

Chapter 12: Density modeling for marine mammals and sea turtles with environmental covariates

Final Report to the Maryland Department of Natural Resources and the Maryland Energy Administration, 2015

Logan J. Pallin¹, Evan M. Adams², Holly F. Goyert³, Ari S. Friedlaender⁴, and David W. Johnston¹

¹Duke University Marine Laboratory, Division of Marine Science and Conservation, Beaufort, NC

²Biodiversity Research Institute, Portland, ME

³North Carolina State University, Department of Forestry and Environmental Resources, Raleigh, NC

⁴Oregon State University, Department of Fisheries and Wildlife, Marine Mammal Institute, Newport, OR

Project webpage: www.briloon.org/mabs

Suggested citation: Pallin LJ, Adams EM, Goyert HF, Friedlaender AS, and Johnston DW. 2015. Density modeling for marine mammals and sea turtles with environmental covariates. In: Baseline Wildlife Studies in Atlantic Waters Offshore of Maryland: Final Report to the Maryland Department of Natural Resources and the Maryland Energy Administration, 2015. Williams KA, Connelly EE, Johnson SM, Stenhouse IJ (eds.) Report BRI 2015-17, Biodiversity Research Institute, Portland, Maine. 37 pp.

Acknowledgments: This material is based upon work supported by the Maryland Department of Natural Resources and Maryland Energy Administration under Contract Number 14-13-1653 MEA, and by the Department of Energy under Award Number DE-EE0005362. HiDef Aerial Surveying, Ltd., Dr. Richard Veit (College of Staten Island), and Capt. Brian Patteson made significant contributions towards the completion of this study.

Disclaimers: The statements, findings, conclusions, and recommendations expressed in this report are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Maryland Department of Natural Resources or the Maryland Energy Administration. Mention of trade names or commercial products does not constitute their endorsement by the State.

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government. Neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof.

Chapter 12 Highlights

Density modeling for marine mammals and sea turtles

Context¹

Part IV of this report contains several instances in which boat survey and digital video aerial survey datasets were modeled with environmental covariates to describe populations of interest (Chapters 12-14). Cetaceans and sea turtles are taxa of regulatory and conservation concern in the Mid-Atlantic region. By combining boat and aerial survey data for these taxa with remotely sensed environmental data, we can use spatial-temporal modeling methods to estimate habitat influences on distributions and relative abundance, and explore potential overlap with offshore human interests, including Wind Energy Areas (WEAs). In some cases, one survey method was significantly better than the other for surveying a particular taxon, as with digital video aerial surveys for sea turtles. Both boat and aerial surveys were suspected to inaccurately estimate group size for cetaceans, so models were developed to identify patterns of occurrence of delphinid pods, rather than abundance of individual animals.

Study goal/objectives addressed in this chapter

Describe the distributions of cetaceans and sea turtles across the Mid-Atlantic Outer Continental Shelf using boat and aerial survey data.

Highlights

- At least five different species of dolphins and porpoises were observed in surveys, four of which occurred within the Maryland study area. Five species of baleen whales were also observed, two of which occurred within the Maryland study area.
- Bottlenose dolphins were observed primarily closer to shore in spring through fall. Primary productivity and sea surface temperature were also important predictors; models suggest minimal presence of the species in Mid-Atlantic WEAs during cooler months.
- Common dolphins were most frequently observed in offshore areas in winter and early spring.
- Five species of sea turtles were observed in boat and aerial surveys, all of which occurred within the Maryland study area.
- Turtles were much more frequently observed in digital aerial surveys than in boat surveys.
- Sea turtles were most abundant from May to October. In addition to water temperature, primary productivity and distance from shore were important influences, and sea turtles were primarily distributed offshore. There was substantial overlap of predicted habitat use with WEAs, particularly in the southern part of the Mid-Atlantic Baseline Studies (MABS) study area.

Implications

Small sample sizes made modeling difficult for some taxa, but results suggest that there may be overlap between cetacean and sea turtle distributions and areas of potential offshore wind development in the Mid-Atlantic. Given the protected status of these species, additional research may be indicated on their distributions, as well as potential approaches for mitigating the effects of wind power development.

¹ For more detailed context for this chapter, please see the introduction to Part IV of this report.

Abstract

Marine mammals and sea turtles are often of management and conservation concern, and effective management of these large marine vertebrates requires reliable information on distribution, abundance, and trends in habitat use. This chapter utilizes observation data of cetaceans and sea turtles from boat and digital video aerial surveys to describe the distributions of these taxa across the Mid-Atlantic Outer Continental Shelf, determine the habitat or environmental drivers of these distributions, and identify the locations and timing of potential overlap with areas of potential offshore wind energy development. Dolphin, porpoise, whale, and sea turtle observations from boat and aerial surveys were assessed for species composition, relative numbers, and geographic and temporal distributions. Relative density estimates were produced for sea turtles (using digital video aerial survey data) and bottlenose dolphins (using boat survey data) using both general linear and general additive models (GLMs and GAMs, respectively). For both bottlenose dolphins and sea turtles, GAMs proved more effective at modeling the density of these animals with relation to spatial covariates than their counterpart GLMs. Bottlenose dolphins were observed primarily in more near shore areas in spring, summer, and fall, in areas with high levels of primary productivity and higher sea surface temperatures. There were few observations of the species during cooler months. Sea turtles were also most abundant from May to October, and their densities were correlated with warmer water temperatures and farther distances from shore. There was substantial overlap between sea turtle distributions and WEAs, particularly in the southern part of the Mid-Atlantic Baseline Studies (MABS) study area. There was also overlap between WEAs and predicted habitat usage of bottlenose dolphins and other delphinids, although the degree of this overlap was difficult to discern with the datasets used in this analysis.

Introduction

Marine mammals and sea turtles are often of management and conservation concern, as their large home ranges and habitat requirements may overlap and conflict with human activities such as offshore development and commercial fishing (Trites et al. 1997). As the United States pursues the development of offshore wind energy it will be important to consider interactions with other offshore uses including commercial fisheries, shipping lanes, recreational areas, and military areas, as well as areas of ecological importance.

Cetaceans (whales, dolphins, and porpoises) and sea turtles represent a particular challenge for population monitoring, due to their vast ranges and cryptic behaviors, resulting in only small portions of the animals' bodies being visible (Hammond et al. 2002). However, the conservation and management of these large marine vertebrates requires reliable information on distribution, abundance, and trends in habitat use, and quantitative research is essential for overcoming these challenges. Acoustic disturbance has been recently identified as a primary concern for marine mammals and sea turtles within the marine environment (Dow Piniak et al. 2012; Bergström et al. 2014). This includes such noises as shipping, seismic surveys, blasting, pile driving, and operational wind turbines. The severity of avoidance and displacement effects appear to vary with a variety of factors, including the species being exposed as well as the frequency, intensity, and duration of noise (Goold 1996; McCauley et al. 2000; Madsen et al. 2002). These disturbances may not only deter marine species from development areas, but have the potential to be detrimental to the animals in other ways as well, including a variety of

behavioral, acoustical, and physiological effects (Nowacek et al. 2007; Southall et al. 2007; Tyack et al. 2011).

The Mid-Atlantic Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) is of key importance to many large marine species during both breeding and nonbreeding periods. This region also acts as a key migration route for one of the most sensitive and protected marine mammals, the North Atlantic Right whale (Kenney et al. 2001). The most recent marine mammal stock assessment reports (SARs) for the North Atlantic place 13 cetacean and three pinniped species within the MABS study area, all of which are protected under the Marine Mammal Protection Act (Waring et al. 2011; Waring et al. 2013). It is also important to note that sound travels long distances underwater, and just to the east of the MABS study area (over the shelf break), a whole new group of deep diving cetacean species that are highly sensitive to marine noise, such as sperm and beaked whales, may also be exposed to development noise from the MABS study area (Mate et al. 1994; Cox et al. 2006). Furthermore, five of the seven extant species of sea turtle occur in the Mid-Atlantic OCS, and all five are protected under the Endangered Species Act. The abundance of large marine megafauna within the Mid-Atlantic OCS makes it a potentially sensitive and challenging location for offshore development.

Given the difficulties associated with estimating animal abundance (or occurrence) based on count data from large-scale surveys (Royle et al. 2007), modeling spatial and temporal distributions of animals can help to determine areas of high and low use and inform decisions for development (Garthe and Hüppop 2004; Kinlan et al. 2012). However, distributions of animals in the offshore environment can be highly variable, and are driven by environmental and biophysical factors working at a variety of temporal and spatial scales (O'Connell et al. 2009; Zipkin et al. 2010). By combining boat and aerial survey data with oceanographic habitat and climatological data, we can use spatial-temporal modeling methods to estimate these habitat influences on the distributions and relative abundances of a species of interest, and explore potential overlap with offshore human interests. Accurately assessing such relationships is essential for predicting spatial distributions and the potential shifts that could occur in these geographic distributions. In this study, we quantify sea turtle and marine mammal densities seasonally throughout the MABS study area; develop models to examine spatial patterns and trends based on interactions with environmental conditions; and help identify species at potential risk from turbine construction and operation due to their movements, behavior, or migration strategies.

Methods

Survey methods

Standardized boat-based surveys are a widely used method of obtaining density estimates for birds, sea turtles, and marine mammals (Thompson and Harwood 1990). In our boat-based surveys, transects extended perpendicularly to the coastline, from three nautical miles offshore to the 30 m isobath or the eastern extent of the Mid-Atlantic Wind Energy Areas (WEAs), whichever was furthest. Boat transects were spaced 10 km apart and extended at least one transect north and south of each WEA (Figure 12-1 to Figure 12-3). We conducted eight surveys per year on a scheduled basis as the weather allowed, between April 2012 and April 2014, as part of the Mid-Atlantic Baseline Studies (MABS) project. Eight of the 16 surveys (from March 2013 to February 2014) also included extensions of three transects farther

west into Maryland state waters. Two pairs of observers alternated 2-hour shifts collecting standard line-transect data using distance sampling (Buckland et al. 1993). While the recorder entered data into the program dLOG (R.G. Ford Consulting, Inc.), and regularly updated changes in environmental conditions (sea state, etc.), the observer scanned the horizon, focusing on one forward quadrant on either side of the vessel. We continuously recorded the species, count, distance, and angle to the observation (see Chapter 6 for more details on data collection methods). Cetaceans were photographed when possible. Photos were submitted for individual identification using the established North Atlantic fin whale, humpback whale, and North Atlantic right whale catalogues. Surveys were conducted in “passing mode”, meaning that the boat stayed on transect and at constant survey speed (10 knots) except when complying with National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) rules about approaching marine mammals, including rules regarding vessel speed and encounters with endangered North Atlantic Right Whales (*Eubalaena glacialis*). More detailed methods for boat surveys may be found in Chapter 6.

Fifteen high resolution digital video aerial surveys were conducted by HiDef Aerial Surveying, Ltd. (hereafter, HiDef), across the MABS study area between March 2012 and May 2014 (Chapter 3). Each survey was completed using two small commercial aircraft, allowing complete coverage of the MABS study area in two to three days (weather permitting). Aerial transects were flown at high densities within the Delaware, Maryland, and Virginia WEAs to obtain accurate abundance estimates within these specific footprints; the remainder of the study area was surveyed on an efficient sawtooth transect path to provide broad-scale context for the intensive WEA surveys (Figure 12-4 to Figure 12-6). Beginning in March 2013, surveys included the addition of high-density video aerial survey transects in a large area south and west of the Maryland WEA (adding about 21% of additional transect length to the existing study design; Chapter 3). A fifteenth survey was conducted in August 2013, and covered only the Maryland WEA and the high-density Maryland Project area (Chapter 3). Recorded images were stored on heavy duty disk drives or solid state recording devices for subsequent review and analysis. Wildlife locations, taxonomic identities, and behaviors were determined from the video footage (Hatch et al. 2013).

Data preparation

Boat-based and aerial survey observations of marine mammals and sea turtles seen within the MABS dataset are summarized in Table 12-1 and Table 12-2, with effort data summarized in Table 12-3. Observations specific to the Maryland study area (shown in all map figures) are summarized in Table 12-4 and Table 12-5, with effort information in Table 12-6. All animals not identified to the species level were combined into an “unidentified” category. Due to the lack of data at the species level for the aerial surveys, sea turtle observations were grouped as a single taxon for all further analyses by season (Spring: Mar-May, Summer: June-Aug., Fall: Sept-Nov., Winter: Dec-Feb). The number of whale sightings from both surveys ($n = 51$) was not sufficient to produce descriptive models, and thus this taxon was excluded from further analysis.

Effort and species observation data were modeled using the “count” method (Hedley et al. 1999). Boat and aerial survey track lines were divided into segments approximately 5 km in length. Start and end locations of these segments were calculated using the COGO proportions function in ArcMap 10.2 (ESRI

2011). The location of the midpoint of each segment (latitude and longitude) was calculated using the feature to point command in ArcMap 10.2.

Oceanographic processes were evaluated as spatial covariates to predict marine mammal and sea turtle location and density. Sea surface temperature (SST) and chlorophyll *a* (Chl *a*), were extracted using the Marine Geospatial Ecology Toolbox (MGET) data products function in order to provide spatial coverage across the MABS study area (Roberts et al. 2010). SST and Chl *a* data were extracted as a monthly average, for all twelve months, at a 4 km spatial resolution. The monthly averages were then averaged by season. Additionally, the distance from shore (DFS) from each transect segment's midpoint to the nearest coastline was calculated (ESRI 2011).

Modeling detection probability

A conventional stratified analysis was conducted on the boat-based survey data in program DISTANCE to estimate the probability of detecting delphinids within a 5% truncation of the trackline (Laake 1994). In standard distance sampling a truncation limit of the largest distances, generally 5%, is set to avoid a size bias and increase the estimation of the detection function. Detection probability of bottlenose dolphin encounters across seasons was modeled at the species level as a smooth function of perpendicular distance. Common dolphin, unidentified dolphin, and sea turtle sightings were not included in this distance analysis due to the lack of total individuals. The sightings included in the line transect distance analysis only included those within the front 180 degree observation window from the boat, and thus effective strip width was used to calculate relative density of bottlenose dolphin encounters. Encounters of bottlenose dolphin groups (rather than individuals) were modelled due to uncertainty in group size estimates arising from "passing mode" surveys. Relative density modelling was stratified by season for spring, summer and fall (Figure 12-7 to Figure 12-9), as there were not enough sightings of bottlenose dolphins in winter. Candidate forms for the detection function were the half-normal model and hazard rate function with a cosine smoothing term (Buckland et al. 2001). Sea state, as recorded by observers on the Beaufort scale, was not included as a candidate covariate as no plausible detection functions were produced. Models were selected using Akaike's Information Criterion (AIC; Akaike 1973).

Aerial transects were treated as strip transects, whereby density was determined as the number of sightings per transect length of 5 km and strip width of 200 m, and detection was assumed to be perfect (Buckland et al. 2005). Relative density estimates from the aerial transects were only produced for sea turtles by season for spring, summer and fall, as there were not enough sea turtle sightings during the winter aerial surveys. Species specific aerial density estimates for marine mammals were not modelled due to the small sample size of individuals identified at the species level. Furthermore, a general "all delphinids" model was not run due to the challenges that arise by lumping multiple species that have distinct behaviors.

Building descriptive models

The covariates for each 5 km transect segment midpoint were joined with their corresponding density and input into R for model fitting. For the purposes of this study, both general additive models, or GAMs (using R package mgcv), and general linear models, or GLMs (using the built-in glm R function), were used in model development following a negative binomial family fitting response (Wood 2006; Dobson

and Barnett 2011; R Core Team 2014). Both model outputs were a result of different combinations of covariates. Seven different models were used for each model type (Table 12-7 to Table 12-12). The selection of the best model was based according to the AIC score and the percent of deviance from the null model that the model explained (Table 12-7 to Table 12-12). The higher the percent of deviance explained from the null model, the better that particular model fits the input data. In cases where the AIC values of two models were very similar, the percent deviance was solely used as the deciding criterion for model selection.

Once a model had been chosen according the selection criterion above, a 4 km square gridded data set was created for each season to act as the predicting platform for the model results. This platform extended 25-30 km east of the WEAs, 30 km south of the VA WEA and 75 km north of the DE WEA. Every grid cell centroid was assigned a distance to shore value, as well as SST and Chl *a* values extracted from seasonal climatologies using the MGETs data products toolbox in ArcGIS (Roberts et al. 2010). The seasonal prediction grids were then passed to the chosen descriptive model for bottlenose dolphins and sea turtles using the `predict.gam` command in R. The estimated encounter rates from the bottlenose dolphin detection functions and the calculated relative density of sea turtles per strip segment were used as the model response variables. The output of the model was an estimate of the predicted relative density at 1 km² at the center of each grid cell according to the variables used in the chosen model. These predicted densities were scaled according to the 16 km² prediction grid, imported in ArcMap 10.2 as a raster data set, and smoothed using the point to raster conversion function (ESRI 2011). Missing (white) cells in the interpolated relative density maps indicate areas where no covariate data were available or the prediction grid limits ended.

Results

A total of 374 marine mammal and sea turtle sightings were reported in the MABS boat-based surveys, representing 1,349 individuals. Of these, 1,211 individuals were identified to the species level (Table 12-1). Of all observed marine mammal and sea turtle individuals, 1,200 were dolphins, 35 were whales, and 114 were sea turtles (Table 12-1). A total of 3,808 individual marine mammals and sea turtles were observed during the MABS aerial surveys (Table 12-2). Of these, 2,036 were dolphins, 3 were porpoises, 16 were whales, 5 were unidentified cetaceans, and 1,748 were sea turtles (Table 12-2). A total of 278 individual marine mammal and sea turtles were observed within the Maryland study area from boat based surveys (Table 12-4). Of these individuals, 259 were dolphins, 7 were whales, and 120 were sea turtles (Table 12-4).

A total of 1,489 individual marine mammal and sea turtles were observed within the Maryland study area from aerial surveys (Table 12-5). Of these individuals, 1,119 were dolphins, 3 were whales, 1 was a porpoise, and 366 were sea turtles (Table 12-5). Locations of whales, dolphins, and sea turtles observed on the boat surveys are presented in Figure 12-1 to Figure 12-3. Locations of whales, dolphins, and sea turtles observed on the aerial surveys are presented in Figure 12-4 to Figure 12-6. MABS aerial survey observations were highest in May and July (late spring, mid-summer) and aerial observations within the Maryland study area were highest in the summer and fall (Table 12-3, Table 12-6). Humpback whales (*Megaptera novaeangliae*) were the most common large whales observed in the MABS study, although

minke whales (*Balaenoptera acutorostrata*) were the most common whale observed within the Maryland study area. Five species of whales were observed in the MABS study, with two species observed within the Maryland study area (Table 12-1, Table 12-2, Table 12-4, Table 12-5). Bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*) were the most common of the four delphinid species observed in the MABS study and within the Maryland study area, and were observed mainly inshore (Table 12-1, Table 12-2, Table 12-4, Table 12-5, Figure 12-2, Figure 12-5). Common dolphins (*Delphinus delphis*) were the next most abundant species, and were more commonly observed offshore (Figure 12-2, Figure 12-5). Sea turtle distributions were primarily offshore (Figure 12-3, Figure 12-6), and loggerhead sea turtles (*Caretta caretta*) were the most abundant of the five species observed within both the MABS and the Maryland study areas (Table 12-1, Table 12-2, Table 12-4, Table 12-5).

In all cases, GAMs outperformed GLMs (Table 12-7 to Table 12-12). The encounter rate (number of sightings per km²) model for bottlenose dolphins in the spring predicted a strong nearshore-oriented density gradient within the prediction area, and the corresponding density map correlated well with the bottlenose dolphin sighting data spatially. The highest predicted encounter rates were at the mouth of the Delaware Bay (Figure 12-10), as well as near the western edges of the Delaware and Maryland WEAs. Like the spring model, the encounter rate model for bottlenose dolphins in the summer predicted very strong nearshore-oriented, northerly concentrated density gradient in and around the mouth of the Delaware Bay (Figure 12-11), including a density of encounters near the western edges of the Delaware and Maryland WEAs. Like the spring model, the encounter rate model for bottlenose dolphins in the fall predicted a strong nearshore-oriented density gradient along the prediction area, with the highest densities seen farther south at the mouth of the Chesapeake Bay (Figure 12-12). The fall model predicted no substantial encounter overlap with any of the WEAs.

The relative density model for sea turtles in the spring predicted a very strong off shore-oriented, southern density gradient (Figure 12-13), including high densities within the Virginia WEA. The density model for sea turtles in the summer predicted a less dense gradient across the southeastern portions of the MABS study area, including areas near and within the Virginia WEA (Figure 12-14). In the summer density map, the relative density of sea turtles also begins to migrate north. The predicted density model for sea turtles in the fall predicted a less dense, latitudinally uniform density gradient (Figure 12-15). The corresponding fall density map predicted high densities within all three WEAs.

Discussion

Effective conservation plans require precise assessments of the spatial distributions and densities of the species they are trying to protect. With such information, policy makers, regulators, and managers can predict how a species' distribution may respond to changes within their environment, including naturally occurring fluctuations and human activities. Species distribution modeling can provide a measure of a species' spatial density over a desired region. Our primary goal was to quantify sea turtle and marine mammal densities seasonally throughout the MABS study area by developing models to examine spatial patterns and trends based on interactions with environmental conditions, in hopes of identifying species that could be exposed to future turbine construction and operation. By applying spatial modelling techniques to line transect boat-based survey data and high resolution digital video aerial survey

footage, we produced relative density estimates of sea turtles and relative encounter rate estimates for Bottlenose Dolphins (as dolphin sightings may represent either an individual or a pod) across the MABS study area by correlating species abundance to spatial and environmental covariates. One of the possible advantages gained by utilizing a spatial model to estimate density is an enhancement in the estimated precision, as deviation in density can be explained by relatively few spatial covariates (Hedley et al. 1999).

The combined effort of both surveys did not yield enough whale sightings to investigate potential density relationships with environmental covariates. An examination of publicly available whale data outside the MABS study area was conducted, but there were still insufficient sightings within the last ten years to allow for parameterization of a model (the 10-year temporal limit was set to avoid any variation in sighting patterns that could be caused by climate change). It is still important to note, however, that large whales were observed across the survey area during both surveys, including within each of the WEAs. Of particular importance, nine North Atlantic right whales were observed during the surveys of the MABS study area, of which none occurred within the Maryland study area. Currently, North Atlantic Right Whales are among the most endangered whales in world, with an estimated 455 individuals left in the western North Atlantic (Fisheries 2015). They are protected under the United States Endangered Species Act (ESA) as well as the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA). Vessel strikes and entanglement in fishing gear account for nearly half of all North Atlantic right whale mortality since 1970 (Knowlton and Kraus 2001). Considering hearing is a sensory modality for these animals, as well as most other marine mammals, it is important to understand the potential increase in underwater noise posed by construction of offshore wind energy facilities. A study published in 2012 discovered that a decrease in underwater noise was associated with a decrease in baseline levels of stress-related hormones, such as glucocorticoids and cortisol, which are associated with chronic stress, and if not produced at proper levels can hinder the processes of a successful birth and even lead to adult mortality (Rolland et al. 2012). A recent passive acoustic study showed that North Atlantic right whales were present off the coasts of North Carolina and Georgia in all seasons, with peaks in abundance in autumn and winter, when they were not expected to be present (Hodge et al. 2015). We encourage further data collection in the region to better understand the distribution of large whales, in particular the North Atlantic right whale, in relation to environmental covariates and the position of the WEAs.

For both bottlenose dolphins and sea turtles, GAMs proved more effective at modelling the density of these animals with relation to spatial covariates than their counterpart GLMs. This is due to GAMs' capacity to model the non-linear nature of ecological data and produce complex response curves (Guisan et al. 2002; Venables and Dichmont 2004). It is also important to look at the effectiveness of each models capacity to model temporal trends. GLMs are generally used in modelling long-term trends, such as annual outcomes, while GAMs are better at modelling short term responses, such as across seasons (Cheng and Gallinat 2004). It is also important to note, however, that if not used carefully, GAMs can seriously over-fit data, and, thus, have low predictive power. GAMs also do not allow for the depiction of the interaction of two or more spatial covariates.

The relative density of bottlenose dolphin encounters within the MABS study area during the spring was explained by Chl a and DFS, the summer model was best explained by only SST and Chl a , and the fall model was best explained by SST and DFS. The relationship with SST may be attributed to the bottlenose dolphins' migratory behavior, as the species generally moves south as temperatures decline (Barco et al. 1999; Natoli et al. 2005). It is also probable that there are permanent residents, transients, and seasonal migrants of this species that occupy estuarine, coastal, and offshore waters from Florida to New Jersey (Urian et al. 2009). North of Cape Hatteras, North Carolina, bottlenose dolphins display a bimodal distribution with coastal and offshore components (Kenney 1990), and the Mid-Atlantic study area likely contains several different coastal morphotypes at different times of year, including both Northern Migratory and Southern Migratory stocks (Waring et al. 2013). The relationship between bottlenose dolphin encounter rates and DFS in this study is likely due to the inshore distribution of the coastal ecotype of bottlenose dolphins during the spring, summer, and fall seasons (Kenney 1990; Gannon and Waples 2004). It is possible that during the spring and fall months, resident coastal ecotype dolphins were surveyed more often, thus, producing the very nearshore density gradient observed in this study. In summer, however, the influx of transient populations may have produced a more robust density gradient from west to east. The association with high areas of Chl a may be attributed to delphinids' capacity to utilize areas of high primary productivity for feeding, particularly in and around the mouths of the Chesapeake Bay and Delaware Bay (Young and Phillips 2002). It is important to note that the development of the bottlenose dolphin models excluded dolphins lumped into the "unidentified" category, of which some proportion were likely bottlenose dolphins.

The relative density of sea turtles during the spring was best explained by SST and DFS. The relative density of sea turtles during the summer was best explained by SST and Chl a , while the fall model was best explained by only DFS. Past aerial surveys have shown that Loggerhead sea turtles, in particular, migrate into Mid-Atlantic coastal waters at depths of 60 m or less as the water warms during the spring (Shoop 1980). This would explain the higher density of sea turtles predicted in the spring, as roughly 60% of the identified sea turtles from both surveys were loggerheads. In general, there was a decreasing trend in density from spring to fall. The most common sea turtles observed in the aerial survey were loggerhead and leatherback sea turtles. Prime nesting for these two species occurs from March to September along the east coast of the United States (Miller et al. 2003; Rabon Jr et al. 2003). As nesting of female sea turtles occurs on sandy beaches, we would expect the sexually mature females to be closer to shore during the nesting season. It is possible that the aerial survey did not efficiently survey the nesting population during the summer, as surveys did not extend within 5.5 km of shore in most locations; this could explain the lower predicted densities than in spring. Furthermore, the northern migration of predicted densities during the summer and fall could be a result of the mixing of the northern Labrador and Gulf Stream currents. The complete mixing of these currents around the survey region occurs in late summer and early fall (Talley and McCartney 1982; Rossby and Benway 2000). The delayed uniform mixing of these currents has the potential to hinder the northern migration of these turtles. This is also likely why so few turtles were observed in the winter, as bottom temperatures in the Mid-Atlantic drop to 10°C or less by mid-December, a known lethal thermal limit for some species of sea turtles (Schwartz 1978; Lutcavage and Musick 1985; Hawkes et al. 2007). It is also possible that this delayed mixing accounts for the greater number of turtles observed in the summer as

it is estimated that turtles within the MABS study area spend about 25% of the time at the surface basking during the spring (cooler water temps), as opposed to about 5% of the time during the summer and fall when current mixing has occurred (Barco et al. 1999).

Sea turtles and offshore wind energy development in the Mid-Atlantic

Five of the seven extant species of sea turtle occur in the Mid-Atlantic study area, and all five are protected under the Endangered Species Act. As such, they are likely to be priority species for regulators during the offshore wind environmental permitting process. Sea turtles are uncommon in European waters, so no information is available about their interactions with offshore wind facilities. Sea turtles could potentially be affected by offshore wind energy development in several ways, however, including noise from seismic surveys, construction, and operations; electromagnetic fields; vessel collisions; and changes to habitat caused by artificial reef effects (Read 2013).

Construction of offshore wind facilities has been identified as the development period with the most potential risks for sea turtles, due to noise from pile driving and other activities, though the potential for injury remains largely unknown (Michel 2013). Sea turtles can detect low-frequency sounds (Lenhardt et al. 1983; Dow Piniak et al. 2012), and the frequencies emitted by seismic airguns, offshore drilling, low-frequency and mid-frequency sonar, pile driving, cargo vessels, and operational wind turbines are all within the underwater hearing range of Leatherback sea turtles (Dow Piniak et al. 2012). Sea turtles have exhibited startle responses when exposed to low frequency sounds and vibrations in a laboratory setting (Lenhardt et al. 1983), and laboratory and *in situ* studies on seismic airguns for offshore oil and gas exploration have showed changes in sea turtle swimming pattern and orientation (O'Hara and Wilcox 1990) and a range of avoidance behaviors up to at least one kilometer away from the source (O'Hara and Wilcox 1990; McCauley et al. 2000). Sea turtles are known to collide with vessels, and are also displaced from areas with vessel traffic, though observed responses to boat noise have varied with species (Samuel et al. 2005; Lester et al. 2013).

During operations of offshore wind facilities, sea turtles may be displaced due to turbine or vessel noise, or may aggregate around turbine foundations due to artificial reef effects, which change local habitats (Read 2013). Similar aggregation patterns have been observed around oil rigs in the Gulf of Mexico (Continental Shelf Associates 2004). The degree to which turbines may aggregate sea turtles will likely vary by location and other factors, and the effects on individuals or populations are unclear. Likewise, past studies have shown that electromagnetic fields (EMF) and heat signatures associated with offshore turbines have the potential to affect species such as sea turtles that use geomagnetic cues during migration (Lohmann et al. 2008). Data on the effects of EMF on sea turtles are generally lacking, however (Read 2013), and we know of no studies to date that have assessed whether EMF emissions from subsurface cables at operational facilities influence navigational decisions of turtles.

Overall, our results indicate that there is overlap between predicted habitat usage of sea turtles and the placement of WEAs in the Mid-Atlantic. Chesapeake Bay and the coastal waters of Virginia are known to serve as a key summer developmental habitat for juvenile sea turtles, particularly loggerheads and Kemp's ridley sea turtles, thus placing the Virginia WEA in a potentially sensitive location (Lutcavage and Musick 1985). During spring, summer, and fall, the relative density of sea turtles did not change

drastically, though the distribution of turtles across the MABS study area varied substantially; of note, the Maryland study area had lowest densities of turtles in the spring, and highest densities in the fall (Figure 12-13 to Figure 12-15). Winter is the time period where the likelihood of interactions between offshore construction and sea turtles is lowest, but winter is a difficult time for offshore construction, and most development activities are likely to occur in the other three seasons. As such, and given the group's conservation status, the development of techniques to avoid or reduce interactions between sea turtles and construction activities, vessel traffic, and other development activities should be considered a priority. The development of taxon-specific effects data is also a key area for additional research.

Bottlenose dolphins and offshore wind energy development in the Mid-Atlantic

All cetaceans that occur in the U.S. are protected under the Marine Mammal Protection Act. Cetaceans use sound for communication, and some, like dolphins, also use echolocation to navigate through their environment and hunt for prey. Acoustic disturbance has been recently identified as the primary concern for marine mammals with regards to offshore wind development in Europe (Bergström et al. 2014). This may include noise from seismic surveys, blasting, pile driving, and operational turbines. The severity of avoidance and displacement effects appear to vary with a variety of factors, including the frequency, intensity, and duration of noise, as well as species and time of year (Goold 1996; McCauley et al. 2000; Madsen et al. 2002). European studies have indicated that Harbor Porpoises could hear pile driving noise over 80 km from the source, and showed displacement up to 20 km away during construction (Thomsen et al. 2006; Teilmann and Carstensen 2012). Results of operational displacement studies in Denmark and the Netherlands have varied (Scheidat et al. 2011; Teilmann and Carstensen 2012). There has been little or no detectable avoidance during operations at some facilities, while in at least one instance, even nine years after construction had been completed, porpoise acoustic activity levels were at only 29% of pre-construction levels (Teilmann and Carstensen 2012). Prey availability may be an important factor affecting porpoise behavior around operational wind facilities (Teilmann and Carstensen 2012).

Overall, our results indicate that there is overlap between predicted habitat usages of bottlenose dolphins and the placement of WEAs in the Mid-Atlantic, although the relationship between dolphin distributions and potential offshore wind energy development may be somewhat difficult to interpret from this particular data set. During spring, summer, and fall, bottlenose dolphin encounters within the Maryland study area were highest near shore (Figure 12-10 to Figure 12-12). During the summer, higher densities of bottlenose dolphin encounters were predicted within the western portion of the Maryland WEA (Figure 12-13). Our models suggest minimal presence of bottlenose dolphins within all WEAs during cooler months. However, it is important to note that other species of delphinids, such as common dolphins, are more cold-tolerant than bottlenose dolphins. Common dolphin observations increased in both the boat-based and aerial surveys during winter and early spring. Thus, it is possible that delphinids will be present in some numbers in WEAs during all seasons. Efforts to mitigate the effects of construction activities, in particular, will be important as offshore wind energy development proceeds in the Mid-Atlantic.

Caveats, considerations, and next steps

Conservationists and policy-makers must remember that models are simply an approximation of a species' potential distribution and density. Modeling the density and distributions of marine mammals and sea turtles in the present study was challenging due to the methods employed during surveys, the limited number of sightings generated during surveys, and the difficulties of merging aerial and boat-based survey data. "Passing mode" surveys, where the research vessel does not deviate from the transect line, present significant challenges in determining species identifications and group size. Many marine mammals will form multi-species groups that often become apparent only after close approach, and the movements and dive behavior of these animals make judging group size from a distance difficult. As a result, we chose to model encounter rates (with one or more delphinid) rather than predict numbers of individual animals. Clearly, in applying any analytical technique to ecological data, tradeoffs are often involved to meet certain assumptions. Traditional distance sampling, in particular, assumes all objects on or near the transect line are detected with 100% certainty, that the animals are detected at their initial location, and that recorded distances and angles made by the observer are exact, and without measurement error or bias (Thomas et al. 2002). The marine environment and the general physiology (diving behavior) of these animals make it very difficult to meet these assumptions. As previously mentioned, marine mammals were not modelled using any of the aerial data due to the small sample size of individuals identified at the species level. Furthermore, a general "all delphinids" model would not have been useful as lumping multiple species that have distinct behaviors would have likely been problematic and uninformative. Many species of marine mammals can be highly clustered in space and time, leading to difficulties in merging datasets collected under disparate methods, both of which contained methodological and technological shortcomings.

Future boat survey assessments of marine mammals in this region should be designed to best address issues associated with species identification and group size estimation, ideally using a "closing mode" approach, whereby the research vessel would deviate from the transect line to more accurately describe a sighting by allowing more time for each encounter. A dedicated dual observer approach would also be warranted, as observers searching for both birds and marine mammals must maintain an extremely high level of vigilance to achieve appropriate survey effort. Clearly, aerial surveys pose a challenge to marine mammal surveys due to behaviors such as fast surface intervals as well as species identification success. However, the aerial survey did prove useful in sea turtle relative density estimates, where, unlike marine mammals, the number of species present in our study area was limited, as is the diversity in species-specific behaviors.

Finally, small sample sizes pose challenges to any statistical analyses, and result in diminished analytical potential as compared to models developed with more data (McPherson et al. 2004). As sample size increases, accuracy and predictive power also increase, at least until reaching a maximum accuracy potential (Hernandez et al. 2006). Future surveys designed specifically for marine mammals will help address this issue and improve our understanding of marine mammal distributions and habitat use in the Mid-Atlantic region.

Literature cited

- Akaike H (1973) Maximum likelihood identification of Gaussian autoregressive moving average models. *Biometrika* 60: 255-265
- Barco SG, Swingle WM, Mellan WA, Harris RN, Pabst D (1999) Local abundance and distribution of bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*) in the nearshore waters of Virginia Beach, Virginia. *Marine Mammal Science* 15: 394-408
- Bergström L, Kautsky L, Malm T, Rosenberg R, Wahlberg M, Capetillo NÅ, Wilhelmsson D (2014) Effects of offshore wind farms on marine wildlife—a generalized impact assessment. *Environmental Research Letters* 9: 034012
- Boesch DF, Rabalais NN (1987) Long-term environmental effects of offshore oil and gas development. CRC Press
- Buckland S, Anderson D, Burnham Laake P (2001) DL Borchers & L. T. Tomas. 2001. Introduction to distance sampling: Estimating abundance of biological populations. Oxford University Press. Oxford. UK.
- Buckland ST, Anderson DR, Burnham KP, Laake JL (1993) Distance Sampling: Estimating Abundance of Biological Populations. Chapman and Hall, London
- Buckland ST, Anderson DR, Burnham KP, Laake JL (2005) Distance sampling. Wiley Online Library
- Cheng YW, Gallinat MP (2004) Statistical analysis of the relationship among environmental variables, inter-annual variability and smolt trap efficiency of salmonids in the Tucannon River. *Fisheries Research* 70: 229-238
- Continental Shelf Associates (2004) Explosive removal of offshore structures information synthesis report. U.S. Department of the Interior
- Cox TM, Ragen T, Read A, Vos E, Baird R, Balcomb K, Barlow J, Caldwell J, Cranford T, Crum L (2006) Understanding the impacts of anthropogenic sound on beaked whales. DTIC Document
- Dobson AJ, Barnett A (2011) An introduction to generalized linear models. CRC press
- Dow Piniak W, Eckert S, Harms C, Stringer E (2012) Underwater hearing sensitivity of the leatherback sea turtle (*Dermochelys coriacea*): Assessing the potential effect of anthropogenic noise. US Dept of the Interior, Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Headquarters, Herndon, VA OCS Study BOEM 1156
- ESRI R (2011) ArcGIS desktop: release 10. Environmental Systems Research Institute, CA
- Fisheries (2015) North Atlantic Right Whales (*Eubalaena glacialis*): NOAA Fisheries
- Gannon DP, Waples DM (2004) Diets of coastal bottlenose dolphins from the US Mid-Atlantic coast differ by habitat. *Marine Mammal Science* 20: 527-545

- Garthe S, Hüppop O (2004) Scaling possible adverse effects of marine wind farms on seabirds: developing and applying a vulnerability index. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 41: 724-734
- Goold JC (1996) Acoustic assessment of populations of common dolphin *Delphinus delphis* in conjunction with seismic surveying. *Journal of the Marine Biological Association of the United Kingdom* 76: 811-820
- Guisan A, Edwards TC, Hastie T (2002) Generalized linear and generalized additive models in studies of species distributions: setting the scene. *Ecological modelling* 157: 89-100
- Hammond P, Berggren P, Benke H, Borchers D, Collet A, Heide-Jørgensen M, Heimlich S, Hiby A, Leopold MF, Øien N (2002) Abundance of harbour porpoise and other cetaceans in the North Sea and adjacent waters. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 39: 361-376
- Hatch SK, Connelly EE, Divoll TJ, Stenhouse IJ, Williams KA (2013) Offshore observations of eastern red bats (*Lasiurus borealis*) in the Mid-Atlantic United States using multiple survey methods. *PLoS one* 8: e83803
- Hawkes LA, Broderick AC, Coyne MS, Godfrey MH, Godley BJ (2007) Only some like it hot—quantifying the environmental niche of the loggerhead sea turtle. *Diversity and distributions* 13: 447-457
- Hedley SL, Buckland ST, Borchers DL (1999) Spatial modelling from line transect data. *Journal of Cetacean Research and Management* 1: 255-264
- Hernandez PA, Graham CH, Master LL, Albert DL (2006) The effect of sample size and species characteristics on performance of different species distribution modeling methods. *Ecography* 29: 773-785
- Hodge KB, Muirhead CA, Morano JL, Clark CW, Rice AN (2015) North Atlantic right whale occurrence near wind energy areas along the mid-Atlantic US coast: implications for management. *Endanger Species Res* 28:225–234. doi: 10.3354/esr00683
- Kenney RD (1990) Bottlenose dolphins off the northeastern United States. *The bottlenose dolphin*, Academic Press, San Diego: 369-386
- Kenney RD, Mayo CA, Winn HE (2001) Migration and foraging strategies at varying spatial scales in western North Atlantic right whales: a review of hypotheses. *Journal of Cetacean Research and Management* 2: 251-260
- Kinlan B, Menza C, Huettmann F (2012) Predictive modeling of seabird distribution patterns in the New York Bight. *A Biogeographic Assessment of Seabirds, Deep Sea Corals and Ocean Habitats of the New York Bight: Science to Support Offshore Spatial Planning NOAA Technical Memorandum NOS NCCOS 141*
- Knowlton AR, Kraus SD (2001) Mortality and serious injury of northern right whales (*Eubalaena glacialis*) in the western North Atlantic Ocean. *Journal of Cetacean Research and Management (Special Issue)* 2: 193-208

- Laake JL (1994) Distance User's Guide: Version 2.1. Chapman & Hall
- Lenhardt ML, Bellmund S, Byles R, Harkins S, Musick J (1983) Marine turtle reception of bone-conducted sound. *The Journal of auditory research* 23: 119-125
- Lester LA, Avery HW, Harrison AS, Standora EA (2013) Recreational boats and turtles: behavioral mismatches result in high rates of injury. *PLoS One* 8:e82370.
- Lohmann KJ, Lohmann CMF, Endres CS (2008) The sensory ecology of ocean navigation. *Journal of Experimental Biology* 211: 1719-1728 doi Doi 10.1242/Jeb.015792
- Lutcavage M, Musick JA (1985) Aspects of the biology of sea turtles in Virginia. *Copeia*: 449-456
- Madsen P, Møhl B, Nielsen B, Wahlberg M (2002) Male sperm whale behaviour during exposures to distant seismic survey pulses. *Aquatic Mammals* 28: 231-240
- Mate BR, Stafford KM, Ljungblad DK (1994) A change in sperm whale (*Physeter macrocephalus*) distribution correlated to seismic surveys in the Gulf of Mexico. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 96: 3268-3269
- McCauley RD, Production AP, Association E (2000) Marine seismic surveys: a study of environmental implications. Australian Petroleum Production and Exploration Association
- McPherson J, Jetz W, Rogers DJ (2004) The effects of species' range sizes on the accuracy of distribution models: ecological phenomenon or statistical artefact? *Journal of applied ecology* 41: 811-823
- Michel J (2013) South Atlantic Information Resources: Data Search and Literature Synthesis. US Department of the Interior, Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Gulf of Mexico OCS Region, New Orleans, LA OCS Study BOEM 1157
- Miller JD, Limpus CJ, Godfrey MH (2003) Nest site selection, oviposition, eggs, development, hatching, and emergence of loggerhead turtles. *Loggerhead sea turtles*: 125-143
- Natoli A, Birkun A, Aguilar A, Lopez A, Hoelzel AR (2005) Habitat structure and the dispersal of male and female bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*). *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 272: 1217-1226
- Nowacek DP, Thorne LH, Johnston DW, Tyack PL (2007) Responses of cetaceans to anthropogenic noise. *Mamm Rev* 37:81-115. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2907.2007.00104.x
- O'Hara J, Wilcox JR (1990) Avoidance responses of loggerhead turtles, *Caretta caretta*, to low frequency sound. *Copeia*: 564-567
- O'Connell A, Gardner B, Gilbert A, Laurent K (2009) Compendium of Avian Occurrence Information for the Continental Shelf Waters along the Atlantic Coast of the United States, Final Report (Database Section-Seabirds). Prepared by the USGS Patuxent Wildlife Research Center, Beltsville, MD. US

Department of the Interior, Geological Survey, and Bureau of Ocean Energy Management
Headquarters, OCS Study BOEM 2012-076.

R Core Team (2014) R: A language and environment for statistical computing. . R Foundation for
Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria

Rabon Jr DR, Johnson SA, Boettcher R, Dodd M, Lyons M, Murphy S, Ramsey S, Roff S, Stewart K (2003)
Confirmed leatherback turtle (*Dermochelys coriacea*) nests from North Carolina, with a summary of
leatherback nesting activities north of Florida. *Marine Turtle Newsletter* 101: 4-8

Read A (2013) Chapter 9: Sea Turtles. *South Atlantic Information Resources: Data Search and Literature
Synthesis*. US Department of the Interior, Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Gulf of Mexico
OCS Region, New Orleans, LA OCS Study BOEM

Roberts JJ, Best BD, Dunn DC, Trembl EA, Halpin PN (2010) *Marine Geospatial Ecology Tools: An
integrated framework for ecological geoprocessing with ArcGIS, Python, R, MATLAB, and C++*.
Environmental Modelling & Software 25: 1197-1207

Rolland RM, Parks SE, Hunt KE, Castellote M, Corkeron PJ, Nowacek DP, Wasser SK, Kraus SD (2012)
Evidence that ship noise increases stress in right whales. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B:
Biological Sciences* 279: 2363-2368

Rosby T, Benway R (2000) Slow variations in mean path of the Gulf Stream east of Cape Hatteras.
Geophysical Research Letters 27: 117-120

Royle JA, Kéry M, Gautier R, Schmid H (2007) Hierarchical spatial models of abundance and occurrence
from imperfect survey data. *Ecological Monographs* 77: 465-481

Scheidat M, Tougaard J, Brasseur S, Carstensen J, van Polanen Petel T, Teilmann J, Reijnders P (2011)
Harbour porpoises (*Phocoena phocoena*) and wind farms: a case study in the Dutch North Sea.
Environmental Research Letters 6: 025102

Schwartz FJ (1978) Behavioral and tolerance responses to cold water temperatures by three species of
sea turtles (Reptilia, Cheloniidae) in North Carolina. *Florida Marine Research Publications* 33: 16-18

Shoop C (1980) Sea turtles in the Northeast. *Maritimes* 24: 9-11

Southall BL, Bowles AE, Ellison WT, et al (2007) *Marine Mammal Noise Exposure Criteria: Initial Scientific
Recommendations*. *Aquatic Mammals* 33:411–521. doi: 10.1578/AM.33.4.2007.411

Talley L, McCartney M (1982) Distribution and circulation of Labrador Sea water. *Journal of Physical
Oceanography* 12: 1189-1205

Teilmann J, Carstensen J (2012) Negative long term effects on harbour porpoises from a large scale
offshore wind farm in the Baltic—evidence of slow recovery. *Environmental Research Letters* 7:
045101

- Thomas L, Buckland ST, Burnham KP, Anderson DR, Laake JL, Borchers DL, Strindberg S (2002) Distance sampling. Encyclopedia of environmetrics
- Thompson PM, Harwood J (1990) Methods for estimating the population size of common seals, *Phoca vitulina*. Journal of Applied Ecology: 924-938
- Thomsen F, Lüdemann K, Kafemann R, Piper W (2006) Effects of offshore wind farm noise on marine mammals and fish. Biola, Hamburg, Germany on behalf of COWRIE Ltd: 62
- Trites AW, Christensen V, Pauly D (1997) Competition between fisheries and marine mammals for prey and primary production in the Pacific Ocean. Journal of Northwest Atlantic Fishery Science 22: 173-187
- Tyack PL, Zimmer WMX, Moretti D, et al (2011) Beaked whales respond to simulated and actual navy sonar. PLoS One 6:e17009. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0017009
- Urian KW, Hofmann S, Wells RS, Read AJ (2009) Fine-scale population structure of bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*) in Tampa Bay, Florida. Marine Mammal Science 25: 619-638
- Venables WN, Dichmont CM (2004) GLMs, GAMs and GLMMs: an overview of theory for applications in fisheries research. Fisheries research 70: 319-337
- Waring G, Josephson E, Maze-Foley K, Rosel P (2011) US Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico marine mammal stock assessments--2010. NOAA Tech Memo NMFS NE 219: 02543-01026
- Waring GT, Josephson E, Maze-Foley K, Rosel PE (2013) US Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico Marine Mammal Stock Assessments--2012. NOAA Tech Memo NMFS NE 223: 02543-01026
- Wood S (2006) Generalized additive models: an introduction with R. CRC press
- Young RF, Phillips HD (2002) Primary production required to support bottlenose dolphins in a salt marsh estuarine creek system. Marine Mammal Science 18: 358-373
- Zipkin EF, Royle JA, Dawson DK, Bates S (2010) Multi-species occurrence models to evaluate the effects of conservation and management actions. Biological Conservation 143: 479-484

Figures and tables




Figure 12-1. Whale sightings from boat survey transects (all surveys, 2012-2014).




Figure 12-2. Delphinid sightings from boat survey transects (all surveys, 2012-2014).




Figure 12-3. Sea turtle sightings from boat survey transects (all surveys, 2012-2014). Unidentified sea turtles are non-Leatherback Sea Turtles that were not definitively identified to species.




Figure 12-4. Whale sightings from aerial survey transects (all surveys, 2012-2014).




Figure 12-5. Delphinid and porpoise sightings from aerial survey transects (all surveys, 2012-2014).




Figure 12-6. Sea turtle sightings from aerial survey transects (all surveys, 2012-2014). Unidentified sea turtles are non-Leatherback Sea Turtles that were not definitively identified to species.




Figure 12-7. Spring global detection function used in boat survey bottlenose dolphin line transect distance density analysis.




Figure 12-8. Summer global detection function used in boat survey bottlenose dolphin line transect distance density analysis.




Figure 12-9. Fall global detection function used in boat survey bottlenose dolphin line transect distance density analysis.




Figure 12-10. Interpolation of encounter rates of bottlenose dolphins in the study area during the spring (Mar.-May), based on two years of boat survey data (2012-2014).




Figure 12-11. Interpolation of encounter rates of bottlenose dolphins in the study area during the summer (Jun. -Aug.), based on two years of boat survey data (2012-2014).




Figure 12-12. Interpolation of encounter rates of bottlenose dolphins in the study area during the fall (Sep.-Nov.), based on two years of boat survey data (2012-2014).




Figure 12-13. Interpolation of predicted relative density of sea turtles in the study area during the spring (Mar.-May), based on two years of aerial survey data (2012-2014).




Figure 12-14. Interpolation of predicted relative density of sea turtles in the study area during the summer (Jun.-Aug.), based on two years of aerial survey data (2012-2014).




Figure 12-15. Interpolation of predicted relative density of sea turtles in the study area during the fall (Sep.-Nov.), based on two years of aerial survey data (2012-2014).

Table 12-1. Summary data for the MABS boat surveys by season. (Spring: March - May; Summer: June - August; Fall: September - November; Winter: December – February). Counts include all observed individuals seen on survey transects.

Species Group	Spring	Summer	Fall	Winter	Total Count (Ind.)
<i>Tursiops truncatus</i> (Bottlenose)	239	400	227	8	874
<i>Delphinus delphis</i> (Common)	65	0	0	144	209
<i>Stenella frontalis</i> (Spotted)	0	4	0	0	4
Unidentified Delphinid	11	35	54	13	113
Dolphins Total	315	439	281	165	1200
<i>Balaenoptera physalus</i> (Fin)	2	0	0	1	3
<i>Balaenoptera borealis</i> (Sei)	0	0	0	1	1
<i>Balaenoptera acutorostrata</i> (Minke)	0	0	1	2	3
<i>Eubalaena glacialis</i> (Right)	1	0	0	0	1
<i>Megaptera novaeangliae</i> (Humpback)	0	1	4	7	12
Unidentified Whale	2	0	3	10	15
Whales Total	5	1	8	21	35
<i>Caretta caretta</i> (Loggerhead)	11	52	26	0	89
<i>Dermochelys coriacea</i> (Leatherback)	0	9	6	0	15
Unidentified Sea Turtle	2	4	4	0	11
Sea Turtles Total	13	65	36	0	114
Percent of Total by Season:	24.68	37.43	24.09	13.78	100
Grand Total	333	505	325	186	1,349

Table 12-2. Summary data for the MABS aerial surveys by season. (Spring: March - May; Summer: June - August; Fall: September - November; Winter: December - February). Counts include all observed individuals seen on survey transects.

Species Group	Spring	Summer	Fall	Winter	Total Count (Ind.)
<i>Tursiops truncatus</i> (Bottlenose)	226	265	176	10	677
<i>Delphinus delphis</i> (Common)	11	7	4	39	61
<i>Grampus griseus</i> (Risso's)	0	0	1	0	1
Unidentified Delphinid	282	420	454	141	1297
Dolphins Total	519	692	635	190	2036
<i>Phocoena phocoena</i> (Harbor Porpoise)	2	0	0	1	3
Porpoises Total	2	0	0	1	3
<i>Balaenoptera physalus</i> (Fin)	0	0	0	1	1
<i>Balaenoptera acutorostrata</i> (Minke)	1	0	1	1	3
<i>Eubalaena glacialis</i> (Right)	3	0	0	5	8
<i>Megaptera novaeangliae</i> (Humpback)	0	0	0	2	2
Unidentified Whale	1	0	0	1	2
Whales Total	5	0	1	10	16
Unidentified Cetacean (Whale or Dolphin)	2	1	2	0	5
Unidentified Cetaceans Total	2	1	2	0	5
<i>Caretta caretta</i> (Loggerhead)	60	50	78	0	188
<i>Dermochelys coriacea</i> (Leatherback)	2	78	42	0	122
<i>Chelonia mydas</i> (Green)	3	1	7	0	11
<i>Eretmochelys imbricate</i> (Hawksbill)	0	0	2	0	2
<i>Lepidochelys kempii</i> (Kemp's)	13	10	14	1	38
Unidentified Sea Turtle	523	438	425	1	1387
Sea Turtles Total	601	577	568	2	1748
Percent of Overall Total by Season:	29.65	33.35	31.67	5.33	100
Grand Total	1129	1270	1206	203	3808

Table 12-3. Individual marine mammal and sea turtle aerial survey sightings by month in relation to survey effort. Sightings are summarized by linear transect km, as well as per hour of survey time based on a constant flight speed of 250km/hr.

Month	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Avg
Number of Sightings/km	0.00	0.06	0.07	0.00	0.61	0.25	0.77	0.31	0.38	0.18	0.00	0.10	0.23
Number of Sightings/hr	0.00	15.00	17.50	0.00	152.50	62.50	192.50	77.50	95.00	45.00	0.00	25.00	56.88

Table 12-4. Summary data for boat surveys by season within the Maryland survey area. (Spring: March - May; Summer: June - August; Fall: September - November; Winter: December – February). Counts include all observed individuals seen on survey transects.

Species Group	Spring	Summer	Fall	Winter	Total Count (Ind.)
<i>Tursiops truncatus</i> (Bottlenose)	20	156	67	0	243
<i>Delphinus delphis</i> (Common)	2	0	0	24	6
<i>Stenella frontalis</i> (Spotted)	0	0	0	0	0
Unidentified Delphinid	0	26	1	2	29
Dolphins Total	22	182	68	26	298
<i>Balaenoptera physalus</i> (Fin)	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Balaenoptera borealis</i> (Sei)	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Balaenoptera acutorostrata</i> (Minke)	0	0	1	2	3
<i>Eubalaena glacialis</i> (Right)	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Megaptera novaeangliae</i> (Humpback)	0	0	0	1	1
Unidentified Whale	0	0	2	2	4
Whales Total	0	0	3	5	8
<i>Caretta caretta</i> (Loggerhead)	0	8	7	0	15
<i>Dermochelys coriacea</i> (Leatherback)	0	0	3	0	3
Unidentified Sea Turtle	0	1	1	0	2
Sea Turtles Total	0	9	11	0	20
Percent of Total by Season:	7.2	60.8	27.3	4.7	100
Grand Total	22	191	82	31	326

Table 12-5. Summary data for aerial surveys by season conducted within the Maryland survey area. (Spring: March - May; Summer: June - August; Fall: September - November; Winter: December - February). Counts include all observed individuals seen on survey transects.

Species Group	Spring	Summer	Fall	Winter	Total Count (Ind.)
<i>Tursiops truncatus</i> (Bottlenose)	59	165	116	0	340
<i>Delphinus delphis</i> (Common)	0	7	1	19	27
<i>Grampus griseus</i> (Risso's)	0	0	1	0	1
Unidentified Toothed Whale	84	356	293	18	751
Dolphins Total	143	528	411	37	1119
<i>Phocoena phocoena</i> (Harbor Porpoise)	1	0	0	0	1
Porpoises Total	1	0	0	0	1
<i>Balaenoptera physalus</i> (Fin)	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Balaenoptera acutorostrata</i> (Minke)	1	0	0	0	1
<i>Eubalaena glacialis</i> (Right)	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Megaptera novaeangliae</i> (Humpback)	0	0	0	1	1
Unidentified Whale	0	0	0	1	1
Whales Total	1	0	0	2	3
<i>Caretta caretta</i> (Loggerhead)	2	4	16	0	22
<i>Dermochelys coriacea</i> (Leatherback)	0	3	13	0	16
<i>Chelonia mydas</i> (Green)	1	0	4	0	5
<i>Eretmochelys imbricate</i> (Hawksbill)	0	0	1	0	2
<i>Lepidochelys kempii</i> (Kemp's)	2	0	6	0	8
Unidentified Sea Turtle	123	84	107	0	314
Sea Turtles Total	129	91	146	0	366
Percent of Total by Season:	18.4	41.6	37.4	2.6	
Grand Total	274	619	557	39	1489

Table 12-6. Individual marine mammal and sea turtle aerial survey sightings by season in relation to survey effort within the Maryland survey area. Sightings are summarized by linear transect km, as well as per hour of survey time based on a constant flight speed of 250 km/hr.

Season	Spring	Summer	Fall	Winter	Avg
Number of Sightings/km	0.24	0.55	0.50	0.03	0.33
Number of Sightings/hr	60	137.5	125	7.5	52.5

Table 12-7. Model selection criterion for bottlenose dolphins in the spring. The chosen model is highlighted in green. (AIC- Akaike’s Information Criterion, % Dev-Percent of deviance explained from the null model, Mean-average predicted density, SE- Standard error, SST-Sea Surface Temperature, Chl a-Chlorophyll a, DFS- Distance from shore)

#	GAM Model Covariates	AIC	% Dev	Mean	SE
1	s(SST) + s(Chl a) + s(DFS)	92.43	43.00	0.09	0.67
2	s(SST) + s(Chl a)	92.45	42.10	0.10	0.56
3	s(SST) + s(DFS)	92.89	37.90	0.10	0.65
4	s(Chl a) + s(DFS)	90.49	42.70	0.10	0.67
5	s(SST)	103.40	16.90	0.10	0.33
6	s(Chl a)	93.24	31.90	0.10	0.51
7	s(DFS)	92.72	33.70	0.10	0.66
#	GLM Model Covariates	AIC	% Dev	Mean	SE
8	s(SST) + s(Chl a) + s(DFS)	100.60	20.52	0.10	2.29
9	s(SST) + s(Chl a)	100.73	17.57	0.11	2.26
10	s(SST) + s(DFS)	99.74	18.95	0.10	2.15
11	s(Chl a) + s(DFS)	98.90	20.12	0.10	0.94
12	s(SST)	107.91	4.81	0.10	2.23
13	s(Chl a)	99.59	16.38	0.11	0.50
14	s(DFS)	98.12	18.42	0.10	0.37

Table 12-8. Model selection criterion for bottlenose dolphins in the summer. The chosen model is highlighted in green. (AIC- Akaike’s Information Criterion, % Dev-Percent of deviance explained from the null model, Mean-average predicted density, SE- Standard error, SST-Sea Surface Temperature, Chl a-Chlorophyll a, DFS- Distance from shore)

#	GAM Model Covariates	AIC	% Dev	Mean	SE
1	s(SST) + s(Chl a) + s(DFS)	153.67	23.90	0.20	0.32
2	s(SST) + s(Chl a)	152.63	24.10	0.20	0.30
3	s(SST) + s(DFS)	159.96	17.20	0.20	0.25
4	s(Chl a) + s(DFS)	155.81	23.20	0.20	0.31
5	s(SST)	157.24	19.70	0.20	0.29
6	s(Chl a)	158.36	17.30	0.20	0.24
7	s(DFS)	164.66	12.50	0.20	0.25
#	GLM Model Covariates	AIC	% Dev	Mean	SE
8	s(SST) + s(Chl a) + s(DFS)	157.75	23.16	0.20	5.75
9	s(SST) + s(Chl a)	156.63	22.29	0.20	0.59
10	s(SST) + s(DFS)	165.98	13.18	0.20	0.60
11	s(Chl a) + s(DFS)	155.82	23.09	0.20	5.62
12	s(SST)	171.80	5.56	0.20	0.52
13	s(Chl a)	157.24	19.75	0.20	5.30
14	s(DFS)	164.66	12.52	0.20	0.29

Table 12-9. Model selection criterion for bottlenose dolphins in the fall. The chosen model is highlighted in green. (AIC- Akaike’s Information Criterion, % Dev-Percent of deviance explained from the null model, Mean-average predicted density, SE- Standard error, SST-Sea Surface Temperature, Chl a-Chlorophyll a, DFS- Distance from shore)

#	GAM Model Covariates:	AIC	% Dev	Mean	SE
1	s(SST) + s(Chl a) + s(DFS)	126.54	23.50	0.14	0.31
2	s(SST) + s(Chl a)	125.45	22.10	0.14	0.31
3	s(SST) + s(DFS)	125.09	22.30	0.14	0.31
4	s(Chl a) + s(DFS)	127.43	19.9	0.14	0.3
5	s(SST)	138.00	10.10	0.14	0.25
6	s(Chl a)	126.35	18.20	0.14	0.30
7	s(DFS)	125.71	19.10	0.14	0.30
#	GLM Model Covariates	AIC	% Dev	Mean	SE
8	s(SST) + s(Chl a) + s(DFS)	128.57	18.31	0.15	4.04
9	s(SST) + s(Chl a)	127.67	17.02	0.16	3.63
10	s(SST) + s(DFS)	127.99	16.65	0.14	5.07
11	s(Chl a) + s(DFS)	128.69	15.82	0.14	1.27
12	s(SST)	139.48	0.88	0.14	4.17
13	s(Chl a)	127.22	15.20	0.15	0.46
14	s(DFS)	127.89	14.42	0.14	0.41

Table 12-10. Model selection criterion for sea turtles in the spring. The chosen model is highlighted in green. (AIC- Akaike’s Information Criterion, % Dev-Percent of deviance explained from the null model, Mean-average predicted density, SE-Standard error, SST-Sea Surface Temperature, Chl a-Chlorophyll a, DFS- Distance from shore)

#	GAM Model Covariates	AIC	% Dev	Mean	SE
1	s(SST) + s(Chl a) + s(DFS)	1572.07	31.40	0.72	0.08
2	s(SST) + s(Chl a)	1572.56	30.90	0.73	0.08
3	s(SST) + s(DFS)	1570.71	31.00	0.72	0.08
4	s(Chl a) + s(DFS)	1625.67	24.30	0.72	0.07
5	s(SST)	1589.60	27.40	0.73	0.07
6	s(Chl a)	1633.23	21.30	0.73	0.06
7	s(DFS)	1649.61	18.40	0.72	0.06
#	GLM Model Covariates	AIC	% Dev	Mean	SE
8	s(SST) + s(Chl a) + s(DFS)	1604.50	24.47	0.73	0.80
9	s(SST) + s(Chl a)	1602.80	24.43	0.73	0.70
10	s(SST) + s(DFS)	1609.10	23.50	0.74	0.70
11	s(Chl a) + s(DFS)	1663.00	15.52	0.72	0.40
12	s(SST)	1627.60	20.47	0.74	0.65
13	s(Chl a)	1667.60	14.54	0.72	0.12
14	s(DFS)	1669.20	14.31	0.74	0.10

Table 12-11. Model selection criterion for sea turtles in the summer. The chosen model is highlighted in green. (AIC- Akaike’s Information Criterion, % Dev-Percent of deviance explained from the null model, Mean-average predicted density, SE-Standard error, SST-Sea Surface Temperature, Chl a-Chlorophyll a, DFS- Distance from shore)

#	GAM Model Covariates	AIC	% Dev	Mean	SE
1	s(SST) + s(Chl a) + s(DFS)	1725.07	34.60	0.89	0.07
2	s(SST) + s(Chl a)	1723.65	34.20	0.89	0.07
3	s(SST) + s(DFS)	1724.79	34.70	0.89	0.07
4	s(Chl a) + s(DFS)	1780.89	27.80	0.89	0.06
5	s(SST)	1744.02	30.90	0.89	0.06
6	s(Chl a)	1781.20	26.80	0.89	0.07
7	s(DFS)	1813.78	21.90	0.09	0.06
#	GLM Model Covariates	AIC	% Dev	Mean	SE
8	s(SST) + s(Chl a) + s(DFS)	1725.80	33.49	0.90	2.20
9	s(SST) + s(Chl a)	1729.30	32.72	0.89	2.19
10	s(SST) + s(DFS)	1725.90	33.21	0.90	2.14
11	s(Chl a) + s(DFS)	1821.50	19.88	0.89	0.31
12	s(SST)	1749.90	25.59	0.90	1.95
13	s(Chl a)	1840.20	17.00	0.87	0.11
14	s(DFS)	1827.00	18.84	0.91	0.13

Table 12-12. Model selection criterion for sea turtles in the fall. The chosen model is highlighted in green. (AIC- Akaike’s Information Criterion, % Dev-Percent of deviance explained from the null model, Mean-average predicted density, SE-Standard error, SST-Sea Surface Temperature, Chl a-Chlorophyll a, DFS- Distance from shore)

#	GAM Model Covariates	AIC	% Dev	Mean	SE
1	s(SST) + s(Chl a) + s(DFS)	1494.74	8.31	0.56	0.07
2	s(SST) + s(Chl a)	1501.47	5.42	0.56	0.06
3	s(SST) + s(DFS)	1492.79	8.40	0.56	0.07
4	s(Chl a) + s(DFS)	1493.04	8.02	0.56	0.07
5	s(SST)	1512.83	4.74	0.56	0.06
6	s(Chl a)	1500.29	5.29	0.56	0.06
7	s(DFS)	1491.42	7.98	0.56	0.07
#	GLM Model Covariates	AIC	% Dev	Mean	SE
8	s(SST) + s(Chl a) + s(DFS)	1501.20	5.80	0.56	3.11
9	s(SST) + s(Chl a)	1501.50	5.42	0.56	2.67
10	s(SST) + s(DFS)	1509.50	4.11	0.56	2.90
11	s(Chl a) + s(DFS)	1501.80	5.36	0.56	0.34
12	s(SST)	1517.10	2.52	0.56	1.57
13	s(Chl a)	1500.30	5.29	0.56	0.11
14	s(DFS)	1507.90	4.04	0.56	0.13