



HAL
open science

Shipping noise in a dynamic sea: a case study of grey seals in the Celtic Sea

Feng Chen, Georgy I Shapiro, Kimberley A Bennett, Simon N Ingram, Dave Thompson, Cécile Vincent, Debbie Jf Russell, Clare Embling

► To cite this version:

Feng Chen, Georgy I Shapiro, Kimberley A Bennett, Simon N Ingram, Dave Thompson, et al.. Shipping noise in a dynamic sea: a case study of grey seals in the Celtic Sea. *Marine Pollution Bulletin*, 2016. ⟨hal-02494554⟩

HAL Id: hal-02494554

<https://hal.science/hal-02494554v1>

Submitted on 28 Feb 2020

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



HAL Authorization

Shipping noise in a dynamic sea: a case study of grey seals in the Celtic Sea

1
2 Chen, F.^a, Shapiro, G.I.^a, Bennett, K.A.^{a,b}, Ingram, S.N.^a, Thompson, D.^c, Vincent, C.^d,
3 Russell, D.J.F.^c, Embling, C.B.^a

4
5
6 ^a School of Marine Science and Engineering, Plymouth University, Drake Circus, Plymouth, PL4
7 8AA, UK

8
9
10 ^b School of Science, Engineering and Technology, Abertay University, Dundee, UK.

11
12 ^c Sea Mammal Research Unit, Scottish Oceans Institute, University of St Andrews, UK.

13
14 ^d Centre d'Etudes Biologiques de Chizé, CNRS/University of La Rochelle, 2 rue Olympe de Gouges,
15 17000 La Rochelle, France.

16
17
18 **Keywords:** anthropogenic noise; marine animals; sound propagation; acoustic modelling; ocean fronts

19 20 **Abstract**

21
22
23 Shipping noise is a threat to marine wildlife. Grey seals are benthic foragers, and thus
24
25 experience acoustic noise throughout the water column, which makes them a good model
26 species for a case study of the potential impacts of shipping noise. We used ship track data
27 from the Celtic Sea, seal track data and a coupled ocean-acoustic modelling system to assess
28 the noise exposure of grey seals along their tracks. It was found that the animals experience
29 step changes in sound levels up to ~20dB at a frequency of 125Hz, and ~10dB on average
30 over 10–1000Hz when they dive through the thermocline, particularly during summer. Our
31 results showed large seasonal differences in the noise level experienced by the seals. These
32 results reveal the actual noise exposure by the animals and could help in marine spatial
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

1 Introduction

1 Anthropogenic noise in the marine environment has increased significantly over the past five
2 decades (McDonald et al., 2006). Growing evidence suggests that this increased noise is
3 negatively impacting a range of species from crabs (Wale et al., 2013) to cetaceans (e.g.
4 Rolland et al., 2012). Most research has concentrated on the acute impacts of loud impulsive
5 sounds, such as pile driving, sonar and seismic air guns on acoustically sensitive species (e.g.
6 Richardson et al., 1995). However, chronic, persistent noise, such as that from shipping, is
7 becoming the focus of more recent research (e.g. Rolland et al., 2012; Simpson et al., 2016).
8 Shipping noise has increased by 2.5 – 3dB per decade over the last four decades (30 – 50Hz;
9 McDonald et al., 2006). This increase is particularly evident near major ports due to greater
10 shipping density, usually concentrated in shallow shelf waters.

11 Noise from ships has the potential to mask the communication of acoustically active marine
12 mammals (e.g. Williams et al 2014) and result in changes in their behaviour such as (i)
13 reducing the communication distance between the animals (e.g. grey seal (*Halichoerus*
14 *grypus*): Bagocius, 2015), (ii) increasing the amplitude of vocalisations (e.g. right whales
15 (*Eubalaena glacialis*): Parks et al., 2011) and (iii) reducing calling rates (e.g. beluga whales
16 (*Delphinapterus leucas*): Lesage et al., 1999). The mitigation of shipping noise pollution is
17 therefore integral to marine spatial planning in the shelf seas, where anthropogenic activities
18 are rapidly increasing (Ellison et al., 2011). The International Maritime Organisation (IMO)
19 recently released guidelines for the reduction of underwater shipping noise (IMO 2014
20 MEPC.1/Circ.833). Anthropogenic underwater noise has also recently been recognised as a
21 form of pollution in European legislation through the Marine Strategy Framework Directive
22 (MFSFD descriptor 11: 2010/477/EU). Shipping noise is principally concentrated at low (<300
23 Hz) frequencies (Richardson et al., 1995). For low frequency noise policy requires monitoring
24 of trends in the ambient noise level within the 1/3 octave bands of 63 and 125Hz (centre
25

frequency), which will be studied in this paper. With chronic persistent noise, a comprehensive approach is required since both the source (ship) and the receiver (mobile marine species) are moving through space and time, and this provides an additional challenge to assessing sound exposure.

Currently, there is insufficient observational data to support a thorough assessment of either ambient noise levels or their impacts on marine animal populations (UKMS, 2014), and there is an urgent need for detailed sound propagation predictions for complex noises and moving sources to generate and test hypotheses about their impacts on behaviour and energetics.

Sound propagation modelling is an essential tool to assess the impact of shipping noise on marine mammals. The area affected by noise and the severity of the impacts depend on the frequency, duration and ability of the sound to propagate (Bailey et al., 2010). Key factors affecting sound propagation are the oceanographic and geomorphological characteristics of the surrounding region. Underwater acoustic signals do not propagate along a straight line, instead sound waves experience multiple reflections from the sea surface and seabed (Katsnelson et al., 2012). Furthermore, meso-scale features (e.g. fronts and eddies) and fine-scale characteristics (e.g. internal waves) can result in fluctuations of sound energy by up to ~20dB (Lynch et al., 2006; Shapiro et al., 2014). Despite of their importance, these features are rarely incorporated into sound transmission models due to the lack of high resolution data on seawater parameters (e.g. temperature and salinity).

The Celtic Sea (see Fig. 1) provided the ideal location in which to investigate the use of oceanographically-referenced sound propagation models for assessing shipping noise exposure to marine animals. Shipping traffic in the Celtic Sea is heavy because it links the Atlantic with the UK coastal waters. The Celtic Sea is shallow with depths rarely exceeding 120m. The sea is strongly stratified with a sharp thermocline from April to November and is

1 mixed in winter, and a series of bottom fronts exist during the summer (Pingree, 1980). In
2 addition, eddies with a typical diameter of 20 – 40km also exist over the shelf-break region in
3 late summer (Pingree, 1980).

4
5
6 Our previous study (Shapiro et al., 2014) showed the strong variability of sound propagation
7
8 in the Celtic Sea due to strong seasonal variability in water column stratification. The
9 transmission loss (hereafter TL) differs between summer and winter by as large as ~20dB. In
10 summer, when the source of sound is on the onshore side of the bottom front, sound energy is
11 mostly concentrated in the near-bottom layer, resulting in step changes of TL in the water
12 column up to ~20dB. In winter sound from the same source is, however, distributed more
13 evenly in the vertical. When the source is on the seaward side of the front, the sound level
14 from a shallow source is nearly uniform in the vertical and the TL is significantly greater
15 (~16dB at 40km distance) in summer than in winter. Such large seasonal differences in sound
16 TL are, therefore, likely to result in significant seasonal changes in shipping noise exposure
17 experienced by marine animals.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 Assessing the effects of underwater noise on marine animals requires large databases that
35 characterise animals' behaviour, movements and associated noise levels. Grey seals
36 (*Halichoerus grypus*) are a highly tractable species which move over wide areas and feed
37 predominantly at the benthos in shelf seas (McConnell et al., 1999; Thompson, 2012). This
38 makes them a good choice for the reconstruction and assessment of received sound levels of
39 animals. The movements of individuals and underwater behaviour can be tracked in fine
40 detail using GPS-GSM (Russell & McConnell, 2014) or satellite tags that record position and
41 dive profiles, allowing dive by dive sound exposure to be calculated and potential behavioural
42 or energetic consequences to be assessed. Unlike many cetaceans, grey seals do not critically
43 depend on hearing to survive, but they are highly vocally active in air and in water with a
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 substantial repertoire (Asselin et al., 1993). They use sound and vibrations in aggression,
2 mating and in mother-pup bonding (Bishop et al., 2015) and the repertoire extends across a
3 wide range of frequencies though most are typically less than 3kHz. They can also use sounds
4 passively in foraging scenarios (Stansbury et al., 2015). Pinnipeds have anatomical
5 adaptations that mean they are well-adapted to hearing in water, and have hearing ranges from
6 very low frequencies ~100Hz (Kastak and Schusterman, 1998) to high frequencies ~30kHz
7 (Cunningham et al., 2016). It is therefore likely that shipping noise is within the hearing range
8 of grey seals.
9
10

11 The aim of this paper is to assess the shipping noise exposure experienced by grey seals along
12 their tracks, and how this exposure varies seasonally. We used two grey seals and the Celtic
13 Sea for this case study. However, we believe that the general outcomes of this research are
14 applicable to other shelf seas and other animals, where both the source (ship) and receiver
15 (marine animal) move in space and time. To achieve this we used a state-of-the-art ocean and
16 acoustic propagation model (Shapiro et al., 2014) populated with GPS tracks and dive data
17 from grey seals, and real-time AIS shipping data from winter and summer.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 **2 Materials and methods**

36 **2.1 Shipping data**

37 The accurate modelling of shipping noise first requires detailed information on shipping in
38 order to estimate the source levels (SL) of ships. The realistic operational information and
39 ship properties were extracted from an Automatic Identification System (AIS) database
40 through a web-based ship tracking database (<http://www.marinetraffic.com/>), which are now
41 widely used for shipping noise studies (e.g. Merchant et al., 2012; Erbe et al., 2012).
42 Recorded vessel parameters, including vessel name, type, dimension, operational speed,
43 location and time, are updated at most every 2 minutes. For a moving ship the operational
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

level occurred at ~50Hz and they are ~185dB, ~183dB and ~173dB depending on the lengths and operational speeds of the ship.

2.2 Ocean-acoustic modelling system

A coupled ocean-acoustic modelling system, implemented in the Celtic Sea by Shapiro et al. (2014), was used to calculate TL of sound energy. This modelling system combines an oceanographic model (POLCOMS) with an acoustic propagation model (HARCAM).

POLCOMS is a three-dimensional (3D) model that has been used successfully for modelling temperature and salinity in different regions of the world ocean and has been used operationally by the UK Met Office for the European Shelf seas (Bell, 2012). The main features of POLCOMS are available from Holt and James (2001), and are therefore not repeated here. The implementation and validation of POLCOMS in the Celtic Sea has been performed in previous studies (Shapiro, 2011; Chen et al., 2013), which demonstrated that the mean error of the model in predicting temperature over the whole 3D domain was approximately 0.72°C against observational data. The model was constructed with 2km horizontal resolution and 30 vertical layers, which were used to provide high-resolution hourly temperature and salinity data for the acoustic propagation model.

HARCAM is an acoustic model which is used as a transmission loss engine of the Naval Tactical Decision Aid WADER system, a sonar range prediction and global ocean information system used operationally by the UK Royal Navy. The model has been validated by the U.K. Ministry of Defence (MOD) over a variety of frequencies (10Hz – 500kHz) in both shallow and deep waters (Etter, 2001). The model has been also verified by comparison with other similar models (Etter, 2001) and UK MOD benchmark TL data. HARCAM calculates the acoustic signal TL and the level of sound exposure at a distance from a sound source. Unlike the simpler and range-independent models, that assume the oceanographic and

1 sediment parameters are identical over the propagation range, the HARCAM model is able to
2 take into account the spatial variability of environmental parameters. The setup of the model
3 is similar to that of Shapiro et al (2014), although the sediment data used in this study (see
4 Table 2) covers a wider range of sediment types.
5
6
7

8 9 **2.3 Seal tag data**

10 We explored the tracks of adult and pup grey seals tagged in Wales (Ramsey Island,
11
12 Pembrokeshire) in 10/2010 – 10/2011 and France (the Iroise Sea) in 08/2010 – 12/2012 to
13 identify animals that spent some of their time in the region identified in Fig. 1 during a period
14 when AIS data were also available. Grey seals were caught on or near haul outs and tags
15 attached using the methods described previously (McConnell et al., 1999) under Home Office
16 licence number 60/4009 and in accordance with the UK Animals (Scientific Procedures) Act
17 1986, and licence number 11/873/DEROG by the French ministry of Environment. The
18 telemetry devices were Sea Mammal Research Unit GPS-GSM phone tags. GPS-GSM phone
19 tags provide GPS quality locations and only require the animal to surface for less than 1s to
20 obtain an accurate location fix, through use of the Fastloc system. Erroneous locations do
21 occur and these were removed using the thresholds of a number of satellites and residual error
22 (Russell & McConnell, 2014). Following these cleaning procedures 95% of locations have
23 distance error of less than 50m. Tags record whether the animal is wet or dry and contain a
24 pressure sensor to record dive depth. The GSM- GPS phone tags used in this study record
25 every dive and transmit almost all recorded dives, which results in up to 90 locations per day
26 depending on the specific tags. Behaviour was recorded as a ‘dive’ when the sensor was wet
27 and the pressure sensor recorded a depth below a 1.5m threshold for 8 seconds. Dives ended
28 when the sensor was dry, or when the pressure sensor recorded depth above 1.5m. Location
29 and behavioural information were stored on board in the tag until transmission. Data were
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

transmitted by a quad band GSM mobile phone module when the animal came within range of a receiver.

One seal from each data set spent some of its time in the shipping lane area in summer and winter respectively and the relative positions between ships and seals are given in Fig. 1. Seal 1 corresponds to the summer condition whilst Seal 2 is for the winter. Two segments (arrows in Fig. 1) were extracted from the seal track data based on the time when the ship started travelling northwards from the southernmost point of the shipping lane. The parameters of the seals were summarised in Table 1. As the location data were less frequently recorded than dive data, in order to obtain the location information for each dive the locations were interpolated between known GPS locations by assuming straight movements at a constant speed. Specifically, the horizontal speed of seals was first calculated based on the adjacent GPS location points for which latitude, longitude and recorded time were available. Subsequently the location data were linearly interpolated to an interval of 1s. Dive parameters included total dive time, maximum depth of dive, and depths at nine even spaced time points. The depth data were also interpolated to 1s interval. By doing so, the seal position was characterised by location data and vertical depth at an interval of 1s. The sound exposure in 3D space experienced by the seals was calculated by linking the ocean-acoustic modelling system and seal track parameters, in which seals and ships were modelled as moving receivers and sources simultaneously.

2.4 Calculation of shipping noise parameters

2.4.1 Transmission loss over transect A

The common approach to calculating acoustic TL is to consider a two-dimensional (2D) problem (range and depth) assuming that the azimuthal dependence is small and the source is treated as an omnidirectional monochromatic point, a single point where source energy is

concentrated and sound energy radiates spherically through all directions (Katsnelson, et al., 2012). A transect (A in Fig. 1) that crosses the bottom temperature front was selected to perform the TL calculation for summer and winter. The ship (MMSi: 353633000) travelled northwards through the shipping lane on 5th August and 5th December in 2010. These two days were thus chosen for transect A, giving the summer and winter conditions respectively.

Transect A shows the sound propagation pattern in 2D space, in which sound energy propagates from the ship to the seals' location. Calculations were carried out for 125Hz since it is one of two 1/3-octave bands (63 and 125Hz) proposed to be monitored by MSFD and is believed to be within the hearing range of pinnipeds such as grey seals (Kastak & Schusterman, 1998; Cunningham et al., 2014).

2.4.2 Comparison to generic spreading models

Generic basic spreading models (e.g. Bailey et al., 2010; Erbe et al., 2012) are a simplified way to assess the TL for anthropogenic noise, which were sometimes used in bioacoustics studies. In this study we tested the difference between the more accurate HARCAM and basic spreading models to assess the level of errors introduced by the simplification of the TL process in basic models. The basic spreading models that were used for comparison are $S = \frac{1}{r^\alpha} e^{-\alpha r}$, where S is a factor for spreading loss, α is the absorption coefficient and r is the range. α is defined by 10, 20 and 15 (e.g. Bailey et al., 2010; Erbe et al., 2012), representing the cylindrical spreading, spherical spreading and intermediate empirical spreading respectively. The absorption coefficient α is estimated using the formulas from Francois and Garrison (1982).

2.4.3 Sound exposure level of ships

SEL is considered to be an exposure metric for non-pulse sound (such as shipping noise) because it considers the cumulative effect of sound energy over time (Southall et al., 2007). In

order to simulate the spatial pattern of the noise field in 3D space, we calculated the multi-transect TL fields generated by a point source, with an azimuthal resolution of 2.5°.

Received levels (RL) of receivers were estimated using the sonar equation:

$$(2)$$

where SL is the source level in dB re 1μPa @1m predicted from equation (1) and TL is calculated by HARCAM. The source depth (SD) for all calculations is deployed at 7m, a typical depth of ship propellers (McKenna, et al., 2012). Accordingly, the RL at 1/3 octave central frequencies can be obtained using this equation.

SEL is originally defined by,

$$\text{SEL} = 10 \log_{10} \left(\frac{p_{\text{rms}}^2}{p_{\text{ref}}^2} \right) \quad (3)$$

where p_{rms} is the received mean square pressure and p_{ref} is the reference pressure of 1μpa. In order to calculate the SEL when a ship covers the entire shipping route across the Celtic Sea (as indicated by the solid line in Fig. 1), an approximate discretisation was adopted here by,

$$\text{SEL} = 10 \log_{10} \left(\frac{p_{\text{rms}}^2}{p_{\text{ref}}^2} \right) \quad (4)$$

Taking the spectrum of the SL into account, the received mean square pressure was calculated by,

$$\text{SEL} = 10 \log_{10} \left(\frac{p_{\text{rms}}^2}{p_{\text{ref}}^2} \right) \quad (5)$$

where N is the number of central 1/3 octave band frequencies between 10 and 1000Hz. p_{rms} is the individual received pressure derived from equation (2), where the RL in dB were converted into pressure. T is the duration in seconds between two time points sampled along the ship track.

2.4.4 Sound exposure of seals

1 Sound exposure levels received by seals were presented in SPL averaged over a frequency
2 bandwidth of 10 – 1000Hz, and cumulative SEL. SPL is also an appropriate metric for
3
4
5
6 quantifying exposure to non-pulse sounds, and is defined as the root mean square pressure
7
8 expressed in decibels (Southall et al., 2007). To determine the SPL of the seals along their
9
10 travelling path, ship and seal were treated as a moving source-receiver pair, between which
11
12 TL was calculated at a time step of 1s using the HARCAM model. At each time step the RLs
13
14 in a 1/3 octave band were calculated using equation (2) and converted to pressures. The mean
15
16 square pressure was then obtained by finding the mean of the pressures in 1/3 band and
17
18 converted back to decibels. Cumulative SEL was calculated using equation 3.
19
20

21 **3 Results**

22 **3.1 Transmission loss under different seasonal conditions**

23
24
25
26
27 As shown in Fig. 3a and Fig. 3b, the water depth of transect A varied from ~30m to ~90m and
28
29 the temperature pattern changed significantly between two seasons. In winter the water
30
31 column was well mixed vertically with only slight variations of temperature (~0.3°C) in the
32
33 horizontal direction, while the intense thermocline and the associated bottom front were well
34
35 developed in summer. The subsurface front was located at the range ~9km from the source
36
37 whilst the thermocline existed at a water depth of ~25m (see Fig. 3a). The front spatially
38
39 separated the water into an onshore mixed water and an offshore strong stratified area, leading
40
41 to a temperature difference of ~3°C across the front. However, the vertical contrast of
42
43 temperature increased dramatically on the offshore side of the front, reaching as much as
44
45 ~7°C across the thermocline.
46
47
48
49
50
51

52
53 Fig. 3c and 3d illustrate the TL fields of transect A for summer and winter, in which
54
55 distinctive features from different seasons can be seen. In winter, the TL reduced with range
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 from the ship with a relatively low rate (see Fig. 3d). The sound energy was relatively evenly
2 distributed vertically through the water column, giving a TL of ~75dB at a range of 40km. In
3 summer, sound energy varied little vertically to around 8km from the source (see Fig. 3c).
4 However, beyond 8km, most of the sound energy was directed down into the bottom water
5 below the thermocline, and propagated more efficiently in this deeper water. This pattern of
6 propagation is due to both the descending bathymetry, which reduces the grazing angles of
7 the acoustic rays at the sediment interface, hence lower bottom loss, and to the strong sound
8 speed gradient at the thermocline, which prevents the acoustic rays from penetrating the
9 thermocline upwards. In the upper layer the acoustic energy decayed rapidly at the front
10 (~9km), showing a typical TL difference of ~20dB between the upper and lower layers which
11 was not present in winter. An upper quiet zone was thus formed in summer, with the
12 boundary following the thermocline. This caused a strong vertical step change of the TL at the
13 interface of the thermocline in summer, reaching as large as the seasonal difference ~20dB.
14 The propagation range was, therefore, significantly reduced in the upper layer during summer.
15
16 The TL cut-off of 70dB in the upper layer, for example, can propagate ~40km in winter but
17 only ~12km in summer. Below the thermocline the broad pattern of the TL was, however,
18 very similar in both seasons although small differences were predicted to exist locally.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 **3.2 Testing the difference in performance between two sound propagation** 43 **models**

44
45 Fig. 3e and Fig. 3f shows the comparison of TL of transect A at a water depth of 10m
46 between HARCAM and three generic spreading models in summer and winter. In summer the
47 TL calculated by HARCAM was between the 20log and 15log models to the range ~23km,
48 subsequently following the trend of the 15log model. The 20log overestimated the TL by ~4 –
49 8dB at shorter range (<15km). Large differences in TL (~10dB – ~40dB) were found between
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

HARCAM and the 10log model, increasing over the travel distance of the sound. In contrast to the summer time, in winter the 15log matched with HARCAM very well in such vertically mixed water. However, TL from 10log was predicted to be lower than that of HARCAM by ~20dB while TL calculated by the 20log model was higher by ~20dB.

3.3 Sound exposure level for grey seals moving near the shipping lane

Fig. 4 shows the SEL for the ship (MMSi: 353633000) at two water depths (15m and 50m) for summer and winter. The highest SEL existed along the shipping lane and the surface layer was always louder than the bottom layer at various scales, depending on the latitude of the shipping lane. The spatial pattern of the SEL in summer was more complicated than that in winter due to complex water column conditions (such as stratification, fronts and eddies). A notable feature was that sound energy could propagate much further or has higher intensity at a defined location during winter.

The magnitude of the difference in SEL increased with distance from the shipping lane, reaching ~10dB near the Bristol Channel for example. The propagation range was compressed dramatically in summer when the intense thermocline and bottom front developed, and the discrepancy for a specific threshold (e.g. 140dB) was up to ~60km shorter than that in winter.

3.4 Calculated sound level during diving in grey seals

Fig. 5a shows the relative distance between seal and ship against the travelling time of the seal while Fig. 5b illustrates the SPL (10 – 1000Hz) at each diving depth for Seal1. 69 dives occurred within ~10525 seconds and each dive was numbered as shown in Fig. 5b. The black arrow marked the time point when the ship crossed the bottom front from onshore to offshore. As seen in Fig. 5b, the sound levels perceived by Seal1 were predicted to be highly variable in time and with water depth. Sound intensity was always low (~65 – 75dB) when the seal

1 cruised near the sea surface (above 1.5m water depth). This is due likely to scatterings of
2 sound energy at the surface boundary. The SPL of many diving profiles exhibited strong
3 dependence on depth, showing frequent step changes in sound level. Taking the 6th dive for
4 instance, the change of SPL was as large as ~15dB when the seal dived from 20m to 35m,
5 with higher sound intensity (~95dB) in the bottom layer. This occurred during the case of
6 downslope sound propagation in summer described in Fig. 3c in which a strong TL step
7 change in the vertical direction occurred at the interface of the thermocline and sound energy
8 was trapped mainly below the thermocline. From 0 to ~3100 seconds, when the ship was on
9 the onshore side of the subsurface front, there were 21 dive profiles in total, including 20
10 shallower diving associated with relatively lower sound levels and closer distance to the ship,
11 and 1 bottom dive, which was marked by number 6. In contrast, from ~3100 to 10525 seconds
12 when the ship was on the offshore side of the bottom front, sound level reduced as the relative
13 distance between seal and ship increased and a strong step change in the sound level, as
14 observed in the 6th dive profile, disappeared. As a result, it was predicted that when the seal
15 dived into the bottom layer the sound energy perceived by the seal can be lower by up to
16 ~15dB, e.g. by comparing dive profile 27 to 6. More frequent deeper dives associated with
17 lower noise levels occurred down to the seabed from ~3100 to 10525s.

18 Fig. 5c was constructed in the same way as Fig. 5b, with the water column parameters being
19 replaced by winter temperature and salinity for noise TL calculation. This allowed direct
20 comparison of received sound levels between summer and winter. The overall seasonal
21 difference in received sound levels was higher by approximately 10dB in winter. An obvious
22 feature can be seen that strong step changes of sound energy in water depth disappeared (e.g.
23 diving profile 6). From 0 to 3100 seconds during which the ship was located on the onshore
24 side of the front and shallower diving occurred more frequently, the sound energy received by
25

1 Seal1 above ~30m in water depth was greater by ~15 – 20dB than that of summer. Below
2 30m the predicted sound level was, however, almost the same.
3

4 Fig. 6 shows the noise pattern for Seal2 in winter when the water column was well mixed.
5

6 Overall, the received SPL over its diving path for Seal2 was higher by ~20dB than that of
7 Seal1 due primarily to the stronger source level for Seal2 (see Fig. 2) and different
8
9

10 environmental parameters. At the top and bottom boundary layers where sound interacts,
11 sound level was, as expected, to be lower (~10dB for this case) than that of the intermediate
12 water layer due to scattering and reflection. In contrast to Seal1, the sound level experienced
13 by Seal2 exhibited weak variability in diving depth, among a range of different dive profiles.
14 Seal2 started shallower diving when it approached the closest point (at ~4900 seconds) to the
15 ship, and returned to bottom diving at ~7900 seconds when the ship was moving away.
16
17

18 Similar to Fig. 5, Fig. 6c shows the predicted noise level of Seal2 where summer temperature
19 and salinity were used for TL calculation. When the ship was on the onshore side of the front
20 many step changes in sound level were observed among bottom diving profiles. The
21 magnitude of the step changes reduced with the decrease of the distance between Seal2 and
22 the ship, e.g. from ~15dB in profile 1 to ~3dB in profile 19. After the ship crossed the front,
23 strong step changes in sound level disappeared and the overall sound level was ~10dB lower
24 than that of winter.
25
26

27 The cumulative SEL for Seal1 and Seal2 is presented in Fig.7, showing a nearly constant
28 seasonal difference of ~5dB for two seals. In summer a step change of SEL can be also
29 observed when the seal travelled from 0 to ~3km. The difference of realistic SEL between
30 summer (red) and winter (blue) reached as much as a ~20dB, due primarily to the difference
31 in the source level and the changes of water column parameters.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

4 Discussion

1 We have shown that in order to get a reasonable estimate of the shipping noise exposure
2 experienced by marine animals, the acoustic model has to take into account the complex 3D
3 structure of temperature and salinity fields in the ocean. The ocean-acoustic modelling system
4 used in this study was able to assess the sound level exposure when the ships and animals
5 were moving simultaneously. The results demonstrated that there was a strong seasonal
6 difference in the sound level exposure due to the seasonal variation of ocean parameters.
7 There was also a strong variability in the exposure level at different dive depths, in particular
8 during summer.

4.1 Seasonal differences in sound propagation

9 Using the combined ocean-acoustic modelling system, populated with high resolution water
10 column data, sediments, bathymetry and sea surface wind speed, we have shown a significant
11 difference in noise propagation in summer and winter around an important shipping lane in
12 the Celtic Sea. In winter the water was well mixed, and the TL was only weakly dependent on
13 water depth: the variability in the level of TL was typically less than 5dB (see Fig. 3d). By
14 contrast, in the presence of a thermocline and bottom fronts (Fig. 3c), when the source was
15 located on the onshore side of the bottom front, sound energy was trapped below the
16 thermocline. As a result, a quiet area above the thermocline was formed and the TL difference
17 at a frequency of 125Hz could be as large as ~20dB in the vertical water column, which is
18 comparable to the study by Shapiro et al. (2014) in which the vertical TL discrepancies were
19 ~15dB at a frequency of 300Hz and ~20dB for 1000Hz in the Celtic Sea. The mechanism that
20 forms the non-uniform propagation pattern in summer has been discussed in detail by Shapiro
21 et al. (2014).

1 The sound distribution mapped in this study demonstrated a strong variability in time and
2 space (see Fig. 4). The combined effects of ship movements relative to the front and the sound
3 propagation characteristics of the water affect the value of SEL. The effect of downwards
4 refraction, which is caused mainly by stratification in the water column, dominated the sound
5 distribution and led to a significant reduction of the propagation range in summer. As a result,
6 the SEL is highly dependent on the formation of the seasonal stratification that develops in
7 early summer and breaks down in the later autumn (Pingree, 1980). In contrast to the
8 downwards refraction effect, the bottom front produces a more localised effect that is
9 dependent on the relative position of the front and its source. For instance, in the south of the
10 shipping lane where the bottom fronts existed, the propagation range of noise was increased
11 by ~15km, see Fig. 3c and Fig. 4c.

12 One of the monitoring schemes proposed by MSFD is to monitor trends in the ambient noise
13 level within the 1/3 octave bands 63 and 125Hz (MSFD-GES, 2012). In this study we have
14 followed this scheme and clearly shown a strong influence of water column conditions on
15 noise distribution, which would affect any receivers. It is therefore suggested that the seasonal
16 variability of the water column should be taken into account in the documentation of noise
17 trends.

4.2 Differences in sound propagation model performance

18 Our study showed that in order to achieve representative results on the noise exposure of
19 marine mammals, acoustic models should not ignore variation in temperature and salinity
20 within the water column, as was the case with some older basic bioacoustics studies (e.g.
21 Richardson, et al., 1995). Our comparison between HARCAM and basic spreading models
22 has shown that the cylindrical spreading model (10log) failed to estimate the TL in such
23 shallow water, because the difference between the two models was as large as ~20 – ~40dB

(Fig. 3e). The intermediate empirical spreading model (15log) underestimated the TL by up to ~20dB, while the spherical spreading model (20log), which is generally used for deep waters (Jensen et al., 2011), overestimated the TL in the Celtic Sea with a maximum value of ~20dB. Significant errors produced by the basic models were also evidenced by field measurements in coastal water undertaken by Pine et al. (2014), who demonstrated a disparity between the theoretical spherical spreading model and field measurements of up to 41dB. Significant errors produced by the basic models were confirmed by Madsen et al. (2006), who used on-board acoustic recording tags. The above analysis suggests that the basic spreading models should not be used in dynamic shelf seas as they do not simulate the TL fields accurately.

4.3 Noise exposure of tracked seals

Zones of noise influence (Richardson et al., 1995) are spatial representations which classify noise distribution based on the estimated severity of injury. These zones are centred at the source, where animals are expected to receive the most severe injury, and decrease in severity with increasing distance from the source. The SEL characteristics calculated in this study suggest that the radius of these zones is strongly affected by season and water depth. We have also shown that the seasonal difference in sound propagation, and hence the size of the zone of influence, depends on the value of the threshold; the lower the threshold value, the greater the seasonal difference. As seen in Fig. 4, the difference in the size of the area covered by the 150dB contour line is relatively small between summer and winter, while the size of the area covered by the threshold of 140dB is approximately 4 – 5 times greater. Such attenuation in sound suggests that the zones of audibility and behavioural response are more strongly influenced than injury zones, within which noise is strong enough to cause discomfort or tissue damage to animals.

Auditory masking, which is a reduction of the animals' ability to detect biologically important sounds in the presence of noise, might affect their communication, energy budget, behaviours and fitness, and hence their survival. Acoustical surveys in the Baltic Sea by Bagocius (2015) showed that local shipping noise had high masking potential for grey seal communication calls. In this study, the rups call type (in recorded grey seal vocalisations within 0.1 – 5kHz range) was shown to have an average sound level of 71dB at a centred frequency of 256Hz, and maximum sound level of 103dB. On average, the calculated SPLs in our study were ~60dB – ~90dB and ~85 – ~97dB for Seal1 and Seal2, respectively, and therefore significantly overlap the vocalisation signals observed by Bagocius (2015). Ship noise thus has a potential to mask the auditory communication of grey seals, especially in winter. For example, Seal2 would have to raise its signal intensity to be audible to its conspecifics, which may have energetic consequences. Permanent hearing damage (PTS) to pinnipeds exposed to non-pulse sound such as shipping noise is predicted to occur when the peak SPL of noise is 218dB and above, or the M-weighted SEL is 203dB and above. The exposure criteria for temporary hearing damage (TTS) are 212dB for SPL and 183dB for SEL (Southall et al., 2007). However, the loudness of the sounds in our study did not reach levels at which either permanent or temporary damage would be expected to occur for seals (e.g. Hastie et al., 2015).

Cliff-based surveys have shown that seals are less likely to be sighted when vessel traffic is high (Anderwald et al., 2013). Our study had insufficient data to determine firmly whether seals showed behavioural avoidance of shipping within the available tracking data. Of all the seals tracked, very few used the area surrounding the shipping lane, so that finding a portion of track that overlapped in real time and space with that of a real ship was challenging. One possibility is that seals avoid this area altogether, possibly as a result of noise or other disturbance, or because the area is not a good foraging ground. Previous research overlaying

1 VMS data and seal tracks in Ireland has shown a lack of overlap between seal habitat usage
2 and fishing effort (Cronin et al., 2010), which reflects either the targeting of different areas by
3 seals and fishermen, or active avoidance by seals. However, seal usage maps based on tracks
4 from years in which AIS data were not available show high seal usage in the same region as
5 the shipping lane (Thompson, 2012). Further work on the overlap between seal usage from
6 telemetry data and shipping lanes would be informative, particularly in assessing potential
7 winter versus summer differences in use which may be associated with sound.
8
9
10

11 Received sound at the deepest portion (>90% dive depth) of the dive may have the greatest
12 impact on seals, since this is where they spend most time (40 – 45% of total dive time) on a
13 dive-by-dive basis (Thompson, 2012). An analysis of cumulative time spent at depth in areas
14 predicted to be noisy and quiet using our approach would be valuable in estimating any
15 potential long term impacts.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 The behaviour of seal pups in response to shipping noise is of particular interest because they
30 are weaned abruptly on land and thus learn to forage without parental guidance (Bennett et al.,
31 2010), and have higher mass specific metabolic costs than adults (Sparling & Fedak, 2004).
32 The disruption of foraging behaviour may have energetic consequences for individuals,
33 which, depending on the magnitude of the effect, could influence survival. Whether such
34 reduced survival would have population consequences is dependent on the proportion of the
35 population exposed and the predominant age class affected. Understanding the sound
36 transmission of shipping noise in the Celtic Sea is therefore of additional importance because
37 the seal populations in Wales, Ireland, Cornwall and France are relatively small (e.g. Vincent
38 et al., 2005; Leeney et al., 2010). Louder background noise in winter and prior to the
39 development of a thermocline may be of biological consequence particularly for pups, which
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 mostly enter the sea for the first time to learn to forage during winter and early spring in this
2 population.
3

4 One interesting feature of the predicted received sound here is the step changes that seem to
5 occur during the summer within and between dives. We have studied these effects caused by a
6 single ship. The extent to which these step changes are masked or amplified by the inclusion
7 of sound produced by multiple ships requires investigation. However, step changes during the
8 rapid descent or ascent phase could deter animals from performing subsequent dives to below
9 the depth at which the step change was experienced. The seal track avoiding a loud near-
10 bottom area shown in Fig. 5b (see the time range between 751 and 3759 seconds) would
11 support this hypothesis. We have insufficient data to confirm these hypotheses at present, but
12 extension of our modelling approach to areas with greater telemetry data overlap would allow
13 greater exploration of these possibilities. Our approach may allow us to examine whether
14 seals avoid specific depths after sound exposure, and whether they show heading changes or
15 alter dive characteristics in response to parameters including received sound, given time of
16 year and activity and/or physiological state (Ellison et al., 2011). This requires the
17 simultaneous modelling of sound produced by all ships in the region at any given time,
18 ambient noise caused by waves and wind and the inclusion of data from multiple seals.
19 Additional tagging efforts in South Wales or Northern Cornwall would help address the
20 relative dearth of seal tracking data in the Celtic Sea.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 Although the long-term or chronic effects from shipping noise on marine life are still largely
47 unknown and have not yet been incorporated into management decisions (Ellison, et al.,
48 2011), there is increasing concern about the detrimental impacts in chronically exposed areas.
49 For example, in a unique study, North Atlantic right whales (*Eubalaena glacialis*) appeared to
50 have reduced faecal stress hormone (cortisol) levels after the reduction in shipping traffic
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 following the events on 11th September 2001 (Rolland et al., 2012). This type of effect is
2 difficult to assess under normal conditions, where shipping noise levels are constant and
3 pervasive. Environmental conditions can lead to significant sound propagation anomalies,
4 thus increasing the uncertainty surrounding the predictions of noise impacts. Including
5 detailed environmental conditions in shipping noise management would aid our understanding
6 of how the dynamic acoustic environment affects the noise field, and thus marine organisms.
7 It would also enable the optimisation of noise mitigation strategies and the designation of
8 MPAs. Coupled ocean-acoustic models similar to those used in this study are an effective and
9 reliable method that can simulate the sound field over large areas and long periods of time.
10 This facility is important for both biological applications and anthropogenic noise estimation,
11 especially for continuous acoustic events in wide geographic areas (e.g. shipping noise),
12 because direct measurement can be impractical and/ or expensive. In addition, the long
13 distance movements of seals (and other large, mobile predators), particularly the less
14 predictable dispersal movements of pups (Bennett et al., 2010; Thompson, 2012), make a
15 modelling approach to estimate sound exposure quite attractive. Even when viable animal-
16 borne sound sensors have been developed, our approach will help compare the sound profiles
17 of areas actually used by animals for different activities with less frequented areas. This will
18 allow us to better evaluate the impacts of anthropogenic noise on habitat availability and
19 quality, and to tease apart shipping noise from other sources of background noise.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 **5 Summary**

44 We have selected the Celtic Sea and grey seals as a case study and shown how the seasonal
45 variability in the hydrological structure of the water column affects the exposure levels of
46 grey seals to shipping noise. This effect is likely to influence any free-ranging highly mobile
47 marine mammals in shelf seas. In summer the areas of high noise exposure by animals were
48 situated below the thermocline when the ship was located on the onshore side of the oceanic
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59

1 front. These were areas located above the thermocline when the ship was on the offshore side
2 of the front. The difference in the received sound level between the surface and near-bottom
3 parts of the water column was as high as ~20dB. Shipping noise propagated much further (by
4
5 tens of kilometres) in winter than in summer. Furthermore, this study showed strong step
6
7 changes of the sound perceived by seals during their descent and ascent through the water
8
9 column. Since seals are bottom foragers, the step-change in shipping noise sound exposure
10
11 may have negative impacts on their foraging behaviour. Although these results relate to a
12
13 single ship, they show the value of including oceanographic features in sound transmission
14
15 models and form the basis for more complex simulations of multiple ships. The approach
16
17 established in this study can be applied to other species and other shelf seas, for instance, to
18
19 generate biological and noise databases characterising the effects that shipping noise has on
20
21 marine mammals. It is only through a more realistic understanding of the exposure of animals
22
23 to ship noise, in which source and receiver are both moving, that we can set appropriate
24
25 management and mitigation targets.
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 **6 Acknowledgements**

33
34 This study was supported by the EU (via PERSEUS grant FP7-OCEAN-2011-287600
35 and MyOcean SPA.2011.1.5-01 grant 283367). In addition, C.B. Embling was supported by
36 the 2014 SoMSE Plymouth University Small research grant. D.J.F. Russell and D. Thompson
37 were supported by the National Capability funding from the Natural Environment Research
38 Council to the Sea Mammal Research Unit (grant no. SMRU1001). C. Vincent was supported
39 by the Parc naturel marin d'Iroise and Région Poitou – Charentes. The authors are also
40 grateful to Ocean Acoustic Developments Ltd and personally to Mr John J. Hodgson for
41 provision of HARCAM software and advice for its best use, and to
42 <http://www.marinetraffic.com/> for provision of ship AIS data.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

7 References

1 Anderwald, P., Brandecker, A., Coleman, M., Collins, C., Denniston, H., Haberlin, M.D.,
2
3 O'Donovan, M., Pinfield, R., Visser, F., Walshe, L., 2013. Displacement responses of a
4 mysticete, an odontocete and a phocid seal to construction – related traffic. *Endangered*
5 *Species Research*. 21: 231 – 240.
6

7
8
9 Asselin, S., Hammill, M.O., Barrette, C., 1993. Underwater vocalizations of ice breeding grey
10 seals. *Can J Zool* 71: 2211 – 2219.
11

12
13 Bagocius, D., 2015. Potential Masking of the Baltic Grey Seal Vocalisations by Underwater
14 Shipping Noise in the Lithuanian Area of the Baltic Sea. *ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH,*
15 *ENGINEERING AND MANAGEMENT*. 4(70): 66 – 72.
16

17
18
19 Bailey, H., Senior, B., Simmons, D., Rusin, J., Picken, G., Thompson, P.M. 2010. Assessing
20
21 underwater noise levels during pile driving at an offshore windfarm and its potential effects
22 on marine mammals. *Marine Pollution Bulletin*. 60, 888 – 897.
23
24

25
26 Bell, M., 2012, Ocean Forecasting – progress and plans.
27 http://www.metoffice.gov.uk/media/pdf/f/d/MOSAC_17.7_MBell.pdf.
28

29
30 Bennett, K. A., McConnell, B. J., Moss, S. E. W., Speakmand, J. R., Pomeroy, P. P., Fedak,
31 M. A., 2010. Development of diving capabilities of grey seal pups: costs and benefits of the
32 postweaning fast. *Physiol Biochem Zool* 83: 911 – 923.
33
34

35
36 Bishop, A., Denton, P., Pomeroy, P., Twiss, S., 2015. Good vibrations by the beach boys:
37 Magnitude of substrate vibrations is a reliable indicator of male grey seal size. *Animal*
38 *Behaviour* 100: 74.
39

40
41
42 Breeding, J. E., Pflug, L. A., Bradley, M., Walrod, M. H. and McBride, W., 1996. Research
43 Ambient Noise Directionality (RANDI) 3.1 Physical Description. Naval Research Laboratory,
44 MS 39529 – 5004. NRL/FR/7176 – – 95 – 9628
45
46

47
48 Chen, F., Shapiro, G. and Thain, R., 2013. Sensitivity of Sea Surface Temperature Simulation
49 by an Ocean Model to the Resolution of the Meteorological Forcing, *ISRN Oceanography*, v.
50 2013: Article ID 215715, 12 pages. doi.org/10.5402/2013/215715
51

52
53
54 Cronin, M, Jessopp, M and Reid, D., 2010. Seals and Fish Stocks in Irish Waters. Briefing
55 Note to European Parliament Directorate General for Internal Policies. IP/B/PECH/IC/2010 –
56

1 Cunningham, K.A., Southall, B.L. Reichmuth, C. (2014) Auditory sensitivity of seals and sea
2 lions in complex listening scenarios. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 136, 340.

3 Cunningham, K. A., and Reichmuth, C., 2016. High – frequency hearing in seals and sea
4 lions. *Hearing Research*, 331: 83 – 91.

5
6
7 Ellison, W.T., Southall, B.L., Clark C.W. Frankel A.S. 2011. A new context – based approach
8 to assess marine mammal behavioural responses to anthropogenic sounds. *Conservation*
9 *Practice and Policy* 26, 21 – 28.

10
11
12 Erbe, C., MacGillivray, A. and Williams, R. 2012. Mapping cumulative noise from shipping
13 to inform marine spatial planning. *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.* 132 (5): EL423 – EL428.

14
15
16
17
18
19 Etter, P. C., 2001. Recent advances in underwater acoustic modelling and simulation. *Journal*
20 *of sound and vibration.* 240(2), 351 – 383.

21
22
23 Francois R. E., Garrison G. R., 1982. Sound absorption based on ocean measurements: Part
24 I: Pure water and magnesium sulfate contributions. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of*
25 *America*, 72(3): 896 – 907.

26
27
28
29 Hamilton, E. L., 1980. Geoacoustic modelling of sea floor. *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.* 68, 1313.

30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37 Hastie, G.D., Russell, D.J.F., McConnell, B, Moss, S., Thompson, D., Janik, V. M., 2015.
38 Sound exposure in harbour seals during the installation of an offshore wind farm: predictions
39 of auditory damage. *J App Ecol.* 52: 631 – 640.

40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

Jensen, F. H., Kuperman, W., A., Porter, M., B. and Schmidt, H., 2011. *Computational Ocean Acoustics*. Springer, 812p.

Kastak, D., and Schusterman, R. J., 1998. Low – frequency amphibious hearing in pinnipeds: methods, measurements, noise, and ecology. *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.* 103, 2216 – 2228.

Katsnelson, B., Petnikov V. and Lynch J., 2012, *Fundamentals of shallow water Acoustics*. Springer, 540p.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Leeney, R.H., Broderick, A.C., Mills, C., Sayer, S., Witt, M.J., Godley, B.J., 2010. Abundance, distribution and haul – out behaviour of grey seals (*Halichoerus grypus*) in Cornwall and the Isles of Scilly. *J. Mar. Biol. Assoc. UK* 90, 1033 – 1040.

Lesage, V., C. Barrette, M. C. S. Kingsley and B. L. Sjare. 1999. The effect of vessel noise on the vocal behavior of belugas in the St. Lawrence River estuary, Canada. *Marine Mammal Science* 15: 65 – 84.

Lynch, J. F., Colosi, J. A., Gawarkiewicz, G. G., Duda, T. F., Pierce, A. D., Badiey, M., Katsnelson, B. G., Miller, J. E., Siegmann, W., Chiu, C. S. and Newhall, A., 2006. Consideration of Fine – Scale Coastal Oceanography and 3 – D Acoustics Effects for the ESME Sound Exposure Model. *IEEE Journal of Oceanic Engineering*. 31(1), 33 – 48.

Madsen, P. T., Johnson, M., Miller, P. J. O., Soto, N. A., Lynch, J. and Tyack, P., 2006. Quantitative measures of air – gun pulses recorded on sperm whales (*Physeter macrocephalus*) using acoustic tags during controlled exposure experiments. *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.* 120(4): 2366 – 2379.

McConnell, B. J., Fedak, M. A., Lovell, P., Hammond, P. S., 1999. Movement and foraging areas of grey seals in the North Sea. *J App Ecol* 36, 573 – 590.

McDonald, M.A., Hildebrand, J.A., Wiggins, S.M., 2006. Increases in deep ocean ambient noise in the northeast pacific west of San Nicolas Island, California. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 120 (2), 711 – 718.

McKenna, M.F., Ross, D., Wiggins, S.M., Hildebrand, J.A., 2012. Underwater radiated noise from modern commercial ships. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 131 (1), 92 – 103.

Merchant, N.D., Witt, M.J., Blondel, P., Godley, B.J., Smith, G.H., 2012. Assessing sound exposure from shipping in coastal waters using a single hydrophone and Automatic Identification System (AIS) data. *Marine Pollution Bulletin* 64 (7): 1320 – 1329.

MSFD, 2010/477/EU: Commission Decision of 1 September 2010 on criteria and methodological standards on good environmental status of marine waters (notified under document C(2010) 5956) Text with EEA relevance. Available at [http://eur – lex.europa.eu/legal – content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:32010D0477\(01\)](http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:32010D0477(01))/. Accessed 2/2/2016

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Parks, S. E., Johnson, M., Nowacek, D., Tyack P. L., 2011. Individual right whales call louder in increased environmental noise. *Biology Letters* 7(1): 33 – 35.

Pingree, R. D., 1980. Physical oceanography of the Celtic Sea and English Channel. In: Banner, F.T., Collins, W.B., Massie, K.S. (Eds.), *The North – west European Shelf Seas: The Sea Bed and the Sea in Motion II Physical and Chemical Oceanography and Physical Resources*. Elsevier, Amsterdam, Oxford, NY, pp. 415 – 465.

Richardson J, Greene C, Malme C, Thomson D., 1995. *Marine Mammals and Noise*. Academic Press, 525 B Street, San Diego, California 92101 – 4495 USA, ISBN 0 – 12 – 588440 – 0.

Rolland, R.M., Parks, S.E., Hunt, K.E., Castellote, M., Corkeron, P.J., Nowacek, D.P., Wasser, S.K., Kraus, S.D., 2012. Evidence that ship noise increases stress in right whales. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 279 (1737), 2363 – 2368.

Ross, D., 1976. *Mechanics of Underwater Noise* (Pergamon, New York), pp. 272 – 287.

Russell, D. J. F., McConnell, B. T., 2014. Report to DECC - Seal at-sea distribution, movements and behaviour. Available at

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/346304/OESE_A2_SMRU_Seal_distribution_and_behaviour.pdf

Shapiro, G., 2011. Effect of tidal stream power generation on the region – wide circulation in a shallow sea. *Ocean Science*, 7: 165 – 174.

Shapiro, G., Chen, F., Thain, R., 2014. The effect of ocean fronts on acoustic wave propagation in the Celtic Sea. *Journal of Marine Systems*. 139: 217 – 226.

Simpson, S. D., Radford, A. N., Holles, S., Ferarri, M. C. O., Chivers, D. P., McCormick, M. I., Meekan, M. G., 2016. Small-Boat Noise Impacts Natural Settlement Behavior of Coral Reef Fish Larvae. *Adv Exp Med Biol*. 875:1041 – 8.

Southall, B.L., Bowles, A.E., Ellison, W.T., Finneran, J.J., Gentry, R.L., Greene, J., Charles, R., Kastak, D., Ketten, D.R., Miller, J.H., Nachtigall, P.E., Richardson, W.J., Thomas, J.A., Tyack, P. L., 2007. Marine mammal noise exposure criteria: Initial scientific recommendations. *Aquatic Mammals*, 33(4), 411 – 521.

Sparling, C. E., Fedak, M. A., 2004. Metabolic rates of captive grey seals during voluntary diving. *J Exp Biol* 207: 1615 – 1624.

1 Stansbury, A., Gotz, T., Deecke, V. B., Janik, V. M., 2015. Grey seals use anthropogenic
2 signals from acoustic tags to locate fish: evidence from a simulated foraging task. Proceeding
3 of the Royal Society London B, 282, 20141595.
4

5 Thompson, D., 2012. Assessment of Risk to Marine Mammals from Underwater Renewable
6 Devices in Welsh Waters. Phase 2 - Studies of Marine Mammals in Welsh High Tidal Waters
7 on behalf of the Welsh Assembly Government. Annexe 1 Movements and diving behaviour
8 of juvenile grey seals in areas of high tidal energy. Doc ref JER3688 R 120712 HT Annex 1
9 Movements and diving behaviour of grey seals.
10

11 UKMS, 2014. Marine Strategy Part Two: UK Marine Monitoring Programmes. Available at
12 [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/341146/msfd-](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/341146/msfd-part-2-final.pdf)
13 [part-2-final.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/341146/msfd-part-2-final.pdf)
14

15 Veirs, S., Veirs, V., Wood, J. D., 2016. Ship noise extends to frequencies used for echolocation
16 by endangered killer whales. PeerJ 4:e1657.
17

18 Vincent, C., Fedak, M. A., McConnell, B. J., Meynier, L., Saint-Jean, C., Ridoux, V., 2005.
19 Status and conservation of the grey seal, *Halichoerus grypus*, in France. Biological
20 Conservation, 126(1), 62-73.
21

22 Wale, M. A., Simpson, S. D., Radford, A. N., 2013. Noise negatively affects foraging and
23 antipredator behaviour in shore crabs. Animal Behaviour 86: 111 - 118.
24

25 Williams, R., Clark, C. W., Ponirakis, D., Ashe, E., 2014. Acoustic quality of critical habitats
26 for three threatened whale populations, Animal Conservation.
27 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/acv.12076>.
28
29
30

Table 1 Summary of details of ships and seals

	Name	Length (m)	Horizontal speed	Start time	End time	
Summer	Ship	Auteuil (LPG tanker) (MMSI: 563483000)	93.0	12.2 knots	21/09/2011 02:02:28	21/09/2011 04:51:24
	Seal1	hg29-11-10	N/A	Mean: 1.368 m/s Std: 0.198	21/09/2011 02:02:28	21/09/2011 04:51:24
Winter	Ship	Oscar Wilde (Passenger ship) (MMSI: 308847000)	166.3	15.8 knots	19/12/2012 06:40:04	19/12/2012 09:49:00
	Seal2	B29	N/A	Mean: 1.459 m/s Std: 0.218	19/12/2012 06:40:04	19/12/2012 09:49:00

Table 2 Geoacoustic parameters for HARCAM

Sediment type	Sound speed ratio	Density ratio	Attenuation of longitudinal waves (dB/m/kHz)
Clay ^a	0.994	1.421	0.2
Silt ^a	1.057	1.74	0.8
Muddy sand ^a	1.115	1.856	0.67
Sand ^a	1.145	1.941	0.52
Gravelly sand ^a	1.201	2.034	0.46
Sandy Gravel ^b	1.250	2.1	0.4
Chalk ^b	1.6	2.2	0.2
Limestone ^b	2.0	2.4	0.1

^aHamilton et al., 1982; ^bJensen et al., 2011.




Fig. 1 Study area showing the bathymetry of the model domain. Transect A (thick red solid line) is used to calculate 2D transmission loss. Dot represents the location of the source. Solid line with time stamps express an example of shipping track from a commercial cargo ship (MMSi: 353633000). Arrows represent the horizontal tracks of two seals.




Fig. 2 Source level spectrum in 1/3 octave band radiated by three ships. MMSi: 353633000 (black square) was used to calculate sound exposure levels. MMSi: 563483000 (blue circle) and MMSi: 308847000 (red star) were used to calculate sound pressure levels received by Seal1 and Seal2 respectively. l is ship length and v is averaged operational speed.




Fig. 3 Seasonal variations of parameters on transect A: (a) and (b): temperature; (c) and (d): transmission loss at frequency 125Hz with source (7m) located on the onshore side of the bottom front; (e) and (f): comparisons of transmission loss at a water depth of 10m between HARCAM and spreading models (10log, 15log and 20log)




Fig. 4 Sound exposure level with the ship (MMSI: 353633000) travelling northwards over the shipping lane (see Fig. 1)




Fig. 5 Sound exposure for Seall1 (see Fig. 1) in summer. (a): relative distance between Seall1 and ship (MMSI: 563483000); (b): SPL (dB) over a frequency bandwidth of 10-1000Hz for Seall1 over its diving path. The black arrow in the figure marks the time point when the ship crosses the bottom front from onshore to offshore while the numbers are indices of diving profiles; (c): same as (b) with the water column data replaced by winter temperature and salinity for noise calculation




Fig. 6 Sound exposure for Seal2 (see Fig. 1) in winter. (a) Relative distance between Seal2 and ship (MMSI: 308847000); (b) SPL (dB) over a frequency bandwidth of 10-1000Hz for Seal2 over its diving path; (c): same as (b) with the water column data replaced by summer temperature and salinity for noise calculation




Fig. 7 Cumulative sound exposure levels for Sela1 and Seal2: Seal1 in summer (red solid line), Seal1 in winter (black dot-dash line), Seal2 in winter (blue dashed line) and Seal2 in summer (pink dotted line)