report is publicly available and easily accessible at www.mitt-eis.com. The rationale for updating the constants and exponents is explained in detail in the technical report, along with any additional assumptions that were made at the time of the criteria update. The constants C and K are defined in the following sections in the technical report, Section 2.2 (Weighting Functions and Exposure Functions), and the steps to deriving the weighting and exposure functions are described in Section 2.3 (Methodology to Derive Function Parameters). These updated equations were reviewed by several subject matter experts and found to be correct.
MMC-07	More importantly, the Navy used the onset mortality and onset slight lung injury criteria to determine only the range to	The Navy used the range to one percent risk of mortality and injury (referred to as "onset" in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS) to inform the development of

	Comment	Navy Response
	effects, while it used the 50 percent mortality and 50 percent slight lung injury criteria to estimate the numbers of marine mammal takes. That approach is inconsistent with the manner in which the Navy estimated the numbers of takes for PTS, TTS, and behavior for explosive activities. All of those takes have been and continue to be based on onset, not 50-percent values. Although the effectiveness of the Navy's mitigation measures has yet to be determined, the circumstances of the deaths of multiple common dolphins during one of the Navy's underwater detonation events in March 2011 (Danil and St. Leger 2011) indicate that the Navy's mitigation measures are not fully effective, especially for explosive activities. It would be more prudent for the Navy to estimate injuries and mortalities based on onset rather than a 50-percent incidence of occurrence. The Navy did indicate that it is reasonable to assume for its impact analysis—thus its take estimation process—that extensive lung hemorrhage is a level of injury that would result in mortality for a wild animal (Department of the Navy 2017). Thus, it is unclear why the Navy did not follow through with that premise. What is clear is that the 50-percent rather than onset criteria underestimate both predicted mortalities and injuries. The Navy's response in the AFTT and HSTT final EISs that overpredicting impacts by using onset values would not afford extra protection to any animal is irrelevant from an impact analysis basis. The intent of an impact analysis is to describe and estimate impacts (i.e., takes) from the proposed activities accurately. There is no logical reason for basing the estimated impacts on onset of PTS, TTS, and behavioral response for sublethal effects; while for lethal and injurious	mitigation zones for explosives. In all cases, the mitigation zones for explosives extend beyond the range to one percent risk of non-auditory injury, even for a small animal (representative mass = 5 kg). In this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy clarified that the "onset" non-auditory injury and mortality criteria are actually one percent risk criteria. The Navy concurs that the intent of an impact analysis is to describe and estimate impacts from proposed activities accurately. Therefore, similar to other physiological criteria (PTS and TTS), the mean dose (i.e., 50%) at which an outcome was observed in experimental data was used to establish the non-auditory injury thresholds. The terminology in the EIS has been revised to address this misunderstanding of the threshold since the AFTT and HSTT Draft EISs. The Navy, in coordination with NMFS, has determined that the mean dose is a reasonable representation of these potential effects. Ranges to effect based on one percent risk criteria were examined to ensure that explosive mitigation zones would encompass the range to any potential mortality or non-auditory injury, affording actual protection against these effects. Contrary to the comment, the Navy used extensive lung hemorrhage as indicative of mortality. Extensive lung hemorrhage is assumed to result in mortality, and the explosive mortality criteria are based on extensive lung injury data [See the technical report titled *Criteria and Thresholds for U.S. Navy Acoustic and Explosive Effects Analysis (Phase III)* available at www.mitt-eis.com.

	Comment	Navy Response
	effects, the impacts are based on a 50-percent criterion. Potential mortalities and injuries should be fully accounted for rather than be erroneously discounted in any impact analysis. The Commission recommends that the Navy use onset mortality, onset slight lung injury, and onset GI tract injury thresholds to estimate both the numbers of marine mammal takes and the respective ranges to effect.	
MMC-08	Mitigation measures Mitigation effectiveness—The Navy's proposed mitigation zones are similar to the zones32 previously used during Phase II activities and are intended, based on the Phase III DSEIS, to avoid the potential for marine mammals to be exposed to levels of sound that could result in injury (i.e., PTS). However, the Phase III proposed mitigation zones would not protect various functional hearing groups from PTS. For example, the mitigation zone for an explosive sonobuoy is 549 m but the mean PTS zones range from 2,076–2,364 m for HF34. Similarly, the mitigation zone for an explosive torpedo is 1,920 m but the mean PTS zones range from 5,051–8,388 m for HF35. The appropriateness of such zones is further complicated by platforms firing munitions (e.g., for missiles and rockets) at targets that are 28 to 139 km away from the firing platform. An aircraft would clear the target area well before it positions itself at the launch location and launches the missile or rocket. Ships, on the other hand, do not clear the target area before launching the missile or rocket. In either case, marine mammals could be present in the target area at the time of the launch unbeknownst to the Navy. In addition, the Navy indicated in the DSEIS that lookouts would not be 100 percent effective at detecting all species of marine mammals for every activity because of the inherent	The Navy's Phase III mitigation zones are designed to avoid or reduce potential impacts on marine mammals to the maximum extent practicable. The mitigation zones for active sonar and weapons firing noise extend beyond the average ranges to PTS for all marine mammal hearing groups. The explosive mitigation zones extend beyond the ranges to mortality for all marine mammals, and beyond or into a portion of the average ranges to PTS for marine mammals, depending on the activity and hearing group. The mitigation zones for some explosives also extend beyond or into a portion of the average ranges to TTS for marine mammals. Therefore, depending on the species, mitigation would help avoid or reduce mortality and all or a portion of the potential for exposure to non-auditory injury, PTS, and higher levels of TTS. Per Section 5.3.3 (Explosive Stressors), any additional increases in explosive mitigation zone size (beyond what is depicted for each explosive activity) or observation requirements would be impractical to implement due to implications for safety, sustainability, and mission requirements. Implementing mitigation measures during activities that involve vessels firing missiles and rockets would be impractical for the reasons described in Section 5.3.3.4 (Explosive Missiles and Rockets). The Lookout effectiveness study mentioned by the commenter is still ongoing. This type of study, has never been conducted, is extremely complex to ensure data validity, requires a substantial amount of data to conduct meaningful statistical analysis, and the Navy is committed to completing it. As noted by the commenter, there has not been enough data collected to conduct a sufficient

	Comment	Navy Response
	limitations of observing marine species and because the likelihood of sighting individual animals is largely dependent on observation conditions (e.g., time of day, sea state, mitigation zone size, observation platform). The Commission agrees and has made repeated recommendations to the Navy regarding the effectiveness of visual monitoring. Since 2010, the Navy has been collaborating with researchers at the University of St. Andrews to study Navy lookout effectiveness. The Navy does not appear to have mentioned that study in its DSEIS for Phase III. For its Phase II DEISs, the Navy noted that the data that had been collected could not be analyzed in a statistically significant manner. The Commission understands that point but continues to consider the basic information provided by the studies to be useful. In one instance, the marine mammal observers (MMOs) sighted at least three marine mammals at distances of less than 914 m (i.e., within the mitigation zone for mid-frequency active sonar for cetaceans), which were not sighted by Navy lookouts (Department of the Navy 2012). In other instances, MMOs sighted a group of approximately three dolphins at a distance of 732 m (Department of the Navy 2014a), a group of approximately 20 dolphins at a distance of 759 m (Department of the Navy 2014c), a group of approximately 9 pilot whales at a distance of 383 m (Department of the Navy 2014b), and a small unidentified marine mammal at 733 m (Department of the Navy 2014b)—none of which were documented as having been sighted by the Navy lookouts. Further, MMOs have reported marine mammal sightings not observed by Navy lookouts to the Officer of the Deck, presumably to implement mitigation measures (Department of the Navy 2010). Neither the details regarding those reports	analysis; therefore, drawing conclusions on an incomplete data set is not scientifically valid.

	Comment	Navy Response
	nor the raw sightings data were provided to confirm this. More recent data have confirmed the earlier observed trends. Department of the Navy (2016) noted that 10 of the 13 marine mammal sightings occurred at or within 1 km of the vessel, and Navy lookouts only detected 4 of 13 total sightings. The Commission understands that any data that have been collected since then would still not be sufficient to allow a meaningful statistical analysis. The Commission recognizes that the study will be very informative once completed but believes that in the interim, the preliminary data provide a basis for taking a precautionary approach. Accordingly, the Commission continues to believe that rather than simply reducing the size of the zones it plans to monitor, the Navy should supplement its visual monitoring efforts with other monitoring measures. The Navy proposed to supplement visual monitoring with passive acoustic monitoring during three explosive activity types but not during the other explosive activities or during low-, mid- and high-frequency active sonar activities.	
MMC-09	The Navy uses visual, passive acoustic, and active acoustic monitoring (via HF/M3) during SURTASS LFA sonar activities to augment its mitigation efforts over large areas. The Navy indicated in its Phase III DSEIS that it is not able to use HF/M3 during training and testing activities due to impacts on speed and maneuverability that can affect safety and mission requirements due to costs associated with designing, building, installing, maintaining, and manning the equipment. The Navy also stated that it did not have sufficient resources to construct and maintain additional passive acoustic	The Navy employs passive acoustic monitoring when practical to do so (i.e., when assets that have passive acoustic monitoring capabilities are already participating in the activity). As discussed in Section 5.6.3 (Active and Passive Acoustic Monitoring Devices), there are significant manpower and logistical constraints that make constructing and maintaining additional passive acoustic monitoring systems or platforms for each training and testing activity impractical. The Navy's existing passive acoustic monitoring devices (e.g., sonobuoys) are designed, maintained, and allocated to specific training units or testing programs for specific mission-essential purposes. Reallocating these assets to different training unit or testing programs for the purpose of monitoring for marine mammals would prevent the Navy from using its

	Comment	Navy Response
	monitoring systems or platforms for each training and testing activity. The Commission again points out that sonobuoys, which are deployed and used during many of the Navy's activities, could be deployed and used without having to construct or maintain additional systems. For example, sonobuoys could be deployed with the target prior to an activity to better determine whether the target area is clear and remains clear until the munition is launched. The Navy went on to indicate that passive acoustic detections would not provide range or bearing to detected animals and therefore cannot be used to determine an animal's location or confirm its presence in a mitigation zone. The Commission does not agree with that supposition. In the DSEIS, the Navy indicated that it had capabilities to monitor instrumented ranges in real time or through data recorded by hydrophones at the Southern California Offshore Range, the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) off Kauai, and the Atlantic Undersea Test and Evaluation Center in the Bahamas. The Commission also understands that the Navy is quite adept at detecting, classifying, and localizing individual marine mammals on those ranges. For example, Helble et al. (2015) were able to track multiple animals on PMRF hydrophones in real time, including humpback whales, a species that can be problematic to localize. Several animals were localized simultaneously with a localization error rate of 2 percent or less. Similar methods can be used for other species. Baird et al. (2015) also indicated that the PMRF hydrophones allow the PAM analyst to isolate animal vocalizations on the range, confirm species classification, and localize groups of animals in real time. Multiple detectors can be used for sperm whales, delphinids, beaked whales, and baleen whales.	equipment for its intended mission-essential purpose. Diverting platforms that have integrated passive acoustic monitoring capabilities would impact their ability to meet mission requirements and reduce the service life of those systems. Furthermore, adding a passive acoustic monitoring capability to additional explosive activities (either by adding a passive acoustic monitoring device to a platform already participating in the activity, or by adding an additional platform to the activity) for mitigation is not practical. For example, all platforms participating in an explosive bombing exercise (e.g. firing aircraft, safety aircraft) must focus on situational awareness of the activity area and continuous coordination between multiple training components for safety and mission success. Therefore, it is impractical for participating platforms to divert their attention to non-mission essential tasks, such as deploying sonobuoys and monitoring for acoustic detections during the activity (e.g., setting up a computer station). The Navy does not have available manpower or resources to allocate additional aircraft for the purpose of deploying, monitoring, and retrieving passive acoustic monitoring equipment during a bombing exercise. As stated in Section 5.6.3 (Active and Passive Acoustic Monitoring Devices), to develop an estimated position for an individual marine mammal, the animal's vocalizations must be detected on at least three hydrophones. As stated in Section 5.2.1 (At-Sea Procedural Mitigation Development), "Based on the number and type of passive acoustic devices that are typically used, passive acoustic detections do not provide range or bearing to a detected animal in order to determine its location or confirm its presence in a mitigation zone." This sentence was taken out of context and implied the Navy indicated passive acoustic detections do not provide range or bearing to marine mammals in general. The Navy reemphasizes that the passive acoustic monitoring devices typically used during its training and testing activities do not provide range or bearing to marine mammals, based on the number (e.g., one or two) and type of assets used. The Study Area does not currently contain an instrumented range. As discussed in Section 5.6.3 (Active and Passive Acoustic Monitoring), although the Navy is continuing to improve its capabilities to use range instrumentation to aid in the

	Comment	Navy Response
	Similar to Helble et al. (2015), Baird et al. (2015) indicated that localization algorithms could determine an animal's position. In the case of bottlenose dolphins, localized positions were within approximately 100 m of the vocalizing animal. Similar localizations have been used to direct researchers to groups of vocalizing odontocetes to deploy satellite-linked tags (Baird et al. 2014). Moreover, the Navy itself has indicated the success of using sonobuoys to detect bottlenose dolphins in real-time during mine exercises. Although the Navy indicated that it was continuing to improve its capabilities for using range instrumentation to aid in the passive acoustic detection of marine mammals, it also stated that it didn't have the capability or resources to monitor instrumented ranges in real time for the purpose of mitigation. That capability clearly exists. While available resources could be a limiting factor, the Commission notes that personnel who monitor the hydrophones and sonobuoys on the operational side do have the ability to monitor for marine mammals as well. Department of the Navy (2013) confirmed that ability exists—four independent sightings were made not by the Navy lookouts but by the passive acoustic technicians. Similarly, Department of the Navy (2014c) reported that echolocation clicks of short-finned pilot whales were reported by the sonar technician to the bridge prior to mitigation being implemented. The Commission has supported the use of the instrumented ranges, operational hydrophones and active acoustic sources, and sonobuoys to fulfill mitigation implementation for quite some time and contends that localizing certain species (or genera) provides more effective mitigation than localizing none at all.	passive acoustic detection of marine mammals, at this time it would not be effective or practical for the Navy to monitor instrumented ranges for real-time mitigation or to construct additional instrumented ranges as a tool to aid in the implementation of mitigation.

	Comment	Navy Response
	Given that the effectiveness of Navy lookouts conducting visual monitoring has yet to be determined, the Commission believes that passive or active acoustic monitoring should be used to supplement visual monitoring, especially for activities that could injure or kill marine mammals. Therefore, the Commission again recommends that the Navy to passive and active acoustic monitoring, whenever practicable, to supplement visual monitoring during the implementation of its mitigation measures for all activities that could cause injury or mortality beyond those explosive activities for which passive acoustic monitoring already was proposed—at the very least, sonobuoys expended and active sources and hydrophones used during an activity should be monitored for marine mammals.	
MMC-10	Pre- and post-activity monitoring—Based on the limitations noted for implementing mitigation measures during explosive activities, the Commission believes additional pre- and post-activity monitoring should be required. Although the Navy likely could not provide additional assets to clear an area prior to an activity, the existing assets (primarily for aircraft) could conduct additional flyovers of the mitigation zone before expending any ordnance. Therefore, the Commission recommends that the Navy conduct additional pre-activity overflights, barring any safety issues (e.g., low fuel), before conducting any activities involving detonations.	As described in Section 5.3.3 (Explosive Stressors), the Navy developed a new mitigation measure for the Proposed Action requiring additional platforms already participating in explosive activities to support observations of the mitigation zone before, during, and after the activity while performing their regular duties. There are typically multiple platforms in the vicinity of activities that use explosives, such as safety aircraft. When available, having additional personnel support observations of the mitigation zone will help increase the likelihood of detecting biological resources.
MMC-11	In addition, NMFS would require the Navy to conduct post-activity monitoring for certain, but not all, activities involving underwater detonations. Specifically, post-activity monitoring would not be required after activities involving medium- and large-caliber projectiles, missiles and rockets, or bombs. Based on the uncertain effectiveness of the Navy's proposed mitigation measures, the Commission believes it would be prudent to require post-activity monitoring for these	As described in Section 5.3.3 (Explosive Stressors), the Navy developed a new mitigation measure for the Proposed Action requiring the Lookout to observe the mitigation zone after completion of explosive activities. In accordance with the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS consultation requirements, the Navy currently conducts post-activity observations for some, but not all explosive activities. When developing mitigation measures for this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy determined it could expand the requirement to other explosive activities for enhanced consistency and to help determine if any resources were injured

	Comment	Navy Response
	activities as well. That monitoring could occur immediately after the activity, with additional surveys by activity aircraft as previously specified or by vessels or when personnel retrieve the targets. The Commission recommends that the Navy conduct post-activity monitoring for activities involving medium- and large-caliber projectiles, missiles, rockets, and bombs.	during explosive events, when practical. If additional platforms are supporting an explosive activity (e.g., providing range clearance), those assets will assist in the post-event visual observation of the area where detonations occurred. The Navy will continue to follow the incident reporting procedures outlined in Section 5.1.2.2.3 (Incident Reports) if an incident is detected at any time during the event, including during the post-activity observations.
MMC-12	Pile-driving activities For pile-driving activities, the Navy accumulated the energy for both impact and vibratory pile driving based on 1 minute and 6 minutes of activities, respectively, rather than accumulating the energy over the entire day of activities—the latter is standard practice for all pile-driving activities, including those the Navy conducts (e.g., 83 Fed. Reg. 9366 and 10689). The Navy assumed that animals would avoid higher sound levels because (1) most marine mammals should be able to easily move away from the expanding range to effects for both TTS/PTS within 60 seconds and (2) most animals should avoid the zone altogether if they are outside of the immediate area upon startup. Those assumptions do not comport with actual monitoring data. For many pile-driving activities involving both impact and vibratory pile driving, including those that the Navy has conducted, marine mammals routinely are observed approaching and occurring within the PTS zone. Although the animals are able to avoid the zone, they do not. Therefore, the Commission recommends that the Navy (1) accumulate the energy for the entire day of proposed activities to determine the ranges to PTS and TTS for impact and vibratory pile-driving activities, (2) reassess the appropriateness of the proposed mitigation zones, and (3) re-estimate the numbers of takes accordingly.	Impact or vibratory pile driving would not occur during training and testing activities in the Study Area for the proposed alternatives, and is therefore not analyzed in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS.

	Comment	Navy Response
MMC-13	Level A harassment and mortality takes The Navy used various post-model analyses to estimate the numbers of marine mammal takes during acoustic and explosive activities that are similar to methods used in its Phase II DEISs. Those analyses effectively reduced the model-estimated numbers of Level A harassment (i.e., PTS) and mortality takes. The analyses were based on (1) animal avoidance, (2) mitigation effectiveness, and (3) cut-off distances. The Commission has discussed the first two aspects at length in letters regarding Phase II activities. That information is not repeated herein but should be reviewed in conjunction with this letter (see the Commission's 15 September 2014 letter). The Commission has a few additional comments on those analyses. For avoidance, the Navy assumed that animals present beyond the range to onset PTS for the first three to four pings would avoid any additional exposures at levels that could cause PTS (Department of the Navy 2018a). That equated to approximately 5 percent of the total pings or 5 percent of the overall time active; therefore, 95 percent of marine mammals predicted to experience PTS due to sonar and other transducers were instead assumed to experience TTS (Department of the Navy 2018a).	As stated in Section 3.4.2.1.2.1 (Methods for Analyzing Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers), the consideration of marine mammals avoiding the area immediately around the sound source is provided in the technical report titled *Quantitative Analysis for Estimating Acoustic and Explosive Impacts to Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles*. This report was provided as supporting documentation to the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As the commenter correctly articulates: "For avoidance, the Navy assumed that animals present beyond the range to onset PTS for the first three to four pings are assumed to avoid any additional exposures at levels that could cause PTS. That equated to approximately 5 percent of the total pings or 5 percent of the overall time active; therefore, 95 percent of marine mammals predicted to experience PTS due to sonar and other transducers were instead assumed to experience TTS." As discussed in the Quantitative Analysis for Estimating Acoustic and Explosive Impacts to Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles, animats in the Navy's acoustic effects model do not move horizontally or 'react' to sound in any way, necessitating the additional step of considering animal avoidance of close-in PTS zones. This approach is fully supported by the best available science. Based on a growing body of behavioral response research, animals do in fact avoid the immediate area around sound sources to a distance of a few hundred meters or more depending upon the species. Avoidance to this distance greatly reduces the likelihood of impacts on hearing, such as TTS and PTS. Specifically, the ranges to PTS for most marine mammal groups are within a few tens of meters and the ranges for the most sensitive group, the HF cetaceans, average about 200 m, to a maximum of 270 m in limited cases; however, high-frequency cetaceans such as harbor porpoises, have been observed reacting to anthropogenic sound at greater distances than other species and are likely to avoid their zones to hearing impacts (TTS and PTS) as well. Querying the dosimeters of the animats would not produce useful information since animats do not move in the horizontal and are not programmed to 'react' to sound or any other stimulus.
MMC-14	The Navy should have been able to query the dosimeters of the animats to verify whether its 5-percent assumption was	Details of this analysis are provided in the technical report titled *Quantifying Acoustic Impacts on Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles: Methods and Analytical*

	Comment	Navy Response
	valid, but on its face that assumption has no scientific basis. Given that sound sources are moving, it may not be until later in an exercise that the animal is close enough to experience PTS and it is those few close pings that contribute to the potential to experience PTS. Since both sources and animals are moving during an exercise, whether an animal is initially beyond the PTS zone has no bearing on whether it will later come within close range. Behavioral response studies (BRS) have shown this as well. For example, Southall et al. (2014) indicated that Risso's dolphins and California sea lions approached the 200-m shut-down zone when a source was operating at full power, resulting in having to shut down the source. Both instances occurred well after the first three or four pings. Department of the Navy (2010b and 2012) also noted multiple instances in which dolphins were observed 27 to 460 m from a vessel emitting mid- frequency active sonar, some instances were apparently numerous hours after the source was active. Those dolphins did not receive only the first three or four pings emitted, nor did they avoid the source. Avoidance aside, Navy vessels may move faster than the speed animals are capable of moving to evacuate the area. Thus, the animals would be exposed to pings after the first three or four as well. Regarding mitigation effectiveness, the Commission notes that the specific mitigation effectiveness scores for the various activities were provided for Phase II but not for Phase III activities. For Phase III, the Navy included more detail regarding how the scores were determined (including species sightability, observation area extent, visibility factors, and whether sound sources were under positive control) but did	*Approach for Phase III Training and Testing*. As stated in Section 3.4.2.1.2.1 (Methods for Analyzing Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers) and Section 3.4.2.2.2.1 (Methods for Analyzing Impacts from Explosives) of the technical report, the consideration of marine mammal avoidance and mitigation effectiveness is integral to the Navy's overall analysis of impacts from sonar and explosive sources. The quantitative analysis assumes a conservative slow animal travel speed when accounting for avoidance. The quantitative analysis also accounts for a portion of animats being exposed to sound exposure levels that could result in PTS at any time during an event using sonar. Many sonar sources are not used omni-directionally, which would affect the exposure level at different angles and depths relative to the sound source, and thus potential physiological and behavioral responses. As discussed in the 2017 technical report titled *Quantifying Acoustic Impacts on Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles: Methods and Analytical Approach for Phase III Training and Testing*, the Navy's acoustic effects model does not consider procedural mitigation measures (e.g., power-down or shut-down of active sonar or pausing explosive activities when marine mammals or sea turtles are observed in a specified mitigation zone around a sound source or detonation location), which necessitates consideration of these factors in the Navy's overall acoustic analysis. Determination of mitigation effectiveness is extremely conservative. The Navy has fully described its analytical process in the above technical report. The Navy refined the Phase III analysis by considering mitigation effectiveness at the scenario level, rather than at the activity level as in Phase II. Many scenario details are classified, thus the level of detail requested by the Commission cannot be provided in an unclassified document. The Commission is wrong to accuse the Navy of "zeroing out" estimated mortality. No mortality nor non-auditory injury takes of any marine mammal species were estimated by the Navy Acoustic Effects Model; therefore, the Navy did not assess the potential for mitigation to avoid a portion of model-predicted mortalities under this Proposed Action. If the model had estimated any mortality take, the Navy would have followed the process described in the technical report to realistically assess the potential for mitigation to avoid a portion of impacts.

	Comment	Navy Response
	not specify what the actual scores were for those four factors or the mitigation scores as a whole. The Navy also apparently did not include model-estimated numbers of takes. The lack of information makes it difficult for the Commission and the public to assess the appropriateness of the mitigation scores or their effect on the overall numbers of marine mammal takes. And, although the Navy did not reduce the numbers of injury (slight lung and GI tract) and PTS takes for explosive activities as it had for Phase II analyses, it still assumed its model- estimated mortality takes would not occur, zeroed out those takes, and enumerated them as injury takes. Since the Navy has yet to determine the effectiveness of its mitigation measures, it is premature to include any related assumptions to reduce the numbers of marine mammal takes. The concerns with the cut-off distances, which reduced the numbers of takes, were articulated in a previous section of this letter and it seems apparent that the post-analyses as a whole would underestimate the various numbers of takes. Therefore, the Commission again recommends that the Navy (1) specify the total numbers of model-estimated Level A harassment (PTS) and mortality takes rather than reduce the estimated numbers of takes based on the Navy's post-model analyses and (2) include the model-estimated Level A harassment and mortality takes in its LOA application to inform NMFS's negligible impact determination analyses. Most, if not all, of the Commission's recommendations would apply to the Navy's LOA application as well and should be considered as such. Please contact me if you have questions concerning the Commission's recommendations or rationale.	Not considering animal avoidance and mitigation effectiveness would lead to a great overestimate of injurious impacts. NMFS has concurred with the analytical approach used. The results of the quantitative analysis represent the best estimate of the maximum number of instances that marine mammals may be impacted under this Proposed Action.

This page intentionally left blank.

Table K-3: Response to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations

	Comment	Navy Response
Northern Marianas Descent Corporation (NMDC), John Oliver Gonzales		
NMDC-01	The Northern Marianas Descent Corporation (NMDC) indisputably objects to the U.S. Navy's illegal and dishonest approach to its expansion of live- fire training and testing facilities in and around the Marianas archipelago through use of subterfuge. The Navy's tactics include: 1. Breaking its monumental live-fire project into smaller, more innocuous appearing projects of limited geographic scope. 2. Ignoring and refusing to consider any and all alternatives that allow them to meet their objectives elsewhere besides the Marianas. 3. Ignoring the cumulative impacts of its multiple and obviously inter- related live-fire projects. These projects include: a. Military Training in the Marianas (1999) b. Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance and Strike (ISR/Strike) (2006) c. Mariana Islands Range Complex (MIRC) (2010) d. Mariana Islands Testing and Training (MITT) (2015) e. Marines Relocation to Guam (2015) f. CNMI Joint Military Training (CJMT) (Begun 2015) g. Divert Activities and Exercises (2016) h. Ritidian Live-Fire Training Range Complex (LFTRC) (2018) i. Supplemental Mariana Islands Testing and Training (MITT) – 2019	The Navy is not proposing any geographic expansion of the training and testing area in this Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (OEIS). Proposed activities are similar to those conducted in the Study Area for decades. The Navy has been conducting training and testing activities in the Mariana Islands Training and Testing (MITT) EIS/OEIS Study Area (Study Area) for decades and this supplement to the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS supports the continuation of that training and testing. The activities analyzed in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS are largely a continuation of the ongoing training and testing activities that were analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, 2010 MIRC Final EIS/OEIS, 1999 Military Training in the Marianas Final EIS, and other environmental compliance documents. Section 1.2 (The Navy's Environmental Compliance and At-Sea Policy) discusses the Navy's past environmental compliance. This Supplemental EIS/OEIS (1) includes the analysis of activities at sea and on Farallon de Medinilla (FDM) necessary to meet readiness requirements beyond 2020 and into the reasonably foreseeable future, (2) includes any changes to those activities previously analyzed, and (3) reflects the most up-to-date compilation of training and testing activities deemed necessary to accomplish military readiness requirements. The proposed Live-Fire Training Range Complex is not part of this Proposed Action. The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during training and testing activities, and the Department of Defense (DoD) strives to reduce or minimize potential impacts as much as possible. The alternatives carried forward for analysis were developed to meet the Navy's purpose and need and to ensure it can fulfill its obligation under Title 10 of the U.S. Code. See Section 2.4 (Action Alternatives Development) for more detailed information on the development of alternatives and rationale on why alternative training and testing locations are not feasible. Ongoing training and testing activities within the Study Area are not dependent on other DoD activities that are outside the scope of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS or this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. For example, proposed and ongoing MITT training and

	Comment	Navy Response
		testing activities within the Study Area would proceed regardless of whether other proposed actions are taken, such as the CNMI Joint Military Training EIS/OEIS. Different projects have vastly different scopes, timetables, and action proponents. According to Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations, training and testing activities in the Study Area may logically be viewed in isolation because they have independent utility, as they are ongoing activities. In addition, courts have upheld federal agencies' decisions to organize and plan their actions in a reasonable or rational manner. Cumulative impacts of these independent actions are analyzed in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Navy used the best available science and conducted a comprehensive review of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable actions to develop a robust analysis of cumulative impacts (Chapter 4, Cumulative Impacts). As required under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the level and scope of the analysis are commensurate with the potential impacts of the action as reflected in the resource-specific discussions in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences). The Navy considered proposed and ongoing activities alongside with other activities in the region whose impacts are truly meaningful to the analysis. Furthermore, the entire Supplemental EIS/OEIS provides the cumulative impacts analysis, not just Chapter 4. Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) provides the current effects of past and present impacts and environmental conditions that represent the baseline of the environment as it is; Chapter 3 also discusses the consequences or potential future impacts from Navy activities. Therefore, the current aggregate impacts of past and present actions are reflected in the baseline information as presented in Chapter 3 and used in the cumulative effect analysis. Chapter 4 discusses other reasonably foreseeable activities to the extent they are known and the incremental impact of the Navy's proposal when added to past, present, and future impacts.
NMDC-02	4. Creating massive and highly technical Environmental Impact Statements that are beyond the reasonable comprehension of the public that the Navy is obligated to inform of the impacts of their project. In this case nearly 1,500 pages, all in college	The Navy recognizes the complexity of the information presented within this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. This Supplemental EIS/OEIS contains a rigorous scientific analysis of the potential impacts of the Navy's proposal, and thoroughly explains the scientific methodology, analysis methods, and findings. The Navy attempts to

	Comment	Navy Response
	level English, were presented to a community where English is a second or third language to the majority of adults.	explain challenging concepts, methods, and the results of the analysis as clearly as possible and developed public informational materials for lay audiences. The Navy prepared project brochures, videos, a website, and posters using layperson terms to enhance public understanding of the information presented in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. A project fact sheet was also translated into Chamorro. The informational materials, including the translated fact sheet, were made available at all four public meetings and on the project website (www.mitt-eis.com).
NMDC-03	5. Failing to provide reasonably adequate time for public scrutiny of the EIS.	To better accommodate stakeholders and the public, the Navy provided 75 days to review and comment on the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The comment period for the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS was from February 1, 2019 to April 17, 2019, which is 30 days longer than the minimum required time for review (40 CFR section 6.203(c)(3)(v)).
NMDC-04	6. Failing to provide the public with informational meetings that encourage open discussion. In this case public meetings provided almost no information and were staffed by very few personnel who had limited knowledge of the EIS except in their tiny area of involvement. It is clear that the Navy is actively evading its responsibility to follow the letter and the intent of the National Environmental Policy Act. Each of the above listed tactics renders the Navy's DSEIS/OEIS incomplete and inadequate. Because of this failure to comply with NEPA, the DSEIS/OEIS and related informing activities must be redone in a prudent manner that corrects the above deficiencies.	The Navy held four open house public meetings, one each on Tinian (March 14, 2019), Rota (March 15, 2019), Saipan (March 18, 2019), and Guam (March 19, 2019). The public meetings were an ideal opportunity for the public to ask questions of Navy team members (and specific subject matter experts on Saipan and Guam) about the analysis documented in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Navy encouraged the public to attend these meetings and broadly notified the public through the media, including paid newspaper advertisements and news releases, and direct mail, including letters, postcards, and emails.
NMDC-05	MARINE NOISE The DSEIS/OEIS does not take into consideration the cumulative impacts of its active sonar use and testing in light of current high levels of marine noise caused by other activities in the ocean, particularly sonar or acoustic sensing used for oil exploration. The Navy is required to consider not	The Navy analyzed cumulative impacts on marine mammals through the regulatory processes for the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA) and Endangered Species Act (ESA), administered by the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). Compliance with these regulatory requirements help ensure the Navy's Proposed Action would not have a measurable effect on marine mammals. The cumulative impact analysis is described in Section 4.4.4.5 (Cumulative Impacts

	Comment	Navy Response
	only the impact on marine life of the noise it creates, but must consider the cumulative impacts of all ocean noise that it contributes to. Man-caused noise levels in the ocean today are at historic high and there is ample scientific evidence that this source of ocean noise is disruptive and detrimental to marine mammals.	on Marine Mammals). Section 4.4.4.3.5 (Ocean Noise) considers the cumulative impact of all ocean noise in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS cumulative effects analysis.
NMDC-06	IRREVERSIBLE DESTRUCTION OF RESOURCES The Navy intends to continue its high-level bombing of Farallon de Medinilla (FDM) despite the fact that the island is already irreversibly damaged. In fact, after already increasing the rate of bombing by 300%, the Navy now proposes to increase the rate of bombing with its highest destructive bombs. FDM is public land, owned collectively by the people of Northern Marianas Descent. It is our nearest northern island and it sits on the largest thriving coral reef in Micronesia. Unequivocally, this is an immensely valuable natural and cultural resource to the people of the NMI for sustainable food sustenance and traditional cultural and environmental conservation management practices. Continued bombing of FDM and testing and training activities in the surrounding waters and the coral reef must be stopped as the land resource and the fisheries resource are not only being denied to the people of the NMI today, but are in danger of becoming irreversibly and irretrievably lost permanently for all time. The island was never leased to be destroyed. The Navy has simply taken it upon itself to define what is acceptable use of the island under the lease. The owners of the island, as well as the CNMI government, have a right to object to the Navy's self-serving interpretation that the lease that cost them a mere $20,000 entitles them a free reign to destroy the island. Assuredly, the DSEIS/OEIS must describe the impact of past, present, and future MITT training on FDM and the surrounding	The Navy is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment while conducting necessary training and testing. The Navy continues to monitor general ecological conditions on FDM through the use of aerial images and routine surveys. The Navy has relocated targets and relocated impact area boundaries away from island edges and cliffs to reduce erosion. The Navy has also implemented an Operational Range Clearance Plan at FDM, which includes provisions for vegetation management and removal/disposal of materials that may present an explosive risk. Clearance of the range occurs every 2–4 years, depending on the type of ordnance to be removed. Management procedures are in place for FDM that limit the amount of annual ordnance expenditure by explosive weight and location (based on the current U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Biological Opinion), and restrict the amount of high explosive ordnance used in the southern impact area; these procedures will continue to be followed. The Navy regularly monitors island resources to responsibly manage potential effects.] Qualitative observations of nearshore waters of FDM during multi-year dive surveys included indicators of good water quality. There was little evidence of military impacts on benthic sediments and substrates observed during the dive surveys, and, where noted, impacts were localized and shown to recover during subsequent dive surveys. In 2017, the Navy funded additional coral reef surveys in the nearshore areas of FDM. Surveys were conducted by Space and Naval Warfare Systems Center Pacific, Scientific Diving Services. The results were approved for public release in September 2018 and are available at: https://apps.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/1069450.pdf. The 2017 survey found little

	Comment	Navy Response
	coral reef, and must project the condition of the island in relation to its becoming an irreversibly and irretrievably lost valuable resource. The island must be returned in the condition in which it was given to the Department of Defense. If it cannot be restored to that condition already, then bombing must end. If it still can be restored to that condition, then the DSEIS/OEIS must project when it will be necessary to cease destructive use of the island so that it can be restored and returned in as original, good condition.	evidence that training has affected coral communities at FDM. Only three relatively fresh ordnance items were observed, but no blast pits, craters, or significant areas of coral breakage were observed. The ordnance observed during the 2017 survey was almost exclusively old and encrusted in marine life, and was not having any discernable impact on surrounding communities. The Navy updated the MITT Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS to include the results of the 2017 survey as presented in Carilli et al (2018). The report information has been added to Section 3.1 (Sediments and Water Quality) and Section 3.8 (Marine Invertebrates). Specific text on impacts on FDM are available in Section 3.1.3.1.5.3 (Farallon de Medinilla Specific Impacts) in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, and Section 3.1 (Sediments and Water Quality) and Section 3.8 (Marine Invertebrates) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. This Supplemental EIS/OEIS and 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS also includes information from surveys conducted prior to 2017. At the conclusion of its use as a military range, FDM would be cleared of unexploded ordnance to the greatest extent practicable in accordance with Article 9(b) of the 1983 Lease Agreement and all applicable U.S. laws and regulations.
NMDC-07	RESTRICTIONS ON SEA TRAVEL AND FISHING Any continuation or expansion of the MITT activities that limits the right of the people of the Marianas to freedom of movement between their islands or access to the marine resources for cultural practices and available food source supply that the indigenous *Chamoru* and *Refaluwaasch* community has relied on for over 4,000 years is unacceptable. The DSEIS/OEIS is blatantly vague about the restrictions that the Navy's plans will put on public interisland travel. The DSEIS/OEIS must state who, what, when, where, and why travel will be restricted. The NMI is actively involved in resettling its northern islands. The DSEIS/OEIS must state how the project will impact this. The NMI community has long valued and used the fishing grounds around FDM. The DSEIS/OEIS must state how the project will impact this. The	**<u>Restrictions on Sea Travel and Fishing</u>** The Navy is not proposing any geographic expansion of the training and testing area in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS as the proposed activities are similar to those conducted in the Study Area for decades. Nor is the Navy proposing any new activities or restrictions which would interfere with interisland travel. However, waters around FDM within 3 NM from shore would continue to be permanently closed for safety reasons due to the potential presence of unexploded ordnance. Waters around FDM within 12 NM from shore would be closed for safety reasons as necessary when the range is in use. The Navy regards the safety of fishermen and other boaters as a top priority. The Navy would not restrict the freedom of movement between islands. Various means are used to communicate information to the public about areas restricted to public or commercial activities and are described in Section 3.13 (Public Health and Safety). As specified in Title 33 C.F.R. Subpart 72.01, Notices to Mariners, the U.S. Coast Guard issues information to the public concerning maritime navigation.

	Comment	Navy Response
	CNMI community is actively re-establishing its ancient maritime tradition and promoting canoe culture as a means to improve health, strengthen cultural identity, and attract tourists to our islands. We intend to put hundreds of traditional canoes on our seas and to travel again between our islands. The DSEIS/OEIS must state how the project will impact this.	Additionally, nautical charts issued by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration include these federally designated zones and areas. Operators of recreational and commercial vessels have a duty to abide by maritime regulations administered by the U.S. Coast Guard. The Navy will continue to use new and innovative methods to communicate closures to the public and fishing community, including Facebook and WhatsApp.
CNMI Women's Summit and Association Joint Working Group (SAJWG), Retta Sue Hamilton		
SAJWG-01	The people of the Mariana Islands have been confronted by ever-expanding and compounding plans presented by the US military — including the Marine Relocation to Guam, the Mariana Islands Range Complex (MIRC), the Mariana Islands Training and Testing (MITT) Study Area, the Divert Activities and Exercises, and the CNMI Joint Military Training (CJMT) — all of which are interconnected projects that involve the irreparable damage of the land, sea, air, and biological systems of the Marianas archipelago. Military activities conducted in the Marianas threaten to harm the local population by increasing the likelihood of illnesses caused by exposure to contaminants and civilian injuries and deaths caused by botched Military training exercises (both of which occurred during military training range exercises on the Puerto Rican island of Vieques), and therefore degradation of the land, water and air by any pollutants, including all physical, chemical and biologic agents should not be allowed. Military training and testing in the Marianas also poses a dire threat to our sustainable economic development by jeopardizing the health of the local workforce and degrading the natural beauty of the Marianas (including the many historic sites and structures around the islands and in the surrounding seas) which constitutes an essential element	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities. The Navy's environmental stewardship programs contribute both to the success of the military mission and the preservation of the environment for future generations. Ongoing military training and testing activities within the Study Area are not dependent on other DoD activities that are outside the scope of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS or this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. For example, proposed and ongoing training and testing activities within the Study Area would proceed regardless of whether other proposed actions are taken, such as the CNMI Joint Military Training EIS/OEIS. Different projects have vastly different scopes, timetables, and action proponents. According to Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations, training and testing activities in the Study Area may logically be viewed in isolation because they have independent utility, as they are ongoing activities. In addition, courts have upheld federal agencies' decisions to organize and plan their actions in a reasonable or rational manner. Cumulative impacts of these independent actions are analyzed in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The safety of the public and military personnel is of utmost importance to the military. The Navy employs precautions when planning and conducting training and testing activities, such as ensuring impact areas and targets are unpopulated prior to potentially dangerous activities; canceling or delaying activities if public or personnel safety is a concern; notifying the public of the location, date, and time of potentially dangerous activities; implementing temporary access restrictions to

	Comment	Navy Response
	attracting tourists to our islands. The degradation of the natural environment, human health and local economy of the Marianas threatens to trigger a mass emigration from our homeland, thus constituting an existential threat to our sense of cultural identity. Following the above line of logic, it can be concluded that any damage to the natural environment of the Marianas archipelago constitutes violence enacted upon the indigenous Chamorro and Refaluwasch (Carolinian) peoples and the degradation of their cultures — for the natural environment, the indigenous peoples who dwell upon and protect the natural environment, and the cultures of those peoples constitute one indivisible whole. In resisting this violence, we stand in solidarity with all islander and indigenous peoples fighting against the needless destruction of their physical persons, homelands, and cultures by the US military. The people of the CNMI, Guam, and indigenous and islander peoples across the globe, pledge to vigorously oppose any US military plans which threaten to degrade the natural environment, human health, indigenous culture, economic development and political empowerment of the people of the CNMI and Guam.	training and testing areas; and conducting thorough environmental and safety reviews for all test systems before tests are conducted on range sites. The Navy used the best available science and conducted a comprehensive review of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable actions to develop a robust analysis of cumulative impacts (Chapter 4, Cumulative Impacts). As required under NEPA, the level and scope of the analysis are commensurate with the potential impacts of the action as reflected in the resource-specific discussions in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences). The Navy considered proposed and ongoing activities alongside other activities in the region whose impacts are truly meaningful to the analysis, as noted in the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) publication Considering Cumulative Effects Under the National Environmental Policy Act. Furthermore, the entire Supplemental EIS/OEIS provides the cumulative impacts analysis, not just Chapter 4. Chapter 3 provides the current effects of past and present impacts and environmental conditions that represent baseline environmental conditions; Chapter 3 also discusses the consequences or potential future impacts from Navy activities. Chapter 4 discusses other reasonably foreseeable activities to the extent they are known and the incremental impact of the Navy's proposal when added to past, present, and future impacts. Both this Supplemental EIS/OEIS and the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS include an analysis of potential impacts from metals and contaminants as a result of military training and testing activities on marine resources. This analysis is presented in Section 3.1.2.2 (Metals), Section 3.4.2.7 (Secondary Stressors), Section 3.5.2.7 (Secondary Stressors), Section 3.7.2.3 (Secondary Stressors), Section 3.8.2.7 (Secondary Stressors), and Section 3.9.2.7 (Secondary Stressors). Based on the analysis presented in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS and the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, the Navy concluded that all levels of metals, chemicals, and other byproducts would be either below detectable levels or at levels below existing standards, regulations, and guidelines. This Supplemental EIS/OEIS, as well as the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, include discussion of the fate and transport of specific chemicals with references to

	Comment	Navy Response
		chemical properties of munitions and munitions constituents. In summary, the Navy's analysis concludes that no federal or local guidelines would be exceeded because of the following reasons: (1) rapid and natural degradation of substances (e.g., munitions constituents and other chemicals), and (2) localized concentrations where impact would occur. These conclusions are based on evidence gathered on other military ranges in similar environments (e.g., Vieques), as well as legacy dump site studies conducted off the coast of Oahu. These studies are summarized in Section 3.1 (Sediments and Water Quality).
Micronesia Climate Change Alliance (MCCA), Michelle Voacolo		
MCCA-01	To Whom it May Concern, I am writing you this letter today as a climate change advocate, an environmentalist, a business owner and a resident of Guam. My organization, Micronesia Climate Change Alliance, seeks to raise awareness on climate related issues through outreach and education. Guam, like many pacific islands, is at risk for the worst effects of climate change due to our size and location. Although Guam's carbon footprint cannot even compare to that of China or the U.S., we still need to mitigate our emissions as much as possible. It is also important for us to become more resilient in the face of our changing climate and dangerous storms to come. At the ongoing rate of the Military's actions against our environment, it is concerning that the residents of Guam will suffer because of this. Most recently, beached whales have been showing up on Navy shores. While the military denies active use of sonar testing in the involvement of beached whales, extensive research proves otherwise. In January 2019, a small beaked whale was euthanized after becoming stranded on a reef for the second time. While the military continuously states that they look at all environmental, cultural, historical, natural and marine life	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities. While exact causes of strandings are uncertain, scientists have identified potential contributing factors for strandings including age, illness, or disease; ingestion of marine debris/plastics; contaminant load; and manmade sources. A small number of strandings have been associated with the use of U.S. Navy sonar; none of these have occurred in the Study Area. The Navy is committed to protecting marine life by implementing mitigation measures when training or testing using active sonar or explosives; working with regulatory agencies; and furthering our understanding of marine mammals through research and monitoring. Please see the Navy's technical report on marine mammal strandings (Marine Mammal Strandings Associated with U.S. Navy Sonar Activities, 2017 – Available on the project website: https://mitt-eis.com/) for more information. The Center for Naval Analysis (CNA) recently conducted a statistical study of correlation of beaked whale strandings around the Mariana Islands with the use of U.S. Navy sonar, finding that insufficient evidence of a correlation exists. The CNA study used the complete record of all U.S. Navy sonar use between 2007 and 2019, including major training events, joint exercises, and unit level training/testing. The analysis also included the complete beaked whale stranding record for the Mariana Islands through 2019. Following the methods in Simonis et al. (2020), the CNA analysis found insufficient evidence of a correlation between sonar use and beaked whale strandings when considering the complete sonar use record. The

	Comment	Navy Response
	resources, history would prove otherwise. It is well known and documented that the military has caused severe damage on Guam. The brown tree snakes that came here on a US Naval Cargo ships after World War two caused 10 species of forest birds, 2 native mammals and 6 species of lizards to go extinct. Military dumping and nuclear testing contaminated the Pacific with PCBs and radiation. In 2007, a U.S. Navy Nuclear submarine leaked trace amounts of radioactivity in our waters, poisoning the fish and further damaging our reefs.	CNA finding is in contrast to the finding in Simonis et al. (2020), which depicted a significant correlation between beaked whale strandings and Navy sonar use. However, the Simonis et al. (2020) result relied on substantially incomplete or inaccurate assumptions about U.S. Navy sonar use around the Mariana Islands. CNA also conducted statistical analyses specific to each island where beaked whale strandings have been observed in the Mariana Islands, similarly finding insufficient evidence of a correlation to sonar use. Additional information on the findings of the CNA analysis are presented in Section 3.4.2.1.1.6 (Stranding) in Chapter 3.4 (Marine Mammals). Section 3.4.2.1.1.6 (Stranding) has been expanded to include additional information about strandings of beaked whales in the Mariana Islands and the Navy's support of efforts to better understand the causes of marine mammal strandings.
MCCA-02	Another major concern is climate change. Ocean acidification, sea level rise and warming waters are all a result of man-made climate change. Heat in the oceans acts as fuel, causing ocean-based storms to become more destructive. We witnessed Typhoon Yutu make catastrophic landfall in the Marianas only last year. Saipan and Tinian are still trying to recover from this. It was reported recently that the world's oceans have been absorbing far more excess heat in recent decades than scientists had predicted. Earth's oceans have absorbed 93% of the excess heat from greenhouse gas emissions. The warming of our oceans leads to deoxygenation, and sea level rise resulting from the expanding seas as they heat up and increase the melting of sea ice. This already has multiple effects on marine life, such as loss of breeding grounds for marine mammals, seabirds and fisheries. In 1911, earth's atmosphere had 300 parts per million of carbon dioxide. Today, we hover around 410 parts per million, planetary conditions that are unknown to any human beings before us and uncharted territory for our survival.	Section 3.2 (Air Quality) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS addresses regional emissions, existing air quality, hazardous pollutants, and greenhouse gases. Chapter 4 (Cumulative impacts), Section 4.4.2 (Air Quality) addresses greenhouse gases and climate change from a cumulative perspective. The analysis indicates there would be a minor increase in greenhouse gas emissions from the Proposed Action, but the increase is not expected to significantly affect the global climate. Additionally, the Secretary of the Navy has established energy goals that aim to reduce the overall impact the department has on climate change. These activities would more than offset the small increase in greenhouse gas emissions that would result from the implementation of Alternative 1 or 2.

	Comment	Navy Response
MCCA-03	In sections 2.4.2.1 under the No Action Alternative in the draft supplemental EIS/OEIS it states: "Cessation of proposed Navy at-sea training and testing activities would mean that the Navy would not meet its statutory requirements and would be unable to properly defend itself and the United States from enemy forces, unable to successfully detect enemy submarines, and unable to effectively use its weapons systems or defensive countermeasures due to a lack of training of forces and testing of systems that replicate the conditions to which Naval forces must operate while executing the range of military operations required to further national security objectives. Navy personnel would essentially not obtain the unique skills or be prepared to safely and effectively use sensors, weapons, and technologies in realistic scenarios required to accomplish the overall mission." In short, this section states that the military has the ability to not take action but phrases it in such a way that makes it seem like this is their only option. "Sole reliance on simulation would deny service members the ability to develop battle-ready required proficiency in the employment of active sonar during military operations" (Section 2.4.1.4, Simulated Training and Testing Only). Similarly, sonar and explosive uses deny the residents of Guam and our Marine life the ability to become resistant against climate change, ocean acidification, rising seas and warming waters. These only make us, our seas, our coral, our marine life, more vulnerable to the devastating effects of climate change. Active sonar and explosive testing may benefit the Military's ability to train and defend, but it weakens Guam's ability to fight back against natural disasters that are increasing because of climate change.	The U.S. military must train personnel and test new technologies to defend the United States, its territories, and its interests. Realistic training and testing are crucial for military readiness, personnel safety, and national defense. The Mariana Islands offer realistic environments, with sufficient sea and airspace for safety and mission success. Proposed training and testing activities are needed to achieve and maintain military readiness within the Study Area. Alternatives carried forward were developed to meet the Navy's purpose and need and to ensure it can fulfill its obligation under Title 10 of the U.S. Code. See Section 2.4 (Action Alternatives Development) for more detailed information on the development of alternatives and rationale on why alternative training and testing locations were deemed not feasible. Section 3.2 (Air Quality) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS addresses regional emissions, existing air quality, hazardous pollutants, and greenhouse gases. In addition, Chapter 4 (Cumulative impacts), Section 4.4.2 (Air Quality) addresses greenhouse gases and climate change from a cumulative perspective. The analysis indicates there would be a minor increase in greenhouse gas emissions from the Proposed Action, but the increase is not expected to significantly affect the global climate. Additionally, the Secretary of the Navy has established energy goals that aim to reduce the overall impact the department has on climate change. These activities would more than offset the small increase in greenhouse gas emissions that would result from the implementation of Alternative 1 or 2.

	Comment	Navy Response
MCCA-04	Marine life has declined 49% on average from 1970-2012. Since 2008, 25.3 million people have been newly displaced due to natural disasters. While climate change will never be that one thing that causes a war, a government to fail or driver of migration, it is a factor that makes all other factors increasingly difficult. Climate change is a threat multiplier, which means that it exacerbates underlying issues already within susceptible communities. Guam is a vulnerable place because of its location and size. Increased military testing compromises our land, our waters and our capacity to work on mitigation and adaptation efforts in the face of climate change. How can we work on restoring our reefs, our marine life with active testing? How can we become more climate conscious when our Military is polluting our land and waters? How can we demand change when our military denies the ability to do testing in other ways? How can we grow stronger when our military fights to gain control of sacred Chamorro land? How can the people here prosper and grow when the military takes all of the opportunities away?	The analysis indicates there would be a minor increase in greenhouse gas emissions from the Proposed Action, but the increase is not expected to significantly affect the global climate. Additionally, the Secretary of the Navy has established energy goals that aim to reduce the overall impact the department has on climate change. These activities would more than offset the small increase in greenhouse gas emissions that would result from the implementation of Alternative 1 or 2.
MCCA-05	The MITT Final EIS/OEIS states the various mitigation efforts the military plans on taking during testing. But, how can we ensure that these efforts will be followed through given our long history with the military? How can we ensure the safety of our reefs, marine life and water? Is there any guarantee that this testing will not cause long-term damage? There are several paragraphs in the EIS/OEIS that state there will be no long-term damage but forgive me if I am not so easily trusting of the military considering their long and toxic legacy. Some of the most polluted places in the world are left behind from the US military. There needs to be specific data that ensures, guarantees and promises no long-term damage. There needs to be complete transparency. Citizens of Guam need to be engaged in this and we need to be made aware of every single step the military makes. Our livelihoods are at stake and we	As described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy implements procedural and geographic mitigation measures during its training and testing activities to avoid or reduce potential impacts on biological and cultural resources. The Navy strictly adheres to its mitigation requirements, as required under the law. As discussed in Section 5.1.2.2 (Monitoring, Research, and Reporting Initiatives), the Navy developed reporting requirements in cooperation with NMFS during the MMPA and ESA consultation and permitting processes. The Navy's training and testing activity reports and incident reports are designed to verify implementation of mitigation; comply with current permits, authorizations, and consultation requirements; and improve future environmental analyses. For example, the Navy reports to NMFS if mitigation was implemented during sinking exercises (e.g., number of times explosive detonations were delayed due to marine mammal sightings). For major training exercises, the Navy's annual training and testing activity reports include information on each individual marine mammal sighting related to mitigation implementation.

	Comment	Navy Response
	cannot afford military testing and training on our already compromised lands and oceans. ***The wars you are preparing for are the same wars you are contributing to.*** We will start having wars over food, water and resources if we do not act. There will be no need for training when the seas rise, and our waters are poisoned. **There will be no need for a military on a dead planet.**	
Prutehi Litekyan: Save Ritidian (PLSR), Monaeka Flores		
PLSR-01	Prutehi Litekyan: Save Ritidian (PLSR) is a direct-action group dedicated to the protection of natural and cultural resources in the areas identified for DOD live-fire training on Guam. We oppose the continued destruction and desecration of our sacred land and ocean by U.S. Military training and testing activities in the Marianas and in the broader Pacific region. Prutehi Litekyan: Save Ritidian vehemently opposes the continued destruction caused by the Navy's training and testing activities that include the use of active sonar and explosives in the Mariana Islands Range Complex (MIRC) and the Mariana Islands Training and Testing (MITT) study area. We oppose the use of active sonar and explosives in and the continued occupation of 984,601 square nautical miles of the entire ocean across and beyond the Mariana Islands, which is larger than the states of Washington, Oregon, California, Idaho, Nevada, Arizona, Montana and New Mexico combined. We oppose the serious threats to our marine archaeological sites and our ocean ecosystem. We are deeply concerned about the consequences such actions will have on the significant resources our great ocean and land provide us in the Mariåna Islands. These actions have a devastating impact	Training and testing activities proposed in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS would occur at sea and on FDM, and do not include the live-fire training on Guam. Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2 in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) present current and proposed training and testing activities. The Navy analyzed land-based activities on Guam, Saipan, Tinian, and Rota in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS; the Navy did not reanalyze land-based activities because there are no changes proposed to those activities. This Supplemental EIS/OEIS fully complies with NEPA. The Navy conducted extensive studies and analysis, and using the best available science, exceeds the required hard look at impacts on environmental resources. All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS.

	Comment	Navy Response
	on indigenous culture and lifeways, increase our dependence on imported foods sources, and erode our resilience. Our community has been made aware of serious risks associated with this training through the review of the MITT Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) and analysis made public by local officials.	
PLSR-02	We oppose the continued taking of marine mammals and rare and endangered species as a result of military training and testing activities. The MITT draft SEIS lacks current research on the impacts of sonar, vessel interactions, and explosives detonation in the water on marine mammals. The Guam Department of Agriculture has noted that recent information on strandings, sightings, whales sighted giving birth were not included in the draft SEIS for the MITT. The Agat offshore mine detonation area is a well-documented site with photographic evidence of sperm whales birthing, which is listed both as an endangered species and marine mammal. At least five sea turtles were killed by vessel strike in the last seven years in inner Apra Harbor, which is closed to all activity except military vessel activities. There have also been reports of the military encroaching on important fishing grounds outside of the test sites and closing off public access.	The Navy reviewed the best available scientific data and information on marine mammals at the time the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS was completed and incorporated relevant information into the analysis of impacts on marine mammals in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Peer-reviewed scientific publications are considered to be the most reliable and accurate sources of data and information and were used throughout this Supplemental EIS/OEIS to support the analysis and conclusions. Well respected and historically vetted government reports (e.g., marine mammals stock assessment reports) were also used to support the analysis. Any newly published data and information relevant to the analysis of potential impacts on marine mammals that has become available since the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS was completed was incorporated into the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS. In addition, Section 3.4.2.1.1.6 (Stranding) has been expanded to include additional information about strandings of beaked whales in the Mariana Islands and the Navy's support of efforts to better understand the causes of marine mammal strandings. Two photographs that are Associated Press File photos depict this calf; mention of those photos has been added to the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS. To reiterate, that single known occurrence of a newborn calf approximately 19 years ago does not indicate the area to be an established and routinely used sperm whale calving and nursery habitat. While it is possible that several species of marine mammals could occur at the Agat Bay Mine Neutralization Site, the Navy's procedural mitigation involving observing for marine mammals and sea turtles prior to conducting activities using explosives at the site reduces the likelihood of impacts on marine mammals, as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) and Appendix I (Geographic Mitigation Assessment).
PLSR-03	We oppose the continued destruction of our coral reefs and continued contamination of our waters and marine life. The	Section 3.8 (Marine Invertebrates) includes an analysis of potential impacts on coral reefs off Guam and FDM from the Proposed Action. In addition, the Navy is

	Comment	Navy Response
	Guam Coastal Management Program has posed concerns about potential contamination from the breakdown from military expended material, as well as the potential for contamination to spread through ocean ecosystem and food chain. Additionally, the program also discussed the potential damage to hard bottom substrate, which as a site for coral polyp settlement.	consulting with NMFS regarding Essential Fish Habitat, which includes corals and coral reefs. Smith and Marx (2016) concluded that the health, abundance, and biomass of fishes, corals, and other marine resources at FDM are comparable to or superior to those in similar habitats at other locations within the Mariana Archipelago. The Navy funded additional reef surveys in the nearshore areas of FDM in 2017. The results are approved for public release, and available at: https://apps.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/1069450.pdf. The 2017 survey found little evidence that training has affected coral reef communities at FDM. Only three relatively fresh ordnance items were observed, but no blast pits, craters, or significant areas of coral breakage were observed. The ordnance observed during the 2017 survey was almost exclusively old, encrusted in marine life, and was not having any discernable impact on surrounding communities. Based on the most recent NOAA coral reef condition report, coral reefs off Guam are moderately impacted, and overall conditions are fair. Guam's reefs are struggling from threats such as pollution, overfishing, and climate change.
PLSR-04	We oppose the increase in underwater mine charges. The Guam Environmental Protection Agency has reported that neither the 2015 MITT nor the 2019 Supplemental MITT have a discussion on the rational for an increase from a 10 lbs. underwater mine charge to the new standard of a 20 lbs. charge for the listed mine detonation activities.	The proposed training and testing activities in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS are needed to achieve and maintain military readiness within the Study Area. This Supplemental EIS/OEIS furthers the Navy and other military services' execution of their roles and responsibilities under 10 U.S.C. section 8062. Certain mine neutralization measures require the use of larger charges to ensure the efficacy of the technique and procedures trained to. While occurrence of this event will be infrequent, the capability to conduct this type of event was included in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and is reanalyzed in this supplement.
PLSR-05	We oppose the lack of transparency. The military has not been diligent in providing reports of species taking, surveys, and other impacts to the public. EPA officials have also stated that reports have not been provided to document the impacts of all activities.	The Navy is obligated under the ESA and MMPA to provide information on any incidents involving ESA-listed species, the Navy will continue to submit the appropriate reports to NMFS immediately, or as soon as operational security considerations allow, if it observes an incident that is or may be attributable to Navy activities, including: (1) a vessel strike of a marine mammal or sea turtle during training or testing, (2) a stranded, injured, or dead marine mammal or sea turtle during training or testing, or (3) an injured or dead marine mammal, sea turtle, or ESA-listed fish species during post-explosive activity monitoring. The

	Comment	Navy Response
		Navy's Marine Species Monitoring Program website provides access to reports, documentation, data, and updates on current monitoring projects. Information on current monitoring projects, technical reports, conference presentations and data are available at: https://www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/. Additionally, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, NMFS, Guam Division of Aquatic and Wildlife Resources, and the CNMI Division of Fish and Wildlife are cooperating with the Navy on INRMP implementation with other federal and local agencies. The Navy will continue to improve coordination and collaboration with the CNMI as part of the INRMP project development and implementation.
PLSR-06	We oppose continued destruction to our ancestral sites and cultural resources. The Guam State Historic Preservation Officer has expressed concerns that the list of cultural resources referenced in the SEIS does not fully incorporate all the cultural resources that may be impacted.	The Navy has reviewed and incorporated the best available science on cultural resources, including underwater cultural heritage and maritime archeology that are listed or eligible for listing under the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA). The Navy is required to complete independent statutory obligations under both NEPA and NHPA. Thus, the Navy has prepared this Supplemental EIS/OEIS and will continue Section 106 consultation under the NHPA with the Guam Historic Preservation Officer until a Programmatic Agreement can be reached
PLSR-07	Guam, the Marianas Islands, the larger Micronesian region, and the broader Pacific have all had a long history of destruction and contamination from U.S. military activities. On a regular basis, we are flooded with more news of contamination and devastating loss of cultural and natural resources. The U.S. military has historically proven and continues to prove that they are not good stewards of the land and sea. In this process, we are reminded that we do not have a "seat at the table". Prutehi Litekyan: Save Ritidian opposes the continued injustice against our ocean, lands, and people.	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities. Potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Also, as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), the Navy implements, to the maximum extent practicable, procedural and geographic mitigation measures during its training and testing activities to reduce potential impacts on biological and cultural resources. Ritidian is not part of the Proposed Action.
Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC)		
NRDC-01	On behalf of the Natural Resources Defense Council and Center for Biological Diversity, and our millions of members, activists, and constituents, we submit these comments on the Navy's Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact	Comment introduction noted. This Supplemental EIS/OEIS fully complies with NEPA, includes extensive studies and analysis, and, using the best available science, exceeds the required hard look

	Comment	Navy Response
	Statement/Offshore Environmental Impact Statement ("Draft SEIS") for the Mariana Islands Training and Testing ("MITT") Study Area. 84 Fed. Reg. 677 (Jan. 31, 2019). I. LEGAL FRAMEWORK The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 ("NEPA") "declares a broad national commitment to protecting and promoting environmental quality." Robertson v. Methow Valley Citizens Council, 490 U.S. 332, 348 (1989). NEPA establishes a national policy to "encourage productive and enjoyable harmony between man and his environment" and "promote efforts which will prevent or eliminate damage to the environment and biosphere and stimulate the health and welfare of man." 42 U.S.C. § 4321. To achieve its broad goals, NEPA mandates that "to the fullest extent possible" the "policies, regulations, and public laws of the United States shall be interpreted and administered in accordance with [it]." 42 U.S.C. § 4332. Central to NEPA is its requirement that, before any federal action that "may significantly degrade some human environmental factor" can be undertaken, agencies must prepare an EIS. Steamboaters v. F.E.R.C., 759 F.2d 1382, 1392 (9th Cir. 1985) (emphasis in original). The requirement to prepare an EIS "serves NEPA's action-forcing purpose in two important respects." Robertson, 490 U.S. at 349. First, "the agency, in reaching its decision, will have available, and will carefully consider, detailed information concerning significant environmental impacts," and second, "the relevant information will be made available to the larger audience that may also play a role in both the decision-making process and the implementation of that decision." Id. (emphasis added). As the Supreme Court explained: "NEPA's instruction that all federal agencies comply with the impact statement	at impacts on the human and natural environment. The Navy is committed to protecting the environment while training and conducting testing. A comprehensive analysis of potential effects on environmental resources from Navy training and testing activities is presented in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS. While some impacts would occur from training and testing activities, the analysis concludes that impacts would be minimal and would not have a significant impact on the environment. As described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), the Navy implements mitigation measures during its training and testing activities to avoid or reduce potential impacts on biological or cultural resources.

	Comment	Navy Response
	requirement… 'to the fullest extent possible' [cit. omit.] is neither accidental nor hyperbolic. Rather the phrase is a deliberate command that the duty NEPA imposes upon the agencies to consider environmental factors not be shunted aside in the bureaucratic shuffle." Flint Ridge Development Co. v. Scenic Rivers Ass'n, 426 U.S. 776, 787 (1976). The fundamental purpose of an EIS is to force the decision-maker to take a "hard look" at a particular action—at the agency's need for it, at the environmental consequences it will have, and at more environmentally benign alternatives that may substitute for it—before the decision to proceed is made. 40 C.F.R. §§ 1500.1(b), 1502.1; Baltimore Gas & Electric v. NRDC, 462 U.S. 87, 97 (1983). This "hard look" requires agencies to obtain high quality information and accurate scientific analysis. 40 C.F.R. § 1500.1(b). "General statements about possible effects and some risk do not constitute a hard look absent a justification regarding why more definitive information could not be provided." Klamath-Siskiyou Wilderness Center v. Bureau of Land Management, 387 F.3d 989, 994 (9th Cir. 2004) (quoting Neighbors of Cuddy Mountain v. United States Forest Service, 137 F.3d 1372, 1380 (9th Cir. 1998)). The law is clear that the EIS must be a pre-decisional, objective, rigorous, and neutral document, not a work of advocacy to justify an outcome that has been foreordained. To comply with NEPA, an EIS must inter alia include a "full and fair discussion" of direct and indirect environmental impacts (40 C.F.R. § 1502.1), consider the cumulative effects of reasonably foreseeable activities in combination with the proposed action (id. § 1508.7), analyze all reasonable alternatives that would avoid or minimize the action's adverse impacts (id. § 1502.1), address measures to mitigate those	

	Comment	Navy Response
	adverse effects (id. § 1502.14(f)), and assess possible conflicts with other federal, regional, state, and local authorities (id. § 1502.16(c)).	
NRDC-02	II. ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS AND MITIGATION MEASURES At bottom, an EIS must "inform decision-makers and the public of the reasonable alternatives which would avoid or minimize adverse impacts or enhance the quality of the human environment." 40 C.F.R. § 1502.1. This requirement has been described in regulation as "the heart of the environmental impact statement." Id. § 1502.14. The courts describe the alternatives requirement equally emphatically, citing it early on as the "linchpin" of the EIS. Monroe County Conservation Council v. Volpe, 472 F.2d 693 (2d Cir. 1972). The agencies must therefore "[r]igorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives, and for alternatives which were eliminated from detailed study, briefly discuss the reasons for their having been eliminated." Id. § 1502.14(a). Consideration of alternatives is required by (and must conform to the independent terms of) both sections 102(2)(C) and 102(2)(E) of NEPA. In addition, agencies must discuss measures designed to mitigate their action's impact on the environment. See 42 C.F.R. § 1502.14(f). (A) Information Essential to an Analysis of Reasonable Alternatives Under NEPA, agencies are required to obtain information that is "essential to a reasoned choice among alternatives," provided that the overall costs of obtaining it are not exorbitant (40 C.F.R.§ 1502.22(a)); if the information cannot be obtained, then agencies must proceed with their evaluation using "theoretical approaches or research methods generally accepted in the scientific community" (id. at § 1502.22(b)(1)).	In the fall of 2016, the Navy entered a cooperative agreement to provide contributory funding for NMFS' large scale visual and passive acoustic surveys. This effort is titled the Pacific Marine Assessment Program for Protected Species (PacMAPPS) (https://swfsc.noaa.gov/PacMAPPS/). The PacMAPPS partnership includes Bureau of Ocean Energy Management (BOEM), NOAA Fisheries (Alaska, Northwest, Pacific Islands, and Southwest Fisheries Science Centers), U.S. Navy, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). Data collected during PacMAPPS primarily includes line-transect (visual sightings), passive-acoustic, and photographic data and skin and blubber biopsy samples for cetaceans, strip transect (visual sightings) data for seabirds, physical and biological oceanographic data, and data on mid-trophic fishes and invertebrates (e.g., active acoustics, net sampling). The data will potentially be used to generate population abundance estimates for the surveyed areas, abundance trend estimates, delineate stock structure (i.e., based on photo ID data and genetic analysis of the biopsy samples), augment large-whale photo-identification catalogs (which ultimately contribute to knowledge about stock structure and large scale movement patterns), and provide time series information on seabird community composition, distribution, and abundance indices. Most of these cetacean metrics inform various elements (e.g., stock structure and abundance estimates) of stock assessment reports (SARs) that are required under the Marine Mammal Protection Act. To date, the Navy has already contributed to two completed surveys and one 2020 pending survey in the Pacific. Technologies that will be employed during PacMAPPS efforts include standardized line transect visual surveys, passive acoustic towed arrays, and deployment of multiple Drifting Acoustic Spar Buoy Recorders (DASBR) which have shown promise in detecting beaked whales (Griffiths and Barlow 2015, 2016). Under the PacMAPPs program, NMFS' first large scale survey ever in the Mariana Island EEZ is currently scheduled for summer 2021 and will have significant Navy funding to support. This PacMAPP survey will address almost all of the

	Comment	Navy Response
	The data gaps for many marine mammal stocks within the MITT Study Area pose challenges to the development of meaningful alternatives. Without better information on marine mammal population structure, distribution, and important habitat, it is not possible to evaluate what formula of alternative will avoid or minimize adverse impacts for many species. In this case, the Navy must actively work to address the limiting data gaps, particularly for beaked whales. As the Navy is aware, and as further discussed in Section III.A of these comments, beaked whales are highly sensitive to disturbance from naval training and testing activities to the point where serious injury and mortality may occur. Indeed, the best available evidence indicates that such impacts are occurring in the MITT Study Area—a result that is not surprising given the relative naivete of beaked whales in the regions to Navy activities and the ramp-up of those activities over the past several cycles. There remain significant data gaps for beaked whales across the Navy's ranges, which are only amplified in regions that are generally data-depauperate, such as the MITT Study Area. The only systematic large-scale survey for marine mammals undertaken in the MITT Study Area was the Mariana Islands Sea Turtle and Cetacean Survey ("MISTCS") conducted during January-April in 2007 in waters around Guam and the Northern Mariana Islands. While several smaller scale surveys have taken place since that time, there remains a critical need to carry out a new large- scale systematic survey targeted specifically at beaked whales, in order to update and improve density estimates for these species as well as to identify important habitat areas for time-area protections and other alternatives. Any new systematic survey should integrate new methods and tools for detecting beaked whales and	commenter's statements and will be repeated at five-year intervals. The Navy also continues to refine the development of underwater gliders with passive acoustic sensors and is currently testing the latest generation of these gliders in Southern California from 2019 through 2020. The Navy has already conducted two previous underwater surveys with early generation gliders for cetaceans including beaked whales in the Mariana Islands area in 2014 and 2015. Under future monitoring considerations with NMFS, Navy is considering a number of technologies for additional beaked whale work in the Study Area (ex., gliders, bottom-deployed passive acoustic sensors). Opportunistic satellite tagging of beaked whales in the Study Area is likely not feasible given the large spatial extent area, the cryptic nature of beaked whales, sensitivity of beaked whales to close approaches by research boats, and high sea states in the region which could make offshore small boat tagging efforts problematic. Although records of marine mammal strandings exist as far back as 1878 in Guam, reporting of marine mammal strandings across the Mariana Islands has likely only become consistent in recent years, similar to other regions, whereas sonar use has occurred in the area around the Mariana Islands for decades. It is unlikely that beaked whales in the Study Area are naïve to sonar. While exact causes of strandings are uncertain, scientists have identified potential contributing factors for strandings, including age, illness, or disease; ingestion of marine debris/plastics; contaminant load; and manmade sources. A small number of strandings have been associated with the use of U.S. Navy sonar; none of these have occurred in the Study Area. Information on strandings associated with Navy training and testing activities is provided in the 2017 technical report, "Marine Mammal Strandings Associated with United States Navy Sonar Activities." Sonar use occurred prior to four of nine beaked whale strandings in the Mariana Islands. NMFS was able to necropsy two of the beaked whales after stranding, one from the 2011 Saipan stranding and one from a 2015 Guam stranding. Upon examination, the dead stranded beaked whales did not exhibit most of the diagnostic features described by Bernaldo de Quiros et al. (Bernaldo de Quirós et al., 2019), suggesting that these strandings are unlikely to be associated with sonar exposure. Section 3.4.2.1.1.6 (Stranding) has been expanded to include additional information about strandings of beaked whales in the Mariana Islands and the

	Comment	Navy Response
	understanding their habitat use, including systematic vessel-based surveys, passive acoustic monitoring, telemetry, and unmanned vehicles. Additionally, and as discussed in greater detail at section II.C.2, the Navy should expand its existing Behavioral Response Study on beaked whales to assess the reactivity of these species to modified sonar signals, given the demonstrated potential of ostensibly practicable signal modifications to reduce the extent and severity of behavioral response in at least some cetaceans. We strongly believe that focusing on these research questions would be among the most effective uses of the Navy's research resources for the MITT Study Area at this time. Indeed, such a focus is necessary to "a reasoned choice among alternatives" (40 C.F.R. § 1502.22(a)). Such alternatives include establishing Geographic Mitigation Areas in beaked whale habitat, particularly in areas with relatively high densities or associated with range-limited populations; concentrating training and testing activities in habitat of lesser importance to beaked whales; and, conditional on additional research, modifying the sonar signal to reduce the extent and severity of behavioral response in these species.	Navy's support of efforts to better understand the causes of marine mammal strandings. As described in Section 5.1.2.2.1 (Marine Species Research and Monitoring Programs), for this Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy agreed to several additional research and monitoring initiatives designed to help advance the understanding of beaked whales and strandings in the MITT Study Area. The Navy will co-fund the Pacific Marine Assessment Program for Protected Species (PACMAPPS) Mariana Islands survey in spring-summer 2021 and future studies starting in 2022 to help document beaked whale occurrence, abundance, and distribution in the Mariana Islands. The Navy will also fund additional stranding response and necropsy analyses for the Pacific Islands region, and research on a framework to improve statistical stranding analysis. Collaboratively with NMFS, the Navy will fund and organize an expert panel to provide recommendations on scientific data gaps and uncertainties for further protective measure consideration to minimize potential impacts of Navy training and testing activities on beaked whales in the Mariana Islands. Please see the response to NRDC-20 in regard to research with modified sonar signals.
NRDC-02	(B) Time-Area Management Spatial restrictions designed to protect important habitat are one of the most effective available means to reduce the potential impacts of noise and disturbance on marine mammals, including mid-frequency sonar and noise resulting from other naval activities. The Navy proposes to implement three Geographic Mitigation Areas based on criteria related to biological effectiveness and operational practicability, described as Marpi Reef, Chalan Kanoa Reef, and Agat Bay Nearshore (DEIS at Appendix I). Three other potential mitigation areas were considered but it was concluded that they not meet the Navy's criteria because, based on the	The Navy considered using bathymetry to define the Marpi Reef Mitigation Area when initially evaluating potential mitigation areas, but instead relied on confirmed sightings of humpback whales to define the area. After reviewing the cited reference presenting detailed bathymetry of the reef (or bank) coupled with the brief nature of marine mammal sightings, the Navy has reevaluated how the Marpi Reef Mitigation Area is bounded and has redefined the area based on the extent of the 400 m isobath. Given most sightings of humpback whales were in waters less than 200 m in depth, this provides an additional buffer between most sighting locations and the boundary for the area. Humpback whale sightings at the southern extent of the reef help to identify the reef as an area of potential biological importance, but do not define the reef. Seafloor areas extending beyond the reef are not necessarily areas of potential biological importance (i.e., whales may have been transiting to or from the reef when sighted). Scientist from the

	Comment	Navy Response
	available data, the areas are not key areas of biological importance to any marine mammal or sea turtle species: North Guam Offshore Area, Ritidian Point Offshore Area, and Tumon Bay Offshore Area (DEIS at Appendix I-4). To effectively protect marine mammals, the Navy's mitigation areas must be properly sited, and the management objectives for each must be based on the best available science and be precautionary in nature. Below, we evaluate each of the three proposed areas and highlight gaps, where they exist, in their geographic coverage and mitigation requirements. We subsequently highlight additional areas of geographic importance for marine mammals for which Geographic Mitigation Areas should be considered. (1) Evaluation of proposed Geographic Mitigation Areas a. Marpi Reef Geographic Mitigation Area The Marpi Reef Geographic Mitigation Area is intended to provide year-round protection for marine mammals from in-water explosives and a seasonal (December-April) reporting requirement for MF1 surface-ship hull-mounted mid-frequency active sonar used in this area, due to aggregations of breeding humpback whales occurring at this time. Other species afforded protection by the prohibition on explosives include spinner dolphins, bottlenose dolphins, short- finned pilot whales, and false killer whales, all of which have been documented at Marpi Reef (DEIS at Appendix I-5). The boundaries of the proposed Marpi Reef Geographic Mitigation Area are defined by a simple polygon encompassing recorded sightings of humpback whales at the reef during a broad-area line-transect survey in 2007 and during non-	NMFS's Pacific Islands Fisheries Science Center, who have conducted numerous humpback whale surveys in Hawaii and Mariana Islands, stated that the majority of humpback whale breeding activity (mother-calf pairs, competitive behavior) happens in water depths of 200 m or less, with more mother-calf pairs in water depths 50 m or less. In addition, during a review of the Marpi Reef sightings and bathymetry, the Navy found that the mitigation graphics in Appendix I (Geographic Mitigation Assessment) had errors where bathymetric lines plotted were incorrectly shifted. This issue was fixed using a more accurate small-scale bathymetric dataset. Revised figures for the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS show that all humpback whale sightings near Marpi Reef where suspected reproductive behaviors were observed (mother-calf pairs, competitive behavior) were shallower than the 200 m isobath. Therefore, the Navy revised this area so the 400 m isobath is used to define the Marpi Reef Mitigation Area. The Navy does not see a need to extend the area beyond the 400 m isobath based on sightings or to add a buffer to encompass areas beyond the reef given the biologically important activities that typically occur in water depths < 200 m. Using the 400 m isobath offers some degree of built-in buffer when considering humpback whale biology. As described in Appendix I (Geographic Mitigation Assessment), the Navy developed new mitigation for the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS to include a restriction on the number of hours of surface ship hull-mounted MF1 mid-frequency active sonar used from December 1 to April 30 within the Marpi Reef Mitigation Area and Chalan Kanoa Reef Mitigation Area.

	Comment	Navy Response
	systematic small-boat surveys occurring from 2010 through 2018 (DEIS at Appendix I-5). However, defining the Geographic Mitigation Area based solely on survey sightings may overlook other important habitat in the immediate vicinity (described below) that shares the same characteristics and supports the same biological function. In addition, humpback whales, like all baleen whales, are particularly vulnerable to vessel collisions, which can cause serious injury and mortality. A recent study carried out in the 4- island region around Maui indicates that humpback whale calves are at relatively higher risk. Calves represented 25-39% of whales not seen until <300 m, which would constitute a "near- miss," even though they comprised only 7-9% of the population. Collision risk was found to correlate directly to vessel speed: Encounters with humpback whales dropped by 91.5% when vessels were traveling at 12.5 knots or less. As such, it is important that the Navy implement vessel speed regulations in this important breeding habitat. We therefore make the following recommendations with respect to this area: 1. *Extend the Marpi Reef Geographic Mitigation Area boundaries to the 400 m depth contour plus a buffer than encompasses humpback whale sightings data*. In defining the boundaries of the Marpi Reef Geographic Mitigation Area, we recommend that the Navy include the entirety of Marpi Reef as defined by the 400 m depth contour plus a buffer that encompasses the humpback whale sightings beyond this contour (i.e., the distance between the 400 m depth contour and the southernmost point of the current	

	Comment	Navy Response
	proposed Marpi Reef Geographic Mitigation Area [DEIS at Appendix I, Figure I-2]).	
NRDC-03	*2. Implement vessel speed restrictions from December through April.* Ship strikes and vessel noise pose a serious risk to humpback whales, particularly in calving and breeding areas. As such, the Navy should implement restrictions to limit vessel speed within the Marpi Reef Geographic Mitigation Area from December through April.	To avoid physical disturbance and strike from vessel movements, the Navy maneuvers to maintain a 500 yd. mitigation zone from whales and other marine mammals (except bow-riding dolphins). As further described in Section 5.3.4.1 (Vessel Movement), implementing mitigation to limit vessel speed restrictions in the Study Area would be incompatible with the practicality assessment criteria for safety, sustainability, and mission requirements. For example, Navy vessel operators need to train to proficiently operate vessels as they would during military missions and combat operations, including being able to react to changing tactical situations and evaluate system capabilities. Navy studies from other range complexes demonstrated that median speeds near coasts are already low, varying from 5 to 12 knots. Furthermore, given that there have been no vessel strikes involving humpback whales or other marine mammals and Navy vessels conducting training and testing activities in the Study Area, implementing vessel speed restrictions in the Marpi Reef Mitigation Area or other locations in the Study Area would not be an effective mitigation measure because it would not result in an avoidance or reduction of impacts.
NRDC-04	*3. Prohibit use of air-deployed mid-frequency active sonar year-round.* Dipping sonar has been shown to have disproportionate impacts on beaked whales and may impact other species in a similar manner, due to the unpredictability of the signal. The Marpi Reef Geographic Mitigation Area should include a year-round prohibition on air-deployed mid- frequency active sonar.	It should be pointed out that the commenter's recommendation is based on new Navy-funded behavioral response research specific to beaked whales. There are still important limitations to these data that are still under investigation such as proximity to source and other factors. Furthermore, the research was focused exclusively on beaked whales. Behavioral responses of beaked whales from dipping and other sonars cannot be universally applied to other marine mammal species. For example, Navy-funded behavioral response studies of blue whales to simulated surface ship sonar has demonstrated there are distinct individual variations as well as strong behavioral state considerations that influence any response or lack of response. With regards to beaked whales, water depths in the Marpi Reef Mitigation Area are not suitable habitat for beaked whales. There is no evidence to suggest that prohibiting the use of mid-frequency dipping sonar in the Marpi Reef Mitigation Area would have any benefit whatsoever to beaked whales.

	Comment	Navy Response
NRDC-05	*4. Prohibit use of low-frequency active sonar from December through April* Baleen whales are vulnerable to the impacts of low-frequency active sonar, particularly in calving areas where low-amplitude communication calls between mothers and calves can be easily masked. Low-frequency sonar within the Cautionary Area should be prohibited from December through April.	Low-frequency sonar use under the MITT Proposed Action has been significantly scaled down from previous authorization. The Navy is only seeking authorization for 11 hours or less per year of low-frequency sonar use in the Study Area, with most of these systems used further offshore. Furthermore, the most used source at approximately 10 hours (LF5) has source levels <180 dB. Only one hour of LF4 with source levels >180 dB and <200 dB is proposed. Based on historical sonar use in the Study Area, it is highly unlikely that the few planned low-frequency sonar hours would occur in the Marpi Reef Mitigation Area from December through April. Therefore, a prohibition would have very limited or no potential benefit to humpback whales and other marine mammals in the area and would unnecessarily impose a restriction on training and testing in the Study Area.
NRDC-06	b. Chalan Kanoa Reef Geographic Mitigation Area The Chalan Kanoa Reef is intended to provide year-round protection for marine mammals from in-water explosives and a seasonal (December-April) reporting requirement for MF1 surface- ship hull-mounted mid-frequency active sonar used in this area is required due to aggregations of breeding humpback whales. Other species afforded protection by the prohibition on explosives include spinner dolphins, bottlenose dolphins, short-finned pilot whales, false killer whales, rough-toothed dolphins, and pygmy killer whales, all of which have been documented at Chalan Konoa Reef (DEIS at Appendix I-16-I-17). The boundaries of the proposed Chalan Kanoa Reef Geographic Mitigation Area are defined by a simple polygon encompassing exposed fringing reef, reef flats exposed at low tide, nearshore shallow waters (less than 20 meters in depth), and a portion of Saipan Harbor (DEIS at Appendix I-13). The relative concentration of total marine mammal sightings and tag detections as observed and documented between 2007 and 2018, which include seasonal (February-March) humpback	As with the Marpi Reef Mitigation Area, the Navy considered using bathymetry to define the Chalan Kanoa Reef Mitigation Area, but instead relied on confirmed sightings of marine mammals and sea turtles to define the area. Using the recommendation in the comment and after reviewing the cited reference presenting bathymetry of the reef and surrounding areas, coupled with the ephemeral nature of marine mammal sightings, the Navy has reevaluated how the Chalan Kanoa Reef Mitigation Area is defined and has redefined the spatial extent of the area based on the 400 m isobath. Humpback whale sightings seaward of the forereef helped to identify the seaward extent of the area of potential biological importance. Sightings of humpback whales, other cetacean, and sea turtles along the fore reef and closer to shore than the offshore humpback sightings suggested that these areas may be of greater importance to multiple species, including humpbacks, than the areas farther from shore. Deeper areas beyond the reef are not necessarily areas of potential biological importance (i.e., humpbacks in these areas may have been transiting to or from the shallower areas closer to the reef when sighted). In addition, during a review of the Chalan Kanoa Reef sightings and bathymetry, the Navy found that the mitigation graphics in Appendix I (Geographic Mitigation Assessment) had errors where bathymetric lines plotted were incorrectly shifted. This issue was fixed on using a more accurate small-scale bathymetric dataset. Revised figures for the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS show that most humpback whale sightings near Chalan Kanoa Reef where suspected reproductive behaviors were observed (mother-calf pairs, competitive behavior)


	Comment	Navy Response
	whale sightings documented during non-systematic small-boat surveys occurring from 2015 through March 2018. Id. As with Marpi Reef, defining the Geographic Mitigation Area based solely on survey sightings may overlook other important habitat in the immediate vicinity that shares the same characteristics and biological function. In addition, vessel speed restrictions and a prohibition on low-frequency sonar should be observed during the humpback whale breeding season. Given the observed presence of particularly noise-sensitive species at Chalan Kanoa Reef (e.g., false killer whales), the Navy should also impose a year-round prohibition on air-deployed mid-frequency active sonar within the Geographic Mitigation Area. We therefore make the following recommendations with respect to this area: *1. Extend the Chalan Kanoa Reef Geographic Mitigation Area boundaries to encompass the entire reef as defined by the 200 m depth contour.* In defining the boundaries of the Chalan Kanoa Reef Geographic Mitigation Area, we recommend that the Navy include the entirety of Chalan Kanoa Reef as defined by the 200 m depth contour (i.e., the Mitigation Area should be extended to the west and south to encompass the entire reef habitat).	were shallower than the 200 m isobath. There were two mother-calf pair sightings outside of the 200 m isobath, but shallower than the 400 m isobath. Therefore, the Navy revised the Chalan Kanoa Reef boundaries to encompass the 400 m isobath on the northern, western, and parts of the southern boundaries, shown in Appendix I, Figure I-3, which encompasses most sightings. As described in Appendix I (Geographic Mitigation Assessment), the Navy developed new mitigation for the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS to include a restriction on the number of hours of surface ship hull-mounted MF1 mid-frequency active sonar used from December 1 to April 30 within the Marpi Reef Mitigation Area and Chalan Kanoa Reef Mitigation Area.
NRDC-07	*2. Implement vessel speed restrictions from December through April.* Ship strikes and vessel noise pose a serious risk to humpback whales, particularly in calving and breeding areas. As such, the	Similar to the response for Marpi Reef, Navy vessel speeds in coastal zones are often already low. Given that there have been no vessel strikes involving Navy vessels conducting training and testing activities on marine mammals in the Study Area, implementing vessel speed restrictions in the area would further limit Navy

	Comment	Navy Response
	Navy should implement restrictions to limit vessel speed within the Chalan Kanoa Reef Geographic Mitigation Area from December through April.	training and testing activities with little or no benefit to marine mammals and sea turtles at the Chalan Kanoa Reef Mitigation Area.
NRDC-08	*3. Prohibit use of air-deployed mid-frequency active sonar year-round.* Dipping sonar has been shown to have disproportionate impacts on beaked whales and may impact other species in a similar manner. The Chalan Kanoa Reef Geographic Mitigation Area should include a year-round prohibition on air-deployed mid-frequency active sonar.	Beaked whales have not been sighted at Chalan Kanoa Reef and there is no indication that the shallow, nearshore reef area is an area of particular biological importance to beaked whales, which are found in much deeper waters. Therefore, there is no evidence to suggest that prohibiting the use of mid-frequency dipping sonar in the Chalan Kanoa Reef Mitigation Area would have any particular benefit to beaked whales.
NRDC-09	*4. Prohibit use of low-frequency active sonar from December through April.* Baleen whales are vulnerable to the impacts of low-frequency active sonar, particularly in calving areas. Low-frequency sonar within the Cautionary Area should therefore be prohibited within the Geographic Mitigation Area from December through April.	Low-frequency sonar use under the MITT Proposed Action has been significantly scaled down from previous authorization. The Navy is only seeking authorization for 11 hours or less per year of low-frequency sonar use in the Study Area, with most of these systems used further offshore. Furthermore, the most used source at approximately 10 hours (LF5) has source levels <180 dB. Only one hour of LF4 with source levels >180 dB and ≤200 dB is proposed. Based on historical sonar use in the Study Area, it is highly unlikely that the few planned low-frequency sonar hours would occur in the Chalan Kanoa Reef Mitigation Area from December through April. Therefore, a prohibition would have very limited or no potential benefit to humpback whales and other marine mammals in the area and would unnecessarily impose a restriction on training and testing in the Study Area.
NRDC-10	c. Agat Bay Nearshore Geographic Mitigation Area The Agat Bay Nearshore Geographic Mitigation Area is intended to provide year-round protection for spinner dolphins and sea turtles from in-water explosives and MF1 surface-ship hull-mounted mid-frequency active sonar (DEIS at Appendix I-26). The boundaries of the proposed Agat Bay Nearshore Geographic Mitigation Area are designed to encompass the	The current western boundary of the Agat Bay Nearshore Mitigation Area essentially follows the 100 m isobath except at the southern extent of the area. At its northern extent, the area includes deeper waters beyond the 100 m isobath to include an area with a cluster of sea turtle sightings. The greater number of sightings may indicate that the northern portion of the Agat Bay Nearshore Mitigation Area may be of greater importance than the southern portion due to some physical or biological features. The point of land at the southern end of the Agat Bay Nearshore Mitigation Area is a convenient physical feature for defining the area, and as with other sightings data, it is reasonable to assume that animals just outside of the boundary of the area may be transiting to (or from) the

	Comment	Navy Response
	shoreline between Tipalao, Dadi Beach, and Agat on the west coast of Guam, with a boundary across the bay enclosing an area of approximately 5 km2 in relatively shallow waters (less than 100 m) (DEIS at Appendix I-21). The boundaries are based on spinner dolphin sightings documented during small boat surveys from 2010 through 2014. Sea turtle sightings from 2010 through 2014 were also used. Id. In this case, we recommend the southern portion of the Geographic Mitigation Area be extended westwards to include the 100 m depth contour to encompass the aggregation of sightings and protect nearshore habitat for these species. We therefore make the following recommendation with respect to this area: *Extend the southern boundary of the Agat Bay Nearshore Geographic Mitigation Area boundaries seaward to the 100 m depth contour* In defining the boundaries of the Agat Bay Nearshore Geographic Mitigation Area, we recommend that the Navy extend the southern portion of the Mitigation Area westwards out to the 100 m depth contour (DEIS Appendix I at Figure I-4). This extension would encompass a cluster of sea turtle sightings and protect nearshore habitat that, based on sightings data, appear generally important for spinner dolphins and sea turtles. Id.	northern portion of the area and that areas beyond the boundary do not constitute areas of any particularly biological significance.
NRDC-11	(2) Additional habitat areas of importance within MITT Study Area The Navy should consider several additional habitat areas that are not discussed as potential Mitigation Areas in the Draft EIS.	Navy has cited Eldredge (2003), which included a short paragraph on sperm whales sited in the "Micronesian Area" between the years 1761 and 2001; Navy has considered all the information in that reference. The mention of a calf in the sentence, "Eight sperm whales were sighted June 15, 2001, including a young calf with a trailing umbilical cord (web site for Micronesian Divers Association)" is not sufficient to designate a sperm whale breeding and calving habitat off Agat Bay, which is not mentioned in the report. No information on the referenced website is

	Comment	Navy Response
	a. Sperm whale calving and nursery habitat offshore Agat Bay, Guam	provided in Eldredge (2003). Two photographs that are Associated Press File photos depict this calf; mention of those photos has been added to the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS. To reiterate, a single known occurrence of a newborn calf approximately 19 years ago does not indicate the area to be an established and routinely used sperm whale calving and nursery habitat.
NRDC-12	In a 2012 survey, a single sperm whale was sighted close to the western coast of Guam. Additionally, Eldredge (2003) reported a sighting of a group of sperm whales including a newborn calf, made during June 2001 off the west coast of Guam.[15] Just over one-quarter of the sightings (26%) were in or on the periphery of Agat Bay, an area where the bathymetry drops to depths beyond 2000 m very quickly, and closer to shore than any other area around Guam, Rota or Saipan. The Navy should consider designating a Geographic Mitigation Area in the offshore area of Agat Bay encompassing the continental shelf break and slope and extending out to the 2000 m depth contour to protect this potentially important calving and nursing area for endangered sperm whales. b. Sperm whale breeding and calving habitat offshore Apra Harbor, Guam Sightings of several sperm whale calves and a large bull have been observed 2.5 km offshore of the mouth of Apra Harbor. The Navy should consider designating a Geographic Mitigation Area offshore Apra Harbor, encompassing the continental shelf break and slope and extending out to the 2000 m depth contour, to protect this potential breeding and calving habitat for endangered sperm whales.	U.S. Department of the Navy (2007) notes that the closest sighting off Apra Harbor was 2.5 km from the mouth of the harbor, a distance that extends approximately to the 1,000 m isobath off Apra Harbor. Sperm whales are a highly mobile species. Single or small numbers of visual sightings do not necessarily correspond to long term, repeated occupancy of small areas in the ocean. There are many areas in the Mariana Islands where the bathymetry drops to great depth very quickly in comparison to continental margins. Sperm whales are considered a deep-water species and sightings by the U.S. Department of the Navy (2007) are consistent with that. Depths where sperm whales were sighted ranged from 800 to 10,000 m and occurred throughout the Mariana Islands. There is no compelling scientific evidence to consider the area from the shelf break to 2,000 m off Apra Harbor as an area of particular biological importance for sperm whales.
NRDC-13	c. Spinner dolphin resting habitat at Bile Bay, Tumon Bay, and Double Reef, Guam	While spinner dolphins occur in other bays in the Study Area (Bile Bay, Tumon Bay and Double Reef in Guam; Cocos Island and lagoon in Guam; Rota Bank, and Tanapaq Lagoon in Saipan), the sighting data suggest that Agat Bay may be of

	Comment	Navy Response
	Spinner dolphin resting habitat in lagoons is well characterized[18] and has been identified in Bile Bay, Tumon Bay, and Double Reef located on the west side of Guam. Similar to the protections for the Agat Bay Nearshore Geographic Mitigation Area, the Navy should establish Geographic Mitigation Areas in these bays to protect important habitat for spinner dolphins.	particular biological importance for resting behavior. The criteria for establishing a geographic mitigation area included is that "The best available science suggests that the mitigation area is particularly important to one or more species of marine mammals or sea turtles for a biologically important life process (e.g., foraging, migration, reproduction)." While future surveys and research may identify an area other than Agat Bay as a key area of biological importance, the available data indicate that geographic mitigation at Agat Bay would have the most benefit.
NRDC-14	d. Breeding habitat for a possibly resident pygmy killer whale population and resting habitat for spinner dolphin at Cocos Island and Lagoon, Guam Eight pygmy whales were encountered west of Guam in 2013 and the same group with a new calf was encountered west of Cocos Island in 2014 indicating that this area comprises important breeding and calving habitat for a population of pygmy killer whales that exhibits site fidelity to the area. Cocos Lagoon (off Merizo) is also known as important resting habitat for spinner dolphins. In addition, Cocos Island and Lagoon may represent high-use areas for sea turtles. The Navy should consider protecting Cocos Lagoon and the continental shelf and slope waters west of Cocos Island seaward to the 2000 m depth contour as important habitat areas for multiple species.	The cited reference (Hill et al., 2014) indicates that the same 8 pygmy killer whales were sighted off Guam in 2013 and 2014, but it makes no mention of the area as a possible breeding or calving area for pygmy killer whales, nor does it suggest that the population is a resident or island associated population (pygmy killer whale were also seen off Saipan in 2011). In summary, the scientific data acquired to date are insufficient to identify any area off Guam as a key area of biological importance for a pygmy killer whale behavior. While future surveys and research may identify an area other than Agat Bay as a key area of biological importance, the available data indicate that geographic mitigation at Agat Bay would have the most benefit.
NRDC-15	e. Short-finned pilot whale core use areas, west of Guam and Rota The area of highest probability of use (ten percent) for eleven short-finned pilot whales satellite- tagged off Guam and Rota during the summers (June through August) of 2013, 2014, and 2016, were located off the west sides of Guam and Rota (see Figure 1). Short-finned pilot whales found off Guam and Rota are genetically different from short-pinned pilot whales found off Saipan and Tinian, indicating that these core areas represent important habitat for a genetically distinct group of	The analysis by Hill et al., (2018) makes a convincing case that all or part of the highest use area, as depicted in Figure 3 of their paper, may meet the Navy's criteria for being a key area of biological significance. However, the area is sufficiently large that it would be impractical to implement and would not meet the Navy's criteria as described in Section 5.2.4 (Practicality of Implementation) and Appendix I.2.3 (Assessing Practicality of Implementation). Because the area extends north from Apra Harbor along the entire west coast of Guam (and beyond), it would impact the Navy's ability to safely plan, schedule, and conduct training and testing activities from Guam.

	Comment	Navy Response
	short-finned pilot whales and two distinct social networks within that group (the Guam social network is separate from the Rota social network). The Navy should consider designating a Geographic Mitigation Area to protect the ten percent "highest use area" for short- finned pilot whales.  **Fig. 1.** Panel A: Two-daily satellite tag locations (n = 1,007) from 11 short-finned pilot whales satellite tagged off Guam and Rota during summer (June–August) 2013, 2014, 2016 (black dots). Panel B: the probability density contours (magenta 10%, pink 50%, violet 95%) estimated from kernel densities of the satellite tag locations. Red line denotes the Guam and Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands exclusive economic zone boundary. All individuals were a part of the main social cluster. (Adapted from Hill et al. 2018).	

	Comment	Navy Response
NRDC-16	f. Persistent important habitat for spinner and bottlenose dolphins and potential feeding habitat for Bryde's whales, Rota Bank Spinner dolphins and bottlenose dolphins were consistently encountered within 500 m of the same location at Rota Bank over four years, and the area is considered an offshore area with higher relative abundance of spinner dolphins. Bottlenose dolphins have low genetic diversity relative to other populations and show evidence of nuclear introgression with Fraser's dolphin, indicating a hybridization event; bottlenose dolphins in the Marianas are therefore a small genetically isolated and genetically distinct population.[28] A Bryde's whale was also observed lunge-feeding at Rota Bank in 2015, indicating it may serve as a feeding area for this species. The Navy should designate a Geographic Mitigation Area to protect important habitat for multiple species of marine mammals at Rota Bank.	As discussed in Appendix I (Geographic Mitigation Assessment), the Navy considered six potential geographic mitigation areas based on multiple years of sighting and satellite tagging data. The data from the surveys were used to determine which, if any, of the areas could be particularly important to one or more species of marine mammals or sea turtles for a biologically important life process (e.g., foraging, migration, reproduction). While multiple marine mammal species occurred in all six areas, only three of the areas were proposed as mitigation areas, because there was clear evidence that the area supported a biologically important process (e.g., breeding behavior). There is insufficient evidence to identify Rota Bank as an important area for spinner dolphins. Spinner dolphins have also been sighted at multiple other locations exhibiting the same behavior, including resting behavior in Agat Bay where the Navy has developed a geographic mitigation area. The single sighting of a Bryde's whale feeding approximately five years ago does not indicate the presence of an established feeding area for the species.
NRDC-17	g. Important resting habitat for spinner dolphins, Tanapaq Lagoon, Saipan Spinner dolphin resting habitat is well characterized in Tanapaq Lagoon, Saipan. Similar to the Agat Bay Nearshore Geographic Mitigation Area, the Navy should establish a Geographic Mitigation Area to protect this important habitat for spinner dolphins.	As discussed in Appendix I (Geographic Mitigation Assessment), the Navy considered six potential geographic mitigation areas based on multiple years of sighting and satellite tagging data. The data from the surveys were used to determine which, if any, of the areas could be particularly important to one or more species of marine mammals including spinner dolphins. The survey data used did not identify other locations in the Study Area where spinner dolphins would benefit from establishing other mitigation areas.
NRDC-18	(3) Recommendations for Geographic Mitigation Assessment within the MITT Study Area In carrying out its Geographic Mitigation Assessment, we are concerned that the Navy makes unsupported assumptions that lead to the outright dismissal of potential Geographic Mitigation Areas located in data-poor areas that may otherwise be afforded further consideration.	See Appendix I (Geographic Mitigation Assessment) for a complete discussion of mitigation areas considered for the MITT Study Area.

	Comment	Navy Response
	The Ninth Circuit has soundly rejected an underprotective approach to data-poor areas, pursuant to the MMPA's mitigation provision. Specifically, the Court held, inter alia, that NMFS, in predicating its Offshore Biologically Important Areas (OBIAs) in such regions on habitat- specific data, had made a policy choice inconsistent with its duty to prescribe mitigation producing the "least practicable adverse impact" on marine mammals. NRDC v. Pritzker, 828 F.3d 1125, 1140 (9th Cir.). Protecting habitat, as the Court recognized, is "of paramount importance" under the MMPA. Id. at 1141 (citing the mitigation requirement's application to "species or stock and their habitat" and NMFS' duty to "pay[] particular attention to rookeries, mating grounds, and areas of similar significance"). To meet that law's "stringent standard" (id. at 1129), the agencies must follow a more precautionary approach that does not proceed "as if the 'no data' scenario were equivalent to… 'no biological importance'" (id. at 1140, quoting a NMFS White Paper identifying potentially important habitat, infra). See 40 C.F.R. § 1502.2(d). As such, the Navy and NMFS should consider the guidelines for capturing biologically important marine mammal habitat in data-poor areas that NMFS' subject-matter experts provided that were addressed by the Ninth Circuit, as those guidelines are relevant to the broader MITT Study Area, much of which is comprised of data-poor, offshore areas. These "White Paper" guidelines call for: (i) designation as OBIAs of all continental shelf waters and waters 100 km seaward of the continental slope as biologically important for marine mammals; (ii) establishment of OBIAs within 100 km of all islands and seamounts that rise within 500 m of the surface; and (iii) nomination as OBIAs of high-productivity regions that are not	

	Comment	Navy Response
	included in the continental shelf, continental slope, seamount, and island ecosystems above as biologically important. In addition, and consistent with the Court's decision in Pritzker, the Navy should adjust its approach to Geographic Mitigation Assessment as follows: *First,* the Navy must not dismiss the existence of persistent areas of primary productivity. In its discussion of the West Mariana Ridge, the DEIS states: "The Navy recognizes that biological productivity is often associated with bathymetric features like ocean ridges and seamounts; however, productivity in such areas is often highly dependent on changeable conditions, including weather patterns, wind intensity and direction, localized currents and eddies, and the presence of nutrients in the water column" (DEIS at Appendix I-27). To the contrary, bio- physical coupling leads to static bathymetric features promoting and retaining areas of elevated localized production, resulting in persistent biodiversity 'hotspots' in the open ocean. This mechanism is well supported in marine systems and has led in other contexts, including the development of Important Marine Mammal Areas (IMMAs), to static bathymetric features being considered as a strong basis for marine protected area and biologically important area establishment. *Second,* the Navy must not conflate the lack of survey effort with an absence of biologically important habitat. In relation to the West Mariana Ridge, which has received little targeted research effort, the DEIS states: "The available data do not indicate that the West Mariana Ridge or surrounding area is an area of key biological importance for marine mammals or other marine species, nor is it clear that limiting the use of sonar and explosives in the area would result in an avoidance	

	Comment	Navy Response
	or reduction of impacts. Therefore, the West Mariana Ridge area does not meet the Navy's criteria for effective geographic mitigation" (DEIS Appendix I at I-27, I-28). The DEIS continues: "Based on the distribution of marine mammals as known from visual surveys and satellite tag detections within the Study Area (Figure I-5), limiting Navy training and testing activities at the West Mariana Ridge and surrounding region to the 3,500 m isobath would not result in avoiding "high concentrations" of marine mammals" (DEIS Appendix I at I-27). Yet it is clear from Figure I-5 that the data the Navy is relying on to support this statement originate from studies carried out specifically in the vicinity of the Marianas Islands, far to the east; moreover, the target species of those studies are island-associates and would be unlikely to make regular commutes across the ~250 km to the Ridge, even if some individuals may do so. As such, the Navy cannot make any conclusions regarding the biological importance of the West Mariana Ridge based on these data alone. As discussed above, the bathymetric complexity of the Ridge provides strong support that it likely serves as an OBIA for multiple species. *Third,* the Navy overlooks evidence of island-associated small or resident populations, and relative risk to those populations. The DEIS states that "there are no indications from satellite tag data or photographic identification of marine mammals that there are any island-associated small or resident populations of marine mammals in the Mariana Islands" (DEIS at Appendix I-30). However, there is evidence that two demographically independent stocks of spinner dolphins may occur—one around Guam and the other from Rota northward. The Guam spinner dolphins resemble populations observed in Hawaii, exhibiting very close association with calm bays during the day. The Rota spinner dolphins are also found in nearshore	

	Comment	Navy Response
	waters, but in much more dynamic and turbid waters, and also on offshore shallow reefs. In addition, satellite telemetry data suggest bottlenose dolphins are associated with the islands and offshore reefs and seamounts, and that a connected population between Guam and islands north of Saipan exists. This population is likely to be relatively small given encounter rates and re-sight rates for individuals. Moreover, the DEIS includes a statement suggesting that cumulative exposure to training and testing activities do not negatively affect small and resident populations of marine mammals: "Additionally, research from areas, including Hawaii, where training and testing activities occur more often and involve more concentrated use of sonar and explosives, such as at the Pacific Missile Range Facility, has documented the presence of numerous small and resident populations of marine mammals and long-term residency of individuals (Baird et al., 2015). These marine mammals have co-existed for decades alongside areas of concentrated Navy training and testing activity" (DEIS at Appendix I-30). This is completely misleading. Resident populations are at relatively greater risk of cumulative exposure to noise and other disturbances. Relatively few marine mammal species occur in the Pacific Missile Range Facility as compared to other islands in the main Hawaiian archipelago, suggesting an incompatibility of repeated Navy activity with some species. Elsewhere in the archipelago, the Big Island stock of melon-headed whales was recently cited as a key example in a scientific study highlighting the potential harm to the population from naval sonar, given its residency to the area. The authors emphasize a general point of how "displacement can also be a significant source of harm (including injury or death), particularly for small, resident populations that may have 'nowhere to go' and for which the costs of leaving their habitat may be severe." For this and	

	Comment	Navy Response
	other reasons, NMFS has identified the presence of small, range-limited populations as a critical factor in defining Biologically Important Areas ("BIAs") and has endeavored to systematically identify BIAs off the U.S. mainland on that basis. These "severe" effects have been borne out within the Navy's AUTEC Operating Area. A comprehensive study of the population ecology of beaked whales in the Grand Bahama Canyon has demonstrated that the "Cul de Sac" region has high relative density of beaked whale species (Ziphius cavirostris and Mesoplodon spp.) compared to other portions of the Andros-AUTEC Operating Area ("OPAREA"). While the Cul de Sac is part of the OPAREA, it is an acoustically "quiet" region not currently used for tactical sonar exercises. To the north, the Cul de Sac is directly connected to the Tongue of the Ocean ("TOTO"), a deep-water basin that is home to the AUTEC hydrophone array and, as such, the site of regular mid-frequency active sonar training activities. The TOTO provides foraging habitat for Blainville's beaked whales and probably for other species as well; however, the density of beaked whales in the TOTO is estimated to be just over half that of the Cul de Sac (39.5 whales/1000 km2 compared to 73.4 whales/ 1000km2 for Mesoplodon spp.). Fewer immature animals and calves were observed in the TOTO, although the number of females was comparable between the two sites, adding to ongoing concern that the regular use of mid-frequency active sonar at AUTEC is driving the lower recruitment and overall densities of beaked whales in the TOTO. It is entirely remiss for the Navy to ignore evidence of small and resident populations within the MITT Study Area and afford them no additional protections.	
NRDC-19	(C) Other Measures	As described in Section 5.6.2 (Explosives) of the Navy's 2019 Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, when assessing and developing mitigation, the Navy considered reducing the number and size of explosives and limiting the locations and time of day of

	Comment	Navy Response
	NMFS should consider the following additional measures, whether as mitigation measures to prescribe or as research. (1) Avoidance of underwater detonations at night and in other low-visibility conditions At night and during periods of low-visibility, the Navy's ability to detect marine mammals within its safety zone declines significantly. Additionally, some endangered species engage in rest or shallow diving during the night, increasing their vulnerability to ship collision and to injury from explosives and ordnance. Many individual Navy exercises, tests, and maintenance activities last eight hours or fewer, making avoidance of nighttime activity practicable, at least in some cases. Yet the Navy does not require, nor, apparently, does it consider, avoidance of underwater detonations at night and/or during other low-visibility conditions.	explosive training and testing in the Study Area. The locations and timing of the training and testing activities that use explosives vary throughout the Study Area based on range scheduling, mission requirements, testing program requirements, and standard operating procedures for safety and mission success. Although activities using explosives typically occur during daytime for safety reasons, it is impractical for the Navy to prohibit every type of explosive activity at night or during low visibility conditions. Doing so would diminish activity realism, which would impede the ability for Navy Sailors to train and become proficient in using explosive weapons systems (which would result in a significant risk to personnel safety during military missions and combat operations), and would impede the Navy's ability to certify forces to deploy to meet national security tasking.
NRDC-20	(2) Research into sonar signal modifications NOAA's Ocean Noise Strategy puts an emphasis on source modification, along with habitat management, as an important means of reducing acoustic impacts on marine life.[47] In the case of naval activities, behavioral response studies on harbor porpoises and gray seals have yielded preliminary insights into how different characteristics of the sonar signal may differentially affect marine mammals in terms of impact. This research highlights ways in which the sonar signal might be modified to reduce the level of impact at the source. For example, research to date suggests that behavioral response to up-sweep and down-sweep signals vary, depending on the presence or absence of harmonics (i.e., side-bands). For 1 to 2 kHz sweeps with harmonics, harbor porpoises were observed to swim further away from the	NOAA's Ocean Noise Strategy Roadmap acknowledges that sound caused by sonar is an integral and necessary part of an associated sonar activity, and it does not propose sonar signal modification as a means of reducing acoustic impacts on marine life. Rather, the Roadmap suggests exploration of technologies for activities in which low-frequency, broadband sound is incidental to the activity (e.g., maritime traffic and pile driving). As described in the HSTT 2018 Final EIS/OEIS and MITT Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS, at this time, the science on the differences in potential impacts of up or down sweeps of the sonar signal (e.g., different behavioral reactions) is extremely limited and requires further development before a determination of potential mitigation effectiveness can be made. The studies cited by the commenter report the behavioral responses of a few captive harbor porpoises to varying signals. Although this very limited data set suggests up or down sweeps of the sonar signal may result in different reactions by harbor porpoises in certain circumstances, the author of those studies highlights the fact that different species respond to signals with varying characteristics in a number of ways. In fact, the same signals cited here were also played to harbor seals, and their responses were different than the harbor

	Comment	Navy Response
	sound source in response to the up-sweeps than to the down-sweeps; in the absence of harmonics, however, sweep type (up-sweep and down-sweep) caused no significant difference in the response. For simulated naval sonar sounds with fundamental frequencies in the 1 to 2 kHz range containing harmonics, using down-sweeps appears to affect harbor porpoise less than up- sweeps. A related study showed that for 1-2 kHz sweeps without harmonics, a 50% startle response rate occurred at maximum received levels (mRLs) of 133 dB re 1 µPa; for 1-2 kHz sweeps with strong harmonics at 99 dB re 1 µPa; and for 6-7 kHz sweeps without harmonics at 101 dB re 1 µPa. A follow-up study quantifying the behavioral effects of 25-kHz FM signals with high frequency side bands showed that harbor porpoise respiration rate, a probable indicator of stress-response, increased by ~39% compared to signals without side bands at an average received sound pressure level of 148 dB re 1 µPa. Based on these studies, mitigating active sonar impacts could be achieved by employing down- sweeps with harmonics or by reducing the level of side bands (or harmonics). In addition, results indicate that low-frequency (1-2 kHz) active naval sonar systems without harmonics can therefore operate at higher source levels than mid-frequency (6-7 kHz) active sonar systems without harmonics with similar startle effects on porpoises. To our knowledge, the Navy is not presently investigating signal modification as a potential mitigation measure. Given the tangible management implications of this research, however, and the potentially broad benefits to multiple species through modification at the signal source, we recommend that more research of this nature should be carried out in order to understand the extent to which these results can be generalized across species. In parallel, the feasibility of implementing signal modifications (such as those	porpoises. Furthermore, harmonics in a signal result from a high-intensity signal being detected in close proximity; they could be artificially removed for a captive study, but cannot be whitened in the open ocean. Active sonar signals are designed explicitly to provide optimum performance at detecting underwater objects (e.g., submarines) in a variety of acoustic environments. If future studies indicate that modifying active sonar signals could be an effective mitigation approach, then the Navy will investigate if and how the mitigation would affect the sonar's performance. As described throughout Chapter 5 (Mitigation), mitigation must meet the appropriate balance between being effective and practical to implement.

	Comment	Navy Response
	recommended above) into Navy operations should be explored. Other signal characteristics may also be of interest. For example, short rise times (i.e., rise times less than or equal to 15 ms) are correlated across mammalian species with startle response, raising concerns about sensitization. In a 2011 study, researchers demonstrated that sounds with short rise times elicited an acoustic startle response in captive grey seals, followed by "rapid and pronounced" sensitization, taking hold after about 3 playbacks, whereas sounds with longer rise times failed to induce a startle response and did not sensitize the animals. The startled seals then displayed sustained spatial avoidance, rapid flight responses, and "clear signs of fear conditioning," and, once sensitized, even avoided food that was proximate to the sound source. According to the authors, sounds with short rise times thus have "the potential to cause severe effects on long-term behavior, individual fitness and longevity of individuals in wild animal populations." In a follow-on study, high-frequency echosounders with short rise times were found to produce a strong behavioral response in the same species, leading the researchers to conclude that it could produce startle responses, and therefore potentially sensitization, as well. Here, too, we recommend further research and exploration of the feasibility of signal modification. While the Navy, in its recent EIS for Hawaii-Southern California training and testing, rejected modifying sonar sound sources as a mitigation measure, a decision summarily upheld by NMFS, it never explained why making the modifications implicated by the marine mammal behavioral studies discussed above would be impracticable. Indeed, some of	

	Comment	Navy Response
	those modifications, such as converting up-sweeps to down-sweeps, would not alter the system's spectral output in any way. We believe source modification requires greater validation across species and in more behavioral contexts before any decisions are made to alter signals—but given the preliminary data, and given the potential of this measure to reduce the instances and severity of behavioral harassment—particularly for beaked whales and small, resident populations around the Marinas archipelago—we urge the Navy to expedite that research.	
NRDC-21	(3) Thermal detection systems Because mitigation measures based on visual observation, such as safety zone maintenance, results in highly limited risk reduction for most species and under most conditions (e.g., Leaper et al. 2015; see Impacts section for further discussion), we view alternative detection measures as a significant area for development. Thermal detection offers a supplement to visual detection measures and has been demonstrated to outperform observers in number of detected whale blows and ship-whale encounters due to its ability to continuously monitor a 360° field of view during both daylight and nighttime hours. In addition, aerial-mounted infrared cameras have proven able to detect thermal 'trails' up to 300 m behind humpback whales, formed by the thermal mixing of the stratified water that persists for up to 2 minutes. The emerging development of automated whale blow detection systems for infrared video also indicate this technology can feasibly be used for real-time whale detection and mitigation. The Navy has correctly indicated the limitations inherent in thermal detection systems, including its lesser utility in warmer temperatures and foggy conditions, when whale blow	Analysis of the potential for thermal detection systems as a mitigation tool was presented in Section 5.6.4 (Thermal Detection Systems) of the Navy's 2019 Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Office of Naval Research Marine Mammals and Biology program funded a project (2013-2018) to test the thermal limits of infrared-based automatic whale detection technology. That project focused on capturing whale spouts at two different locations featuring subtropical and tropical water temperatures, optimizing detector/classifier performance on the collected data, and testing system performance by comparing system detections with concurrent visual observations. The Navy has also been investigating the use of thermal detection systems with automated marine mammal detection algorithms for future mitigation during training and testing, including on autonomous platforms. For example, the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency funded six initial studies to test and evaluate infrared-based thermal detection technologies and algorithms to automatically detect marine mammals on an unmanned surface vehicle. Based on the outcome of these initial studies, follow-on efforts and testing are planned for 2018–2019. The Navy plans to continue researching thermal detection systems to determine their effectiveness and compatibility with Navy applications. If the technology matures to the state where thermal detection is determined to be an effective mitigation tool during training and testing, the Navy will assess the practicality of using the technology during training and testing events and retrofitting its observation platforms with thermal detection devices. The Navy will provide information to NMFS about the status and findings of Navy-funded thermal detection studies and any associated practicality

	Comment	Navy Response
	is less distinguishable from the ambient air; but such systems are effective in colder conditions as a supplement to visual monitoring. NMFS should consider requiring the Navy to employ thermal detection in optimal conditions, or, alternatively, require the establishment of a pilot program for thermal detection, with annual review under the adaptive management system. According to the DEIS, the Navy "plans to continue researching thermal detection technology to determine their effectiveness and compatibility with Navy applications." A pilot program would be consistent with that interest, while allowing for trial use as a monitoring measure.	assessments at the annual adaptive management meetings. Information about the Navy's adaptive management program is included in Section 5.1.2.2.1.1 (Adaptive Management).
NRDC-22	(4) Mitigation and research on Navy ship speeds The speed at which Navy vessels operate during testing and training exercises, and during general transit between exercises, has direct implications for the probability of mortality from a ship strike as well as for the size of the ship's acoustic footprint. A vessel speed of 15 knots is estimated to result in an 80% probability of mortality if a ship strike were to occur, and this probability approaches 100% at a speed of 20 knots or higher. Slowing ships below 10 knots can reduce collision rates by 90% and decrease the probability of serious injuries or death. The acoustic footprint of vessels also widens dramatically with speed; an increase from a ~7 km footprint at a speed of 10 knots to a ~14 km footprint at 12 knots was observed for commercial shipping vessels in waters off British Columbia. While the Navy has indicated a need to operate at higher speeds under certain circumstances, such as when an aircraft carrier must maintain a minimum wind speed relative to ground in order to launch and receive aircraft, there are other conditions when maintaining a 10-knot vessel speed is surely practicable.	As described in Section 5.6.7 (Reporting Requirements) of the Navy's 2019 Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy developed its reporting requirements in conjunction with NMFS to be consistent with mission requirements and balance the usefulness of the information to be collected with the practicality of collecting it. The Navy's training and testing activity reports and incident reports are designed to verify implementation of mitigation; comply with current permits, authorizations, and consultation requirements; and improve future environmental analyses. Additional reporting would be ineffective as mitigation because it would not result in modifications to training or testing activities or further avoidance or reductions of potential impacts. For example, additional reporting of vessel speed data would not result in modifications to vessel speeds (e.g., speed restrictions) or reduce the already low potential for vessel strikes of marine mammals for the reasons described in Section 5.3.4.1 (Vessel Movement). The speed of Navy vessels can fluctuate an unlimited number of times during training and testing events. Burdening operational Commanders, vessel operators, and event participations with requirements to complete additional administrative reporting would distract them from preparing a ready force and focusing on mission-essential tasks. Additional reporting requirements would draw event participants' attention away from the complex tactical tasks they are primarily obligated to perform, such as driving a warship or engaging in a gunnery event, which would adversely impact Navy personnel safety, public safety, and the effectiveness of training or testing.

	Comment	Navy Response
	Additionally, given that the speed of Navy ships during all aspects of their operations potentially impacts marine mammals, we recommend that the Navy collect and report data on ship speed as part of the EIS process. This will allow for objective evaluation of ship-strike risk, of harassment resulting from vessel activity, and of the potential benefit of additional speed-focused mitigation measures.	As described in Section 2.3.3 (Standard Operating Procedures) Navy vessels operate in accordance with the navigation rules established by the U.S. Coast Guard, which require that vessels proceed at a safe speed so that proper and effective action can be taken to avoid collision and be stopped within a distance appropriate to the prevailing circumstances and conditions. As described in Section 5.3.4.1 (Vessel Movement), any additional vessel speed restrictions would prevent vessel operators from gaining skill proficiency, would prevent the Navy from properly testing vessel capabilities, or would increase the time on station during training or testing activities as required to achieve skill proficiency or properly test vessel capabilities (which would significantly increase fuel consumption); therefore, the mitigation proposed by the comment would be impractical to implement. Finally, given the discussion of ship speeds is primarily focused on potential risk of strike to marine mammals, and that there have been no Navy ship strikes to date combined with existing Navy large whale avoidance mitigation and marine species awareness, the risk to marine mammals from Navy vessel transit at any speed is low.
NRDC-23	III. IMPACTS ANALYSIS Fundamental to satisfying NEPA's requirement of fair and objective review, agencies must ensure the "professional integrity, including scientific integrity," of the discussions and analyses that appear in environmental impact statements. 40 C.F.R. § 1502.24. To this end, they must make every attempt to obtain and disclose data necessary to their analysis. The simple assertion that "no information exists" will not suffice; unless the costs of obtaining the information are exorbitant, NEPA requires that it be obtained. See 40 C.F.R. § 1502.22(a). Agencies are further required to identify their methodologies, indicate when necessary information is incomplete or unavailable, acknowledge scientific disagreement and data gaps, and evaluate indeterminate adverse impacts based upon	The Navy reviewed the best available scientific data and information on marine mammals available at the time the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS was completed and incorporated relevant information into the analysis of impacts on marine mammals in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Peer-reviewed scientific publications are considered to be the most reliable and accurate sources of data and information and were used throughout this Supplemental EIS/OEIS to support the analysis and conclusions. Well respected and historically vetted government reports (e.g., marine mammals stock assessment reports) were also used to support the analysis. Any newly published data and information relevant to the analysis of potential impacts on marine mammals that has become available since the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS was completed and was incorporated into the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Navy has continued to fund basic research on marine mammals, including behavioral response studies specifically designed to determine the effects on marine mammals from the Navy's use of mid-frequency sonar and other

	Comment	Navy Response
	approaches or methods "generally accepted in the scientific community." 40 C.F.R. §§ 1502.22(2), (4), 1502.24. Such requirements become acutely important in cases where, as here, so much about an activity's impacts depend on newly emerging science. Finally, NEPA does not "permit agencies to falsify data or to ignore available information that undermines their environmental impact conclusions." Hoosier Environmental Council v. U.S. Department of Transportation, 2007 WL 4302642 *13 (S.D. Ind. Dec. 10, 2007). Thus, the Navy's review must be thorough and it must not "sweep[] negative evidence under the rug." National Audubon Society v. Department of the Navy, 422 F.3d 174, 194 (4th Cir. 2005). (A) Beaked Whales At least four species of beaked whale are found within the MITT Study Area: Cuvier's beaked whale, Blainville's beaked whale, Longman's beaked whale, and Ginkgo-toothed beaked whale. Beaked whales were acoustically detected in almost every month where there was recording effort off Saipan and Tinian (2010-2013). No beaked whale species is considered "threatened" or "endangered" under the Endangered Species Act, or "depleted" under the Marine Mammal Protection Act; however, U.S. stock assessments have only limited information on animals in offshore regions or remote naval use areas such as the MITT Study Area. While there is little information on beaked whale population structure in the MITT Study Area, new science shows differences in the echolocation signal frequency of Blainville's beaked whales between the Northern Marianas Islands and other locations in the Pacific, Western Atlantic, and Gulf of Mexico. The observed acoustic delineation between regions suggest population-level boundaries of Blainville's beaked	transducers. Relevant data needed for improving these analytical approaches for population level consequences resulting from disturbances will continue to be collected during projects funded by the Navy's marine species research programs. There is limited information about beaked whale populations in the Study Area. Navy funded projects have provided nearly the entirety of marine mammal science collected in the Marianas. In fact, prior to Navy funding of marine mammal science, there had not been any dedicated marine mammal surveys performed in the Mariana Islands. The commenter infers that spectral differences in Blainville's beaked whale echolocations correspond to spatially limited populations; however, the cited research does not make this claim. Baumann-Pickering et al. suggest reasons why Blainville's beaked whale echolocation may differ between regions, while acknowledging that information to investigate those hypotheses are limited. Also, while citing research that identifies populations with relatively small ranges (e.g., Baird et al. 2016), the commenter has misinterpreted other research showing year-round species presence as implying range limitation (e.g., Cummings et al. 2017). The Navy will continue to meet its mission requirements as it funds research investigating the potential effects of training and testing on marine species, as well as research that will better inform the understanding of species presence, including beaked whales, in the Study Area. The Navy has implemented an adaptive management plan in coordination with NMFS to periodically review recent science and evaluate its mitigation procedures. As described in Section 3.4.2.1.2.1 (Methods for Analyzing Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers), a few minor to moderate TTS or behavioral reactions to an individual over the course of a year are unlikely to have any significant costs or long-term consequences for that individual. Considering these factors and the mitigation measures that would be implemented as described in Section 5.3.2.1 (Active Sonar) and Section 5.4.2 (Mitigation Areas for Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles), long-term consequences for the species or stocks are not expected.

	Comment	Navy Response
	whales, including a population specific to the Northern Marianas Islands. In other parts of the world, scientific studies now indicate that beaked whales show remarkable site fidelity. Range-limited beaked whale populations have been found on the shelf break approximately 50 km east of Cape Hatteras, as well as off Canada, in the Mediterranean, off Southern California, in the Bahamas, and around the Hawaiian Islands. A recent passive acoustic monitoring study similarly indicates that beaked whales reside in areas year-round. In a similar vein, range-limited sperm whale populations, another deep-diving species, have been found off Cape Hatteras, the Gulf of Mexico, and off Western Australia. Resident populations are at relatively greater risk of cumulative exposure to noise and other disturbances. The Cuvier's beaked whale population off Cape Hatteras was recently cited as a key example in a scientific study highlighting the greater potential harm to the population from seismic surveys, given its residency to the area. The authors emphasize that "displacement can also be a significant source of harm (including injury or death), particularly for small, resident populations that may have 'nowhere to go' and for which the costs of leaving their habitat may be severe." The study, which was led by NMFS biologists, emphasizes how "[f]ailure to consider effects of both noise exposure and displacement of Cuvier's beaked whales from their habitat in this region could lead to more severe biological consequences than 'Level B Harassment' (as defined under US law), because (1) not all animals that can be injured are likely to be detected, and (2) displacement out of their population range may adversely affect foraging rates, reproduction, or the health of Cuvier's beaked whales."	

	Comment	Navy Response
	Given this contextual data, it is conservative to assume that range-limited beaked whale populations inhabit the MITT Study Area and are regularly exposed to the Navy's training and testing activities.	
NRDC-25	The increase in the stranding incidence of beaked whales in recent years—six beaked whales stranded in Guam since 2007 compared to only a single stranding in the previous 35 years—is therefore of great concern. Moreover, the strandings appear to be correlated with Navy training and testing activities—four of the six recent strandings occurred within days of Navy operations. The observed correlation is hardly surprising, as numerous studies clearly representing the best available science, including post-stranding pathology, laboratory study of organ tissue, theoretical work on dive physiology, and expert reviews, provide support for behaviorally-mediated injury and mortality through maladaptive alteration of the dive pattern in response to Navy sonar exposure. Experiments on common bottlenose dolphin to test for nitrogen bubble formation after sudden repetitive dives have found no evidence of gas bubble formation. But beaked whales, which are adapted to perform long and deep dives, show saturation of nitrogen levels at the surface, making them particularly vulnerable. *For purposes of analysis, the Navy must assume that beaked whales are subject to both acute and chronic injury from gas-bubble formation under certain conditions of sonar exposure—and, indeed, have already suffered injury and death from training and testing activities in the MITT Study Area.*	Although records of marine mammal strandings exist as far back as 1878 in Guam, reporting of marine mammal strandings across the Mariana Islands has likely only become consistent in recent years, similar to other regions, whereas sonar use has occurred in the area around the Mariana Islands for decades. While exact causes of strandings are uncertain, scientists have identified potential contributing factors for strandings including age, illness, or disease; ingestion of marine debris/plastics; contaminant load; and manmade sources. A small number of strandings have been associated with the use of U.S. Navy sonar; none of these have occurred in the Study Area. The Navy is committed to protecting marine life by implementing mitigation measures when training or testing using active sonar or explosives; working with regulatory agencies; and furthering our understanding of marine mammals through research and monitoring. Information on strandings associated with Navy training and testing activities is provided in the Navy's technical report on marine mammal strandings (Marine Mammal Strandings Associated with U.S. Navy Sonar Activities, 2017 – Available on the project website: https://mitt-eis.com/) for more information. Sonar use occurred prior to four of nine beaked whale strandings in the Mariana Islands. NMFS was able to necropsy two of the beaked whales after stranding, one from the 2011 Saipan stranding and one from a 2015 Guam stranding. Upon examination, the dead stranded beaked whales did not exhibit most of the diagnostic features described by Bernaldo de Quiros et al. (Bernaldo de Quirós et al., 2019), suggesting that these strandings are unlikely to be associated with sonar exposure. The Center for Naval Analysis (CNA) recently conducted a statistical study of correlation of beaked whale strandings around the Mariana Islands with the use of U.S. Navy sonar, finding that insufficient evidence of a correlation exists. The CNA study used the complete record of all U.S. Navy sonar use between 2007 and 2019,

	Comment	Navy Response
		including major training events, joint exercises, and unit level training/testing. The analysis also included the complete beaked whale stranding record for the Mariana Islands through 2019. Following the methods in Simonis et al. (2020), the CNA analysis found insufficient evidence of a correlation between sonar use and beaked whale strandings when considering the complete sonar use record. The CNA finding is in contrast to the finding in Simonis et al. (2020), which depicted a significant correlation between beaked whale strandings and Navy sonar use. However, the Simonis et al. (2020) result relied on substantially incomplete or inaccurate assumptions about U.S. Navy sonar use around the Mariana Islands. CNA also conducted statistical analyses specific to each island where beaked whale strandings have been observed in the Mariana Islands, similarly finding insufficient evidence of a correlation to sonar use. Additional information on the findings of the CNA analysis are presented in Section 3.4.2.1.1.6 (Stranding) in Chapter 3.4 (Marine Mammals). Section 3.4.2.1.1.6 (Stranding) has been expanded to include additional information about strandings of beaked whales in the Mariana Islands and the Navy's support of efforts to better understand the causes of marine mammal strandings.
NRDC-26	In addition, new science shows that northern bottlenose whales (Hyperoodon ampullatus) not previously exposed to sonar exhibit sustained avoidance and cessation of feeding at low received levels; moreover, distance to the source was found not to significantly influence responses, indicating that whales did not perceive less risk from, or react less severely to, a relatively distant sound source (28 km). Populations of beaked whales in the MITT Study Area may be similarly naïve to sonar exposure and, as such, may be expected to react strongly even at considerable distances. This is all the more concerning in light of the fact that the Navy is currently operating without a permit for Level A take of beaked whales. NMFS may not conclude, under the Marine Mammal Protection Act, that an activity will have only a "negligible impact" on a particular species or stock if it has no	The reactions by bottlenose whales to sonar exposure described in Wensveen et al. (2019) occurred at received sound pressure levels and distances similar to reactions observed in other tagged beaked whales. The greater sensitivity of beaked whales to behavioral disturbance, both to lower sound pressure levels and at greater distances, is considered in the estimate of potential impacts to these species. Further information can be found in the Navy technical report titled *Criteria and Thresholds for U.S. Navy Acoustic and Explosive Effects Analysis (Phase III)*, available at www.mitt-eis.com. There are records of beaked whales stranding in the Mariana Islands for approximately 150 years and there is no evidence that Navy activities in the Mariana Islands have resulted in the mortality to beaked whales found stranded in more recent times. With the PIFSC and DAWR data, the Navy conducted an independent review of the beaked whale strandings between August 2007 and December 2019. During that 13-year time period there were nine beaked whale stranding events, the majority of which were identified as Cuvier's beaked whales. There were 7 years across the 13-year period in which no beaked

	Comment	Navy Response
	information on which to do so, see 40 C.F.R. § 1502.25(a) at 1225, as is the case for beaked whales. As such, the Navy's present activities are being conducted illegally; and its failure to acknowledge the potential for serious injury and mortality in its DEIS, and in its February 2019 take application, is arbitrary and capricious and will result in further illegal action under the MMPA.	whale strandings occurred and 2 years in which two strandings occurred within a given year. From 2007 to 2019, 18 of 23 (or 78 percent) of multi-national Navy events using sonar in the MITT Study Area did not co-occur with any beaked whale strandings. 56% (5 of 9) of the beaked whale strandings occurred without any Navy sonar use prior, therefore, some factors other than Navy sonar may be influencing these strandings. It should also be noted that the PIFSC conducted necropsies on three of the beaked whales that stranded after sonar use (two in March 2011 and one in March 2015). The results did not show evidence of gas bubble disease (gas emboli and fat emboli were not observed), which can occur during a rapid ascent to the surface and has been suggested as a response by beaked whales to sonar. Based on the above information, the Navy does not predict that any beaked whales would be injured under this Proposed Action. The issue of Navy-only sonar exclusively causing mortality to beaked whale is complex for a species known to be susceptible to behavioral reactions to any anthropogenic sound, including commercial shipping transits. Other anthropogenic causes of beaked whale mortalities include plastic ingestion. Factoring in natural causes of mortality (e.g., disease, predation, foraging success), determining direct causal relationships is complex for any species of marine mammals, especially beaked whales. The Navy's MITT Supplemental EIS does a thorough job of qualitatively and quantitatively summarizing potential effects to all marine mammal species, including beaked whale, within the MITT Study Area. Criteria development, modeling improvements for assessing acoustic and explosive impacts, refinements to the science used for the impact assessment framework, and Navy-funded monitoring in the Marianas Islands have been advancing for over 10 years in consultation with the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). The Navy stands by the MITT Supplemental EIS conclusions and associated NMFS take request under the Marine Mammal Protection Act.
NRDC-27	(B) Other Methodological Problems In our comments on the Navy's previous third-phase DEISs, particularly those prepared for Hawaii-Southern California and Atlantic Fleet training and testing activities ("HSTT" and "AFTT"	Information about the quantitative analysis process, including the consideration of mitigation effectiveness, is described in detail in the technical report titled *Quantifying Acoustic Impacts on Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles: Methods and Analytical Approach for Phase III Training and Testing*. It should be noted that even before consideration of mitigation effectiveness, there were no modeled

	Comment	Navy Response
	respectively), we identified a number of significant issues concerning the Navy's analysis of acoustic and other impacts on marine mammals. In most instances, the Navy has not modified its approach to address the issues we raised. We therefore note these issues again. (1) (1) Post-modeling analysis of Level A injury and mortality In estimating the number of instances of injury and mortality, the DEIS makes two post hoc adjustments, significantly reducing the totals based on presumed animal avoidance and mitigation effectiveness. These two reductions are arbitrary and non-conservative. By itself, the Navy's avoidance adjustment effectively reduces the number of estimated auditory injuries by 95%, on the assumption that marine mammals initially exposed to three or four sonar transmissions at levels below those expected to cause permanent injury would avoid injurious exposures. While it is certainly true that some marine mammals will flee the sound, there are no data to inform us how many would do so, let alone that 95% would move as expeditiously as the Navy presumes. Marine mammals may remain in important habitat, and the most vulnerable individuals may linger in an area, notwithstanding the risk of harm; marine mammals cannot necessarily predict where an exercise will travel; and Navy vessels engaged in certain activities may move more rapidly than a marine mammal that is attempting to evacuate. Avoidance adjustments were first used in 2012, for an environmental impact report prepared under the California Environmental Quality Act; in that case, the authors, to compensate for their non- conservative assumptions about avoidance, presumed that every instance of permanent	mortalities to any marine mammal or sea turtle species. The Navy assumes that Lookouts will not be 100% effective at detecting all individual marine mammals and sea turtles within the mitigation zones for each activity. This is due to the inherent limitations of observing marine species and because the likelihood of sighting individual animals is largely dependent on observation conditions (e.g., time of day, sea state, mitigation zone size, observation platform) and animal behavior (e.g., the amount of time an animal spends at the surface of the water). The Navy quantitatively assessed the effectiveness of its mitigation measures on a per-scenario basis for four factors: (1) species sightability, (2) a Lookout's ability to observe the range to permanent threshold shift (for sonar and other transducers) and range to mortality (for explosives), (3) the portion of time when mitigation could potentially be conducted during periods of reduced daytime visibility (to include inclement weather and high sea-state) and the portion of time when mitigation could potentially be conducted at night, and (4) the ability for sound sources to be positively controlled (e.g., powered down). The g(0) values used by the Navy for their mitigation effectiveness adjustments take into account the differences in sightability with sea state, and utilize averaged g(0) values for sea states of 1-4 and weighted as suggested by Barlow (2015). Using g(0) values is an appropriate and conservative approach (i.e., underestimates the protection afforded by the Navy's mitigation measures) for the reasons detailed in the technical report. For example, during line-transect surveys, there are typically two primary observers searching for animals. Each primary observer looks for marine species in the forward 90-degree quadrant on their side of the survey platform and scans the water from the vessel out to the limit of the available optics (i.e., the horizon). Because Navy Lookouts focus their observations on established mitigation zones, their area of observation is typically much smaller than that observed during line-transect surveys. The mitigation zone size and distance to the observation platform varies by Navy activity. For example, during hull-mounted mid-frequency active sonar activities, the mitigation zone extends 1,000 yd. from the ship hull. During the conduct of training and testing activities, there is typically at least one, if not numerous, support personnel involved in the activity (e.g., range support personnel aboard a torpedo retrieval boat or support aircraft). In addition to the Lookout posted for the purpose of mitigation, these

	Comment	Navy Response
	threshold shift would result in biological removal. The Navy should not adjust for avoidance here. The Navy's adjustment of injury and mortality numbers for "mitigation effectiveness" is also problematic. The DEIS starts with the species-specific g(0) factors applied in professional marine mammal abundance surveys, then multiplies them by a simple factor to reflect the relative effectiveness of its lookouts in routine operating conditions. Yet the Navy's sighting effectiveness is likely to be much poorer than that of experienced biologists dedicated exclusively to marine mammal detection, operating under conditions that maximize sightings. As one recent paper observed, for example, abundance survey rates declined significantly as sea states rose above Beaufort 1, and average Beaufort sea states in the MITT Study Area are notably high, as evidenced by marine mammal survey reports. Given this, and given that most Navy activities would be allowed to occur in all sea conditions and hours of day, it seems seldom that Navy visual surveys can approximate the sighting effectiveness of a large-vessel abundance survey. In any case, the public has no meaningful way to evaluate the Navy's adjustment further since the DEIS does not provide the scores used to generate the effectiveness factor, nor does it provide pre-adjustment take numbers. Notably, as the Marine Mammal Commission observes, an ongoing study on mitigation effectiveness, conducted by the Navy in partnership with the University of St. Andrews, has reported instances where Navy lookouts failed to site or report marine mammals spotted by Marine Mammal Observers within established mitigation zones. We urge the Navy to provide more transparency about its post hoc modeling adjustments (40 C.F.R. §§ 1502.9(a), 1503.1(a), 5	additional personnel observe for and disseminate marine species sighting information amongst the units participating in the activity whenever possible as they conduct their primary mission responsibilities. However, as a conservative approach to assigning mitigation effectiveness factors, the Navy elected to account only for the minimum number of required Lookouts used for each activity; therefore, the mitigation effectiveness factors may underestimate the likelihood that some marine mammals and sea turtles may be detected during activities that are supported by additional personnel who may also be observing the mitigation zone. The Navy has fully described its analytical process in the above technical report. The Navy refined the Phase III analysis by considering mitigation effectiveness at the scenario level, rather than at the activity level as in Phase II. Many scenario details are classified, thus the level of detail requested cannot be provided in an unclassified document. As discussed in *Quantifying Acoustic Impacts on Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles: Methods and Analytical Approach for Phase III Training and Testing*, animats in the Navy's acoustic effects model do not move horizontally or "react" to sound in any way, necessitating the additional step of considering animal avoidance of close-in PTS zones. This approach is fully supported by the best available science. Based on a growing body of behavioral response research, animals do in fact avoid the immediate area around sound sources to a distance of a few hundred meters or more depending upon the species. Avoidance to this distance greatly reduces the likelihood of impacts to hearing such as temporary and permanent threshold shift (TTS and PTS, respectively). Specifically, the ranges to PTS for most marine mammal groups are within a few tens of meters and the ranges for the most sensitive group, the HF cetaceans, average about 200 m, to a maximum of 270 m in limited cases; however, HF cetaceans such as harbor porpoises have been observed reacting to anthropogenic sound at greater distances than other species and are likely to avoid their zones to hearing impacts (TTS and PTS) as well. Not considering animal avoidance and mitigation effectiveness would lead to a great overestimate of injurious impacts. NMFS has concurred with the analytical approach used. The results of the quantitative analysis represent the best estimate

	Comment	Navy Response
	U.S.C. § 706(2)(D)) and, conservatively, to use unadjusted injury and mortality numbers in finalizing the EIS.	of the maximum number of instances that marine mammals may be impacted under this Proposed Action.
NRDC-28	(2) Behaviorally-mediated injury and mortality In the past, both the Navy and NMFS have discounted the leading explanation about the mechanism of sonar-related pathologies, maladaptive alteration of the dive pattern, as one of several controversial hypotheses. But this explanation has now been supported by numerous studies, including post-stranding pathology, laboratory study of organ tissue, and theoretical work on dive physiology, as well as by expert reviews, and is clearly best available science. Experiments on common bottlenose dolphin to test for nitrogen bubble formation after sudden repetitive dives have found no evidence of gas bubble formation.90 But beaked whales, which are adapted to perform long and deep dives, show saturation of nitrogen levels at the surface, making them particularly vulnerable. For purposes of analysis, the Navy should assume that beaked whales are subject to both acute and chronic injury from gas-bubble formation under certain conditions of sonar exposure. studies, including post-stranding pathology, laboratory study of organ tissue, and theoretical work on dive physiology, as well as by expert reviews, and is clearly best available science. Experiments on common bottlenose dolphin to test for nitrogen bubble formation after sudden repetitive dives have found no evidence of gas bubble formation. But beaked whales, which are adapted to perform long and deep dives, show saturation of nitrogen levels at the surface, making them particularly vulnerable. For purposes of analysis, the Navy should assume that beaked whales are subject to both acute and chronic injury from gas-bubble formation under certain conditions of sonar exposure. studies, including post- stranding pathology, laboratory study of organ tissue, and theoretical work on dive	Nitrogen decompression is discussed in the MITT Final EIS/OEIS in Section 3.4.2.1.1.1 (Marine Mammals - Injury - Nitrogen Decompression). This section discusses the background of potential impacts on marine mammals—and specifically beaked whales—from Acoustic stressors, such as sonar, and outlines the literature currently available with regards to this potential impact. This Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS includes additional information on Cuvier's beaked whale strandings relative to sonar use in the Study Area in Section 3.4.2.1.1.6 (Stranding) under Environmental Consequences due to Acoustic Stressors in the Marine Mammal section (Section 3.4). Based on the best available science summarized in this FEIS/OEIS, the Navy does not predict that any beaked whales would be injured due to behaviorally-mediated injury under this Proposed Action.

	Comment	Navy Response
	physiology, as well as by expert reviews, and is clearly best available science. Experiments on common bottlenose dolphin to test for nitrogen bubble formation after sudden repetitive dives have found no evidence of gas bubble formation. But beaked whales, which are adapted to perform long and deep dives, show saturation of nitrogen levels at the surface, making them particularly vulnerable. For purposes of analysis, the Navy should assume that beaked whales are subject to both acute and chronic injury from gas-bubble formation under certain conditions of sonar exposure.	
NRDC-29	(3) Thresholds and weighting systems for auditory impacts The criteria that SPAWAR has produced to estimate temporary and permanent threshold shift in marine mammals are erroneous and non-conservative. Wright (2015) has identified several statistical and numerical faults in the Navy's approach, such as pseudo-replication and inconsistent treatment of data, that tend to bias the proposed criteria towards an underestimation of effects. Similar and additional issues were raised by a dozen scientists during the public comment period on the draft criteria held by NMFS. At the root of the problem is the Navy's broad extrapolation from a small number of individual animals, mostly bottlenose dolphins, without taking account of what Racca et al. (2015b) have succinctly characterized as a "non- linear accumulation of uncertainty." The auditory impact criteria should be revised.	The permanent threshold shift/temporary threshold shift criteria and thresholds, as set by NMFS, include numerous conservative assumptions, such as: (1) Navy assumes no recovery of hearing during time intervals between intermittent exposures. However, multiple studies from humans, terrestrial mammals, and marine mammals have demonstrated less temporary threshold shift from intermittent exposures compared to continuous exposures with the same total energy because hearing is known to experience some recovery in between noise exposures. Therefore, the Navy's approach is known to over-estimate the effects of intermittent noise sources such as tactical sonars. (2) Marine mammal temporary threshold shift data have shown that, for two exposures with equal energy, the longer duration exposure tends to produce a larger amount of temporary threshold shift. Since most marine mammal temporary threshold shift data have been obtained using exposure durations of tens of seconds up to an hour, much longer than the durations of many tactical sources, the use of the existing marine mammal temporary threshold shift data tends to over-estimate the effects of sonars with shorter duration signals. Since marine mammal hearing and noise-induced hearing loss data are limited, both in the number of species and in the number of individual's available, attempts to minimize pseudoreplication would further reduce these already limited data sets. Specifically, with marine mammal behavioral temporary threshold shift studies, behaviorally-derived data are only available for two mid-frequency cetacean species (bottlenose dolphin, beluga) and two phocids in water pinniped species (harbor seal and northern elephant seal), with OW pinnipeds and high-frequency cetaceans only having behaviorally-derived data from one species. Arguments from Wright (2015)

	Comment	Navy Response
		regarding pseudo replication within the temporary threshold shift data are therefore largely irrelevant in a practical sense because of limited data. Multiple data points were not included for the same individual at a single frequency - if multiple data existed at one frequency, the lowest temporary threshold shift onset was always used. There is only a single frequency where temporary threshold shift onset data exist for two individuals of the same species: 3 kHz for dolphins. Their temporary threshold shift (unweighted) onset values were 193 and 194 dB re 1 µPa2s. Thus, Navy believes that the current approach makes the best use of the given data. Appropriate means of reducing pseudoreplication may be considered in the future, if more data become available. Many other comments from Wright (2015) and the comments from Racca et al. (2015b) appear to be mistakenly based on the idea that the shapes of the auditory weighting functions and temporary threshold shift/permanent threshold shift exposure thresholds are directly related to the audiograms; i.e., that changes to the composite audiograms would directly influence the threshold shift/permanent threshold shift exposure functions [e.g., Wright (2015) describes weighting functions as "effectively the mirror image of an audiogram" (p. 2) and states "The underlying goal was to estimate how much a sound level needs to be above hearing threshold to induce temporary threshold shift." (p. 3) — both statements are incorrect and suggest a fundamental misunderstanding of the criteria/threshold derivation.] This would require a constant (frequency-independent) relationship between hearing threshold and temporary threshold shift onset that is not reflected in the actual marine mammal temporary threshold shift data. Attempts to create a "cautionary" outcome by artificially lowering the composite audiogram thresholds would not necessarily result in lower temporary threshold shift/permanent threshold shift exposure levels, since the exposure functions are to a large extent based on fitting mathematical functions to the existing temporary threshold shift data.
NRDC-30	(4) Behavioral response thresholds For its third phase of offshore range compliance, the Navy has finally abandoned the narrowly conceived behavioral risk function that it employed in its first two rounds of programmatic environmental review. In lieu of a simple dose-	Please see the *Criteria and Thresholds for U.S. Navy Acoustic and Explosive Effects Analysis (Phase III) Technical Report* (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2017) for details on how the Navy accounted for the differences in captive and wild animals in the development of the behavioral risk functions. The Navy uses the best available science in the analysis which has been reviewed by external scientists and approved by NMFS. The Navy has utilized all available data for the

	Comment	Navy Response
	response curve, the Navy applies a biphasic function that assumes an unmediated dose-response relationship at higher received levels and a context-influenced response at lower received levels. And instead of limiting its data sources to three studies, at least one of which— the response of captive bottlenose dolphins to tones generated in a temporary threshold shift experiment—was inapposite and should not have been used, the Navy has incorporated data from a broader set of behavioral response studies, including the SOCAL BRS and the 3S project funded jointly by the U.S., French, and Norwegian navies. We agree with the Navy that a biphasic approach is better suited to the data and incorporates contextual factors far better than the simple approach it used in previous analyses; and we concur with its expansion of data sources along with its removal of the threshold shift experiment as a basis for analysis, as we have recommended. The resulting functions, however, depend on a number of inappropriate assumptions that tend to underestimate effects. (a) Data sources For example, two of the proposed behavioral response functions rely substantially on captive animal studies, even though it is generally accepted that captive animals, especially (but not limited to) those that have previously been trained, are likely to be less responsive to intrusive sound. Every data point that informs the pinniped function, and nearly two-thirds of the data points informing the odontocete function (30/49), are derived from a captive animal study. In the case of the odontocete function, the reliance on captive studies exacerbates that function's heavy dependence on the	development of updated criteria and threshold, and limiting the data to the small number of field studies would not provide enough data with which to develop the new risk functions. In addition, the Navy accounts for the fact that captive animals may be less sensitive, and the scale at which a moderate-to-severe response was considered to have occurred is different for captive animals than for wild animals, as the Navy understands those responses will be different.

	Comment	Navy Response
	bottlenose dolphin, a species that is generally considered relatively insensitive, to represent a diverse set of taxa with divergent sensitivity and reactiveness to mid- frequency anthropogenic noise. If, for example, the number of wild killer whale data points (n=8) and captive bottlenose dolphin data points (n=30)—a discrepancy that owes itself to the greater accessibility of captive animals—were exchanged, such that killer whales represented the larger and bottlenose dolphins the lesser amount of data, the resulting response function would differ substantially. That result is arbitrary.	
NRDC-31	Additionally, the risk functions do not incorporate (nor does the Navy apparently consider) a number of relevant studies on wild marine mammals, such as a passive acoustic study on blue whale vocalizations and a tagging study on behavioral responses to dipping sonar, for which received levels are either available or can be estimated. It is not clear from the DEIS or from the Navy's recently released technical report on acoustic "criteria and thresholds" exactly how each of the studies the Navy employed were applied in the analysis, or how the functions were fitted to the data, but the available evidence on behavioral response raises concerns that the functions are not conservative for some species. For this reason and others, and given the obvious importance of this analysis for future acoustic impact analyses, we ask the Navy to make additional technical information available, including expert elicitation and peer review (if any), so that the public can fully comment pursuant to NEPA.	The new risk functions were developed in 2016, before several recent papers were published or the data were available. The Navy continues to evaluate the information as new science is made available. The criteria have been rigorously vetted within the Navy community, among scientists during expert elicitation, and then review by the public before being applied, it is unreasonable to revise and update the criteria and risk functions every time a new paper is published. These new and future papers provide additional valuable information, and the Navy has already begun to consult them for updates to the criteria in the future, when the next round of updated criteria will be developed. Regarding consideration of research findings involving passive acoustic study on blue whale vocalizations and behavior, Navy considered multiple recent references including but not limited to: Paniagua-Mendoza, 2017; Lesage, 2017; DeRuiter, 2017; Mate, 2016; Lomac-MacNair, 2016; Friedlaender, 2016; Mate, 2015. Thus far, no new information has been published or otherwise conveyed that would fundamentally change the assessment of impacts or conclusions of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. To be included in the behavioral response function, data sets needed to relate known or estimable received levels to observations of individual or group behavior. Melcon et al. (2012) does not relate observations of individual/group behavior to known or estimable received levels [at that individual/group]. In Melcon et al. (2012), received levels at the HARP buoy averaged over many hours are related to probabilities of D-calls, but the received level at the blue whale individuals/group are unknown.

	Comment	Navy Response
		As stated in MITT Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.2.1.2.1 (Methods for Analyzing Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers), the derivation of the behavioral response functions is provided in the technical report titled *Criteria and Thresholds for U.S. Navy Acoustic and Explosive Effects Analysis (Phase III)*. The appendices to this report detail the specific data points used to generate the behavioral response functions. Data points come from published data that is readily available and cited within the technical report.
NRDC-32	(b) Incorporating effects of dipping sonar Dipping sonar, like hull-mounted sonar, appears on the basis of preliminary data to be a significant predictor of deep-dive rates in beaked whales on SOAR, with the dive rate falling significantly (e.g., to 35% of that individual's control rate) during sonar exposure, and likewise appears associated with habitat abandonment. Importantly, these effects were observed at substantially greater distances (e.g., 30 or more kilometers) from dipping sonar than would otherwise be expected given the systems' source levels and the beaked whale response thresholds developed from research on hull-mounted sonar. Researchers have hypothesized that the inherently unpredictable nature of dipping sonar—the inability of whales to track its progress in the water—make it a disproportionately powerful stressor. Yet all the data sources used to produce the Navy's behavioral response functions concern hull-mounted sonar, an R/V-deployed sonar playback, or an in-pool source. The Navy's generic behavioral response function for beaked whales thus does not incorporate their heightened response to these sources, although such a response would be presumed to shift the function "leftward." Nor do the response functions for other species account for this difference, although unpredictability is known to exacerbate stress response in mammalian species and should conservatively be presumed, in this case, to lead to a	The Navy relied upon the best science that was available to develop the behavioral response functions in consultation with NMFS. The Navy's current beaked whale BRF acknowledges and incorporates the increased sensitivity observed in beaked whales during both behavioral response studies and during actual Navy training events. The article cited in the comment (Falcone, 2017) was not available at the time the behavioral response functions were developed. The new information and data presented in the article were thoroughly reviewed when they became available and further considered in discussions following presentation in October 2017 at a recent scientific conference. The Navy will incorporate these findings into the Navy's future behavioral response functions as appropriate. However, the Navy's current beaked whale BRF covers the responses observed in the new article since the beaked whale risk function is more sensitive than the other risk functions at lower received levels. Thus far, no new information has been published or otherwise conveyed that would fundamentally change the assessment of impacts or conclusions of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS.

	Comment	Navy Response
	heightened response in marine mammal species other than beaked whales.	
NRDC-33	(c) Use of distance-based "cut-offs" As with injury and mortality, the Navy applies cut-offs in estimating the number of behavioral impacts on marine mammals. The DEIS does not provide pre-adjusted take numbers, as noted above, but it is evident that these cut-offs significantly affect the estimates. As the Marine Mammal Commission observed in its HSTT comments with respect to sonar type MF1 (i.e., the most powerful hull-mounted mid-frequency sonars), "the estimated numbers of takes would be reduced to zero for odontocetes beginning where the probability of response is 40 percent, for pinnipeds where the probability of response is 27 percent, and for beaked whales where the probability of response is 28 percent (Table 3.7-11 in the [HSTT] DEIS). On a related note, takes for mysticetes would be eliminated for MF1 sources at a received level of 154 dB re 1 µPa equating to a probability of response of 17 percent." Not only does this adjustment make no sense theoretically (again as the Commission observes) since distance is already incorporated in the responses functions as a contextual factor; not only are the chosen cut-offs based for each function on little to no data; but the results are inconsistent with the available data, including but not limited to blue whale feeding response, blue whale vocalization response, and opportunistic data from strandings. As the Commission notes, "Use of cut-off distances could be perceived as an attempt to reduce the numbers of takes." We urge the Navy to abandon this arbitrary, highly concerning element in its new analysis.	The consideration of proximity (cut-off distances) was part of the criteria developed in consultation with NMFS and was applied within the Navy's acoustic effects model. Cut-off distances were used to better reflect the take potential for military readiness activities as defined in the MMPA. As stated in Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.2.1.2.1 (Methods for Analyzing Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers), the derivation of the behavioral response functions and associated cut-off distances is provided in the 2017 technical report titled *Criteria and Thresholds for U.S. Navy Acoustic and Explosive Effects Analysis (Phase III)*. Briefly, much of the data used to derive the behavioral response functions was from nearby, scaled sources, thereby potentially confounding results since it is difficult to tell whether the focal marine mammal is reacting to the sound level or the proximity of the source and/or vessel amongst other potentially confounding contextual factors that are unlike actual Navy events for which the behavioral response functions (BRF's) are being derived. To account for these non-applicable contextual factors, all available data on marine mammal reactions to actual Navy activities and sound sources (or other large-scale activities such as seismic surveys when information on proximity to sonar sources is not available for a given species group, i.e. harbor porpoises) were reviewed to find the farthest distance to which significant behavioral reactions were observed. These distances were rounded up to the nearest 5 or 10 km interval, and for moderate to large scale activities using multiple or louder sonar sources, these distances were greatly increased—doubled in most cases. The Navy's BRF's applied within these distances is currently the best-known method for providing the public and regulators with a more realistic (but still conservative where some uncertainties exist) estimate of impact and potential take under military readiness for the Proposed Action within this Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS.
NRDC-34	(d) Behavioral thresholds for explosives	Marine mammals may be exposed to isolated impulses in their natural environment (e.g., lightning). There is no evidence to support the assertion that animals have significant behavioral responses (rising to the level of 'harassment'

	Comment	Navy Response
	For purposes of take estimation, the DEIS effectively assumes that marine mammals do not respond behaviorally to single explosive detonations. This assumption appears to derive from final rules issued under the Marine Mammal Protection Act for ship-shock trials in the late 1990s and 2000s, and is entirely without empirical support. The Navy's preferred alternative provides for detonations with net explosive weights up to 2000 lbs., enough to sink a vessel. As the Marine Mammal Commission observed in its comments on the HSTT DEIS, "The Navy provide[s] no justification for why it believes that an animal would exhibit a significant behavioral response to two 5-lb. charges detonated within a few minutes of each other but would not exhibit a similar response for a single detonation of 50 lbs., let alone detonations of up to 2000 lbs." To restate the Commission's conclusion: The Navy, in estimating takes and assessing impacts, should accept that all in-water explosive activities, including those involving single detonations, can cause behavioral takes. IV. CONCLUSION Thank you for considering our comments. We welcome the opportunity to meet with you, your staff, and other relevant offices at any time to discuss these matters.	under the MMPA definition for military readiness activities) to temporally and spatially isolated explosions, regardless of charge size. Still, the analysis conservatively assumes that any modeled instance of temporally or spatially separated detonations occurring in a single 24-hour period would result in harassment under the MMPA for military readiness activities. Further, the criteria do not preclude the consideration of animals being behaviorally disturbed during single explosions if they are exposed above the TTS threshold, which is only 5 dB higher than the behavioral harassment threshold. The range to effect for TTS would be correlated to the size of the explosive. The Navy has been monitoring detonations since the 1990s and has not observed these types of reactions. To clarify, this monitoring has occurred under the monitoring plans developed specifically for shock trials, the detonations with the largest net explosive weight conducted by the Navy (no shock trials are proposed in this Study Area). Temporary threshold shifts (TTS) and all other higher-order impacts are assessed for all training and testing activities that involve the use of explosives or explosive ordnance. All Navy monitoring projects, reports, and publications are available on the Marine Species Monitoring website (https://www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/).
Friends of the Mariana Trench (FOTMT), Ignacio V. Cabrera		
FOTMT-01	We have reviewed the MITT Supplemental EIS/OEIS and our over-arching concerns are: • Training and testing activities proposed have the potential to temporarily limit access to areas of the ocean, which has the potential to impact traditional fishing practices, and tourism in the Study Area" Supplemental MITT, pg. 3.12-16. Alternatives that do not impact traditional fishing, recreation and access to	The military is committed to continuing to work with the local community on issues that potentially affect the public, including access to fishing sites, while ensuring public safety at all times. The military actively promotes compatible use of ocean areas by minimizing public access restrictions and limiting the extent and duration of necessary closures. To clarify information presented in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, range access would not always be restricted when a range is not in use; therefore, no change has been made to the document. Range access is dependent on the nature and type of activity being conducted. The Navy does not propose a change to the ocean areas currently used by both the Navy and the

	Comment	Navy Response
	the ocean should be developed and analyzed including other locations.	public. Restrictions on accessing areas of co-use would continue to be infrequent and short-term, while other fishing sites in the Study Area would continue to be available to the public. Proposed training and testing activities are needed to achieve and maintain military readiness within the Study Area. Alternatives carried forward were developed to meet the Navy's purpose and need and to ensure it can fulfill its obligation under Title 10 of the U.S. Code. See Section 2.4 (Action Alternatives Development) for more detailed information on the development of alternatives and rationale on why alternative training and testing locations were deemed not feasible.
FOTMT-02	• According to the Navy's MITT Fact Sheet, the active sonar testing proposed in the ocean around the Marianas will no real effect on marine mammal; however, this contradicts studies conducted by both marine scientists and the Navy itself. In a previous environmental impact statement or EIS draft, the Navy admitted that the sonar exercises planned for 2014-2018 may unintentionally "harm marine mammals 2.8 million times over five years." Included in this estimate are two million incidents of "temporary hearing loss," and two thousand incidents of permanent hearing loss." The discrepancy should be explained, and even if modeling indicates that marine mammals may be less impacted than previously estimated, methods that reduce and avoid incidents of marine mammal harm should be implemented, reducing number of sonar exercises, avoiding areas with marine mammal activity, stopping activity if a marine mammal approaches the area, etc...	The fact sheet the commenter is referring to states, that the Proposed Action "may affect certain species, but is not expected to decrease overall health and survival of any population," and that "almost all predicted effects are behavioral responses that cause no injury." The summary of findings presented in the fact sheet is consistent with the information presented in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The potential effects of sonar and explosives on marine mammals are quantitatively estimated using the Navy's Acoustics Effects Model (see the Technical Report, *Quantifying Acoustic Impacts on Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles: Methods and Analytical Approach for Phase III Training and Testing*, available on the project website for details on the quantitative methodology). Predicted effects from sonar on marine mammals are presented by species in Section 3.4.2.1.2.3 (Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers Under the Action Alternatives) and from explosives in Section 3.4.2.2.2.3 (Impacts from Explosive Stressors Under the Action Alternatives). For the Proposed Action, over a seven-year period being requested, the Navy's quantitative analysis for acoustic and explosive sources in the MITT Study Area estimates no mortality or direct injury to any marine mammal and a total of 496 Level A exposures (i.e., PTS) and 471,407 Level B exposures (i.e., TTS and behavioral impacts). Behavioral responses by marine mammal species are predicted by the acoustic effects model. Research cited in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS and in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS indicates behavioral responses by marine mammals exposed to underwater sound vary from no response to an immediate change in behavior, such as a change in swimming direction. Behavioral

	Comment	Navy Response
		changes are temporary and not necessarily repeated and animals frequently return to and continue their prior behavior after the initial interruption. Information on strandings associated with Navy training and testing activities is provided in the 2017 technical report, *Marine Mammal Strandings Associated with United States Navy Sonar Activities*. NMFS, as the regulator, maintains the authoritative National Stranding Database. As summarized in the fact sheet and discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), the Navy would implement a robust suite of mitigation measures to avoid or reduce potential impacts on marine mammals to the maximum extent practicable. The Navy's mitigation includes a combination of procedural mitigation measures (e.g., powering down or shutting down sonar if a marine mammal is observed within a certain distance from the sonar source) and mitigation areas (e.g., prohibiting the use of explosives within two identified areas that may be particularly important for humpback whale reproduction). Additional information about the Navy's mitigation areas is presented in Appendix I (Geographic Mitigation Assessment). Information about why the Navy cannot implement further restrictions on the type or number of activities involving active sonar and explosives in the Study Area is presented in Section 5.6.1 (Active Sonar) and Section 5.6.2 (Explosives).
FOTMT-03	• The expansions proposed in the Supplemental Impact Statement for the MITT would increase the annual rate of naval surface fire explosive rounds fired on FDM from 1,000 to 2,800 (alternative 1) or 4,200 (alternative 2). Medium-caliber gunnery increases by 700 to 94,650 rounds plus 17,500 explosive rounds. The current rate of 2,000 explosive rockets is maintained, while explosive missiles increase from 85 to 115. Explosive grenade/mortar attacks increase from 600 to 2,000 per year and small-caliber rounds from 18,000 to 30,000." The training can be completed with a lower number of rounds, so the least environmentally damaging methods should be used by eliminating live rounds, or only using a minimal number of rounds.	Proposed activities are similar to those conducted in the Study Area for decades. The military has safely and effectively trained at FDM for more than four decades. This training supports aircrew combat readiness and is critical to developing the skills needed to respond to operational missions throughout the region and ensure a stable, free, and open Indo-Pacific region. The impact of training on FDM was evaluated in both the 2010 MIRC Final EIS/OEIS and 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS by the Navy, NMFS, and USFWS. During development and review of the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS and associated Biological Opinions, specific thresholds were established that cannot be exceeded during any given 12-month period, regardless of the frequency of training, which may differ depending on training and exercise requirements. These thresholds were established during the section 7 ESA consultation between the Navy and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and included in the USFWS's 2015 Biological Opinion. For this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Proposed Action included increases in some munitions types; however,

	Comment	Navy Response
		because of the overall changes in the munitions types used on FDM, the net increase in net explosive weight (NEW) is less than 1 percent compared to what was analyzed in the Navy's 2015 Final EIS/OEIS and USFW's Biological Opinion. After careful examination of reinitiation triggers specified in 50 CFR § 402.16 and in the 2015 Biological Opinion, the Navy has determined that this *de minimis* increase does not warrant reinitiation of section 7 consultation.
FOTMT-04	• The Supplemental EIS for the MITT does not include the full disclosure of the cumulative impacts associated with the massive live-fire range in and around the Marianas, of which the MITT is just one component. Pitt et al (2019) reported that pathways for invasive species opened by the massive live-fire range and the Marines Relocation to Guam activities are highly likely to bring numerous invasive species to the region and beyond, to Hawai'i and the U.S. mainland. These include five species of snakes including the Taiwan Pit Viper (from Taiwan and Okinawa) and the Banded Krait (from India and Southeast Asia), both of which are venomous and can be deadly to humans. Pitt, William & Stahl, Randal & Yoder, Christi. (2010). Emerging Challenges of Managing Island Invasive Species: Potential Invasive Species Unintentionally Spread from Military Restructuring. Proceedings of the Vertebrate Pest Conference. 24. 10.5070/V424110495.	The Navy used the best available science and conducted a comprehensive review of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable actions to develop a robust analysis of cumulative impacts (Chapter 4, Cumulative Impacts). As required under NEPA, the level and scope of the analysis are commensurate with the potential impacts of the action as reflected in the resource-specific discussions in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences). The Navy considered proposed and ongoing activities alongside other activities in the region whose impacts are truly meaningful to the analysis. Furthermore, the entire Supplemental EIS/OEIS provides the cumulative impacts analysis, not just Chapter 4. Chapter 3 provides the current effects of past and present impacts and environmental conditions that represent the baseline of the environment as currently it is; Chapter 3 also discusses the consequences or potential future impacts from Navy activities. Chapter 4 discusses other reasonably foreseeable activities to the extent they are known and the incremental impact of the Navy's proposal when added to past, present, and future impacts. The proposed Live-Fire Training Range Complex is not part of this Proposed Action. However, this proposal was included in the analysis of cumulative impacts. The Navy recognizes the importance of biosecurity, ecological integrity, and resiliency of island ecosystems to the potential introduction of invasive species to the Mariana Islands associated with military training and testing. The Navy maintains that introduction of invasive species associated with military training and testing activities is low. The Navy has a number of policies in place to prevent, interdict, and control invasive species introductions in both terrestrial and marine environments. Specific policies for marine invasive species are detailed in the following Navy Instructions: OPNAV M-5090.1 Chapter 35-3.19 (Ship and Ballast Water), M-5090.1

	Comment	Navy Response
		Chapter 35-3.1 (Environmentally Sound Ships), and M-5090.1 Chapter 12-3.9 (Invasive Species). For potentially invasive terrestrial species, the Navy has policies and procedures in place to reduce or remove species from potential introduction pathways through their Biosecurity Plan. These measures include coordination with U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) for inspection procedures for incoming cargo, equipment, and personnel from foreign locations. It should be noted that the Navy or other military services does not have jurisdiction of other potential pathways for introduction (e.g., commercial activities, U.S. mail, non-DoD personnel). As part of the INRMP, the Navy will implement management recommendations identified in the biosecurity plan for Micronesia and Hawaii.
FOTMT-05	Below we provided details for our specific comments by section and page number: Volume 1, ES.2 Purpose of and Need for Proposed Training and Testing Activities, page ES-1: It should be stated that NMFS also has the authority to evaluate the proposed action under ESA and EFH regulations, not just MMPA.	Text in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS (ES.3 Scope and Content of this Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement) refers to NMFS authority to evaluate the action under the ESA and Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act, in addition to the MMPA.
FOTMT-06	Volume 1, ES.4.1 Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement, page ES-2: This sentence "The Draft SEIS/OEIS is available for review and comment, and two public meetings are scheduled (February 26, 2019 in Guam and February 27, 2019 in Saipan, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands [CNMI])." needs to be updated with the actual dates of the "open houses". Also, more effort should have been made to provide for native language speakers to answer questions. If there is a true interest in engaging the public, then conducting meetings in a locally, culturally appropriate way should have been the number one priority. Additional meetings on Rota and Tinian should have also been scheduled.	Text in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS has been updated to reflect the actual dates of the public meetings. Due to the effects of Typhoon Wutip, Navy officials postponed the public meetings originally scheduled for February 26 and 27, 2019. The Navy held the rescheduled meetings on March 18 and 19, 2019, in Saipan and Guam respectively. The Navy also held public meetings on Tinian (March 14, 2019) and Rota (March 15, 2019). Public notice of the rescheduled public meetings was published multiple days in the *Marianas Variety*, *Pacific Daily News*, and *Saipan Tribune*. The Navy issued a press release and mailed over 500 postcards to individuals and organizations. The Navy also provided a project fact sheet translated into Chamorro. The translated fact sheet was available at all four public meetings and on the project website.

	Comment	Navy Response
FOTMT-07	Volume 1. Table ES.6-1: Summary of Environmental Impacts for the No Action Alternative, Alternative 1, and Alternative 2 (continued), page ES-14: please provide a copy of the survey data collected during Periodic helicopter-based surveys of FDM have occurred since 1998 (monthly up to 2009, and quarterly thereafter through September 2016) for marine birds nesting on the island.	Survey data collected during periodic helicopter-based surveys of FDM is presented in the *Farallon De Medinilla Seabird and Tinian Moorhen Analysis* (Camp et al. 2014). The Camp et al. report is available at: https://hilo.hawaii.edu/hcsu/documents/TR60_Camp_Seabird.pdf. Camp, R.J., Leopold, C., Brinck, K.W., & Joula, F. (2014). Farallon de Medinilla Seabird and Tinian Moorhen Analysis. Hawaii Cooperative Studies Unit, University of Hawaii at Hilo. Technical Report HCSU-060. December 2014).
FOTMT-08	Volume 1 ES.6.1 Cumulative Impacts, page ES-22: Reword this sentence "Under Alternative 1 and Alternative 2, danger zones could potentially restrict access to fishing and recreational areas when ranges are in use,' to read "Under Alternative 1 and Alternative 2, danger zones will restrict access to fishing and recreational areas when ranges are in use." (striking the word potentially).	Text in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS has been updated to reflect the requested text revision.
FOTMT-09	Volume 1 ES.7.2 Mitigation, page ES-23. This section should be rewritten to include a summary all mitigation measures that were agreed during the original FEIS process and should also include a summary of all mitigation measures that have been implemented to date, as well as, conservation actions currently being proposed to offset additional impacts of the Proposed Action.	The Executive Summary provides a high-level summary of the document. The Navy is consulting with NMFS under the ESA for potential effects on ESA listed species and received a Biological Opinion. Mitigation measures and monitoring requirements specified in the Biological Opinion are presented in Chapter 5 (Mitigation). Mitigation measures in the Biological Opinion will also be reflected in the Record of Decision.
FOTMT-10	Volume 1 ES.7.5 Reporting, page ES-24: Please include a website where monitoring reports and reports that document environmental impacts /reductions of impacts will be posted for public access.	As noted in Section 3.0.1.1 (Navy Compiled and Generated Data), the Navy invests extensively in basic and applied research. In fact, the U.S. Navy is one of the largest funding sources of marine mammal research in the world, which has greatly enhanced the scientific community's understanding of marine species. The Navy's support and conduct of cutting-edge marine mammal research includes: marine mammal detection, including the development and testing of new autonomous hardware platforms and signal processing algorithms for detection, classification, and localization of marine mammals; improvements in density information and development of abundance models of marine mammals; and advancements in the understanding and characterization of the behavioral, physiological (hearing and

	Comment	Navy Response
		stress response), and potentially population-level consequences of sound exposure on marine life. Within the Study Area, the Navy has sponsored several monitoring projects to better understand marine mammal and sea turtle distribution and habitat use, and to assess the presence of corals and ESA-listed species at FDM. Additional information is available on the U.S. Navy Marine Species Monitoring Program website (https://www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/).
FOTMT-11	Volume 1 ES.7.6.3 Irreversible or Irretrievable Commitment of Resources, page ES-25: The following sentences should be rewritten: "Since there would be no building or facility construction, the consumption of materials typically associated with such construction (e.g., concrete, metal, sand, fuel) would not occur" , and "Since fixed- and rotary-wing flight and ship activities could increase, relative total fuel use could increase," to read "There would be no building or facility construction, therefore; the consumption of materials typically associated with such construction (e.g., concrete, metal, sand, fuel) would not occur", and "Relative total fuel use could increase because fixed- and rotary-wing flight and ship activities could increase".	The Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS has been updated to reflect the requested change in ES.7.6.3.
FOTMT-12	Volume 1, 2 Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives, 2.1.1.2 Sea and Undersea Space, page 2-3: Even though restrictions in the Marianas Trench Marine National Monument do not apply to military exercises, the Navy still is required to determine the least environmentally damaging alternative, therefore: an alternative that includes avoiding activities that could result in direct damage, or debris accumulation in the boundary of the Marianas Trench Marine National Monument should be developed and analyzed.	The least environmentally damaging practicable alternative is a requirement under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and does not apply to the Proposed Action as the Navy is not requesting a Section 404 Permit. The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during training and testing activities, and the DoD strives to reduce or minimize potential impacts as much as practicable. The alternatives carried forward were developed to meet the Navy's purpose and need and to ensure it can fulfill its obligation under Title 10 of the U.S. Code. See Section 2.4 (Action Alternatives Development) for more detailed information on the development of alternatives and rationale on why alternative training and testing locations are not feasible.
FOTMT-13	Volume 2, Table 4.2-1: Past, Present, and Reasonably Foreseeable Actions (continued), page 4- 16: For the Academic	Text in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS has been updated to include information on foreign vessels and organizations conducting research.

	Comment	Navy Response
	Research section, no mention is made of foreign vessels and organizations conducting research within the study area that is coordinated through the U.S. State Department and applicable federal agencies. Please include this information in the discussion.	
FOTMT-14	Volume 2, 5.1.2.2.3. Incident Reports, page 5-7: the incident reports that have been submitted to date (since the 2015 FEIS was published) should be made available to the public and data should be analyzed and presented in this section so that an assessment of this measure's effectiveness can be made.	To date, the Navy has had no incidents involving marine mammals, sea turtles, or ESA-listed species that were (or might have been) attributable to Navy activities in the Study Area; therefore, no incident reports have been submitted. NMFS maintains the national stranding database, and public access information is at https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/national/marine-life-distress/national-stranding-database-public-access.
FOTMT-15	Volume 2, 5.2.1.2 Mitigation Zones, page 5-11: A discussion of how often and type of measure that have been implemented in mitigation zones to date should be included, so that an assessment of this measure's effectiveness can be made.	As discussed in Section 5.1.2.2 (Monitoring, Research, and Reporting Initiatives), the Navy developed reporting requirements in cooperation with NMFS during the MMPA and ESA consultation and permitting processes. The Navy's training and testing activity reports and incident reports are designed to verify implementation of mitigation; comply with current permits, authorizations, and consultation requirements; and improve future environmental analyses. For example, the Navy reports to NMFS if mitigation was implemented during sinking exercises (e.g., number of times explosive detonations were delayed due to marine mammal sightings). For major training exercises, the Navy's annual training and testing activity reports include information on each individual marine mammal sighting related to mitigation implementation. As described in Section 5.6.7 (Reporting Requirements), the Navy does not keep records of mitigation implementation for every training and testing activity. The Navy developed its reporting requirements in conjunction with NMFS to be consistent with mission requirements and balance the usefulness of the information to be collected with the practicality of collecting it. Additional reporting requirements would draw event participants' attention away from the complex tactical tasks they are primarily obligated to perform, such as driving a warship or engaging in a gunnery event, which would adversely impact Navy personnel safety, public safety, and the effectiveness of training or testing.
FOTMT-16	Volume 2, Chapter 5- Mitigation, pages 5-1 through 5-76. Mitigation should also include offsets for impacts that are	Chapter 5 (Mitigation) presents a full description of the robust suite of mitigation measures developed to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed

	Comment	Navy Response
	expected to occur. The Navy should also mitigate impacts of increased marine debris, noise, decreased air and water quality by implementing tangible improvements throughout Guam and CNMI ocean and coastal zones. Sponsoring assessments, clean- ups and restoration of areas impacted either directly or indirectly by the activities proposed in MITT should be developed and are lacking. If conservation or offset measures have been implemented through the ESA consultation process, then these measures need to be included in the discussion as to their status and level of success to date. Consideration of out of kind mitigation such as restoring areas affected by coral bleaching, providing signage for sensitive resource areas, or assistance in providing education, or trainings for all stakeholders on resource management. Regular public meetings to report out status of the proposed activities, incidents that affected public safety or environmental quality, and injury to fish, wildlife, and sensitive resource should be implemented.	Action. Information on natural resource management and stewardship projects, such as sea turtle monitoring and bird recovery programs, is discussed in the Joint Region Marianas INRMP. Other projects suggested, such a restoration for coral bleaching, is outside the scope of the Proposed Action.
FOTMT-17	The Navy recently released a draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) for the MITT for public comment. Per the MITT website, the SEIS "specifically addresses the at-sea and FDM portion of the Study Area and includes a reassessment based on updated training and testing requirements; incorporates new information from an updated acoustic effects model; updates marine mammal density data; and incorporates evolving and emergent best available science." (Supplemental Draft MITT EIS Vol. 1, pg. ES-1 Volume 2, 6.1.2 Marine Protected Areas, page 6-6: Activities within Marine Protected Areas should be avoided, and a discussion of resources protected within these areas should be included. Training for personnel involved in the proposed activities should include familiarization of rules and regulations associated with special designated area.	The 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS presents Marine Protected Areas within the Study Area in Table 6.1-2 (Marine Protected Areas within the Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area) and Figures 6.1-1 and 6.1-2 (Marine Protected Areas in Guam and Saipan). No updates were required to the table or figure during the preparation of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS.

	Comment	Navy Response
	In summary, the destruction of the natural habitat and non-human life of the Mariana Islands poses a dire threat to the health of the indigenous peoples of the Marianas in various ways, including increased incidences of diseases and toxic exposure caused by contamination of local food and water sources by ordnance as well as civilian injuries and deaths resulting from errors that occur during military training exercises (both of which occurred during military training range exercises on the Puerto Rican island of Vieques); Also, the destruction of the natural and human environments of the Marianas poses a dire threat to the archipelago's local tourism-based economy by straining local infrastructure and degrading an essential element attracting tourists to our islands — the natural beauty of the Marianas — along with the health and capacity of the local workforce, and the degradation of the natural environment, human health and local economy of the Marianas threatens to trigger a mass emigration from the Marianas Archipelago to the continental US, spreading two relatively small indigenous groups of people across a vast tract of land in which their ethnicity is widely unrecognized and, thus, diluting and straining Mariana Islanders' capacity to participate in cultural practices, in turn, eroding any shared sense of cultural identity and threatening to extinguish local indigenous culture outright; therefore, the project should not move forward and the no action alternative selected until more reasonable, less environmentally damaging alternatives can be developed. Thank you for the opportunity to comment. Please add us to the Supplemental EIS/OEIS mailing list to receive notifications of meetings, project information, availability of reports, or any associated future federal register notices.	

	Comment	Navy Response
PaganWatch (PW), Peter Perez		
PW-01	COMMENTS SUBMITTED IN PROTEST PaganWatch protests the Navy's intentional segregation of the activities described in the Mariana Islands Training and Testing Range (MITT) from the whole of the massive-scale live-fire training and testing activities that the Navy has introduced to the Mariana Islands in a series of related, interdependent and coordinated projects in recent years. This segregation is a blatant evasion of the Navy's legal obligations under the National Environmental Policy Act to inform affected governments and communities of the cumulative impacts of their projects. By separating "MITT activities" from the whole, the cumulative impacts are not only not discussed but they are hidden, as is the massive scale of the Navy's live-fire current activities and intentions in and around the Marianas. The result is less government and community understanding, interest and participation in the NEPA required environmental assessments (EAs) and environmental impact statements (EISs), which provide public officials with relevant information and allow a "hard look" at the potential environmental consequences of proposed projects. For ease of discussion and clarity, the whole of the current and proposed massive-scale, life-fire training and testing activities in and around the Mariana Islands will be referred to in these comments as the Marianas Bombing Range (MBR). The segregation of elements of the MBR to form smaller and seemingly isolated projects goes beyond the MITT. To date, the segregated projects are: Mariana Islands Range Complex (MIRC) - 2010 Mariana Islands Testing and Training (MITT) – 2015 Marines Relocation to Guam - 2015	The Navy has been conducting training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades and proposes to continue training in the region into the reasonably foreseeable future. The activities analyzed in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS are largely a continuation of the ongoing training and testing activities that were analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, 2010 MIRC Final EIS/OEIS, 1999 Military Training in the Marianas Final EIS, and other environmental compliance documents. This Supplemental EIS/OEIS (1) includes the analysis of activities at sea and on FDM necessary to meet readiness requirements beyond 2020 and into the reasonably foreseeable future, (2) includes any changes to those activities previously analyzed, and (3) reflects the most up-to-date compilation of training and testing activities deemed necessary to accomplish military readiness requirements. Training and testing activities within the Study Area are not dependent on other DoD activities. It is important to note that proposed military actions are not dependent on each other for their justification. For example, proposed and ongoing training and testing activities within the Study Area would proceed regardless of whether other proposed actions are taken, such as the CNMI Joint Military Training EIS. According to CEQ regulations, training and testing activities in the Study Area may logically be viewed in isolation because they have independent utility, as they are ongoing activities. In addition, courts have upheld federal agencies' decisions to organize and plan their actions in a reasonable or rational manner. Cumulative impacts of these independent actions are analyzed in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Because different projects have vastly different scopes, timetables, and action proponents, a joint presentation is not practicable. The Navy used the best available science and conducted a comprehensive review of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable actions to develop a robust analysis of cumulative impacts (Chapter 4, Cumulative Impacts). As required under NEPA, the level and scope of the analysis are commensurate with the potential impacts of the action as reflected in the resource-specific discussions in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences). The Navy considered proposed and ongoing activities alongside with other activities in the region whose

	Comment	Navy Response
	CNMI Joint Military Training (CJMT) – Begun 2015 Divert Activities and Exercises - 2016 Litekyan (Ritidian), Live-Fire Training Range Complex (LFTRC) - 2018 Supplemental Mariana Islands Testing and Training (MITT) – 2019 These projects build on previous projects: Military Training in the Marianas – 1999 Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance and Strike (ISR/Strike) - 2006 Each project is subject review that leads to expansion as is happening now with the MITT. There is also a high probability, based on the Navy's pattern of rolling out new projects that add even more training and testing capacity to the MBR, that the Navy will continue to initiate new projects that expand the MBR in the future. The MBR is not a collection of projects. It is a collection of facilities and activities authorized by the Navy through segregated projects. The MBR is a resource shared by three branches of the U.S. armed forces who train both separately and together in MBR facilities that are coordinated to offer a wide range of complementary training options with little to no duplication. It is clearly a giant modern bombing range that was carefully planned and its implementation orchestrated by Navy staff with experience evading NEPA and local government and public scrutiny. Below is a partial listing that summarizes the facilities and activities within the MBR based on current and proposed activities under all the segregated projects.	impacts are truly meaningful to the analysis. Furthermore, the entire Supplemental EIS/OEIS provides the cumulative impacts analysis, not just Chapter 4. Chapter 3 provides the current effects of past and present impacts and environmental conditions that represent the baseline of the environment as it is; Chapter 3 also discusses the consequences or potential future impacts from Navy activities. Chapter 4 discusses other reasonably foreseeable activities to the extent they are known and the incremental impact of the Navy's proposal when added to past, present, and future impacts.

	Comment	Navy Response
	• Open Ocean - 984,469 square nautical miles around the Marianas o Massive Multi-nation Naval Exercises o Passive and Active Sonar Testing o High Energy Lasers Testing o Underwater Explosives Testing o Missile Launch by Ships o Shelling by Ship • Tinian - 2/3 of the island o Airbase for Military Exercises o Artillery Firing Range o Mortar Firing Range o Tank Maneuvers Range o Amphibious Assault Beaches o Live-fire Maneuver Area o High Hazard Impact Zone o Beach Landing Craft Training o Small Boat Training • No'os (FDM) - Entire island o Air to Ground Bombing o Small, Medium and Large Caliber Gunnery o Grenades, Small Caliber Weapons o Aircraft-mounted Machineguns • Pagan - Entire island o 1,000 LB Aerial Bombardment Practice o Shelling from Navy Ships Practice o Field Artillery - Direct Firing Range o Field Artillery - Indirect Firing Range o Amphibious Beach Assault (6 areas) o Live-fire Maneuver Area o Rocket, Missile, Mortar Target Areas o High Hazard Impact Zone o Beach Landing Craft Training o Small Boat Training	

	Comment	Navy Response
	o Tank maneuvers o Troop ground training • Guam - Multiple Areas o Combat Vehicle Operators Course o Live-fire Shoot House o Breacher Facility o Urban Terrain Facility o Rifle Range o Pistol Range o Machinegun Range o Modified Record Firing Range o Non-standard Small Arms Range o Hand Grenade Range Though its strategic practice of breaking the MBA into segregated projects that it presents as isolated, unrelated projects, the Navy fails in its NEPA mandated obligation to provide public officials with relevant information and allow a "hard look" at the potential environmental consequences of the MBA. The Marianas public, local governments, and other stakeholders are not afforded the opportunity to be informed of the cumulative impacts of the destructive activities occurring in the MBA. Some segregated projects appear to only apply to Guam, while others appear to only apply to Saipan, while still others appear apply only to the CNMI's northern islands and Tinian. The MITT appears to only apply to the open ocean and FDM. Consequentially, the governments and communities in these separate islands think the project does not affect them and do not get involved. But each project affects every island and all the people of the Marianas because they are coordinated and interrelated projects that produce impacts not only as separate projects, but cumulatively.	

	Comment	Navy Response
	It is impossible to arrive at a complete, informed understanding of the cumulative impacts of all the proposed activities when they are presented one at a time, to be considered in isolation, as if each does not add to the impacts of the others. The cumulative impacts threaten the environmental health of the entire archipelago. The impacts will have cascading effects on the tourism-based economies of both Guam and the CNMI as well as on human health as our waters, land and air are contaminated by MTR activities. The U.S. Navy is well documented to be the world's biggest polluter and the worst of their activities will now be carried out on and around the Marianas. The resulting diminished attractiveness of the Marianas as a tourist destination will damage the tourism-based economies in the CNMI and Guam. The threat to human health caused by environmental contamination and the constant danger of errant ordnance hitting populated areas will force families to move away from live-fire areas and even entire islands. When considered in its true scope as a massive live fire range surrounding and on all but one of the populated Mariana islands and non-populated islands as well, the MTR is an existential threat to the American people living in Guam and the CNMI.	
PW-02	The Navy's proposal is in direct contradiction to Executive Order 12898 "Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations" and therefore must be withdrawn. Executive Order 12898 provides that "*each Federal agency shall make achieving environmental justice part of its mission by identifying and addressing, as appropriate, disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of its programs, policies, and activities on minority populations and low-income populations*."	This Supplemental EIS/OEIS fully complies with Executive Order 12898. Environmental justice is analyzed in Section 3.12 (Socioeconomic Resources and Environmental Justice) and Executive Order 12898 is listed as one of the environmental compliance requirements that were considered in preparing this Supplemental EIS/OEIS (Table 6.1-1, Summary of Environmental Compliance for the Proposed Action). In Section 3.12 (Socioeconomic Resources and Environmental Justice), the Navy analyzes the impacts of the proposed activities on socioeconomic resources and evaluates if the Proposed Action would result in a disproportionate effect on minority or low-income populations. While impacts on certain resources (e.g., accessibility to fishing sites) may increase, these impacts are not expected to be substantial. Traditional fishers in Guam and the CNMI would not be disproportionately impacted by testing and training activities

	Comment	Navy Response
	The U.S. insular islands of American Samoa, Guam, the U.S. Virgin Islands, and the CNMI all suffer high levels of poverty. But among them the CNMI is the poorest. According to the 2010 CNMI Census the CNMI has the lowest annual family median income (MFI); only $22,455 compared to Guam's $50,607, American Samoa's $24,706, and the U.S. Virgin Islands' $45,058. This is about one third of MFI in the U.S. mainland where MFI is $64,400. The CNMI's low MFI is persistent, achieving a miniscule growth of just $1,180 across the 20-year period from 1990 when CNMI MFI was at $21,275 per year. The census on the poverty level covered 53,366 individuals. The data showed 11,693 individuals were below 50 percent of the poverty level; 32,885, below 125 percent of poverty level and 40,368, below 185 percent of the poverty level. The proposed continuation and expansion of MITT live-fire and weapons testing activities described in the DSEIS/OEIS will do tremendous and irreversible damage and harm to the CNMI. The proposed activities are literally ruining our islands' reputation and appeal as beautiful and peaceful islands. We are rapidly becoming known as the world's biggest bombing range rather than a tourist destination. Loss of access to the sea as a result of the MITT activities negatively impacts local commercial and recreational fishing as well. These impacts cause economic damage to the CNMI by discouraging tourism and blocking commercial fishing. The overall effect of the proposed activities is to severely reduce economic options and opportunities for the already impoverished people of the CNMI, 97.6 percent of which are ethnic minorities. The proposed activities will bring deeper and more painful poverty to the community. This is a classic "not in my backyard" scenario where the CNMI is a scapegoat that is being forced to bear a burden that would be unthinkable in	because traditional fishing practices likely occur in the same general areas as recreational fishing, which are close to shore and far from the majority of training and testing activities. The military is committed to continuing to work with the local community on issues that potentially affect the public, including access to fishing sites while ensuring public safety at all times. The military actively promotes compatible use of ocean areas by minimizing public access restrictions and limiting the extent and duration of necessary closures. To clarify information presented in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, range access would not always be restricted when a range is in use; therefore, no change was made to the document. Range access is dependent on the nature and type of activity being conducted. The Navy is not proposing any geographic expansion of the training and testing area in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS as the proposed activities are similar to those conducted in the Study Area for decades. However, waters around FDM within 3 NM from shore would continue to be permanently closed for safety reasons due to the potential presence of unexploded ordnance. Waters around FDM within 12 NM from shore would be closed for safety reasons as necessary when the range is in use. Restrictions on accessing areas of co-use would continue to be short-term, while other fishing sites in the Study Area would continue to be available to the public.

	Comment	Navy Response
	any wealthy mainland American community. The proposal is therefore not in compliance with Executive Order 12898.The following questions pertain to the requesting agency's compliance with Executive Order 12898. 1. Is it your position that Executive Order 12898 does not apply to the U.S. military? If so, why not? 2. Is it your position that the protections of Executive Order 12898 do not apply to Americans living in the CNMI? If so, why not? 3. Are the adverse human health and environmental effects of proposed activities in the CNMI in proportion to what affluent and non-minority communities in the rest of the United States of America must bear for the same purposes? If yes, please explain and cite examples.	
PW-03	The proposed activities threaten the health and safety of the public. The activities described in the DSEIS/OEIS add to the damage already done to the community by the Navy and the Air Force who use the Mariana islands for live-fire training and weapons testing. These activities are poisoning our waters, destroying our land, killing our wildlife, polluting our air and ruining our health. Expended Navy ordnance can be found on and around every populated island and in most unpopulated islands as well. Some of it is unexploded and poses a continuous danger to people, especially children, who live and play among it. We now have to consider the potential for injuries to divers and swimmers who are in the water when the Navy conducts active sonar testing. There have been instances where civilians in the water during testing were seriously injured. On August 25, 1994 a scuba diver was accidentally exposed to testing of the US Navy's LFA sonar system. (Comments	The safety of the public and military personnel is of utmost importance to the military. The Navy employs precautions when planning and conducting training and testing activities, such as ensuring impact areas and targets are unpopulated prior to potentially dangerous activities; canceling or delaying activities if public or personnel safety is a concern; notifying the public of the location, date, and time of potentially dangerous activities; implementing temporary access restrictions to training and testing areas; and conducting thorough environmental and safety reviews for all test systems before tests are conducted on range sites. Section 3.13 (Public Health and Safety) includes details regarding safety and inspection procedures for aviation, submarine navigation, surface vessel navigational, sonar, electromagnetic, laser, high-explosive ordnance, and weapons firing and ordnance expenditure safety. Section 3.13 (Public Health and Safety) documents how and to what degree the activities described in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) could impact public health and safety. In the section, public health and safety stressors are analyzed. Additional information regarding the Navy's standard operating procedures is provided in Section 2.3.3 (Standard Operating Procedures) and Chapter 5 (Mitigation).

	Comment	Navy Response
	submitted at Public Hearing of California Coastal Commission, 12/12/97). The ship transmitting the sonar was over 100 miles northwest of the diver who reported distinct and disorienting lung vibration as a result. Pestorius and Curley (1996) exposed Navy divers to low frequency active sonar and reported that one of the divers had to be hospitalized and was later under treatment for seizures. A Hawaiian resident who was in the water when the Navy was conducting their low frequency active sonar test in Hawaii in March, 1998 was disoriented and nauseous afterward and had to see a physician who diagnosed her with symptoms comparable to acute trauma. (Declaration filed in court, March 25, 1998.) The Navy admitted that this swimmer was exposed to the sonar at 120 dB while she was in the water, far below the operational sonar at 240 dB. In her court declaration this woman also detailed the behavior of nearby dolphins while the broadcast was taking place. The dolphins' behavior, in her view as a naturalist and long-term observer of dolphins, was abnormal, including staying close to shore, staying near the surface and vocalizing excessively. According to the Navy's own test results on the bioeffects of low frequency (100-500 Hz, which is the frequency range of LFA) underwater sound on human divers, at 140-148 decibels a small number of divers rate their aversion to the sound as very severe. At 157 decibels they estimate that at least 20% of divers will immediately abort an open ocean dive. At 160 decibels they say the lung resonance created by LFA may induce "significant decrements in vestibular function." This effect on vestibular function may have caused the stranding of the beaked whales in the Mediterranean (Nature, 1998) when they were exposed to the sonar at 150-160 dB. Lung hemorrhaging was observed in rodents exposed to 170-184 decibels. Above 184 decibels liver hemorrhage and soft tissue damage are likely. The Navy says significant concussion effects	Based on the analysis presented in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, public health and safety would not be adversely affected because standard operating procedures are in place to ensure there is no overlap between military and non-military activities. Various means are used to communicate information to the public about areas restricted to public or commercial activities and are described in Section 3.13 (Public Health and Safety). As specified in Title 33 CFR Subpart 72.01, Notices to Mariners, the U.S. Coast Guard issues information to the public concerning maritime navigation. Additionally, nautical charts issued by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration include these federally designated zones and areas. Operators of recreational and commercial vessels have a duty to abide by maritime regulations administered by the U.S. Coast Guard. Waters around FDM within 3 NM from shore are permanently closed for safety reasons due to the potential presence of unexploded ordnance.

	Comment	Navy Response
	are unlikely to occur at levels below 194 decibels but don't explain how they reached this conclusion. According to the Navy's Draft Environmental Impact Statement the sonar sound field around the transmitting ship will be 180 dB up to 1 km away and 150-160 dB up to 160 km away (100 mi). This means that many marine animals will be exposed to LFA sonar levels capable of causing stranding and, possibly, lung hemorrhaging over large areas of the ocean. The DSEIS/OEIS also describes the Navy's intention to test high-energy laser weapons in the waters surrounding the CNMI as well. There is little information on the potential impacts of these weapons on public safety and on marine wildlife. The following questions pertain to the threat to human health caused by the Navy's testing of active sonar and high-energy lasers in our waters. 1. Can you guarantee that nobody will be killed or injured by active sonar or high-energy laser testing in the MITT? 2. What is the nature of potential injuries to humans from these weapons? 3. Access to underwater environment is critical to our island communities that relies on the ocean for food, recreation and tourism. How will MITT activities impact this access, how can the Navy avoid putting restrictions on this access? 4. What specifically, in terms of resources and the value of those resources, will be damaged, reduced or lost as a result of MITT weapons training and testing activities? What other kinds of underwater weapons testing and training in the MITT pose a threat to human health and safety?	

	Comment	Navy Response
PW-04	The DSEIS/OEIS fails to fulfil the requirement under NEPA to inform the public when it failed to make the information in the DSEIS/OEIS available to the public in a form that they could reasonably access and understand. For most people in the CNMI, English is not their first language. For almost all of us, English is not a strength. Yet the DSEIS/OEIS is 1500 pages of moderate to highly technical. Based on hundreds of conversations with members of the CNMI public by myself and colleagues, most people find EIS documents to be intimidating reading. Very few are able to comprehend the consequences of the proposed activities due to EIS documents' highly technical nature and complicated presentation. It is hard not consider that the massive DSEIS/OEIS is intentionally incomprehensible for 95% of the CNMI population in order to take advantage of the low level of reading comprehension as a strategy to avoid informing the public of the impacts of the supplemental MITT proposal. Many people here in the CNMI find this decision to produce such a document apprehensible, manipulative and grossly self-serving by the U.S. Navy. If the Navy truly wanted to follow the intent and spirit of the EIS process they would have provided versions in our local and official languages of Chamorro and Carolinian, and they would have provided comprehensive summaries that made the information accessible to the public. The NEPA process was not followed when the U.S. military failed to do effective outreach that informs the community about the impacts of its project. A version of the DSEIS/OEIS in local languages and an effective outreach program with mechanisms in place to measure its success in informing the community is both reasonable and required to comply with	The Navy understands the complexity of the information presented within this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. This Supplemental EIS/OEIS contains a rigorous scientific analysis of the potential impacts of the Navy's proposal, and thoroughly explains the scientific methodology, analysis methods, and findings. The Navy attempts to explain challenging concepts, methods, and the results of the analysis as clearly as possible in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS and developed public informational materials for lay audiences. The Navy prepared project brochures, videos, a website, and posters, using layperson terms to enhance public understanding of the information presented in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. A project fact sheet was also translated into Chamorro. The informational materials, including the translated fact sheet, were made available at all four public meetings and on the project website (http://mitt-eis.com/). The Navy held four open house public meetings, one each on Tinian (March 14, 2019), Rota (March 15, 2019), Saipan (March 18, 2019), and Guam (March 19, 2019). The public meetings were an ideal opportunity for the public to ask questions of Navy team members about the analysis documented in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Navy encouraged the public to attend these meetings and broadly notified the public through the media, including paid newspaper advertisements and news releases, and direct mail, including letters, postcards, and emails. The Navy has received feedback from attendees that the open-house format is more conducive to promoting public understanding and constructive dialogue. Open house meetings allow a greater number of individuals to directly engage and interact with Navy team members and ask questions about this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, as well as provide comments on the document. When planning the dates and locations for public meetings, the Navy considered cultural and religious holidays whenever possible. To better accommodate stakeholders and the public, the Navy provided 75 days to review and comment on the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, which is 30 days longer than the minimum required time for review under NEPA. The Navy appreciates input received from local government agencies and communities on how it can improve public notification and outreach efforts.

	Comment	Navy Response
	the directives and intent of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). In responding to this section, please ensure that the following questions that relate to compliance with the NEPA mandated requirement to conduct effective outreach that informs the community and stakeholders of the impacts of the proposed activities are answered fully: 1. Were the reading level and language skills of the CNMI community ascertained in advance of the public comment period in order to inform the outreach strategy? 2. Was any effort made to survey the public during the public comment period to find out if the information was reaching the stakeholders? 3. Was any effort made, such as the use of focus groups, in order to learn whether or not the average CNMI reader had the English literacy skills to successfully read and understand the DSEIS/OEIS and make an informed assessment of how the proposed activities would affect them?	
Ohana Ho`opakele (OHO), Ronald Fujiyoshi		
OHO-01	I find the MITT EIS totally inadequate. I oppose the inclusion of the Guam - Hawaii corridor in this EIS. This EIS is simply a request to damage nature and natural resources. Who speaks out on behalf of nature and the preservation of nature and natural resources? I see no agency that represents nature or nature's resources. Then, the only organization or representative that stands on behalf of nature or nature's resources are the public, or more specifically the indigenous people. The Chamorro people are the only ones that represent nature. Their voice must be listened to!	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.

	Comment	Navy Response
	This process is not fair. It is biased against the Chamorro people who represent nature. Thus, this MITT EIS is a flawed process. It cannot pass the simplest verdict of, "Is this process fair?" Thank you for allowing me and my organization to comment on this EIS!	
Mariana Islands Fishing Co-Operative (MIFCO), Gerhard Sword		
MIFCO-01	I am a fisherman. Farrallon De Medinilla (FDM) is the largest reef in Micronesia and with an abundance of a variety of fish. Our fishermen enjoy going to FDM because you never come back empty handed. Closure of Medinilla started at 3 miles then grew to 10 miles and now sits at 13 miles. Additionally, the closures used to be 3 months a year are now about 80% of the year. The open fishing times are set at a time when the waters are too rough to tread north. Safety and fuel impede venturing for fishing further north as the cell phone and VHF radio range ends at FDM. This has forced the fishermen to over-fish the southern Mariana islands fishing stocks and resort to fishing methods which cause more environmental damage. Further escalation of bombing and shelling will further diminish the times when we can fish at FDM. The real owners of the lands and waters, our children, are impacted by the very fact that they are denied the privilege of fishing in the northern islands due to the military closures. Although the lands are “leased” to the United States, the United States Navy proposes to increase shelling, bombing and	The military understands that fishing is an important socioeconomic and cultural resource for the people of the CNMI and will continue to work with the fishing community to enable safe access to fishing areas around FDM. The Navy restricts public access within a 3 NM danger zone around FDM for safety. Beyond 3 NM, the Navy may need to temporarily close the area from 3 to 12 NM for safety reasons during potentially hazardous training activities using explosives. The Navy is committed to working with fishers to accommodate the need for access to productive fishing sites. To help civilian mariners better plan fishing and boating activities that involve accessing the waters around FDM, the Navy notifies them through various means, such as U.S. Coast Guard-issued Notices to Mariners, newspapers, and social media of the time periods when FDM will not be in use for several consecutive days. Announcing in advance when FDM will be in use (and when it will not be in use for an extended period of time) facilitates use of waters around FDM by the public during time periods that will not conflict with training and testing activities. Impacts on accessibility to popular fishing areas in or adjacent to the northern part of W-517 remain accessible when activities are conducted in the southern part of the warning area (Figure 3.12-5). While closure of the entire warning area had been a concern of fishers (Tibbats & Flores, 2012), the accommodation by the military allows areas within W-517 to be open to non-military vessels for fishing and transit to Galvez Bank, Santa Rosa Reef, and White Tuna Banks (see

	Comment	Navy Response
	destruction of FDM up to 4 times the current allowance. This is pure negligence of damaging the land owner's property. The owners are our children. Our islands are an environmental trust, left by our forefathers. There should be a reduction in bombing and shelling since we have suffered long enough going on 40 years of the loss of use of these waters and reefs. Sonic testing should NOT happen as many of our sea creatures are destructively affected by sonar and will further upset our fragile ecosystem. We are very limited in land area and we must conserve and protect our miniscule amount of lands assign by the almighty God for our people. We are still cleaning up after World War 2 with live ammo still being unearthed every day. The Chamorro and Carolinian people almost lost our language and culture to the Spanish, Germans and Japanese and now we are in damage of losing our environment and lands to the United States of America. The US Navy is blessed that at the end of the day you all go back to your comfortable homes and families while we are left with an environmental mess and land that will be totally useless. Please curb the destruction of our lands, waters and way of life. God bless our service men and women and may God Bless the people of the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.	Section 3.12, Socioeconomic Resources, in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS for details). As described in Section 2.3.3.2 (Sea Space and Airspace Deconfliction), the Navy restricts public access within a 3 NM danger zone around FDM for safety. Beyond 3 NM, Section 2.3.3.2 (Sea Space and Airspace Deconfliction, the Navy schedules training and testing activities to minimize conflicts with the use of sea space to ensure safety and minimize conflicts within areas used for commercial and recreational fishing, subsistence use, and tourism. The Navy is not proposing a change to the ocean areas currently used by both the Navy and the public in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Restrictions on accessing areas of co-use would continue to be periodic and short term (with the exception of the danger zone extending from shore to 3 NM around FDM that is permanently restricted and inaccessible to the public for safety reasons), while other fishing and tourism sites in the Study Area would continue to be available to the public. Regarding overfishing, the National Marine Fisheries Services manages fisheries in U.S. waters and sets regulations on fishing to help sustain fisheries. The Navy is not involved in setting those regulations.

	Comment	Navy Response
Commission on Decolonization (COD), Melvin Won Pat. Borja		
COD-01	The DEIS admits that there is still much to be learned about how sonar affects marine mammals, yet still claims that sonar testing will have no significant impacts on these animals. We have seen multiple cases of beached whales on island with very little explanation as to why this is happening. Lack of research and lack of information should not be reason to simply assume that our marine wildlife is unaffected by sonar testing. More research must be done before the U.S. Military is permitted to proceed with any amount of sonar testing (both active & passive) so that the people of Guam can make an informed decision on this proposed action. This is a stipulation set forth by D.O.D. - I suggest you honor it.	As explained in the Navy's technical report on marine mammal strandings (*Marine Mammal Strandings Associated with U.S. Navy Sonar Activities, 2017*, which is available on the project website [https://mitt-eis.com/]) marine mammal strandings have been a historic and ongoing occurrence attributed to a variety of causes, both natural and anthropogenic. Over the last 50 years, increased awareness and reporting has led to more information about species affected and raised concerns about anthropogenic sources of stranding. While there have been limited numbers of marine mammal mortalities potentially associated with U.S. Navy activities, the root causes are not clear in most cases. The Navy has continued to fund basic research on marine mammals, including behavioral response studies specifically designed to determine the effects on marine mammals from the Navy's use of mid-frequency sonar and other transducers. Relevant data needed for improving these analytical approaches for population level consequences resulting from disturbances will continue to be collected during projects funded by the Navy's marine species research programs. Navy funded projects have provided nearly the entirety of marine mammal science collected in the Marianas. In fact, prior to Navy funding of marine mammal science, there had not been any dedicated marine mammal surveys performed in the Mariana Islands. The Navy will continue to meet its mission requirements as it funds research investigating the potential effects of training and testing on marine species. The Navy has implemented an adaptive management plan in coordination with NMFS to periodically review recent science and evaluate its mitigation procedures.
COD-02	With a training & testing area that is 984,469 sq. miles, it is difficult to imagine that the proposed activities do not predict a significant impact on air quality, marine vegetation & marine habitats or that the proposed bombing of FDM (& Pagan for that matter) would have no significant impact on our cultural resources. This islands & this ocean are some our most valuable resources and any threat to them is a significant impact. 12,580 detonations per year for 5 years is	The military is committed to protecting the environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities, including FDM. Effects from military training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the EIS/OEIS. Also, as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy implements mitigation measures during its training and testing activities to avoid or reduce potential impacts on biological and cultural resources.

	Comment	Navy Response
	unacceptable, & mitigations like "posting qualified lookouts" or "participating in the U.S. Coral Reef Task Force" are not only inadequate, they are insulting. Furthermore, this type of hyper-militarization of our island is counterproductive and even destructive to Guahan's right to decolonize - a right recognized by the United Nations as per Resolution 1514 & 1541 - a resolution signed by the U.S. binding them in sacred trust to uphold.	Training and testing activities are proposed to occur at sea and on FDM. Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2 of Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS present current and proposed training and testing activities. The Navy analyzed land-based activities on Guam, Saipan, Tinian, and Rota in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS; the Navy did not reanalyze land-based activities in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS because there are no changes proposed to those land-based activities. The Proposed Action does not include Pagan.
Chamorro Cultural Development and Research Institute (CCDRI), Trini Torres		
CCDRI-01	In the first place, we do not want the transfer of the many thousands of marines (5,000 to 8,000+marines) to Guam -- the dumping ground for the marines from Okinawa to Guam. Then-- you need lands, housing, tearing down/clearing of forests (including lime forests), animal habitats, destruction of natural and historical treasures, the killing of the Mariana crow, the kingfisher, the Mariana fruit bats, the hayun lagu, the numerous marine large and small animals (including microbes), the corals and their reefs which protect the safety of our Island of Guam from sea storms and which very importantly provide habitats for fishes and other marine creatures, big and microbes. The ruining of the sea bottoms (which will never be cleaned up just as the military left their old war machines, training arms and machineries, and war gears in Puerto Rico Culebra and Vieques ocean waters left or dumped, to rust and rot (actual views during my visit during a conference there in 2000). The ruining of our indigenous fishing habitats as we have been deprived from fishing in our traditional fishing waters in developed marine preserves, and in the ocean and fresh water bodies under control of the military bases and ammunition storages, and the restricted areas for military trainings and military control of harbors. And now you are demanding to	Training and testing activities are proposed to occur at sea and on FDM. Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2 of Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS present current and proposed training and testing activities. The Navy analyzed land-based activities on Guam, Saipan, Tinian, and Rota in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS; the Navy did not reanalyze land-based activities in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS because there are no changes proposed to those land-based activities. The Navy will continue to implement procedural and mitigation measures to avoid, minimize, and mitigate environmental impacts from the Proposed Action. The Proposed Action does not include the transfer of Marines to Guam.

	Comment	Navy Response
	have permanent control of the ocean waters and beaches within the "Finegayan" military training and firing range. And in addition, an especially large area in our sea for danger range to involve the presence of ships and their dangerous sonar and rocket firing, explosions, and every war maneuver possible and live-training activities to be conducted. You mean to take over another big part of our most fertile land, another large area of our ocean waters, Litekyan, with its pristine beach, trees and plants? And you also mean to keep us out from fishing in Litekyan--fishing, which we have traditionally depended on for our survival? Do you want to keep repeating the many harm and destructions your U.S. military bases abroad have done to Guam and Puerto Rico, and other hand and destructions they have done to America and the World (Vine, David, 2015. BASE NATION: How U.S. Military bases abroad harm America and the World; New York, pp. 144-148.) and are still doing to American and the World. Do not forget the destruction the U.S. Military have done in their bases in the world. And most important, let's not forget the impacts on the environmental ecosystem and natural resources on Guam's surrounding lands. Their firing range complex and what are being fired from it, above and below into the surrounding lands and tree areas and the ocean, and from the beaches to the depths of the sea are tremendously noisy, frightening, and deafening to our Guam Island people. Live ammunitions firing by military in training, particularly the presence of numerous marines, machine guns firing, bring nightmares to our Chamoru people, just as what happened to our Charnoru people during and after World War II. We don't really want the marines, their dependents and the administrative staff here in large numbers on Guam. My offspring and I are also heirs to the Finegayan land (original	

	Comment	Navy Response
	name is Finaguayok (Northwest Field). Finaguayok was then a very fertile land with tropical trees like the rare ijit trees, and historic remains of our ancestors. My own grandfather owned a large parcel of land in Finaguayok, and he and other farmers used to farm a lot on a daily basis to feed their families and to sell. Now that land is taken up and controlled by the U.S. Military and now reserved for the Marines and their dependents (and a large number of administrative staff who were also known with Marines to have raped Okinawan women?) All of these marines and their dependents and administrative staff could be based in any or several states in the continental U.S. Why not? Costs should also be considered. We don't welcome these people on Guam. We are also at present overcrowded with people from other Micronesians, Filipinos, and others from other countries allowed by the U.S.to migrate to Guam. We can depend on ourselves for our survival and especially on sustainability for our survival. Si Yu'os ma'ase' (May God have Mercy), Chamoru Yul	
EarthJustice (EJ), David L. Henkin		
EJ-01	The National Environmental Policy Act ("NEPA") commands all federal agencies, including the Navy, to prepare an environmental impact statemen t ("EIS") for all "major Federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment." 42 U.S.C. § 4332(2)(C). "The primary purpose of an [EIS] is to serve as an action-forcing device to insure that the policies and goals defined in [NEPA] are inf used into the ongoing programs and actions of the Federal Government." 40 C.F.R. § 1502.1. An EIS must "provide full and fair discussion of significant environmental impacts and [must] inform decision makers and the public of the reasonable alternatives which would avoid or minimize adverse impacts or enhance the	The Navy has been conducting training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades and proposes to continue training in the region into the reasonably foreseeable future. The activities analyzed in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS are largely a continuation of the ongoing training and testing activities that were analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, 2010 MIRC Final EIS/OEIS, 1999 Military Training in the Marianas Final EIS, and other environmental compliance documents. This Supplemental EIS/OEIS: 1) includes the analysis of activities at sea and on FDM necessary to meet readiness requirements beyond 2020 and into the reasonably foreseeable future; 2) includes any changes to those activities previously analyzed; and 3) reflects the most up-to-date compilation of training

	Comment	Navy Response
	quality of the human environment." Id. An EIS must discuss, among other things: the environmental impact of the proposed federal action, any adverse and unavoidable environmental effects, any alternatives to the proposed action, and any irreversible and irretrievable commitment of resources involved in the proposed action. 42 U.S.C. §4332(2)(C); see also id. § 4332(2){E). Effects of the Action The Draft SEIS falls far short of complying with NEPA's command for the Navy to take a "hard look" a t the environmental consequences of its proposed training and testing activities in the Mariana Islands. 'Ilio' ulaokalani Coalition v. Rumsfeld, 464 F.3d 1083, 1094 (9th Cir. 2006). To comply with NEPA, the SEIS must thoroughly analyze all impacts associated with all proposed activities, including all "ecological (such as the effects on natural resources and on the components, structures, and functioning of affected ecosystems), aesthetic, historic, cultural, economic, social, or health" effects. 40 C.F.R. § 1508.8. Among other things, the SEIS must analyze the impacts to local communities from noise, restrictions on access to fishing grounds, restrictions on access to beaches used for recreation and subsistence activities, and disruptions to marine and air transportation between the Mariana Islands that is vital for, among other things, access to emergency medical treatment. The SEIS must disclose all impacts, "whether direct, indirect, or cumulative." *Id.*	and testing activities deemed necessary to accomplish military readiness requirements. This Supplemental EIS/OEIS fully complies with NEPA, includes extensive studies and analysis, and, using the best available science, exceeds the required hard look at impacts on the human and natural environment. The military is committed to protecting the environment while training and conducting testing. A comprehensive analysis of potential effects on environmental resources from Navy training and testing activities is presented in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS. These resources include: water quality and sediment quality, marine habitats, marine mammals, fish, sea turtles, birds, socioeconomics, cultural resources, and invertebrates. While some impacts would occur from training and testing activities, the analysis concludes that impacts would be minimal and would not have a significant impact on the environment. As described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), the Navy implements mitigation measures during its training and testing activities to avoid or reduce potential impacts on biological and cultural resources.
EJ-02	*Cumulative Impacts* With respect to cumulative impacts, the SEIS must consider the full range of past, current and planned future military activities in the Mariana Islands. See id. §§ 1508.7, 1508.25{a)(2) & (c). The quality of life of local communities in	The Navy used the best available science and conducted a comprehensive review of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable actions to develop a robust analysis of cumulative impacts (Chapter 4, Cumulative Impacts). As required under NEPA, the level and scope of the analysis are commensurate with the potential impacts of the action as reflected in the resource-specific discussions in Chapter 3

	Comment	Navy Response
	the Mariana Islands is threatened by a wide range of current and proposed military activities that the Navy is obliged to, but failed to, examine fully in the SEIS. The Draft SEIS acknowledges the Navy's duty to analyze the cumulative impacts of a number of past, present and reasonably foreseeable "military mission, testing, and training activities" in the Marianas, including, but not limited to, the relocation of thousands of Marines from Okinawa to Guam, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands ("CNMI") Joint Military Training ("CJMT") proposal, and Divert activities and exercises. See Draft SEIS at Table 4.2-1. Unfortunately, the Draft SEIS then fails to take the requisite "hard look" and, instead, provides only cursory, conclusory statements. For example, the Draft SEIS states vaguely that "[o]ther military activities that limit access to popular fishing sites could increase cumulative socioeconomic impacts on commercial, recreational, and subsistence fishers beyond impacts associated with the Proposed Action." Id. at 4-45. The Draft EIS then notes the potential for "significant cumulative impacts on certain socioeconomic resources in the Study Area ... if they resulted in extensive limitations on accessibility by residents, businesses, and tourists to ocean areas needed for commercial, recreational, and subsistence fishing and tourism." *Id.* The Draft SEIS fails, however, to "provide any objective quantification" of these potentially significant impacts, and "[t]he reader is not told what data the conclusion was based on, or why objective data cannot be provided." Klamath-Siskiyou Wildlands Ctr. v. Bureau of Land Mgmt., 387 F.3d 989, 994 (9th Cir. 2004). Such "[g]eneral statements about possible effects and some risk" do not satisfy NEPA. Neighbors of	(Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences). The Navy considered proposed and ongoing activities alongside with other activities in the region whose impacts are truly meaningful to the analysis. Furthermore, the entire Supplemental EIS/OEIS provides the cumulative impacts analysis, not just Chapter 4. Chapter 3 provides the current effects of past and present impacts and environmental conditions that represent the baseline of the environment as it is; Chapter 3 also discusses the consequences or potential future impacts from Navy activities. Chapter 4 discusses other reasonably foreseeable activities to the extent they are known and the incremental impact of the Navy's proposal when added to past, present, and future impacts. The Navy acknowledges the potential for cumulative impacts on some socioeconomic resources that depend on access to certain areas of the marine environment, such as fishing and tourism. The Navy used the best available data and information to analyze how the proposed training and testing activities would impact fishing and tourism in Section 3.12 (Socioeconomic Resources and Environment Justice). Metrics, including fisheries landings and trends in visitation to Guam and the CNMI, are used to quantify the analysis to the extent data are available. It is reasonable to assume that military training and testing activities that require exclusive use of ocean space (e.g., around FDM), if only temporarily, would contribute to access limitations by the public to those areas. Analysis results in Section 3.12 (Socioeconomic Resources and Environment Justice) show impacts on accessibility would not be significant.

	Comment	Navy Response
	Cuddy Mountain v. U.S. Forest Serv., 137 F.3d 1372, 1380 (9th Cir. 1998).[1]	
EJ-03	*Impacts to Marine Mammals* MITT activities threaten serious harm to marine mammals, with Navy use of sonar and explosives posing particularly significant threats. See generally U.S. Navy, Request for Regulations and Letter of Authorization for the Incidental Taking of Marine Mammals Resulting from U.S. Navy Training Activities in the Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area (Feb. 2019) ("LOA Application") (seeking authorization to harm marine mammals in conducting MITT activities); 84 Fed. Reg. 9,495 (Mar. 15, 2019). To satisfy NEPA's command to provide "high quality" environmental information to public officials and the public, the Navy must evaluate those impacts based on the most up-to-date scientific information available. See 40 C.F.R. § 1500.l(b). As a threshold matter, the Draft SEIS's analysis of impacts to marine mammals relies substantially on scientific recommendations about marine mammal noise exposure criteria that are over a decade old. See, e.g., Draft SEIS at 3.4-93 (citing Southall et al., 2007). The Navy must revise its analysis to incorporate the latest scientific knowledge on this critical topic. See, e.g., Southall et al., Marine Mammal Noise Exposure Criteria: Updated Scientific Recommendations for Residual Hearing Effects, Aquatic Mammals, 45(2): 125-232 (Mar. 2019) (enclosed).	This Supplemental EIS/OEIS does in fact rely on best available science to assess acoustic impacts on marine mammals. The acoustic criteria used in the analysis in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS are provided in the Technical Report titled *Criteria and Thresholds for U.S. Navy Acoustic and Explosive Effects Analysis (Phase III)*. This technical report was included in the description of the acoustic and explosive impact analyses in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS and is available at https://mitt-eis.com. Southall et al. (2019) was published after the Notice of Availability of the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As shown in the above technical report, however, the auditory criteria used in the Navy's analysis and the recommended criteria in Southall et al. (2019) are the same.
EJ-04	In addition, the Draft SEIS fails to take the legally required "hard look" at the impacts to marine mammals in the Marianas of stranding events related to the Navy's use of sonar, including, but not limited to, mid-frequency active ("MFA") sonar, and explosives. As the Navy has previously acknowledged, "[s]onar use during exercises involving the U.S.	Cuvier's beaked whale strandings in the Study Area are summarized in Section 3.4.1.17.5 (Species-specific Threats) in the background information on Cuvier's beaked whales. The Navy's analysis of impacts on beaked whales took into account their greater sensitivity to disturbance relative to other marine mammals, as demonstrated by the data used to develop the behavioral response criteria for beaked whales [see the technical report titled *Criteria and Thresholds for U.S. Navy*

	Comment	Navy Response
	Navy has been identified as a contributing cause or factor in five specific mass stranding events" that "have resulted in about 40 known cetacean deaths, consisting mostly of beaked whales and with close linkages to m id-frequency active sonar activity." LOA Application at 92.[2] The Navy has further conceded that ''[i]mpulsive sources (e.g., explosions) also have the potential to contribute to strandings." LOA Application at 165. In the Draft SEIS, the Navy notes that many marine mammals have died or been injured in stranding events in the Mariana Islands, including species known to be extremely sensitive to anthropogenic noise, including Navy sonar. See, e.g.. ., Draft SEIS at 3.4-8. Such species include Cuvier's beaked whales, which the draft SEIS notes has had repeated stranding events in the Marianas in the past 12 years and is known to be particularly vulnerable to Navy sonar. *Id.* at 3.4-28. The Draft SEIS fails to mention, however, that "MFA sonar was detected near Saipan concurrent with [the August 21, 2011] stranding event involving two Cuvier's beaked whales." Simonis et al., M id-frequency active sonar and beaked whale acoustic activity in the Northern Mariana Islands, Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 140(4) (November 2016) (enclosed).	*Acoustic and Explosive Effects Analysis (Phase III)* available at https://mitt-eis.com]. This Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS includes additional information of Cuvier's beaked whale strandings relative to sonar use in the Study Area in Section 3.4.2.1.1.6 (Stranding) under Environmental Consequences due to Acoustic Stressors in the Marine Mammal section (Section 3.4). Additional information does not change the conclusions of the analysis of potential impacts on Cuvier's beaked whales described in this Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS.
EJ-05	Similarly, the Draft SEIS notes that melon-headed whales experienced a "mass stranding" event involving a few hundred animals at Sasanhaya Bay, Rota in 2004, but fails to disclose or analyze the implications of a National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (''NOAA") study that concluded a similar mass stranding event involving melon-headed whales in Hawai'i was likely caused by Navy sonar. Draft SEIS at 3.4-35; see Southall et al., Hawaiian Melon-headed Whale (Peponacephala electra) Mass Stranding Event of July 3-4, 2004, NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-OPR-3 1(April 2006) (enclosed); see also Draft SEIS at 3.4-36 ("melon-headed	Please see the technical report cited in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS and this Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS titled *Marine Mammal Strandings Associated with U.S. Navy Sonar Activities* (www.mitt-eis.com) for a discussion of the melon-headed whales observed at Hanalei Bay, Hawaii and concurrently at Sasanhaya Bay, Rota in 2004. As explained in that report, it is unlikely that sonar caused the melon-headed whales to enter Hanalei Bay or resulted in the behaviors noted. In 2004, the Navy verified that there was no sonar use in the Mariana Islands area during or preceding the 2004 Sasanhaya Bay mass stranding, nor were any Navy surface ships at sea in the vicinity.

	Comment	Navy Response
	whales may be particularly sensitive to impacts from anthropogenic sounds").	
EJ-06	That Navy sonar may be responsible for the Cuvier's beaked whales and melon-headed whales that died and were injured in these stranding events cannot be dismissed lightly. The Navy failed, however, to disclose and analyze in its Draft SEIS the potential link between the Navy's use of sonar and explosives and these stranding events, or the multiple other stranding events in the Marianas involving Cuvier's beaked whales, melon-headed whales, and other marine mammal species. See, e.g., Draft SEIS a t 3.4-28 (four known dwarf sperm whale strandings in the Mariana Islands), 3.4-30 (three reported false killer whale strandings in Study Area), 3.4-35 (melon-headed whale strandings on Guam in 1980 and 2009), 3.4-38 (stranding of pygmy sperm whale in Study Area). Overall, the Draft SEIS's failure to take the requisite hard look a t the potential for Navy sonar and explosives to provoke stranding events that cause death or injury to marine mammals violates NEPA's command to "insure that [high quality] environmental information is available to public officials and citizens before decisions are made and before actions are taken." 40 C.F.R. § 1500.l(b).	Although records of marine mammal strandings exist as far back as 1878 in Guam, reporting of marine mammal strandings across the Mariana Islands has likely only become consistent in recent years, similar to other regions, whereas sonar use has occurred in the area around the Mariana Islands for decades. While exact causes of strandings are uncertain, scientists have identified potential contributing factors for strandings, including age, illness, or disease; ingestion of marine debris/plastics; contaminant load; and manmade sources. A small number of strandings have been associated with the use of U.S. Navy sonar; none of these have occurred in the Study Area. The technical report cited in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS and this Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS titled *Marine Mammal Strandings Associated with U.S. Navy Sonar Activities* (available at https://mitt-eis.com) summarizes: (1) stranding events associated with Navy sonar activities, and (2) strandings speculated but not linked to Navy sonar activities. This report also discusses other natural and anthropogenic factors that have been shown to contribute to strandings. The Center for Naval Analysis (CNA) recently conducted a statistical study of correlation of beaked whale strandings around the Mariana Islands with the use of U.S. Navy sonar, finding that insufficient evidence of a correlation exists. The CNA study used the complete record of all U.S. Navy sonar use between 2007 and 2019, including major training events, joint exercises, and unit level training/testing. The analysis also included the complete beaked whale stranding record for the Mariana Islands through 2019. Following the methods in Simonis et al. (2020), the CNA analysis found insufficient evidence of a correlation between sonar use and beaked whale strandings when considering the complete sonar use record. The CNA finding is in contrast to the finding in Simonis et al. (2020), which depicted a significant correlation between beaked whale strandings and Navy sonar use. However, the Simonis et al. (2020) result relied on substantially incomplete or inaccurate assumptions about U.S. Navy sonar use around the Mariana Islands. CNA also conducted statistical analyses specific to each island where beaked whale strandings have been observed in the Mariana Islands, similarly finding insufficient evidence of a correlation to sonar use. Additional information on the findings of

	Comment	Navy Response
		the CNA analysis are presented in Section 3.4.2.1.1.6 (Stranding) in Chapter 3.4 (Marine Mammals). The Navy's analysis of impacts on beaked whales took into account their greater sensitivity to disturbance relative to other marine mammals, as demonstrated by the data used to develop the behavioral response criteria for beaked whales [see the technical report titled *Criteria and Thresholds for U.S. Navy Acoustic and Explosive Effects Analysis (Phase III)* available at https://mitt-eis.com]. This Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS includes additional information of Cuvier's beaked whale strandings relative to sonar use in the Study Area in Section 3.4.2.1.1.6 (Stranding) under Environmental Consequences due to Acoustic Stressors in the Marine Mammal section (Section 3.4). Additional information does not change the conclusions of the analysis of potential impacts on Cuvier's beaked whales described in this Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As described in Section 5.1.2.2.1 (Marine Species Research and Monitoring Programs), for this Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy agreed to several additional research and monitoring initiatives designed to help advance the understanding of beaked whales and strandings in the MITT Study Area. The Navy will co-fund the Pacific Marine Assessment Program for Protected Species (PACMAPPS) Mariana Islands survey in spring-summer 2021 and future studies starting in 2022 to help document beaked whale occurrence, abundance, and distribution in the Mariana Islands. The Navy will also fund additional stranding response and necropsy analyses for the Pacific Islands region, and research on a framework to improve statistical stranding analysis. Collaboratively with NMFS, the Navy will fund and organize an expert panel to provide recommendations on scientific data gaps and uncertainties for further protective measure consideration to minimize potential impacts of Navy training and testing activities on beaked whales in the Mariana Islands.
EJ-07	*Alternatives* The alternatives section "is the heart of the environmental impact statement." Id. § 1502.14. In this section, the Navy	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during training and testing activities, and the DoD strives to reduce or minimize potential impacts as much as practicable. The alternatives carried forward were developed to meet the Navy's purpose and need and to ensure that it can fulfill its

	Comment	Navy Response
	must "[r]igorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives," devoting ''substantial treatment to each alternative considered in detail ... so that reviewers may evaluate their comparative merits." Id. § 1502.14(a), (b). The core purpose of the alternatives analysis is to "sharply def in[e] the issues and provid[e] a clear basis for choice among options by the decisionmaker and the public." Id. § 1502.14. As discussed above, local communities in the Mariana Islands face serious threats from military activities. Accordingly, in the scoping comments we submitted for the SEIS in September 2017, we urged the Navy to consider a range of alternatives that would allow the Navy to carry out its mission while avoiding or, at least, minimizing the impacts on those communities. As noted in our scoping comments, reasonable alternatives include eliminating or severely restricting training and testing activities in locations that would inflict high levels of noise on the civilian population, would restrict access to fishing grounds, would restrict access to beaches used for recreation or subsistence, and/or would disrupt the ability of civilians to travel between islands by air or sea (e.g., to access medical treatment or visit with relatives). The Draft SEIS fails to consider all such alternatives, violating NEPA's command "to permit informed public comment on ... choices or alternatives that might be pursued with less environmental harm." Lands Council v. Powell, 395 F.3d 1019, 1027 (9th Cir. 2004).	obligation under Title 10 of the U.S. Code. See Section 2.4 (Action Alternatives Development) for more detailed information on the development of alternatives. As required by the CEQ regulations, the Navy included the No Action Alternative. In Appendix I (Geographic Mitigation Assessment), the Navy analyzed area restrictions to ensure decision makers take into account all possible approaches which would mitigate environmental impacts. Pursuant to 40 CFR 1502.14(f) appropriate mitigation measures can be considered outside the context of reasonable alternatives. Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2 in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) present the current and proposed training and testing activities. The training and testing activities largely occur in locations away from the public and thus would not result in high levels of noise on the civilian population. The Navy analyzed land-based activities on Guam, Saipan, Tinian, and Rota in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS; the Navy did not reanalyze land-based activities in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS because no changes are proposed to those land-based activities. The military is committed to continuing to work with the local community on issues that potentially affect the public, including access to fishing sites while ensuring public safety at all times. The military actively promotes compatible use of ocean areas by minimizing public access restrictions and limiting the extent and duration of necessary closures. The Navy does not propose a change to the ocean areas currently used by both the Navy and the public. Restrictions on accessing areas of co-use would continue to be infrequent and short-term, while other fishing sites in the Study Area would continue to be available to the public.

	Comment	Navy Response
EJ-08	In our scoping comments, we also urged the Navy to consider alternatives that eliminate--or, at least, severely limit-training and testing activities in biologically sensitive areas. After all, as NOAA has recognized, there is a general consensus among the scientific community that "[p]rotecting important marine mammal habitat is… the most effective mitigation measure currently available" to reduce the harmful impacts of mid-frequency sonar on marine mammals. Letter from Jane Lubchenco, then-Under Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere, to Nancy Sutley, then-Chair of the Council on Environmental Quality at 2 (Jan. 19, 2010) (enclosed). We specifically urged the Navy to consider alternatives that impose restrictions on MITT activities in areas identified as likely calving grounds for humpback whales during the winter months when humpbacks are present in the Marianas (December to April). Unfortunately, the Draft SEIS fails to evaluate any alternative that would prohibit all use of sonar in the two "geographic mitigation areas" proposed for humpbacks--Marpi Reef and Chalan Ka noa Reef--during the few months when humpbacks are present in the Mariana Islands to breed, birth and nurse. Instead, the Draft SEIS examines only a single alternative, in which the Navy would merely report to NMFS the total hours of MF1 surface ship hull-mounted MFA sonar used in these areas. Draft SEIS at I-12, I-20. This proposed "mitigation" does nothing to protect humpbacks. It is entirely feasible and reasonable for the Navy to consider alternatives that prohibit the use of sonar altogether in these limited portions of the MITT Study Area during the few months when humpbacks are present. The Navy is proposing to establish a "geographic mitigation area" to benefit spinner dolphins in the nearshore waters of Agat Bay, Guam, where	Recognizing the importance of the Mariana Islands to marine mammals, the Navy has developed three geographic mitigation areas in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Appendix I (Geographic Mitigation Assessment) includes information about areas considered and evaluated to be potential mitigation areas. Each area was assessed based on two criteria: (1) is the area a key area of biological importance for one or more marine mammal species or sea turtle species for an important life process, and (2) would the mitigation result in an avoidance or reduction of impacts. In addition, implementation of the area as a mitigation area must be practical and allow the Navy to carry out its mission requirements. The Navy used the best available scientific data on vulnerable or sensitive species, such as humpback whales, to identify the three geographic mitigation areas that met the two criteria. Updates to the appendix have been made in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS based on the Navy's ESA and MMPA consultations with NMFS. Appendix I (Geographic Mitigation Assessment) details the geographic mitigation areas where training and testing activities using explosives would be prohibited, and surface ship hull-mounted MF1 mid-frequency active sonar would be prohibited or restricted seasonally. To meet training and testing requirements in the Mariana Islands, the Navy needs to have the ability to conduct activities using mid-frequency sonar in relatively shallow-water environments, such as in the vicinity of Saipan, which are limited in the Study Area. In Hawaii, the Navy was able to prohibit mid-frequency sonar (MF1) use in the 4-Islands Region Mitigation Area as additional shallow water areas are available, preserving the ability to train and test with mid-frequency sonar in relatively shallow waters in the Study Area.

	Comment	Navy Response
	MF1 sonar will be prohibited year-round. Id. at I-24 to I-26. In Hawai'i, the Navy likewise has prohibited all use of MF1 sonar in the 4-Islands Region Mitigation Area during the winter months when humpbacks are present. U.S. Navy, Hawaii-Southern California Training and Testing Final EIS/OE IS at 5-70 to 5-72 (Oct. 2018) (excerpts enclosed). The Navy has no excuse for refusing to consider alternatives involving a similar prohibition in important humpback whale habitat off Saipan. Thank you for your consideration of these comments.	

Table K-4: Response to Comments from Individuals

	Comment	Navy Response
Else Demeulenaere (ED)		
ED-01	The proposed actions in the MITT Study Area, using active sonar, explosives and other detrimental actions allow for over 80,000 takings of 26 marine mammal species per year for five years and allow to damage or kill over six square miles of endangered coral reefs. The Mariana Islands archipelago is part of the Micronesia-Polynesia biodiversity hotspot and is recognized internationally. Therefore, this valuable biodiversity, which is part of the archipelago's cultural and natural heritage, is at stake. I'm also concerned about the coastal habitats and their destruction, due to debris and pollutants. Damage to the coastal habitats can be detrimental for the fauna and flora inhabiting these habitats. Sea turtle, sea birds, … can be adversely affected by habitat destruction, ingestion of dangerous substances. It is also unclear what will happen to injured animals. The cumulative effects from previous, current and future actions is unknown and certainly not the sustainable future our people are hoping for. I'm also concerned about the islands' people's mental and physical health. Families have been displaced away from some of the northern islands long time ago, during previous colonization, families still have descendants who might want to visit these islands, and even relocate back. In addition, land and submerged cultural resources/sites will be affected, as well fishing grounds. The thought of not having that possibility anymore to return to their homeland due to military training and or contamination of military expended material is a true concern. The traditional healers in the archipelago stand in solidarity with each other and feel the connection that binds them as all the Mariana Islands are one. Again, the cumulative effect or potential impact is not	This Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)/Overseas EIS (OEIS) fully complies with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Using the best available science, the extensive studies and analysis conducted by the Navy exceeded the required hard look at impacts on environmental resources. The potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. In accordance with Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) guidance, Chapter 4 (Cumulative Impacts) focused on impacts that are truly meaningful. This was accomplished by reviewing the direct and indirect impacts that would occur for each resource area. Key factors considered were the current status and sensitivity of the resource and the intensity, duration, and spatial extent of the impacts of each potential stressor. In general, long-term and widespread impacts were considered more likely to contribute to cumulative impacts than short-term and localized impacts. Those impacts on a resource that were considered to be negligible were not considered further in the analysis. The level of analysis for each resource was commensurate with the intensity of the impact identified in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences). As explained in the Navy's technical report (*Marine Mammal Strandings Associated with U.S. Navy Sonar Activities*, 2017 [www.mitt-eis.com]), marine mammal strandings have been a historic and ongoing occurrence attributed to a variety of causes, both natural and anthropogenic. Over the last 50 years, increased awareness and reporting has led to more information about species affected and raised concerns about anthropogenic sources of strandings. While there have been limited numbers of marine mammal mortalities potentially associated with U.S. Navy activities, the root causes are not clear in most cases. NMFS, as the regulator, maintains the authoritative National Stranding Database.

	Comment	Navy Response
	stated. I know the use of Tinian, Pagan, and Ritidian Life Fire Training Range is not part of this EIS but it adds up to all the actions undertaken in the archipelago with no end in sight. Fishing grounds has been off limits in Guam and will be again in the future, which impacts substance fishing for families (noncommercial use), and therefore affect the local fishing community. A paper published in the Royal Society shows a naval mid-frequency active sonar ban on MFASs around the Canary Islands successfully prevented additional BW MSEs in the region, but atypical MSEs have continued in other places of the world, especially in the Mediterranean Sea, with examined individuals showing a correlation (https://royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/10.1098/rspb.2018.2533) between marine mammals strandings and sonar use. Due to this obvious link, these practices are abandoned in some parts of the world. During the informational briefing at the legislature it was stated that the local agencies have not received any previous MITT reports outlining activities and their affects. Monitoring reports from previous mine and detonation, and damage to corals, animals and plants need to be available for the public. Again, the cumulative effect of all the activities is not clear to the agencies and the public. For the people of Mariana Islands, this is the opposite of a sustainable and secure future, it is one of fear to lose the most valuable of all: their land, natural and cultural resources.	The Center for Naval Analysis (CNA) also recently conducted a statistical study of correlation of beaked whale strandings around the Mariana Islands with the use of U.S. Navy sonar, finding that insufficient evidence of a correlation exists. The CNA study used the complete record of all U.S. Navy sonar use between 2007 and 2019, including major training events, joint exercises, and unit level training/testing. The analysis also included the complete beaked whale stranding record for the Mariana Islands through 2019. Following the methods in Simonis et al. (2020), the CNA analysis found insufficient evidence of a correlation between sonar use and beaked whale strandings when considering the complete sonar use record. The CNA finding is in contrast to the finding in Simonis et al. (2020), which depicted a significant correlation between beaked whale strandings and Navy sonar use. However, the Simonis et al. (2020) result relied on substantially incomplete or inaccurate assumptions about U.S. Navy sonar use around the Mariana Islands. CNA also conducted statistical analyses specific to each island where beaked whale strandings have been observed in the Mariana Islands, similarly finding insufficient evidence of a correlation to sonar use. Additional information on the findings of the CNA analysis are presented in Section 3.4.2.1.1.6 (Stranding) in Chapter 3.4 (Marine Mammals). As described in Section 5.1.2.2.1 (Marine Species Research and Monitoring Programs), for this Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy agreed to several additional research and monitoring initiatives designed to help advance the understanding of beaked whales and strandings in the MITT Study Area. The Navy will co-fund the Pacific Marine Assessment Program for Protected Species (PACMAPPS) Mariana Islands survey in spring-summer 2021 and future studies starting in 2022 to help document beaked whale occurrence, abundance, and distribution in the Mariana Islands. The Navy will also fund additional stranding response and necropsy analyses for the Pacific Islands region, and research on a framework to improve statistical stranding analysis. Collaboratively with NMFS, the Navy will fund and organize an expert panel to provide recommendations on scientific data gaps and uncertainties for further protective measure consideration to minimize potential impacts of Navy training and testing

	Comment	Navy Response
	Else Demeulenaere, MSc Supported by: Susan Aguon, Betty Malakai, Yo' åmte Zita D. Pangelinan, Victor D. Pangelinan, Sr. Lourdes Pangelinan, Grace Campos, SSND Dena Rendon, Lina P. Atalig	activities on beaked whales in the Mariana Islands. Information on current monitoring projects, technical reports, conference presentations and data are available on the Navy's Marine Species Monitoring Program website at https://www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/. The Navy's assessment of potential impacts reflects using the best available and applicable science determined in consultation with NMFS. This includes analysis of the cumulative impacts, mid- and high-frequency active sonar, underwater detonations, and activities within the Marianas Trench Marine National Monument. The training activities within the Study Area are not expected to have significant effects on those resources designated for special protection under the Marianas Trench Marine National Monument designation. Furthermore, the Presidential Proclamation included that the prohibitions included in the Proclamation shall not apply to the activities and exercises of the Armed Forces. The mitigation measures followed during military activities and exercises within the Monument ensure that the activities are consistent so far as is reasonable and practicable with the Proclamation. Section 3.8 (Marine Invertebrates) includes an analysis of potential impacts on coral. A detailed analysis of potential impacts on coral around FDM is also provided. Based on the analysis, coral fauna are healthy and robust, and the nearshore physical environment and basic habitat types at FDM would remain unchanged. These conclusions are based on (1) a limited amount of physical damage, (2) very low levels of partial mortality and disease (less than one percent of all species observed), (3) absence of excessive mucus production, (4) good coral recruitment, and (5) complete recovery by 2012 of the 2007 bleaching events. Smith and Marx (2016) also concluded that the health, abundance, and biomass of fishes, corals, and other marine resources in those habitats are as good as, or better than, those in similar habitats elsewhere in the Mariana Archipelago. The Navy funded additional reef surveys in the nearshore areas of FDM in 2017. The results were approved for public release in September 2018 and are available at https://apps.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/1069450.pdf. The 2017 survey found little evidence that training has affected coral reef communities at FDM. Only three relatively fresh ordnance items were observed,

	Comment	Navy Response
		but no blast pits, craters, or significant areas of coral breakage were observed. The ordnance observed during the 2017 survey was almost exclusively old, encrusted in marine life, and had no discernable impact on surrounding communities. The analysis of potential impacts on environmental justice is limited primarily to traditional fishing practices, because, with the exception of training activities at FDM, the vast majority of activities occur at sea, where potential socioeconomic impacts are limited to commercial, recreational, and tourism activities that take place in the marine environment, including fishing. As described in Section 3.12.1.4 (Environmental Justice), fishing for subsistence is not easily distinguishable from recreational or commercial fishing in the small boat fishing communities of the CNMI, even for a single fishing trip, and fishers who use their own catch as a regular source of food are not necessarily minority or low-income.
Matthew Ulloa (MU)		
MU-01	I am a local residence of the Island of Guam and I do have my own concerns about the protection of our coral reefs that surround around island because I am a fisherman and also, I was a part of the "REEF RANGER" program with the Guam National Park service. So, I would like to take part in this organization and whatever plans to help save our coral reefs	Marine life and marine habitat are important to the Navy. Please contact the Guam National Park Service regarding the Reef Ranger program.
Dorathina Herrero (DH)		
DH-01	*Marine Habitat most of the explosive military expended materials would detonate at or near the water surface. training activities that include bottom-laid in-water explosions would affect marine habitat structure. bottom substrates could be disturbed by vessel and in-water device strikes, military expended materials, seafloor devices used for military readiness	Marine life and marine habitat are important to the Navy. Using the latest science and technology, the Navy completed extensive analyses and computer-based modeling to determine impacts and develop science-based protective measures to reduce or avoid potential impacts on marine life. All potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Also, as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), the Navy implements, to the maximum extent practicable, procedural and geographic mitigation

	Comment	Navy Response
	activities, and from walking, standing, or swimming in the nearshore waters. *socioeconomic resource and environmental injustice may result in impacts on commercial and recreational fishing, traditional fishing practices, or tourism when areas of co-use are temporarily inaccessible to ensure public safety during training and testing activities. please see attached copied text from PDF doc (Effects of Underwater Explosions on Life in the Sea) found here: https://ia802804.us.archive.org/35/items/DTIC_ADA315490/DTIC_ADA315490.pdf	measures during its training and testing activities to reduce potential impacts on marine life. The Navy's analysis indicates that, with implementation of its protective mitigation measures, there would be no significant impacts on marine species. [18456] This Supplemental EIS/OEIS does not propose a change to the ocean areas currently used by both the Navy and the public. Restrictions on accessing areas of co-use would continue to be relatively infrequent and short term, while other fishing and tourism sites in the Study Area would continue to be available to the public. The military is committed to continuing to work with the local community on issues that potentially affect the public, including access to fishing sites.
Eric Borja (EB)		
EB-01	I do not support the testing site. Our coral reefs are important to our marine resources and for our islands. please do not threaten our ocean for testing sites.	Marine life and marine habitat are important to the Navy. Using the latest science and technology, the Navy completed extensive analyses and computer-based modeling to determine impacts and develop science-based protective measures to reduce or avoid potential impacts on marine life. Potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Also, as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), the Navy implements, to the maximum extent practicable, procedural and geographic mitigation measures during its training and testing activities to reduce potential impacts on marine life. The Navy's analysis indicates that, with implementation of its protective mitigation measures, there would be no significant impacts on marine species. [18456] Section 3.8 (Marine Invertebrates) includes an analysis of potential impacts on coral. A detailed analysis of potential impacts on coral around FDM is also provided. Based on the analysis, coral fauna are healthy and robust, and the nearshore physical environment and basic habitat types at FDM would remain unchanged. These conclusions are based on (1) a limited amount of physical

	Comment	Navy Response
		damage, (2) very low levels of partial mortality and disease (less than one percent of all species observed), (3) absence of excessive mucus production, (4) good coral recruitment, and (5) complete recovery by 2012 of the 2007 bleaching events. Smith and Marx (2016) also concluded that the health, abundance, and biomass of fishes, corals, and other marine resources at FDM are as good as, or better than, those in similar habitats elsewhere in the Mariana Archipelago. The Navy funded additional reef surveys in the nearshore areas of FDM in 2017. The results were approved for public release in September 2018 and are available at https://apps.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/1069450.pdf. The 2017 survey found little evidence that training has affected coral reef communities at FDM. Only three relatively fresh ordnance items were observed, but no blast pits, craters, or significant areas of coral breakage were observed. The ordnance observed during the 2017 survey was almost exclusively old, encrusted in marine life, and had no discernable impact on surrounding communities.
Timothy Murer (TM)		
TM-01	Why don't you go blow up your own land and leave ours alone. You Americans are a trash race with no care in the world talking what's not yours and destroying people's homes but as long as it isn't yours it's okay right. I hope Russia fucks you guys up soon. Leave Guam alone	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.
Katrina West (KW)		
KW-01	The MITT allows 81,962 takings of 26 different marine mammal species (including whales and dolphins) per year for 5 years due to detonation, sonar, and other training and testing activity within the MITT The MITT also allows damage or kill of over 6 square miles of endangered coral reefs plus additional 20 square miles of coral reef around FDM through the use of highly explosive bombs.	Marine life and marine habitat are important to the Navy. Using the latest science and technology, the Navy completed extensive analyses and computer-based modeling to determine impacts and develop science-based protective measures to reduce or avoid potential impacts on marine life. Potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Also, as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), the Navy implements, to the maximum extent practicable, procedural and geographic mitigation measures during its training and testing activities to reduce potential impacts on marine life. The Navy's analysis indicates that, with implementation of its protective

	Comment	Navy Response
	We are deeply concerned about the consequences such actions will have on the significant resources our great ocean and land provide us in the Mariåna Islands. These actions have a devastating impact on indigenous culture and lifeways, increase our dependence on imported foods sources, and erode our resilience. Do not expand, protect the environment.	mitigation measures, there would be no significant impacts on marine species. The Navy is formally consulting with NMFS concerning potential impacts of the proposed training and testing activities on all marine mammals protected under the MMPA and known to occur in the MITT Study Area. The Navy has updated this Supplemental EIS/OEIS based on section 7 consultation and will incorporate all reasonable and prudent measures, and terms and conditions that are set forth in the Biological Opinion, in the Record of Decision. Section 3.8 (Marine Invertebrates) includes an analysis of potential impacts on coral. A detailed analysis of potential impacts on coral around FDM is also provided. Based on the analysis, coral fauna are healthy and robust, and the nearshore physical environment and basic habitat types at FDM would remain unchanged. These conclusions are based on (1) a limited amount of physical damage, (2) very low levels of partial mortality and disease (less than one percent of all species observed), (3) absence of excessive mucus production, (4) good coral recruitment, and (5) complete recovery by 2012 of the 2007 bleaching events. Smith and Marx (2016) also concluded that the health, abundance, and biomass of fishes, corals, and other marine resources at FDM are as good as, or better than, those in similar habitats elsewhere in the Mariana Archipelago. The Navy funded additional reef surveys in the nearshore areas of FDM in 2017. The results were approved for public release in September 2018 and are available at https://apps.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/1069450.pdf. The 2017 survey found little evidence that training has affected coral reef communities at FDM. Only three relatively fresh ordnance items were observed, but no blast pits, craters, or significant areas of coral breakage were observed. The ordnance observed during the 2017 survey was almost exclusively old, encrusted in marine life, and had no discernable impact on surrounding communities. Section 3.11.1.3 (Cultural/Traditional Practices and Beliefs) has been added to this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Navy is not proposing any geographic expansion of the training and testing

	Comment	Navy Response
		area in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Proposed activities are similar to those conducted in the Study Area for decades.
Carl Cruz (CC)		
CC-01	Why are you destroying the earth? To be prepared to protect the US, but you are destroying the US. The money won't be of any value once your time on earth has passed and what you're doing to the planet will end up effecting life for our children! Test your bombs on area 51 or places you have ALREADY destroyed. Leave the ocean alone!	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.
Anthony Sablan (AS)		
AS-01	"Protect the American chamorro people and the almost extinct wildlife indigenous to the marianas.	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.
Erisa Cristobal (EC)		
EC-01	No more further militarizing our lands and our waters without Decolonization! CHamorus should not have to bear the burden that the United States of America has placed on this island and it's resources! Decolonization before mitigation!	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.
Ann-Marie Taitague (AMT)		
AMT-01	Please don't do this to our island.	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.

	Comment	Navy Response
Marinna Julian (MJ)		
MJ-01	Y'all really do not need more than what y'all currently possess. Using this extra land in order to train will poison water that locals, you, and your own families will ingest. If earth gets wrecked from the environmental problems, you'll get sent to war to fight for scarce resources for a little bit. But eventually the world will be so desperate, the military can no longer exist when civilized society breaks down. And when that happens, y'all will be too old to go toe to toe with younger, desperate people trying to survive like you. So you're really just playing yourselves by contributing to the earth's demise with this proposed plan. Our country's biggest threat in the future is the planet's wrath not another country.	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.
Kayle Tydingco (KT)		
KT-01	The MITT "study area" will permit the destruction of our natural resources. This destruction has to stop. The Bikini Atoll test site is a reminder to us all of what happens when Pacific Islanders comply for the "good of humanity" (jelly babies, cancer, contaminated waters). I'm sure you'd like us all to believe that your test site is designed "for our protection" as our waters become depleted of fish and coral.	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities. In addition, the military is committed to protecting public health and safety. Section 3.13 (Public Health and Safety) includes an analysis of potential impacts associated with underwater energy, in-air energy, physical interactions, and secondary stressors.
Miehilani Trinidad (MT)		
MT-01	I reject the degradation and the plans the USA Military will subject my home and the natural resources too, endangering my future and the rights of my children and their children to a naturally & occurring environment. This God given environment was created as an oasis to protect, shelter and restore the people and all other inhabitants. Leave it alone	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities. In addition, the military is committed to protecting public health and safety. Section 3.13 (Public Health and Safety) includes an analysis of potential impacts associated with underwater energy, in-air energy, physical interactions, and

	Comment	Navy Response
	please and allow us to prosper.	secondary stressors.
Jonita Kerr (JK)		
JK-01	Referring to Quantifying Acoustic Impacts for Phase III Technical Report, page 6-7, 6. Mitigation Effectiveness. I take issue with procedural mitigation procedures based on trained Lookouts. Should active sonar by implemented, sonar waves travel many kilometers beyond a trained Lookout's scope of view. It's true that this method is not 100% effective for sighting cetaceans or sea turtles, however, given the inherent flaws and assumptions that animals might leave the area if they hear or feel sonar, this does not constitute mitigation.	The Navy's procedural mitigation measures for active sonar involve trained Lookouts observing and implementing mitigation. Mitigation includes power down zones within 1,000 yard (yd.) and 500 yd., and a 200 yd. shut down mitigation zone if a marine mammal is present. There is not a requirement for Lookouts to visually observe thousands of kilometers, as the commenter implies. For the highest source levels (the active sonar sources with the longest predicted ranges to Permanent Threshold Shift [PTS]), the mitigation zones extend beyond the average ranges to PTS for all marine mammal and sea turtle species found in the MITT Study Area; therefore, the mitigation zones for active sonar will help avoid or reduce the potential for exposure to PTS for marine mammals. The active sonar mitigation zones also extend into a portion of and beyond the average ranges to Temporary Threshold Shift (TTS) for marine mammals and sea turtles, respectively; therefore, mitigation will help avoid or reduce the potential for some or all exposure to TTS.
Angela Hoppe (AH)		
AH-01	Hafa Adai, I am a Chamoru woman. Born and raised on Guam. I moved away for college opportunities in Hawaii which is where I now reside. Hawaii and Guam have many things in common, especially as a military training site. Growing up on Guam the trainings my home island is utilized for was always sensationalized. We would watch “airshows” at Anderson Air Force Base in awe. Our community saw the military as knights in shining armor and we felt privileged that our home could be used for such a noble cause as training the tip of the spear for military strategic positioning. When I moved away and attended college, I was on the outside looking in. The devastatingly high rates of cancer, of	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities. The use of Litkeyan is not included as part of this Proposed Action. In addition, the military is committed to protecting public health and safety. Section 3.13 (Public Health and Safety) includes an analysis of potential impacts associated with underwater energy, in-air energy, physical interactions, and secondary stressors.

	Comment	Navy Response
	suicide of chronic preventable disease correlates to the use of our islands and surrounding neighbor islands such as the Marshall Islands as training sites. The environmental impact statement you are releasing cannot be assessed from an objective lens. Detonating this sacred site will devastate the natural habitat and poison the water and land both our people and all living creatures need to sustain themselves. I oppose the use of Litkeyan for the use of training due to the devastating irreversible impacts it will cause to the environment. There is little left to save, please support our request to not use Litkeyan as a site.	
Odyessa San Nicolas (OSN)		
OSN-01	I am against any type of training in the Marianas. It will effect our environment and animals around. We should be protecting our islands not destroying it for war training.	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.
Kate Quiambao (KQ)		
KQ-01	As a child of Guam, Marianas Islands, and the Pacific, I DO NOT support the MITT! Please do not allow all these trainings within the Pacific Ocean! It will kill precious organisms that are already trying to survive in the oceans they live in today. Please think about the future! Please think about the long-term effects of this activity! It will effect our way of life, our culture, and all the previous animals. I do not support the MITT.	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.

	Comment	Navy Response
Mathew Bamba (MB)		
MB-01	People writing all this are probably wasting our time. You probably don't even dive a fuck about the environment. Your military has used our island as a dump for many years, taken our most prime lands for your bases. Now you want to use our waters as your training ground. Why don't you go use somewhere else like San Diego or New York City as training ground? You don't give a fuck about anything but yourselves. Playing world police, and colonizing lands. Leave our waters alone go do your training somewhere else other than our place of relaxation	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.
Edrienne Garrido (EG)		
EG-01	Why do DOD keep on forcibly taking land and destroying it? When will this be put to an end? It's unjust and unfair for the people of Guam, especially for the Chamorus. Too many things have been taken from them, have some respect, Guam is the only home they have.	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.
N DeLisle Duenas (NDD)		
NDD-01	I strongly oppose any and all of the U.S. military's training and testing in the Mariana Islands. There exists a long history of military-related contaminations in Guam, the Marianas and throughout Micronesia, which certainly cannot be "mitigated" when further militarization is taking place. Any new proposed militarization whether through training, testing and land acquisition — as well as the U.S. military's ongoing occupation and activities — are a major detriment to the health and environment of the people in the region. Absolutely no detonations of any magnitude should occur, nor should any marine life and coral reefs be compromised or adversely effected; the MITT mitigation and allowance for "81,962 takings of 26 different marine mammal species per year for 5 years due to detonation, sonar and other training and testing activity" and the "kill of over 6 square miles of	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities. Section 3.8 (Marine Invertebrates) includes an analysis of potential impacts on coral, including a detailed analysis of potential impacts on coral around FDM. Based on the analysis, coral fauna are healthy and robust, and the nearshore physical environment and basic habitat types at FDM would remain unchanged. These conclusions are based on (1) a limited amount of physical damage, (2) very low levels of partial mortality and disease (less than one percent of all species observed), (3) absence of excessive mucus production, (4) good coral recruitment, and (5) complete recovery by 2012 of the 2007 bleaching events. Smith and Marx (2016) also concluded that the health, abundance, and biomass of fishes, corals, and other marine resources at FDM are as good as, or better than, those in similar habitats elsewhere in the Mariana Archipelago. The Navy funded additional reef surveys in the nearshore areas of FDM in 2017. The

	Comment	Navy Response
	endangered coral reefs plus additional 20 square miles of coral reefs around FDM" (No'os) are unacceptable. Additionally, the marine life and environmental balance of the Marianas plays an incredibly important role in Micronesian seafaring traditions, which are older than the United States nation itself. Much more respect and regard should thus be given to these oceans that are deeply part of the region's cultural identities. I additionally oppose the separation of MITT activities in the Programmatic Agreement, which works to delineate and divide the Marianas region. Also, on the premise of "National Security," the rhetoric to train, test and occupy "so that the military may meet their respective missions to be combat-ready and capable of winning wars, and maintaining freedom of the seas" is a manipulative colonial ideology that places the homes, lives, health and values of Mariana islanders beneath that of the United States. The proposed MITT, ongoing and further militarization, explosive tests and occupation of lands for military trainings are just updated forms of colonialization in the Pacific; and thus also detrimental to decolonization efforts in the region. Leave Tinian, Pågan, Guam — all of the Marianas and Micronesia — alone! Lastly and for the record, I also strongly opposed the 2015 Record of Decision, and live-fire training ranges near Litekyan (Ritidian).	results were approved for public release in September 2018 and are available at https://apps.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/1069450.pdf. The 2017 survey found little evidence that training has affected coral reef communities at FDM. Only three relatively fresh ordnance items were observed, but no blast pits, craters, or significant areas of coral breakage were observed. The ordnance observed during the 2017 survey was almost exclusively old, encrusted in marine life, and had no discernable impact on surrounding communities. The potential effects of sonar and explosives on marine mammals are quantitatively estimated using the Navy's Acoustics Effects Model (see the Technical Report, *Quantifying Acoustic Impacts on Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles: Methods and Analytical Approach for Phase III Training and Testing*, available on the project website for details on the quantitative methodology). Predicted effects from sonar on marine mammals are presented by species in Section 3.4.2.1.2.3 (Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers Under the Action Alternatives) and from explosives in Section 3.4.2.2.2.3 (Impacts from Explosive Stressors Under the Action Alternatives). For the Proposed Action, over a seven-year period being requested, the Navy's quantitative analysis for acoustic and explosive sources in the MITT Study Area estimates no mortality or direct injury to any marine mammal and a total of 496 Level A exposures (i.e., PTS) and 471,407 Level B exposures (i.e., TTS and behavioral impacts). Behavioral responses by marine mammal species are also predicted by the acoustic effects model. Research cited in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS and in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS indicates behavioral responses by marine mammals exposed to underwater sound vary from no response to an immediate change in behavior, such as a change in swimming direction. Behavioral changes are temporary and not necessarily repeated, and animals frequently return to and continue their prior behavior after the initial interruption. Information on strandings associated with Navy training and testing activities is provided in the 2017 technical report, *Marine Mammal Strandings Associated with United States Navy Sonar Activities*. NMFS, as the regulator, maintains the authoritative National Stranding

	Comment	Navy Response
		Database. As summarized in the fact sheet and discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), the Navy would implement a robust suite of mitigation measures to avoid or reduce potential impacts on marine mammals to the maximum extent practicable. The Navy's mitigation includes a combination of procedural mitigation measures (e.g., powering down or shutting down sonar if a marine mammal is observed within a certain distance from the sonar source) and mitigation areas (e.g., prohibiting the use of explosives within two identified areas that may be particularly important for humpback whale reproduction). Additional information about the Navy's mitigation areas is presented in Appendix I (Geographic Mitigation Assessment). Information about why the Navy cannot implement further restrictions on the type or number of activities involving active sonar and explosives in the Study Area is presented in Section 5.6.1 (Active Sonar) and Section 5.6.2 (Explosives).
Maria Hernandez (MH)		
MH-01	As a CHamoru woman born and raised on Guam, I feel strongly about the preservation of our island's environmental, cultural and historical resources. I resent that our region is the largest training area in the world considering the wide expanse of other locations the military could train without adversely and permanently impacting our land and cultural resources, which we are fighting to preserve after centuries of colonialism. I am infuriated about the 12,580 detonations of various magnitudes per year over the span of five years. I oppose the damaging/killing/bombing of over 6 square miles of endangered coral reefs and 20 square miles of coral reef around FDM. Our GovGuam agencies have spoken about the concerns of various detonations on our coastal floors and how they will impact sea life. Recently, a biologist with the Department of Agriculture testified stating the EIS does not have current information about true impacts to marine mammals. Such mammals have been	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities. Using the latest science and technology, the Navy completed extensive analyses and computer-based modeling to determine impacts and develop science-based protective measures to reduce or avoid potential impacts on marine life. Potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Also, as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), the Navy implements, to the maximum extent practicable, procedural and geographic mitigation measures during its training and testing activities to reduce potential impacts on marine life. The Navy's analysis indicates that, with implementation of its protective mitigation measures, there would be no significant impacts on marine species. The Navy reviewed the best available scientific data and information on marine mammals available for inclusion in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, and incorporated relevant information into the marine mammals impact analysis in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Peer-reviewed scientific publications are considered

	Comment	Navy Response
	photographed giving birth to marine mammal and endangered species listed organisms at the Agat offshore mine detonation site. Additionally, the administrator of the Guam Coastal Management Program of the Bureau of Statistics and Plans has stated that particles may be consumed by organizations around detonation sites that have the potential to affect the food chain. I also strongly oppose the proposed bifurcation for the MITT. We have, and always will be, one Marianas. I am a mother, daughter, sister, friend to many who call Guam home. I am concerned about the health effects of military training on my growing family. I am concerned that the 12,580 detonations across our region will add further toxicity to our increasingly toxic 210 square mile island. Military activities including missiles, torpedoes, radar, sonar systems, mine and strike warfare, anti-submarine warfare, as well as air water and surface warfare will adversely impact our cultural heritage, historic sites, native plants and animals, marine life, fishing, travel by boat, tourism, and public health and safety. Our home, our history is not your training ground. It is not your target practice.	to be the most reliable and accurate sources of data and information and were used throughout this Supplemental EIS/OEIS to support the analysis and conclusions. Well-respected and historically vetted government reports (e.g., marine mammals stock assessment reports) were also used to support the analysis. Any newly published data and information relevant to the analysis of potential impacts on marine mammals that has become available since the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS was incorporated into this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Recently published information by NMFS indicates that the Mariana Islands may be a calving area for humpback whales. In consideration of this, the Navy has developed in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS a geographic mitigation area at Marpi Reef off Saipan (see Appendix I, Geographic Mitigation Assessment). Two photographs that are Associated Press File photos depict this calf; mention of those photos has been added to this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. To reiterate, a single known occurrence of a newborn calf approximately 19 years ago does not indicate the area to be an established and routinely used sperm whale calving and nursery habitat. While it is possible that several species of marine mammals could occur at the Agat Bay Mine Neutralization Site, the Navy's procedural mitigation measures involving observing for marine mammals and sea turtles prior to conducting activities using explosives at the site reduces the likelihood of potential impacts on marine species. Please refer to Chapter 5 (Mitigation) for additional information on the Navy's procedural mitigation measures. As discussed in Sections 3.8 (Marine Invertebrates) and 3.9 (Fishes) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, recent surveys conducted by the Navy (Smith and Marx, 2016) at FDM found that coral fauna are healthy and robust, and the nearshore physical environment and basic habitat types at FDM would remain unchanged. These conclusions are based on (1) a limited amount of physical damage, (2) very low levels of partial mortality and disease (less than one percent of all species observed), (3) absence of excessive mucus production, (4) good coral recruitment, and (5) complete recovery by 2012 of the 2007 bleaching events. Smith and Marx (2016) also concluded that the health, abundance, and biomass of fishes, corals, and other marine resources at FDM are as good as, or better than, those in similar habitats elsewhere in the Mariana Archipelago. The Navy funded additional reef surveys in the nearshore areas of FDM in 2017. The

	Comment	Navy Response
		results were approved for public release in September 2018 and are available at https://apps.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/1069450.pdf. The 2017 survey found little evidence that training has affected coral reef communities at FDM. Only three relatively fresh ordnance items were observed, but no blast pits, craters, or significant areas of coral breakage were observed. The ordnance observed during the 2017 survey was almost exclusively old, encrusted in marine life, and had no discernable impact on surrounding communities. This Supplemental EIS/OEIS and the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS include discussions of the fate and transport of specific chemicals with specific references to chemical properties of munitions and munitions constituents. Although binding to sediments is one possible outcome (e.g., for PCBs), other chemical pollutants behave differently. For example, when metals are exposed to seawater, they begin to slowly corrode, a process that creates a layer of corroded material between the seawater and uncorroded metal. This layer of corrosion removes the metal from direct exposure to the corrosiveness of seawater, a process that further slows movement of the metals into the adjacent sediments and water column. This is particularly true of aluminum. Elevated levels of metals in sediments would be restricted to a small zone around the metal, and any release to the overlying water column would be diluted and influenced by mixing and diffusion. Although there are few specific studies on bioaccumulation in the CNMI, there are other studies cited concerning metals deposition in the marine environment in waters off of military training ranges. For example, the Navy's Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS includes discussions of multiple studies off of Vieques Island in Puerto Rico, Pamlico Sound in North Carolina, and a Canadian military site (Canadian Forces Maritime Experimental and Test Ranges near Nanoose Bay, British Columbia) for lead and lithium. This Supplemental EIS/OEIS also includes information that suggests that the majority of concerns regarding bioaccumulation are associated with urban coastal environments with specific point source and non-point source contributors of pollutants. The studies concerning military sites suggest that metals exposed to seawater are of less concern because of decreased bioavailability.

	Comment	Navy Response
Nia Serneo (NS)		
NS-01	This is unconscionable on an environmental and social perspective. This island and the surrounding waters are vital to our livelihood and is already being threatened by many other variables such as climate change. In fact, we are still recovering from the environmental and social impact of WW2. We do not need to cause more harm in the name of "national defense."	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.
Will Flores (WF)		
WF-01	I am a former serviceman in the U.S. Coast Guard and I am from Guam. I fully support the presence and integration of the U.S. Armed Forces on Guam but this I can't support. The U.S. has a duty to its citizens and itself to protect our resources-including those same resources that we have already deemed endangered or threatened. You can't harm animals or their habitat. It's illegal. I'm not an activist by a long shot but what this plan proposes is a wildly illegal plot to showcase force in this region. Please take into consideration a revision to the training locations and the effects that you will have on our marine life. Please consider the people you will be most affecting if this proposal is allowed to pass as it is.	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.
Julia Faye Munoz (JFM)		
JFM-01	The damage of 6 square miles of endangered coral reefs, plus additional 20 square miles of coral reef around FDM through the use of highly explosive bombs, poses an extreme environmental threat. In regards to acoustic stressors, as acknowledged in the MITT Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS Volume II, "little information is available on the potential	As discussed in Sections 3.8 (Marine Invertebrates) and 3.9 (Fishes) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, recent surveys conducted by the Navy (Smith and Marx, 2016) at FDM found that coral fauna are healthy and robust, and the nearshore physical environment and basic habitat types at FDM would remain unchanged. These conclusions are based on (1) a limited amount of physical damage, (2) very low levels of partial mortality and disease (less than one percent of all species

	Comment	Navy Response
	impacts on marine invertebrates from exposure to sonar and other sound-producing activities." To determine that the analysis presented in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS is "valid and applicable" based on two studies/literary reviews (Roberts et al. (2016) and Hawkins & Popper (2017)) is insufficient given the need to more holistically assess the impacts of acoustic stressors on marine invertebrates. Further analysis of environmental impact onto coral reefs as a result of the MITT is necessary, not just in regards to acoustic stressors but in all aspects of the MITT.	observed), (3) absence of excessive mucus production, (4) good coral recruitment, and (5) complete recovery by 2012 of the 2007 bleaching events. Smith and Marx (2016) also concluded that the health, abundance, and biomass of fishes, corals, and other marine resources at FDM are as good as, or better than, those in similar habitats elsewhere in the Mariana Archipelago. The Navy funded additional reef surveys in the nearshore areas of FDM in 2017. The results were approved for public release in September 2018 and are available at https://apps.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/1069450.pdf. The 2017 survey found little evidence that training has affected coral reef communities at FDM. Only three relatively fresh ordnance items were observed, but no blast pits, craters, or significant areas of coral breakage were observed. The ordnance observed during the 2017 survey was almost exclusively old, encrusted in marine life, and had no discernable impact on surrounding communities. This Supplemental EIS/OEIS fully complies with the NEPA. Using the best available science, the extensive studies and analysis conducted by the Navy exceeded the required hard look at impacts on environmental resources. Potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Navy uses the best available science to support the impact analysis and conclusions. As described in Section 3.8 (Marine Invertebrates), new studies on particle motion detection by Roberts et al. (2016) reinforces the finding that mechanical receptors on some invertebrates are found on various body parts. In addition, these structures are connected to the central nervous system and can detect some movements or vibrations that are transmitted through substrate (Edmonds et al., 2016). Even though some invertebrates may be able to sense or detect particle motion, they would not be impacted by acoustic sources used during training and testing activities, and a recent literature review on assessing impacts of underwater noise on marine fishes and invertebrates (Hawkins & Popper 2017) does not change this conclusion.

	Comment	Navy Response
Vera De Oro (VDO)		
VDO-01	It is a travesty to allow such destruction to the oceans and land in and around the Mariana Islands that this MITT is proposing. The military is fully aware of what this proposal will do to the environment yet will proceed without regard to the long-term effects. I am indigenous to the Marianas and love my island. Chamorus have survived here for millenia and this proposal is surely going to affect our environment. The scope of the size that will be affected is huge. Would states allow this much destruction to happen in their backyard? Stop the evil destructive war games that is designed not to protect us but to line the pockets of military industrial complex	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.
Heidi Cody (HC)		
HC-01	We need to speak for the younger generations that don't have a voice. It is our civic duty to ensure that future generations can have clean air, land and water. No military buildup and testing. Let's honor and preserve Guam and its surroundings.	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.
Monaeka Flores (MF)		
MF-01	Around the island, I am constantly reminded of the destruction from a legacy of war. From multiple sites of contamination, to areas of land that are still scarred from the violent American recapture of World War II, to areas taken away from families through eminent domain, and important	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities. Using the latest science and technology, the Navy completed extensive analyses and computer-based modeling to determine impacts and develop science-based protective measures to reduce or avoid potential impacts on marine life. Potential effects

	Comment	Navy Response
	sacred sites closed from public access - all I can see is war. From silent forests caused by the military spraying of chemicals or the import of invasive species, to silent forests because the birds and bats had to escape the loud sounds of military training and war jets flying overhead - all I hear is war. From contamination from jet fuel leaks in our soil, to the many lives lost because of diseases linked to the military contamination from Guam to the Marshall Islands - all around us is war. The U.S. military's appetite to increase their hold over areas of land and ocean continues to grow like an insatiable parasite. Almost every week, we learn of new contamination sites, pristine areas of land being destroyed, scared ancestral sites being desecrated, of dead whales and other sea life washing up on our shores, of damaged coral reef and limestone forest habitat - all at the hands of the military and in the name of national defense. What is clear to me, is that the U.S. military is not a good partner, not a good steward, and that the people of Guam do not have a fair say in what happens in our land and waters. This is NOT real security. What do they intend to defend if they destroy so much? Guam, the Mariana Islands, and the larger Micronesian region are especially vulnerable to impacts of climate change, which are further exacerbated and complicated by the destructive actions of the U.S. military. We have so much at stake and we have already lost so much. Now, the military wants to break down the activities to simplify things, when instead it is watering down the cumulative destruction of all of these connected actions. It is a manipulation of perception and legal parameters to justify this destruction.	from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Also, as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), the Navy implements, to the maximum extent practicable, procedural and geographic mitigation measures during its training and testing activities to reduce potential impacts on marine life. The Navy's analysis indicates that, with implementation of its protective mitigation measures, there would be no significant impacts on marine species. The Navy reviewed the best available scientific data and information on marine mammals available for inclusion in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS and incorporated relevant information into the marine mammals impact analysis in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Peer-reviewed scientific publications are considered to be the most reliable and accurate sources of data and information and were used throughout this Supplemental EIS/OEIS to support the analysis and conclusions. Well-respected and historically vetted government reports (e.g., marine mammals stock assessment reports) were also used to support the analysis. Any newly published data and information relevant to the analysis of potential impacts on marine mammals that has become available since the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS was incorporated into this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Recently published information by NMFS indicates that the Mariana Islands may be a calving area for humpback whales. In consideration of this, the Navy has developed in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS a geographic mitigation area at Marpi Reef off Saipan (see Section 5.4.2, Mitigation Areas for Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles, in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS). The proposed training and testing activities in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS are needed to achieve and maintain military readiness within the Study Area. This includes the use of underwater mine charges up to 20 lb. at the Agat underwater detonation site. Underwater detonation activities at Apra Harbor and Piti would remain a charge of 10 lb. The use of 20 lb. underwater mine charges was originally assessed in the 2015 Final MITT EIS/OEIS. This Supplemental EIS/OEIS furthers the Navy and other military services' execution of their roles and responsibilities under 10 U.S.C. section 8062.

	Comment	Navy Response
	I strongly oppose the continued destruction caused by the Navy's training and testing activities that include the use of active sonar and explosives in the Mariana Islands Training and Testing (MITT) study area and in the Mariana Islands Range Complex (MIRC). I oppose the continued taking of marine mammals, of rare and endangered species, and of coral reef as a result of military training and testing activities. The MITT draft SEIS does not include up to date research on the impacts of sonar, vessel interactions, and explosives detonation in the water on marine mammals. Activities are planned for a known whale birthing sites. Turtles have died from vessels in areas limited to military activities. Important local fishing areas have been closed to the public. I oppose the continued contamination of sea life from military materials left from these activities and damage to hard bottom substrate, which supports the health of corals and reefs. I oppose the destructive impacts on our cultural practices, our food resources, and our economic sovereignty. I oppose the increase in underwater mine charges. The Navy has not provided the rational for the increase, nor does it make its findings on impacts from activities, including surveys taken before and after exercises, available to the public. I oppose the continued destruction to our ancestral sites and cultural resources. The SEIS does not incorporate all the cultural resources that may be impacted. The U.S. military wants us to believe that they understand how "irreplaceable" the air, land and sea of the Marianas Islands are. They will use our own words to try to make us think this. They will say that some of them also call our islands, "home". They will say that they need the islands,	

	Comment	Navy Response
	because it gives the U.S. a global and strategic presence, but they will not say how the island, sea, and people are being used as collateral damage. The military will say that the islands have always provided a "safe training and testing environment for the U.S. military," and not say how it has never been a safe environment for the people of the Marianas. They will say they need realistic training, that it helps with humanitarian efforts and work to keep the "U.S., its territories and environment protected and safe". They will not say how they continue to colonize and harm the indigenous peoples of these islands. They will argue that they are a "cleaner Navy" when are constantly reminded otherwise. There is so much more contamination and destruction that is not made public. How does this make us safer? I oppose this continued injustice. I oppose the continued destruction and poisoning of our land, seas, water, and people. I oppose the continued occupation and destruction of the Marianas. I oppose the relocation of Marines from Okinawa to Guam. I oppose the continued occupation of sacred and stolen land. I oppose the continued desecration of our sacred sites.	
PJ San Nicolas (PJSN)		
PJSN-01	Our island has many natural resources that will be significantly affected in the short term and will eventually be destroyed in the long term. The native biological life cycles and ecosystems will be disturbed to a point that the community will be affected greatly as well. The most amazing part of all this is that the military knows this, but is unfazed and as eager as ever to have more control over our island. The language is plain and simple within this EIS, and it says	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.

	Comment	Navy Response
	that life will get harder, our cultural practices will be lost, animal and plant life will be negatively affected. Yet, there isn't any hesitation in your plans. Its beyond funny how the government criticizes citizens' and non citizens' behavior when this behavior is so extremely sketchy, yet unquestioned.	
Margaret Anderson (MA)		
MA-01	Though I deeply respect the military here on Guam, the taking of Ritidian land and "more" land and sea from the people of this island is reprehensible. You need a shooting range? Build one on the vast amount of land you already have. You need to test? Ban sonar and other water testing that harms sea animals. Get smarter. Figure out a better way. Protect the land and allow the Chamorro people to have the Ritidian land of their ancestors.	The shooting range is not part of the Proposed Action. The 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS analyzed land-based activities on Guam, Saipan, Tinian, and Rota; the MITT Supplemental EIS/OEIS did not reanalyze land-based activities because there are no changes proposed to those land-based activities.
Zoltan Grossman (ZG)		
ZG-01	Dear Project Manager, I am a Professor of Geography and Indigenous Studies at The Evergreen State College in Olympia, Washington, with my Ph.D. in Geography from the University of Wisconsin. I am commenting on the Mariana Islands Training and Testing Activities Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement, focusing on the topic of cultural resources. I have long been concerned about the effects of explosives and other forms of physical disturbance and strikes (as mentioned in Table 3.0-1) on cultural resources, including sacred sites that may be accessed by citizens exercising their religious freedoms. Many of the objections to naval bombing of Kaho'olawe in Hawai'i and Vieques in Puerto Rico, for	The MITT Supplemental EIS/OEIS pertains to activities that occur at sea and on FDM. The Navy is required to comply with both NEPA and the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), as well as a host of other environmental statutes that pertain to the Proposed Action. As described in Section 2.3.3 (Standard Operating Procedures) and Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy is committed to avoiding cultural resources and mitigating any potential negative impacts from it training and testing activities. NHPA applies to historic properties, a specific subset of cultural resources. Under the Act, the Navy must consider the undertaking's effects upon historic properties. However, Section 3.11.1.3 (Cultural/Traditional Practices and Beliefs) has been added to the MITT Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS as part of the study so as to analyze the Navy's potential impact on the broader category of cultural resources and traditional practices and beliefs. Consultations with CNMI Historic Preservation Officer (HPO), Guam HPO, and

	Comment	Navy Response
	example, stemmed from the explosives' physical and acoustic effects on cultural resources, not simply on environmental resources. The same is true in the Territory of Guam and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (CNMI). The Mariana Islands Training and Testing (MITT) would allow the Navy to execute 12,580 detonations (of various magnitudes) every year for five years. I attended several recent events in Seattle, Portland, and Olympia, hosted by my college and the Veterans for Peace organization, that focused on military testing and training in the Pacific. The more than 250 attendees viewed a video of a B-52 bombing No'os (Farallon de Medinilla) in the CNMI, with multiple M-117 bombs (Freeman 2014). When the bombs struck, there were audible gasps in the audience. It was not known what kind of sacred shrines or other Indigenous cultural resources might have either been directly struck by the bombs, or damaged through earthquakes or acoustic effects from the B-52 bombing strikes. I find the Draft Supplemental EIS/Overseas EIS wholly inadequate in addressing concerns about cultural resources of the CHamoru and other Indigenous peoples in Pacific territories. The word "cultural" only appears on 10 pages out the total 682 pages of the report. The report refers to mitigation actions that the military has taken to avoid damage to terrestrial and underwater cultural resources, without specifying in any detail what the mitigation actions have involved. Alternatives 1 and 2 propose that mitigation actions "previously implemented to avoid and protect submerged historic properties would continue to be implemented,"	interested stakeholders under Section 106 of the NHPA is ongoing and development of new Programmatic Agreements (PAs) to replace and update the now expired 2009 MIRC PA is also in progress. While the consultation focuses on historic properties, all input on cultural resources has been welcomed to help inform the Navy's analysis of cultural resources under NEPA. As Navy continues to actively consult and develop a new PA for the MITT undertaking, the Parties have executed interim PAs which incorporate all of the terms and mitigations of the 2009 MIRC PA. The interim PAs took effect after the expiration of the 2009 MIRC PA and serve to maintain the DoD's compliance with Section 106 of the NHPA for MITT activities. The interim PA with the CNMI HPO expires September 10, 2020, while the interim PA with Guam HPO expires June 30, 2020. The Navy has reviewed and incorporated the best available science on cultural resources, including underwater cultural heritage and maritime archeology, in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS.

	Comment	Navy Response
	without specifying the actions, or using any measurement to assess the success or failure of the previous mitigation actions. Simply ordering mitigation does not automatically result in protection of cultural sites, whether terrestrial or underwater. What kind of damage assessments have been carried out, and with what kind of consultation with CNMI or other regional officials, local cultural practitioners or holders of local place-based. cultural knowledge, or academic archeological experts? How exactly have cultural resources been protected "by reducing the potential for interaction with underwater detonation activities"? (2.3.35). Do the report's authors simply take the naval officials claims of mitigation on faith? Has the Naval Facilities Engineering Command engaged with the extensive literature on underwater cultural heritage (UCH) and maritime archeology? It could also engage with the maritime archeology literature about the effects of armed conflict on underwater cultural heritage, which has numerous overlaps with military testing and training issues. Michael de Ruy's 2014 study at Flinders University, "Under the Cruel Sea: Effects of Armed Conflict on Underwater Cultural Heritage" examined case studies from Iraq, Sri Lanka, and Korea, and concluded "underwater cultural heritage is at risk in armed conflict. The main hazards to UCH generated by armed conflict are identified as explosions, unexploded ordnance, marine pollution, military construction, mechanical stress, sunken craft and debris, looting and military use or occupation. When vulnerable UCH is exposed to any of these hazards, or the myriad secondary hazards they can cause, one or more of the intrinsic heritage values of the site may be	

	Comment	Navy Response
	changed, resulting in an adverse effect" (De Ruy 2014, 88). U.S. citizens are becoming more aware of the effects of military testing and training being done in our name in the Pacific, and in particular in territories such as the CNMI where the citizens do not have full democratic control over military operations. Deputy Defense Secretary Robert Ellsworth stated in 1976, before the Compact that led to the formation of the CNMI, "The ability to deny the Northern Marianas to the military of other nations, coupled with the right to operate and base U.S. forces in the area, is important to the maintenance of [a credible defense] posture[.]" (Horey 2011, 192). In times of "geopolitical tensions, the CNMI constitutes an important part of the informal U.S. empire in the Pacific" (Pöllath 2018, 240). It is a travesty that the people of the Territory of Guam and the CNMI do not have full self- determination over their ancestral lands and oceanic territory, and their decisions continue to be made in Washington, D.C. on their behalf, without adequate consultation with local citizens or their elected government officials. Although I live 5,458 miles from the repeatedly bombed island of No'os (Farallon de Medinilla), my voice as a U.S. citizen in this EIS process counts equally with, or even more than, a local CNMI citizen who fishes near the island, and had ancestors who lived and worshipped there. That is also a travesty, especially when the Navy's decisions affect an Indigenous culture that is wholly unique to the affected MITT area. The people who are most affected by the Navy's decisions	

	Comment	Navy Response
	should have a central seat at the table, and their voices should be elevated in any review process. The Bush administrations halted the bombing of Kaho'olawe and Vieques, and I hope CHamoru concerns about the bombing of No'os are also heard in Washington D.C, as they are being heard in Washington state. For these and other reasons, I would support the No Action Alternative, because it "would result in fewer stressors that potentially affect submerged cultural resources" (Table ES.6-1). Dr. Zoltán Grossman	
Cara (Flores) Mays (CM)		
CM-01	1. You don't use the most recent research for marine animals and marine life. This is unacceptable and is new information that is ignored and would change the analysis and conclusion. 2. Research is extremely limited. No efforts have been made to collect data from the local people who fish, surf, swim in these areas almost daily. This would be new information that would change the analysis and conclusions. 3. Your website says that public participation is an important part of this process and yet, this information is entirely inaccessible to the public. Even educated people can read this document and still have no idea what it says. And who has time to read such a lengthy document when they're trying to pay bills? The most difficult language is used and the summaries are not sufficient. True intentions and impact are hidden in verbiage which seems to be intentional and substantial studies that are more current or don't fit the DoD bias have been left out. This document prevents a true commenting process because it is only accessible to a very	This Supplemental EIS/OEIS fully complies with NEPA. Using the best available science, the extensive studies and analysis conducted by the Navy exceeded the required hard look at impacts on environmental resources. Potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Navy reviewed the best available scientific data and information on marine mammals available for inclusion in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, and incorporated relevant information into the marine mammals impact analysis in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Peer-reviewed scientific publications are considered to be the most reliable and accurate sources of data and information and were used throughout this Supplemental EIS/OEIS to support the analysis and conclusions. The Navy is consulting with the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) under the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA) and Endangered Species Act (ESA) for potential impacts of the Proposed Action on marine mammals. This Supplemental EIS/OEIS contains a detailed list in Appendix A of training and testing activities descriptions, which includes lists of what types of military expended materials are included in each activity. The health of coastal

	Comment	Navy Response
	small portion of the population. 4. Impact on mental health of people reading this document and submitting comments is not considered. 5. Impact on mental health of native Chamorus and locals who are impacted by this ongoing massive training is not considered and should be clarified. 6. The research that inspired this article should be considered: https://www.smithsonianmag.com/science/talking-to-whales-180968698/ 7. The document needs to clarify by list - what bullets/bombs/devices will be used; what impact each will have on the ocean water, species, ocean floor and eco-systems; what each is composed of; what residue, each will leave after testing/training is complete; what potential effect each of these have on marine life, eco system, people who will consume marine food sources and people. 8. This is dumb. I'm so tired of small island peoples and whole parts of the ocean being sacrificed so that the Department of Defense can cause more environmental destruction and excuse it by saying that they need to be ready for war. This is selfish and irresponsible and if you are deeply unhappy, it's because you should be ashamed to be a part of it.	communities, fisheries, and ecosystems is important to the Navy. Section 3.1 (Sediments and Water Quality) concludes that chemical, physical, and biological changes to sediment or water quality as a result of military expended munitions (as stated in the comment, bullets/bombs/devices) would be measurable but below applicable standards, regulations, and guidelines, and would be within the existing conditions or designated uses. The Navy will comply with all applicable laws and regulations. This Supplemental EIS/OEIS also includes information that suggests that the majority of concerns regarding bioaccumulation are associated with urban coastal environments with specific point source and non-point source contributors of pollutants. The studies concerning military sites suggest that metals exposed to seawater are of less concern because of decreased bioavailability. The Navy fully recognizes the importance of public participation in the development of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS and has exceeded requirements for providing public notification, project information, and the opportunity for the public to submit comments on the analysis. This Supplemental EIS/OEIS fully complies with NEPA, CEQ requirements, and Navy instructions for implementing NEPA. The Navy understands the complexity of the information presented within this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. This Supplemental EIS/OEIS contains a rigorous scientific analysis of the potential impacts of the Navy's proposal, and thoroughly explains the scientific methodology, analysis methods, and findings. The Navy attempts to explain challenging concepts, methods, and the results of the analysis as clearly as possible in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS and developed public informational materials for lay audiences. The Navy prepared project brochures, videos, a website, and posters, using layperson terms, to enhance public understanding of the information presented in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. A project fact sheet was also translated into Chamorro. The informational materials, including the translated fact sheet, were made available at all four public meetings and on the project website (http://mitt-eis.com/).

	Comment	Navy Response
		The Navy held four open house public meetings, one each on Tinian (March 14, 2019), Rota (March 15, 2019), Saipan (March 18, 2019), and Guam (March 19, 2019). The public meetings provided an opportunity for the public to ask questions of Navy team members about the analysis documented in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Navy encouraged the public to attend these meetings and broadly notified the public through the media, including newspaper advertisements and news releases, and direct mail, including letters, postcards, and emails. The Navy has received feedback from attendees that the open-house format is more conducive to promoting public understanding and constructive dialogue. Open house meetings allow a greater number of individuals to directly engage and interact with Navy team members and ask questions about this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, as well as provide comments on the document. Although the Navy took cultural and religious holidays into account when planning the dates and locations for public meetings, those considerations had to be balanced with the deadlines and schedules of the large number of federal and local agency stakeholders, as well as the overall schedule of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. To try to accommodate stakeholders and the public, the Navy provided 75 days to review and comment on the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, 30 days longer than the minimum required time for review. Section 2.3.1 (Changes to Proposed Activities) describes those activities that change in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As shown in Table 2.5-1 (Current and Proposed Training Activities), the only new training activity proposed in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS is Surface Ship Object Detection. As shown in Table 2.5-2 (Current and Proposed Testing Activities), proposed new testing activities include Radar and Other System Testing and Simulant Testing. These activities and associated systems have already been tested by the Navy in other locations, but not in the MITT Study Area. Therefore, they are new to the Study Area and have been analyzed for environmental impacts in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The training and testing activities proposed in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS are

	Comment	Navy Response
		part of the overall Navy program and are not unique to the Mariana Island Range Complex. Appendix A (Training and Testing Activities Descriptions) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS provides detailed data sheets describing each training and testing activity.
Sonya Ann Perez (SAP)		
SAP-01	I am commenting to plead with the DOD to haunt the expansion of their training area within the oceans surrounding our beautiful Mariana islands. I am a mother of an 11-month-old baby boy and I want him to grow up to experience the beaches and waters as I once had. If they continue with this "project", the dreams I once had for my son might not become a reality. This will hurt our oceans, our land, our people, and our culture. Our people deserve better. Our ocean deserves better. Our planet deserves better.	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities. The Navy is not proposing any geographic expansion of the training and testing area in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Proposed activities are similar to those conducted in the Study Area for decades.
Darryl Delgado (DD)		
DD-01	1) Section 1 Purpose and Need fails to identify existing ranges that may be used to perform additional "training" and "testing" and only calls out Mariana Islands to be used. There is no justification as to why existing training/testing areas cannot be used. 2) Section 3.11 - Cultural Resources: This section specifies that no live bombs will be used within 3 miles of the Mariana Islands, however, beyond the 3-mile radius from the islands, live bombs will be used and will affect all sea life. Data has shown that sea turtles, whales, etc. migrate throughout the archipelago and are highly likely to be within the testing zone during evolutions. Furthermore, there is no plan to remove live bombs that have not been detonated in the proposed training areas.	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities. Existing training areas are proposed to be used under this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. This Supplemental EIS/OEIS to the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS supports ongoing and future training and testing activities conducted at sea and on Farallon de Medinilla (FDM) within the Study Area beyond 2020. The activities analyzed are largely a continuation of the activities previously analyzed. This Supplemental EIS/OEIS: (1) includes the analysis of activities at sea and on FDM necessary to meet readiness requirements beyond 2020 and into the reasonably foreseeable future, (2) includes any changes to those activities previously analyzed, and (3) reflects the most up-to-date compilation of training and testing activities deemed necessary to accomplish military readiness requirements. The alternatives carried forward were developed to meet the Navy's purpose and need and to ensure fulfilment of obligation under Title 10 of the United States Code. See Section 2.4 (Action Alternatives Development) for more

	Comment	Navy Response
		detailed information on the development of alternatives and rationale on why alternative training and testing locations are not feasible. Location of live munitions use remains consistent with previous training and testing activities. Marine life and marine habitat are important to the Navy. Using the latest science and technology, the Navy completed extensive analyses and computer-based modeling to determine impacts and develop science-based protective measures to reduce or avoid potential impacts on marine resources. Potential effects from military training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Also, as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy implements mitigation measures to avoid and minimize the potential effects of the Proposed Action on marine resources. Please see Section 3.4 (Marine Mammals) for the analysis of impacts on marine mammals, and Section 3.5 (Sea Turtles) for the analysis of impacts on sea turtles. The Navy is consulting with the NMFS under MMPA and ESA to ensure that the Proposed Action will not put the population and the future of marine species within the Study Area in jeopardy.
Victoria Cepeda Diaz (VCD)		
VCD-01	As a daughter born and raised on this island, I object to the training and testing in our ocean. Our brothers and sisters have lost their homes in Banabas and the Marshallas. What more do we Islanders need to lose? The military bases on island already take up prime lands of our islands, so to do "research" and "testing" in our ocean is unnecessary. I refuse to have our marine life and marine environment to undergo whatever testings are being proposed. What will affect military personnel and their families who are stationed here temporarily, will surely affect me and my son and the rest of our families here on island. Enough is enough. Our jungles and sacred medicinal plants	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.

	Comment	Navy Response
	have been destructed and destroyed, and all this taking and taking and injustice needs to stop. You saved my grandparents and great grandparents, thank you. You do not need to save me or those of us now who are fully aware and capable of what we as a people and inhabitants of this island need. We live here and our roots run deep, so that means no testing, training or research in our ocean(s). NA PARA. Respetu i tano yan i hanom tåsi of our peoples.	
Cristina Bejado LeBrun (CBL)		
CBL-01	I whole-heartedly disagree with this military training and testing on the island of Guam or in our waters. Guam is the island of the CHamoru people, not an American detonation zone or "tip of the spear." We are more than that. Our island has hopes and dreams that our children & future generations to come will be able to swim, fish, and hunt in our waters, just as our ancestors did, without the detriment that this training will cause. This particular training & testing will harm the ecological and environmental sustainability that our island and community has worked so hard to keep in tact for years. For example, traditional, recreational, & commercial fishing will be hindered by such detonations & training. Fishing and tourism is one of Guam's most common sources of economy, and destroying the habitats of marine life that we rely on isn't WRONG. There is NOTHING from this military plan that would benefit the island at all. Our island was never meant to host this many people, and quite frankly, the visitors are destroying a place where Pacific Islanders call HOME. How would you feel if we decided to detonate your home and turned a blind eye to all of the negative, LIFE-THREATENING impacts that it had on your lifestyle and your family's future? Please, we beg of you, take this training somewhere else. It is not allowed nor welcomed on Guam.	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities. The Proposed Action will not restrict traditional, recreational, or commercial fishing. The Navy issues Notices to Mariners (NOTMARs) to advise fishers when fishing areas are temporarily restricted. The Navy also implements procedural mitigation measures to avoid or reduce impacts of the Proposed Action on marine and cultural resources.

	Comment	Navy Response
Addy C (AC)		
AC-01	This is unacceptable. Does it not weigh on your conscience that marine life and the livelihood of an entire population of humans will be destroyed at your hands? We do not need this type of harmful wreckage for the sake of testing. Please reconsider your actions.	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.
Shane Quintanilla (SQ)		
SQ-01	It's ridiculous to say "Please DO NOT move forward with bomb detonations and sonar use in our fragile waters. Please honor what we consider sacred and honor our cultural beliefs." It is ridiculous to say that because as human beings, YOU SHOULD KNOW that it is WRONG. Complete disregard for beliefs and cultural insensitivity almost always breeds "terrorism." DO NOT turn the indigenous people of Guam into terrorists. Just respect our deep desire to preserve what little we have, protect our fragile ecosystem and honor our beliefs as we honor the US Governments societal etiquette.	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.
Veronica Mendez-Arriola (VMA)		
VMA-01	You are destroying g food and the tourism I industry. Not to mention the human consequence of killing people by poisoning them. U live here and my children live here and you are destroying our home.	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.
Monica Flis (MoF)		
MoF-01	Please protect our natural environment and resources in the Marianas.	Marine life and habitat are important to the Navy. The Navy trains worldwide, not just in the MITT Study Area. Using the latest science and technology, the Navy completed extensive analyses and computer-based modeling to determine

	Comment	Navy Response
	From what I understand, the MITT will the largest DOD training area in the world. Training would include underwater bombers detonations and sonar training. The MITT allows 81,962 takings of 26 different marine mammal species (including whales and dolphins) per year for 5 years due to detonations, sonar, or other training and testing activity. The MITT also allows damage or kill of over 6 square miles of endangered coral reefs plus additional 20 square miles of coral reef around FDM through the use of highly explosive bombs. I find this all unacceptable. I am deeply worried about the consequences such actions will have on the resources our ocean and land provide us in the Mariåna Islands. These actions will have a devastating impact for the future of our islands and people.	impacts and develop science-based protective measures to reduce or avoid potential impacts on marine life. The Navy's acoustic effects model predicts that the vast majority of marine mammals' exposure to acoustic stressors (sonar and explosives) would cause temporary changes in behavior. The Navy avoids areas where coral reefs are present to the greatest extent practicable. Long-term surveys of nearshore waters and habitat surrounding FDM have shown very little disturbance from Navy activities. These surveys also indicate that the health, abundance, and biomass of fishes, corals, and other marine resources in those habitats are as good as, or better than, those in similar habitats elsewhere in the Mariana Archipelago (see Smith and Marx, 2016). Potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Also, as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), the Navy implements, to the maximum extent practicable, procedural and geographic mitigation measures during its training and testing activities to reduce potential impacts on marine life. The Navy's analysis indicates that, with implementation of its protective mitigation measures, there would be no significant impacts on marine species.
Brian Lee Flores (BLF)		
BLF-01	I am native to these lands. I am a veteran. Of all the land owned by the USA, you opt and plan to devastate our nature lands, and the place I call home. You have massive plains and deserts, space multiple times the mass of the Marianas to use, yet you choose to make ours your playground of war simulation. You as a country have taken enough from natives from the eastern shore, over the west coast, and onto the Pacific islands. It's disgusting the true history of America. This is how you reward your citizens who have very little, and have a deep sense of patriotism. I deeply oppose this, and I dare say, it will change my mind on how I view this country.	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.

	Comment	Navy Response
	You do too much wrong to everything you touch.	
Chae Phillips (CP)		
CP-01	Do not bring the firing range here to Guam. Guam has so much history in our lands & waters. For the sake of the future of Guam and the Mariana islands and the natural habitat for many species, we do not want a fire range on our island, our home.	The firing range is not part of the Proposed Action.
Lenae Nofziger (LN)		
LN-01	I do not support the expansion of the Department of Defense training area. This expansion will have negative impacts on both animals and humans. The MITT allows 81,962 takings of 26 different marine mammal species (including whales and dolphins) per year for 5 years due to detonation, sonar, and other training and testing activity within the MITT. That represents an unacceptable threat to marine mammals. Further, disrupting this ecosystem affects the humans who rely on it.	The Navy is not proposing any geographic expansion of the training and testing area in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Proposed activities are similar to those conducted in the Study Area for decades. Marine life and habitat are also important to the Navy. The Navy trains worldwide, not just in the MITT Study Area. Using the latest science and technology, the Navy completed extensive analyses and computer-based modeling to determine impacts and develop science-based protective measures to reduce or avoid potential impacts on marine life. The Navy's acoustic effects model predicts that the vast majority of marine mammals' exposure to acoustic stressors (sonar and explosives) would cause temporary changes in behavior. The Navy avoids areas where coral reefs are present to the greatest extent practicable. Long-term surveys of nearshore waters and habitat surrounding FDM have shown very little disturbance from Navy activities. These surveys also indicate that the health, abundance, and biomass of fishes, corals, and other marine resources in those habitats are as good as, or better than, those in similar habitats elsewhere in the Mariana Archipelago (see Smith and Marx, 2016). Potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Also, as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), the Navy implements, to the maximum extent practicable, procedural and geographic mitigation measures during its training and testing activities to reduce potential impacts on marine life. The Navy's analysis indicates that, with implementation of its protective mitigation measures, there would be no significant impacts on

	Comment	Navy Response
		marine species.
Christian Life Center (CLC) Steven McManus		
CLC-01	I have served as the pastor of our church for more than 25 years as well as the founder and president of Southern Christian Academy since 1994. I am also the founder of Career TEch High Academy Charter School which seeks to begin in the fall of 2019. As an educator and community leader for the island of Guam, I am deeply opposed to the creation and expansion of the MITT program for the following reasons: I. Irreversible damage to limited natural resources and endangered species. This has already been litigated when the US Navy was found to violate environmental law: The U.S. District Court, District of Hawai'i, found that the U.S. Navy and the National Marine Fisheries Service violated the law when they failed to meet multiple requirements of the Marine Mammal Protection Act, the Endangered Species Act, and the National Environmental Policy Act when authorizing the Navy's plan. Smarting from their recent legal loss in Hawaii, is the US DoD trying to transgress US law again in a less known area with less opposition? Is the DoD prepared to waste their time and money litigating against the rule of law?	The Navy is not proposing any geographic expansion of the training and testing area in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Proposed activities are similar to those conducted in the Study Area for decades. The 2015 Hawaii-Southern California Training and Testing EIS/OEIS-related settlement agreement has no bearing on the MITT Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Navy has been conducting training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and this supplement to the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS supports the continuation of that training and testing. The activities analyzed in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS are largely a continuation of the ongoing training and testing activities that were analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, 2010 MIRC EIS/OEIS, 1999 Military Training in the Marianas Final EIS, and other environmental compliance documents. Proposed training and testing activities are needed to achieve and maintain military readiness within the Study Area. This Supplemental EIS/OEIS furthers the Navy's and other military services' execution of their roles and responsibilities under 10 U.S.C. section 8062. All potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), the Navy implements procedural and geographic mitigation measures during its training and testing activities to avoid or reduce potential impacts on marine life. This science-based analysis indicates, with implementation of the Navy's protective mitigation measures, there is not a significant impact on marine species. The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.

	Comment	Navy Response
	II. Counterproductive to Sustainability Sound bi-partisan science has already proven that the destruction of our natural resources for the betterment of humanity (advancement of national defense) is just plain non-sense. See the following: In 1946, Navy Commodore Ben Wyatt met with the 167 people living on Bikini Atoll. Wyatt asked the Marshallese to relocate, and for use of their atoll "for the good of mankind." He explained that they were a chosen people and that perfecting atomic weapons could prevent future wars. The residents were promised they could return one day, but realistically they had no choice in this matter. Immediately following this speech, the U.S military began preparations to relocate the residents to Rongerik Atoll, an uninhabited island with limited resources 125 miles away. Residents of Bikini Atoll resettled in 1969, but then evacuated in 1978, after radiation levels were determined to be excessive. I thought we were done with such archaic and inhumane practices. Its 2019, not 1946! Surely, we can come up with less destructive practices to insure the survival of humanity.	
Marilyn Schofield (MS)		
MS-01	Further exploitation is an affront to the people of the Marianas. More whale & dolphin beachings, further destruction of already compromised coral reefs, loss of endangered species, more contamination, more poisoning of our natural resources. Killing our environment is akin to destroying our island homes, culture, traditions & literally sickening & killing our people. This is a form of cold-blooded	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.

	Comment	Navy Response
	genocide, disrespect for us as a people & utter disregard for the environment. Please reconsider your decision. Guam & the Marianas Islands Chain is more than a military experiment it is home to fellow human beings who deserve the same respect, safe haven, environmental preservation, dignity & freedoms as the rest of the United States. Sincerely, Marilyn Pangelinan Schofield	
Rebekah Garrison (RG)		
RG-01	Your presence in Guåhan is an extension of the US settler state. Your imagined community of island buffers, that encircle the continent, is not an expression of settler responsibility but a painful and constant reminder to the CHamoru, Kanaka Maoli, and Boricua communities of their statuses as US island colonies and colonized peoples. Instead of expanding US Empire's colonial cartographies and violent structures of destruction into these oceanic spaces, take time to critically self-reflect on what you really know about Indigenous histories and counter-narrative critique to your continual acts of arrogance through perpetuating manifest destiny and the white man's burden. What you're doing is painful to Indigenous communities. Shame on you and the delusional realm in which you impose power, privilege, and Eurocentric ways of understanding space, history, and the present onto our planet's and humanity's future. This is the second time that I send this message to you. The first time was in January 2019 when I submitted this exact comment for the Danger Zones and Restricted Areas: Pacific Ocean at Naval Base Guam Telecommunication Site, Finegayan Small Arms Range, on the Northwestern Coast of Guam. Curiously, you did not publish this comment and share with the	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities. The Navy is not proposing any geographic expansion of the training and testing area in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Proposed activities are similar to those conducted in the Study Area for decades.

	Comment	Navy Response
	CHamoru community. Why is that? Are you ashamed of what you're doing? I oppose the MITT now and always. White settlers invented the very laws still used to govern society—still used to erase Indigenous claims to land. As settlers/immigrants/arrivants, white or not, wealthy or poor, we all uphold settler structures of control that disempower Indigenous communities. We settlers must do better.	
George Delgado (GD)		
GD-01	This idea concerns the community due to such ignorance and lack of obligation to our planet. Everything you are doing as our government's military is evil and abusive to the masses and mother earth Gaia. Your time is over and change is coming.	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.
Gwen Kim (GK)		
GK-01	This is an egregious destruction of Moana Nui for military hegemony. People's of the Earth will stand against this ♡✊♡	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.
De-Anna Taijeron (DAT)		
DAT-01	I am deeply concerned about the consequences such actions will have on the significant resources our great ocean and land provide us in the Mariåna Islands. These actions have a devastating impact on indigenous culture and lifeways, increase our dependence on imported foods sources, and erode our resilience. Have respect for this land that you are visiting. You will be destroying it, and take time to consider how this will fully IMPACT the world in terms of global warming. How can you protect a country, when you're destroying the planet it is on?	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.

	Comment	Navy Response
Alexandra Quenga Kerr (AQK)		
AQK-01	I am a concerned citizen of Guam. I am cognizant of the various current and emerging geo-political threats to the US and US-occupied territories, but I have concerns over the DOD's perceived need to expand military training in the Marianas. I am concerned that this vast expansion of the MITT zone will come at the cost of the Mariana Islands' agency to conduct its own affairs and administer its own lands and resources. I am concerned that a possible separation of the Mariana island programmatic agreement into two separate programmatic agreement goes against that wishes of the people of the Mariana islands and acts to perpetuate a schism between the two governments and in the power of the Mariana people to act as advocates for their cultural and natural resources. Although geo-politically distinct because of differing colonizer histories, in recent years, sentiment for a 'One Marianas' has been expressed in the general public in both CNMI and Guam. Pre-historically and environmentally, the Mariana Archipelago are a seamless collective of islands. I oppose any moves to create separate programmatic agreements for the CNMI and Guam. There is concern that decisions made in the SEIS do not use or cite information on marine animal that is most recently available. Strandings, sightings, whale births do not seem to be accounted for. This is in reference to an April 15th joint informational briefing at the Guam Legislature with several participating Guam agencies. A biologist at the Department of Agriculture confirmed during this session that the Agat offshore mine detonation site is an area where sperm whales have recently been recorded giving birth. This was not	The Navy is required to complete independent statutory obligations under both NEPA and NHPA. Thus, the Navy has prepared the MITT Supplemental EIS/OEIS and is pursuing continued compliance with the NHPA using the Section 106 process. The Navy is not proposing any geographic expansion of the training and testing area in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Proposed activities are similar to those conducted in the Study Area for decades. The Navy reviewed the best available scientific data and information on marine mammals available for inclusion in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, and incorporated relevant information into the marine mammals impact analysis in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Peer-reviewed scientific publications are considered to be the most reliable and accurate sources of data and information and were used throughout this Supplemental EIS/OEIS to support the analysis and conclusions. Well-respected and historically vetted government reports (e.g., marine mammals stock assessment reports) were also used to support the analysis. Any newly published data and information relevant to the analysis of potential impacts on marine mammals that has become available since the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS was incorporated into this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Recently published information by NMFS indicates that the Mariana Islands may be a calving area for humpback whales. In consideration of this, the Navy has developed in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS a geographic mitigation area at Marpi Reef off Saipan (see Appendix I, Geographic Mitigation Assessment). Two photographs that are Associated Press File photos depict this sperm whale calf; mention of those photos has been added to this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. To reiterate, a single known occurrence of a newborn calf approximately 19 years ago does not indicate the area to be an established and routinely used sperm whale calving and nursery habitat. While it is possible that several species of marine mammals could occur at the Agat Bay Mine Neutralization Site, the Navy's procedural mitigation measures involving observing for marine mammals and sea turtles prior to conducting activities using explosives at the site reduces

	Comment	Navy Response
	mentioned in the SEIS. The annual take of marine animals, although anticipated by your estimates not to be reached, is quite high, 400,000 over a five-year period. This is in consideration of the fact that the Guam Coastal Zone Management has an acceptable take per year of 0. It is also my opinion that marine animal take in any given year for any activity should be 0 whether in surrounding waters or at sea. As research on whales increases, we are increasing our knowledge of cetaceans and their intelligence as complex social beings. How would anticipated takes affect the ability of pods to function as a whole? How might the proposed military exercise affect the ability of marine mammals to birth their offspring? I also object to the use of the word "take." It seems to be a choice of word that obscures the full impact of the harm that could potentially be done to marine mammals and fish. I urge you to call it "harassment, injury, or kill." I am concerned about sonar use, especially as it relates to whale strandings and potential permanent hearing loss for Kogia breviceps: "Sonar use during exercises involving the U.S. Navy has been identified as a contributing cause or factor in five specific mass stranding events: Greece in 1996; the Bahamas in March 2000; Madeira Island, Portugal in 2000; the Canary Islands in 2002, and Spain in 2006 (Cox et al., 2006; Fernandez, 2006; U.S. Department of the Navy, 2017c). These five mass strandings resulted in about 40 known cetacean deaths consisting mostly of beaked whales and with close linkages to mid-frequency active sonar activity. In these	the likelihood of potential impacts on marine species. Please refer to Chapter 5 (Mitigation) for additional information on the Navy's procedural mitigation measures. Please see the technical report cited in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS and this Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS titled *Marine Mammal Strandings Associated with U.S. Navy Sonar Activities* (available at www.mitt-eis.com), which summarizes (1) stranding events associated with U.S. Navy sonar activities and (2) strandings speculated but not linked to U.S. Navy sonar activities. This report also discusses other natural and anthropogenic factors that have been shown to contribute to strandings. Over the last 50 years, increased awareness and reporting has led to more information about species affected and raised concerns about anthropogenic sources of stranding. While there have been limited numbers of marine mammal mortalities potentially associated with U.S. Navy activities, as noted by the commenter, the root causes are not clear in most cases. NMFS, as the regulator, maintains the authoritative National Stranding Database. The Center for Naval Analysis (CNA) also recently conducted a statistical study of correlation of beaked whale strandings around the Mariana Islands with the use of U.S. Navy sonar, finding that insufficient evidence of a correlation exists. The CNA study used the complete record of all U.S. Navy sonar use between 2007 and 2019, including major training events, joint exercises, and unit level training/testing. The analysis also included the complete beaked whale stranding record for the Mariana Islands through 2019. Following the methods in Simonis et al. (2020), the CNA analysis found insufficient evidence of a correlation between sonar use and beaked whale strandings when considering the complete sonar use record. The CNA finding is in contrast to the finding in Simonis et al. (2020), which depicted a significant correlation between beaked whale strandings and Navy sonar use. However, the Simonis et al. (2020) result relied on substantially incomplete or inaccurate assumptions about U.S. Navy sonar use around the Mariana Islands. CNA also conducted statistical analyses specific to each island where beaked whale strandings have been observed in the Mariana Islands, similarly finding insufficient evidence of a correlation to sonar

	Comment	Navy Response
	circumstances, exposure to non-impulsive acoustic energy was considered a possible indirect cause of death of the marine mammals (Cox et al., 2006)." (3.4-87 3.4 Marine Mammals (pdf p.319 vol1)) Strandings are a public safety bio-hazard, requiring time and resources from the local government to oversee clean up and ensure no harm to humans. How might the military determine if a potential future stranding on Mariana Island shores is not caused by military activities, and if it is, how would the military help to mitigate the cost of strandings on the local government? I am concerned that the potential negative impacts to Kogia brevicieps whales are not addressed in the sonar use mitigation section: "The analysis in Section 3.4.2.1.2 (Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers) of this SEIS/OEIS indicates that pygmy and dwarf sperm whales (Kogia whales) are the only deep-diving marine mammal species that could potentially experience PTS impacts from active sonar in the Study Area. The 30-minute wait period for vessel deployed sources will cover the average dive times of marine mammal species that could experience PTS from sonar in the mitigation zone, except for Kogia whales." (pdf p.288 vol2). What is the potential mitigation for the possible harm done to Kogia breviceps?	use. Additional information on the findings of the CNA analysis are presented in Section 3.4.2.1.1.6 (Stranding) in Chapter 3.4 (Marine Mammals). The NMFS Pacific Islands Regional Office and Science Center coordinates responses to marine mammal strandings through the National Marine Mammal Health and Stranding Response Program. The Navy does not anticipate that any marine mammal strandings would result from Navy activities in the Study Area. Since the inception of current monitoring protocols over a decade ago, no marine mammals have been reported distressed or injured in association with Navy training and testing activities. The Navy will continue to coordinate with NMFS to better understand potential impacts on marine mammals, both through adaptive management and notification and reporting under the Letter of Authorization under the MMPA. As described in Section 5.1.2.2.1 (Marine Species Research and Monitoring Programs), for this Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy agreed to several additional research and monitoring initiatives designed to help advance the understanding of beaked whales and strandings in the MITT Study Area. The Navy will co-fund the Pacific Marine Assessment Program for Protected Species (PACMAPPS) Mariana Islands survey in spring-summer 2021 and future studies starting in 2022 to help document beaked whale occurrence, abundance, and distribution in the Mariana Islands. The Navy will also fund additional stranding response and necropsy analyses for the Pacific Islands region, and research on a framework to improve statistical stranding analysis. Collaboratively with NMFS, the Navy will fund and organize an expert panel to provide recommendations on scientific data gaps and uncertainties for further protective measure consideration to minimize potential impacts of Navy training and testing activities on beaked whales in the Mariana Islands. Behavioral responses by marine mammals are predicted by the Navy's acoustic effects model. Research cited in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS and in the MITT 2015 Final EIS/OEIS indicates that behavioral responses by marine mammals exposed to underwater sound vary from no response to an immediate change in behavior (e.g., change in swimming direction). Behavioral changes are temporary and not necessarily repeated and animals frequently return to and continue

	Comment	Navy Response
		their prior behavior after the initial interruption. Information on strandings associated with Navy training and testing activities is provided in the 2017 technical report, *Marine Mammal Strandings Associated with United States Navy Sonar Activities*. In addition, Section 3.4.2.1.1.6 (Stranding) has been expanded to include additional information about strandings of beaked whales in the Mariana Islands and the Navy's support of efforts to better understand the causes of marine mammal strandings. The Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from active sonar on marine mammals. The Navy's mitigation zones extend beyond the average range to PTS for all marine mammal species, including Kogia. Therefore, the Navy anticipates that mitigation will help avoid or reduce the potential for PTS from active sonar for Kogia.
Janice Toves (JT)		
JT-01	When will you realize the importance of our waters and land and any damage to it directly correlates to our lives and our children. When you hurt our waters, you hurt the food that we rely on to feed our families. If you want to test things, go to your own backyard, in your own community and we'll see how that goes. Life may mean little to you people more than money and power but with no people, food, environment YOU WILL HAVE NOTHING TO HAVE POWER OVER. DO YOU NOT SEE THE DAMAGE THAT YOU DO AND THE POWER THAT YOU OVER OUR LIVES?! WHEN OUR FUTURE IS RIDDLED WITH DISEASE AND DEATH AND OUR CHILDREN UNABLE TO SURVIVE OR THRIVE IT WILL BE TOO LATE. ARE YOU NOT SOME OF THE SMARTEST PEOPLE IN THE ENTIRE WORLD? WHEN WILL YOU REALIZE THAT WE CANNOT FLUSH THE OCEAN AND REVERSE ANY DAMAGE YOU CAUSE. I RESPECT THE GOVERNMENT SYSTEM, I AM APART OF IT, I AM A	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.

	Comment	Navy Response
	PRODUCT OF IT. PLEASE FIND ALTERNATE MEANS TO GET YOUR CONTROL. WE ARE NOT JUST PROPERTY!	
Allan Santos (AS)		
ASA-01	I Urge your officials NOT to Destroy Guam, and the Marianas Islands already limited natural resources the US military has already seized and destroyed so much Native property and territory resulting in loss of native Flora and Fauna and habitat... We must protect these islands for the future generations to enjoy. I urge you to STOP the buildup NOW! Enough is enough!	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.
Jourdene Rosella Aguon (JRA)		
JRA-01	Expanding the military presence or intrusion on these lands will not improve your war efforts, only science and technology will do that, in terms of your weaponry. The massive amount of money spent on this endeavor is an assertion of dominance, not a tactical move to improve safety or lethality: more money can be funneled into the likes of Microsoft, Cisco, Boeing, or even other bio or chemical companies that produce better weapons, vehicles, toxins and viruses. Win your wars smarter, with better weapons, better tech, and better equipped soldiers-- don't need any more land from an already exploited island. Yankee, stay at home.	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities. The Navy is not proposing any geographic expansion of the training and testing area in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Proposed activities are similar to those conducted in the Study Area for decades.
Chelsea Uhl (CU)		
CU-01	I don't believe the military should be taking MORE land and ocean and training/destroying it. Enough of the world has be unnecessarily taken and being destroyed. Micronesian people	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.

	Comment	Navy Response
	are being poisoned and shafted out of their culture and property. No more bombing and trainings	The Navy is not proposing any geographic expansion of the training and testing area in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Proposed activities are similar to those conducted in the Study Area for decades.
Eliseo Silverio III (ES)		
ES-01	I am a resident of Guam and have heard of DOD's plan to expand the training range. I do not agree as it does not conserve and protect the regions rich natural resources and ecosystems. Destroying coral reef systems through training and detonating bombs will have great impacts on the regions livelihood, the marine animals and our oceans.	The Navy is not proposing any geographic expansion of the training and testing area in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Proposed activities are similar to those conducted in the Study Area for decades. Marine life and marine habitat are important to the Navy. Using the latest science and technology, the Navy completed extensive analyses and computer-based modeling to determine impacts and develop science-based protective measures to reduce or avoid potential impacts on marine life. Potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Also, as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), the Navy implements, to the maximum extent practicable, procedural and geographic mitigation measures during its training and testing activities to reduce potential impacts on marine life. The Navy's analysis indicates that, with implementation of its protective mitigation measures, there would be no significant impacts on marine species.
Jessie Davis (JD)		
JD-01	I am against the MITT plan to bomb the west Pacific for "training." Why would you endanger humans and animals, many of which are already endangered, with your "Training"? What a senseless waste of life and money!	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.
Kimberly Diego (KD)		
KD-01	Why does a professional and large US organization even need to be told of the effects and consequences of these actions?	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.

	Comment	Navy Response
	Guam is not just a military base but home to thousands of people who care and love the island we live in. Thousands of our grandchildren who won't be able to experience the paradise we live in now because of what? We love and have pride in the US military and what they have done for us in the past. It would be a shame to have to say that they are not only our saviors but our cause of destruction. yours truly, GUAM LOVER	
Lani Perez (LP)		
LP-01	I am opposed to this project!!!!!!!	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.
Kalani Perez (KP)		
KP-01	I am opposed to this project!!!	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.
Uriah Aguon		
UA-01	This shouldn't even be an issue! Why would they need to militarize more? How many bases or depots, or whatever do they already have? If you need to build more, build it on your own soil. If you continue to defrqde the land, then you'll begin to degrade the people and eventually their culture. If you don't care abput that, then care about preserving the land so that there's still something natural for people to stand on and live off of twenty years from now. Show some consideration; show some respect!	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.

	Comment	Navy Response
Geraldine Pablo (GP)		
GP-01	These planned military training in the ocean will have an affect on animal, coral and sea plants. This will negatively impact the delicate balance of the environment that will ripple and affect further out than the training area. I do not want the ocean around the Mariana Islands to become an underwater desert....no life. This will in turn affect our land. Have not learned from the past?	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.
Jesse Chargualaf (JC)		
JC-01	I don't want my homeland to host the MITT. The UN charter says that the territorial administrator should not harm the territory's natural resources. The MITT will harm our sea life and our lives as well. The military thinks we will be content with how they run things and how they run many aspects of our lives, but we are not content, we will fight.	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.
Nicole Sablan (NS)		
NS-01	I am against the Mariana Islands Training and Testing Supplemental EIS/OEIS project!!!	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.
Simone Bollinger		
SB-01	Please slow down with your use of the Marianas as a training ground for weapons. Many of us don't condone it and our marine life is unique and worth preserving. Please listen.	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.
Natasha Cruz (NC)		
NC-01	I do not support this project. This will have damaging effects to the ocean, coral reefs, & land of the Mariana's Islands. The lasting effects on the islands in the Marianas and will severely affect our natural resources.	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.
James Slao (JS)		

	Comment	Navy Response
JS-01	Every empire has failed by over extending themselves, trying to conquer more than they can handle and taking a shit where they eat/sleep. The military is nothing more than a bunch of corporations with corporate greed and disconnect from the lands they grab and destroy. You are not welcome to test nothing, you have contaminated all over the islands already and now back to shit on it yet again. Testing from alaska through to california and the whole eastcoast isnt a good idea why? Just because the military is able to buy off corrupt leaders of the island and bury evidence while using your own analysis to give us fake data showing rigged test result. Just because you were successful at breaking up 3,000+ years written history/friendship between japan and guahan. Just because you give us ''aid'' with money you take from us in the 1st place. Just because you are killing our roots. Just because you have been successful so far, does not mean you are not going to fall. You are not welcome to destroy our islands. Dont think we dont know about all the chemical weapons you been testing on all our sister islands either, justice is not the word since justice can be bought, the word is karma. Now feel free to go home and never look back.	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.

	Comment	Navy Response
Elilai Rengiil (ER)		
ER-01	I am incredibly concerned that the marine species and our coral reefs will not survive the Navy's underwater detonations. As ocean acidification increases we should be doing all we can to protect our reefs from further damage. The reef is a source of livelihood for people dependent on their natural resources to survive and so by continuing with this project you are endangering lives.	This Supplemental EIS/OEIS fully complies with NEPA. Using the best available science, the extensive studies and analysis conducted by the Navy exceeded the required hard look at impacts on environmental resources. Potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Also, as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), the Navy implements, to the maximum extent practicable, procedural and geographic mitigation measures during its training and testing activities to reduce potential impacts on marine life. The Navy's analysis indicates that, with implementation of its protective mitigation measures, there would be no significant impacts on marine species.
Christopher Guerrero (CG)		
CG-01	Of grave concern is the omittance of the most latest, pertinent scientific data concerning all marine mammal species thus far observed or noted to be within the proposed areas. This lack of the most recent scientific data highlights faulty data collection practices and unacceptable shortcomings within the MITT EIS, considering the magnitude and scope of such intense Military related proposed activities. Certain species of whales, such as Sperm Whales, have been observed and documented by the local scientific community as giving birth within the proposed areas of the MITT. This data has been omitted or excluded from consideration and has not been included into the MITT EIS. Improper data collection, faulty analysis techniques, incomplete research data on specific species of whales to be impacted all lead to a faulty, inaccurate MITT EIS.	In this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy cites peer-reviewed scientific publications and government reports that document the latest research on marine mammals. The Navy has reviewed those publications and completed extensive analyses and computer-based modeling to determine impacts and develop science-based protective measures to reduce or avoid potential impacts on marine life. Potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Also, as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), the Navy implements, to the maximum extent practicable, procedural and geographic mitigation measures during its training and testing activities to reduce potential impacts on marine life. The Navy's analysis indicates that, with implementation of its protective mitigation measures, there would be no significant impacts on marine species. Two photographs that are Associated Press File photos depict this sperm whale calf; mention of those photos has been added to this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. To reiterate, a single known occurrence of a newborn calf approximately 19 years ago does not indicate the area to be an established and routinely used sperm whale calving and nursery habitat. While it is possible that several species of marine mammals could occur at the Agat Bay Mine Neutralization Site, the

	Comment	Navy Response
		Navy's procedural mitigation measures involving observing for marine mammals and sea turtles prior to conducting activities using explosives at the site reduces the likelihood of potential impacts on marine species. Please refer to Chapter 5 (Mitigation) for additional information on the Navy's procedural mitigation measures.
Sienna Kaske (SK)		
SK-01	I do not agree with this at all and you will harm the environment and the people.	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities. This Supplemental EIS/OEIS fully complies with NEPA. Using the best available science, the extensive studies and analysis conducted by the Navy exceeded the required hard look at impacts on environmental resources. Potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS.
Jaya Black-Lazo (JBL)		
JBL-01	I don't agree with this! I oppose this! I don't think this is a good idea!	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.
Aiko Yamashiro (AY)		
AY-01	I would like more clarification on section 3.11 "Cultural Resources." In the Public Scoping Comments, it is noted that the Navy should conduct a cultural survey of FDM. The response of the EIS is that a survey done in 1996 reported no archaeological sites. However, in an earlier part of section 3.11, re: Saipan, the same conclusion was drawn (no archaeological sites) but then it is stated that a 2011 survey revealed new information. 1996 sounds like a long time ago to base a claim that there are no submerged cultural resources in FDM, especially considering advances in archaeology as well as in Indigenous research methodologies since 1996. I would ask the Navy to do due diligence of resurveying FDM, in order to support the claim that there are	The Navy is required to comply with both NEPA and Section 106 of the NHPA. To meet the requirements under Section 106, consultations with CNMI HPO, Guam HPO, and interested stakeholders have been ongoing since January 2019. One of the objectives of the consultation is to replace the now expired 2009 MIRC PA. The consultation revealed that there is much interest in a survey of FDM. This request is being considered. Additionally, appropriate mitigations will be developed through the consultation process. NHPA applies to historic properties, a specific subset of cultural resources. Under the Act, the Navy must consider the undertaking's effects upon historic properties. However, Section 3.11.1.3 (Cultural/Traditional Practices and Beliefs) has been added to the MITT Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS as part of the study so as to analyze the Navy's potential

	Comment	Navy Response
	no noteworthy cultural sites in the area. I would also suggest the Navy consult with cultural experts, and research stories and song, to consider the significance of the area not just as a static bounded place, but as a place historically and culturally connected to other parts of the ocean and islands (i.e., that may be mentioned in stories and songs about other places). I would also like to see this section of the report recognize broader cultural significance of not just sites, but animals, plants, etc., and track impact to these elements as well. I would like to see this level of rigorous and respectful research in this EIS before decisions can be made. We are responsible to both our ancestors and our children to care for our culture so this is a big responsibility. Thank you for allowing this voice to be heard.	impact on the broader category of cultural resources and traditional practices and beliefs.
Caitlin Feitz (CF)		
CF-01	I am a mother of 3 and married to a navy active duty member. I am very concerned with how our world is changing and especially concerned for my children. I do not want the earth to be destroyed anymore! These underwater tests should not be done. All the animals that are hurt with sonar testing alone should be a deterrent for you all. Also, the deterioration from the blasts to the ocean can't be good for the environment. I understand your wanting to make bigger badder weapons but come on. Let's think about the planet we live on! Please and thank you 🙏 I know I'm just a civilian and this is probably a pointless comment but I would appreciate a little more thought on what everyone else that live on this planet or at least on the islands about how they feel about these "tests".	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.
Serena Ngaio (SN)		
SN-01	There is no need to continue harming the environment in Guahan through military training and testing. There has been substantial land theft and incredible damage wrought on the	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.

	Comment	Navy Response
	lands, species, and marine life unique to Guahan already as a result of U.S. military greed and it is unnecessary to continue encroaching on what little is left to the Indigenous peoples of that place. Leave this place alone.	
Joanna Vretos (JV)		
JV-01	Please do not expand the U.S. Navy's military training and testing on Guam and surrounding areas. The resources the land and water provide to human, animal and other life are immeasurable and so important. Protect the air, land and water for future generations by stopping efforts to expand military training. That said about the important environmental implications, Americans do not want our world destroyed for expanded "protection" - because it will lead to more wars: for natural resources.	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities. The Navy is not proposing any geographic expansion of the training and testing area in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Proposed activities are similar to those conducted in the Study Area for decades.
Shelly Johnston (SJ)		
SJ-01	As a former resident of the Marianas/current resident of a coastal area where whales play an important role in tourism and the ecosystem at large, I'm writing regarding concerns about impacts of the proposed increase in training and testing in this draft SEIS. Due to the sheer volume of this document and the focus of this proposal on obtaining Marine Mammal Protection Act and Endangered Species Act permits for "taking" listed species, this comment primarily focuses on marine animals; however, many of these concerns also relate to habitat, biodiversity, the economy, and preservation of the culture and tradition of the people of the Marianas as a whole. Although the slight extension of the comment period was helpful and much appreciated, this draft report is simply too extensive for the average community member to review and comment on the range of technical information and	As noted in Section 3.0.1.1 (Navy Compiled and Generated Data), the Navy invests extensively in basic and applied research. In fact, the U.S. Navy is one of the largest funding sources of marine mammal research in the world, which has greatly enhanced the scientific community's understanding of marine species. The Navy's support and conduct of cutting-edge marine mammal research includes marine mammal detection, including the development and testing of new autonomous hardware platforms and signal processing algorithms for detection, classification, and localization of marine mammals; improvements in density information and development of abundance models of marine mammals; and advancements in the understanding and characterization of the behavioral, physiological (hearing and stress response), and potentially population-level consequences of sound exposure on marine life. Information on current monitoring projects, technical reports, conference presentations and data are available on the Navy's Marine Species Monitoring Program website at

	Comment	Navy Response
	conclusions regarding impacts and appropriate mitigation activities within the report in the time provided. As both the Navy and other scientific studies agree, although marine mammals rely on sound for all the fundamental biological and ecological aspects of their lives including navigation, prey location and capture, predator avoidance, and communication (including during migration and reproduction), the "causal mechanism for mortality of individuals from naval sonar remains unknown, as does the extent of its impact" (see S.J. Dolman et al./Marine Pollution Bulletin 58 (2009) 465–477). Given uncertainties regarding impacts, I believe additional monitoring should be conducted in the Marianas to ensure current and proposed activities do not have significant impacts on marine animals, as well as the ecosystems and communities that rely on these species. In general, it would be helpful if the Navy provided summaries of technical documents that could be more accessible to lay-people, but based on the information presented, I wonder how the significance of impacts of effects of sonar use and in-water weapons including explosives and "new technology" can be credibly assessed, let alone minimized and mitigated given the lack of good data regarding impacts or well developed data regarding the range and distribution of marine mammals and sea turtles in the Marianas? The Navy itself acknowledges critical data gaps in the supplemental information included in the draft SEIS/OEIS. For example, the report, Criteria and Thresholds for U.S. Navy Acoustic and Explosive Effects Analysis (Phase III) (June 2017)	https://www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/. Technical reports are also provided on the website at https://mitt-eis.com/. Based on the analysis presented in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS and use of best available data, additional monitoring or tagging is not required in order for the Navy to comply with NEPA. However, it is important to note that, within the Study Area, the Navy has sponsored several monitoring projects to better understand marine mammal and sea turtle distribution and habitat use, and to assess the presence of corals and ESA-listed species at FDM. Additional information is available on the U.S. Navy Marine Species Monitoring Program website (https://www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/). The Navy will also continue to support marine mammal surveys in waters surrounding Guam and the CNMI to better quantify the abundance and distribution of marine mammals and to increase scientific understanding of marine mammal behavior in the Study Area. Future monitoring efforts would be coordinated with NMFS. In the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy took a hard look at the potential impacts of the Proposed Action on marine mammals and sea turtles using the best available science. The Navy's quantitative analysis process for analyzing impacts from active sonar and explosives has been reviewed by external scientists and approved by NMFS. The Navy also worked collaboratively with NMFS to develop mitigation measures using input from military operators, the best available science, predicted activity impact footprints, and marine species monitoring and density data. The Navy has implemented and will continue to implement procedural mitigation measures designed to reduce or avoid impacts on marine mammals in the Study Area (see Chapter 5, Mitigation). At this time, these procedural mitigation measures represent the most practicable methods for protecting marine mammals while allowing the Navy to complete its training and testing mission. Recognizing the importance of the Mariana Islands to marine mammals, the Navy has developed three geographic mitigation areas in this Supplemental

	Comment	Navy Response
	states that "equal loudness contours are available for only a single marine mammal (a dolphin) across a limited range of frequencies (2.5 to 113 kHz)". However, it appears that these loudness contours were used to model effects across nine marine animal species groups "under the assumption that reaction time is correlated with subjective loudness" and therefore effects. Numerous behavior effects have been identified in regards to sonar use on marine animals. A National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration study said the Navy's use of sonar contributed to the beaching of 16 whales and two dolphins in the Bahamas in 2000. Eight of those whales died, showing hemorrhaging around their brains and ear bones, possibly because they were exposed to loud noise. There is no scientific doubt that intense acoustic energy from Navy sonar and other active sound sources can kill, injure, or significantly alter the behavior of marine mammals, whose sensitive hearing and reliance on sound for communication, foraging, and avoidance of predators make them particularly vulnerable. Scientists have documented mass strandings; mortal injuries, including lesions and hemorrhaging in vital organs; and behavioral changes in numerous marine mammal species following naval sonar training exercises around the world. Even where animals escape physical injury, the use of military explosives can significantly alter their behaviors. These are significant effects in any region and should be avoided and minimized where ever possible. It would be helpful if the total number of hours of active and passive sonar and total number and extent of explosions being proposed, and the total number of modeled "take" for	EIS/OEIS. Appendix I (Geographic Mitigation Assessment) includes information about areas considered and evaluated to be potential mitigation areas. Each area was assessed based on two criteria: (1) is the area a key area of biological importance for one or more marine mammal species or sea turtle species for an important life process, and (2) would the mitigation result in an avoidance or reduction of impacts. In addition, implementation of the area as a mitigation area must be practical and allow the Navy to carry out its mission requirements. The Navy used the best available scientific data on vulnerable or sensitive species, such as humpback whales, to identify the three geographic mitigation areas that met the two criteria. Updates to the appendix have been made in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS based on the Navy's ESA and MMPA consultations with NMFS. In addition, the Navy developed its reporting requirements in conjunction with NMFS as discussed in Section 5.1.2.2 (Monitoring, Research, and Reporting Initiatives). The commenters' assertion that a lack of equal loudness contours for all marine mammal species equates to a critical data gap is incorrect. As described in the technical report titled *Criteria and Thresholds for U.S. Navy Acoustic and Explosive Effects Analysis (Phase III)* (June 2017), reaction times to tones can be measured using a scientifically valid assumption that reaction time is correlated with subjective loudness (Pfingst et al., 1975; Stebbins, 1966). The guidance for commercial whale watching vessels was specifically designed for vessels whose sole purpose is to intentionally approach marine mammals. The Navy's use of vessels during training and testing activities is fundamentally different from the purpose of commercial whale watching. Navy vessels never intentionally approach marine mammals. Navy procedural mitigation measures require vessels to maneuver to maintain a distance of at least 500 yd. from whales and 200 yd. from other marine mammals (except bow-riding dolphins), which are larger standoff distances than the guidance for whale watching vessels mentioned by the commenter. It is not practical for the Navy to implement vessel speed restrictions in response to a marine mammal sighting for the

	Comment	Navy Response
	all marine species for the duration of this activity were summarized to ease review. However, even without this information, it is clear that explosions, sonar and ship strikes during Navy exercises could harm marine life. It does not follow that a best practice to protect marine mammals is to simply monitor with a "look out" and stop activities if animals are spotted – as the Navy notes in the draft SEIS, "Lookouts will not be 100 percent effective at detecting all individual marine mammals and sea turtles within the mitigation zones for each activity. This is due to the inherent limitations of observing marine species and because the likelihood of sighting individual animals is largely dependent on observation conditions (e.g., time of day, sea state, mitigation zone size, observation platform) and animal behavior (e.g., the amount of time an animal spends at the surface of the water). This is particularly true for sea turtles, small marine mammals, and marine mammals that display cryptic behaviors (e.g., surfacing to breathe with only a small portion of their body visible from the surface)". Mitigation measures such as tagging animals with GPS and avoiding areas where they congregate to feed or breed as well as their migration corridors would seem like a better approach to avoiding impacts to these important creatures. It would be helpful if the final SEIS/OEIS detailed in a clear readable what mitigation measures and alternatives have been considered for the MITT. Have marine animal migration routes and breeding areas been identified and avoided throughout the range? Are there alternatives such as avoiding use of explosives and high intensity sonar during breeding and migration periods that could further reduce	reasons detailed in Section 5.3.4.1 (Vessel Movement). The Navy's procedural mitigation measures for active sonar involves trained Lookouts observing and implementing mitigation measures within a 1,000 yd. to 500 yd. power-down mitigation zone, and a 200 yd. shutdown mitigation zone. The mitigation zones for active sonar extend beyond the ranges at which permanent threshold shift (PTS) would occur for all marine mammal species found in the Study Area; therefore, mitigation will help avoid or reduce the potential for exposure to PTS. It is not practical for the Navy to implement larger mitigation zones during active sonar activities for the reasons detailed in Section 5.3.2.1 (Active Sonar). Behavioral responses by marine mammals and sea turtles are predicted by the Navy's acoustic effects model. Research cited in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS and in the MITT 2015 Final EIS/OEIS indicates that behavioral responses by marine mammals exposed to underwater sound vary from no response to an immediate change in behavior (e.g., change in swimming direction). Behavioral changes are temporary and not necessarily repeated. Unlike noise associated with commercial shipping, for example, sound sources used by the military do not continuously produce sound. Given the range of possible responses and variability in the type and severity of behavioral responses observed in marine mammals, potential long-term or population-level impacts are speculative. The Navy has addressed recent research on possible long-term effects in Section 3.4.2.1.1.7 (Long-Term Consequences) in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS and in Section 3.4.3.1.3 (Long-Term Consequences to the Individual and the Population) in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. The Navy funds research on marine mammal responses to underwater sound, including sonar (e.g., Goldbogen et al. 2013) and has funded marine mammal surveys in the MITT Study Area (e.g., Fulling et al. 2011). For additional discussion on the potential effects of stressors on marine mammals, refer to Section 3.4.1.7 (General Threats), 3.4.2.1.1.3 (Physiological Stress), and 3.4.2.1.1.5 (Behavioral Reactions). As discussed in Section 5.1.2.2 (Monitoring, Research, and Reporting Initiatives), the Navy developed its reporting requirements in conjunction with NMFS to be

	Comment	Navy Response
	impacts to marine mammals and sea turtles? Are additional monitoring and studies being proposed within the area to support data collection and more informed decision making to achieve Navy readiness and environmental sustainability objectives? Are there other best practices that the Navy is implementing to reduce contributions to ocean noise? The World Cetacean Alliance's Global Best Practices for Responsible Whale and Dolphin Watching suggests that for commercial whale watching, best practices include that: Once within 300 metres of a cetacean, boat speed should be reduced to a no wake speed, avoiding gear changes and any sudden changes of speed or direction within this vicinity, except in cases of emergency; Boats should not approach a whale closer than 100 metres and should not approach a dolphin or porpoise closer than 50 metres; Boats must switch off echo sounders within 300 metres of a cetacean, if it is safe to do so. Based on this guidance, it seems that the Navy should consider limiting speeds and sonar use if they are within 300 meters as well. To supplement mitigation activities with monitoring and data collection, as well as ensure transparency and compliance with proposed mitigation measures, Lookouts on Navy vessels should log details of animals they spot, behavior observed, and the Navy's response to the sighting.	consistent with mission requirements and balance the usefulness of the information to be collected with the practicality of collecting it. The Navy's training and testing activity reports and incident reports are designed to verify implementation of mitigation; comply with current permits, authorizations, and consultation requirements; and improve future environmental analyses (https://www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/). The Navy reports to NMFS if mitigation was implemented during sinking exercises (e.g., number of times explosive detonations were delayed due to marine mammal sightings). For major training exercises, the Navy's annual training and testing activity reports include information on each individual marine mammal sighting related to mitigation implementation. In the unlikely event that a vessel strike of a marine mammal should occur, the Navy would provide NMFS with relevant information pertaining to the incident, including, but not limited to, vessel speed. Additional reporting would be ineffective and impractical for the reasons detailed in Section 5.6.7 (Reporting Requirements). This Supplemental EIS/OEIS (1) includes the analysis of activities at sea and on FDM necessary to meet readiness requirements beyond 2020 and into the reasonably foreseeable future, (2) includes any changes to those activities previously analyzed, and (3) reflects the most up-to-date compilation of training and testing activities deemed necessary to accomplish military readiness requirements. Proposed activities are similar to those that have been conducted in the Study Area for decades. This Supplemental EIS/OEIS supports the issuance of federal regulatory permits and authorizations under the MMPA and the ESA. The MMPA authorization for this Supplemental EIS/OEIS would be valid for seven years. It is important to note that the Navy is then bound by the limits of its expected types and levels of activities to comply with the permits and authorizations. If a need arises that exceeds those predicted activities, the Navy would be required to conduct additional environmental analyses.

	Comment	Navy Response
	Impacts to marine animals can harm endangered and threatened species groups as well as the marine ecosystem and the people that rely on it for food, recreation, and tourism, which is the lifeblood of the CNMI economy in particular. It does not appear that the long-lasting effects of these impacts have been well categorized for the proposed duration of this activity, which itself is unclear. How long will these proposed actions continue? Will additional time and area modifications be made for the duration of these activities as new range data, reports on species sightings, and other best practices become available? Anyone that has spent time in the Marianas understands that the culture of these islands is closely linked to the well-being of marine species and the tradition of inter-island travel. The treatment of impacts to the health of the marine ecosystem and the culture of the people who have four thousand years of navigational history throughout the island chain does not appropriately address the significance of impacts to food fish, sea life in general, and free navigability through these waters. In a fifteen-island chain with a strong history of intra-island navigation, the loss of access to a whole island and a twelve nautical mile zone around that island is significant. The harassment and potential death of already imperiled species is significant. The potential loss of tourism revenue due to species declines and increased stress on habitats and marine life is significant. Relying on data from other regions to try to claim otherwise is simply not responsive to the context of the Marianas or the relative intensity of the activities that are being proposed here – activities which have been limited in other ranges due to known impacts to marine life. Data being used to make claims regarding the significance of impacts	The Navy has funded numerous biological resource surveys in the MITT Study Area, including in the CNMI. Additional surveys are ongoing and the Navy plans to continue supporting marine species surveys in the future. In addition to surveys conducted in the MITT Study Area, the Navy has and will continue to use best available data from training and testing activities conducted within other Navy study areas, such as Hawaii and Southern California, which are the same or very similar to activities being conducted in the MITT Study Area. If there is a lack of data in the Study Area, it is acceptable to use the best scientific data, regardless of source, to determine potential impacts. The military is committed to continuing to work with the local community on issues that potentially affect the public, including access to fishing sites that are important to the culture. The analysis presented in Section 3.12 (Socioeconomic Resources and Environmental Justice) uses the best available data and includes an analysis of the importance of fishing as a socioeconomic and cultural resource for the people of the CNMI. The Navy does not propose a change to the ocean areas currently used by both the Navy and the public. Restrictions on accessing areas of co-use would continue to be infrequent and short term, while other fishing sites in the Study Area would continue to be available to the public. The military understands that fishing and tourism is an important socioeconomic and cultural resource for the people of the CNMI and will continue to work with the fishing and boating community to enable safe access in areas of co-use. The Navy understands the complexity of the information presented within this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Navy attempts to explain challenging concepts, methods, and the results of the analysis as clearly as possible and developed public informational materials for lay audiences. The Navy prepared project brochures, videos, a website, and posters, using layperson terms, to enhance public understanding of the information presented in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. A project fact sheet was also translated into Chamorro. The

	Comment	Navy Response
	should be based on local conditions. If data doesn't exist to describe the unique context of the cultural and socio-economic resources that will be impacted with expanded use of the MITT range then that data should be collected and shared in plain English as well as translated into Chamoru and Carolinian so some of the most potentially effected stakeholder groups can understand these potentially significant impacts and share their knowledge of appropriate mitigation options. Instead, by publishing nearly 2,000-page reports with additional supporting materials online and scheduling public hearings in a hotel conference room, the Navy has taken an approach to information sharing that limits involvement from the public at large. If the NEPA process aims to support meaningful community involvement in decision-making and improved resource management outcomes, then the Navy should take active steps to involve the community in this process instead of doing the bare minimum required to "check the box" on engagement requirements. I sincerely hope that when this report is updated and the next round of public comments are opened that the Navy considers publishing notices of the public comment period in local papers and on local radio stations, holding meetings at public meeting spaces with ample parking – potentially in more than one location and for more than a two-hour period during what is dinner time for many families – and providing a longer comment period to allow for more meaningful engagement and comment development. Thank you for your consideration and your commitment to the NEPA process.	informational materials, including the translated fact sheet, were made available at all four public meetings and on the project website (http://mitt-eis.com/). To better accommodate stakeholders and the public, the Navy provided 75 days to review and comment on the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The comment period for the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS was from February 1, 2019 to April 17, 2019, which is 30 days longer than the minimum required time for review (40 CFR section 6.203(c)(3)(v)). Although the Navy took cultural and religious holidays into account when planning the dates and locations for public meetings, those considerations had to be balanced with the deadlines and schedules of the large number of federal and local agency stakeholders, as well as the overall schedule of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Navy held four open house public meetings, one each on Tinian (March 14, 2019), Rota (March 15, 2019), Saipan (March 18, 2019), and Guam (March 19, 2019). The public meetings provided an opportunity for the public to ask questions of Navy team members about the analysis documented in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Navy encouraged the public to attend these meetings and broadly notified the public through the media, including newspaper advertisements and news releases, and direct mail, including letters, postcards, and emails. The Navy has received feedback from attendees that the open-house format is more conducive to promoting public understanding and constructive dialogue. Open house meetings allow a greater number of individuals to directly engage and interact with Navy team members and ask questions about this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, as well as provide comments on the document.

	Comment	Navy Response
	Sincerely, Shelly Johnston	
David Baker (DB)		
DB-01	I strongly feel that the implementation and expansion of the MITT and MBR should be immediately halted. These activities will cause irreversible damage to the ecosystems within the bombing and training areas at a time when our planet is undergoing anthropogenic (human-caused) changes, including but not limited to climate change, ocean acidification, overfishing and pollution. But adding the destructive activities you propose on top of these other damaging inputs, you're causing irreversible damage to ecosystems and the livelihoods and quality of life for the local people living nearby. Please do not continue to engage in and expand these training and bombing activities. Find a suitable location, and wait until after we, as a global society, get a handle on these larger factors.	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities. The Navy is not proposing any geographic expansion of the training and testing area in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Proposed activities are similar to those conducted in the Study Area for decades.
Melissa Mekras (MM)		
MM-01	I urge you to desist with this project. Guam is already the largest DoD training area in the world. Guam's ecological fate is in your hands. The communities most affected by climate change are indigenous peoples and marginalized populations. Our continued land grabs and modern colonization are a shame that needs to end if we have any hope of saving our planet and specifically if the	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities. Potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Also, as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), the Navy implements, to the maximum extent practicable, procedural and geographic mitigation measures during its training and testing activities to reduce potential impacts on marine life. The Navy's analysis indicates that, with implementation

	Comment	Navy Response
	island of Guam has any hope. Already by calling it a U.S. territory we remove any ability for them to vote for themselves. The people of Guam CLEARLY do not want this, and that needs to be respected. And the people who do want this may need it out of necessity because of late-stage capitalism, and the glimmer of hope that they may make some money out of it which is ridiculous. The only benefactor of this project would be the military, for a short time of course, until the planet can no longer take the continued carbon emissions and pollution and wipes us out one way or another. Your underwater bomb detonations and sonar are PROVEN to harm and kill marine life, and the cautions you have laid out are not expansive enough. Our oceans are already under great threat from plastic pollution, continued oil spills, coral bleaching, ocean acidification, and the rising sea levels (which also threats coastal and island communities such as Guam). It is our duty as adults to speak for the younger generations to come. It is our civic duty to ensure that they have clean air, land, and water.	of its protective mitigation measures, there would be no significant impacts on marine species or habitat.
Travis Wells (TW)		
TW-01	I am opposed to this project and buildup. The military does not respect the voice and the interest of the CHamoru people or the international law that prohibits military buildup on colonized territory.	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.
Shari Bush (SB)		
SB-01	Although I am not currently residing on Guam, I was born and raised there. My brother lives there with his children, my	Marine life is important to the Navy. Section 3.8 (Marine Invertebrates) includes an analysis of potential impacts on coral. A detailed analysis of potential impacts

	Comment	Navy Response
	niece and nephew are 10 and 6 years old. My father lives on Saipan. I have graduated from the University of California, Irvine with a B.S. in Earth System Science and have a comprehensive understanding of the issues facing Guam's marine environment, not only from my studies but from growing up there. Swimming in the oceans around Guam in the 90's and early 00's I saw firsthand the degradation of coral reefs around the island. Bleaching from stress, erosion and warming oceans. Other impacts of climate change will cause many problems for the waters around Guam as well; ocean acidification and rising seas will heavily impact these important ecosystems. However, our open waters are just as important. Scientists and mathematicians have come out against detonating bombs underwater, as it will harm vulnerable marine mammals. Our oceans are already stretched so thin from overfishing and plastic pollution. The valuable organisms that will be harmed by these tests are already suffering from such man-made disasters, and it would be irresponsible to subject them to further danger from a direct and avoidable harm. Please consider further the detrimental harm to marine mammals and the degradation of environment that testing and training will do to the proposed area.	on coral around FDM is also provided. Based on the analysis, coral fauna are healthy and robust, and the nearshore physical environment and basic habitat types at FDM would remain unchanged. These conclusions are based on (1) a limited amount of physical damage, (2) very low levels of partial mortality and disease (less than one percent of all species observed), (3) absence of excessive mucus production, (4) good coral recruitment, and (5) complete recovery by 2012 of the 2007 bleaching events. Smith and Marx (2016) also concluded that the health, abundance, and biomass of fishes, corals, and other marine resources at FDM are as good as, or better than, those in similar habitats elsewhere in the Mariana Archipelago. The Navy funded additional reef surveys in the nearshore areas of FDM in 2017. The results were approved for public release in September 2018 and are available at https://apps.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/1069450.pdf. The 2017 survey found little evidence that training has affected coral reef communities at FDM. Only three relatively fresh ordnance items were observed, but no blast pits, craters, or significant areas of coral breakage were observed. The ordnance observed during the 2017 survey was almost exclusively old, encrusted in marine life, and had no discernable impact on surrounding communities. The Navy is consulting with the NMFS under MMPA and ESA to ensure that the Proposed Action will not put the population and the future of marine species within the Study Area in jeopardy.
Kimberly Hammond (KH)		
KH-01	I am strongly opposed to this project. My family lived in the Marshall Islands and I grew up in the pristine environment. Do not let the Navy ruin it!	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.
Tim Cespedes (TC)		
TC-01	I oppose the military's plans to destroy our sacred land. If the US is really "full" as the president has stated, then why would we destroy any land where our people can live?	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.

	Comment	Navy Response
	This is sacred homeland. Do not destroy it.	
Darryl Lai (DL)		
DL-01	I oppose this project. Please address the following issues: • How explosive weapons pollute the air, land and water and threaten your health. • How active sonar testing should be stopped unless the Navy proves it doesn't harm fish and marine mammals. • How the destruction of No'os (FDM) is occurring and all bombing should be stopped immediately since it is leased land and the destruction is irreversible • How increased training will further interfere with access to fishing and sea travel • How the Navy hasn't done an adequate study on the impacts of underwater explosive weapons on marine life • How the Navy's providing a 1500 page EIS without further explanation and in English only creates a barrier to public understanding of the impacts • How the Navy is hiding the cumulative impact of its massive Marianas Bombing Range by breaking it into smaller projects • Inadequate time for the public and government to read and process the 1500 page EIS Moreover, you do realize people live in these areas? Please address these issues for the people who live there.	The health of coastal communities, fisheries, and ecosystems is important to the Navy. Section 3.1 (Sediments and Water Quality) concludes that chemical, physical, and biological changes to sediment or water quality would be measurable but below applicable standards, regulations, and guidelines, and would be within the existing conditions or designated uses. The Navy complies with all applicable laws and regulations. The military is committed to protecting the environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities. A comprehensive analysis of potential effects on environmental resources from Navy training and testing activities is presented in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. These resources include sediments and water quality, marine habitats, marine mammals, fishes, sea turtles, marine birds, and marine invertebrates. While some impacts would occur from training and testing activities, the analysis concludes that impacts would be minimal and would not have a significant impact on the environment. Also, as described in Section 2.3.3 (Standard Operating Procedures) and Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy implements, to the maximum extent possible, mitigation measures during its training and testing activities. The Navy took a hard look at the potential impacts of the Proposed Action on marine mammals and sea turtles using the best available science. The Navy's quantitative analysis process for analyzing impacts from active sonar and explosives has been reviewed by external scientists and approved by NMFS. The Navy also worked collaboratively with NMFS to develop mitigation measures using inputs from the operational community, the best available science, predicted activity impact footprints, and marine species monitoring and density data. The Navy will implement procedural mitigation measures to avoid or

	Comment	Navy Response
		reduce potential impacts on marine mammals and sea turtles whenever and wherever applicable activities occur in the Study Area, as detailed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation). The military understands that fishing is an important socioeconomic and cultural resource for the people of the CNMI and will continue to work with the fishing community to enable safe access to fishing areas around FDM. The military is committed to continuing to work with the local community on issues that potentially affect the public, including access to fishing sites. As stated in Section 3.8.2.2 (Explosive Stressors) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, although the vast majority of explosions occur at distances greater than 3 nautical miles (NM) from shore (where water depths are greater than the depths where shallow-water coral species occur), some explosions may occur close to marine invertebrates that could kill or injure them. Explosions near the seafloor and very large explosions in the water column may impact shallow-water corals of any life stage, hard-bottom habitat and associated marine invertebrates, and deep-water corals. Effects could include physical disturbance, fragmentation, or mortality to sessile organisms and pelagic larvae. Energy from an explosion at the surface would dissipate below detectable levels before reaching the seafloor and would not injure or otherwise impact deep-water, benthic marine invertebrates. Marine life is important to the Navy. Using the latest science and technology, the Navy completed extensive analyses and computer-based modeling to determine impacts and develop science-based protective measures to reduce or avoid potential impacts on marine life. As explained in the Navy's technical report on marine mammal strandings (*Marine Mammal Strandings Associated with U.S. Navy Sonar Activities*, 2017 [www.mitt-eis.com]), marine mammal strandings have been a historic and ongoing occurrence attributed to a variety of causes, both natural and anthropogenic. Over the last 50 years, increased awareness and reporting has led to more information about species affected and raised

	Comment	Navy Response
		concerns about anthropogenic sources of strandings. While there have been limited numbers of marine mammal mortalities potentially associated with U.S. Navy activities, the root causes are not clear in most cases. NMFS, as the regulator, maintains the authoritative National Stranding Database. The Navy analyzes for TTS and PTS effects to the stock level for the species as presented in Section 3.4.2.1 (Acoustic Stressors). The vast majority of estimated impacts are behavioral. Small numbers of TTS are estimated for these resident odontocete populations around the Marians Islands such that most individuals would not receive TTS, and a small number of individuals could receive one to a few TTS per year. TTS only suppresses a portion of an animal's hearing and complete recovery normally occurs within a period of minutes to hours. Additionally, TTS thresholds are used conservatively in the Navy's model in that they do not account for recovery of the ear in between noise exposures (e.g., individual sonar pings) and assume animals are ideal receivers (i.e., facing the sound source). The Navy updated the MITT Final EIS/OEIS to include the most recent dive reports (released in 2013, with dives occurring in 2012), and the EIS/OEIS includes information discussed below. The Navy's analysis of mass movement and erosion on FDM includes historical photograph analyses and direct observations during dive surveys conducted off FDM since 1999. Additionally, the Navy will investigate methods to baseline current physical conditions on FDM and to monitor those conditions over time.. The report information has been added to Section 3.1 (Sediments and Water Quality), with specific new text in Section 3.1.3.1.5.3 (Farallon de Medinilla Specific Impacts) in the MITT Final EIS/OEIS and in Section 3.1 of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. It should be noted that, since the signing of the ROD in 2015, the dive surveys have been published (Smith, S. H., D. E. Marx. 2016. "De-facto marine protection from a Navy bombing range: Farallon De Medinilla, Mariana Archipelago, 1997 to 2012," Marine Pollution Bulletin, 102(1):187–198). The 1999–2004 surveys were completed by a Navy contractor and a representative from the USFWS, NMFS

	Comment	Navy Response
		and the CNMI. All surveys since 2004 have been performed by the NAVFAC and Expeditionary Warfare Center's Scientific Diving Services (SDS). Direct ordnance impacts upon the submerged physical environment, which were clearly attributable to training activities, were detected in dive surveys conducted in 2007, 2008, 2010, and 2012. Indirect impacts, such as ordnance that skipped or eroded off the island and rock and ordnance fragments blasted off the island, were detected every year. However, natural phenomena such as typhoons, tropical storms, large wave events, tsunamis/micro-tsunamis, and earthquakes are the primary disturbances, which shape and modify FDM's physical environment between the intertidal zone and depths of 30 m. During the 2004 survey, the dive survey team (which included representatives of stakeholder agencies cited above and a Navy contractor) noted changes to the submerged lands relative to observations made between 1999 and 2003. These physical changes included (1) fresh boulder/rock slides; (2) submerged rock areas off the southern tip of FDM, that appeared to have been peeled back to expose bright yellow-orange patches of underlying rock; and (3) cracked and broken coral colonies. The 2004 report (released in 2005) stated: "Examination of photographs from 1944 indicate that changes in the geologic structure of the island by erosion and mass wasting…have been going on for decades." No newly submerged cliff blocks were observed between 2005 and 2012. The detonation of live ordnance, and the impact of inert ordnance, both act to fracture rock and make the island more susceptible to the impacts of earthquakes, typhoons, and other natural erosional forces. Small to moderate sized (generally < 30 cm) fresh rock fragments have been observed yearly. Many, if not most of these, are clearly the result of training activities. However, the number and size of these items and the locations in which they occur have not resulted in any significant changes to the topography or significant adverse impacts on marine biological resources. In 2017, the Navy funded additional surveys in the nearshore areas of FDM. The results were approved for public release in September 2018, and available at https://apps.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/1069450.pdf. The 2017 survey found little evidence that training has affected coral communities at FDM.

	Comment	Navy Response
		Only three relatively fresh ordnance items were observed, but no blast pits, craters, or significant areas of coral breakage were observed. The ordnance observed during the 2017 survey was almost exclusively old, encrusted in marine life, and had no discernable impact on surrounding communities. Public safety is also important to the Navy and various means are used to communicate information on areas restricted to public or commercial activities. As discussed in the Draft Supplemental EIS Section 2.3.3.2 (Sea Space and Airspace Deconfliction), the Navy has worked, and will continue to work, collaboratively with local communities to deconflict sea space used for fishing to the maximum extent practicable, such as avoiding known fishery infrastructures (e.g., fish aggregating devices) and high-use fishing areas. To help civilian mariners better plan fishing and boating activities that involve accessing the waters around FDM, the Navy notifies them through various means, such as U.S. Coast Guard-issued Notices to Mariners and social media. The Navy has been conducting training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades and proposes to continue training in the region into the reasonably foreseeable future. The activities analyzed in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS are largely a continuation of the ongoing training and testing activities that were analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, 2010 MIRC Final EIS/OEIS, 1999 Military Training in the Marianas Final EIS, and other environmental compliance documents. Environmental regulations, including those associated with NEPA, MMPA, and ESA require that the military reanalyze impacts from its activities after a designated time period and reapply for any needed permits. According to the CEQ regulations, the proposed training and testing activities in the MITT Study Area may logically be viewed in isolation, because the activities are ongoing, have independent utility, and primarily occur in offshore waters beyond 3 NM from shore (with the notable exception of activities occurring at FDM). In addition, courts have upheld federal agencies' decisions to organize and plan their actions in a reasonable or rational manner.

	Comment	Navy Response
		The Navy understands the complexity of the information presented within this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. This Supplemental EIS/OEIS contains a rigorous scientific analysis of the potential impacts of the Navy's proposal, and thoroughly explains the scientific methodology, analysis methods, and findings. The Navy attempts to explain challenging concepts, methods, and the results of the analysis as clearly as possible in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS and developed public informational materials for lay audiences. The Navy prepared project brochures, videos, a website, and posters, using layperson terms, to enhance public understanding of the information presented in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. A project fact sheet was also translated into Chamorro. The informational materials, including the translated fact sheet, were made available at all four public meetings and on the project website (www.mitt-eis.com). The Navy held four open house public meetings, one each on Tinian (March 14, 2019), Rota (March 15, 2019), Saipan (March 18, 2019), and Guam (March 19, 2019). The public meetings provided an opportunity for the public to ask questions of Navy team members about the analysis documented in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Navy encouraged the public to attend these meetings and broadly notified the public through the media, including newspaper advertisements and news releases, and direct mail, including letters, postcards, and emails. The Navy has received feedback from attendees that the open-house format is more conducive to promoting public understanding and constructive dialogue. Open house meetings allow a greater number of individuals to directly engage and interact with Navy team members and ask questions about this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, as well as provide comments on the document. The Navy took cultural and religious holidays into account when planning the dates and locations for public meetings. To try to accommodate stakeholders and the public, the Navy provided 75 days to review and comment on the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, 30 days longer than the minimum required time for

	Comment	Navy Response
		review. The Navy appreciates input received from local government agencies and communities on how it can improve public notification and outreach efforts. The Navy provided the public 75 days to review and comment on the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, 30 days longer than the minimum recommended time for review of Navy documents. Cumulative impacts from multiple military activities, including those identified in the comment, are discussed in Chapter 4 (Cumulative Impacts) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Combining all projects into a single analysis would not aid in the public and local governments' review, because these different projects and actions vary greatly in their scopes, timetables, action proponents, and potential environmental impacts. The Navy conducted a 45-day public scoping period, four public meetings following publication of the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, and provided 75 days for stakeholders and the public to review and comment on the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS. These outreach efforts have afforded the public the opportunity to ask questions about the proposed training and testing activities as well as cumulative impacts from multiple military activities occurring in the region.
Hope Trautman (HT)		
HT-01	I think this bombing is a terrible idea and I oppose to it	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.
Daniel Cespedes (DC)		
DC-01	It is a strong concern of mine that the Navy's activity in and around the Mariana Islands (Guam, CNMI, and Northern Islands including Pågan) as per the MITT will adversely affect the health of the local population, specifically in regards to the maritime culture which is currently undergoing a vital phase in its restoration. As I write this comment, traditional canoes are being built on Guam and Saipan (from organizations such as Ulitao and 500 Sails), and swimming, navigation, and sailing techniques are being taught to locals	Public safety is also important to the Navy and various means are used to communicate information on areas restricted to public or commercial activities. As discussed in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 2.3.3.2 (Sea Space and Airspace Deconfliction), the Navy has worked, and will continue to work, collaboratively with local communities to deconflict sea space used for fishing and other boating activities to the maximum extent practicable, such as avoiding known fishery infrastructures (e.g., fish aggregating devices) and high-use fishing areas. To help civilian mariners (including those conducting recreation activities) better plan fishing and boating activities that involve accessing the waters

	Comment	Navy Response
	of all ages which are activities of ineffable value to the health and culture of the Mariana Islands. The use of these proa canoes will enable inter-island travel, reintroduce a culture of sustainable seafaring, and will enable the citizens of Guam and the CNMI to travel to the Northern Islands in accordance with local travel laws. The Navy's presence and use of munitions, sonar, and otherwise for training in the waters of the Mariana Islands will most certainly pose risks for these essential seafaring activities and the local American citizens who take part in them. The presence of more military ships around the coastlines of the islands will require ample communication to ensure all citizens using traditional canoes for travel and fishing do not accidentally cross paths with military operations. Plans to mitigate these kinds of dangerous instances have not been addressed. The plans to use Pågan as a training ground will absolutely interfere with the life quality of local citizens, as well as their use of traditional sailing vessels to and around the island. Citizens who use traditional sailing vessels in the Northern Mariana islands (specifically Tinian and Farallon De Medinilla), in their legal recreational use of local waters, will be at risk of crossing paths with dangerous military operations. The risk of encountering previous military operations in the form of unexploded ordinances (UXO's) is also of great risk and the cleanup of these threats has still not been addressed by the Navy. This abuse of American land by American forces is entirely irresponsible. Citizens who use local waters to swim for health	around FDM, the Navy notifies them through various means, such as U.S. Coast Guard-issued Notices to Mariners and social media. Pagan is not part of this Proposed Action. Training and testing activities are proposed to occur at sea and on FDM. Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2 in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS present current and proposed training and testing activities. The Navy analyzed land-based activities on Guam, Saipan, Tinian, and Rota in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS; the Navy did not reanalyze land-based activities in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS because there are no changes proposed to those land-based activities. Marine life and marine habitat are important to the Navy. Using the latest science and technology, the Navy completed extensive analyses and computer-based modeling to determine impacts and develop science-based protective measures to reduce or avoid potential impacts on marine life. Potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Also, as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), the Navy implements, to the maximum extent practicable, procedural and geographic mitigation measures during its training and testing activities to reduce potential impacts on marine life. The Navy's analysis indicates that, with implementation of its protective mitigation measures, there would be no significant impacts on marine species.

	Comment	Navy Response
	improvement may be affected by the use of sonar activity in the waters of the Mariana Islands. Marine animal activity in the wake of sonar use is inconclusive and swimmers may be affected by their behavior. Insufficient information is in the MITT in regards as to how their livelihoods will be protected from the complications of sonar use in nearby waters. All of these risks have been inadequately addressed. Therefore, it would be an egregious error for the Navy to move forward with the MITT without reexamining the plan to account for how local canoe and seafaring culture would be protected. After all, the purpose of the MITT and the Navy's presence in the Pacific is to strengthen the protection and safety of the American people. The Navy would be working against the interest of protecting the American people by moving forward with the MITT without further studies about how to protect the livelihood of the local citizens, and their participation in the healthy activities of swimming and traditional sailing.	
Melissa Greff (MG)		
MG-01	leave those islands alone and stop bombing altogether. i'm vehemently opposed to this kind of violence and even more opposed to a US military presence in these islands. leave them alone.	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.
Veronica Rosser (VR)		
VR-01	I am opposed to this project! It is immoral!	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.
Hila'an Pali'I (HP)		
HP-01	Stop destroying our irreplaceable resources for your stupid war games please. The earth is not yours to destroy. You have	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.

	Comment	Navy Response
	to share it with us and the rest of mankind so please stop ruining it for us all	
Artemia Perez (AP)		
AP-01	Hafa Adai, As an indigenous CHamoru woman, I feel the future of Guahan weighing heavily on my mind at all times. One of the pillar values of the CHamoru people is the concept of "inafa'maolek" which translates literally to "to make better for everyone." So, you see, I have come to understand that my purpose in life is not entirely my own. It has been and will continue to be to serve my community and my island. It is through such a value that I've learned that my contributions, good and bad, to this world, have incalculable impacts on lives I may never come to know. Guam is many things, but grounds for military advancement is not one of them. Put fabot, please, consider the irreplaceable resources at risk. See this issue through the eyes of a people who's holistic soul and culture is embedded in its land, animals, air, and most importantly, in this case, the ocean. The ocean is what connects us. The ocean is life. The ocean is sacred. This project allows for 12,580 detonations per year for five years. In five years, the world's scape will be completely different if we continue at this rate of carelessness. The	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities. The Navy took a hard look at the potential impacts of the Proposed Action on marine mammals and sea turtles using the best available science. The Navy's quantitative analysis process for analyzing impacts from active sonar and explosives has been reviewed by external scientists and approved by NMFS. The Navy also worked collaboratively with NMFS to develop mitigation measures using inputs from the operational community, the best available science, predicted activity impact footprints, and marine species monitoring and density data. The Navy will implement procedural mitigation measures to avoid or reduce potential impacts on marine mammals and sea turtles whenever and wherever applicable activities occur in the Study Area, as detailed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation).

	Comment	Navy Response
	marine life to include the 26 different marine mammal species that the military intends to "take" (harm/kill) as means of progressive testing, will undoubtedly shift the status of these species; status meaning becoming endangered or threatened. We need to focus on revitalizing our waters. The biggest threat to our island is not a militant enemy, but it is our recklessness with the environment.	
Kayla Dela Rosa (KDR)		
KDR-01	I truly believe it is crucial to the existence of our untouched and unscathed oceans to only be further explored to understand better how our world itself works. The notion for advocating a "legal" way to destroy some of these things will be faced with much regret in future times. If there is a way to stop this testing in our ocean, please, do whatever it takes to stop. Not substitute or find out how to accomplish between the thin lines, just stop. Altogether. We only have two homes in each and every single one of our lifetimes, those include the earth and our bodies, let us take the utmost care of both equally.	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.
Casierra Cruz (CaC)		
CaC-01	How has the Dept. of the Navy garnered community voice and input in the supplemental draft of the EIS/OEIS analysis? Has the Navy intentionally sought input from local fishermen or other indigenous/native environmental stewards, protectors, and researchers from the Mariana Islands? What, if any, were some of the concerns, arguments, and/or agreed upon statements voiced by community members and leaders in the proposed draft? How were some of the concerns addressed and/or mitigated by representatives of the	The Navy complies with all applicable environmental laws, including its requirements under NEPA when developing this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. NEPA requires federal agencies to provide opportunities for meaningful public involvement. Comments received during the scoping period were considered in the development of the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Comments received on the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS have been considered in the development of this Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS.

	Comment	Navy Response
	department? Part of assessing the potential environmental impacts associated with ongoing military activities requires holistic evaluation. In the past decade, what did this evaluation plan consist of? What were some of the questions and/or statements evaluated regarding human resources, cultural resources, and public health/safety? How were they measured? What would the prospective evaluation plan entail? Will the plan take into account the grave impact of climate change in the Mariana Islands and how the ongoing, proposed military activities will exacerbate such effects? In regards to complete transparency and clarity on the breadth of information presented, how will the Navy ensure the results of the analysis are disseminated properly to the community and are culturally tailored enough for any community member to understand and comprehend on various levels? Has the Navy explored alternative avenues to help disseminate such pertinent information - such as working with local environmental agencies/organizations, conservation districts, the Department of Public Health and Social Services, or the educational system with the intent to maximize community involvement and allow adequate time for community members to express what can potentially happen to their water, land, and overall environment they heavily rely on?	From past experience, the Navy has concluded that the open-house-style public meeting format used during this Supplemental EIS/OEIS public meetings is the most conducive to effective dialogue. Open-house-style meetings allow a greater number of individuals to engage and interact with Navy team members and ask questions of subject matter experts. At the public meetings (Tinian Public Library, March 14, 2019; Rota Mayor's Conference Hall, March 15, 2019; Saipan Kanoa Resort, March 18, 2019; and University of Guam, March 19, 2019), multiple comment opportunities were provided to the public. A stenographer was available to record verbal comments and written comments were accepted. The Navy accepted comments from the public, and Navy team members stationed at the posters were responsible for discussing this Supplemental EIS/OEIS and responding to questions from the public. This Supplemental EIS/OEIS fully complies with NEPA. Using the best available science, the extensive studies and analysis conducted by the Navy exceeded the required hard look at impacts on environmental resources. Potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. In accordance with CEQ guidance, the cumulative impacts analysis focused on impacts that are truly meaningful. This was accomplished by reviewing the direct and indirect impacts that would occur on each resource under each of the alternatives. Key factors considered were the current status and sensitivity of the resource and the intensity, duration, and spatial extent of the impacts of each potential stressor. In general, long-term and widespread impacts were considered more likely to contribute to cumulative impacts than short-term and localized impacts. Those impacts on a resource that were considered to be negligible were not considered further in the analysis. The level of analysis for each resource was commensurate with the intensity of the impacts identified in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences).
Davina Artero (DA)		
DA-01	Please don't destroy our oceans. I am 22 years old and I would love to show my children and grandchildren the	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.

	Comment	Navy Response
	beauty of our island's ocean. The ocean plays a very important part of our lives and if we don't take care of our ocean. We will suffer the consequences for it one day and it'll be too late to make amends. Don't try to fix the ocean when it becomes too late cause there is no turning back. The ocean has taken care of us for billions of years. It provides us with food but we have become greedy with it and have over fished and hunted on sea creatures that are an important part of balancing the ecosystem. With you using our waters a bombing area with destroy the ocean even more and we won't be able to come back from that. This is my island and don't want it to become a war zone. You have taken our land and pride. Your country has taken so much from us already. PLEASE DONT TAKE OUR OCEAN AWAY FROM US.	
Female Topasna (FT)		
FT-01	Hafa Adai, I am a concerned citizen, parent, grandparent, daughter, sister etc. I have had so many concerns with the military's intentions of Guam. My concerns are based on research and testimonials of a variety of people. I will name 2 general ones that cover many situations. First, I feel that they often say they care about the island however, many of their actions say or prove otherwise. SECOND, I have many personal experiences of cancer in my family and friends. I wholeheartedly feel it they are all due to the many military activities on the whole island. (contamination, bombings, practice bombing on the while Marianas Island.) I am always hopeful that there will be a better balance of the military and the people of Guam. However, the US military's track record not only on Guam but around the world says	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.

	Comment	Navy Response
	there is little hope for a better balance. I hope and pray our voices will be heard and our concerns are taken more seriously.	
Erlinda Montecalvo (EM)		
EM-01	I strongly oppose the ongoing increase military training activities on land base and at sea training using sonar, explosive and other manner of detonation. The effect is destructive and have irreversible devastating consequences to marine life, (whales, turtles, Dolphins, coral, reef fish and other rare species), restricted/off limit access to fishing, cultural sites and recreational beaches. Mr. John Van Name stated the military have been conducting training testing activities around the island for decades, but he did not provide clarity on the environmental impact of operations. Was there an environmental sampling performed? When and what was the results. If we allow the military activities (military preparedness) to continue, the capacity for this destruction is immense, unexploded ordnance, unsafe debris, toxic waste on land and ocean. The future for my grandchildren is bleak. The future for Guahan will be to conduct environmental restoration resulting from past DOD activities- 1) study phase, 2) clean phase. We are still finding and removing WW II debris. This will take years and years to happen.	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities. The Navy has implemented and will continue to implement standard operating procedures and mitigation measures to reduce or avoid impacts on marine resources in the Study Area (see Section 2.3.3, Standard Operating Procedures; and Chapter 5, Mitigation)
Kiara Quichocho (KQ)		
KQ-01	Håfa adai. I am a resident and native of Guåhan (Guam), writing with concern for the future of my home and all people who call the Marianas home. When, and if, this comment is read I urge the parties involved to reevaluate the detriments of prolonging any and all testings in the MITT “study area”. I assure that my, along with many other concerns regarding these activities are not fabricated nor unprecedented. They are extremely relevant and justified given that those activities	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.

	Comment	Navy Response
	compromise the limited chances we have to address and mitigate those issues which are detrimental to our ocean and our islands. Ocean acidification, rising sea levels, and bleached coral (to name a few) ARE NOT false apprehensions. They are tangible issues with real, visible implications which will most definitely harm and alter our future as a region and as a people. To continue this is both politically and morally unacceptable. Knowingly endangering the lives of animals and people of the Marianas for the purpose of "security" is not only a neocolonial pursuit but also exemplifies American exceptionalism at the expense of Pacific territories, a tradition which proves to drive the DoD's decisions regardless of the lives which will be periled as a result of them. If these implications and consequences are not enough to justify a mere re-evaluation of ongoing and future activities in the Marianas, it is obvious that no amount of substantive comments from the effected communities would alter those decisions and the fate of our islands are unanimously left to DoD.	
Haruna Saito (HS)		
HS-01	Hello, Please consider the impacts of your actions to our island. Please consider the impacts of your actions on the marine life. Please consider the continued loss of culture from the constant stealing of what belongs to the island and its people. PLEASE consider the people of this island, the land, the ocean, and everything in it. Consider this again and again until it becomes aligned with the what the island needs. Thank you.	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.

	Comment	Navy Response
Abby Crain (AC)		
AC-01	I Do Not support the expansion. I DO NOT SUPPORT THE EXPANSION I don't not want testing or underwater explosions in or around the Guam waters.	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities. This Navy Supplemental EIS/OEIS does not propose any geographic expansion of the training and testing area.
Karmen Vilander (KV)		
KV-01	To whom it may concern, In the maritime world we have seen the effects that sonar has on migrating whales and general sea life. I am originally from the Pacific Northwest where we have seen these effects and are now having to play catch up. I am not suggesting we should ban testing but perhaps work harder for a compromise that can benefit both our ocean and our military. Thank you, Karmen Vilander	Marine life is important to the Navy. Using the latest science and technology, the Navy completed extensive analyses and computer-based modeling to determine impacts and develop science-based protective measures to reduce or avoid potential impacts on marine life. Potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Also, as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), the Navy implements, to the maximum extent practicable, procedural and geographic mitigation measures during its training and testing activities to reduce potential impacts on marine life. The Navy's analysis indicates that, with implementation of its protective mitigation measures, there would be no significant impacts on marine species.
Raymond Lujan (RL)		
	I am in STRONG opposition to the Mariana Island Training and Testing Study Area. Decisions regarding the MITT were done without the consent of the CHamoru people of Guåhan. It is neither democratic nor socially just. The ways in which Congress has exercised its unilateral authority to our island is a blatant disrespect and disregard to its people. Article 73b in "Chapter XI: Declaration Regarding Non- Self- Governing Territories" of the U.N. Charter instructs administering countries "to develop self- government, to take due account of the political aspirations of the peoples, and to assist them in the progressive development of their free political	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.

	Comment	Navy Response
	institutions, according to the particular circumstances of each territory and its peoples and their varying stages of advancement". A strong military presence on an unincorporated island territory who has yet to exercise their international right to political self-determination, is unmistakably a conflict of interest. The U.S. as the administering power of Guåhan is legally obligated, both federally and internationally, to aid the island towards the path of self- governance and that is all. The military presence and planned military build-up, including the MITT Study Area, violates the intention of the criterion mentioned in the article above. Whether it is the physical desecration of our ancient CHamoru sites, the political deprivation of voice and representation to the U.S. as second class citizens, or EIS "public involvement" commenting periods, Congress, the Navy, and its affiliates couldn't be any clearer that the needs of the CHamoru people of Guåhan come second to theirs.	
Matthew Simpson (MS)		
MS-01	I do not agree with the MITT plan as it will be detrimental to the environmental well-being of the area to be used. The environmental impact assessment should not be glossed over. The planet does not need the USA to set off more practice bombs. This is shameful and will reflect poorly on the part that the US military has had to play in the degradation of the environment and resources which it should be protecting. I feel that the impact on whales should be more closely analyzed. I would like to see more importance given to the toxic pollution of ancestral lands important to the indigenous people of the region.	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.

	Comment	Navy Response
Kianna Reyes (KR)		
KR-01	As a native indigenous to the island of Saipan (roughly 136 miles from Guam), I do not support the Department of Defense's decision to utilize Chamorro ancestral lands or any of the surrounding areas (including the oceans around the Marianas Islands) as a base for weapons-testing. The U.S. Naval Forces have already acknowledged the fact that hundreds of aquatic animals (including whales, corals, and fish) will most likely perish when confronted with training methods that include the use of underwater sonar and bomb detonations. In addition, the Navy has also confessed to the likelihood that millions of maritime creatures will probably experience temporary hearing loss during the process of field training. Underwater sonar has also been known to produce slow-rolling sound waves that top up to 235 decibels. In most cases, it only takes about 140 decibels to reach the threshold of pain. Whales have been known to strand themselves in shallow waters in attempt to escape the unbelievable agony - and even bleed from the eyes and ears when rapidly changing depth to escape. As the Department of Defense cannot guarantee the safety of lives led underseas, I will not support and will continue to advocate against these methods until an alternative solution can be reached. As there is no effective way the military is able to redirect all marine wildlife away from an underwater training spot, it remains a fact that the methods used in training will continue to harm, harass, and even life forms residing within a reasonable distance to the grounds. It is for these reasons (and many more), that I will continue to hold my place of	Marine life and marine habitat are important to the Navy. Using the latest science and technology, the Navy completed extensive analyses and computer-based modeling to determine impacts and develop science-based protective measures to reduce or avoid potential impacts on marine life. Potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Also, as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), the Navy implements, to the maximum extent practicable, procedural and geographic mitigation measures during its training and testing activities to reduce potential impacts on marine life. The Navy's analysis indicates that, with implementation of its protective mitigation measures, there would be no significant impacts on marine species.

	Comment	Navy Response
	opposition against field training conducted underseas, above-ground, and around the Marianas Islands.	
Lisa Marquez (LM)		
LM-01	please dont renew contract in Guam, their island needs a break from all the damage you all have done	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.
Lawrence Lizama (LL)		
LL-01	According to the EIS statement, the purpose of the training is to maintain, train, and equip combat ready forces for winning wars, deterring aggression, and maintaining freedom of the seas. However, what wars is the US fighting other than those brought about and continued by them? What aggression is the US deterring other than the aggression they bring about through the militarization of our region? What freedom of the seas is the US maintaining when their own fellow citizens, second class citizens, on Guahan aren't even free to explore their own seas? These issues that the military states are the reasons, purposes, and needs for this training are only increasing the danger in our region. Increasing the training area in this region will only increase our chances to be a target for an enemy of the US. The military already has more than enough, not only in Guahan but also in the CNMI. I want to reference section 3.10.2.1 of Volume II regarding acoustic stressors. In this section, it clearly states that there will be periods of continuous noises from explosions or some being for a short duration and they will affect the bird population. The section explicitly states that birds may be killed, injured, or expend their energy trying to get away from the explosions during these activities. This is clearly a negative environmental impact that the military doesn't seem to care about. Our bird population is already in a dangerous state because of the brown tree snake that was	The health of coastal communities, fisheries, and ecosystems is important to the Navy. Section 3.1 (Sediments and Water Quality) concludes that chemical, physical, and biological changes to sediment or water quality would be measurable but below applicable standards, regulations, and guidelines, and would be within the existing conditions or designated uses. The Navy complies with all applicable laws and regulations. The military is committed to protecting the environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities. A comprehensive analysis of potential effects on environmental resources from Navy training and testing activities is presented in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. These resources include sediments and water quality, marine habitats, marine mammals, fishes, sea turtles, marine birds, and marine invertebrates. While some impacts would occur from training and testing activities, the analysis concludes that impacts would be minimal and would not have a significant impact on the environment. Also, as described in Section 2.3.3 (Standard Operating Procedures) and Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy implements, to the maximum extent possible, mitigation measures during its training and testing activities to avoid and minimize impacts on marine and cultural resources.

	Comment	Navy Response
	introduced to the islands through US military cargo. The military as a so-called "responsible environmental steward" is clearly irresponsible, as we have seen historically in the region and in this EIS. The proposal to increase the training area is also alarming because it will not only affect the Marianas, but also the surrounding areas. The military is ignoring the fact that the chemicals, explosives, munitions and other military wastes don't have borders. These lines that the military drew up for the training site don't exist in nature. The environment has no borders. It is clear that these activities will affect the people and other species living in this region as outlined in section 3.0 of Volume I, regarding the affected environment and environmental consequences. Our water and air quality are in even more danger with this MITT in combination with the militarization at Litekyan, which sits on the water lens and limestone forests. The military has shown in the past, and also recently with the pool tablets in the drinking water, that they can't even provide quality water for their dependents living on base. How much more can we trust the military to protect the environment? The EIS also fails to outline how this will affect future generations, especially with the ongoing obstacles from climate change. These proposed training activities for the MITT are not sustainable practices in such a critical period for our region and the rest of the world, regarding climate change. If the military were to truly be a responsible steward of the environment, then it should seriously consider that these activities outlined are not for the protection of the environment and are clearly destructive. It should also take into consideration climate change as a threat multiplier and	

	Comment	Navy Response
	how these activities will add to the progression of climate change, thus further increasing chances of conflict. The proposed training in these areas as being "responsible" is blatant disrespect for the Chamoru people, all those who call Guahan home, and their environment. It makes no consideration for the wellbeing of the environment in these areas and the people inhabiting these islands, especially not the generations to come.	
Alicia Mafnas (AM)		
AM-01	Please do not proceed with the testing in our ocean! We need to protect our sea animals and waters! Think about how it will negatively affect our environment and economy! Think about our future, our children, your children! Sonar training will especially kill our whales and dolphins... Imagine future generations never knowing these incredibly intelligent and majestic creatures. Please listen to our outcry. Please have a heart. Si yu'us ma'ase	Marine life and marine habitat are important to the Navy. Using the latest science and technology, the Navy completed extensive analyses and computer-based modeling to determine impacts and develop science-based protective measures to reduce or avoid potential impacts on marine life. Potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Also, as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), the Navy implements, to the maximum extent practicable, procedural and geographic mitigation measures during its training and testing activities to reduce potential impacts on marine life. The Navy's analysis indicates that, with implementation of its protective mitigation measures, there would be no significant impacts on marine species.
Victoria Espaldon (VE)		
VE-01	I am completely against DOD's Marianas island testing renewal/expansion.	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities. This Navy Supplemental EIS/OEIS does not propose any geographic expansion of the training and testing area.
Maria Calori (MC)		
MC-01	EIS Comments The NEPA process itself is flawed in that it puts the perpetrator of the action in power and leaves the (lay)	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.

	Comment	Navy Response
	citizens being affected at a disadvantage as the accusers - long documents written in military jargon expected to be read and analyzed in short amounts of time. Comments received are expected to be concise and specific, backed by science. WE, the citizens, are innocent until proven guilty - not you, U.S. Department of Defense (/Department of the Interior) ; You have been proven guilty over and over and over again. The Marshall Islands, Sumay, Hagåtña, my grandparents, my parents - living (dying) proof of your trespasses. I reject any and all military training in and around Guam and the Mariånas. Bombing, Firing ranges, jets fueling and flying overhead, and war training exercises all have a negative impact on all living species most especially native species of sea mammals, fruit bats, monitor lizards, butterflies (and other native insects), trees, shrubs, plants (used in native medicines). Guam's limestone forests are very limited and species that depend on that habitat are struggling to survive. The northern islands allow us to research and learn more about our pristine habitats and how to ensure the survival of species threatened in Guam. As a people, the CHamoru and other locals suffer from high rates of cancer and illness resulting from exposure to chemicals specifically used by the U.S. military. Military exercises also have an emotional and mental impact on the community at large, please refer to and read in entirety "Colonial Dis-Ease: US Navy Health Policies and the Chamorros of Guam, 1898–1941 (Pacific Islands Monographs Series)" by Anne Perez Hattori.	

	Comment	Navy Response
Stephanie Piper (SP)		
SP-01	We need to project our oceans, ocean life, and the corals! I'm standing up for what is right for environment.	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.
Rebecca Delafield (RD)		
RD-01	I wish to comment on the plans to continue the bombing of Farallon de Medinilla, the expanded military exercises in the Mariana Islands and the waters surrounding. I feel that the process has neglected to account for significant environmental and cultural impacts on the island and ocean environments. Specifically, the bombing of Pagan, which has historical sites and until relatively recently had residents that were able to live off the land, is akin to the bombing of Kaho'olawe in the Hawaiian Islands. The cleanup of Kaho'olawe is still ongoing after nearly two decades and serves as a disturbing illustration of the both the damage that can be inflicted by bombing and the historic inadequacy of U.S. military to address the harm done. This should not be replicated in Pagan and Tinian, resulting in the citizens of the islands to bear the cost through loss of access to these historic treasures and through having to clean up after it is no longer found useful to the military. The environmental impacts related to the use of Naval sonar and underwater are explosives are a serious concern and to date, the extent of the impact to marine mammals is unclear. The fact that there are restrictions in place for areas in Hawaiian waters, but those same protections have not been included in this Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS points to a disregard for the science that we have and suggests that other scientific concerns might be ignored in this assessment in order to pursue the Navy's stated aims.	The Navy is not proposing any geographic expansion of the training and testing area in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Proposed activities are similar to those conducted in the Study Area for decades. Training and testing activities within this Supplemental EIS/OEIS are proposed to occur at sea and on FDM. Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2 in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) present the current and proposed training and testing activities. The Proposed Action does not include Pagan. The potential effects of sonar and explosives on marine mammals are quantitatively estimated using the Navy's Acoustics Effects Model (see the technical report *Quantifying Acoustic Impacts on Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles: Methods and Analytical Approach for Phase III Training and Testing*, available on the project website). Predicted effects from sonar on marine mammals are presented by species in Section 3.4.2.1.2.3 (Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers Under the Action Alternatives) and from explosives in Section 3.4.2.2.2.3 (Impacts from Explosive Stressors Under the Action Alternatives). No mortality or direct injury to any marine mammals is predicted. Appendix I (Geographic Mitigation Assessment) details three areas, one in Agat Bay off Guam and two off Saipan, as geographic mitigation areas where training and testing activities using explosives would be prohibited, and surface ship hull-mounted MF1 mid-frequency active sonar would be prohibited or restricted seasonally. In this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy cites peer-reviewed scientific publications and government reports that document the latest research on marine mammals. The Navy has reviewed those publications and completed extensive analyses and computer-based modeling to determine impacts and develop science-based protective measures to reduce or avoid potential impacts

	Comment	Navy Response
		on marine life. Potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Also, as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), the Navy implements, to the maximum extent practicable, procedural and geographic mitigation measures during its training and testing activities to reduce potential impacts on marine life. The Navy's analysis indicates that, with implementation of its protective mitigation measures, there would be no significant impacts on marine species.
Justine Guzman (JG)		
JG-01	How does one do think about doing something on purpose knowing it has a big effect on marine life? LIFE! Living things will be affected. I'm hoping and praying that whoever has the last word on this decision, puts themselves in our shoes, our shoes that walk daily on this beautiful island we call home. I hope that they come to realize how life threatening this is and says NO on moving forward with having our oceans compromised any more than they already are. Please also think about our future generations so that they may grow up with clean water, land and air.	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.
Maria Barcinas (MB)		
MB-01	I oppose the expansion and renewal of the Mariana Islands Training and Testing outlined in this proposal. I believe that the military can conduct sufficient realistic training and testing without the use of live fire detonations the waters of the Marianas. These trainings will harm our ocean and negatively impact our ability to live sustainably through decrease in the overall health of the environment. Public information regarding the results and harm to the environment and sea life as a result of the training needs	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities. The Navy is not proposing any geographic expansion of the training and testing area in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Proposed activities are similar to those conducted in the Study Area for decades.

	Comment	Navy Response
	should be increased and shared within a more timely manner to create more effective mitigation strategies.	
Kathleen Bejado (KB)		
KB-01	Håfa Adai, Militarism on Guahan has posed detrimental effects to the island for a long time now. We have been losing our identity as a culture because of colonization and now we are losing our lands because of it as well. Research has already proven that these testings will harm and kill our sea life - which is something of great importance to our culture. The world is already seeing effects due to climate change like rising sea levels, coral bleaching, and ocean acidification. Our island cannot withstand any more issues when we are already dealing with so much. Please take all of these comments into consideration and think about the future of our island and of our people. Our lands and our oceans mean the world to us... they are a part of who we are as people, I hope you understand that. Si Yu'os Må'åse'	Training and testing activities are proposed to occur at sea and on FDM. Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2 in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS present current and proposed training and testing activities. The Navy analyzed land-based activities on Guam, Saipan, Tinian, and Rota in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS; the Navy did not reanalyze land-based activities in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS because there are no changes proposed to those land-based activities.
Tina Grandinetti (TG)		
TG-01	I am writing to express serious concerns about the environmental impacts of the MITT. 1. Training and testing activities will limit access to the ocean and its fishing resources. Though the EIS says these will only be temporary, even short-term denial of access can have profound impacts on the cultural rights of Chamorro people as well as impacts to tourism. 2. In areas where live fire training occurs, or where access is	Marine life and marine habitat are important to the Navy. Using the latest science and technology, the Navy completed extensive analyses and computer-based modeling to determine impacts and develop science-based protective measures to reduce or avoid potential impacts on marine life. Potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Also, as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), the Navy implements, to the maximum extent practicable, procedural and geographic mitigation measures during its training and testing activities to reduce potential impacts on marine life. The Navy's analysis indicates that, with implementation

	Comment	Navy Response
	temporarily restricted, contamination and pollution is likely. What happens to the people who return to those areas for fishing or recreation. The US Military has a well-documented history of contaminating Micronesia and leaving its people to suffer the health effects of such contamination. Any proposal should be accompanied with extensive, binding, and well-funded plans for cleanup. 3. The EIS says there will not be substantial impact on marine mammals. This contradicts studies conducted by both marine scientists and the Navy itself. In a previous EIS draft, the Navy admitted that the sonar exercises planned for 2014-2018 may unintentionally "harm marine mammals 2.8 million times over five years." While the EIS states that the majority of these harms will only be "harassment", harassment at this magnitude and frequency will have detrimental effects. 4. I am deeply concerned with the proposal to increase the number of naval surface fire explosive rounds fired on Noʻos [Farallon de Medinilla]. This does immense, undeniable, and probably irreversible damage to an island ecosystem and repeats the crimes that the US military committed on Kahoʻolawe. The US Military consistently fails to rehabilitate damaged ecosystems. Noʻos is part of the cultural and physical heritage of the Chamorro people. 5. The Supplemental EIS for the MITT does not include the full disclosure of the cumulative impacts associated with the massive live-fire ranges and transit corridors that connect California, Hawaii, and the Marianast. Pitt et al (2019) reported that pathways for invasive species opened by the massive live-fire range and the Marines Relocation to Guam activities are highly likely to bring numerous invasive species	of its protective mitigation measures, there would be no significant impacts on marine species. This Supplemental EIS/OEIS does not propose a change to the ocean areas currently used by both the Navy and the public. Restrictions on accessing areas of co-use would continue to be relatively infrequent and short term, while other fishing and tourism sites in the Study Area would continue to be available to the public. The military is committed to continuing to work with the local community on issues that potentially affect the public, including access to fishing sites. The use of explosive ordnance during training and testing activities occurs on FDM, at locations far from shore, and at a few areas closer to shore specifically designated for certain types of explosives (e.g., Outer Apra Harbor UNDET Site). Refer to Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) for details on where training and testing activities using explosives would occur and maps depicting the locations of nearshore ranges and areas where explosives may be used. FDM has been used as a target area for both explosive and non-explosive munitions since 1971. Between 1997 and 2012, the Navy has conducted 14 underwater scientific surveys around the island, providing a consistent, long term investigation of a single site where munitions have been used regularly (Smith & Marx, 2016). Marine life assessed during these surveys included algae, corals, benthic invertebrates, sharks, rays, bony fishes, and sea turtles. The investigators found no evidence, over the 16-year period, that the condition of the physical or biological resources had been adversely impacted to a significant degree by the training activities (Smith & Marx, 2016). Furthermore, they found that the health, abundance, and biomass of fishes, corals, and other marine resources were as good as, or better than, those in similar habitats elsewhere in the Mariana Archipelago. The authors concluded that restricting access to the islands has created a de facto marine preserve for many reef fish species targeted by fishers. Explosive ordnance used far offshore sinks to the seafloor where water depths are several hundred meters or more, and little to no light is present. Water temperatures at these depths approach freezing temperature

	Comment	Navy Response
	to the region. It is also completely arbitrary to review these ranges and transit corridors separately, as the impacts on the Pacific Ocean and cumulative. The US Military has effectively turned huge swaths of the Pacific into its training area.	and, under these conditions, the degradation rate of metals, including ordnance, is extremely slow. Ordnance and other expended materials that become buried in soft sediments where little to no oxygen penetrates would degrade even more slowly. Under these conditions, constituent materials and other degradation products, most of which occur naturally in the marine environment, would be released into the environment slowly and in areas inaccessible to humans (see Section 3.1 (Sediments and Water Quality) for details. The potential effects of sonar and explosives on marine mammals are quantitatively estimated using the Navy's Acoustics Effects Model (see the technical report *Quantifying Acoustic Impacts on Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles: Methods and Analytical Approach for Phase III Training and Testing*, available on the project website, for details on the quantitative methodology). Predicted effects from sonar on marine mammals are presented by species in Section 3.4.2.1.2.3 (Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers Under the Action Alternatives) and from explosives in Section 3.4.2.2.2.3 (Impacts from Explosive Stressors Under the Action Alternatives). No mortality or direct injury to any marine mammals is predicted. The Navy has supported multi-year dive surveys of waters surrounding FDM since 1999, with the most recent dive survey available from 2017. While nearshore impacts can occur from errant ordnance targeted at FDM; these impacts are short term and localized, with no evidence of coral reef or other habitat. In 2017, the Navy funded additional surveys in the nearshore areas of FDM. The results were approved for public release in September 2018, and available at https://apps.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/1069450.pdf. The 2017 survey found little evidence that training has affected coral communities at FDM. Only three relatively fresh ordnance items were observed, but no blast pits, craters, or significant areas of coral breakage were observed. The ordnance observed during the 2017 survey was almost exclusively old, encrusted in marine life, and had no discernable impact on surrounding communities. The paper by Smith and Marx (2016) cited in Section 3.4 (Marine Mammals) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS concludes that the habitat surrounding FDM is as good as, or better than, other areas in the CNMI and that restricting access to the

	Comment	Navy Response
		island and nearshore waters has resulted in the area becoming a “de facto” marine preserve. The vast majority of takes under the MMPA noted in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS are Level B harassment involving behavioral response which have the "potential to disturb behavioral patterns," and involve no physical harm or injury. As noted in Appendix E (Estimated Marine Mammal and Sea Turtle Impacts from Exposure to Acoustic and Explosive Stressors Under Navy Training and Testing Activities) and in the species breakdown in Section 3.4 (Marine Mammals), these instances of Level B harassment take place over many species, many stocks, and many locations; not to specific populations or critically endangered species in particular. While the Navy models all of its activities to estimate the potential number of takes of marine mammals by species, to overall totals is an over estimation due to various reasons listed in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Research cited in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS and in the MITT 2015 Final EIS/OEIS indicates that behavioral changes are temporary and not necessarily repeated. The Navy has addressed recent research on possible long-term effects in Section 3.4.2.1.1.7 (Long-Term Consequences) in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS and in Section 3.4.3.1.3 (Long-Term Consequences to the Individual and the Population) in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Based on this research, long-term effects to individuals and populations from short-term, intermittent noise exposures are not anticipated. Potential impacts on marine mammals are further reduced by mitigation that will be implemented for all activities using sonar and explosives. In addition, the Navy has developed three geographic mitigation areas in the MITT Study Area (see Appendix I, Geographic Mitigation Assessment) where the use of explosives would be prohibited, and surface ship hull-mounted MF1 mid-frequency active sonar would be prohibited or restricted seasonally. The U.S. Navy recognizes the importance of biosecurity, ecological integrity, and resiliency of island ecosystems to the potential introduction of invasive species to the Mariana Islands associated with military training and testing. The Navy has a number of policies in place to prevent, interdict, and control invasive species introductions in both terrestrial and marine environments. Specific federal and Navy policies for marine invasive species can be found at: Public Law 104-332,

	Comment	Navy Response
		National Invasive Species Act of 1996, Executive Order 13112 (Invasive Species) and amended by Executive Order 13751 (Safeguarding the Nation from the Impacts of Invasive Species), OPNAV M-5090.1 Chapter 35-3.19. (Ship and Ballast Water), M-5090.1 Chapter 35-3.1 (Environmentally Sound Ships), and M-5090.1 Chapter 12-3.9 (Invasive Species).
Elsa Pangelinan (EP)		
EP-01	I completely disagree with the United States Military using part of the Mariana Islands as a military field which includes activities such as bombing, training, and other related ones. Our islands pristine water, island and air is what gives life to people and animals. Destroying natural habitats and ecosystems of animals greatly place them at risk for extinction and possibly low count of population. Military activities affect the physical environment in the following ways: 1) pollution if the air, land, and water 2) immediate long term side effects of natural resources damaged 3) nuclear weapons development and production 4) land use 5) militarization of outer space	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities. Using the latest science and technology, the Navy completed extensive analyses and computer-based modeling to determine impacts and develop science-based protective measures to reduce or avoid potential impacts on marine life. Potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Also, as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), the Navy implements, to the maximum extent practicable, procedural and geographic mitigation measures during its training and testing activities to reduce potential impacts on marine life. The Navy's analysis indicates that, with implementation of its protective mitigation measures, there would be no significant impacts on marine species.
Anna Hawkins (AH)		
AH-01	We respect the military for their sacrifices now can the military respect what's left of our culture, land and ocean? Why remember what it was when we can work with what we have and make things better. I get we need to defend ourselves with weapons but have you ever wonder the biggest weapon we can use is love and not fear. When we all	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.

	Comment	Navy Response
	stand together as 1 fighting for the same cause. This is worst then going into a country and bombing it and stripping their rights!! These animals can't defend themselves from the only home they know and these animals all play a part in our life. Please remember we have one home we call Earth!!	
Christian Oasay (CO)		
CO-01	100% AGAINST this military training. The environment is still trying to recover from all other previous trainings conducted. I'm from Hawaii and we know how devastating the tests can end up. You've already done enough damage to the land and now you want to start damaging the oceans. These tests are gonna have such a negative impact on our planet. Pretty sure there are more options to practice training than this current proposal.	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.
Siobhon McManus (SM)		
SM-01	https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fmars.2017.00295/full from this article by Dr. E. C. M. Parsons, George Mason University "The risks military sonar poses to cetaceans received international attention with a highly-publicized mass stranding of Cuvier's beaked whales (Ziphius cavirostris), Blainville's beaked whales (Mesoplodon densirostris), and northern minke whales (Balaenoptera acutorostrata) in the Bahamas in 2000. This was the first time that the US Government determined a stranding to be the result of mid-frequency active sonar use. Subsequently attention has been drawn to other mass strandings coincident with naval	Marine life and habitat is also important to the Navy. The Navy trains worldwide, not just in the MITT Study Area. Using the latest science and technology, the Navy completed extensive analyses and computer-based modeling to determine impacts and develop science-based protective measures to reduce or avoid potential impacts on marine life. The Navy's acoustic effects model predicts that the vast majority of marine mammals' exposures to acoustic stressors (sonar and explosives) would cause temporary changes in behavior. Potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Also, as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), the Navy implements, to the maximum extent practicable, procedural and geographic mitigation measures during its training and testing activities to reduce potential impacts on marine life. The Navy's analysis indicates that, with implementation of its protective mitigation measures, there would be no significant impacts on marine species.

	Comment	Navy Response
	exercises, including events preceding the 2000 mass stranding. The list of species for which mass strandings have been linked to naval exercises has also increased to include other beaked whales, dwarf and pygmy sperm whales (Kogia spp.), pilot whales (Globicephala spp.), several dolphin species (Stenella sp. and Delphinus delphis), and harbor porpoises (Phocoena phocoena). In particular, there have been several mass strandings in the northern Indian Ocean coincident with naval exercises—including one of the largest (200–250 dolphins)—which have received little attention. Changes in beaked whale behavior, including evasive maneuvering, have been recorded at received levels below <100 dB re 1 µPa (rms) and mass stranding may occur at received levels potentially as low as 150–170 dB re 1 µPa. There is strong scientific evidence to suggest that a wide range of whale, dolphin and porpoise species can also be impacted by sound produced during military activities, with significant effects occurring at received levels lower than previously predicted. Although there are many stranding events that have occurred coincident with the presence of naval vessels or exercises, it is important to emphasize that even the absence of strandings in a region does not equate to an absence of deaths, i.e., absence of evidence does not mean evidence of absence. Strandings may be undetected, or be unlikely to be observed because of a lack of search effort or due to coastal topography or characteristics. There may also be "hidden" impacts of sonar and exercises not readily observable (e.g., stress responses). Due to the level of uncertainty related to this issue, ongoing baseline monitoring for cetaceans in exercise areas is important and managers should take a precautionary approach to mitigating impacts and protecting species."	As explained in the Navy's technical report on marine mammal strandings (*Marine Mammal Strandings Associated with U.S. Navy Sonar Activities*, 2017 [www.mitt-eis.com]), marine mammal strandings have been a historic and ongoing occurrence attributed to a variety of causes, both natural and anthropogenic. Over the last 50 years, increased awareness and reporting has led to more information about species affected and raised concerns about anthropogenic sources of stranding. While there have been limited numbers of marine mammal mortalities potentially associated with U.S. Navy activities, the root causes are not clear in most cases. NMFS, as the regulator, maintains the authoritative National Stranding Database. The Center for Naval Analysis (CNA) also recently conducted a statistical study of correlation of beaked whale strandings around the Mariana Islands with the use of U.S. Navy sonar, finding that insufficient evidence of a correlation exists. The CNA study used the complete record of all U.S. Navy sonar use between 2007 and 2019, including major training events, joint exercises, and unit level training/testing. The analysis also included the complete beaked whale stranding record for the Mariana Islands through 2019. Following the methods in Simonis et al. (2020), the CNA analysis found insufficient evidence of a correlation between sonar use and beaked whale strandings when considering the complete sonar use record. The CNA finding is in contrast to the finding in Simonis et al. (2020), which depicted a significant correlation between beaked whale strandings and Navy sonar use. However, the Simonis et al. (2020) result relied on substantially incomplete or inaccurate assumptions about U.S. Navy sonar use around the Mariana Islands. CNA also conducted statistical analyses specific to each island where beaked whale strandings have been observed in the Mariana Islands, similarly finding insufficient evidence of a correlation to sonar use. Additional information on the findings of the CNA analysis are presented in Section 3.4.2.1.1.6 (Stranding) in Chapter 3.4 (Marine Mammals). Section 3.4.2.1.1.6 (Stranding) has been expanded to include additional information about strandings of beaked whales in the Mariana Islands and the Navy's support of efforts to better understand the causes of marine mammal

	Comment	Navy Response
	In January of this year, an 11-foot 1,000-pound beaked whale was found on the reef flats of Agat and then Dadi Beach on Naval Base. The MITT-EIS does not account for numerous studies linking US Navy sonar testing to damaging effects on cetaceans. The MITT-EIS is insufficient in gauging the negative impact these testings will specifically have on cetaceans within the Marianas Islands region. More independent studies are needed. A tangential note: The MITT-EIS is completely inaccessible to the general public — in language, length, and response time. We have never been given an adequate amount of time or resources to properly digest and disseminate the information within this statement, let alone gather substantial responses from our communities.	strandings. As part of the MMPA consultation with NMFS, a stranding plan will be developed that details Navy actions in the event of a mass stranding that would be potentially linked to Navy activities. NMFS is the lead agency for stranding response and Navy will continue to support NMFS as required and outlined in the stranding plan. As described in Section 5.1.2.2.1 (Marine Species Research and Monitoring Programs), for this Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy agreed to several additional research and monitoring initiatives designed to help advance the understanding of beaked whales and strandings in the MITT Study Area. The Navy will co-fund the Pacific Marine Assessment Program for Protected Species (PACMAPPS) Mariana Islands survey in spring-summer 2021 and future studies starting in 2022 to help document beaked whale occurrence, abundance, and distribution in the Mariana Islands. The Navy will also fund additional stranding response and necropsy analyses for the Pacific Islands region, and research on a framework to improve statistical stranding analysis. Collaboratively with NMFS, the Navy will fund and organize an expert panel to provide recommendations on scientific data gaps and uncertainties for further protective measure consideration to minimize potential impacts of Navy training and testing activities on beaked whales in the Mariana Islands. The Navy understands the complexity of the information presented within this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. This Supplemental EIS/OEIS contains a rigorous scientific analysis of the potential impacts of the Navy's proposal and thoroughly explains the scientific methodology, analysis methods, and findings. The Navy attempts to explain challenging concepts, methods, and the results of the analysis as clearly as possible in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS and developed public informational materials for lay audiences. The Navy prepared project brochures, videos, a website, and posters, using layperson terms, to enhance public understanding of the information presented in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. A project fact sheet was also translated into Chamorro. The informational materials, including the translated fact sheet, were made available at all four public meetings and on the project website (http://mitt-eis.com/). To better accommodate stakeholders and the public, the Navy provided 75 days to review and comment on the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, which is 30 days longer than the minimum required time for review. Due to the effects of

	Comment	Navy Response
		Typhoon Wutip, Navy officials postponed the public meetings originally scheduled for Feb. 26 and 27, 2019. The Navy held the rescheduled meetings on March 18 and 19, 2019 in Saipan and Guam respectively. The Navy also added meetings on Tinian (March 14, 2019) and Rota (March 15, 2019). Public notice of the rescheduled public meetings was published multiple days in the Marianas Variety, Pacific Daily News, and Saipan Tribune. The Navy issued a press release and mailed over 500 postcards to individuals and organizations.
Mary Dema-ala (MD)		
MD-01	As a citizen of the United States, a resident of Guam, and a human being on this planet Earth...this military training area will not only affect our corals and local environment but will also endanger the planet we live on. We do not need this training area. We do not want this training area. Please put a stop to this NOW.	Marine life and habitat is also important to the Navy. The Navy avoids areas where coral reefs are present to the greatest extent practicable. Long-term surveys of nearshore waters and habitat surrounding FDM have shown very little disturbance from Navy activities. These surveys also indicate that the health, abundance, and biomass of fishes, corals, and other marine resources in those habitats are as good as, or better than, those in similar habitats elsewhere in the Mariana Archipelago (see Smith and Marx, 2016). Potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Also, as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), the Navy implements, to the maximum extent practicable, procedural and geographic mitigation measures during its training and testing activities to reduce potential impacts on marine life. The Navy's analysis indicates that, with implementation of its protective mitigation measures, there would be no significant impacts on marine species.
Madison Coveno (MC)		
MC-01	Our oceans are already under so much threat from plastic pollution and overfishing. Runoff from industrial agriculture is causing ocean dead-zones and global warming is causing coral bleaching. Guam in particular has already lost so much of our coral reef, and we are home to 2 species of endangered sea turtles. And long-range sonar can affect whales, dolphins, and other sea life even from far away! Our oceans are part of our ecosystem, if we destroy them it will	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.

	Comment	Navy Response
	affect not only our ability to enjoy the outdoors and observe beautiful animals (a major source of tourism money on Guam, by the way), but will actually threaten our survival- the oceans help absorb CO2 from the air and slow global warming. PLEASE do not destroy our oceans any further with unnecessary military exercises. Please consider alternate ways of conducting training, and keep any potentially destructive practices to a bare minimum. Harassing endangered species is against the law- please hold the military to a high standard when it comes to environmental protection!	
AJ Taimanglo (AJT)		
AJT-01	I sat thinking about how to write a "substantive" comment that contains practical importance, value, or effect. I proceeded looking through the extremely lengthy documents you've posted trying to extract information that highlight why you shouldn't proceed with further testing and training. After a while, I realized that it was completely silly. It would be foolish of me to repeat what you already know. You know that without a doubt that what you are doing is harmful to the Chamoru people and our environment. This commenting process is but a mere formality when considering that the military has a legacy of taking without asking. The "practical importance, value, or effect" that I offer is that I AM A NATIVE of this land that you will be destroying yet again and who will feel the aftermath of further training and testing long after you leave. It is heartbreaking knowing that it is the Chamoru people who will have to endure the mess you've made and our responsibility to heal it. There is still	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.

	Comment	Navy Response
	room for you to change the legacy you've created for yourselves by listening to the Chamoru people and actually considering our well-being. Testing and training for the sake of "security" is not an excuse nor will it ever be.	
Camarin Meno (CM)		
CM-01	I do not support this initiative. I believe it will be harmful to CHamoru cultural heritage sites, and believe it will harm existing CHamoru cultural practices. I also believe that the initiative has failed to fully examine the effects on our marine life. More importantly, I am in strong disagreement with the manner in which this initiative has been carried out, without the consent of the people of the Mariana Islands.	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities. Section 3.11.1.3 (Cultural/Traditional Practices and Beliefs) has been added to this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. This Supplemental EIS/OEIS analyzes effects of the Proposed Action on marine resources. This analysis is presented in Section 3.3 (Marine Habitats), Section 3.4 (Marine Mammals), Section 3.5 (Sea Turtles), Section 3.7 (Marine Vegetation), Section 3.8 (Marine Invertebrates), and Section 3.9 (Fishes).
Shannon McManus (SM)		
SM-01	The proposed expansion for this training area in our Pacific region and all U.S military training in our region should be put to a stop. As Pacific Islanders, we are the most vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change in our islands and seas, which have only been accelerated by the military industrial complex's rampant pollution and destruction caused by these kinds of training exercises. We cannot continue to allow military "preparedness" for wars the US has no business fighting to take precedence over all manner of life being threatened by these trainings. The harmful toxic waste, the destruction of our coral reefs that lead to a lack of biodiversity in sea life, making us more vulnerable to rising sea levels / storm driven waves, whale beachings and deaths from sonar testing - none of it should be collateral. The	The Navy is not proposing any geographic expansion of the training and testing area in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Proposed activities are similar to those conducted in the Study Area for decades. The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.

	Comment	Navy Response
	people of the Pacific are not, should never be collateral damage for the US Department of Defense.	
April Silvestre (AS)		
ASi-01	By proceeding with the mistreatment of the waters surrounding the island, disastrous consequences will arise that will not only affect the ocean environment itself, but the island environment that benefits from a healthy ocean ecosystem. But seeing as how this is common sense, I will also attempt to appeal to emotion and ask that this island is given the respect it deserves as it is not only a home, but a life that deserves to be protected.	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.
Christabel Calicdan (ChC)		
ChC-01	It starts with us the people of earth to make a change, all unnecessary testing in the oceans are changing and harming us along with the planet and the animals. We all are affected. Global warming is happening why not make a change to save earth and our people, also our kids so they may have a future and a place to call home! We must make a stand now more than ever, no more saying oh it's ok someone else will pick up our mess, NO! It's time we all stand and unite and stop hurting earth, animals, and our people!	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.
Pika Fejeran (PF)		
PF-01	I wholeheartedly object to training and testing in the waters of the Marianas. Our waters are some of the most diverse- definitely the most diverse in the US. Why use our waters for these trainings and testings? Find another location where large ocean mammals will not be harmed. There is no way that the military's new technology is harmless to whales and other ocean mammals- in fact, quite the opposite- we have already seen the stranding and needless death of whales that were trying to escape the sonar or whatever testing is already happening. To expand the scope and area of testing will	The Navy is not proposing any geographic expansion of the training and testing area in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Proposed activities are similar to those conducted in the Study Area for decades. Marine life and marine habitat are important to the Navy. Using the latest science and technology, the Navy completed extensive analyses and computer-based modeling to determine impacts and develop science-based protective measures to reduce or avoid potential impacts on marine life. Potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of this

	Comment	Navy Response
	multiply the negative effects and will harm the ocean we call home.	Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Also, as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), the Navy implements, to the maximum extent practicable, procedural and geographic mitigation measures during its training and testing activities to reduce potential impacts on marine life. The Navy's analysis indicates that, with implementation of its protective mitigation measures, there would be no significant impacts on marine species.
Mario Martinez (MaM)		
MaM-01	The Mariana Islands should not be used for training and testing. It adversely affects the natural resources for a temporary goal. The Marianas islands has been governed by many nations in the past. They come and go. It is not ok for the current occupying nation to destroy the very limited resources the Marianas currently has just so the occupier can train their military. There is far more space and opportunity to train in the continental United States, train there.	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.
Marissa Wright (MW)		
MW-01	I oppose any further military development on Guam. These plans are disrespectful and waste of funding and resources. Guam's fragile environment should be protected and preserved at all times.	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.
Chloe Babauta (CB)		
CB-01	I am concerned for the state of Guam's marine life and environment, due to potential environmental impacts of the proposed action for the Mariana Islands training and testing. I am speaking in opposition to these detrimental effects to the island and its ocean surroundings. The following points are outlined based on information from the draft supplemental EIS at www.MITT-EIS.com. Most of the explosive military expended materials would	Marine life and marine habitat are important to the Navy. Using the latest science and technology, the Navy completed extensive analyses and computer-based modeling to determine impacts and develop science-based protective measures to reduce or avoid potential impacts on marine life. Potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Also, as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), the Navy implements, to the maximum extent practicable, procedural and geographic mitigation measures during its training and testing activities to reduce potential impacts on marine life. The Navy's analysis indicates that, with implementation

	Comment	Navy Response
	detonate at or near the water surface. Training activities that include bottom-laid in-water explosions would affect marine habitat structure. Bottom substrates could be disturbed by vessel and in-water device strikes, military expended materials, seafloor devices used for military readiness activities, and from walking, standing, or swimming in the nearshore waters. The use of sonar and other transducers would have the potential to expose marine mammals to sound-producing activities which would present risks that could range from a temporary or permanent threshold shift, auditory masking, physiological stress, or behavioral responses. The use of munitions in the water or near the water's surface present a risk to marine mammals in close proximity to the explosion, because the resulting shock waves can cause injury or result in the death of an animal. Bottom-feeding marine mammals would be more likely to encounter expended materials that have already sunk to the floor. In the unlikely event that a marine mammal encounters and ingests expended material, the individual might be negatively affected if the material becomes lodged in the digestive tract. Marine mammals would be exposed to multiple secondary causes of impact associated with training and testing activities in the study area. In-water explosions have the potential to injure or kill prey species that marine mammals feed on. The use of sonar and other transducers, explosives, in-water electromagnetic devices, vessels and in-water devices, military expended materials, seafloor devices, and military expended materials of ingestible size associated with training	of its protective mitigation measures, there would be no significant impacts on marine species.

	Comment	Navy Response
	and testing activities may affect sea turtles present within the study area. The use of military expended materials and munitions may cause short-term or long-term disturbance to an individual sea turtle due to ingestion of munitions used in training activities. The use of cables and wires, and decelerators/parachutes may cause short-term or long-term disturbance to an individual sea turtle. Physical disturbance and strike and the use of in-water explosives could affect marine vegetation by destroying individual plants or damaging parts of plants. The use of explosives, military extended materials, and seafloor devices during military readiness activities could affect marine vegetation by destroying individual plants or damaging parts of plants. These activities also may affect fishes and marine invertebrates. These activities may result in impacts on commercial, recreational, and traditional fishing practices, or tourism, when areas of co-use are temporarily inaccessible to ensure public safety during training and testing activities. Resources that will be permanently and continually consumed by project implementation include water, electricity, natural gas, and fossil fuels. Greenhouse gas emissions would increase from the baseline by approximately 20 percent.	
Helana Leon Guerrero (HLG)		
HLG-01	Please DO NOT expand the area and frequency of military training for the MIRC in the Pacific Ocean. Your bombs and	The Navy is not proposing any geographic expansion of the training and testing area in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Proposed activities are similar to those

	Comment	Navy Response
	sonar training are negligent toward the natural inhabitants of the ocean. The effects to the aquatic life are massive and detrimental to our livelihood here on the islands. We are real people with love for our land and oceans. We pray, beg, and plead that your eyes will be opened to how badly our land, sea, and culture will suffer.	conducted in the Study Area for decades. The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.
Lena Leishman (LeL)		
LeL-01	Please stop the underwater testing. I am a diver and lover of the water and ocean. The things we do as humans affects the habitats of all of the creatures. Guam already has a huge problem with limited marine life and underwater bombs and tests will put the marine life still at more risk. We have awesome pods of dolphins and manta rays that are dwindling. Our coral beds are dying of from damage and bleaching. Stop the testing and experimenting which can harm and risk this environment and change the Marianas underwater habitat forever!	Marine life and marine habitat are important to the Navy. Using the latest science and technology, the Navy completed extensive analyses and computer-based modeling to determine impacts and develop science-based protective measures to reduce or avoid potential impacts on marine life. Potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Also, as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), the Navy implements, to the maximum extent practicable, procedural and geographic mitigation measures during its training and testing activities to reduce potential impacts on marine life. The Navy's analysis indicates that, with implementation of its protective mitigation measures, there would be no significant impacts on marine species.
Lauren Swaddell (LS)		
LS-01	Obviously, the military's mission is to national security. That is to be respected. However, the health of the ocean's marine life (fish, reptile, mammal, coral, plant, other invertebrates) are all dependent on the suitability of the ocean as their only environment. We as Americans rely on healthy fisheries and healthy coral reef ecosystems. Sonar and explosives will disrupt, damage, or destroy marine life that support our fisheries. Increased instances of beached whales have occurred in the region. With overall ocean health in decline, "minimizing impact" to marine life is not enough. Having zero negative impact on marine life is the minimal requirement to slow the negative impact on our economic and food	Marine life and marine habitat are important to the Navy. Using the latest science and technology, the Navy completed extensive analyses and computer-based modeling to determine impacts and develop science-based protective measures to reduce or avoid potential impacts on marine life. Potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Also, as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), the Navy implements, to the maximum extent practicable, procedural and geographic mitigation measures during its training and testing activities to reduce potential impacts on marine life. The Navy's analysis indicates that, with implementation of its protective mitigation measures, there would be no significant impacts on marine species.

	Comment	Navy Response
	prosperity. Having a positive impact on marine life by aiding natural resource managers with watershed restoration, coral reef restoration, and marine protected areas can boost homeland security, economic security, and food security--all arguably components of national security. Sonar impacts while shown to be disruptive to marine mammals are not completely understood, and using sonar at this stage of a lack of understanding when there are reduced marine mammal populations is irresponsible and a poor example to the world. Further, when coral reef ecosystems are damaged, the reduce the natural ecological services that are vital to the Mariana Islands: fisheries habitats; protection from coastal erosion from wave action, strong storms, and tsunamis; revenue from tourism; cultural enrichment; and recreation. Coral reef ecosystems in the Marianas are already impacted by increased incidences of elevated sea surface temperatures, over-fishing, increased ocean acidity, sedimentation, invasive and nuisance species, disease outbreaks, recreational misuse, boat groundings, abandoned equipment, and pollution. The abandoned casings will be akin to abandoned equipment, and explosives will damage already stressed reef ecosystems in need of recovery. Even if corals are impacted away from military bases, the coral and fish spawning circulations that occur can be disrupted causing population reductions in areas near US military bases. Military bases on Guam benefit from coral ecosystems because most are located near coasts. The reef ecosystems protect those regions and reduce flooding in surrounding areas. These services make military installations safer and make travel/commuting into bases by military personnel safer as well. Other benefits corals have been the potential for important pharmaceutical discoveries, such as the ones that treat various cancers and HIV. The Marianas have the	Section 3.8 (Marine Invertebrates) includes an analysis of potential impacts on coral. A detailed analysis of potential impacts on coral around FDM is also provided. Based on the analysis, coral fauna are healthy and robust, and the nearshore physical environment and basic habitat types at FDM would remain unchanged. These conclusions are based on (1) a limited amount of physical damage, (2) very low levels of partial mortality and disease (less than one percent of all species observed), (3) absence of excessive mucus production, (4) good coral recruitment, and (5) complete recovery by 2012 of the 2007 bleaching events. Smith and Marx (2016) also concluded that the health, abundance, and biomass of fishes, corals, and other marine resources at FDM are as good as, or better than, those in similar habitats elsewhere in the Mariana Archipelago. The Navy funded additional reef surveys in the nearshore areas of FDM in 2017. The results were approved for public release in September 2018 and are available at https://apps.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/1069450.pdf. The 2017 survey found little evidence that training has affected coral reef communities at FDM. Only three relatively fresh ordnance items were observed, but no blast pits, craters, or significant areas of coral breakage were observed. The ordnance observed during the 2017 survey was almost exclusively old, encrusted in marine life, and had no discernable impact on surrounding communities.

	Comment	Navy Response
	highest biodiversity (over 200 observed species of coral) in the US (compared to 20-60 in the Caribbean), thus the potential to add to US health security is greater by protecting the Mariana coral reef ecosystems. I urge you to consider using simulations rather than active sonar and explosives over our vulnerable and valuable natural resources that need more help. The benefits that healthy oceans provide are hard to mitigate at the same time scale they would be damaged. The amount of financial resources needed to mitigate could be very high and the economic value these marine and coastal resources provide would be lost if damaged. https://eos.org/articles/new-program-connects-ocean-health-and-national-security https://www.guampdn.com/story/news/2019/03/03/military-proposes-sonar-use-more-whales-wash-up-guams-shores/2865769002/ https://oceanleadership.org/the-state-of-our-ocean/ https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fmars.2016.00087/full https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&source=web&rct=j&url=https://www.boem.gov/Marine-Mammals-And-Noise-Fact-Sheet/&ved=2ahUKEwi4w8DUouzhAhXnUN8KHb2lAZMQFjAEegQIBRAB&usg=AOvVaw0WrU70h2jqjePRl7Y2gyAP&cshid=1556230655197 https://www.icriforum.org/about-coral-reefs/benefits-coral-reefs https://coral.org/coral-reefs-101/why-care-about-reefs/medicine/	
Amber Kirschbaum (AK)		
AK-01	I cannot urge you enough not to carry through with this or rather, the renewal of this. The environment and habitat have already suffered enough. The sonar testing will be of	Marine life and marine habitat are important to the Navy. Using the latest science and technology, the Navy completed extensive analyses and computer-based modeling to determine impacts and develop science-based protective

	Comment	Navy Response
	great detriment to the surrounding ocean wildlife which is already fighting so hard for its preservation.	measures to reduce or avoid potential impacts on marine life. Potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Also, as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), the Navy implements, to the maximum extent practicable, procedural and geographic mitigation measures during its training and testing activities to reduce potential impacts on marine life. The Navy's analysis indicates that, with implementation of its protective mitigation measures, there would be no significant impacts on marine species.
Reina Ross (RR)		
RR-01	Don't expand your testing area! Please. The ocean and sea life are important.	The Navy is not proposing any geographic expansion of the training and testing area in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.
Narcis Nalani (NN)		
NN-01	Please, discontinue your plans. The people of Guam have already suffered and sacrificed enough. I would like future generations to be able to have a place to call home that has not been destroyed, polluted, or bulldozed down due to the military. Our ocean and marine life should not be taken advantage of or destroyed because they do not have a voice of their own.	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities. Using the latest science and technology, the Navy completed extensive analyses and computer-based modeling to determine impacts and develop science-based protective measures to reduce or avoid potential impacts on marine life. Potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Also, as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), the Navy implements, to the maximum extent practicable, procedural and geographic mitigation measures during its training and testing activities to reduce potential impacts on marine life. The Navy's analysis indicates that, with implementation of its protective mitigation measures, there would be no significant impacts on marine species.
Veronica Dydasco (VeD)		
VeD-01	Can we stop bombing around the Marianas? It's cause so much destruction for our people, the land, and ocean. So many people getting sick from the poison you put in our air and the sea life just disappearing before our eyes. It's	Marine life and marine habitat are important to the Navy. Using the latest science and technology, the Navy completed extensive analyses and computer-based modeling to determine impacts and develop science-based protective measures to reduce or avoid potential impacts on marine life. Potential effects

	Comment	Navy Response
	heartbreaking because I feel like we don't matter. I know we're just a small island in the middle of nowhere but we are real people that want what's best for our lives and home. I know it seems like some of us just want to fight for what we want but we really just want you guys to understand where we are coming from and help make it better. Please help the Marianas and the aquatic life by bombing no more.	from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Also, as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), the Navy implements, to the maximum extent practicable, procedural and geographic mitigation measures during its training and testing activities to reduce potential impacts on marine life. The Navy's analysis indicates that, with implementation of its protective mitigation measures, there would be no significant impacts on marine species.
Demiliza Saramosing (DS)		
DS-01	My name is Demiliza Saramosing, a PhD student at American Studies at the University of Minnesota. As a graduate student that is invested in decolonial and Indigenous sovereignty scholarship and activism in Hawai'i and the Oceania context, I am alarmed by the potential negative environmental consequences of the MITT. For example, Section 3.4.2.1.5 notes that marine mammals would be "…exposed to sounds caused by the firing of weapons, objects in flight, and inert impact of non-explosive munitions on the water's surface… these are impulsive sounds generated in close vicinity to or at the water surface, with the exception of items that are launched underwater." In addition, in section 3.3.2.1, the EIS states that "...mine warfare training and testing activities utilizing bottom placed detonations would only occur in the existing mine warfare underwater detonation areas at Piti, Agat, and Outer Apra Harbor." It is important to note that these areas are all populated by civilians and that fisherman, tourists, and young locals often visit and swim in the area. Furthermore, in section 3.0.4.2.1.1., the EIS elaborates that "Detonations would typically occur in waters greater than 200 ft. in depth, and greater than 3 NM from shore, with the exception of existing mine warfare areas, including Outer Apra Harbor,	Marine life and marine habitat are important to the Navy. Using the latest science and technology, the Navy completed extensive analyses and computer-based modeling to determine impacts and develop science-based protective measures to reduce or avoid potential impacts on marine life. Potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Also, as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), the Navy implements, to the maximum extent practicable, procedural and geographic mitigation measures during its training and testing activities to reduce potential impacts on marine life. The Navy's analysis indicates that, with implementation of its protective mitigation measures, there would be no significant impacts on marine species. Underwater detonations take place in designated areas that are located away from popular dive sites, primarily for human safety. See Section 2.3.3.5 (Underwater Detonation Safety) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS for details of the Navy's standard operating procedures.

	Comment	Navy Response
	Piti, and Agat." Conducting explosive detonations close to the civilian populated areas is clearly alarming, especially since Marine Drive runs near the coastline of these villages. These are only a few examples of the alarming environmental consequences of the MITT. Thus, as a scholar activist of Oceania, I cannot possibly support the project.	
Ashley Castro (AC)		
AC-01	Please. There is no tolerance for any more destruction of my island and ocean. Please think about the results these underwater trainings will undergo if you to do this. Please keep in mind that I am a 23-year-old, undergraduate from University of Guam who looks forward to having my children enjoy the pristine reef/ocean with a healthy marine life, not contaminated toxic water that will prevent us from acquiring such experiences. I am an aspiring marine biologist who needs to protect and conserve our tåsi (ocean) and I will speak up for what is right. Our ocean surrounding the island has already suffered by having our fish absorb toxic compounds which our people thrive on in local supermarkets or just backyard fishing. It is devastating to know that the training of war is more important that protecting the people. Please protect us, don't destroy us. Our island is small but our gratitude will be eternal. Thank you for your time.	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.
Tia Muna Aguon (TMA)		
TMA-01	My wish is that You and or the military and or any other personnel would completely discontinue and no longer conduct further trainings or testings in the marianas. The	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.

	Comment	Navy Response
	people of the land and those that occupy it matter. The lives of our future generations matter. Please stop the trainings and the testing. Please don't rape of us our land and prevent us from going to places on our island. These places are sacred to us, and your trainings and testings do not supersede our rights to the land and all that it stands for us and our children and our children's children. Please stop.	
Kenneth Garrido (KG)		
	The Military has been a part of my family, my grandfather was in the Navy before and during the WW-II, my father along with his brothers and my mother brothers were all in the military serving in Korea and Vietnam along with my immediate family siblings and cousins, my question is why would the military withhold plans that they decide to be utilizing our island and the rest of the chain of islands in the Marian's we our loyal citizens and have sacrificed a lot for this great Country the US, all we r asking is that for the purpose of training dropping bombs, and using our islands as a place to hold Nuclear and biochemical warfare we the people should be aware and should have an opinion whether we allow this, pls respect the people that live here especially on this side of the world bc with China next door and North Korea, we r in imminent danger at any time and we do not want history to repeat itself, we r at the mercy of God and only you the US can stop this ! Thank you 🙏🙏🙏	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.
Selencia Saladier (SS)		
SS-01	Guam is my home. A few years ago, I wouldn't be able to say that since I was born and raised and still living in the states, but over the last few years, I have connected with my island and have learned so much about it. My biggest regret is not	Potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Also, as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), the Navy implements, to the maximum extent practicable, procedural and geographic

	Comment	Navy Response
	learning about my culture, heritage, and island earlier and lacking an interest of where I am from. I have so much more to learn about my culture and island, but with military buildup and harmful testing activities, the islands environment and culture have been extremely affected and continues to change. Our ancestors land and culture they planned on their passing down generation to generation is not worth compromising. The military's testing activities proposal will impair my island, my home, my ancestors' home.	mitigation measures during its training and testing activities to reduce potential impacts on marine life.
Veronica Salas (VS)		
VS-01	Hafa Adai. The impact of proposed actions and tests will have longer negative effects on the Mariana Islands and its surrounding waters in all aspects than the time it takes to construct and carry out your general mission. Restricting access to lands that hold vital flora that are used in traditional, medicinal healing practices is hazardous to the wellbeing of the people living on these islands. As parts of the island continue to be developed, more and more areas of important plant life are being cleared away. Litekyan or Ritidian continues to hold plants that are necessary to practice and perpetuate traditional healing methods. Residents are already restricted from this place. Making it nearly accessible poses a major shift in social interaction between the people and its healers. The use of sonar will expose marine mammals to sound producing actives that will have negative effects on their wellbeing. These include: auditory masking, behavioral responses, stress, etc.	Potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Also, as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), the Navy implements, to the maximum extent practicable, procedural and geographic mitigation measures during its training and testing activities to reduce potential impacts on marine life. The Navy is consulting with NMFS under MMPA and ESA for potential impacts on marine mammals and ESA species, respectively. Mitigation resulting from these consultations will be implemented to minimize impacts. Ritidian is not part of the Proposed Action.

	Comment	Navy Response
	The materials that you leave behind in the waters will no doubt come in contact with marine life and expose them to unnecessary threats. Mistaking these for food items or other forms of predators, these animals' reactions to introduced materials will affect their way of life. These tests and materials could also drive away existing food sources for these marine mammals. It is already a federal mandate to protect sea turtles. Litekyan/Ritidian is home to many. The MITT-EIS will in essence be violating and endangering an animal that is protected by law. The introduction of materials that will be necessary to carry out the training will have negative effects on the turtle and its natural breeding grounds. There will be many negative effects if this project is pushed forward. The U.S. military has within its possession testing sites already in existence for this mission. The U.S. military is also intelligent and resourceful enough to do what it must without having to impose its might, unnecessarily. You have enough space. You have enough resources to dominate without needing to test or create new measures of that destructive dominance. This is all we have. We just want to protect and preserve it. Thank you.	
Nathan Pablo (NP)		
NP-01	stop your testing. you're harming animals	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.

	Comment	Navy Response
Logan Aaron Lee (LAL)		
LAL-01	The EIS "training" that your military commits is a crime against Earth and all life. I am requesting all of the bombings, underwater detonations, and sonar training be stopped indefinitely and immediately for the sake of our Ocean and the respect towards Ocean life. I will only ask you please stop these childish war games once. If continued, i will become a threat towards your entire company and motivation to persur these actions. Mahalo for listening. You've been warned. I will take action for our Mother Earth and do all within my means to defend her. Now, meditate/pray on that and let the light of all that is guide you well.	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.
Elisabeth Castro (EC)		
EC-01	I am appalled and infuriated that the military has such disregard to indigenous needs, voices, and land. Litekyan is my family's home, and we have been fighting for it to be returned to us for generations while the military can simply desecrate our sacred spaces because they want to shoot some guns (that we don't want on island either but it's clear that the imperialist forces are alive and strong).	Litekyan is not part of the Proposed Action.
Heather Garrido (HG)		
HG-01	My people have been ignorant too long but not anymore. The amount of testing on the island is overbearing and we are dealing with the consequences. You can’t keep doing this to us because of the “organic act.” You can’t continue to control us. Test out of Guam, out of the Marianas and out of Micronesia.	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.

	Comment	Navy Response
Camille Denight (CD)		
CD-01	Hafa Adai, I am worried about many things that will happen should you proceed to move forward with all the military projects proposed for Guam but three specific resources that concern me are: 1. Our Drinking Water 2. The Ocean and Marine Life surrounding our Island 3. The destruction of Ancient Chamorro Cultural Artifacts The firing range that is in planning is set to be constructed is above our natural aquifer and on an Ancient sacred cultural site. Please find another place to put this. We already import so much - please do not build anything over our source of water. No person can survive without clean water - this is a terrible idea and is not worth the risk. We are a small island with limited resources and land - build a firing range somewhere else. How many times have the people in this region already suffered because of the US military assuming that their actions will not have an impact on the resources and then they do! Water is essential to life - building a firing range with whatever ammunition you have over our water source is a threat to our water source and a threat to the lives here. So much of this island has been destroyed by war - whatever we have left of the past is extremely precious. Why do you think that destroying artifacts of ancient Chamorro Culture is okay? This mentality is one of the main reasons why the US has terrorists targeting innocent people in the country.	Potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Also, as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), the Navy implements, to the maximum extent practicable, procedural and geographic mitigation measures during its training and testing activities to reduce potential impacts on marine life. The firing range is not part of the Proposed Action.

	Comment	Navy Response
	People are angry that people in power (like the military) have no respect for different cultures and environments. Please do not sonar test in our surrounding ocean. It's obvious that this kills a lot of marine life. This is a natural resource that people here do care about. It's not okay to just kill all this sea life and think that it's justified because you need to test sonar.	
Mi'Yah Max (MM)		
	I DON'T APPROVE THE TEST BOMBINGS IN OUR OCEANS. this is so harmful to the environment, the coral reefs and the animals who live there. please for the love of god STOP.	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.
Amber Ritter (AR)		
AR-01	I believe that the military should end all sonar usage, firing ranges and endless taking of indigenous lands. Due to the military's doing, land and sea are being ravaged at an incredible rate. Whales, dolphins and other marine life are beached due to the interference of the military sonar. The land is being polluted by nuclear waste run-off and the like. This is the land that CHamorus have been living off of for thousands of years and have seen so much destruction just in the last hundred years under the American occupation. The military already has 75-80% of Guahan's land mass and continues to ask for more for firing ranges and other "important facilities". The priority of the government should be in preserving the ancient grounds of a culture that continues to fight against colonization. The U.S military is the world's biggest polluter and we don't have the choice to say that we don't want it on our land. We may get to comment on this study which will more than likely happen regardless of	Potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Also, as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), the Navy implements, to the maximum extent practicable, procedural and geographic mitigation measures during its training and testing activities to reduce potential impacts on marine life. The firing range is not part of the Proposed Action.

	Comment	Navy Response
	how Guam's citizens, who are American citizens too through the Organic Act, feel. Please heed our cries for self-determination and our right to our lands and right the wrong that has happened for far too long. Thank you for your time.	
Charlene Santos (CS)		
CS-01	Our islands are sacred. Our lands are sacred. Please stop destroying our home. Our children need to feel and see the beauty we experienced growing up as kids. Put fabot ✊	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.
Jayvin Chargualaf (JC)		
JC-01	Stop testing military weapons on my island. Your weapons will not help the island grow or benefit it, but only bring more damage than they already have. Go test elsewhere if testing really is that necessary like in a desert where there is no life. I know the earth is big enough to test military weapons in another place than on an island full of life. An island is beneficial to the earth and life, unlike a weapon that brings destruction and death.	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.
Jerrold Castro (JeC)		
JeC-01	For far too long the people of Guam and the Northern Marianas have had little opportunity to affect the outcome of activities in our waters, so I want to thank you for giving us this chance to express our concerns. The impact of military activities on our islands contribute to the loss of usable land that is essential to an island culture. My great grandfather Juan Rivera Castro lost a significant portion of his land in Liktekyan (commonly known as Ritidian) through imminent domain that he used as his livelihood in a thriving copra industry at his time. Those lost fruits of his labor were not passed down to his decedents. After those lands where given back to the people of Guam, because of	Potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Also, as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), the Navy implements, to the maximum extent practicable, procedural and geographic mitigation measures during its training and testing activities to reduce potential impacts on marine life. Liktekyan, bombing of Pagat, and military housing are not part of the Proposed Action.

	Comment	Navy Response
	threat for another reason for imminent domain, the government of Guam had to reassign that land as wildlife refuge to protect the cultural significance of that portion of our island. Now, that same land is again being threatened by the current military buildup for the establishment of ranges. The CHamoru people and our culture continues to be threatened now by the ongoing military activities as it was hundreds of years ago while under the colonial occupation by Spain and during the pre-World War II period by The United States. The use of the Marianas archipelago for military exercises continue to have an impact on our environment. The threat of sonar activities is affecting migration of whales and other species. The bombing of Pagat and other islands are destroying indigenous wildlife and flora. The construction of the ranges and military facilities in Tailalo (northern Guam) are destroying endangered wildlife and flora that the people of Guam have been trying to preserve for decades. Additionally, the largest water lens on Guam is located in that area of the island. We have significant concerns about polluting that area when there may be other areas that would be better suited for service members and their families. Why can't they live off of local economy housing? The money invested in building facilities inside the fence may be better used in improving essential services outside the fence. I plead your serious consideration to stop all military activities for the buildup and exercises in the Marianas and come up with better solutions that address both the people of the Marianas archipelago and the US interests. The people of the	

	Comment	Navy Response
	Marianas can no longer accept the effects that these activities are having on our land, waters, and culture.	
Paige Reyes (PR)		
PR-01	Potential Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action for the Mariana Islands Training and Testing: Marine Habitats - Most of the explosive military expended materials would detonate at or near the water surface. Training activities that include bottom-laid in-water explosions would affect marine habitat structure. Bottom substrates could be disturbed by vessel and in-water device strikes, military expended materials, seafloor devices used for military readiness activities, and from walking, standing or swimming in the nearshore waters. Marine Mammals - the use of sonar and other transducers would have the potential to expose marine mammals to sound-producing activities which would present risks that could range from a temporary or permanent threshold shift, auditory masking, physiological stress, or behavioral responses. The use of munitions in the water or near the water's surface present a risk to marine mammals located in close proximity to the explosion, because the resulting shock waves can cause injury or result in the death of an animal. Bottom-feeding marine mammals would be more likely to encounter expended materials that have already sunk to the floor. In the unlikely event that a marine mammal encounters and ingests expended material, the individual might be negatively affected if the material becomes lodged in the digestive tract. Marine mammals would be exposed to multiple secondary causes of impact associated with training and testing activities in the study area. In-water explosions	Marine life and marine habitat are important to the Navy. Using the latest science and technology, the Navy completed extensive analyses and computer-based modeling to determine impacts and develop science-based protective measures to reduce or avoid potential impacts on marine life. Potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Also, as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), the Navy implements, to the maximum extent practicable, procedural and geographic mitigation measures during its training and testing activities to reduce potential impacts on marine life. The Navy's analysis indicates that, with implementation of its protective mitigation measures, there would be no significant impacts on marine species.

	Comment	Navy Response
	have the potential to injure or kill prey species that marine mammals feed on. Sea Turtles - the use of sonar and other transducers, explosives, in-water electromagnetic devices, vessels and in-water devices, weapons, military expended materials, seafloor devices, and military expended materials of ingestible size associated with training and testing activities may affect sea turtles present within the study area. The use of military expended materials and munitions may cause short-term or long-term disturbance to an individual sea turtle due to ingestion of munitions used in training activities. The use of cables and wires, and decelerators/parachutes may cause short-term or long-term disturbance to an individual sea turtle. Marine vegetation - physical disturbance and strike and the use of in-water explosives could affect marine vegetation by destroying individual plants or damaging parts of plants. The use of explosives, military expended materials, and seafloor devices during military readiness activities could affect marine vegetation by destroying individual plants or damaging parts of plants. Marine invertebrates - use of explosives, vessels and in-water devices, military expended materials and seafloor devices, associated with training and testing activities may impact individual marine invertebrates. The use of in-water explosives, vessels and in-water devices, military expended materials and seafloor devices, explosive by-products, and unexploded ordinance during military readiness activities may have an adverse effect on sedentary invertebrate beds or reefs.	

	Comment	Navy Response
	Fish - the use of sonar and other transducers, explosives, and in-water electromagnetic devices may affect fishes. The use of vessels and in-water devices, aircraft, weapons, military expended materials, seafloor devices, cables, wires, decelerators/parachutes, and military expended materials of ingestible size associated with training and testing activities may affect fishes. The use of sonar and other transducers, in-water explosives, in-water electromagnetic devices, vessels and in-water devices, cables, wires, decelerators/parachutes, and military expended materials associated with training and test activities may affect fishes within the study area. Socioeconomic resources and environmental justice - may result in impact on commercial and recreational fishing, traditional fishing practices, or tourism when areas of co-use are temporarily inaccessible to ensure public safety during training and testing activities. Other notable facts: resources that will be permanently and be continually consumed by project implementation include water, electricity, natural gas and fossil fuels. Greenhouse gas emissions would increase from the baseline by approximately 20 percent.	
Hannah Andersen (HA)		
HA-01	The use of Marianas Archipelago land, including the surrounding ocean of the same region, for conducting military weapons/environmental testing is unconscionable and unconstitutional. The proposed action for this region is permanently destructive and demoralizing to the wildlife and native populations of this region. I'm going to cut my vernacular for a sec and say this—you are batshit evil if you move forward without considering the considerable cry from	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.

	Comment	Navy Response
	indigenous groups to restore their rights to their ancestral/present land.	
Lorimarie Naputi (LN)		
	I am a native-born Chamorro who was born and raised on Guam. I may not be living on the island currently, but I am still very deeply involved and engaged in activities that affect the wellbeing of my island, it's nature, culture, and it's way of being. While I do have a military background as a military brat and understand the goal of wanting to protect our country, we need to also respect the locations and the beings involved in our practices. In-water bombings can cause damage to the various wildlife that live within the water. Guam, being an island in the middle of the Pacific Ocean relies very heavily on its water-life and the animals and vegetation within in. We operate on tourism, so maintaining as natural and as healthy of an environment as we can to appeal to tourist is an essential aspect of our economy. We cannot risk the possible displacement of animals and the corals/vegetation that inhabit the area. That being said, these bombings can cause serious behavioral changes to animals that inhabit the area. These waters that are called home will become inhospitable for the wild animals who will become accustomed to fleeing the test area to the point of not returning, leaving the vegetation and the entire structure of that ecosystem in a very vulnerable state. Once again, this can also be linked back to the tourism industry by then mitigating our snorkeling industries as we would have hardly anything to see.	Marine life and marine habitat are important to the Navy. Using the latest science and technology, the Navy completed extensive analyses and computer-based modeling to determine impacts and develop science-based protective measures to reduce or avoid potential impacts on marine life. Potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Also, as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), the Navy implements, to the maximum extent practicable, procedural and geographic mitigation measures during its training and testing activities to reduce potential impacts on marine life. The Navy's analysis indicates that, with implementation of its protective mitigation measures, there would be no significant impacts on marine species.

	Comment	Navy Response
	Sonar tests are also another aspect of environmental disruption as it can have drastic effects on the marine mammals that rely on echolocation. Despite the general facts booklet including a graph that claims that roughly 99% of harm done to the marine mammals consists of Level B Harassment, it is important to note these "small" or "insignificant" effects. Wild animals, unlike humans, are not readily equipped to adapt or force their surroundings to benefit them. Marine mammals need their supersensitive hearing to locate one another, identify threats, as well as navigate. If these animals have dulled hearing thresholds, even temporarily, it can cause some serious effects that may begin to increase as the sea sonar testing continue. To include their swimming patterns, we need to understand that if they are then enduring dulled hearing thresholds and are also facing behavioral changes that may not make much sense to them, we are leaving them in a very vulnerable position as these animals go against their innate instincts for survival and begin acting out in a fit of stress or discomfort. We also need to address the importance of protecting Guam's corals. Guam once had many coral, beautiful colorful reefs, but are not facing bleached corals that end up getting washed along the shores. We need to respect and protect the remaining corals as often as we can, and we can begin by avoiding the introduction of chemicals or other imbalances to their environment. Shrapnel or leaked chemicals from the explosives can have serious effects on the coral and it would only be noticed once it was too late. Overall, we need to respect the land and the water by taking these "small" issues into serious reflection. Not all harm to	

	Comment	Navy Response
	the environment will be visible or direct, but that is why we must take all of our actions seriously and go forth with deep contemplation of our actions.	
Amanda Bamba (AB)		
AB-01	The air, land, and sea in the Northern Marianas Islands is not yours to destroy. No testing. No bombing. No interference by a government that doesn't belong there.	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.
Kaitlin McManus (KM)		
KM-01	Håfa Adai! Most people know me as Kaity. Im part Chamorro, part Haole and part Palauan. I was born is Saipain and lived most of my life here in Guam. I am now raising my 4 children here on this beautiful island. Its a blessing. But I am worried. I am worried that other people who live here are not being caretakers of our island, our home as God commanded us to in Genesis. Yes Gods very first commandment to mankind was to be caretakers of the Earth. I hold that dear to my heart just like our Inifresi, our promise and pledge on Guam . Incase you forgot or dont know the Inifresi, here it is: Ginen i mas takhelo' gi Hinasso-ku, i mas takhalom gi Kurason-hu, yan i mas figo' na Nina'siñå-hu, Hu ufresen maisa yu' para bai hu Prutehi yan hu Difende i Hinengge, i Kottura, i Lengguahi, i Aire, i Hanom yan i tano' Chamoru, ni'Irensiå-ku Direchu ginen as Yu'os Tåta. Este hu Afitma gi hilo' i bipblia yan i banderå-hu, i banderan Guåhan. (And in case you are not aware of what it means, here is the Englush translation:)	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.

	Comment	Navy Response
	From the highest of my thoughts, from the deepest of my heart, and with the utmost of my strength, I offer myself to protect and to defend the beliefs, the culture, the language, the air, the water and the land of the Chamorro, which are our inherent God-given rights. This I will affirm by the holy words and our banner, the flag of Guåhan! I pray that in the name of our Almighty Creator, that the destruction you are bringing to our island will stop and if not, I pray you reap what you sow. Thankfully God is a God of forgiveness and mercy. If you stop now and do what is right, you will be redeemed. But if you continue, surely it will not just be our island that suffers in the long run. It will be your soul. The money you get for the work and destruction you cause is not anywhere near the cost of losing your integrity and soul. God is watching you. He sees the wrong you are doing. He sees us all. He cares for His Creation. It is good to Him and good to us. Think of what you are doing. The bombing and testing that will destroy and damage our island and waters. Shame on you. It is a wicked thing. Ecclesiastes 3:17 New International Version (NIV) 17 I said to myself, "God will bring into judgment both the righteous and the wicked, for there will be a time for every activity, a time to judge every deed."	

	Comment	Navy Response
Josephine Ong (JO)		
JO-01	My name is Josephine Ong, a MA candidate at Asian American Studies at UCLA, where I am studying the history of Filipino migration to the Marianas. As a graduate student that has extensively studied the Marianas and someone that grew up in Guåhan/Guam, I am alarmed by the potential negative environmental consequences of the MITT. For example, Section 3.4.2.1.5 notes that marine mammals would be "…exposed to sounds caused by the firing of weapons, objects in flight, and inert impact of non-explosive munitions on the water's surface… these are impulsive sounds generated in close vicinity to or at the water surface, with the exception of items that are launched underwater." For marine mammals like dolphins and whales, such sounds could severely impact their echolocation and thus navigation & hunting skills that are important for their everyday survival. In addition, in section 3.3.2.1, the EIS states that "...mine warfare training and testing activities utilizing bottom placed detonations would only occur in the existing mine warfare underwater detonation areas at Piti, Agat, and Outer Apra Harbor." It is important to note that these areas are all populated by civilians and that fisherman, tourists, and young locals often visit and swim in the area. Furthermore, in section 3.0.4.2.1.1., the EIS elaborates that "Detonations would typically occur in waters greater than 200 ft. in depth, and greater than 3 NM from shore, with the exception of existing mine warfare areas, including Outer Apra Harbor, Piti, and Agat." Conducting explosive detonations close to the civilian populated areas is clearly alarming, especially since Marine Drive runs near the coastline of these villages. Furthermore, this could impact the surrounding beach	Marine life and marine habitat are important to the Navy. Using the latest science and technology, the Navy completed extensive analyses and computer-based modeling to determine impacts and develop science-based protective measures to reduce or avoid potential impacts on marine life. Potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Also, as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), the Navy implements, to the maximum extent practicable, procedural and geographic mitigation measures during its training and testing activities to reduce potential impacts on marine life. The Navy's analysis indicates that, with implementation of its protective mitigation measures, there would be no significant impacts on marine species. Mitigation measures associated with the use of sonar and explosives are presented in Section 5.3 (At-Sea Procedural Mitigation to be Implemented) and implemented as appropriate wherever the military trains and tests. Underwater detonation areas are permanently designated safety zones, danger zones, and restricted areas. These areas were designated in accordance with 33 CFR part 165 or 33 CFR part 334. The designation does not expire, and the Navy intends to continue use of the detonation areas to support its mission. The Navy is permitted to conduct underwater detonation activities in accordance with their MMPA and ESA compliance. As discussed above, public notice is provided prior to certain training activities occurring, such as underwater detonations.

	Comment	Navy Response
	tourists visit and waters that fishermen frequent to feed their families. These are only a few examples of the alarming environmental consequences of the MITT. Thus, as a graduate student studying the history of the Marianas and former resident of Guåhan/Guam, I am shocked that such environmental impacts would be approved by the military and do not support the MITT project.	
Ralph Eurich Patacsil (REP)		
REP-01	The proposed action for the MITT would have a number of negative impacts on the local marine habitat and ecosystem. Vessels, in-water strikes, military expended materials, seafloor devices used for military readiness activities, and any and all other traffic/training exercises in the area would disturb substrates and all nearby reef structures. The use of sonar and other transducers are potentially detrimental to marine mammals, notably cetaceans—whales and dolphins, that use echolocation or bio-sonar systems to in their natural functions like communication and feeding. Sonar has been implicated in causing behavioral changes and other biological damage in these mammals, resulting in deaths and mass beaching events. In-water explosions also have the potential to injure or kill prey species that are natural food sources to marine mammals and may overall disturb the general ecological makeup of the zone's marine ecosystem. The MITT may also result in the disturbance of commercial, recreational, and traditional fishing practices when areas of co-use are temporarily inaccessible to ensure public safety during training activities.	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.
Veroni Sablan (VS)		

	Comment	Navy Response
VS-01	Not coming from a place of anger but of hope. I do see the military efforts to gain the trust of the people of Guam. I see the efforts made to try and help our community. I believe if the military wants to make a powerful positive impact in the community for generations to come, putting a halt to any testing on or near our island is necessary. Our children are depending on us now to make the right decisions.	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.
Ryan Smith (RS)		
RS-01	I'm writing this as a former resident of Guam and a proud family member of veterans. I value the military and the lifestyle it has afforded my family and I. With this in mind, the military has an obligation to protect and serve the United States. Part of this responsibility also includes doing so in an honorable way. The expansion of testing and taking over land would cause harm to American citizens by destroying their land and wellbeing. In addition, it is of utmost importance that the environment is kept safe as well. The testing will cause die offs of local species which are essential to the health of the pacific and islands there. Please consider keeping the land and ocean pristine and protected so that Guam and the Marianas islands, along with Micronesia at large, remain healthy places to live. I hope my concerns are taken seriously and that as someone who knows and values the military life I am given gravitas in my comments.	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities. The Navy is not proposing any geographic expansion of the training and testing area in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Proposed activities are similar to those conducted in the Study Area for decades.

	Comment	Navy Response
Angelica Gagan (AG)		
AG-01	You hurt my home, you hurt me and thousands of Chamorros. Out of all the places in the world, you choose a beautiful island to destroy for your testing purposes? There are hundreds and thousands of miles of nothing land in the United States that you can use to destroy. Show humility and humanity and DO NOT continue with this destructive project.	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.
Michala Connelley (MiC)		
MiC-01	substantive	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.
Ramona Nelson (RN)		
RN-01	I support the NO Action option in the MITT Study area. The Navy's proposal for the use of additional lands on Guahan for the purpose of military readiness activities is highly insensitive and threatens the quality of life for all living beings that have made the land and waters of Guahan home. Specifically, the proposed areas for these trainings have strong historical and cultural significance to the CHamoru people and the military should consider utilizing the existing lands on Andersen Air Force Base and Naval Station. I oppose the use of additional tests under water as the ocean is a valuable resource and supports the livelihood of many CHamorus which will be threatened through the use of underwater explosions and sonar testing. The endangered Trongkun Haya (Serianthes Nelsonii) tree which my Great Grandfather Peter Nelson identified, is located near these proposed activities and its ability to survive/thrive will be jeopardized if the military pursues its plans.	Protecting marine life and habitat is also important to the Navy. The Navy trains worldwide, not just in the MITT Study Area. Using the latest science and technology, the Navy completed extensive analyses and computer-based modeling to determine impacts and develop science-based protective measures to reduce or avoid potential impacts on marine life. The Navy's acoustic effects model predicts that the vast majority of marine mammals' exposures to acoustic stressors (sonar and explosives) would cause temporary changes in behavior. Potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Also, as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), the Navy implements, to the maximum extent practicable, procedural and geographic mitigation measures during its training and testing activities to reduce potential impacts on marine life. The Navy's analysis indicates that, with implementation of its protective mitigation measures, there would be no significant impacts on marine species. In addition, Section 3.4.2.1.1.6 (Stranding) has been expanded to include additional information about strandings of beaked whales in the Mariana Islands and the Navy's support of efforts to better understand the causes of marine mammal strandings.

	Comment	Navy Response
	I oppose the exposure of in-water explosions that Marine mammals must endure as there is no way that the preparers of this Environmental Impact Student will be able to accurately state that these explosions will not injure nor effect the marine mammals feeding patterns. Additionally, the proposed sonar testing along with these in-water explosions may result in greater dead whales that will tragically wash up on our shores. As indicated in previous news stories, one Cuvier beaked whale that stranded in Merizo on March 23rd of 2015. Another Cuvier beaked whale stranded on July 26th of 2015 in the village of Agat. An 11-foot, 1,000-pound beaked whale was found on the reef flats off the waters of Agat on Jan. 17, 2019. Lastly, instead of linking a video to watch a clip about the military: Watch an informational video about the importance of Navy training and testing in the Mariana Islands Training and Testing EIS/OEIS Study Area, there should be a clip about the impacts these trainings will have on the environment to include the recent	As explained in the Navy's technical report on marine mammal strandings (*Marine Mammal Strandings Associated with U.S. Navy Sonar Activities*, 2017 [https://mitt-eis.com/]), marine mammal strandings have been a historic and ongoing occurrence attributed to a variety of causes, both natural and anthropogenic. Over the last 50 years, increased awareness and reporting has led to more information about species affected and raised concerns about anthropogenic sources of stranding. While there have been limited numbers of marine mammal mortalities potentially associated with U.S. Navy activities, the root causes are not clear in most cases. NMFS, as the regulator, maintains the authoritative National Stranding Database.
Malcolm Worsham (MaW)		
MaW-01	Returning back to Federal Government Employment, Federal Aviation Administration, (FAA) on the Island of Tinian Divert Airfield Installation in FY 2020....+. PLEASE: Send ALL Information for this Design and Installation to: Malcolm Worsham PO Box 1072 Rancho Cordova, CA. 95741 Malcolm Worsham, Disability Retired FAA Electronic Technician	Information concerning the U.S. Air Force Tinian Divert Infrastructure Improvements can be found at http://pacafdivertmarianaseis.com/.

	Comment	Navy Response
	hm (916) 647-3102 malworsham@aol.com malworsham@gmail.com	
Clare Calvo (ClC)		
ClC-01	Guam has been soil, water, and air location for warfare testing, storage, and practice for years, since WWII. The health of our island and her people have suffered the consequences of that. Neurological disorders, cancer clusters, type 2 Diabetes, are a few among many that have affected our people. From drums in Mong to Big Navy, all the way down to Malesso Bay, back up to Andersen base, everything from agents purple and orange, PCBs, chemical test kits, mustard gas. Investigations have been ongoing and still no results/response in years. Our NCDs disparities are alarming and this needs to stop!!!! Whenever a military personnel is diagnosed with cancer, there have been instances that they were not even counted but instead sent off island. Our numbers are not fully accurate because of this, and because of those undiagnosed. Kindly take this somewhere else.	Potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Also, as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), the Navy implements, to the maximum extent practicable, procedural and geographic mitigation measures during its training and testing activities to reduce potential impacts on marine life.
Lee Taitano (LT)		
LT-01	FDM is one of our islands that is presently being bombed. May I suggest that you partially clean her up for landing exercises and continue using the other portion for target practice and / bombing. Pagan is a beautiful island with unique fauna and flora. Pagan has been inhabited though sparsely for years. One reason that many were forced to relocate to Saipan was due to misunderstood volcanic activity. Yet some cannot abandon their birthplace, nor the serenity and earth-based life she	Potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Also, as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), the Navy implements, to the maximum extent practicable, procedural and geographic mitigation measures during its training and testing activities to reduce potential impacts on marine life. The Proposed Action does not include Pagan.

	Comment	Navy Response
	offers. More bombing will not only destroy this Gem that is Pagan, but destroy and pollute the ocean. The Chamorro and Carolinian people are a sea faring people. We depend on the ocean and our islands for our very sustenance. No to bombing Pagan. No.	
Alexis Street (AS)		
AST-01	I pray for my family and friends in close proximity to your testing area, I pray for future generations who, due to this harmful testing will never know the beauty of Guam and the surrounding areas, I pray for the immediate future of our earth which is directly harmed by such massive testing and training protocols that are not kept in check with regard to boundaries, efficacy, and replenishment. I pray for those conducting the training and testing for their immediate safety and for their emotional well-being, as it cannot be easy knowing you are directly responsible for the disruption of the natural habitat of millions of species of God-given life, which have immediate and lasting effects many of which we have yet to experience. My prayer is that the government responsible for these tests and trainings, with its massive reach due to its coffers of financial resources dedicated to death and destruction, more wisely use these resources to truly protect its constituents instead of harming us in the name of protection preparation.	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.

	Comment	Navy Response
	1 suggestion is to go buy an island that poses the absolute least opportunity for harm to life to conduct these tests and training sessions. I pray that this comment section is not to patronize yet to empower us to have our voices truly heard and our prayers, suggestions, concerns, and wisdom truly considered prior to making a decision that has implications for the entire world. Amen, and thanks for listening!	
Ignacio Aquiningoc (IA)		
IA-01	I have lived on Tinian all my life and I am worried and concerned of the negative impact that the military will bring to my island and to the northern islands. I am opposed to this project.	Potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Also, as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), the Navy implements, to the maximum extent practicable, procedural and geographic mitigation measures during its training and testing activities to reduce potential impacts on marine life. Proposed Action does not include the Northern Islands.
Leah Nathan (LN)		
LN-01	Good evening, I am writing to express deep concerns with the proposed military training and testing activities in the Marianas Island region. As a resident of Guam, as well as AD military family member, I believe in the mission of national security through global health, and ever more presently that means a healthy environment for the communities that depend on it as well as the world at large. Specific to this issue, my concerns are:	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.

	Comment	Navy Response
	-Overall short- and long-term devastation to the delicate habitats and lives of plants and wildlife both in the sea and on land, including turtles, sea mammals, plant life, coral, etc. -Extensive and irreparable damage to already at-risk ocean ecosystems. Ones that are essential for local economies as well as the health of the planet. -The well documented risks to marine mammals from the use of sound-producing devices. Additionally, the damage this equipment poses to fish and marine invertebrates. -Damaging waste material (physical and chemical) under water, on land, and in the overall ecosystems of the Marianas. -The strain on already strained resources- energy, water, land. -Greater consumption of fossil fuels, leading to more greenhouse gases with direct connection to the dire implications of climate change that we all, especially as military personnel and families with a direct connection to global security concerns, are facing. I would like to see the military on Guam and in the Marianas use their presence as a force for future-thinking actions that preserve and better the environment. The proposals in question do just the opposite. Thank you.	
Luis DeleonGuerrero (LD)		
LD-01	I understand the need for DOD to train and the need for training areas, I feel that in order to train in our areas DOD need to take special consideration the need to preserve the	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.

	Comment	Navy Response
	marine and land animals and fish. I have seen how DOD moves troops and equipment from place to place and even with all the measures in place to keep unwanted plants or animals out some still get introduced inadvertently. Should the United States DOD take these islands away for testing and training it should consider all the changes its presence and actions do to the environment and correct them should correction not be possible then compensation for the losses need to be made to the CNMI or the people of the CNMI. The DOD knows that measures in place now are inadequate to keep all nonnative plants, animals, and pollutants off these islands.	
Chloe Tyznik (CT)		
CT-01	Hello! While I appreciate that the military needs to expand, I am strongly opposed to the proposed expansion in Guam. This is a delicate ecosystem that does not need to be ravaged anymore. You will be destroying history and people's ways of life. Thank you for your time.	The Navy is not proposing any geographic expansion of the training and testing area in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Proposed activities are similar to those conducted in the Study Area for decades. Potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Also, as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), the Navy implements, to the maximum extent practicable, procedural and geographic mitigation measures during its training and testing activities to reduce potential impacts on marine life.
Elma Tenorio (ET)		
ET-01	Stop all training/bombing on the Northern Marianas Islands.	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities. The Proposed Action does not include the Northern Islands.

	Comment	Navy Response
Tyler Yu (TY)		
TY-01	I am against military buildup in the CNMI. This will have devastating and lasting negative effect on those targeted islands for generations especially on Pagan Island. When you take a natural habitat and disrupt them in anyway, you are altering the ecosystem one way or the other especially in a large scale like the military have planned. I have no confidence that US DOD will follow through with their promise even with their environmental impact study. The study can be skewed to the benefit of the US DOD. EPA and all the US government will always act on the benefit of the US before any people. I've seen this many time living in the US. They should consider hiring a third-party environmental activist to be a part of the study. We need to learn from Guam military buildup, Bikini atoll, and even Diego Garcia. Once US DOD takes a hold, there's no way to go back. The most they'll do is compensate what they have destroyed. Money comes and goes. They need to take responsibility of their actions. As an example, they have yet to properly dispose of radioactive material that's buried in a dome in one of the atolls in Marshall island. Guam's people had their land taken away as well as the natives that's been barred from Diego Garcia. Why would this be any different. They need to first fix those underlying issues before the study can be trusted.	The Proposed Action does not include the military buildup in the CNMI, including Pagan. Training and testing activities are proposed to occur at sea and on FDM. Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2 in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS present current and proposed training and testing activities. Potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Also, as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), the Navy implements, to the maximum extent practicable, procedural and geographic mitigation measures during its training and testing activities to reduce potential impacts on marine life.
Luciano Rangamar (LR)		
LR-01	I am in full support of our military readiness and might, with that I would like to make a suggestion and somewhat demand. Instead of Tinian and Pagan, why not Anatahan? Why? Well for one, containment - FDM or Farrallon de Medinilla is and continue to be a training ground, so why not	Training and testing activities are proposed to occur at sea and on FDM. Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2 in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS present current and proposed training and testing activities. The Proposed Action does not include Pagan.

	Comment	Navy Response
	include Anatahan for a time being. Another thing as a former resident the terrain could use a little earth moving tools.	
Guillermo Borja (GB)		
GB-01	Tinian is a very tiny Island.However,2/3rd of our island falls under the Dept of Defense and that our community has little resources on the remaining 1/3rd. Fishing and Farming will be limited as most of the best fishing and farmland are on the military leaseback. Peace and tranquility will be denied to our people because of the size of our island. (Noise Pollution). I truly understand the needs to trained our military in order to protect our nation. But, can this be done somewhere else? Now, Pagan residence are trying to move back to their island to resettle after the volcanic eruptions of Mt Pagan in the 80s.They too will be experiencing the same as Tinian. We had some experience during the Vietnam Era when they were bombing Aguiguan Island back in the 70s.We dont want to experience it once again. People cannot go to sleep until all the trainings are done. I am therefore against a major training to be conducted on Tinian and against the use of Pagan for military purposes. Thank You!	Training and testing activities are proposed to occur at sea and on FDM. Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2 in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS present current and proposed training and testing activities. The Proposed Action does not include Pagan.
Joel Omar (JoO)		
JoO-01	I fully support the military build up. However, RESPONSIBLE use of the island is a MUST, lest we forget history, not to create another military wastes, and misuses. PCB and agent orange, and other hazardous waste were left behind, not properly dispose of after WW2 in all the islands.	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.
Sheila Babauta (SB)		
SB-01	Dear evaluators, The comments and questions below are in response to the cumulative impact of the MITT.	As described in Section 2.3.3 (Standard Operating Procedures) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy implements, to the maximum extent possible, standard operating procedures to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action. Mitigation measures detailed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) and Appendix I (Geographic Mitigation Assessment) are also implemented whenever

	Comment	Navy Response
	1. What measures are in place to prevent destruction to historic sites? 2. What mitigation efforts are offered for damages not anticipated? 3. What other alternative sites are available for military training worldwide?	and wherever applicable training or testing activities take place within the Study Area. Section 3.11 (Cultural Resources) analyzes the effects of the Proposed Action on cultural resources and the measures in place to protect known resources.
concerned citizen Torres (CCT)		
CCT-01	I strongly oppose the U.S. military industrial complex and it's proposal of eminent domain to bomb and destroy our beautiful islands for "military exercises". I especially am concerned with they types of weapons used such as depleted uranium bullets, hazardous bombs, and nuclear weapons. We are a people of peace. The U.S. is currently waging wars and invading sovereign countries in the pursuit of oil, power, and monopolization of the fiat money system. 25 cents of every tax dollar goes to fund the military industrial complex and its weapons of mass destruction. I would prefer to use that money to fund our schools pave our roads, protect our reefs, feed the hungry, and provide a social security net for the people of the world. In a time when the earth is facing climate change, where corporate interests TRUMP the environment, at a time when we need to work together as ONE human race; the last thing we need or want is the U.S. military industrial complex polluting our air, bombing our lands, coral reefs, marine life, and water with wasteful bombs, polluting vehicles, and weapons of mass destruction.	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.

	Comment	Navy Response
	Take your nuclear bombs, your radiation bullets, and war machines away from here and leave my islands alone. When you are ready to fight climate change, and respect all people of the world enough not to invade their countries or bomb their lands, come back to Saipan and enjoy our BBQ. Satoshi Nakamotor	
Art Sondheim (AS)		
ASO-01	Brad Ruszala, who earned a Southwest Asia Service Ribbon with two bronze service stars, told Bush that "if my voice counts for anything, I would like to add it to the chorus of voices calling for the creation of a Marianas Trench Marine National Monument." Ruszala adds, "I may not have been born here, but this is my adopted home and I have no plans of ever leaving." Mr. Ruszala you are a huge hypocrite in claiming to try to preserve the Northern Mariana Islands. Leave your ass-kissing high dollar consultant for death and destruction. Money talks and your letter doesn't walk the talk. You are a fraud. Perhaps that is why you couldn't keep your jobs at other places on island. The Navy has ruined Vieques, Kahoolawe, and the islanders there chased you out from bombing their land. Bomb the parks of your hometowns before you destroy another island in the Pacific. Most of the bombing at FDM has been vain glorious.	Training and testing activities are proposed to occur at sea and on FDM. Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2 in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS present current and proposed training and testing activities. The Proposed Action does not include Pagan.

	Comment	Navy Response
	BOMB YOUR OWN HOMETOWNS FIRST! You can start with Brad Ruszala's hometown in New York State. No to bombing Pagan! If you think it is such a wonderful idea to bomb in the 50 states!	
Barbara San Nicolas Benavente (BSNB)		
BSNB-01	The Proposed Actions described in the Mariana Islands Training and Testing EIS/OEIS (to conduct at-sea training and testing activities within the Study Area, to include the use of active sound navigation and ranging (sonar) and explosives) is a major concern to me (Barbara San Nicolas Benavente), my husband (Peter Castro Benavente) and other family members who have established permanent residency in Guam and call Guam, the Marianas, and the Micronesian Region, home. It is stated that the U.S. military must train personnel and test new technologies to defend the United States, its territories, and its interests. The inherent rights and interests of the indigenous CHamoru people and all others who choose to live in Guam and the Marianas (as past generations of our people have), are not described adequately. There lacks true representation and protection of the indigenous people's interests (land, water, environment, cultural practices and traditions) in the Proposed Actions in this MITT/EIS/OEIS. The MITT EIS/OEIS states that military personnel shares the ocean and coastal areas with the community, recognizes the importance of public access, and strives to be a good neighbor by minimizing access restrictions and limiting the extent and duration of closures of public areas whenever possible while ensuring safety at all times. On the contrary - the current occupation of CHamoru lands by the U.S. military in fact limits public access and enjoyment	The Navy is not proposing any geographic expansion of the training and testing area in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Proposed activities are similar to those conducted in the Study Area for decades. Training and testing activities are proposed to occur at sea and on FDM. Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2 in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS present current and proposed training and testing activities.

	Comment	Navy Response
	of Guam's beaches by Guam families who are not affiliated with the military; limits access to traditional fishing areas and experiences that are passed on from one generation to the next; and limits access to harvesting of medicinal plants needed by traditional healers/practitioners, for example. With the proposed land and ocean surface danger zones relative to the establishment and/or expansion of live-fire training ranges, subsistence fishing will be severely interrupted. My husband (who has been fishing Guam's waters for over 50 years) and other traditional fishermen will face serious challenges and limitations set by the US Military for continuing to access traditional fishing spots that span from Tanguisson, through Haputo, Litekyan and Padi Point. Our children and grandchildren will lose opportunities for learning and applying traditional fishing methods as taught by our elders. Scheduled at-sea training and testing activities may result in "temporarily restricted areas" as stated, but threats to ocean life and destruction to their habitat will more than likely be permanent. Moreover, local fishermen and the rest of the public, must have year-round access to fishing Guam's waters and not just during periods of time when the military otherwise decides. The Proposed Actions described in the Mariana Islands Training and Testing EIS/OEIS doesn't provide convincing evidence/data that no harm will result and that there will not be a significant, negative impact on marine mammals and sea turtles from underwater sound and explosives associated with training and testing. Guam and the rest of the Mariana Islands and surrounding ocean and natural resources support the lives, livelihood,	

	Comment	Navy Response
	cultural identity and values of the Pacific peoples. The US Military proclaims to be an environmental steward and yet proposes continued negative action and impacts as a result of naval activities on the marine environment, land and air spaces in our Homelands.	
Anthony Reyesfirt (AR)		
AR-01	First of all, thank you very much for your service...my concerns are the live fire trainings., using high explosive ammunition's containing highly toxic carcinogen TNT. That will or already have contaminated our water system, wildlife and ecosystems..., improper management and disposal practices of countless ammunition's, that are scattered around fruitful hunting and fishing grounds. CNMI is small beautiful and one of a kind for all to enjoy it's beauty. My home is your home. Thank you again for your services.	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.
Isa Arriola (IA)		
IA-01	Pls. see attachment.	The health of coastal communities, fisheries, and ecosystems is important to the Navy. Section 3.1 (Sediments and Water Quality) concludes that chemical, physical, and biological changes to sediment or water quality would be measurable but below applicable standards, regulations, and guidelines, and would be within the existing conditions or designated uses. The Navy will comply with all applicable laws and regulations. The military is committed to protecting the environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities. A comprehensive analysis of potential effects on environmental resources from Navy training and testing activities is presented in Chapter 3 of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. These resources include sediments and water quality, marine habitats, marine mammals, fishes, sea turtles, marine birds, and marine invertebrates. While some impacts would occur from training and testing activities, the analysis concludes that impacts

	Comment	Navy Response
		would be minimal and would not have a significant impact on the environment. Also, as described in Section 2.3.3 (Standard Operating Procedures) and Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy implements, to the maximum extent possible, mitigation measures during its training and testing activities. The Navy provided the public 75 days to review and comment on the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, 30 days longer than the minimum recommended time for review of Navy documents. The Navy is required to complete independent statutory obligations under both NEPA and NHPA. Thus, the Navy has prepared this Supplemental EIS/OEIS and is pursuing continued compliance with the NHPA using the Section 106 process. The Navy recognizes that training activities would result in exposures of stressors to marine birds discussed in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Navy's analysis assumes that marine birds could suffer injury or mortality; however, for the reasons outlined in Section 4.4.6 (Marine Birds), the cumulative impacts would be low. This Supplemental EIS/OEIS (see Section 3.6, Marine Birds) includes a statistical analysis of 17 years of monthly and quarterly bird counts of the three booby species that nest on FDM. The results of this analysis were also included in Section 3.6.2.6 (Rookery Locations and Breeding Activities within the Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area) of the 2015 Final EIS/OEIS. In the previous NEPA document, this statistical analysis was not yet published. In the Navy's 2019 Supplemental, the same information is included in the analysis, but now cites the published article (see: Camp, R., C. Leopold, K. Brinck, and F. Juola. (2016). Farallon de Medinilla seabird and Tinian moorhen analyses. Hilo, HI: Hawaii Cooperative Studies Unit University of Hawaii at Hilo). It should be noted that the three booby species are easily seen (and therefore counted) reducing uncertainty in the survey effort. The results of the statistical analysis do not show any significant changes in population trends for the three booby species included in the analysis. The conclusions for increased numbers of activities on

	Comment	Navy Response
		FDM as not adversely impacting seabird populations is sound, as no new bombing areas would be used. In other words, the same restrictions listed and described in COMNAVMARINST 3500.4A would be carried forward under all alternatives.
Raymond Anthony Kapileo (RAK)		
RAK-01	I am born on Saipan, April 25th, 1972. Second to the youngest of 11 Children. My mother is born on Pagan Island on January 27, 1941. I've visited the island back when I was 10 years old. The floras and faunas of the islands and the resources from the sea, need to be protected and be used for the good of our people. The Floras of the island consist of many herbal plants that we the people can benefit from. Herbal plants for children that are teething is wild and rampant on Pagan. For skin rashes and many other sickness, Herbal plants are to be protected and make good use of for the people by the people with the people of the Marianas. The Faunas are rampantly growing in numbers and they are good for food for the people as well. We can benefit from these wild animals growing on Pagan. We do have endangered species growing on Pagan so let's be mindful of these animals too. One example is the Nightingale wreed wrabbler and the sea green turtles, and many more... Not only that, we have the Ocean that also provide food for the table, and many other resources that we can find in the sea. Both the land and sea provides a wealth of resources that our people can utilize to live a happy life on Pagan. If Military are creating some kind of underwater Sonar weapon then I DO NOT AGREE to a Military buildup on Pagan.	Training and testing activities are proposed to occur at sea and on FDM. Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2 in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS present current and proposed training and testing activities. The Proposed Action does not include Pagan.

	Comment	Navy Response
	I do not agree for any military buildup on Pagan Island. Whatever the Military will be building on Pagan, they should also be building infrastructures like hospitals/dispensaries, schools, the roads, fix the water pipes for homes and commercial uses, and what the people would need for daily living on the island. The military and the people of the island can live and share the island together.	
Bernard Guerrero (BG)		
BG-01	Yes, I do support the US military operation and training for the military soldiers in Tinian, Saipan and Pagan Northern Islands.	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.
Zachary Heston (ZH)		
ZH-01	I am a CHamoru/Chamorro/Chamoru. I am indigenous to the Marianas, my dad from Guåhan (Guam) and my mom from Saipan (C.N.M.I). I am not for the live fire ranges and bomb testing in the northern parts of the Marianas because simply put it is my home. I, along with many others favor against this because we want out next generations to have access to a part of their home, history, and culture. Rising seas are already taking my land, and a firing range/bomb testing or whatever it may be is not necessary. My islands are small and close to one another, so anything in one island can affect the next. I have no solution for this issue because I view this as an unnecessary thing to commence. My advice is to listen to the indigenous of the Marianas, they choose not to have the lands we call home used for war, rising seas takes our land each passing day. At the very least, let us have our land because we are a people who has a history of unnecessary bloodshed unto our people, and we aren't even taught to the	The Proposed Action does not include the establishment of new training areas. The training and testing under the Proposed Action is similar to the activities the Navy has been conducting in the Study Area for decades.

	Comment	Navy Response
	rest of the citizens of America, even though our islands play an important role for its strategic location, and even though us CHamoru of the Marianas enlist in the military more than any other state, mostly to make a living to support our families.	
Alphonso Yangirelit (AY)		
AY-01	The reason for me to signed up to this site is to give some of my findings while staying here in this beautiful Marianas over 29 years. A. Affects of BOMBING during WWII and . 1. FISH - They are contaminated by ordinances used during WWII up till now. Fact: People get sick and even died when they eat the fish caught by fishermen 2. BIRDS - The birds that used to be here in the islands are gone. Only few left. 3. FDM - This island was so beautiful before WWII took place. Now devastated by bombs done by the Military during WWII and even now when the Military continues their training. 4. Farming - Farming is out of question These are the facts that I see that really happen after the war and now. I would recommend that the Military exercise should be done out in the open waters far from the lands in the Marianas. Our new generations will need to have good	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.

	Comment	Navy Response
	environment and good lives to live happily in their life time. Thank you very much for allowing me to join this group. Looking at these three areas	
Segundo Castro (SC)		
SC-01	I am saddened to hear on the radio wave the negative impact of what the U.S. Military proposal for our island chain. For many weeks, we were bombarded with statement against the military and it is a form of feeding false information to the general public. There are many of us that supports what the U.S. Department of Defense is trying to accomplish throughout our island chain. The silent majority of our residents supports such massive influx of military training on our region. It is going to be one of the plus side for our people to realize the economic benefits for the massive. Also, the potential influx of economic growth within our community out way the concern of some of the few radical views towards the military. It will be a mistake for the United States Department of Defense to be influence on its decision by the nationalist individuals who will like to turn the CNMI into an independent island nation. It is been known that certain individuals are or were being critical against the formation of the Political Union between the United States and the CNMI from the beginning. This nationalist individuals had poison the perception of few of our younger generation and we apologized for the actions or unwarranted opinions from our brain wash teenagers during your public hearings on Tinian in the past. I owned massive properties on Tinian and Saipan, I don't see any impact to my livelihood of what the military is	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.

	Comment	Navy Response
	trying to do on our island. Matter of fact, my family welcome DOD's endeavors or proposal on our dearest island of Tinian. Si Yu'us Ma'ase.	
Margaret Aguilar (MA)		
MA-01	The Summary of the Draft SEIS/OEIS findings on page 8 of the MITT project information dated March 2019, states that the Cumulative Impacts: Combined impacts of past, present, and other future actions would continue to have "significant impacts" on socioeconomics, invertebrates, some individual marine mammals, and all sea turtle species in the Study Area. Where can I read more about these impacts and review the data resulting in this finding for clarification? Thank you.	Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS presents the current and proposed training and testing activities. Volumes 1 and 2, which contain discussions of potential impacts, can be found at https://mitt-eis.com/Documents/2019-Mariana-Islands-Training-and-Testing-Supplement-EIS-OEIS-Documents/Draft-Supplemental-EIS-OEIS.
Michael Hall (MH)		
MH-01	I am strongly AGAINST any development of Pagan for military purposes!! It is a beautiful and pristine island, and we should keep it that way. I really do not think it will help military might around the world by adding this to their training grounds, of which the military has enough! I am still pursuing the idea of a surf and adventure resort on Pagan. Even without that, the wildlife need peace and quiet. Why destroy even more of this planet???? Tinian is better to do your training. Military already has a lease.	Training and testing activities are proposed to occur at sea and on FDM. Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2 in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS present current and proposed training and testing activities. The Proposed Action does not include Pagan.

	Comment	Navy Response
Kisha Borja-Quichocho-Calvo (KBQC)		
KBQC-01	As a CHamoru daughter of Guåhan, I must first acknowledge that as a taotao tåno '(person of the land) and taotao tåsi (person of the ocean), all US military activities must be halted in the Mariana Islands. This includes current activities in and around the islands as well as proposed activities with the military buildup (e.g., the realignment of marines from Okinawa to Guåhan and the use of Pågan and Tinian for live-fire training and/or amphibious training areas) and the Mariana Islands Training and Testing (MITT) study area. The US military occupation of the Marianas has caused much destruction on our environment as well as irreversible health impacts on our communities. Moreover, the US military has continued to show blatant disregard for and disrespect of the Indigenous people, islands, and culture of the Marianas. Regarding the MITT more specifically, the EIS/OEIS states that "[t]raining and testing activities, collectively referred to as 'military readiness activities,' […] prepare the Navy to fulfill its mission to protect and defend the United States and its allies, [and] have the potential to impact the environment" (1-1). The acknowledgement by the navy that the MITT activities may impact the environment is cautionary warning of what could happen to our environment (and even further, our health) if we do not address the problems with activities, such as active sonar training/testing and the use of missiles, torpedoes, and large ocean vessels. And if MITT activities harm the environment, they will consequently harm our marine mammal species, sea turtles, and marine invertebrates. Thus, such activities should not be pursued and executed in and around the Mariana Islands. Our marine life and our healthy ocean environment are vital to our survival as the Indigenous people of the Marianas. Harming either	Marine life is also important to the Navy. The analysis and the science show that there would be no significant impacts on marine species. Potential effects from military training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the EIS/OEIS. Also, as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the EIS/OEIS, the Navy implements mitigation measures with the aim of achieving the least practicable adverse impacts on marine mammal species or stocks, to the maximum extent practicable, during its training and testing activities. Please see Section 3.4 (Marine Mammals) regarding an analysis of impacts on marine mammals. The U.S. Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities for decades in the sea space depicted in the Study Area with no indications of long-term consequences to marine mammals. The Navy's assessment of potential impacts reflects using the best available and applicable science determined in consultation with NMFS. This includes analysis of the cumulative impacts, mid- and high-frequency active sonar, underwater detonations, and activities within the Marianas Trench National Marine Monument. The training activities within the MITT are not expected to have significant effects on those resources designated for special protection under the Mariana's Trench Marine National Monument designation. Furthermore, the Presidential Proclamation included that the prohibitions included in the Proclamation shall not apply to the activities and exercises of the Armed Forces. The mitigation measures followed during military activities and exercises within the Monument ensure that the activities are consistent so far as is reasonable and practicable with the Proclamation. The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its training and testing activities, which includes civilians. Section 3.13 (Public Health and Safety) includes details regarding Safety and Inspection Procedures for aviation, submarine navigation, surface vessel navigational, sonar, electromagnetic, laser, high-explosive ordnance, and weapons firing and ordnance expenditure safety. Section 3.13 (Public Health and Safety) evaluates how and to what degree the activities described in Chapter 2

	Comment	Navy Response
	would harm us as the people of this ocean. Further, in several parts of the EIS/OEIS, the document emphasizes that the MITT activities will cause little to no harm on marine life or on the marine environment and, if there are impacts, they will be temporary and short-term. It must be noted that any impacts to our marine life and our ocean environment may easily be passed off as temporary or short-term by people who are not from our communities and are only in the islands temporarily. Overgeneralizations such as these must be avoided when working with Indigenous communities such as ours where any impact is damaging, regardless of how temporary or short-term. It is also premature of the military to assume that impacts would not be more permanent or long-term if adequate studies have not been done for the proposed MITT activities in the MITT study area. Additionally, throughout the EIS/OEIS, it is evident that there is some sort of collaboration between the US navy and federal agencies (e.g., the NMFS) in order to exempt the navy from certain measures put in place to protect our environment and our local flora and fauna. This does not keep the military accountable for its actions but instead simply allows the military to engage in whatever activities it wants, at whatever costs. This is completely unacceptable. Another issue with the MITT EIS/OEIS is the focus on the safety and protection of the United States but rarely any mention of the safety and protection of the US territory of Guåhan and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. The EIS/OEIS states: "The U.S. Navy carries out training and testing activities to be able to protect the United States against its potential adversaries, to protect and defend the rights and interests of the United States and its allies to	(Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) could impact public health and safety. In the section, public health and safety stressors are analyzed. Additional information regarding the Navy's standard operating procedures is provided in Section 2.3.3 (Standard Operating Procedures) and Chapter 5 (Mitigation). The Navy provided the public 75 days to review and comment on the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, 30 days longer than the minimum recommended time for review of NEPA documents.

	Comment	Navy Response
	move freely on the oceans, and to provide humanitarian assistance" (1-2). What about the safety and protection of the Mariana Islands and the people who call these islands home? The MITT EIS/OEIS must explain how the MITT activities will actually benefit the people of the Marianas because these islands and the waters surrounding them are our home. The military is merely a visitor in our home and should therefore act respectfully and accordingly. Finally, there are other requests that I demand the US navy address. One is the need for public hearings throughout the Mariana Islands, where island residents can deliver oral testimonies and voice our concerns (as opposed to the "public meetings"). Another community need is more time to review the MITT EIS/OEIS. We were given only two and a half months to review over 1,400 pages and then submit comments on them. This was an unfair process for our communities. Last, we need more alternatives other than No Action Alternative, Alternative 1, and Alternative 2. For example, an alternative must be included where no military activities will take place in the designated MITT study area. The EIS/OEIS claims, "The military is committed to being a good steward of the environment." It also claims that the military is constantly working with communities in the Mariana Islands to be environmentally friendly and sustainable. But I question: How are bombs and sonar testing examples of the military "being a good steward of the environment"? How are bombs and sonar testing examples of being environmentally friendly and sustainable? None of the proposed activities in the EIS/OEIS are good for the environment, nor are they sustainable. The US military must rethink its role in the Mariana Islands and the detrimental	

	Comment	Navy Response
	destruction it has caused and continues to cause the people, environment, flora, and fauna of the islands. They must be held accountable for their past and present actions and must stop executing activities that go against the will of the people of the Marianas.	
Guinaiya Guåhan (GG)		
GG-01	I oppose any training and testing in the Mariåna Islands, this proposal is unnecessary and also proposes to add continued dependency on US for aid while diminishing resources of the Mariånas which we have relied on for centuries. I firmly oppose any continued contamination and bomb detonations, sonar and all Military war training and games on our islands and within surrounding waters. The US militarization of the Mariåna Islands have proven to have very destructive results on our environment and natural resources. We know about the long lasting affects of militarization, testing and training on places like the Marshall Islands, Pōhakuloa, Culebra, Vieques In Puerto Rico, Kaho'olawe in Hawaii, Amchitka in the Aleutian Islands in Alaska, the list goes on and on unfortunately and we the people of these Islands do not want to partake in the continued destruction of our homes by supporting war games and contamination. The US military is known as the largest contributor to Climate change and world pollution I do not support these ways. Show us a change and begin by cleaning up your mess of fallen bombs, arms, munitions, war planes ect from our waters and land.	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.
Bill Babauta (BB)		
BB-01	No to any future training sites within the Marianas that in any way cause harm or change to its natural environment. We are a small group of islands and indigenous people that don't stand to gain or benefit in even the smallest from the	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.

	Comment	Navy Response
	presence of intense military training, whether that be live fire or increased number of military occupation.	
Sandy Weaver (SW)		
SW-01	My worries and concerns for any military testing on and around our Islands are the destruction and contamination of the land, ocean and environment that will affect not only us but the marine life as well. We just don't need more contamination.	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.
Teresa Laguaña (TL)		
TL-01	" We have not inherited this earth from our parents to do with it what we will. We have borrowed it from our children and we must be careful to use it in their interests as well as our own." I used this specific quote because it is necessary. The land of the Chamoru people is not for you to destroy with your military training for war. The land, THIS LAND, It is not yours to take and do with what you will. It never was. No more. Our island is and always will be sacred to the Chamoru people. We will not stop fighting for what is right.	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.
Sylvia Frain (SF)		
SF-01	Training and testing activities have the potential to temporarily limit access to areas of the ocean, which has the potential to impact commercial transportation and shipping, commercial recreation and fishing, traditional fishing practices, and tourism in the Study Area. Supplemental MITT, pg. 3.12-16 According to the Navy's MITT Fact Sheet, the active sonar testing they conduct in the ocean around the Marianas has no real effect on marine mammals… However, this	The Navy is not proposing any geographic expansion of the training and testing area in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Proposed activities are similar to those conducted in the Study Area for decades. Marine life and marine habitat are important to the Navy. Using the latest science and technology, the Navy completed extensive analyses and computer-based modeling to determine impacts and develop science-based protective measures to reduce or avoid potential impacts on marine life. Potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected

	Comment	Navy Response
	contradicts studies conducted by both marine scientists and the Navy itself. In a previous environmental impact statement or EIS draft, the Navy admitted that the sonar exercises planned for 2014-2018 may unintentionally "harm marine mammals 2.8 million times over five years." Included in this estimate are two million incidents of "temporary hearing loss," and two thousand incidents of permanent hearing loss. "The expansions proposed in the Supplemental Impact Statement for the MITT would increase the annual rate of naval surface fire explosive rounds fired on FDM from 1,000 to 2,800 (alternative 1) or 4,200 (alternative 2). Medium-caliber gunnery increases by 700 to 94,650 rounds plus 17,500 explosive rounds. The current rate of 2,000 explosive rockets is maintained, while explosive missiles increase from 85 to 115. Explosive grenade/mortar attacks increase from 600 to 2,000 per year and small-caliber rounds from 18,000 to 30,000." Left out of the Supplemental EIS for the MITT is the full disclosure of the cumulative impacts associated with the massive live-fire range in and around the Marianas, of which the MITT is just one component…[A]ccording to a 2010 published research paper "Emerging Challenges of Managing Island Invasive Species: Potential Invasive Species Unintentionally Spread from Military Restructuring," pathways for invasive species opened by the massive live-fire range and the Marines Relocation to Guam activities are highly likely to bring numerous invasive species to the region and beyond, to Hawai'i and the U.S. mainland." A JOINT RESOLUTION "Relative to expressing opposition to any US military plans which threaten to degrade the natural environment, human health, indigenous culture, economic development and	Environment and Environmental Consequences) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Also, as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), the Navy implements, to the maximum extent practicable, procedural and geographic mitigation measures during its training and testing activities to reduce potential impacts on marine life. The Navy's analysis indicates that, with implementation of its protective mitigation measures, there would be no significant impacts on marine species. In accordance with CEQ guidance, the cumulative impacts analysis focused on impacts that are truly meaningful. This was accomplished by reviewing the direct and indirect impacts that would occur on each resource under each of the alternatives. Key factors considered were the current status and sensitivity of the resource and the intensity, duration, and spatial extent of the impacts of each potential stressor. In general, long-term and widespread impacts were considered more likely to contribute to cumulative impacts than short-term and localized impacts. Those impacts on a resource that were considered to be negligible were not considered further in the analysis. The level of analysis for each resource was commensurate with the intensity of the impacts identified in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences). Please refer to Section 4.1 (Principles of Cumulative Impacts Analysis) for a discussion of the approach to analysis for cumulative effects. Table 4.2-1 lists the other actions and other environmental considerations identified for the cumulative impact analysis. This includes non-Navy actions, which result in greater effects on marine resources than those the Navy is proposing. The U.S. Navy recognizes the importance of biosecurity, ecological integrity, and resiliency of island ecosystems to the potential introduction of invasive species to the Mariana Islands associated with military training and testing. The Navy has a number of policies in place to prevent, interdict, and control invasive species introductions in both terrestrial and marine environments. Specific policies for marine invasive species can be found at OPNAV M-5090.1 Chapter 35-3.19. (Ship and Ballast Water), M-5090.1 Chapter 35-3.1 (Environmentally Sound Ships), and M-5090.1 Chapter 12-3.9 (Invasive Species). For potentially invasive terrestrial species, the Navy has in place a number of policies and procedures to reduce or remove species from potential introduction pathways. These measures include

	Comment	Navy Response
	political empowerment of the people of the CNMI and Guam." WHEREAS, the people of the Mariana Islands have been confronted by ever-expanding and compounding plans presented by the US military — including the Marine Relocation to Guam, the Mariana Islands Range Complex (MIRC), the Mariana Islands Training and Testing (MITT) Study Area, the Divert Activities and Exercises, and the CNMI Joint Military Training (CJMT) — all of which are interconnected projects that involve the irreparable damage of the land, sea, air, and biological systems of the Marianas archipelago; WHEREAS, military activities conducted in the Marianas threaten to harm the local population by increasing the likelihood of illnesses caused by exposure to contaminants and civilian injuries and deaths caused by botched military training exercises (both of which occurred during military training range exercises on the Puerto Rican island of Vieques), and therefore degradation of the land, water and air by any pollutants, including all physical, chemical and biologic agents should not be allowed; WHEREAS, military training and testing in the Marianas also poses a dire threat to our sustainable economic development by jeopardizing the health of the local workforce and degrading the natural beauty of the Marianas (including the many historic sites and structures around the islands and in the surrounding seas) which constitutes an essential element attracting tourists to our islands, WHEREAS, the degradation of the natural environment, human health and local economy of the Marianas threatens to trigger a mass emigration from our homeland, thus constituting an existential threat to our sense of cultural identity;	coordination with USDA APHIS for inspection procedures for incoming cargo, equipment, and personnel from foreign locations. In conclusion, the Navy maintains that introduction of invasive species associated with military training and testing activities is low. It should be noted that the Navy or other military services does not have jurisdiction of other potential pathways for introduction (e.g., commercial activities, U.S. mail, non-DoD personnel).

	Comment	Navy Response
	WHEREAS, following the above line of logic, it can be concluded that any damage to the natural environment of the Marianas archipelago constitutes violence enacted upon the indigenous Chamorro and Refaluwasch (Carolinian) peoples and the degradation of their cultures — for the natural environment, the indigenous peoples who dwell upon and protect the natural environment, and the cultures of those peoples constitute one indivisible whole; WHEREAS, in resisting this violence, we stand in solidarity with all islander and indigenous peoples fighting against the needless destruction of their physical persons, homelands, and cultures by the US military; NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the CNMI and Guam Legislature, acting in the best interests of the people of the CNMI, Guam, and indigenous and islander peoples across the globe, pledge to vigorously oppose any US military plans which threaten to degrade the natural environment, human health, indigenous culture, economic development and political empowerment of the people of the CNMI and Guam.	
Anne Simonis (AS)		
ASIM-01	We, the signatories of this letter, are a group of researchers who have been studying marine mammals in the Mariana Islands, and we believe that the results of our ongoing investigation should be considered during the review of the 2019 draft EIS for the Mariana Islands Range Complex. A draft manuscript of our findings is included with this letter, which will soon be submitted for publication. The manuscript has not yet undergone a formal peer-review; however, we have sought comments from multiple external reviewers, and we do not anticipate major revisions before it is published. Below we outline our concerns about the 2019 draft EIS and offer recommendations to reduce harm and improve the understanding of how beaked whales respond to active	The issue of Navy only sonar exclusively causing mortality to beaked whale is complex for a species known to be susceptible to behavioral reactions to any anthropogenic sound including commercial shipping transits. Factoring in natural causes of mortality (e.g., disease, predation, foraging success) determining direct causal relationships is complex for any species of marine mammals, especially beaked whales. The Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS qualitatively and quantitatively summarized potential effects to all marine mammal species, including beaked whales, within the MITT Study Area. Criteria development, modeling improvements for assessing acoustic and explosive impacts, refinements to the science used for the impact assessment framework, and Navy funded monitoring in the Marianas Islands have been advancing for over 10 years in consultation with the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS).

	Comment	Navy Response
	sonar. Concerns: 1.The 2019 draft EIS does not reflect the actual likelihood of injury and death for beaked whales within the Mariana Islands Range Complex. The examination of marine mammal stranding events in the study area did not acknowledge the association of beaked whale stranding events on Guam and Saipan with naval activity and mid-frequency active sonar. The stranding rates for beaked whales in Guam and the Mariana Islands has increased since 2007, and there is a strong association between beaked whale strandings and naval activities that utilize mid-frequency active sonar. Between June 2006 and January 2019, we document four of eight beaked whale stranding events occurring during, or within 6 days after naval activities. The probability that these events randomly occurred within this window of naval activities is extremely low (~0.03%). Guam and the Mariana Islands can be added to a global list of locations, including the Bahamas, Canary Islands, and the Mediterranean, where sonar-associated beaked whale strandings have been well documented. 2.The proposed mitigation plan is insufficient to prevent or reduce beaked whale exposure to active sonar. The proposed visual monitoring before and during the use of active sonar is not sufficient to detect beaked whales. Throughout the day and night, most beaked whale species undergo very long dives, often exceeding one hour. They spend little time at the surface and generally are difficult to	The Navy's Supplemental EIS/OEIS analysis of potential impacts on beaked whales took into account their greater sensitivity to disturbance relative to other marine mammals, as demonstrated by the data used to develop the behavioral response criteria for beaked whales [see the technical report titled *Criteria and Thresholds for U.S. Navy Acoustic and Explosive Effects Analysis* (Phase III) available at https://mitt-eis.com]. The quantitative assessment predicts that no species of beaked whale would be injured by the Proposed Action. Since receipt of this comment letter, the commenters published the draft manuscript provided as an attachment (Simonis et al., 2020). This Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS includes further information on Cuvier's beaked whale strandings relative to sonar use in the Study Area in Section 3.4.2.1.1.6 (Stranding) under Environmental Consequences due to Acoustic Stressors in the Marine Mammal section (Section 3.4), including incorporation of Simonis et al. (2020). This further information does not change the conclusions of the analysis of potential impacts on Cuvier's beaked whales described in this Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Navy tracking of specific events by name has become more standardized since 2008 as new tracking tools have been developed and deployed. Given the MITT Study Area's proximity to eastern Asia, Navy vessels equipped with sonar have likely been transiting and at times conducting individual and group training events with sonar in the MITT Study Area since modern hull-mounted active sonars became standard on Navy surface ships in the mid-1960s. Furthermore, the greater number of Navy ships and later improvements to passive acoustic detection technology meant there was a greater likelihood of more active sonar use from the 1960s through the late 1980s than what is currently proposed in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Navy takes exception to some of the analysis and conclusions in the draft, non-peer reviewed manuscript used to inform the commenter's concerns and recommendations. Navy obtained official stranding records from NMFS' Pacific Island Fisheries Science Center (PIFSC) and Guam's Department of Agriculture's Division of Aquatic and Wildlife Resources (DAWR). In addition, PIFSC provided

	Comment	Navy Response
	detect and identify at sea. Especially in the waters of the Mariana Islands Range Complex, where average wind speeds are 15.3 miles per hour, the consistently high sea states make visual observation of any beaked whales particularly challenging. 3.The current beaked whale population size, distribution, and behavior on the Mariana Islands Range Complex is unknown, which prevents an authentic population-level assessment of naval impacts Considering the low density of most beaked whale populations, and the evidence of small-scale, resident population structures, detecting declines using abundance estimates from traditional line transect surveys will be difficult, if not impossible. The current beaked whale population size, distribution, and behavior on the Mariana Islands Range Complex is unknown, which prevents an authentic impact assessment. 4.There are very few personnel in the Mariana Islands who are trained to investigate the presence of traumas associated with the proposed hypothesis under investigation in sonar-associated strandings Fat and gas emboli have been symptomatic indicators of fatal beaked whale strandings related to exposure of active sonar; however, stranded animals must be found before they reach a state of advanced decomposition and examined by qualified personnel. Recommendations	the Navy with current results for Marianas Islands beaked whale strandings where necropsies had been performed or are ongoing. After careful review and analysis of these records, the Navy constructed a detailed annual summary of documented beaked whale strandings and Navy activities within the MITT Study Area from 2003 to January 2019. Given some of the points discussed subsequently, it remains unclear what the significance of small numbers of beaked whale strandings since 2007 really means in terms of population-level effects. It is only over the last 10–20 years that interest and tracking of stranded marine mammals became of higher regulatory and biological interest. One point of contention between the Navy analysis and commenter's analysis is the number of individuals that actually stranded in March 2015. The U.S. Navy, in discussion with researchers affiliated with PIFSC's stranding program, were told there were public reports of two other beaked whales in March 2015 that were pushed back into the sea. But given the unsubstantiated nature of these reports and timing, it is unclear if there was really only one stranding (carcass examined) and it was the same individual as the two previous unconfirmed reports, if there were 2 individuals with at least 1 stranding, or if there really were 3 separate beaked whales. Local news reporting at the time stated, "The first report was of a whale near Cocos Lagoon and the second report was saying it was on the reef. While biologist Brent Tibbits is trying to confirm if this was a second whale sighted or two separate sightings of the same whale, he suspects that there was only one." From the commenter's analysis, it appears the authors selected the less accurate individual count for the March 2015 event (3 individuals) (http://www.kuam.com/story/28585392/2015/03/Monday/beaked-whale-beached-in-merizo-waters). With the PIFSC and DAWR data, the Navy conducted an independent review of the beaked whale strandings. All stranding events were on Guam except for one on Saipan (Aug 2011). Between August 2007 and January 2019, there were 8 beaked whale stranding events of 1–2 beaked whales totaling 9 individuals, the majority of which were identified as Cuvier's beaked whales (7 of 8 or 88%; Aug

	Comment	Navy Response
	1. Based on the strong association of fatal beaked whale strandings and mid-frequency active sonar in the Mariana Islands Range Complex, we recommend a moratorium on mid-frequency active sonar in habitats known to be important to beaked whales. 2. Beaked whale fatalities should be considered as likely outcomes from proposed active sonar activities that occur in beaked whale habitat, and Level-A takes for beaked whales should be incorporated into the 2019 draft EIS. 3. To increase the likelihood of detecting beaked whales and reducing their exposure to active sonar, we recommend that mitigation plans incorporate passive acoustic monitoring for beaked whales before and during active sonar operations. 4. We recommend that a passive acoustic beaked whale survey be conducted to estimate the size of the beaked whale population on the range. 5. We urge officials to support a local team of personnel who are trained to promptly respond to marine mammal strandings, conduct necropsies and investigate the diagnostic features for gas and fat embolic syndrome. We recommend that qualified observers conduct surveys at sea and along the coast during naval operations that utilize MFAS in order to identify animals that are dead, dying, or otherwise in distress.	2007, Jan 2008, Aug 2011, Mar 2015, Jul 2015, Mar 2016, Jan 2019). This stranding event count includes the suspect at-sea visual sighting (Jul 2008). Of the 9 stranded individual beaked whales reported, 5 of 9 or 55.6% of the Cuvier's beaked whales were male (adult or subadult) (Jan 2008, Aug 2011, Mar 2015, Mar 2016, Jan 2019), 1 of 9 or 11.1% was female (Aug 2011), and 3 of 9 or 33.3% were not identified to sex (Aug 2007, Jul 2008, Jul 2015). Concurrent with the independent stranding analysis, the Navy conducted a level of activity analysis. From available internal Navy and public resources, there were 20 named Navy training events in the MITT Study Area between 2007 and Jan 2019, which corresponds to the beaked whale stranding interval used by the commenter. This review also included a Navy review of classified sonar reporting systems to document if active sonar was actually reported as being used 3 days prior to a given beaked whale stranding. From 2007 to 2019, 17 of 20 activities or 85% of named Navy events in the MITT Study Area did not co-occur with any beaked whale stranding. Of named Navy events, 2 of 20 or 10% had active sonar used prior to the stranding (Mar 2015, Mar 2016), and 1 of 8 strandings occurred after unit-level training with active sonar that was not part of a formally named Navy event. Finally, 1 of 8 stranding events occurred during a named Navy aviation event, but no active sonar was used prior to the stranding (Jan 2019), so there can be no association with Navy activity and the Jan 2019 stranding. Therefore, of the 8 reported beaked whale stranding events in the MITT Study Area from 2007 to Jan 2019, 3 of 8 strandings or 37.5% occurred when sonar had been used prior to the stranding. This is only a co-occurrence in time and space, and does not automatically imply sonar was the causative agent. For instance, 6 of 8 strandings or 62.5% occurred when there was no active sonar used prior. Finally, there has not been a beaked whale stranding in the Marianas where sonar was used prior to the stranding in close to 3 years (April 2016-February 2019). The commenter's statement that, "Half of these beaked whale stranding events were associated with naval operations that utilize MFAS" is inaccurate. Especially if talking in terms of events. As discussed above, on a sonar use basis,

	Comment	Navy Response
		37.5% occurred after sonar used and 62.5% occurred when there was no sonar used. Obviously, there are some factors at work influencing beaked whale stranding that are unrelated to Navy activities. The higher number of strandings when there was no Navy sonar used does beg the question then, of what other causative factors other than Navy sonar could be influencing beaked whale strandings in the Mariana Islands? Furthermore, if other factors are potentially involved could they have equally contributed to the strandings, with prior sonar use being coincidental? It should also be noted that PIFSC conducted necropsies on three of the beaked whales that had stranding after sonar use (2 Mar 2011, 1 Mar 2015). Histopathology did not show evidence of gas bubble disease, as gas emboli and fat emboli were not observed. The Center for Naval Analysis (CNA) also recently conducted a statistical study of correlation of beaked whale strandings around the Mariana Islands with the use of U.S. Navy sonar, finding that insufficient evidence of a correlation exists. The CNA study used the complete record of all U.S. Navy sonar use between 2007 and 2019, including major training events, joint exercises, and unit level training/testing. The analysis also included the complete beaked whale stranding record for the Mariana Islands through 2019. Following the methods in Simonis et al. (2020), the CNA analysis found insufficient evidence of a correlation between sonar use and beaked whale strandings when considering the complete sonar use record. The CNA finding is in contrast to the finding in Simonis et al. (2020), which depicted a significant correlation between beaked whale strandings and Navy sonar use. However, the Simonis et al. (2020) result relied on substantially incomplete or inaccurate assumptions about U.S. Navy sonar use around the Mariana Islands. CNA also conducted statistical analyses specific to each island where beaked whale strandings have been observed in the Mariana Islands, similarly finding insufficient evidence of a correlation to sonar use. Additional information on the findings of the CNA analysis are presented in Section 3.4.2.1.1.6 (Stranding) in Chapter 3.4 (Marine Mammals).

	Comment	Navy Response
		Given the preponderance of data described above, including the statistical analysis conducted by CNA, the Navy maintains that the comment authors have not demonstrated a strong association between beaked whale strandings and "multinational naval training operations that utilize MFAS." The author's statement that, "The high association (50%) of beaked whale stranding events with military and sonar activity, with the relative lack of beaked whale strandings before 2007, suggest that there may be particularly high risks of sonar-associated beaked whale strandings in the Mariana Islands…" is statistically incorrect in regard to actual sonar used, and makes erroneous assumptions about association between sonar use and beaked whale strandings that are not supported by all of the scientific data (# of events without stranding, necropsy results, low number of stranding co-occurring with sonar since 2015). The Navy has used passive acoustic monitoring research sensors in the Mariana Islands for monitoring projects, which has been useful in determining overall presence of marine mammal species. Information on the Navy's monitoring projects can be found on the U.S. Navy Marine Species Monitoring website (https://www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/). The Navy also uses passive acoustic monitoring as mitigation during training and testing when practical (i.e., when assets that have passive acoustic monitoring capabilities are already participating in the activity). The Navy's passive acoustic devices (e.g., remote acoustic sensors, expendable sonobuoys, passive acoustic sensors on submarines) can complement visual observations for marine mammals when passive acoustic assets are already participating in an activity. Passive acoustic devices can detect vocalizing marine mammals within the frequency bands already being monitored by Navy personnel. Beaked whales are not an extensively vocal species at the surface and typically start echolocation clicks at depth of >600 feet. The very high frequency and directional signals are difficult for even the most advanced research sensors to detect. Many Navy passive acoustic sensors used during training activities monitor for lower frequencies to aid in detection of submarines and sensors, and

	Comment	Navy Response
		are not optimized for high-frequency beaked whale signals. Marine mammal detections from passive acoustic devices can alert Lookouts to possible marine mammal presence in the vicinity. Lookouts can use the information from passive acoustic detections to assist their visual observations of the mitigation zone. Based on the number and type of passive acoustic devices that are typically used, passive acoustic detections do not provide range or bearing to a detected animal in order to determine its location or confirm its presence in a mitigation zone. Therefore, it is not practical for the Navy to implement mitigation in response to passive acoustic detections alone (i.e., without a visual sighting of an animal within the mitigation zone). Adding additional passive acoustic monitoring capabilities (either by adding a passive acoustic monitoring device to a platform already participating in the activity, or by adding a platform with integrated passive acoustic monitoring capabilities to the activity) for mitigation is not practical for the reasons described in Section 5.6.3 (Active and Passive Acoustic Monitoring Devices) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Navy's Phase III mitigation zones are designed to avoid or reduce potential impacts on marine mammals to the maximum extent practical. The mitigation zones for active sonar extend beyond the average ranges to PTS for all marine mammal hearing groups, including beaked whales. Increasing the size of the Navy's active sonar mitigation zones would be impractical for the reasons described in Section 5.3.2.1 (Active Sonar). As described in Appendix I (Geographic Mitigation Assessment), the Navy developed new mitigation for the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS to include a restriction on the number of hours of surface ship hull-mounted MF1 mid-frequency active sonar used from December 1 to April 30 within the Marpi Reef Mitigation Area and Chalan Kanoa Reef Mitigation Area. The use of surface ship hull-mounted MF1 mid-frequency active sonar is also prohibited year-round in the Agat Bay Nearshore Mitigation Area. The Navy determined that implementing geographic mitigation beyond what is described in Section 5.4 (At-Sea Mitigation Areas to be Implemented) would be impractical due to implications for safety, sustainability, and mission

	Comment	Navy Response
		requirements for the reasons described in Appendix I (Geographic Mitigation Assessment) and Chapter 5 (Mitigation). Regional marine mammal stranding response networks are a mission responsibility of NMFS. There is an existing NOAA Fisheries Marine Mammal Health and Stranding Response Program. Within the national program, there is an annual grant process (Prescott Grant Program) to which regional stranding networks can apply for funds to address (1) recovery and treatment (i.e., rehabilitation) of stranded marine mammals; (2) data collection from living or dead stranded marine mammals, and (3) facility upgrades, operation costs, and staffing needs directly related to the recovery and treatment of stranded marine mammals and the collection of data from living or dead stranded marine mammals. There is an existing regional stranding response network for the relatively small number of annual strandings in the Mariana Islands. Starting in 2018, the Navy began funding necropsy support via the PIFSC. This funding supports labor and travel for a leading regional expert to respond to and analyze select marine mammal strandings including beaked whales in Hawaii and the Marianas Islands. Therefore, the Navy is already contributing to regional marine mammal stranding response. Additional post-event surveys by the Navy are not logistically or fiscally warranted given the high number of Navy activities compared to the relatively few strandings in the region. Nor were post-event island surveys particularly effective when the Navy conducted similar surveys in areas with significantly more sonar use such as the Hawaiian Islands. As described in Section 5.1.2.2.1 (Marine Species Research and Monitoring Programs), for this Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy agreed to several additional research and monitoring initiatives designed to help advance the understanding of beaked whales and strandings in the MITT Study Area. The Navy will co-fund the Pacific Marine Assessment Program for Protected Species (PACMAPPS) Mariana Islands survey in spring-summer 2021 and future studies starting in 2022 to help document beaked whale occurrence, abundance, and

	Comment	Navy Response
		distribution in the Mariana Islands. The Navy will also fund additional stranding response and necropsy analyses for the Pacific Islands region, and research on a framework to improve statistical stranding analysis. Collaboratively with NMFS, the Navy will fund and organize an expert panel to provide recommendations on scientific data gaps and uncertainties for further protective measure consideration to minimize potential impacts of Navy training and testing activities on beaked whales in the Mariana Islands.
Moñeka De Oro (MDO)		
MDO-01	This public process for collecting comments is not easily accessible for many residents of the Marianas. They ways in which information was shared with the community is not very effective. Town meetings, a few newspaper articles and a website just doesn't cut it if the aim to provide meaningful engagement. The mitigation plans especially In regards to impacts to historic properties in the MITT is sorely inadequate. Compounding this with the poor local leadership at the historic resources division, it is easy to see how and why a whole Ancient Village site was destroyed at Magua, Guam last year. That kind of desecration is completely disrespectful, and if the programmatic agreement allowed for that destruction it is problematic. No historic properties that are Eligible for the historic register should be impacted. All construction Near significant Historic areas should also cease until the promised cultural repository is built. One aspect that is troubling about the cultural repository is that there are no support funds for operations and personnel. What good will just a building do? Why should the government of Guam and its tax base be the ones to shoulder the operations costs to house the artifacts from sites the military is destroying?	The Navy is not proposing any geographic expansion of the training and testing area in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Proposed activities are similar to those conducted in the Study Area for decades. Training and testing activities are proposed to occur at sea and on FDM. Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2 in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS present current and proposed training and testing activities. The Navy held four open house public meetings, one each on Tinian (Tinian Public Library, March 14, 2019), Rota (Mayor's Conference Hall, March 15, 2019), Saipan (Kanoa Resort, March 18, 2019), and Guam (University of Guam, March 19, 2019). The public meetings were an opportunity for the public to ask questions of Navy leadership, scientists, and other experts about the analysis documented in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Navy encouraged the public to attend these meetings and broadly notified the public through the media, including paid newspaper advertisements and news releases, and direct mail, including letters, postcards, and emails. A voice recorder was provided for any member of the public that wanted to provide an oral comment in a language other than English. The Navy has received feedback from attendees that the open-house format is more conducive to promoting public understanding and constructive dialogue. Open house meetings allow a greater number of individuals to directly engage and interact with Navy team members and ask questions about this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, as well as provide comments on the

	Comment	Navy Response
	In that's same note, Why should the tax payers of Guam pay for the needed water and waste water upgrades needed to sustain this build up and expansion of military efforts?	document.
JUAN DIEGO BLANCO (JDB)		
JDB-01	PLEASE LEAVE OUR PEACEFUL ISLANDS ALONE! OUR PEOPLE HAVE SUFFERED ENOUGH BY THE WAR WE HAD NOTHING TO DO WITH BETWEEN JAPAN AND THE USA. HAVING MILITARY INSTALLATIONS ON OUR PEACEFUL ISLAND WILL INVITE ANOTHER WAR! JUST RECENTLY, NORTH KOREA THREATEN TO BOMB OUR ISLANDS DUE TO THE EXISTING MILITARY INSTALLATION ON GUAM. WHY IS AMERICA PUTTING ITS OWN CITIZENS AT RISK OF BEING NUKED? WHY IS IT THAT AMERICA FIND IT NECESSARY TO BOMB THE BEAUTIFUL ISLAND OF PAGAN? ISN'T IT ENOUGH THAT AMERICA IS PRESENTLY BOMBING OUR BEAUTIFUL ISLAND OF FDM AND WILL CONTINUE TO BOMB THE ISLAND UNTIL THE 99 YEAR $20,000.00 LEASEHOLD EXPIRES? PLEASE STOP! PEACE NOT WAR!	Training and testing activities are proposed to occur at sea and on FDM. Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2 in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS present current and proposed training and testing activities. The Proposed Action does not include Pagan.
No name provided (NNP)		
NNP-01	The fact that Guam is listed as a country and not a part of the United States in the drop-down menu above is telling on how we are viewed and treated as "American" citizens. We say no to further military expansion on island. We say no to desecration of our cultural heritage sites. We say no to harming our flora and fauna. We say no to the exploitation of our lands for purposes outlined in the plans drafted by the US military.	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.

	Comment	Navy Response
No name provided (NNP)		
NNP-02	I am strongly against bombing of any island(s) and testing that will take place in any ocean(s). These God given lands and oceans that we are preserving are for our future generations. Natural disasters are beyond anyone control and no matter what the outcome, we the People always manage to accept and gradually recover not just rebuilding our damaged houses but emotionally and financially. I say NO, NO, NO to Military Bombing.	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.
Alvaro Santos (AlvS)		
AlvS-01	I am opposed to the military plans for the use of Pagan and Tinian for military live firing and other training activities that will inevitably impact the environments of these islands and ultimately destroy the islands themselves. The U.S. and its Pacific allies will use these islands and one can imagine the magnitude of the military activities that will take place by these multi-nation's militaries. Air space, marine space and the islands will all be significantly impacted including the economy and lives of the CNMI people. Included in the military plan is a mitigation plan to restore and protect the islands' environment somewhere in the future. THIS IS A FARCE NOTHING MORE THAN A MILITARY SALES PITCH. Take the case of the island in Hawaii just off Maui that was used by the Navy for bombing and other military training in the 1800's. After years of military live fire and bombings the island was poisoned to the point that it is now barren. The U.S. Congress appropriated $400 million for mitigation purposes to revive the barren island to no avail. Conservationists tried to restore vegetation on the island but unexploded ordinances and other toxic materials in the soil prevented soil conservation and re-vegetation. The $400	Training and testing activities are proposed to occur at sea and on FDM. Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2 in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS present current and proposed training and testing activities. The Proposed Action does not include Pagan.

	Comment	Navy Response
	million mitigation funding ran out and little or nothing was ever accomplished as far as mitigation is concern. Land mass is extremely limited and precious to the people of the CNMI. Culturally, the people connect themselves with the air, land and sea as providers of life. To the military, land use and destructive results on the CNMI lands for military objectives are mere COLLATERAL DAMAGE. I abhor this ideology.	
AYUMI SUZUKI (AyS)		
AyS-01	Do not come. Do not do war practice. I want Alternative Zero.	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.
AYUMI LITULUMAR (AyL)		
AyL-01	I do not want US come to NMI and do maritally activities. I want alternative zero.	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.
Yaong Yaing (YY)		
YY-01	Leave our island alone!!!! Mitt.com	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.
Jenny Deleon Guerrero (JDG)		
JDG-01	I understand the need to test in order to be better equip but I feel that testing has gone on long enough and it's time to give it a rest. The oceans creatures have endured enough suffering and death. I say no more to testing in Farallon de Medinilla.	The FDM range is operated in accordance with the terms and conditions specified in the 2015 Biological Opinion (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 2015). Testing activities do not occur on the FDM range.
Jerrid Igisaiar (JI)		
JJ-01	As a Northern Marianas descendant, I would not want the outer reaches of my islands to be bombed or there to be testing of sonar in any sort of way that will harm the creatures of the sea. We the people of the Northern Mariana	Marine life and marine habitat are important to the Navy. Using the latest science and technology, the Navy completed extensive analyses and computer-based modeling to determine impacts and develop science-based protective measures to reduce or avoid potential impacts on marine life. Potential effects

	Comment	Navy Response
	Islands detest the idea of having our islands used for military training of any sort, bombings, and sonar testing, because of the environmental consequences, consequences on the ecosystem, and the impact on the future generations. We the people of the NMI will stand up, time and time again, to confront, you, the navy with all the negative impacts you are trying to do to our creatures, to our people, and to our home. The navy has done sonar testing and look what it produced, beachings; both whales and dolphins, as well as many other species in the ocean will suffer from the sonar testing, here in the Northern Marinas Islands. May 1996, Greece, 12 beaked whales mass strandings; March 15-16, 2000, Bahamas, 16 beaked whales mass strandings; May 2000, Madeira, 3 Cuvier's beaked whales mass stranding and 1 found outside of the shoreline dead because of internal brain damage and mass bleeding through the eyes and ears. These strandings are the product of sonar testing in the ocean and this list could go on and on, proving time after time that Sonar testing in the ocean is detrimental to the ecosystem. So, we abhor the idea of, you, the navy coming to our islands and disrupting our ecosystem with your nefarious technology. To be frank, bombing our islands, that may not be inhabited by people, is still inhumane. What of the animals that preside there? They have made it their home far longer than the first conquest or visit to the NMI. So, bombing in any way, shape, or form will not be allowed by the people of the NMI. We could care less if it is for military advancement, the people, creatures, and islands of the NMI come first and foremost before any type of military exercise. It will impact our future generations because they won't know the islands as we knew it, our beautiful islands that hold such treasure that not even	from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Also, as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), the Navy implements, to the maximum extent practicable, procedural and geographic mitigation measures during its training and testing activities to reduce potential impacts on marine life. The Navy's analysis indicates that, with implementation of its protective mitigation measures, there would be no significant impacts on marine species. Note that the stranding events in this comment did not occur in the MITT Study Area and did not involve any training or testing scenarios in the Proposed Action. The Center for Naval Analysis (CNA) recently conducted a statistical study of correlation of beaked whale strandings around the Mariana Islands with the use of U.S. Navy sonar, finding that insufficient evidence of a correlation exists. The CNA study used the complete record of all U.S. Navy sonar use between 2007 and 2019, including major training events, joint exercises, and unit level training/testing. The analysis also included the complete beaked whale stranding record for the Mariana Islands through 2019. Following the methods in Simonis et al. (2020), the CNA analysis found insufficient evidence of a correlation between sonar use and beaked whale strandings when considering the complete sonar use record. The CNA finding is in contrast to the finding in Simonis et al. (2020), which depicted a significant correlation between beaked whale strandings and Navy sonar use. However, the Simonis et al. (2020) result relied on substantially incomplete or inaccurate assumptions about U.S. Navy sonar use around the Mariana Islands. CNA also conducted statistical analyses specific to each island where beaked whale strandings have been observed in the Mariana Islands, similarly finding insufficient evidence of a correlation to sonar use. Additional information on the findings of the CNA analysis are presented in Section 3.4.2.1.1.6 (Stranding) in Chapter 3.4 (Marine Mammals). For a full discussion of historical stranding events, please see the 2017 technical report *Marine Mammal Strandings Associated with U.S. Navy Sonar Activities*, found on

	Comment	Navy Response
	the richest man in the world could have; love. We have great pride, care, and love for those islands. Though, everyone in the NMI does not go to the outer islands, those who do and come back retell their story which expresses the importance of them even more. It is not just an island, it is a second home, it is a form of hunting and gathering for our families, and it is the essence of pure nature and the stronghold of what makes the NMI, the NMI.	the project website at www.mitt-eis.com. NMFS, as the regulator, maintains the authoritative National Stranding Database. The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.
Luise Q. Noisom (LQM)		
LQM-01	Dear sir, Our island is so small and it's part of us and I'm pleading that you find another place to test your bombs and sonars .The end result will be uninhabitable by birds or any creature, just death to our island and resources. Please respect our island culture and resources.	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.
Wayne De Bellonia (WDB)		
WDB-01	As I strongly believe the Military and Navy must be prepared for any attacks we may have on our nation and islands I strongly believe the training will effect sea life and land animal life. Not to mention destruction by amphibious vehicles approaching the beaches. Millions of years of corals will be destroyed and never to come back again. I live on Saipan and I am a 45-year scuba instructor and have seen the devastation on the invasion beaches of corals that were crushed due to the landings. At that time in 1944 it was necessary. Same goes for Tinian where my father served during the war. But for training I believe there could and possibly be other islands the training could take place on. Proof of sonar effecting sea life and killing many whales has	Public safety is also important to the Navy and various means are used to communicate information on areas restricted to public or commercial activities are described in Section 3.13 (Public Health and Safety) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As specified in Title 33 C.F.R. Subpart 72.01, Notices to Mariners, the U.S. Coast Guard issues information to the public concerning maritime navigation. There are three categories of Notices to Mariners: the Local Notice to Mariners (LNM), the Notice to Mariners (NTM), and the Marine Broadcast Notice to Mariners (BNM). Additionally, nautical charts issued by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration include these federally designated zones and areas. Operators of recreational and commercial vessels have a duty to abide by maritime regulations administered by the U.S. Coast Guard. Waters around FDM

	Comment	Navy Response
	been documented. The fragile ocean environment will be effected badly and possibly never to return to normal. Fishermen that frequent the northern islands would be banned from fishing in those areas along with tourist such as myself who would love to visit and dive and fish the islands. While living in St Thomas in the United States Virgin Islands from 71-85 the Military and Navy trained in Culebera. There were plenty of errors by the Navy where the projectiles overshot their targets and hit the small town on the island killing some residents. The islanders fought for years to get all the practice there to cease. They finally got it to stop. Although the Northern Mariana Islands are mostly uninhabited I feel it will affect not only one island but all islands. With sea life and land bird and animal life leaving the area due to the loud bombings and shock waves in the water from the shelling. At this time, I find it for me to be against using the pristine Northern Mariana Islands for land and sea practicing. Hopefully you can find one of the many islands out in the Pacific to do your practice. I fully thank you all for your service and all you do to protect our country and islands. I stand behind our Military, Navy and Coast Guard all the way. I am also so proud of our President Donald J Trump for increasing the funding for our Military and Navy. May God bless you all and God's speed.	within 3 NM from shore are permanently closed for safety reasons due to the potential presence of unexploded ordnance. Landing of amphibious vehicles is not proposed as part of the Proposed Action. Training and testing activities within this Supplemental EIS/OEIS are proposed to occur at sea and on FDM. Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2 in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) present the current and proposed training and testing activities.
Maria Calori (MaC)		
MaC-01	The NEPA process itself is flawed in that it puts the perpetrator of the action in power and leaves the (lay) citizens being affected at a disadvantage as the accusers -	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.

	Comment	Navy Response
	long documents written in military jargon expected to be read and analyzed in short amounts of time. Comments received are expected to be concise and specific, backed by science. WE, the citizens, are innocent until proven guilty - not you, U.S. Department of Defense (/Department of the Interior) ; You have been proven guilty over and over and over again. The Marshall Islands, Sumay, Hagåtña, my grandparents, my parents - living (dying) proof of your trespasses. I reject any and all military training in and around Guam and the Mariånas. Bombing, Firing ranges, jets fueling and flying overhead, and war training exercises all have a negative impact on all living species most especially native species of sea mammals, fruit bats, monitor lizards, butterflies (and other native insects), trees, shrubs, plants (used in native medicines). Guam's limestone forests are very limited and species that depend on that habitat are struggling to survive. The northern islands allow us to research and learn more about our pristine habitats and how to ensure the survival of species threatened in Guam. As a people, the CHamoru and other locals suffer from high rates of cancer and illness resulting from exposure to chemicals specifically used by the U.S. military. Military exercises also have an emotional and mental impact on the community at large, please refer to and read in entirety "Colonial Dis-Ease: US Navy Health Policies and the Chamorros of Guam, 1898–1941 (Pacific Islands Monographs Series)" by Anne Perez Hattori.	

	Comment	Navy Response
Sue Uncangco (SU)		
SU-01	I strongly oppose this. The federal govt don't give a hoot about the people they are poisoning. We are dying and they deny doing anything wrong and won't give proper compensation. we are still fighting for Agent Orange in Guam. radiation fallout etc. Stop making my people suffer. Go to the mainland and do your practices.	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.
Paul Plunkett (PP)		
PP-01	• I was active duty with the US Navy for two tours and worked both directly and indirectly with the US military for many years after that. I also have family that are now both active duty and retired from the US military. • I know very well what our military does, and that is why I'm so concerned about what they will do to the CNMI. • The CNMI will continue to support the military by providing more on active duty per capita than any other state or region. The CNMI supports the US military but does not want the military destroying their islands and using Pagan for any reason. • I know that our military has deep pockets, high paid lawyers and negotiators, and are supported by lawmakers and politicians that give them what they want. • I know that for all the money they spend, that could be much better spent elsewhere, their return on investment and environmental record is appalling. • I know they destroyed numerous islands and other areas to where they're not useable forever, and how people from	Training and testing activities are proposed to occur at sea and on FDM. Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2 in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS present current and proposed training and testing activities. The Proposed Action does not include Pagan.

	Comment	Navy Response
	there deeply regret ever letting them in. • I know that still today kids in Laos, Cambodia, and Vietnam are losing their legs and lives from US military bombs dropped 50 years ago and never cleaned up. • I know that the US military needs new training locations because they completely destroyed areas they used, and because they were finally told to leave Okinawa after they beat and raped a 12 year old, raped and murdered a five year old, and committed numerous other crimes against Okinawans. And that's just one location where the US military destroyed more than just the land. • I know DOD is banking on so few people even knowing what or where the CNMI is, and that the folks and decision makers in DC will think out of sight out of mind. • I know that it was the U.S. military that caused 911 attacks against us because they were over in Saudi disrespecting their culture, just like their doing in over 160 countries now, and they'll do in the CNMI. • I know the U.S military moved into Iraq almost 20 years ago without reason and are still there. • I know the U.S military will try to bomb and destroy the CNMI for 112 or so years they propose or until they've completely destroyed it and are ready to move on to destroy somewhere else. • I know if their proposal is approved, the CNMI won't be able to limit their destructive activities that will extend	

	Comment	Navy Response
	further than just Tinian and Pagan. • I know it's time to do a lot more than speak out at a DOD sponsored hearing and write statements that will be ignored. • I know that DOD public hearings and environmental displays are just a show of good faith and to check the block that we've been heard, and that a true indicator of good faith is to first repair what DOD already destroyed. • I know DOD doesn't care what is said, and especially doesn't want that known beyond the CNMI. • I know DOD expects it will be difficult for the CNMI to coordinate an opposing unity of effort that knows how to direct their message to the right people who now don't even know what or where the CNMI is. • I know that a lot of CNMI residents have more comments and want to be heard, that not enough of them are sharing how they feel and what they don't want that DOD will do. • I know the CNMI needs to better unite and develop a strategy to address DOD's proposal that includes who needs to be involved and informed. "The only thing necessary for the triumph of evil.....is for good men to do nothing." Edmund Burke, Irish statesman My hope is that good men and women in the CNMI will better unite and stand up against what DOD proposes. Thank you,	

	Comment	Navy Response
	Paul Plunkett	
Francis Damian (FD)		
FD-01	**MITT Concerns and Consideration** **The following are ideas and concerns by the Guam Coastal Management Program regarding the Marianas Island Training and Testing proposal by the Navy.** **RESOURCE POLICIES RP3 Water Quality -** Safe drinking water shall be assured and aquatic recreation sites shall be protected through the regulation of uses and discharges that pose a pollution threat to Guam's waters, particularly in estuarine, reef and aquifer areas. The impact of explosives will have impacts to the water quality and needs to be conditioned as the siltation will have far reaching impacts due to the health of the corals and living species that will be affected. **RESOURCE POLICIES RP4 Fragile areas -** Development in the following types of fragile areas shall be regulated to protect their unique character: historic and archaeologic sites, wildlife habitats, pristine marine and terrestrial communities, limestone forests, and mangrove stands and other wetlands. The Navy must conduct surveys to identify artifacts in the coastal areas. Are there any known historical or artifacts in the coastal areas where the Navy will be conducting its activities?	The Navy submitted a Consistency Determination (CD) to the Bureau of Statistics and Plans (BSP) in December 2019 addressing proposed military training and testing activities that may affect Guam's coastal zone and coastal uses. The consistency determination was prepared in accordance with Guam's Procedures Guide for Achieving Federal Consistency with the Guam Coastal Management Program (Bureau of Statistics and Plans May 2011). BSP's response to the Navy's CD (dated March 6, 2020) can be found in Appendix C (Agency Correspondence). The Navy is in discussions with BSP in order resolve any differences and reach an agreement regarding the Navy's compliance with Guam's Coastal Management Program to the maximum extent practicable. The outcome of these discussions will be included in the ROD. The Navy has engaged with the Guam Coastal Management Program throughout the development of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, including meeting with staff during the scoping phase and notifying the program director when the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS was made available for public review and comment. The Navy complies with all applicable laws and regulations. Based on the analysis presented in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS and the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, the Navy concluded that all levels of metals, chemicals, and other byproducts would either be below detectable levels or at levels below existing standards, regulations, and guidelines as documented in Section 3.1 (Sediments and Water Quality). While there are no existing standards and guidelines in Guam for marine sediments and water quality related to explosives and explosive byproducts or metals in the marine environment, the Environmental Protection Agency has established criteria for concentrations of explosives, explosive byproducts, and metals in saltwater. Based on the analysis presented above and

	Comment	Navy Response
	Navy must disclose what explosives will be deployed It is unknown what explosives will be expended into the water environment making it also unknown what metals are being used and what components are involved. This should be known and recognized as harmless to the environment. Most especially the harm an unexploded ordinance brings to anyone traversing the area. The depth and distance of the explosives is critical to the destruction of the coral and colonies it resides in. What type of explosives are being proposed and what will be the impacts to our shoreline environment? **RESOURCE POLICIES RP5 Living Marine Resources -** All living resources within the territory waters on Guam, particularly corals and fish, shall be protected from overharvesting and, in the case of marine mammals, from any taking whatsoever. The depth and distance should also be considered to the impacts of living species such as endangered turtles or any other living species who may be residing or traversing the area due to the proximity of the coastline area. Sonars are a major issue that needs to be address as it will have negative effects to the marine life and the environment. The Navy needs to respond to the magnitude and the depth of sonar signals and how living species of the Ocean are affected.	in the MITT Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, existing federal standards and guidelines would not be violated. The MITT Supplemental EIS/OEIS predominantly pertains to activities that occur at sea. The only land-based activities as part of the MITT Proposed Action are related to the use of ordnance on FDM. The Navy is required to independently comply with the statutory requirements of NEPA and the NHPA. In the MITT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy has reviewed and incorporated the best available science to analyze potential impacts on cultural resources, including underwater cultural heritage and maritime archeology. Section 3.0.4.2 (Explosive Stressors) describes the characteristics of explosions during naval training and testing. Activities analyzed in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS that use explosives are described in Appendix A (Training and Testing Activities Descriptions). As stated in Section 3.8.2.2 (Explosive Stressors), although the vast majority of explosions occur at distances greater than 3 NM from shore (where water depths are greater than the depths where shallow-water coral species occur), some explosions may occur close to marine invertebrates that could kill or injure those invertebrates. Explosions near the seafloor and very large explosions in the water column may impact shallow-water corals of any life stage, hard-bottom habitat and associated marine invertebrates, and deep-water corals. Effects could include physical disturbance, fragmentation, or mortality to sessile organisms and pelagic larvae. Energy from an explosion at the surface would dissipate below detectable levels before reaching the seafloor and would not injure or otherwise impact deep-water, benthic marine invertebrates. Section 5.4.1 (Mitigation Areas for Seafloor Resources) presents mitigation measures the Navy would implement to avoid or reduce impacts from explosives on seafloor resources in mitigation areas throughout the Study Area. For example, the Navy will not conduct explosive mine countermeasure and neutralization activities within a specified distance of shallow-water coral reefs, live hard bottom, artificial reefs, and shipwrecks. Mitigation measures would

	Comment	Navy Response
	RESOURCE POLICIES RP8 Public Access - The public's right of unrestricted access shall be ensured to all non-federally-owned beach areas and all Territorial recreation areas, parks, scenic overlooks, designated conservation areas and other public lands; and agreements shall be encouraged with the owners of private and federal property for the provision of reasonable access to, and use of, resources of public nature located on the such land. The fishermen or anyone boating or even traversing in the coastlines of the military base should also be taken into consideration as to the safeguard for the loss of human life. Has the Navy considered other alternatives in this case as Guam outside of the Navy bases may actually be encroaching outside of the base limits and causing an impact to the inhabitants living within an Island environment. **DEVELOPMENT POLICIES** **Development Policies DP1 Shore Area Development -** *Only those uses shall be located within the Seashore Reserve which:-Enhance, are compatible with or do not generally detract from the surrounding coastal area's aesthetic and environmental quality and beach accessibility; or -can demonstrate dependence on such a location and the lack of feasible alternative sites.*	also help avoid or reduce potential impacts on invertebrates that inhabit these areas. The Navy took a hard look at the potential impacts of the Proposed Action on marine mammals and sea turtles using the best available science. The Navy's quantitative analysis process for analyzing impacts from active sonar and explosives has been reviewed by external scientists and approved by NMFS. The Navy also worked collaboratively with NMFS to develop mitigation measures using input from the military operators, the best available science, predicted activity impact footprints, and marine species monitoring and density data. The Navy has implemented and will continue to implement procedural mitigation measures designed to reduce or avoid impacts on marine mammals in the Study Area (see Chapter 5, Mitigation). At this time, these procedural mitigation measures represent the most practicable methods for protecting marine mammals while allowing the Navy to complete its training and testing mission. The Navy has reviewed and incorporated the best available science to support the impact analysis and conclusions for the coral reef communities. The Navy is consulting with NMFS under the ESA for potential effects on coral and received a Biological Opinion. Mitigation measures and monitoring requirements specified in the Biological Opinion are presented in Chapter 5 (Mitigation). Mitigation measures in the Biological Opinion will also be reflected in the ROD. The potential effects of sonar and explosives on marine mammals are quantitatively estimated using the Navy's Acoustics Effects Model (see the Technical Report, *Quantifying Acoustic Impacts on Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles: Methods and Analytical Approach for Phase III Training and Testing*, available on the project website, for details on the quantitative methodology). Predicted effects from sonar on marine mammals are presented by species in Section 3.4.2.1.2.3 (Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers Under the Action Alternatives) and from explosives in Section 3.4.2.2.2.3 (Impacts from Explosive

	Comment	Navy Response
	What is the Navy doing to minimize impacts due to explosives that have any negative effects to corals and the underwater environment in the shoreline area? Since the FDM is uninhabited has there been any consideration to allow a firing range in the FDM island instead of the ones that are proposed for Guam. Having the firing range in places other than the ones proposed in Guam takes away the safety measures and duration of exercise the Military is proposing for the Island of Guam. The problem is that the removal of the danger zones here on Guam will only get exacerbated in the FDM area as there are many migratory birds and possibly endangered species that are not known at this time. In essence what we are doing to protect life here on Guam may actually transfer to species life endangerment at FDM. The onus is to the safety and wellbeing of the inhabitants living on Guam as opposed to FDM which is uninhabited by humans. These concerns must be addressed by the Navy and mitigated to ensure of the protection to the Ocean waters and living species are protected as much as is ultimately possible. The inhabitants both residential and tourists must remain protected as much as is ultimately possible in order for everyone living on and off base that	Stressors Under the Action Alternatives). No mortality or direct injury to any marine mammals is predicted. Public safety is also important to the Navy. Various means are used to communicate information to the public about areas restricted to public or commercial activities and are described in Section 3.13 (Public Health and Safety). As specified in Title 33 C.F.R. Subpart 72.01, Notices to Mariners, the U.S. Coast Guard issues information to the public concerning maritime navigation. There are three categories of notices to mariners: the Local Notice to Mariners, the Notice to Mariners, and the Marine Broadcast Notice to Mariners. Additionally, nautical charts issued by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration include these federally designated zones and areas. Operators of recreational and commercial vessels have a duty to abide by maritime regulations administered by the U.S. Coast Guard. Waters around FDM within 3 NM from shore are permanently closed for safety reasons due to the potential presence of unexploded ordnance. A firing range is not part of the Proposed Action for this Supplemental EIS/OEIS; therefore, the development of alternatives did not consider a firing range on FDM. Alternatives carried forward were developed to meet the Navy's purpose and need and to ensure fulfilment of obligation under Title 10 of the United States Code. See Section 2.4 (Action Alternatives Development) for more detailed information on the development of alternatives.

	Comment	Navy Response
	make up our island environment and the quality of life remains safeguarded for all to enjoy.	
Gretchen Druliner (GD)		
GD-01	These islands are the heart and soul of the Chamorro people, these islands are our ancestors that have been and they are our ancestors that will be. These islands are our dreams and the dreams of our children, they are our existence. There are so many beautiful things to say about these islands, our islands, and the connectedness of the Chamorro people. But America only seems to recognize and understand the buying and selling of things. These islands are not things for sale. These islands are our collective memory and our imagination and our future. The US military chooses to deny the joint ecosystem of Guam and the CNMI, a connected ridge-line chain of islands, and reports two separate EISs for one continuous marine ecosystem. It is also one military relocation project as indicated by the name CJMT. There are many discrepancies the Military's EIS 's makes. They fail to recognize the physical and disorienting trauma of sonic blasts on marine life, they fail to recognize the toxic leaching from the weapons testing into the waters surrounding the islands, they fail to properly recognize the effects of such an increase in human presence on the ecosystems, they fail to recognize that we are island people who are an integral part of this ecosystem they want to come and bomb and occupy. Additionally, your EIS does not take into account the years of colonization, violence and displacement from globalization and wars, and the cumulative degradation from the global economy of accumulation these islands have weathered thus far. It does not take into account the losses we, as islands and people	Training and testing activities are proposed to occur at sea and on FDM. Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2 in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS present current and proposed training and testing activities. The Proposed Action does not include Pagan.

	Comment	Navy Response
	have already endured, we are only a small piece of land in the pacific. With a strategic location. You want not to only utilize our beautiful Pagan, but to increase use and types of use on Tinian and the waters of the Marianas, an island and ecosystem we live, ranch, garden, fish, and drink the water from. I will quote from a paper because it is written clearly and I see no need to rewrite science: Commonly used military energetic compounds include the explosives 2,4,6-trinitrotoluene (TNT), hexahydro-1,3,5-trinitro-1,3,5-triazine (RDX), and octahydro-1,3,5,7-tetranitro-1,3,5,7-tetrazocine (HMX) [1]. Nitroglycerin (NG), nitroguanidine (NQ), nitrocellulose (NC), 2,4-dinitrotoluene (DNT), and various perchlorate formulations are employed in missile, rocket, and gun propellants [2, 3]. As a result of military activities and due to improper management and disposal practices many energetic substances and their by-products have contaminated environments to levels that threaten the health of humans, livestock, wildlife, and ecosystems. In humans TNT is associated with abnormal liver function and anemia, and both TNT and RDX have been classified as potential human carcinogens [4, 5]. TNT toxicity has been demonstrated using earthworm reproduction tests [6], and studies with Vibrio fischeri have established TNT as being “very toxic” to aquatic organisms [7]. Mutagenicity studies have been carried out using TNT and its metabolites on Salmonella strains and mammalian cell lines [8–11]. TNT was found to be mutagenic, with some metabolites more so than the TNT itself.	

	Comment	Navy Response
	The effects of RDX on mammals are generally characterized by convulsions. Deaths in rats were associated with congestion in the gastrointestinal tract and lungs [12, 13] (oral rat LD50 = 0.07–0.12 g/kg) [14]. Factory employees in Europe and the US have suffered convulsions, unconsciousness, vertigo, and vomiting after RDX exposure [15]. Information is limited concerning health effects of HMX [16]. The USEPA has established lifetime exposure drinking water health advisory limits for TNT, RDX, and HMX at 2.0, 2.0, and 400 µg/L, respectively [17, 18]. Acute exposure to NG can cause headaches, nausea, convulsions, cyanosis, circulatory collapse, or death [19, 20]. Chronic exposure may result in severe headaches, hallucinations, and skin rashes [21]. Perchlorate adversely affects human health by interfering with iodine uptake in the thyroid gland [22]. Energetic compounds may enter the soil environment via numerous avenues including [23–28] the following: Distribution and Fate of Military Explosives and Propellants in Soil: A Review John Pichtel, 2012 Your assurance of transparency, safety and boundaries fall on deaf ears, we have seen the devastation so callously inflicted upon other island nations. We know the history of Bikini Atoll, we know the history or Runit Dome, the history of Enewetak Atoll, Kwajalein Atoll, Kiritimati and Malden Islands, Johnson Atoll…we know the insatiable appetite of military power, of colonialism and we are not assured. There	

	Comment	Navy Response
	is no assurance for our collective imagination, our future, our children's future, our existence, if our homeland is destroyed.	
Ned Pablo (NP)		
NP-01	Follow your EPA, NIPA regulations. Stop doing sonar testing and start listening to the marine biologists and experts that are turning in expert advice and testimonies contradicting and discrediting your experts and false information. Go practice somewhere else, leave the Marianas alone and the Chamoru people alone, also leave our natural resources and marine animals alone. Stop lying and killing our animals & marine resources please!!!!!	Marine life and marine habitat are important to the Navy. Using the latest science and technology, the Navy completed extensive analyses and computer-based modeling to determine impacts and develop science-based protective measures to reduce or avoid potential impacts on marine life. Potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Also, as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), the Navy implements, to the maximum extent practicable, procedural and geographic mitigation measures during its training and testing activities to reduce potential impacts on marine life. The Navy's analysis indicates that, with implementation of its protective mitigation measures, there would be no significant impacts on marine species. The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.
Juan Diego Tenorio Juan (JDTJ)		
JDTJ-01	Please stop bombing our islands. There are other places closer to the US mainland like the Aleutian Islands and other areas in Alaska you can use. Please, please, please stop destroying our islands. You are using some of our islands already for bombing practice. That is enough! I would like for my kids to be able to enjoy those islands in their lifetime. We do not want to be another Kahoolawe. You tore that place up and the people can no longer use it.	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.

	Comment	Navy Response
Dolores Limes (DL)		
DL-01	NO to BOMBINGS in the CNMI	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.
Ana Celis (AC)		
AC-01	Dear Military officials. My name is Ana and I oppose the military usage of Tinian and Pagan Island for bombing practice. our islands are very small and our population is growing. I have three children and they also have a growing family. They have been on the waiting list for homestead for a long time and if these islands are going to be use as practice then my children and their children and the future children will not have any land for their own. The military is already using Farallon de Mendeniza for bombing practice, I think that is good enough already Save the other Island for our Children's future. The United States is already a very STRONG nation. It already take the following Northern Islands. Farallon de Paharous, Maug, Asuncion and Guguan and if Pagan Island is taken for bombing then the other island such as Agrigan and Alamagan will be affected as well because of the air and sea area restrictions. I understand the need to practice, but can it be done somewhere else where there will be no people going to stay. Hundred years from now I know the population will be more so where are they going to stay when the Islands are all destroyed and contaminated. Thank you for your understanding.	Training and testing activities are proposed to occur at sea and on FDM. Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2 in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS present current and proposed training and testing activities. The Proposed Action does not include Pagan.

	Comment	Navy Response
Pamela Sypniewski (PS)		
PS-01	Please don't use Pagan as a bombing site. This is my friend's home island and I don't want to see it destroyed. Thank you for your time.	Training and testing activities are proposed to occur at sea and on FDM. Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2 in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS present current and proposed training and testing activities. The Proposed Action does not include Pagan.
Juan Duenas (JuD)		
JuD-01	don'T TARNISH THE PARADICE...	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.
Macey Fujihira (MF)		
MF-01	I think that the proposed action should not be done to our islands because it could cause harm to our seawater environment or our land environment as well. It has important purposes but I believe they should conduct their experiments and testing at another place or create their own place for testing rather than use our islands. We must protect our resources and this is a way for us to protect it, one step at a time.	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.
Nadine Sablan (NS)		
NS-01	Adding a CORRECTION to my previous comment. I meant SONAR TESTING, for research NOT Solar Testing! Thank you. Nadine Hamilton Sablan, Ph.D.	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.
Nadine Sablan (NS)		
NS-02	Please Stop the destruction of our islands' land and sea resources. This is all we have to give to our children; generations to come. Stop the Solar testing as you are harming the Ocean's natural aura, sea animals' homes and volcanic island stability. Please go elsewhere where the land	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.

	Comment	Navy Response
	and sea resources are endless. May God guide you as you form a solid plan to satisfy your need for research. Thank you. Nadine Hamilton Sablan, Ph.D	
Guadalupe Borja (GB)		
GB-01	I am an indigenous Chamorro from the Northern Mariana Islands. We local people DO NOT WANT the U. S. military doing its exercises and tests in our islands and ocean waters. Our islands are small and our waters need to stay clean and unpolluted for us today and for future generations. You allege that you need to do military exercises and tests in our homeland. U. S. IMPERIALISM exists in the 21st century. Do your own exercises and tests in your own backyard.	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.
Jude Lizama (JL)		
JL-01	The Navy is suggesting the potential impact on land, sea, and cultural resources as piecemeal consequences when in fact, these resources will be impacted cumulatively. These resources, both biological and physical, deteriorate simultaneously. Specifically, the effects of ordinance training on Farallon de Medinilla and Tinian will negatively affect the CNMI pelagic fish stocks since both islands are frequented fishing areas. Furthermore, if fish are caught from these areas, there will be increased risk to disease stemming from the decreased physical land and water quality. Tinian is a populated island that is 39 square miles. If two-	As described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the EIS/OEIS (especially Section 5.2, Mitigation Development Process), the Navy evaluated the effectiveness and practicability of numerous potential mitigation measures. Note that Navy does not employ only visual monitoring, but also makes use of passive acoustic detection when available and appropriate. On Navy ships, hand-held binoculars are always available and pedestal mounted binoculars, very similar to those used in marine mammal surveys, are generally available to Navy Lookouts on board vessels over 60 feet. Also, like marine mammal observers, Navy Lookouts are trained to use a methodical combination of unaided eye and optics as they search the surface around a vessel. In addition to designated Lookouts, there are always additional bridge watch personnel observing the water around the vessel. Finally, the Navy's reliance on visual mitigation has been demonstrated to be

	Comment	Navy Response
	thirds of it will be used for ordinance and vehicle training, then surely there will be conventional pollution and noise pollution affecting residents. How will these pollutants affect residents living on the island and visitors travelling to the island? What will the Navy do to guarantee Tinian residents' quality of life? Vegetation is also still recuperating from damage dealt from the Battle of Tinian and has more new-growth forest than old growth forest. The proposed impact will adversely affect native and endemic avifauna that disperse seeds of flora that are not dispersed by wind. Farallon de Medinilla, even smaller than Tinian, is 0.326 square miles. If it is leased land, then why does bombing continue when damage dealt is irreversible? Active and passive sonar testing around the Marianas should not occur due to its effects on marine mammals. The Navy has suggested having spotters perform 360-degree observation scans from the deck of a vessel to identify marine mammals and sea turtles in test areas to ensure none are in the area during testing, but this is inadequate. This is especially so since these organisms can be subsurface for extended periods of time before requiring oxygen.	effective over years of monitoring associated with Navy training and testing at sea in publicly available reports submitted to NMFS since 2006 and accessible on the NMFS Office of Protected Resources website. In accordance with CEQ guidance, the cumulative impacts analysis focused on impacts that are truly meaningful. This was accomplished by reviewing the direct and indirect impacts that would occur on each resource under each of the alternatives. Key factors considered were the current status and sensitivity of the resource and the intensity, duration, and spatial extent of the impacts of each potential stressor. In general, long-term and widespread impacts were considered more likely to contribute to cumulative impacts than short-term and localized impacts. Those impacts on a resource that were considered to be negligible were not considered further in the analysis. The level of analysis for each resource was commensurate with the intensity of the impacts identified in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences). Please refer to Section 4.1 (Principles of Cumulative Impacts Analysis) for a discussion of the approach to analysis for cumulative effects. Table 4.2-1 lists the other actions and other environmental considerations identified for the cumulative impact analysis. This includes non-Navy actions, which result in greater effects on marine resources than those the Navy is proposing. Use of islands within the CNMI, except FDM, is not proposed as part of the Proposed Action. Training and testing activities within this Supplemental EIS/OEIS are proposed to occur at sea and on FDM. Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2 in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) present the current and proposed training and testing activities.
David Kiyoshi Hosono (DKH)		
DKH-01	You bomb any of the northern islands, and the current will bring debris and fuck up the coral communities of the CNMI, who are you practicing for anyways?	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.
Patricia Hempey (PH)		
PH-01	I object to the continued bombing and use of sonar in the	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment

	Comment	Navy Response
	Mariana Islands.	during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.
Darwin Valenciano (DV)		
DV-01	1. Look into the unintended vulnerability on the part of the indigenous Marianas on the aspect of traditional fishing may arise due to the different activities involved. The cultural way of living as well as other day to day life activities can be indirectly altered and affected by the influx of population brought about by the series of activities included in the No Action Alternative, Alternative 1 and Alternative 2. 2. On the Socio-Economic aspect, discontinuing training and testing activities might have negative impacts in the No Alternative Action, while Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 will bring positive impacts on the socioeconomic resources of Guam and the CNMI, Gender Based Violence should be look upon as there are known cases or reports of said issue in US military bases and US military activities conducted in the Asia and Pacific specifically South Korea, Japan and the Philippines for the last five (5) years. 3. Being prone to HIV-AIDS incidence and to other communicable diseases must also be taken into consideration in the study areas considering influx of military personnel and their families as new inhabitants together with continuous tourist influx and migration will mix up with the increasing population in Guam and the CNMI. Given the very limited health facilities available to the public in the Marianas, there must be a clear mitigating action that can take a look on this very important health aspect. 4. On impact on Marine Habitats, a conduct of baseline	This Supplemental EIS/OEIS does not propose a change to the ocean areas currently used by both the Navy and the public. Restrictions on accessing areas of co-use would continue to be infrequent and short term, while other fishing sites in the Study Area would continue to be available to the public. The military is committed to continuing to work with the local community on issues that potentially affect the public, including access to fishing sites. Comments associated with item #2 are outside the scope of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Navy strives to protect marine life and marine habitat. Using the latest science and technology, the Navy completed extensive analyses and computer-based modeling to determine impacts and develop science-based protective measures to reduce or avoid potential impacts on marine life. Potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Also, as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy implements to the maximum extent practicable, procedural and geographic mitigation measures during its training and testing activities to reduce potential impacts on marine life. The Navy's analysis indicates that, with implementation of its protective mitigation measures, there would be no significant impacts on marine species. The Navy strives to protect marine life and marine habitat. Using the latest science and technology, the Navy completed extensive analyses and computer-based modeling to determine impacts and develop science-based protective measures to reduce or avoid potential impacts on marine life. The health of biological resources around Farallon de Medinilla (FDM) is also important to the Navy. As discussed in Sections 3.8 (Marine Invertebrates) and 3.9 (Fishes), recent surveys conducted by the Navy (Smith and Marx, 2016) at

	Comment	Navy Response
	survey is recommended to define and identify extent of impact to the previously disturbed places in terms of sizes, and condition based on short- and long-term consequences to the marine population on each area. 5. Conduct of a periodic surveys of the islands coral reefs to determine impact of soil erosion coming from nearby islands of the study areas as well as periodic survey (every month or 2 months) to ensure previously disturbed areas are not expanding/ contained. 6. On impact to Marine Mammals, mitigating measures for stressor impacts should be defined in terms of what they need to apply as defined in the Marine Mammals Protection Act of 1972.	FDM found that coral fauna are healthy and robust, and the nearshore physical environment and basic habitat types at FDM would remain unchanged. These conclusions are based on (1) a limited amount of physical damage, (2) very low levels of partial mortality and disease (less than 1 percent of all species observed), (3) absence of excessive mucus production, (4) good coral recruitment, and (5) complete recovery by 2012 of the 2007 bleaching event. Smith and Marx (2016) also concluded that the health, abundance, and biomass of fishes, corals, and other marine resources at FDM are as good as, or better than, those in similar habitats elsewhere in the Mariana Archipelago. In addition, the Navy funded additional reef surveys in the nearshore areas of FDM in 2017. The results were approved for public release in September 2018, and available at https://apps.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/1069450.pdf. The 2017 survey found little evidence that training has affected coral reef communities at FDM. Only three relatively fresh ordnance items were observed, but no blast pits, craters, or significant areas of coral breakage were observed. The ordnance observed during the 2017 survey was almost exclusively old, encrusted in marine life, and had no discernable impact on surrounding communities. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), the Navy would implement a robust suite of mitigation measures for marine mammals that are (1) designed to effect the least practicable adverse impact on marine mammal species or stocks and their habitat and have a negligible impact on marine mammal species and stocks (as required under the Marine Mammal Protection Act), and (2) ensure the Proposed Action does not jeopardize the continued existence of endangered or threatened species (as required under the Endangered Species Act). The Navy is consulting with NOAA under the MMPA and ESA for marine mammals. The consultations resulted in a Final Rule and a Letter of Authorization under MMPA and a Biological Opinion (containing an Incidental Take Permit) under ESA.
Diego Kaipat (DK)		
DK-01	Enough is enough! NO BOMBING OF TINIAN AND PAGAN ISLAND or Guam Once again the people on the Northern Marianas Islands are	The Navy is not proposing any geographic expansion of the training and testing area in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Proposed activities are similar to those conducted in the Study Area for decades.

	Comment	Navy Response
	being continuously lied too and mislead by the Navy. At all public and group meetings that I had attended there had been assurances that inputs and comments from everyone will be taken into considerations, however, as I saw clearly during this last public hearing there is a more bigger proposal by the Navy's planned MASSIVE MARIANAS BOMBING RANGE. The MBR consisting of the following training's will have a devastating effect within the following areas. 1.984,469 square nautical miles around the Marianas. 2. 2/3 of Tinian. 3. The entire Island of Pagan. 4. entire FDM. 5. Multiple areas on the island of Guam. All the MITTI propose expansion such as Aerial Bombardment, Shelling from Ships, Direct and Indirect firing range, Amphibious Beach assaults, Live fire maneuvering, Rockets, Missile, Mortar, Beach Landing will cause damages and irreparable harm to the environment and Native Plants and Animals. Also depriving the local population their freedom to live and enjoy the islands, the only Island that they have lived on for centuries. Lastly, Please explain to me Why is CHINA building Island in the pacific for its defenses purposes and the U.S. is instead planning to destroy the Islands that belong to the people of the Marianas?	Training and testing activities are proposed to occur at sea and on FDM. Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2 in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS present current and proposed training and testing activities. The Proposed Action does not include Pagan.
Joseph Smith (JS)		
JS-01	Why is the US Navy and NMFS not using the definitions of "abandonment" or "significantly altered" as stated in the NDAA of 2004 conference report? This conference report specifically defined these two term as they apply to military readiness activities but these definitions have never been used in any U.S. Navy environmental impact statement. The	Thank you for your questions. Our response is as follows: Both the Navy and NMFS are acting consistently with all laws and regulations that apply to the Navy's activities in the MITT study area. The Navy and NMFS are aware of the legislative history referred to in the comment. The Navy and NMFS both addressed that due to the nature of behavioral response research to

	Comment	Navy Response
	specific wording of the conference report is as follows: "Specifically, the conference agreement would amend section 3(18) of the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1362(18)) by providing a new definition of "harassment'' applicable only to military readiness activities, as defined by section 315(f) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107-314), and scientific research activities by or on behalf of the Federal Government, conducted pursuant to section 104(c)(3) of the Act (16 U.S.C. 1374(c)(3)). The new definition will provide greater clarity for the Department of Defense (DOD) and the regulatory agencies, and would properly focus authorization of military readiness and scientific research activities on biologically significant impacts to marine mammals, a science-based approach. Under the new definition for "Level B Harassment,'' behavioral patterns would be considered "abandoned'' if long-term cessation of behaviors and demographic consequences to reproduction or survivability of the species or stock were involved. In order for natural behavioral patterns to be considered "significantly altered,'' there must be demographic consequences to reproduction or survivability of the species." Questions: 1. Please answer why these very specific definitions have never been used for U.S. Navy environmental planning documents? 2. Also by not using these definitions the USN and NMFS are overstating the amount of behavioral take by vast amounts as they apply to military readiness activities. What is the purpose for overstating the amount of take associated with	date and the complexity and extent of factors influencing behavioral response, it is difficult to identify quantitative thresholds to precisely predict abandonment or significant alteration of a natural behavior pattern. NMFS addressed the application of the definition in light of the best available science in the Proposed Rule as follows on page 5832: Despite the quickly evolving science, there are still challenges in quantifying expected behavioral responses that qualify as take by Level B harassment, especially where the goal is to use one or two predictable indicators (e.g., received level and distance) to predict responses that are also driven by additional factors that cannot be easily incorporated into the thresholds (e.g., context). So, while the behavioral Level B harassment thresholds have been refined here to better consider the best available science (e.g., incorporating both received level and distance), they also still have some built-in conservative factors to address the challenge noted. For example, while duration of observed responses in the data are now considered in the thresholds, some of the responses that are informing take thresholds are of a very short duration, such that it is possible some of these responses might not always rise to the level of disrupting behavior patterns to a point where they are abandoned or significantly altered. We describe the application of this Level B harassment threshold as identifying the maximum number of instances in which marine mammals could be reasonably expected to experience a disruption in behavior patterns to a point where they are abandoned or significantly altered. In summary, we believe these behavioral Level B harassment thresholds are the most appropriate method for predicting behavioral Level B harassment given the best available science and the associated uncertainty. Further, from page 5833 of the Proposed Rule: ...[M]arine mammal responses to sound (some of which are considered disturbances that rise to the level of a take) are highly variable and context specific, i.e., they are affected by differences in acoustic conditions;

	Comment	Navy Response
	military readiness activities? 3. Why has NMFS not adopted the very specific definitions associated with military readiness activities that are clearly defined in the conference report for the NDAA of FY2004? 5. Why has this law not been implemented as written?	differences between species and populations; differences in gender, age, reproductive status, or social behavior; or other prior experience of the individuals. This means that there is support for considering alternative approaches for estimating Level B behavioral harassment. Although the statutory definition of Level B harassment for military readiness activities means that a natural behavior pattern of a marine mammal is significantly altered or abandoned, the current state of science for determining those thresholds is somewhat unsettled. In its analysis of impacts associated with sonar acoustic sources (which was coordinated with NMFS), the Navy used an updated conservative approach that likely overestimates the number of takes by Level B harassment due to behavioral disturbance and response. Many of the behavioral responses identified using the Navy's quantitative analysis are most likely to be of moderate severity as described in the Southall et al. (2007) behavioral response severity scale. These "moderate" severity responses were considered significant if they were sustained for the duration of the exposure or longer. Within the Navy's quantitative analysis, many reactions are predicted from exposure to sound that may exceed an animal's Level B behavioral harassment threshold for only a single exposure (a few seconds) to several minutes, and it is likely that some of the resulting estimated behavioral responses that are counted as Level B harassment would not constitute "significantly altering or abandoning natural behavioral patterns." The Navy and NMFS have used the best available science to address the challenging differentiation between significant and non-significant behavioral reactions (i.e., whether the behavior has been abandoned or significantly altered such that it qualifies as harassment), but have erred on the cautious side where uncertainty exists (e.g., counting these lower duration reactions as take), which likely results in some degree of overestimation of Level B behavioral harassment. We consider application of this Level B behavioral harassment threshold, therefore, as identifying the maximum number of instances in which marine mammals could be reasonably expected to experience a disruption in behavior patterns to a point where they are abandoned or significantly altered (i.e., Level B harassment). Because this is

	Comment	Navy Response
		the most appropriate method for estimating Level B harassment given the best available science and uncertainty on the topic, it is these numbers of Level B harassment by behavioral disturbance that are analyzed in the Preliminary Analysis and Negligible Impact Determination section and would be authorized. As the state of science in this area becomes more precise, the estimation of take will be adjusted to be more accurate, and it may be possible to determine with greater precision what responses constitute "abandonment" and "significant alteration" with respect to military activities.
Lincoln Budasi (LB)		
LB-01	The military is a threat to the environment. They continue to work on stolen land in Guåhan while simultaneously destroying native plants and animals. The Agent Orange issue and firing range debris are a couple examples of their destructive nature. Native animals and plant life are in danger of extinction; some native animals and plants have already been extinct and labeled as critically endangered. They have hurt our waters by using sonar technology, which has led to beaked whales washing up on shore (and do not try to claim that there is no correlation between the washed-up bodies of innocent animals and the military's destructive sonar technology because there most certainly is). The people of Guåhan DO NOT WANT THE MILITARY HERE. You continue to danger us. You continue to kill us. Your presence is not welcomed.	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.

	Comment	Navy Response
Frank Rasa (FR)		
FR-01	I support military presence in the Marianas but I do not support any military training/bombing of any kind or form in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.
Sean Gunnell (SG)		
SG-01	Please don't go through with this. Let those billions in financial revenue for turning a large piece of land on Guam into a new military base be to diverted to helping aid in, for instance, the suicide prevention crisis on the island instead. So much of that money could be used to help stabilize Guam in a productive and healthy manner than for continuing to fuel the military industrial complex. Bring more electric and solar power, business, mental health physicians, and job opportunities that aren't just military occupations, since a substantial portion of the US military forces is made up of Guam citizens. This will negatively affect the ecosystem and environment in the long run. Don't fuel this unnecessary system and structure, but instead fuel life and lives and love and care. Thanks for reading.	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.
David Lotz (DL)		
DL-01	Please provide the annual reports required under the current MITT for endangered species that are submitted to USFWS and NOAA. Then should be part of the draft review.	Information on current monitoring projects, technical reports, conference presentations and data are available on the Navy's Marine Species Monitoring Program website at https://www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/.
Dave Lotz (DL)		
DL-02	This is a complaint that at the public event on Guam, an opportunity was denied to make public comments. Further the personnel stationed about the room were not taking down public comments.	From past experience, the Navy has concluded that the open house style public meeting format used during the MITT Supplemental EIS/OEIS public meetings is the most conducive to effective dialogue. Open house style meetings allow a greater number of individuals to engage and interact with Navy team members

	Comment	Navy Response
		and ask questions of subject matter experts. At the public meetings (Tinian Public Library, March 14, 2019; Rota Mayor's Conference Hall, March 15, 2019; Saipan Kanoa Resort, March 18, 2019; and University of Guam, March 19, 2019), multiple comment opportunities were provided to the public. A stenographer was available to record verbal comments and written comments were accepted. The Navy accepted comments from the public, and individuals stationed at the posters were responsible for discussing the MITT Supplemental EIS/OEIS and responding to questions from the public.
David Lotz (DL)		
DL-03	Chapter 1, Purpose and need, provides absolutely no specific information on the threats that the training is designed to meet nor does the chapter provide a justification for this training to be in the area of the Mariana Islands.	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.
Joseph LeePan Guerrero (JLG)		
JLG-01	For over 30 plus years after the Covenant agreement with the United State of America, the CNMI was never a part of the US for so many factors. We are second class to everything not even considering our geographical locations. U.S. Military interest here in the CNMI is to harm our resources be it water, land and air. There is no other interest whatsoever. All the grant funding that the CNMI receive from the Federal Government are peanuts, but can spend billions on destroying our resources. What, why and how I need to know is, what is the beneficial aspect for the CNMI by allowing the Navy to continue destroying our water, land and air? Is it improving the quality of life here in CNMI and what does the Navy going to provide for the CNMI? Why does the Navy want to increase the size of the current needs and how does the Navy determine that no major impact or harm to our resources in our water, land and air? The CNMI does not have exclusive control of it water like other Territories which we have every rights to control our territorial waters.	The Navy is not proposing any geographic expansion of the training and testing area in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Proposed activities are similar to those conducted in the Study Area for decades. The Navy acknowledges that the information presented in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS is by necessity very complex. This Supplemental EIS/OEIS contains a rigorous scientific analysis of the potential impacts of the Navy's proposal and thoroughly explains the scientific analysis and findings. The Navy attempts to explain challenging concepts, methods, and the results of the analysis as clearly as possible and developed public informational materials for lay audiences. The Navy prepared project brochures, videos, a website, and posters, using layperson terms to enhance public understanding of the information presented in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Based on the demographics of the CNMI, a project fact sheet was also translated into Chamorro. The informational materials, including the translated fact sheet, were made available at all four public meetings and on the project website (www.mitt-eis.com).

	Comment	Navy Response
	The 3,000 pages report is not readable because it is purely written for the military to understand and comprehend all the hidden agendas plus all the military acronyms. One can say that we can have the best presenter speaking for us to understand the conceptual plans, but what is not mention is the concerns that we as a CNMI be really concern on. As a member of this community, I do not support any military expansion or continued use of our water, land or air. FDM will no longer be safe, because we basically allowed continuous bombing, now the Navy want to expand the usage of FDM. If the CNMI is so strategically important to the US for whatever reason(s), than the fair market value of the CNMI is priceless... Leave the CNMI so that we could make use of our water, land and air for future generation. Do not contaminate what is precious to our needs.	The Navy held four open house public meetings, one each on Tinian (Tinian Public Library, March 14, 2019), Rota (Mayor's Conference Hall, March 15, 2019), Saipan (Kanoa Resort, March 18, 2019), and Guam (University of Guam, March 19, 2019). The public meetings were an opportunity for the public to ask questions of Navy leadership, scientists, and other experts about the analysis documented in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Navy encouraged the public to attend these meetings and broadly notified the public through the media, including paid newspaper advertisements and news releases, and direct mail, including letters, postcards, and emails. A voice recorder was provided for any member of the public that wanted to provide an oral comment in a language other than English. The Navy has received feedback from attendees that the open-house format is more conducive to promoting public understanding and constructive dialogue. Open house meetings allow a greater number of individuals to directly engage and interact with Navy team members and ask questions about this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, as well as provide comments on the document. The Navy provided the public 75 days to review and comment on the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, 30 days longer than the minimum recommended time for review of NEPA documents.
ZAJI ZAJRADHARA (ZZ)		
ZZ-01	IT IS VERY SIMPLE...THE CNMI POLITICIANS, VARIOUS CNMI LAWYERS, AND 99% OF THE BUSINESS COMMUNITY> WHICH IS COMPRISED OF 98% FOREIGN SO-CALLED INVESTORS>95% OF THOSE ARE OF CHINESE ETHNIC BACKGROUND..CONTROL THE LOBBYING BODY AND THE SO-CALLED REPUBLICAN/DEMOCRATIC PARTIES... THE LOCAL POWERBROKERS DO NOT, I REPEAT DO NOT WANT THE U.S. MILITARY BOOTS ON THE GROUND BECAUSE OF THE INTELLIGENCE APPARATUS THAT COMES WITH MILITARY ALIGNMENTS...THE CHINESE ARE IN THE PROCESS OF	The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.

	Comment	Navy Response
	MAKING THESE ISLANDS CHINESE SATELLITE STATES, AND THE GOVERNOR, AND SO-CALLED CONGRESSMAN KIOLILI IS MORE THAN HAPPY TO ASSIST THE CHINESE IN EVERY WAY POSSIBLE...ALL THE WHILE FRAMING SAID ASSISSTANCE STABLIZING THE CNMI ECONOMY...BUT, WHICH IN ALL HONESTY A MONEY LAUNDERING / AMERICAN TAXPAYER MONIES LEAVING THESE ISLANDS FOR CHINESE AND THE PHILIPPINES- AND MORE RECENTLY BANGLADESH. I HUMBLY REQUEST THAT A BASE OF BOTH INTELLIGENCE AND MILITARY APPARATUS BE SET-UP HERE IN THE CNMI....Moreover, THE CHINESE FREE VISA WAVIER MUST BE CANCELLED...FOR CAUSE...CHINESE ILLEGAL WORKERS, BABY TOURISTS, AND OVERSTAYERS...ALL YOU NEED DO IS CHECK THE MORE THAN 350 AIR B&B ROOMS...ON ISLAND, THE INCUBATORS CALLED HOTELS/HOSTLES...AND RESEARCH ALL OF THE PROPERTIES THAT ARE BEING BOUGHT AND RESOLD TO OTHER CHINESE All under the guise of e2c/e5c "investment, while at the same time these "investors" are systematically not hiring U.S. CITIZENS...THOUGH, I AM NOT A GENIUS...I READ A LOT...WHICH I HAVE ATTACHED FOR YOUR PURVIEW.	
Juanita Mendiola (JM)		
JM-01	It is pure malice on your part that we, the Chamorro people of the Marianas Islands, United States of America, are continually placed under threat of destruction in guise to protect our islands and our people from threats created by countries, including our own, competing for domination over the world's resources. No great effort is placed on meaningful talk for peace to avoid the demise of human beings, because there exists	Training and testing activities are proposed to occur at sea and on FDM. Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2 in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS present current and proposed training and testing activities. The Proposed Action does not include Pagan.

	Comment	Navy Response
	internal economic machination driving political policies to perpetuate the threat to lives under the semblance of protection. The unfortunate truth is that small colonized communities worldwide are used as testing and training grounds and deployment stations to threaten unfriendly countries. Of course, these training and testing activities are most assuredly tapered down so as not to directly endanger people's lives or create immediately visible environmental affects, but they provide information on the magnitude of destruction that can and will take place when used exponentially. Evidencing this statement is the fact that it was not enough to see the destruction in Hiroshima and Nagasaki, a bigger bomb was tested in Bikini and people were encouraged to watch the fireworks, exposing them to radiation poisoning. To this very day, each generation of children thereafter born I. the Marshall Islands and Japan still experience their latent effects while those who were stillborn were spared the agony of a life devoid of meaningful quality. It does not matter what studies are done to find out the impact of training and testing weaponry. There is no ground, water and air that survived destruction and no human being has been deemed healthy after exposure! The Tinian Mortar range was used since 1945 to 1995. The Site inspection report of August 2015 indicated the presence of MC and MEC to be above the PALs and recommended a	

	Comment	Navy Response
	Remedial Investigation to find out the extent of health and environmental hazards. To this day this area is merely cordoned off with a fence that was destroyed by Typhoon Yutu and is now open. Where is the mitigation planned for this? But, the most evil in all these is the duplicity involved in trying to convince people that all will be fine with mitigation plans in place. Repeatedly incomplete remediation leaches insidious toxins into the environment poisoning our web of life. Runit Dome and Enewetak Atoll and others have created a legacy of islands destroyed to a population experiencing some of the most extant losses The US has intentionally pocketed the Marianas in case of rejection of current militarization, this rejection with Japan and Guam has occurred. This cascade of rejections has left you to the CJMT which has included Pagan for a mere $66 million dollars and Tinian commercial airfield for $40 million. You all claim troop readiness to justify these proposals but what you are failing to include in your proposal is the futility of that readiness when you can't deploy them! What this all boils down to is you all just want a playground to maintain your presence in this region and divert threats away from CONUS. It is an insult and a mockery that we are continually subjected to defend our little resources, way of life and environment against our own country's desire to maintain world power through militarization while China is using the most effective tool - economic domination.	

	Comment	Navy Response
	I plead for transparency and implore on you all to stop treating us without value to our country and world communities. We may be small, but like your small bombs that you plan to test on our grounds, water and air, in the aggregate, will begin to eat away at your own existence. How powerful would we be then when faced with a threat bigger than your weapons? Look around you and see how the climate has changed and the devastations that it continues to bring with forces that are now phenomenal.	
Lynne Bruzzese (LB)		
LB-01	I am writing to express my opposition to the U.S. military's proposal to continue and to expand weapons testing on and around the island of the Farallon de Medinilla in the Northern Mariana Islands, where I lived and worked for many years. I also oppose the proposal to conduct bombing exercises on the island of Pagan. The expanded lease proposal for Farallon de Medinilla and the Navy's Mariana Islands Training and Testing Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (EIS/OEIS) are materially inadequate because there has not been a sufficiently thorough study of the impact of the proposed bombings and underwater testing (active sonar and explosives) on migratory birds or marine mammals. Unusual whale strandings already have been observed in the area following the increase in bombing exercises in the area starting a decade ago, indicating that more in-depth study needs to be conducted under the Endangered Species Act and the Marine Mammals Protection Act. Additionally, while the current lease requires the U.S. military to clean up Farallon de Medinilla when its training exercises	The Navy is not proposing any geographic expansion of the training and testing area in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Proposed activities are similar to those conducted in the Study Area for decades. Training and testing activities are proposed to occur at sea and on FDM. Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2 in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS present current and proposed training and testing activities. The Proposed Action does not include Pagan.

	Comment	Navy Response
	conclude, the military's record is abysmal in this regard. For example, if the military determines that such clean-up prohibitively expensive, as it did not the former testing range of Kahoolawe in Hawai'i, or if the weapons and other testing so ravages the islands that they remain uninhabitable for the foreseeable future, as happened with Bikini atoll. Many of the Mariana Islands remain pristine and largely unspoiled by human activity. The American government has done more than sufficient damage to islands all over Micronesia, including but not limited to in the Mariana Islands, and this needs to stop now. The health and homes of the people in the area has been compromised by past testing, e.g., in the Marshall Islands, just has the health of U.S. mainlanders, and U.S. mainland flora and fauna, were compromised by atmospheric and underground nuclear testing in the 1940s - 70s. The people and natural resources of Micronesia in general, and the Mariana Islands in particular, are no less precious simply because they're located farther from Washington, D.C. and the Pentagon than the Lower 48 states are. Thank you for considering these comments in opposition to the Navy's plan.	
Lincoln Budasi (LiB)		
LiB-01	The military's presence on Guam and other islands in the Marianas is detrimental to the existence of indigenous people. The United States continues to destroy the culture and land of CHamoru people, despite local people and organizations speaking out against them.	Training and testing activities are proposed to occur at sea and on FDM. Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2 in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS present current and proposed training and testing activities.

	Comment	Navy Response
Kawena Phillips (KaP)		
KaP-01	Do not expand the testing area because you are killing whales and destroying land in the Marianas! You are destroying endangered forests! stop! do not expand anymore! in fact go back to America and leave the Pacific Islands alone! we have suffered enough under you	The Navy is not proposing any geographic expansion of the training and testing area in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Proposed activities are similar to those conducted in the Study Area for decades
Travis Wells (TW)		
TW-01	As a CHamoru and a community member I strongly oppose the proposed military action happening on Laguas yan Gani and throughout Oceania. US military presence on Guåhan, a UN recognizes dependency/colony of the US violates international law. The reckless and destructive actions by the US military by extending testing and operations in our homes threatens our safety, our environment, our livelihoods, and our future. The military needs to take a step back and acknowledge they sit on occupied and stolen land, and to treat the CHamoru people with the respect we deserve by stopping action that desecrates our islands and our indigenous ways of life.	The military is committed to protecting public health and safety and the terrestrial and marine environment while training and testing. Training and testing activities are proposed to occur at sea and on FDM. Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2 in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS present current and proposed training and testing activities.
Dr. Amy Eisenberg (AE)		
AE-01	I worked in the Northern Marianas and experienced Super Typhoon Yutu REMOVE THE TOXIC PCBS ON ROTA ISLAND THAT THE U.S. BURIED IN 1970 NEAR TO WHERE NORTHERN MARIANAS COLLEGE, ROTA CAMPUS STANDS TODAY. MANY PEOPLE ON ROTA HAVE CANCER OR THEIR LOVED ONES HAVE CANCER OR HAVE DIED OF CANCER. SHAME ON THIS GOVERNMENT FOR CRIMES AGAINST HUMANITY. CHAMORU LIVES MATTER. RESPECT THE LAND AND THE FIRST PEOPLES.	The military is committed to protecting public health and safety and the terrestrial and marine environment while training and testing. Training and testing activities are proposed to occur at sea and on FDM. Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2 in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS present current and proposed training and testing activities. The Navy analyzed land-based activities on Guam, Saipan, Tinian, and Rota in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS; the Navy did not reanalyze land-based activities in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS because there are no changes proposed to those land-based activities.

	Comment	Navy Response
	RESPONSIBLY REMOVE YOUR TOXINS FROM THIS COMMONWEALTH. IT IS YOUR RESPONSIBILITY THAT YOU ARE NOT FULFILLING. MY FATHER DIED OF CANCER DUE TO HIS EXPOSURE TO RADIATION AND ASBESTOS DURING WWII IN THE PACIFIC. YOU KILLED MY BELOVED DAD. HE WAS DEPLOYED TO NAGASAKI AFTER THE US DROPPED THE NUCLEAR BOMBS. HIS SHIP WAS LADEN WITH ASBESTOS AND MANY ON HIS SHIP DEVELOPED CANCER AND DIED OF CANCER. I WILL NEVER FORGIVE THIS. IMPEACH THE WARMONGER SEXUAL PREDATOR KIDNAPPER WEAPONS SALESMAN FOOL IN THE WHITE HOUSE RESPECT INDIGENOUS LANDS AND PEOPLE. RESPECT THE SACRED AND THEIR CULTURES. CHUMP DISGRACES U.S. GET OUT OF THE MARIANAS AND STOP KILLING RARE SPECIES. Dr. Amy Eisenberg The University of Arizona	
Tanielle Tokoro (TT)		
TT-01	How much more pain and suffering must we, the indigenous people to the land, the ecosystem, our oceans, and all animals must endure from the military? How can we live without our land, resources, and water? How does MITT benefit the indigenous people, and the environment in these space? We must never forget that we as all human being are responsible to these spaces for our future generations.	The military is committed to protecting public health and safety and the terrestrial and marine environment while training and testing.

	Comment	Navy Response
Desiree Pia (DP)		
DP-01	Aloha, I understand that this plan is designed to "test" new military equipment and strategies, but as a Native Hawaiian it pains me to imagine bombing and destroying yet another beautiful island even if it is uninhabited by people, just like our dear island of Kaho'olawe which is still recovering and uninhabitable from being bombed by the US military. I'm worried about the historic and culturally important sites that will be affected and destroyed. I feel sad because it's such a constant disappearance of native and indigenous' s people's culture and identity. Lastly, I'm also worried about the effect on not just the land but also marine life such as the coral reefs, fish, seals, whales, turtles, etc. What is flourishing now will surely disrupt and kill off the population of these creatures due to bombing and underwater sonar testing. Please consider this complaint, I'm an advocate for keeping our earth healthy for generations to come. Mahalo	The military is committed to protecting public health and safety and the terrestrial and marine environment while training and testing. This Supplemental EIS/OEIS analyzes effects of the Proposed Action on marine resources. This analysis is presented in Section 3.3 (Marine Habitats), Section 3.4 (Marine Mammals), Section 3.5 (Sea Turtles), Section 3.7 (Marine Vegetation), Section 3.8 (Marine Invertebrates), and Section 3.9 (Fishes). The analysis of cultural resources is presented in Section 3.11 (Cultural Resources).
Brenden Holland (BH)		
BH-01	Please cease live fire training on islands in US territories that harbor endangered species including Pagan Island and Tinian where some of the las repopulation of the humped tree snail Partula gibba. Pagan also has flying foxes and the rare megapode which's re also listed as endangered so damaging their habitat and or continuing activities that contribute to take of these species is illegal. In addition, species under the Marine Mammal Protection Act including the beaked whale also require protection under US law.	The military is committed to protecting public health and safety and the terrestrial and marine environment while training and testing. Training and testing activities are proposed to occur at sea and on FDM. Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2 in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS present current and proposed training and testing activities. The Proposed Action does not include Pagan.

	Comment	Navy Response
Valerie Weiss (VW)		
VW-01	I oppose the Mariana Islands Training and Testing Supplemental EIS/OEIS for environmental reasons as well as for the safety of marine mammals. Please do not destroy parts of our environmental world with military occupation and war practice. There has to be a better way to train than sending loud, far traveling, sonar into the depths.	The military is committed to protecting public health and safety and the terrestrial and marine environment while training and testing.
Gary Chock (GC)		
GC-01	Since the US has so much money to spend on bombing other people's islands and lands, why don't you just build your own islands to bomb closer to your own country like off the east coast .would probably be cheaper than paying for a lease and clean up after you guys bomb the shit out of it .Why do you have to destroy other nations lands to protect your own asses	The military is committed to protecting public health and safety and the terrestrial and marine environment while training and testing.
Patricia Blair (PB)		
PB-01	I oppose any Navy training exercises by the Navy in Guam, Saipan, Marianas, Okinawa, Hawaii. These exercises displace people, harm the environment on land and sea, and in no way improve the USA's security. The USA Navy should focus on cleaning the ocean, looking at ways to live in peace with other countries by respecting their boundaries.	The military is committed to protecting public health and safety and the terrestrial and marine environment while training and testing.
Marcy Koltun-Crilley (MKC)		
MKC-01	I Oppose these testing and training measures, especially the bombings and sonar testing. Living in Hawaii I have seen how even after spending close to a quarter of a billion dollars, the island of Kahoolawe is still not cleaned up or safe. Research shows that this type of sonar is extremely harmful to marine mammals. No more destruction of our islands, oceans and wildlife!	The military is committed to protecting public health and safety and the terrestrial and marine environment while training and testing.

	Comment	Navy Response
	Thank you.	
Matilda Iwanaga (MI)		
MI-01	To Whom It May Concern, I am writing this letter today as an indigenous resident of Guam, born and raised on sacred land, and an advocate of Guam's land, water, air, biodiversity, and culture. Our island's wildlife has been a casualty of the US military's presence in several ways. First, the Navy proposes continued sonar use throughout the region's waters in your latest Environment Impact Statement despite an increase in beaked whales washing up on Guam's shores and research indicating sonar is correlated with such incidents. These recorded incidents are significant. Also thoroughly researched and documented is the military's accidental introduction of the brown tree snake in the 1940s and the devastating effect its introduction has had on the native bird population, and thereby the jungle ecosystem. Despite the cascading devastation, we have yet to see the military's assistance in neutralizing this very problem that you have caused. Furthermore, your planned live firing range next to the island's National Wildlife Refuge will further erode island biodiversity. Three hundred and fifteen acres of land will be cleared and among them, 89 acres of native limestone forest and 110 acres of disturbed limestone forest.	The military is committed to protecting public health and safety and the terrestrial and marine environment while training and testing.

	Comment	Navy Response
	Based on our history with the military and the decisions that are made about our land and waters, WITHOUT OUR INPUT, we have yet to see decisions that are made for the common good that benefit our people, our land, and our resources. Our elderly are still waiting on war reparations that were promised at the end of World War II. When is the US federal government going to act with integrity? When is the US federal government going to do right by the people of Guam? We still have CHamorro's waiting for their promised land, under the CHamorro Land Trust who has been waiting for over 24 years, why not return some of those properties back to the Government or original owners and let them decide on how they would make much better use with their land. Once again we are taken advantage of, and mistaken that we don't know anything. We are a large group of indigenous supporters who will continue to advocate for our island.	
Glenn Manglona (GM)		
GM-01	I am recommending that all printed materials including but not limited to the EIS, brochures and handouts shall be translated in Chamorro and Carolinian languages. Willing to help out in this area since this is my expertise.	The military is committed to protecting public health and safety and the terrestrial and marine environment while training and testing. The Navy acknowledges that the information presented in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS is by necessity very complex; however, the Navy attempts to explain challenging concepts, methods, and the results of the analysis as clearly as possible and developed public informational materials for lay audiences. The Navy prepared project brochures, videos, a website, and posters, using layperson terms to enhance public understanding of the information presented in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Based on the demographics of the CNMI, a project fact sheet was also translated into Chamorro. The informational materials,

	Comment	Navy Response
		including the translated fact sheet, were made available at all four public meetings and on the project website (www.mitt-eis.com)
Jay Castro (JC)		
JC-01	Please give the land back to the people of Guam. Please leave the ocean clean and free of toxins. Please do not bring more military to Guam, or any other Pacific nation. Please. You've done enough.	The military is committed to protecting public health and safety and the terrestrial and marine environment while training and testing.
Anthony Rinaldi (AR)		
AR-01	According to a 2017 assessment from the US Fish and Wildlife service, native limestone forest, which is the oldest forest on the island of Guam, has been reduced to about 10% of the island. The military buildup plans to bulldoze 1,000 acres of the remaining native limestone forest, reducing the forest's size to 8%. This will have a detrimental effect on the island's environment and wellbeing. Do not do this.	The military is committed to protecting public health and safety and the terrestrial and marine environment while training and testing. Training and testing activities are proposed to occur at sea and on FDM. Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2 in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS present current and proposed training and testing activities.
Analyn Palugod (AP)		
AP-01	To Whom It May Concern, I am writing this letter today as a resident of Guam and an advocate of Guam's land, water, air and biodiversity. Our island's wildlife has been a casualty due to the military's presence. The navy proposes continued sonar use throughout the region's waters in your latest environmental impact statement despite an increase in beaked whales washing up on Guam's shores and research indicating sonar is correlated with such incidents. These recorded incidents are significant. It has also been documented of the military's accidental introduction of the brown tree snake in the 1940s and the devastating effect its introduction has had on the native bird population. Despite the devastation, we have yet to see the	The military is committed to protecting public health and safety and the terrestrial and marine environment while training and testing. Training and testing activities are proposed to occur at sea and on FDM. Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2 in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS present current and proposed training and testing activities.

	Comment	Navy Response
	military's assistance in neutralizing this very problem that you have caused. Your planned live firing range next to the island's national wildlife refuge will also affect the existing biodiversity. Three hundred fifteen acres of land will be cleared and among them, 89 acres of native limestone forest and 110 acres of disturbed limestone forest. Based on our history with the military and the decisions that are made in our land and our waters, we have yet to see decisions that are made for the common good that benefit our people, our land, and our resources.	
NATASHA THOMPSON (NT)		
NT-01	STOP WITH THE SONAR CRAP! OMG!!! QUIT IGNORING AND DENYING THAT MARINE LIFE IS BEING IMPACTED!!! STOP ALREADY!!!!!	The military is committed to protecting public health and safety and the terrestrial and marine environment while training and testing.
Daisy Demapan (DD)		
DD-01	This proposed action still continues to ignore the adverse environmental impacts to the islands and surrounding waters. There are no feasible alternatives because active sonar and explosives will be detrimental to sea life and cost insurmountable damage for future generations. There is documented evidence of the impact of these military activities and exercises and the military's outright refusal to correct, restore, and/or compensate for damages to indigenous lands, waters, and natural resources around the world.	The military is committed to protecting public health and safety and the terrestrial and marine environment while training and testing.
Lei Teno (LT)		
LT-01	"Training and testing activities have the potential to temporarily limit access to areas of the ocean, which has the potential to impact commercial transportation and shipping,	The military is committed to protecting public health and safety and the terrestrial and marine environment while training and testing.

	Comment	Navy Response
	commercial recreation and fishing, traditional fishing practices, and tourism in the Study Area" (Supplemental MITT, pg. 3.12-16) Our island people have been working hard & diligently to relocate families back to Pagan & other northern islands. Many people enjoy outdoor activities on our northern islands, especially during summer months. Our local wildlife staff have been relocating many local native species to our northern islands to repopulate & thrive. Our northern islands hold the biggest of our fish stock as stock around our main islands are quickly deteriorating. Tinian island is home to countless WWII historically significant sites as well as our endangered native bird species, the Tinian Monarch. Any destruction to our islands & it's surrounding waters is a permanent negative impact to our people & our native species. As a small island chain, all land is precious land. We don't have much of it to begin with & it's only getting smaller with ocean tides rising as a result of global warming. Limiting access and bombing/destruction to Pagan/Tinian & other northern islands is simply unacceptable. There is surely an alternative practice range for the military. There is definitely no alternative island/waters for our people & species.	Training and testing activities are proposed to occur at sea and on FDM. Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2 in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS present current and proposed training and testing activities. The Proposed Action does not include Pagan.
Gregory Woodward (GW)		
GW-01	Top of the morning, I hope I have the right office....quick question please---Are the Marines still planning to build an expanded urban guerrilla training complex and grenade range at the old South Andy Air Force Housing Area here on Guam? We live about a mile downwind of this area, and have frequently experienced the sound of small arms fire, stun grenades, and even window rattling explosions on occasion, not to mention low level HSCS-25 HH-60 helos	Training and testing activities are proposed to occur at sea and on FDM. Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2 in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS present current and proposed training and testing activities.

	Comment	Navy Response
	flying directly overhead--all this from the current, relatively small-scale training operation being conducted there. Quality and safety of life are genuine concerns, and I have to wonder, why not co-locate the proposed South Andy complex and grenade range out at Northwest field, where all the rest of the live fire range training will be conducted? Northwest Field is far from heavily populated areas like the Latte Heights/Plantation area where I live. In addition, South Andy could revert to being a peaceful, quiet, military housing area, like it used to be before. Thanks for reviewing my concerns, and I look forward to hearing from you soon... Cheers!	
Susan Tuck (ST)		
ST-01	Whales in the area- stop your sonar testing!	The military is committed to protecting public health and safety and the terrestrial and marine environment while training and testing.
Ayse Demirkan (AD)		
AD-01	Stop it. Damaging ecosystem is the biggest crime.	The military is committed to protecting public health and safety and the terrestrial and marine environment while training and testing.
Katri Langel (KL)		
KL-01	There is no need for this kind of testing. It is absolutely fatal for the sea animals, so cruel!	The military is committed to protecting public health and safety and the terrestrial and marine environment while training and testing.
Alex Poulos (AP)		
AP-01	We need to stop treating our oceans and it's inhabitants as our property. That they just need to deal with the things we do there. This planet is NOTHING without our oceans, we must stop torturing cetaceans with these unnecessary tests.	The military is committed to protecting public health and safety and the terrestrial and marine environment while training and testing.

	Comment	Navy Response
	It is literally killing them. If the situation was turned, we'd consider these tests terrorist attacks.	
Julieann Lujan (JL)		
JL-01	Hafa Adai, I am born and raised in California nearing my 60th birthday. I have lived on this Island approximately 30 years as a state side hire to fell in love with the people, quality of life and especially the ocean. I am proud to be an American and support the military cause coming from a very military oriented family. My father was the first nutritionist and one of the first chief petty officers on Guam. I appreciate the efforts of our country to continue protecting and safeguarding. Unfortunately, the perception by Islanders is that our voice like many other islands and territories is not being heard or acknowledged. My concern is with the environmental impact to our marine life - most recently with dying beached whales that slowly but surely wash up on our shores. And this is just the start of our marine downfall. The research and example conducted in Spain where a dozen beached whales died within 2 years then ceased once sonar testing was banned is not proof enough? Many issues are at stake but mostly our opinion to be heard and to make a difference in the continued exploitation of our tiny, non-voting colony that is a U.S. territory. Maybe you cannot treasure earths greatness as we do here but please give us the opportunity to protect what was once originally ours....	The military is committed to protecting public health and safety and the terrestrial and marine environment while training and testing. Marine life is important to the Navy. Using the latest science and technology, the Navy completed extensive analyses and computer-based modeling to determine impacts and develop science-based protective measures to reduce or avoid potential impacts on marine life. As explained in the Navy's technical report on marine mammal strandings (*Marine Mammal Strandings Associated with U.S. Navy Sonar Activities*, 2017 [www.mitt-eis.com]), marine mammal strandings have been a historic and ongoing occurrence attributed to a variety of causes, both natural and anthropogenic. Over the last 50 years, increased awareness and reporting has led to more information about species affected and raised concerns about anthropogenic sources of stranding. While there have been limited numbers of marine mammal mortalities potentially associated with U.S. Navy activities, the root causes are not clear in most cases. NMFS, as the regulator, maintains the authoritative National Stranding Database. In addition, Section 3.4.2.1.1.6 (Stranding) has been expanded to include additional information about strandings of beaked whales in the Mariana Islands and the Navy's support of efforts to better understand the causes of marine mammal strandings.

	Comment	Navy Response
	Respectfully...	
Jenna Miles (JM)		
JM-01	There is simply no logic in continuing practices that are known to be harmful to wildlife.	The military is committed to protecting public health and safety and the terrestrial and marine environment while training and testing.
William Fife (WF)		
WF-01	NO MILITARY BOMBING OF PAGAN!!!! A supporting statement of this includes the horrendous historical track record of environmental devastation wherever the US military has bombed before, including Hawaii, and most significantly the Marshall Islands. Uninhabitable islands, cultural devastation as well as environmental, on several islands. Destroying Pagan's environmental beauty should be a crime, and not supported by any government. How can the US military "prove" or "promise" that Pagan will not become an environmental wasteland? They cannot, and if they do, they are not being honest. And from what I've read, the move to Guam from Okinawa did not include environmental impacts on the CNMI--what else do you need to know to convince you that this is a bad idea and does not have the local people's best interest in mind?	Training and testing activities are proposed to occur at sea and on FDM. Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2 in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS present current and proposed training and testing activities. The Proposed Action does not include Pagan.
Molly Caccia (MoC)		
MoC-01	Your sonar and explosive training and testing will be so deafening that it will raise whales to abandon their normal feeding grounds and migration patterns, and will destroy their hearing to the point of hemorrhage. Whales are integral to the health of the marine ecosystem, and without them your testing is useless because there will be nothing and no one left in the world once the oceans are compromised. Marine life has declined by 49% since 1970. Please think of marine life, without which we cannot survive. Do not conduct this training and testing.	The military is committed to protecting public health and safety and the terrestrial and marine environment while training and testing. Research cited in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS and in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS indicates that behavioral changes are temporary and not necessarily repeated. Given the range of possible responses and variability in the type and severity of behavioral responses observed in marine mammals, potential long-term or population-level impacts are unlikely. The Navy has addressed recent research on possible long-term effects in Section 3.4.2.1.1.7 (Long-Term Consequences) in

	Comment	Navy Response
		this Supplemental EIS/OEIS and in Section 3.4.3.1.3 (Long-Term Consequences to the Individual and the Population) in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Marine life and marine habitat are important to the Navy. Using the latest science and technology, the Navy completed extensive analyses and computer-based modeling to determine impacts and develop science-based protective measures to reduce or avoid potential impacts on marine life. Potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Also, as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), the Navy implements, to the maximum extent practicable, procedural and geographic mitigation measures during its training and testing activities to reduce potential impacts on marine life. The Navy's analysis indicates that, with implementation of its protective mitigation measures, there would be no significant impacts on marine species. Activities using underwater explosives were modeled to estimate impacts on marine mammals from explosives. No mortalities of any marine mammals are predicted. Mitigation measures specifically for mine countermeasure activities are presented Section 5.3.3.7 (Explosive Mine Countermeasure and Neutralization Activities). The Navy is formally consulting with NMFS concerning potential impacts of the proposed training and testing activities on all marine mammals protected under the MMPA and known to occur in the MITT Study Area. The Navy has updated this Supplemental EIS/OEIS based on section 7 consultation and will incorporate all reasonable and prudent measures, and terms and conditions that are set forth in the Biological Opinion, in the Record of Decision.
Margaret Doran (MaD)		
MaD-01	PLEASE DO NOT IMPLEMENT THE USE OF SOLAR/EXPLOSIVES FOR THE AT-SEA TRAINING AND TESTING. The benefits of doing so will not outweigh the harm it will inflict on marine life. Please reconsider this proposal.	The military is committed to protecting public health and safety and the terrestrial and marine environment while training and testing. The military is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment during the conduct of its military training and testing activities.

	Comment	Navy Response
Toni Morga (TM)		
TM-01	With all due respect, what you are doing is wrong. Not only are you wasting tax dollars on unnecessary expansion of obsolete military practices, you are also destroying an endangered habitat of people who have already been oppressed enough by the federal government. The people of Guam have already given 25% of their island for the military with the promise of reparations that they will likely never see. As a veteran, I suggest you turn your attention to more immediate security concerns, as well as learning more about the environment and people you wish to further burden. The island infrastructure will not be able to handle your build-up demands, nor should you expect them to. The federal government should be helping the people of Guam work towards self-sovereignty and sustainability, but instead, you are more concern with unrealistic imperialistic ideologies and ignoring the clear and present danger of reduced cyber and national security. From comments gathered on your previous attempts at this endeavor, you'll see nothing has changed in the affected resources. The following expansive list from the PDN (2/5/2019) details all the damage you will cause with your pointless MITT: "Marine mammals Marine mammals have an extensive list of potential consequences due to training and testing activities in the document.	The Navy is not proposing any geographic expansion of the training and testing area in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Proposed activities are similar to those conducted in the Study Area for decades. Marine Mammals Response: The stressors listed in the comment are all analyzed in Section 3.4 (Marine Mammals) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The potential impacts from in-water electromagnetic devices, high-energy lasers, vessels, in-water devices, military expended materials, seafloor devices, cables, wires, parachutes are unlikely to have a substantial effect on individual marine mammals or populations of marine mammals in the MITT Study Area. Section 3.0.4.4 (Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors) presents the analysis of the individual sub-stressors, including the use of vessels and in-water devices, military expended materials, and seafloor devices. The analysis indicates that items having the highest potential to affect marine mammals (other than sonar or explosives) have decreased in comparison to the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (Tables 3.0-12 through 3.0-18). Section 3.8 (Marine Invertebrates) includes an analysis of potential impacts on coral. A detailed analysis of potential impacts on coral around FDM is also provided. Based on the analysis, coral fauna are healthy and robust, and the nearshore physical environment and basic habitat types at FDM would remain unchanged. These conclusions are based on (1) a limited amount of physical damage, (2) very low levels of partial mortality and disease (less than one percent of all species observed), (3) absence of excessive mucus production, (4) good coral recruitment, and (5) complete recovery by 2012 of the 2007 bleaching events. Smith and Marx (2016) also concluded that the health, abundance, and biomass of fishes, corals, and other marine resources at FDM are as good as, or better than, those in similar habitats elsewhere in the Mariana Archipelago. The Navy funded additional reef surveys in the nearshore areas of FDM in 2017. The results were approved for public release in September 2018 and are available at https://apps.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/1069450.pdf. The 2017 survey found little evidence that training has affected coral reef communities at FDM. Only three relatively fresh ordnance items were observed,

	Comment	Navy Response
	The use of sonar and other transducers, munitions at or near the water, in-water electromagnetic devices, high-energy lasers, vessels, in-water devices, military expended materials, seafloor devices, cables, wires, parachutes all present a risk to marine mammals in the areas of training and testing. These risks range from temporary affects to death. Marine habitats According to the Navy's analysis, most of the military explosions would detonate at or near the water surface, minimizing effects on marine habitats. However, the document states that training activities that include bottom-laid in-water explosions would affect marine habitat structures, but that "these activities would occur in areas that have been previously disturbed, and impacts would be localized." Sea floor resources that could be affected are shallow-water coral reefs, live hard bottom, artificial reefs and submerged cultural resources. Sea turtles The use of sonar, transducers, explosives, in-water electromagnetic devices, vessels, in-water devices, weapons, military expended materials, seafloor devices, cables and wires may cause short to long-term disturbances to sea turtles, the document states. Marine vegetation	but no blast pits, craters, or significant areas of coral breakage were observed. The ordnance observed during the 2017 survey was almost exclusively old, encrusted in marine life, and had no discernable impact on surrounding communities. The military understands that fishing is an important socioeconomic and cultural resource for the people of the CNMI and will continue to work with the fishing community to enable safe access to fishing areas around FDM. The military is committed to continuing to work with the local community on issues that potentially affect the public, including access to fishing sites.

	Comment	Navy Response
	Physical disturbances and strikes from the use of in-water explosives may destroy plants, or damage parts of plants, the document states. However, "no detectable changes are expected in marine vegetation growth, survival, propagation or population-level impacts." Fish Fish may be affected by the use of sonar and other transducers, explosives, in-water electromagnetic devices, vessels, in-water devices, aircraft, weapons, military expended materials, seafloor devices, cables, wires and parachutes, according to the document, however, effects are expected to be temporary and infrequent. More severe impacts such as mortality or injury could lead to permanent or long-term consequences for individuals, but, overall, long-term consequences for fish populations are not expected, the document states. Socioeconomic resources and environmental justice Training and testing may have on commercial and recreational fishing, traditional fishing practices or tourism when areas of co-use are temporarily inaccessible to ensure public safety during training and testing activities, the document states. This is one of the primary concerns regarding the recent proposed surface danger zone in the Finegayan area, which was initially addressed in the 2015 Marianas Training and Testing document."	

	Comment	Navy Response
Tasi Ada (TA)		
TA-01	As a Chamorro, born and raised on the island Guam, I am firmly against the proposed military activities that have been openly acknowledged by the U.S. military to be detrimental to the island's environment and the inhabiting animals. Guam has limited access to resources for the island's local residents to engage in self-sustainable practices and keep the carbon footprint at a minimum. Military activities would further limit these resources, contribute to the endangerment of animals unique to the Marianas archipelago, and further our dependency on the military presence. Globally, the loss of marine life is recognized to be a significant concern to the ecosystem, as a whole, having left negative impacts that affect all who populate the Earth. The "takes" by military activity directly contribute to this global issue and have an immediate impact on Guam's marine life and the local residents in turn. Guam continues to be used and treated unjustly; a place of not only with unique biodiversity both on land and at sea, but an island rich with culture and history that dates thousands and thousands of years ago as well. These "takes" are not justifiable, not necessary, and not right. The U.S. military activities do not benefit the local residents in the way that respects the people, the environment, the animal inhabitants; instead, it only perpetuates the unfortunate realities that the U.S. military is willing to benefit at the cost of Guam's land and people. That I cannot be for in any way.	The military is committed to protecting public health and safety and the terrestrial and marine environment while training and testing. Training and testing activities are proposed to occur at sea and on FDM. Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2 in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS present current and proposed training and testing activities.
Shawna Bamba (SB)		
SB-01	Testing should not be done at marianas because it endangers the marine ecosystem that the islands depend on. By conducting these tests, it damages corals and sea creatures while contributing to the noise pollution. I understand these trainings and tests must be conducted in order to support the	The military is committed to protecting public health and safety and the terrestrial and marine environment while training and testing.

	Comment	Navy Response
	needs of the training, but aren't their alternatives that do not harm an environment. We live in a time where technology is rapidly evolving, I suggest we find an alternative way that is not at the expense of the environment and the community.	
Paige Reyes (PR)		
PR-01	This proposed action is not only unsafe for our oceans that support us, including the beaked whale population that is endangered because these activities, but because the Navy has failed to conduct enough long term research to warrant these kinds of harmful and disruptive sonar exercises. Marine mammals, sea turtles and marine vegetation may be harmed as the Navy continues, and increases, its training and testing activities, as detailed in the Navy's supplemental environmental impact statement: Marine mammals: Marine mammals have an extensive list of potential consequences due to training and testing activities in the document. The use of sonar and other transducers, munitions at or near the water, in-water electromagnetic devices, high-energy lasers, vessels, in-water devices, military expended materials, seafloor devices, cables, wires, parachutes all present a risk to marine mammals in the areas of training and testing. These risks range from temporary affects to death. Marine habitats: According to the Navy's analysis, most of the military explosions would detonate at or near the water surface,	Marine Mammals Response: The stressors listed in the comment are all analyzed in Section 3.4 (Marine Mammals) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The potential impacts from in-water electromagnetic devices, high-energy lasers, vessels, in-water devices, military expended materials, seafloor devices, cables, wires, parachutes are unlikely to have a substantial effect on individual marine mammals or populations of marine mammals in the Study Area. Section 3.0.4.4 (Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors) presents the analysis of the individual sub-stressors, including the use of vessels and in-water devices, military expended materials, and seafloor devices. The analysis indicates that items having the highest potential to affect marine mammals (other than sonar or explosives) have decreased in comparison to the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS (Tables 3.0-12 through 3.0-17 and Table 3.0-19). Marine life is also important to the Navy. Using the latest science and technology, the Navy completed extensive analyses and computer-based modeling to determine impacts and develop science-based protective measures to reduce or avoid potential impacts on marine life. Potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Also, as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), the Navy implements, to the maximum extent practicable, procedural and geographic mitigation measures during its training and testing activities to reduce potential impacts on marine life. The Navy's analysis indicates that, with implementation of its protective mitigation measures, there would be no significant impacts on marine species. Activities using sonar and activities using underwater explosives were modeled to estimate impacts on marine mammals. For the seven-year LOA period being requested, the Navy's quantitative analysis for acoustic and explosive sources in

	Comment	Navy Response
	minimizing effects on marine habitats. However, the document states that training activities that include bottom-laid in-water explosions would affect marine habitat structures, but that "these activities would occur in areas that have been previously disturbed, and impacts would be localized." Sea floor resources that could be affected are shallow-water coral reefs, live hard bottom, artificial reefs and submerged cultural resources. Sea turtles: The use of sonar, transducers, explosives, in-water electromagnetic devices, vessels, in-water devices, weapons, military expended materials, seafloor devices, cables and wires may cause short to long-term disturbances to sea turtles, the document states. Marine vegetation: Physical disturbances and strikes from the use of in-water explosives may destroy plants, or damage parts of plants, the document states. However, "no detectable changes are expected in marine vegetation growth, survival, propagation or population-level impacts." Fish: Fish may be affected by the use of sonar and other transducers, explosives, in-water electromagnetic devices, vessels, in-water devices, aircraft, weapons, military expended materials, seafloor devices, cables, wires and	the MITT Study Area estimates zero mortalities, 367 Level A exposures, and 377,091 Level B exposures (see Section 5)." The Navy is formally consulting with NMFS concerning potential impacts of the proposed training and testing activities on all marine mammals protected under the MMPA and known to occur in the MITT Study Area. The Navy has updated this Supplemental EIS/OEIS based on section 7 consultation and will incorporate all reasonable and prudent measures, and terms and conditions that are set forth in the Biological Opinion, in the Record of Decision. The military understands that fishing is an important socioeconomic and cultural resource for the people of the CNMI and will continue to work with the fishing community to enable safe access to fishing areas around FDM. The military is committed to continuing to work with the local community on issues that potentially affect the public, including access to fishing sites.

	Comment	Navy Response
	parachutes, according to the document, however, effects are expected to be temporary and infrequent. More severe impacts such as mortality or injury could lead to permanent or long-term consequences for individuals, but, overall, long-term consequences for fish populations are not expected, the document states. Socioeconomic resources and environmental justice: Training and testing may have on commercial and recreational fishing, traditional fishing practices or tourism when areas of co-use are temporarily inaccessible to ensure public safety during training and testing activities, the document states. This is one of the primary concerns regarding the recent proposed surface danger zone in the Finegayan area, which was initially addressed in the 2015 Marianas Training and Testing document. The extent of the harm that has occurred and will continue to be incurred by these Naval activities have not been adequately examined enough to warrant the safety and necessity of these practices. Furthermore, the connection to the ocean and responsibility we have to protect it is far more important, deserves more respect, and demands thorough research and follow-through on the long-term effects than the Navy has shown.	
Mary Aquiningoc (MA)		
MA-01	Please do not mistreat the land and sea around the Marianas, sonar and missile testing are very negatively ecologically impactful. It can actually decimate species considered	The military is committed to protecting public health and safety and the terrestrial and marine environment while training and testing.

	Comment	Navy Response
	cornerstone species to the food chain, and even the use of sonar in the waters of the proposed area will drastically hurt the beak nose whale population which is barely starting up again and already contends with naval sonar pollution. It's a fragile and incredibly important ecosystem that affects the greater Pacific and thus the world. It's also incredibly disrespectful and dangerous to people dependent on the Pacific and the CNMI ecosystem to tamper in this way. Please consult ecological organizations in the marianas, and scientists like those at University of Guam, NOAA, and the US Fish and Wildlife Service in Guam to minimize negative impact!	
Kristine Klar (KK)		
KK-01	Please include the new information recently released regarding how beaked whales, particularly Cuvier's, get so scared by naval sonar that they change their diving pattern so severely to escape the sonar that they essentially get the bends and die. https://www.france24.com/en/20190130-whales-sonar-may-provoke-suicidal-behaviour-study Our marine animals are faced with growing uncertainty every day because of climate change. Let's not make things any more difficult for them by inundating them with sonar that kills them.	The Navy relied on best available science to conduct its impact assessment. The article cited by the commenter refers to a paper published by de Quiros et al. (2019), which summarizes the outcome of a workshop convened to focus on decompression sickness and its role in atypical mass stranding events involving beaked whales. The information reviewed in that summary paper was also considered in the Navy's assessment of potential impacts on marine mammals in the EIS. Please see Section 3.4.2.2.1.1 (Injury) and Section 3.4.2.2.1.6 (Stranding) for additional information.
CJ Paulino (CJP)		
CJP-01	How what is the longterm timeframe of the DoD's "one-for-one" reforestation plan? How do they plan on mimmicking the successional patterns of Guam's limestone forests? What plant species do they plan on utilizing for the early succession of the reforested plot? How long will they be maintained? Another question I have is why the DoD sees it necessary to	The military is committed to protecting public health and safety and the terrestrial and marine environment while training and testing. Training and testing activities are proposed to occur at sea and on FDM. Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2 in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) in

	Comment	Navy Response
	claim and develop older, more pristine plots of limestone forests and not recently disturbed forests? Research from Dr. Haldre Rogers has shown that the lack of birds on the island greatly reduces the forest community's succession and function. This coupled with habitat loss and other stresses makes our pristine forests more fragile than ever. Restoring disturbed sites are the least sustainable option, both financially and environmentally. Limiting our overall impact on all forest ecosystems as a whole is important, but preserving the dwindling old growth forests should be paramount.	this Supplemental EIS/OEIS present current and proposed training and testing activities.
Jesse Torres (JeT)		
JeT-01	Your firing ranges proposed for Ritidian and Pagan should be stopped. It is not necessary to destroy those places for training purposes. The military is supposed to protect our lands not destroy them.	The military is committed to protecting public health and safety and the terrestrial and marine environment while training and testing. Training and testing activities are proposed to occur at sea and on FDM. Tables 2.5-1 and 2.5-2 in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS present current and proposed training and testing activities. The Proposed Action does not include Pagan.
No name provided		
NNP-03	Please consider holding more hearings at schools or other public venues to encourage public participation. Hyperlinking references in the document would help with review. Color coding actions expected to increase and decrease in Appendix A, similar to Appendix F would be helpful. Substantially, I would be interested in seeing more opportunities for community engagement in resource monitoring and ongoing management activities such as these highlighted on the videos displayed at this event. More locally supported monitoring will help provide better data and better environmental outcomes.	The military is committed to protecting public health and safety and the terrestrial and marine environment while training and testing.

	Comment	Navy Response
Tino Aquon (TiA)		
TiA-01	Please send one of hard copy.	A copy of the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS was mailed and delivered to the commenter.
John C. Borja (TCB)		
TCB-01	–Does not fully explained waste management storage impacts on the acquirer or possible contaminants into surface water (watersheds). - Volume + handling of hazardous waste materials; spoilage and or intentional release as mission detects.	Training and testing activities within this Supplemental EIS/OEIS are proposed to occur at sea and on FDM. For land-based activities, the Navy manages solid waste, both non-hazardous or hazardous, in accordance with Navy policies and compliance with federal regulations. The Navy analyzed land-based activities on Guam, Saipan, Tinian, and Rota in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS; the Navy did not reanalyze land-based activities in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS because no changes are proposed to those land-based activities. The Guam Waterworks Authority reviewed the proposed planned military activity and in their submitted comment determined that the MITT Supplemental EIS/OEIS will not have an impact to the ability for Guam Waterworks Authority to provide safe drinking water to its customers and ensure that wastewater discharge is conducted in appropriate manner.
No Name Provided (NNP)		
NNP-04	Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the MITT draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS. I provide this brief comment on behalf of the people of Tinian and the Tinian Leadership. I'm here today to express my appreciation of the Navy's need to train and conduct testing to ensure that the different branches of our Armed Services meet their respective missions and that they maintain combat readiness. With that said, we believe that training activities conducted within out waters, land, air and see must consider the long-term impact of these activities on the environment and the people. Today, I reiterate the concerns which have previously been expressed by the Municipality with regards to underwater testing activities using sonars and explosives. A recent article published in the Pacific Daily News reported	As explained in the Navy's technical report on marine mammal strandings (*Marine Mammal Strandings Associated with U.S. Navy Sonar Activities*, 2017 [www.mitt-eis.com]), marine mammal strandings have been a historic and ongoing occurrence attributed to a variety of causes, both natural and anthropogenic. Over the last 50 years, increased awareness and reporting has led to more information about species affected and raised concerns about anthropogenic sources of stranding. While there have been limited numbers of marine mammal mortalities potentially associated with U.S. Navy activities, the root causes are not clear in most cases. NMFS, as the regulator, maintains the authoritative National Stranding Database. The Center for Naval Analysis (CNA) recently conducted a statistical study of correlation of beaked whale strandings around the Mariana Islands with the use of U.S. Navy sonar, finding that insufficient evidence of a correlation exists. The CNA study used the complete record of all U.S. Navy sonar use between 2007 and 2019, including major

	Comment	Navy Response
	another beaked whale off the waters of Agat on Jan 17 of this year. The whale's stranding coincided with the Navy's anti-submarine warfare training. According to the same article, the first documented incident of a beaked whale washing ashore in Micronesia was in the Marshall Islands in 1975. The next stranding was not until 2007 in Piti, 35 years later. And just within these last 10 years whale strandings went from 1 in 35 years, to 6 in years which some has linked to the increase in military activities in our oceans. Right now, we do not have enough information to determine whether these strandings are a result of these increased activities. What we do know is that strandings have increased with the increase of military training activities in our waters. Many of our people rely on the ocean to not only supplement their income but to feed their families. There is a lot we do not know or understand yet about how all these activities will impact our marine ecosystem in the long run and I'm concerned about long-term impacts not just on marine mammals but on fish stock and pollution in our waters as a result of these activities. I thank you for providing this supplemental study but I want the record to reflect that the concerns of the Municipality remain the same.	training events, joint exercises, and unit level training/testing. The analysis also included the complete beaked whale stranding record for the Mariana Islands through 2019. Following the methods in Simonis et al. (2020), the CNA analysis found insufficient evidence of a correlation between sonar use and beaked whale strandings when considering the complete sonar use record. The CNA finding is in contrast to the finding in Simonis et al. (2020), which depicted a significant correlation between beaked whale strandings and Navy sonar use. However, the Simonis et al. (2020) result relied on substantially incomplete or inaccurate assumptions about U.S. Navy sonar use around the Mariana Islands. CNA also conducted statistical analyses specific to each island where beaked whale strandings have been observed in the Mariana Islands, similarly finding insufficient evidence of a correlation to sonar use. Additional information on the findings of the CNA analysis are presented in Section 3.4.2.1.1.6 (Stranding) in Chapter 3.4 (Marine Mammals). Section 3.4.2.1.1.6 (Stranding) has been expanded to include additional information about strandings of beaked whales in the Mariana Islands and the Navy's support of efforts to better understand the causes of marine mammal strandings.
Leon Guererro (LeG)		
LeG-01	Page 1 of 17; Section 3.5.2.2.1.6 1. Long Term Consequences of Exploding Munitions The Auditory impact of exploding munitions has not been studied according to the MITT-SEIS document. The sea turtles could be hurt. Little is known about how turtles use sound in the environment – the MITT states "sound thresholds for sea turtles not suggested because auditory effects not studied." We should know how explosions effects sea turtles and	This Supplemental EIS/OEIS includes an update to the 2015 Final EIS/OEIS in the methods used to assess potential impacts on sea turtles from explosions. Based on these methods, and the peer-reviewed literature on what is known about sea turtle hearing and how sound pressure waves from explosions move through the water, the Navy presents the best available science to assess impacts on sea turtles. The potential effects of sonar and explosives on marine mammals are quantitatively estimated using the Navy's Acoustic Effects Model (see the technical report, *Quantifying Acoustic Impacts on Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles: Methods and Analytical Approach for Phase III Training and Testing*, available on the project website, for details on the quantitative methodology).

	Comment	Navy Response
	whether they are being damages & behaviors adversely changed. Auditory study on the sea turtle is needed. Page 2 of 17; Section 3.8.1.1 2. Sound Sensing & Productions New studies show invertebrates have receptors connected to their central nervous system that feels vibrations. Yet despite these new studies, the MITT does not reflect that corals can sense vibrations. Does sound alter coral reproductive systems? What level does sound have to reach to hurt coral? We should know this. Climate change is already making corals stressed and sound damage is on top of that – Extra stress on already stressed corals – Is there a study that considers sound on climate effected corals? Page 3 of 17; Sections 3.8.1.3 3. Endangered Species Act NMFS has determined 7 species of clams should be listed as ESA, according to the MITT-SEIS. A colony of clams exists on the Spanish steps at the tip of the Chote Peninsula and at Dadi Beach. The clams' status is under review – We should have this information – What will be the effect of the MITT activities on the Clams? What happens if they are ESA determined after the comment period closes? What is the process then? Page 4 of 17; Section 3.8.2.2 4. Explosive Stressors	This Supplemental EIS/OEIS also includes updated density estimates for sea turtles in nearshore waters of Guam and the CNMI. This information has been used to improve the Navy's impact assessment methods and to identify mitigation measures to avoid high density sea turtle areas. This information has been shared with NMFS Office of Protected Resources, as per the Navy's requirements to consult with NMFS on potential effects on ESA-listed species. As part of the Navy's Proposed Action, the Navy has designed standard operating procedures and procedural mitigation measures to reduce potential impacts on sea turtle species. Additional information regarding the Navy's standard operating procedures is provided in Section 2.3.3 (Standard Operating Procedures) and Chapter 5 (Mitigation). As described in Section 3.8.1.1 (Sound Sensing and Production), new studies on particle motion detection by Roberts et al. (2016) reinforces the finding that mechanical receptors on some invertebrates are found on various body parts. In addition, these structures are connected to the central nervous system and can detect some movements or vibrations that are transmitted through substrate (Edmonds et al., 2016). The 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS stated that invertebrate species detect sounds through particle motion, which diminishes rapidly from the sound source. Most activities using sonar or other active acoustic sources would be conducted in deepwater, offshore areas of the Study Area and are not likely to affect invertebrates. Furthermore, invertebrate species have their best hearing sensitivity below 1 kHz and would not be capable of detecting the majority of sonars and other acoustic sources used in the Study Area. As stated in Section 3.8.1.3 (Endangered Species Act-Listed Species), NMFS determined that seven species of giant clam (*Hippopus, H. porcellanus, Tridacna costata, T. derasa, T. gigas, T. squamosa, and T. tevoroa*) were candidates that may warrant listing under the ESA (82 Federal Register 28946). A status review is currently being done for these species. Two species, *H. hippopus and T. gigas*, have historically been found in the Study Area, but are believed to have been locally extirpated (Meadows, 2016).

	Comment	Navy Response
	Some explosions could occur close to corals and could kill or injure them according to the MITT-SEIS. Also explosions near the sea floor or in the water column may harm corals. Are we informed of explosions that damage coral? Do divers assess damage after explosive event and share damage data? Page 5 of 17; Section 5.4.1 5. Mitigation Measures for Sea Floor Resources According to the MITT-SEIS, the Navy will use observers before sinking a ship on torpedo events. The Look-outs will be looking for jelly-fish aggregations, whales, dolphins & schools of fish. Can their observances be documented and shared to verify marine mortality events? Page 6 of 17; Section 3.8.2.4.1 6. Impacts from Physical Disturbances and Strike Stressors According to the MITT-SEIS, marine amphibious training activities will require combat swimmers to run across reef flats and near shore areas damaging coral. How many U.S. and allied forces will be running across coral while undergoing amphibious training? Combined consequences of all physical disturbances and stressors could degrade habitat at some locations. Knowing this, are there plans to mitigate coral elsewhere? Page 7 of 17; Section 3.8.2.5.1 7. Impacts from Entanglement Stressors	Pursuant with section 7 of the ESA, the Navy is obligated to consult on listed species and will consult on clam species if they are listed as ESA species. The Navy analyzed potential impacts on marine invertebrates in nearshore and offshore environments in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS. Based on a literature review, the Navy has determined that conditions have not changed that would warrant modifying the analysis for marine invertebrates. As stated in Section 3.8.2.2 (Explosive Stressors), although the vast majority of explosions occur at distances greater than 3 NM from shore (where water depths are greater than the depths where shallow-water coral species occur), some explosions may occur close to marine invertebrates that could kill or injure those invertebrates. Explosions near the seafloor and very large explosions in the water column may impact shallow-water corals of any life stage, hard-bottom habitat and associated marine invertebrates, and deep-water corals. Effects could include physical disturbance, fragmentation, or mortality to sessile organisms and pelagic larvae. Energy from an explosion at the surface would dissipate below detectable levels before reaching the seafloor and would not injure or otherwise impact deep-water, benthic marine invertebrates. Section 5.4.1 (Mitigation Areas for Seafloor Resources) presents mitigation measures the Navy would implement to avoid or reduce impacts from explosives on seafloor resources in mitigation areas throughout the Study Area. For example, the Navy will not conduct explosive mine countermeasure and neutralization activities within a specified distance of shallow-water coral reefs, live hard bottom, artificial reefs, and shipwrecks. Mitigation measures would also help avoid or reduce potential impacts on invertebrates that inhabit these areas. Marine mammal monitoring documentation for sinking exercises is recorded and reported via annual exercise reports for the associated study area. Reports are available on the Navy's marine species monitoring program website <https://www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/>.

	Comment	Navy Response
	According to the MITT-SEIS there will be cable guidance wires and parachutes that will be jettisoned into the ocean ecosystem during training missions. These entanglements become marine debris that damages corals and swimming fish, whales and sea turtles. Can the lookouts count what goes into the water and efforts to retrieve that number of entanglements? What is the plan to retrieve entanglements? Page 8 of 17; Section 2.3.3.2 8. Sea Space and Airspace Deconfliction The MITT-SEIS says efforts will be taken to avoid FAD's and concentrations of testing areas – What is the plan for how to avoid disrupting recreational and commercial uses of Apia Harbor during amphibious training and explosive events? We have many businesses that rely on access to Apia Harbor – We also have many recreational uses that could be sadly effected by warfare training. Is there a commercial-recreational water use plan for Apia being developed? Page 9 of 17; Section 2.3.3.6 9. Sonic Booms According to the MITT-SEIS DOD can authorize sonic booms below 30,000 ft. and over inhabited areas. What kind of damage can sonic booms do? We hear of broken windows but are there other adverse impacts of sonic booms? How do we know what kind of damage they can cause and how is that damage redressed? Page 10 of 17; Section 5.1.2.2.1.1	As stated in Section 3.8.2.4 (Physical Disturbance and Strike Stressors) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, activities involving vessels and in-water devices are not intended to contact the seafloor. Benthic invertebrates of the reef crest or flat, such as crabs, clams, and polychaete worms within the disturbed area could be displaced, injured, or killed during amphibious operations. As is current practice, coral and other hard bottom habitats would continue to be avoided to the greatest extent practical under the Proposed Action. The Navy has reviewed and incorporated the best available science to support the impact analysis and conclusions for the coral reef communities. The Navy is consulting with NMFS under the ESA for potential effects on coral and received a Biological Opinion. Mitigation measures and monitoring requirements specified in the Biological Opinion are presented in Chapter 5 (Mitigation). Mitigation measures in the Biological Opinion will also be reflected in the ROD. This Supplemental EIS/OEIS analyzed potential impacts on different marine organisms from military expended materials (such as cables, guidance wires, and parachutes). These items are expended in offshore training areas, sink, and degrade rapidly in the ocean environment and, once on the seafloor, will likely be encrusted with marine life and incorporated into the benthic habitats. While these items are either floating on the surface or sinking through the water column, the Navy acknowledges that some items may pose an entanglement risk. It is important to note that, unlike derelict fishing gear, military expended items are not designed to ensnare fish or other marine life. Rather, there is low tensile strength to materials. The Navy has assessed entanglement risk in section 7(a)(2) consultations with NMFS. In various Biological Opinions provided to NMFS, ESA-listed species (corals, fishes, sea turtles, and marine mammals) are at low risk of entanglement. NMFS has concluded that adverse effects associated with entanglement is so low as to be discountable. The Navy is consulting again with NMFS for the Proposed Action, as described in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, and included an analysis of entanglement stressors. The Navy's Final

	Comment	Navy Response
	10. Adaptive Management Navy's adaptive management review process includes Navy, NMFS, the Marine Mammal Commission and other experts in the scientific community. What role does Guam's scientific community have in this review process? It's important that we all share our knowledge with one another. Page 11 of 17; Section 5.1.2.2.1.2 11. Integrated Comprehensive Monitoring Program According to the MITT-SEIS, the Navy in 2011 established a scientific comprehensive Integrated Monitoring Program with a scientific advisory group. Who is on this advisory group? I think Guam scientists and resource managers should be included so we can share knowledge. Page 12 of 17; Section 5.1.2.2.2 12. The Navy created a repository of Sonar Positional Reporting System – This is to maintain a record of all sonar events during training activities. This info is only shared with NMFS. Why isn't it shared with Guamanian scientific community and our natural resource managers? We should share our knowledge. Can help us verify marine mammal beachings and deaths and understand the use of sonar and effects on our marine fatalities. Page 13 of 17; Section 3.8.2.2 13. Explosive Stressors	Supplemental EIS/OEIS includes updates from this consultation regarding entanglement. The military has been conducting training and testing activities within the Study Area for decades, and has taken and will continue to take measures to prevent interruption of commercial and recreational fishing activities. Various means are used to communicate information to the public about areas restricted to public or commercial activities and are described in Section 3.13 (Public Health and Safety). As specified in Title 33 C.F.R. Subpart 72.01, Notices to Mariners, the U.S. Coast Guard issues information to the public concerning maritime navigation. There are three categories of notices to mariners: the Local Notice to Mariners, the Notice to Mariners, and the Marine Broadcast Notice to Mariners. Additionally, nautical charts issued by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration include these federally designated zones and areas. Operators of recreational and commercial vessels have a duty to abide by maritime regulations administered by the U.S. Coast Guard. Waters around FDM within 3 NM from shore are permanently closed for safety reasons due to the potential presence of unexploded ordnance. As a general policy, aircraft do not intentionally generate sonic booms below 30,000 feet of altitude unless over water and more than 30 miles from inhabited land areas or islands. The military may authorize deviations from this policy for tactical missions, phases of formal training syllabus flights, or research, test, and operational suitability test flights. The standard operating procedures for sonic booms benefit public health and safety by reducing the potential for exposure to sonic booms. The Integrated Comprehensive Monitoring Program (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2010, 2013a), provides the overarching framework for coordination of the Navy's marine species research and monitoring efforts and serves as a planning tool to focus Navy monitoring priorities pursuant to ESA and MMPA requirements. The purpose of the Integrated Comprehensive Monitoring Program is to coordinate monitoring efforts across all regions and to allocate the

	Comment	Navy Response
	Some explosives will be close to corals and will injure or kill the coral. Our coral is already weakened by climate change events such as coral bleaching. When studies are conducted on effect of explosions on coral, do scientists consider cumulative effects with climate change factors? Our corals are stressed to begin with before additional training events. Page 14 of 17; Section 3.0.4.7.5 14. Behavioral Reactions An animal alters its natural behavior because it is avoiding sound stress then uses all its energy to avoid the sound producing activity. Some severe behavioral reactions can lead to stranding of whales, dolphins and alter a fruit bat's feeding, breeding, sheltering and migrating behaviors between Guam and Rota. What type of data is collected that can help us know what sound decibel levels are being emitted and where? What plans exist to protect animals from behavior altering sound activities? Page 15 of 17; Section 3.4.1.4 15. Habitat Use "Bryde's whales and Omura's Whales are thought to be within the study area year round." If they are known to be year round in the area, what else is known about these whales? How many are there? Is there data that can show us how healthy the whales are? What has been the impacts on their population after years of proximity to military training? Page 16 of 17; 3.4-129	most appropriate level and type of monitoring effort for each range complex based on a set of standardized objectives, regional expertise, and resource availability. Although the Integrated Comprehensive Monitoring Program does not identify specific field work or individual projects, it is designed to provide a flexible, scalable, and adaptable framework using adaptive management and strategic planning processes that periodically assess progress and reevaluate objectives. The adaptive management is anticipated to continue between the Navy, NMFS, and the Marine Mammal Commission through technical review meetings and ongoing discussions. As part of the collaborative effort, local partners in Guam and the CNMI are also invited to engage in collaborative research efforts. The most recent collaborative research effort was sea turtle tagging in the Mariana Islands Range Complex (Martin, S. L., A. R. Gaos, and T. T. Jones. (2019). In addition, while outside the current scope of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the military satisfies their Sikes Act obligations through the development and implementation of the Joint Region Marianas Integrated Natural Resource Management Plan (INRMP). The 2019 Joint Region Marianas INRMP includes monitoring programs throughout the Mariana Islands. Guam and the CNMI are signatories and participating members to the 2019 Joint Region Marianas INRMP which details natural resource management and monitoring programs. The Navy will continue to coordinate with Guam and the CNMI as part of the INRMP implementation, which allows for data sharing between the Navy, Guam and the CNMI. The adaptive management group only includes Navy and NMFS (Headquarters Marine Mammal Protection Act and Endangered Species Act) staff. The adaptive management program is an internal opportunity for Navy and NMFS to jointly review the preceding year's monitoring for a given range complex in the Pacific (including the Mariana Islands Range Complex) and see if monitoring priorities

	Comment	Navy Response
	16. Odontocetes "Some beached whales can experience significant behavioral reactions at distances of up to 50 km from the sound source." What type of studies have been done on the range of sound disturbance on beached whales knowing they can be harmed 50 km from the sound source? Maybe past whale strandings in other islands are connected training done on Guam or CNMI. Could this be the case? Page 17 of 17; Section 3.4 – 132 17. Beached Whales "NMFS and the Navy will determine the appropriate way to proceed in the event that a causal relationship were to be found between Navy activities and a future stranding." What is the role of Guamanian scientific community in their process if a causal relationship is determined? Does the Navy have to come back for public involvement if determined sound activities hurts whales? Would hurting whales deter military training activities?	need adjusting. The results of the Navy's monitoring are posted annually and are available on the Navy's public website www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us. Information from the Sonar Positional Reporting System is classified in nature and is shared only with NMFS personnel who maintain a security clearance. The Navy collaborates with scientists and funds research to study acoustic effects on marine mammals in both the Pacific and Atlantic oceans and has done so for years. This includes providing unclassified information from the Sonar Positional Reporting System. See, for example, Simonis et al. (2016), which uses data from the system for a study conducted in the Marianas (Simonis, A., Thayre, B., Oleson, E., & Baumann-Pickering, S. (2016). Mid-frequency active sonar and beaked whale acoustic activity in the Northern Mariana Islands. The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 140(4), 3413-3413.) Section 4.4.8.5 (Cumulative Impacts on Marine Invertebrates) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS states most of the proposed activities would occur over dispersed, deep water areas where marine invertebrates are more sparsely distributed but not at the same specific point each time and, therefore, would be unlikely to affect the same individual invertebrates. In addition, the Navy would not conduct certain activities within a specified distance of shallow coral reefs, live hard bottom, artificial reefs, or submerged cultural resources such as shipwrecks (except designated locations, where these resources will be avoided to the maximum extent practicable). Underwater detonations that would occur in the nearshore areas are only conducted in designated locations and away from known seafloor resources such as shallow coral reefs, live hard bottom, artificial reefs, or submerged cultural resources such as shipwrecks, to the maximum extent practicable. This Supplemental EIS/OEIS provides a discussion on how marine mammals use sound (see Section 3.4.1.6, Hearing and Vocalization) and how noise generally may impact marine mammal communication (see Section 3.4.1.7.5, Noise). Both of these sections cite numerous publications reporting both recent research and well-established findings that describe how marine mammals hear and use

	Comment	Navy Response
		sound and what other types of sounds in the ocean can interfere with marine mammal behavior. Section 3.4.2.1 (Acoustic Stressors) goes into detail on how underwater sounds may affect marine mammals, including the association with stranding events. While sounds from a variety of natural and anthropogenic stressors can affect marine mammal behavior, the analysis in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS shows that behavioral responses to Navy sonar will likely be a result of the animal's behavioral state and prior experience rather than external variables such as ship proximity. If significant behavioral responses occur, they will likely be short term, and no significant behavioral responses such as panic, stranding, or other severe reactions have been observed during monitoring of actual training exercises (see Section 3.4.2.1.1.5, Behavioral Reactions). Behavioral responses to Navy sonar will vary across species, populations, and individuals, however, they are not likely to lead to long-term consequences or population-level effects. Information on the populations of Bryde's whales is provided in Section 3.4.1.9 (Bryde's Whale [*Balaenoptera edeni*]) and Omura's whales in Section 3.4.1.13 (Omura's Whale [*Balaenoptera omurai*]) and in the publications cited in each section. The sections include information on abundance in the Study Area and status of the population, if available. There are no data on how proximity to military training has affected individuals or populations of Bryde's whales or Omura's whales specifically. The Navy's acoustic effects model predicts a small number of temporary effects on hearing and behavioral responses for some individuals of both species due to training and testing activities using sonar and explosives (see Section 3.4.2.1.2.3, Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers Under the Action Alternatives, and 3.4.2.2.2.3 Impacts from Explosive Stressors Under the Action Alternatives). A number of studies have been conducted observing behavioral responses of beaked whales exposed to sonar and similar sound sources, often in coordination with Navy training and testing. Refer to Section 3.4.2.1.1.5 (Behavioral Reactions) and specifically to text under the subheading for

	Comment	Navy Response
		"Odontocetes" for a list of studies analyzing behavioral responses of beaked whales to active and simulated sonar sound sources. Co-occurrence in time between Navy training and beaked whale stranding does not necessarily infer causation. As the Navy points out in response to comment #220 (Anne Simonis), while there have been some beaked whale strandings at time of Navy sonar use, there have been just as many strandings at times the Navy was not present, and significantly more Navy events in which no stranding occurred. The Center for Naval Analysis (CNA) recently conducted a statistical study of correlation of beaked whale strandings around the Mariana Islands with the use of U.S. Navy sonar, finding that insufficient evidence of a correlation exists. The CNA study used the complete record of all U.S. Navy sonar use between 2007 and 2019, including major training events, joint exercises, and unit level training/testing. The analysis also included the complete beaked whale stranding record for the Mariana Islands through 2019. Following the methods in Simonis et al. (2020), the CNA analysis found insufficient evidence of a correlation between sonar use and beaked whale strandings when considering the complete sonar use record. The CNA finding is in contrast to the finding in Simonis et al. (2020), which depicted a significant correlation between beaked whale strandings and Navy sonar use. However, the Simonis et al. (2020) result relied on substantially incomplete or inaccurate assumptions about U.S. Navy sonar use around the Mariana Islands. CNA also conducted statistical analyses specific to each island where beaked whale strandings have been observed in the Mariana Islands, similarly finding insufficient evidence of a correlation to sonar use. Additional information on the findings of the CNA analysis are presented in Section 3.4.2.1.1.6 (Stranding) in Chapter 3.4 (Marine Mammals). The Navy provides contributory funds to the stranding scientists affiliated with NMFS' Pacific Islands Fisheries Science Center Stranding Program, which covers Hawaii and the Mariana Islands. Several of the beaked whales that stranded at the times of Navy sonar use and were necropsied by NMFS-affiliated scientists showed no signs of acoustic trauma. The issue of sound causing harm to beaked whales is complex because this species is susceptible to behavior reactions to commercial shipping transits and other anthropogenic sound. However, in this

	Comment	Navy Response
		case, the strandings do not appear to have been connected to anthropogenic sound. Other anthropogenic causes of beaked whale mortalities include plastic ingestion. Factoring in natural causes of mortality (disease, predation, foraging success, etc.), determining direct causal relationships is complex for any species of marine mammals. Through the Marine Mammal Protection Act and Endangered Species Act permitting processes, the Navy updates marine mammal Stranding Response Plans in coordination with the National Marine Fisheries Service Office of Protected Resources, as needed. The Stranding Response Plans specify the Navy's requirements for reporting marine mammal strandings and assisting with post stranding data collection in association with major training exercises. The Navy also funds extensive marine species monitoring in the Mariana Islands. The Navy and NMFS are jointly funding a large-scale survey across large areas in the Mariana Islands, with a scheduled start of spring/summer of 2021. This survey will deploy several types of acoustic monitoring devices to improve the understanding of beaked whale occurrence in the area. Guam's scientific community can participate in the process by providing new information on beaked whales. If that information is made available to the Navy and NMFS Office of Protected Resources, it can be considered during the annual adaptive management meetings. During those meetings, the Navy and NMFS review new information from Navy-funded monitoring in the Mariana Islands, new published literature on impacts if available, and any new unpublished information that is provided to them. As described in Section 5.1.2.2.1 (Marine Species Research and Monitoring Programs), for this Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy agreed to several additional research and monitoring initiatives designed to help advance the understanding of beaked whales and strandings in the MITT Study Area. The Navy will co-fund the Pacific Marine Assessment Program for Protected Species (PACMAPPS) Mariana Islands survey in spring-summer 2021 and future studies starting in 2022 to help document beaked whale occurrence, abundance, and distribution in the Mariana Islands. The Navy will also fund additional stranding response and necropsy analyses for the Pacific Islands region, and research on a framework to improve statistical stranding analysis. Collaboratively with NMFS, the Navy will fund and organize an expert panel to provide recommendations on

	Comment	Navy Response
		scientific data gaps and uncertainties for further protective measure consideration to minimize potential impacts of Navy training and testing activities on beaked whales in the Mariana Islands.
Victoria C Miller (VcM)		
VcM-01	Para ma Prutehi I Manaotao Pacifico For the Protection of the Pacific Peoples Victoria Miller 14 March 2019 In regards to the proposition of at-sea training and testing within the Northern Marianas, this comment serves to refute the Navy's defense of their argument. According to the Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA) the nation's coast is expected to be managed. to "preserve, protect, develop, and where possible, to restore or enhance the resources of the nation's coastal zone" (CZMA, 1972). However, with the testing of sonar and explosive devices proposed by the Navy, this goal is no longer feasible. The Navy's blatant disregard for the purpose of the CZMA with their actions degrade these values to little more than idealistic suggestions. The easiest route is often favored over the virtuous despite the wake of consequences it leaves behind. Countless times the Navy chooses to do this, not just in the Northern Marianas but in the United States as well: The National Resources Defense Council suit, filed this week, accuses the National Marine Fisheries Service of violating multiple federal laws by allowing the Navy to ramp up sonar and live-fire training in Hawaii and California during the next five years. The action calls for the Northern California U.S. District Court to halt the training, which began in December (Slavin, 2014).	The Navy is committed to protecting the terrestrial and marine environment while training and testing. All potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), the Navy implements procedural and geographic mitigation measures during its training and testing activities to avoid or reduce potential impacts on biological and cultural resources. This science-based analysis indicates, with implementation of the Navy's protective mitigation measures, there is not a significant impact on biological and cultural resources. The Navy submitted a Consistency Determination (CD) to the Bureau of Statistics and Plans (BSP) in December 2019 addressing proposed military training and testing activities that may affect Guam's coastal zone and coastal uses. The consistency determination was prepared in accordance with Guam's Procedures Guide for Achieving Federal Consistency with the Guam Coastal Management Program (Bureau of Statistics and Plans May 2011). BSP's response to the Navy's CD (dated March 6, 2020) can be found in Appendix C (Agency Correspondence). The Navy is in discussions with BSP in order resolve any differences and reach an agreement regarding the Navy's compliance with Guam's Coastal Management Program to the maximum extent practicable. In addition, The Navy submitted a Consistency Determination to the CNMI Division of Coastal Resources Management (DCRM) in December 2019 addressing proposed military training and testing activities that may affect the CNMI's coastal zone and coastal uses. DCRM's response to the Navy's CD (dated March 9, 2020) can be found in Appendix C (Agency Correspondence). The Navy is in discussions with DCRM in order resolve any differences and reach an agreement regarding the Navy's compliance with CNMI's Coastal Management Program to the maximum extent practicable. The outcome of these discussions will be included in the ROD.

	Comment	Navy Response
	The low frequency active (LFA) sonar used during these testings threaten the marine life within these waters. The Navy proposes the testing, not out of fear of another military power. but possibly from ignorance of the consequences of their actions. However, it seems unlikely that such a influential military branch of a nation, regarded as one of the most powerful leaders of the free world, would be oblivious to the effects of their actions on the environment. In a cultural perspective, the marine wildlife plays a crucial role in the lives of the indigenous people in the Pacific. A recurring theme amongst Pacific Island cultures is the interrelatedness of the ocean with the notion of life. This ideology is in part due to the ocean's ability to connect the people of Pan-Pacific. The other half is the resources and life that is within the ocean itself. Within the Maori culture, the culture of the indigenous peoples of New Zealand, whales are regarded as high status beings. "In Pacific cultures, whales are granted the status of older siblings or cousins; they can also be guardians, spirits, ancestors and taniwha" (O'Brien, 2017). Perhaps this adoration for these creatures is the same reason tourists are enthralled by the appearance of whales far off the coast; they are a milestone in lite that one has experienced true unbreakable beauty. The preservation of culture is an argument enough to stop the proposition of testing. From a quantitative point of view, the use of LFA sonar testing is estimated to "kill some 170,000 marine mammals and cause permanent injury to more than 500 whales, not to mention temporary deafness for at least 8,000 others" (EarthTalk, 2019). With a number as substantial as this, there is no choice but to annul the testing. According to the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA) the Navy must prioritize the preservation of marine life within the marianas during their	The Navy has engaged with the DCRM throughout the development of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, including meeting with staff during the scoping phase and providing notification when the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS was made available for public review and comment. The potential effects of sonar and explosives on marine mammals are quantitatively estimated using the Navy's Acoustics Effects Model (see the technical report *Quantifying Acoustic Impacts on Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles: Methods and Analytical Approach for Phase III Training and Testing*, available on the project website, for details on the quantitative methodology). Predicted effects from sonar on marine mammals are presented by species in Section 3.4.2.1.2.3 (Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers Under the Action Alternatives) and from explosives in Section 3.4.2.2.2.3 (Impacts from Explosive Stressors Under the Action Alternatives). No mortality or direct injury to any marine mammals is predicted. The settlement agreement for the 2015 Hawaii-Southern California Training and Testing EIS/OEIS has no bearing on the MITT Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Navy has been conducting training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and this supplement to the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS supports the continuation of that training and testing. The activities analyzed in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS are largely a continuation of the ongoing training and testing activities that were analyzed in the 2015 MITT Final EIS/OEIS, 2010 MIRC EIS/OEIS, 1999 Military Training in the Marianas Final EIS, and other environmental compliance documents. Proposed training and testing activities are needed to achieve and maintain military readiness within the Study Area. This Supplemental EIS/OEIS furthers the Navy's and other military services' execution of their roles and responsibilities under 10 U.S.C. section 8062. Surveillance Towed Array Sensor System (SURTASS) Low Frequency Active (LFA) sonar is not part of our Proposed Action. However, it has been addressed in Section 4.0 (Cumulative Impacts) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Information pertaining to the SURTASS LFA action can be found at http://www.surtass-lfa-eis.com/.

	Comment	Navy Response
	operations (The Marine Mammal Center, 2019). This act includes that the Navy must find a method that will impact the marine life in the most miniscule scale possible. Therefore, under the sanctity of law and the observation of the US law itself, the Navy must not conduct at-sea training and testing of their sonar and explosive devices, and any harming equipment for that matter, within the Northern Marianas. References Carter, H. C. (2007). WHALES in the South Pacific. Wellington, New Zealand: Dept. of Conservation. EarthTalk. (2019). Does Military Sonar Kill Marine Wildlife? NOAA Office for Coastal Management ADS Group. (2019, February 15). Coastal Zone Management Act. NRDC v. Pritzker, Justia US Law 35 (US District Court for the Northern District of California July 15, 2016). NRDC: California. (2016, July 18). Federal Court: Navy Must Limit Long-Range Sonar Use to Protect Marine Mammal. O'Brien, G. (2017, July 1). Whale of a tale. Slavin, E. (2014). Suit to stop Navy training in Pacific cites impact on marine life. Stars and Stripes. The Marine Mammal Center. (2019). Marine Mammal Protection Act. Retrieved from http://www.marinemammalcenter.org/what-we-do/rescue/marine-mammal-protection-act.html	

This device contains the ***Mariana Islands Training and Testing Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement*** (EIS/OEIS).

These documents are in the Portable Document Format (PDF).

If your computer does not have an application to view PDF files, Adobe offers a free PDF reader.
To download the free reader, open your web browser and go to this webpage:
https://get.adobe.com/reader/

For more information about the Mariana Islands Training and Testing Supplemental EIS/OEIS, please visit the project website:
https://mitt-eis.com/