

distribution, abundance, demographics, and genetics; (2) habitat conditions including, but not limited to, amount, distribution, and important features for conservation; (3) status and trends of threats; (4) conservation measures that have been implemented that benefit the species, including monitoring data demonstrating effectiveness of such measures; (5) need for additional conservation measures; and (6) other new information, data, or corrections including, but not limited to, taxonomic or nomenclatural changes, identification of erroneous information contained in the list of endangered and threatened species, and improved analytical methods for evaluating extinction risk.

If you wish to provide information for this 5-year review, you may submit your information and materials electronically or via mail (see **ADDRESSES** section). We request that all information be accompanied by supporting documentation such as maps, bibliographic references, or reprints of pertinent publications. We also would appreciate the submitter's name, address, and any association, institution, or business that the person represents; however, anonymous submissions will also be accepted.

**Authority:** 16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*

Dated: February 17, 2016.

**Angela Somma,**

Chief, Endangered Species Division, Office of Protected Resources, National Marine Fisheries Service.

[FR Doc. 2016-03628 Filed 2-22-16; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510-22-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

**RIN 0648-XE428**

#### Takes of Marine Mammals Incidental to Specified Activities; Taking Marine Mammals Incidental to Russian River Estuary Management Activities

**AGENCY:** National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

**ACTION:** Notice; proposed incidental harassment authorization; request for comments.

**SUMMARY:** NMFS has received a request from the Sonoma County Water Agency (SCWA) for authorization to take marine mammals incidental to Russian River estuary management activities. Pursuant to the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA), NMFS is requesting comments

on its proposal to issue an incidental harassment authorization (IHA) to SCWA to incidentally take marine mammals, by Level B harassment only, during the specified activity.

**DATES:** Comments and information must be received no later than March 24, 2016.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments on the application should be addressed to Jolie Harrison, Chief, Permits and Conservation Division, Office of Protected Resources, National Marine Fisheries Service. Physical comments should be sent to 1315 East-West Highway, Silver Spring, MD 20910 and electronic comments should be sent to [ITP.Laws@noaa.gov](mailto:ITP.Laws@noaa.gov).

**Instructions:** NMFS is not responsible for comments sent by any other method, to any other address or individual, or received after the end of the comment period. Comments received electronically, including all attachments, must not exceed a 25-megabyte file size. Attachments to electronic comments will be accepted in Microsoft Word or Excel or Adobe PDF file formats only. All comments received are a part of the public record and will generally be posted to the Internet at [www.nmfs.noaa.gov/pr/permits/incidental/construction.htm](http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/pr/permits/incidental/construction.htm) without change. All personal identifying information (e.g., name, address) voluntarily submitted by the commenter may be publicly accessible. Do not submit confidential business information or otherwise sensitive or protected information.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Ben Laws, Office of Protected Resources, NMFS, (301) 427-8401.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Availability

An electronic copy of SCWA's application and supporting documents, as well as a list of the references cited in this document, may be obtained by visiting the Internet at: [www.nmfs.noaa.gov/pr/permits/incidental.htm](http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/pr/permits/incidental.htm). In case of problems accessing these documents, please call the contact listed above (see **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**).

#### National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)

NMFS has prepared an Environmental Assessment (EA; 2010) and associated Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) in accordance with NEPA and the regulations published by the Council on Environmental Quality. These documents are posted at the aforementioned Internet address. Information in SCWA's application,

NMFS' EA (2010), and this notice collectively provide the environmental information related to proposed issuance of this IHA for public review and comment. We will review all comments submitted in response to this notice as we complete the NEPA process, including a decision of whether the existing EA and FONSI provide adequate analysis related to the potential environmental effects of issuing an IHA to SCWA, prior to a final decision on the incidental take authorization request.

#### Background

Sections 101(a)(5)(A) and (D) of the MMPA (16 U.S.C. 1361 *et seq.*) direct the Secretary of Commerce to allow, upon request by U.S. citizens who engage in a specified activity (other than commercial fishing) within a specified area, the incidental, but not intentional, taking of small numbers of marine mammals, providing that certain findings are made and the necessary prescriptions are established.

The incidental taking of small numbers of marine mammals may be allowed only if NMFS (through authority delegated by the Secretary) finds that the total taking by the specified activity during the specified time period will (i) have a negligible impact on the species or stock(s) and (ii) not have an unmitigable adverse impact on the availability of the species or stock(s) for subsistence uses (where relevant). Further, the permissible methods of taking and requirements pertaining to the mitigation, monitoring and reporting of such taking must be set forth.

The allowance of such incidental taking under section 101(a)(5)(A), by harassment, serious injury, death, or a combination thereof, requires that regulations be established. Subsequently, a Letter of Authorization may be issued pursuant to the prescriptions established in such regulations, providing that the level of taking will be consistent with the findings made for the total taking allowable under the specific regulations. Under section 101(a)(5)(D), NMFS may authorize such incidental taking by harassment only, for periods of not more than one year, pursuant to requirements and conditions contained within an IHA. The establishment of these prescriptions requires notice and opportunity for public comment.

NMFS has defined "negligible impact" in 50 CFR 216.103 as "... an impact resulting from the specified activity that cannot be reasonably expected to, and is not reasonably likely to, adversely affect the species or stock

through effects on annual rates of recruitment or survival.” Except with respect to certain activities not pertinent here, section 3(18) of the MMPA defines “harassment” as: “. . . any act of pursuit, torment, or annoyance which (i) has the potential to injure a marine mammal or marine mammal stock in the wild [Level A harassment]; or (ii) has the potential to disturb a marine mammal or marine mammal stock in the wild by causing disruption of behavioral patterns, including, but not limited to, migration, breathing, nursing, breeding, feeding, or sheltering [Level B harassment].”

### Summary of Request

On January 20, 2016, we received an adequate and complete request from SCWA for authorization of the taking of marine mammals incidental to Russian River estuary management activities in Sonoma County, California. SCWA proposes to manage the naturally-formed barrier beach at the mouth of the Russian River in order to minimize potential for flooding adjacent to the estuary and to enhance habitat for juvenile salmonids, as well as to conduct biological and physical monitoring of the barrier beach and estuary. Flood control-related breaching of barrier beach at the mouth of the river may include artificial breaches, as well as construction and maintenance of a lagoon outlet channel. The latter activity, an alternative management technique conducted to mitigate impacts of flood control on rearing habitat for Endangered Species Act (ESA)-listed salmonids, occurs only from May 15 through October 15 (hereafter, the “lagoon management period”). Artificial breaching and monitoring activities may occur at any time during the one-year period of validity of the proposed IHA.

Breaching of naturally-formed barrier beach at the mouth of the Russian River requires the use of heavy equipment (e.g., bulldozer, excavator) and increased human presence, and monitoring in the estuary requires the use of small boats. As a result, pinnipeds hauled out on the beach or at peripheral haul-outs in the estuary may exhibit behavioral responses that indicate incidental take by Level B harassment under the MMPA. Species known from the haul-out at the mouth of the Russian River or from peripheral haul-outs, and therefore anticipated to be taken incidental to the specified activity, include the harbor seal (*Phoca vitulina richardii*), California sea lion (*Zalophus californianus*), and northern elephant seal (*Mirounga angustirostris*).

This would be the seventh such IHA, if issued. SCWA was first issued an IHA, valid for a period of one year, effective on April 1, 2010 (75 FR 17382), and was subsequently issued one-year IHAs for incidental take associated with the same activities, effective on April 21, 2011 (76 FR 23306), April 21, 2012 (77 FR 24471), April 21, 2013 (78 FR 23746), April 21, 2014 (79 FR 20180), and April 21, 2015 (80 FR 24237).

### Description of the Specified Activity

#### Overview

The proposed action involves management of the estuary to prevent flooding while preventing adverse modification to critical habitat for ESA-listed salmonids. Requirements related to the ESA are described in further detail below. During the lagoon management period, this involves construction and maintenance of a lagoon outlet channel that would facilitate formation of a perched lagoon. A perched lagoon, which is an estuary closed to tidal influence in which water surface elevation is above mean high tide, would reduce flooding while maintaining beneficial conditions for juvenile salmonids. Additional breaches of barrier beach may be conducted for the sole purpose of reducing flood risk. SCWA’s proposed activity was described in detail in our notice of proposed authorization prior to the 2011 IHA (76 FR 14924; March 18, 2011); please see that document for a detailed description of SCWA’s estuary management activities. Aside from minor additions to SCWA’s biological and physical estuary monitoring measures, the specified activity remains the same as that described in the 2011 document.

#### Dates and Duration

The specified activity may occur at any time during the one-year timeframe (April 21, 2016, through April 20, 2017) of the proposed IHA, although construction and maintenance of a lagoon outlet channel would occur only during the lagoon management period. In addition, there are certain restrictions placed on SCWA during the harbor seal pupping season. These, as well as periodicity and frequency of the specified activities, are described in further detail below.

#### Specific Geographic Region

The estuary is located about 97 km (60 mi) northwest of San Francisco in Sonoma County, near Jenner, California (see Figure 1 of SCWA’s application). The Russian River watershed encompasses 3,847 km<sup>2</sup> (1,485 mi<sup>2</sup>) in

Sonoma, Mendocino, and Lake Counties. The mouth of the Russian River is located at Goat Rock State Beach (see Figure 2 of SCWA’s application); the estuary extends from the mouth upstream approximately 10 to 11 km (6–7 mi) between Austin Creek and the community of Duncans Mills (Heckel and McIver, 1994).

#### Detailed Description of Activities

Within the Russian River watershed, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), SCWA, and the Mendocino County Russian River Flood Control and Water Conservation Improvement District (District) operate and maintain federal facilities and conduct activities in addition to the estuary management, including flood control, water diversion and storage, instream flow releases, hydroelectric power generation, channel maintenance, and fish hatchery production. The Corps, SCWA, and the District conducted these activities for many years before salmonid species in the Russian River were protected under the ESA. Upon determination that these actions were likely to affect ESA-listed salmonids, as well as designated critical habitat for these species, formal consultation under section 7 of the ESA was initiated. In 2008, NMFS issued a Biological Opinion (BiOp) for Water Supply, Flood Control Operations, and Channel Maintenance conducted by the Corps, SCWA, and the District in the Russian River watershed (NMFS, 2008). This BiOp found that the activities—including SCWA’s estuary management activities—authorized by the Corps and undertaken by SCWA and the District, if continued in a manner similar to recent historic practices, were likely to jeopardize the continued existence of ESA-listed salmonids and were likely to adversely modify critical habitat.

If a project is found to jeopardize a species or adversely modify its critical habitat, NMFS must develop and recommend a non-jeopardizing Reasonable and Prudent Alternative (RPA) to the proposed project, in coordination with the federal action agency and any applicant. A component of the RPA described in the 2008 BiOp requires SCWA to collaborate with NMFS and modify their estuary water level management in order to reduce marine influence (i.e., high salinity and tidal inflow) and promote a higher water surface elevation in the estuary in order to enhance the quality of rearing habitat for juvenile salmonids. A program of potential incremental steps prescribed to reach that goal includes adaptive management of the outlet channel. SCWA is also required to monitor the response of water quality, invertebrate

production, and salmonids in and near the estuary to water surface elevation management in the estuary-lagoon system.

The analysis contained in the BiOp found that maintenance of lagoon conditions was necessary only for the lagoon management period. See NMFS' BiOp (2008) for details of that analysis. As a result of that determination, there are three components to SCWA's estuary management activities: (1) Lagoon outlet channel management, during the lagoon management period only, required to accomplish the dual purposes of flood risk abatement and maintenance of juvenile salmonid habitat; (2) traditional artificial breaching, with the sole goal of flood risk abatement; and (3) physical and biological monitoring. The latter activity, physical and biological monitoring, will remain the same as in past years and as described in our 2015 notice of proposed authorization (80 FR 14073; March 18, 2015). Please see the previously referenced Federal Register notice (76 FR 14924; March 18, 2011) for detailed discussion of lagoon outlet channel management, artificial breaching, and other monitoring activities.

NMFS' BiOp determined that salmonid estuarine habitat may be improved by managing the Russian River estuary as a perched, freshwater lagoon and, therefore, stipulates as a RPA to existing conditions that the estuary be managed to achieve such conditions between May 15th and October 15th. In recognition of the complexity and uncertainty inherent in attempting to manage conditions in a dynamic beach environment, the BiOp stipulates that the estuarine water surface elevation RPA be managed adaptively, meaning that it should be planned, implemented, and then iteratively refined based on experience gained from implementation. The first phase of adaptive management, which has been implemented since 2010, is limited to outlet channel management (ESA, 2015). The second phase, begun in 2014, requires study of and consideration of alternatives to a historical, dilapidated jetty present at Goat Rock State Beach (*e.g.*, complete removal, partial removal).

The plan for study of the jetty is described in greater detail in SCWA's "Feasibility of Alternatives to the Goat Rock State Beach Jetty for Managing Lagoon Water Surface Elevations—A Study Plan" (ESA PWA, 2011), and was also described in detail in our notice of

proposed authorization prior to the 2013 IHA (78 FR 14985; March 8, 2013). Implementation of the study plan began in March 2014 with installation of wells monitoring water seepage through the barrier beach and geophysical mapping of the submerged substrate and structures. Visits to the well sites are not anticipated to disturb seals, as the wells are not located near the haul-out. In 2016, SCWA plans to remove the existing wells.

#### **Description of Marine Mammals in the Area of the Specified Activity**

Harbor seals are the most common species inhabiting the haul-out at the mouth of the Russian River (Jenner haul-out) and fine-scale local abundance data for harbor seals have been recorded extensively since 1972. California sea lions and northern elephant seals have also been observed infrequently in the project area. In addition to the primary Jenner haul-out, there are eight peripheral haul-outs nearby (see Figure 1 of SCWA's monitoring plan). These include North Jenner and Odin Cove to the north; Pocked Rock, Kabemali, and Rock Point to the south; and Penny Logs, Patty's Rock, and Chalanahawi upstream within the estuary.

This section provides summary information regarding local occurrence of these species. We have reviewed SCWA's detailed species descriptions, including life history information, for accuracy and completeness and refer the reader to Sections 3 and 4 of SCWA's application instead of reprinting the information here. Please also see NMFS Stock Assessment Reports, which may be accessed at [www.nmfs.noaa.gov/pr/sars/species.htm](http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/pr/sars/species.htm).

#### **Harbor Seals**

Harbor seals inhabit coastal and estuarine waters and shoreline areas of the northern hemisphere from temperate to polar regions. The eastern North Pacific subspecies is found from Baja California north to the Aleutian Islands and into the Bering Sea. Multiple lines of evidence support the existence of geographic structure among harbor seal populations from California to Alaska (Carretta *et al.*, 2015). However, because stock boundaries are difficult to meaningfully draw from a biological perspective, three separate harbor seal stocks are recognized for management purposes along the west coast of the continental U.S.: (1) Inland waters of Washington, (2) outer coast of Oregon and Washington, and (3) California (Carretta *et al.*, 2014). Placement of a stock boundary at the California-Oregon

border is not based on biology but is considered a political and jurisdictional convenience (Carretta *et al.*, 2015). In addition, harbor seals may occur in Mexican waters, but these animals are not considered part of the California stock. Only the California stock is expected to be found in the project area.

California harbor seals are not protected under the ESA or listed as depleted under the MMPA, and are not considered a strategic stock under the MMPA because annual human-caused mortality (43) is significantly less than the calculated potential biological removal (PBR; 1,641) (Carretta *et al.*, 2015). The population appears to be stabilizing at what may be its carrying capacity and the fishery mortality is declining. The best abundance estimate of the California stock of harbor seals is 30,968 and the minimum population size of this stock is 27,348 individuals (Carretta *et al.*, 2015).

Harbor seal pupping normally occurs at the Russian River from March until late June, and sometimes into early July. The Jenner haul-out is the largest in Sonoma County. A substantial amount of monitoring effort has been conducted at the Jenner haul-out and surrounding areas. Concerned local residents formed the Stewards' Seal Watch Public Education Program in 1985 to educate beach visitors and monitor seal populations. State Parks Volunteer Docents continue this effort towards safeguarding local harbor seal habitat. On weekends during the pupping and molting season (approximately March–August), volunteers conduct public outreach and record the numbers of visitors and seals on the beach, other marine mammals observed, and the number of boats and kayaks present.

Ongoing monthly seal counts at the Jenner haul-out were begun by J. Mortenson in January 1987, with additional nearby haul-outs added to the counts thereafter. In addition, local resident E. Twohy began daily observations of seals and people at the Jenner haul-out in November 1989. These datasets note whether the mouth at the Jenner haul-out was opened or closed at each observation, as well as various other daily and annual patterns of haul-out usage (Mortenson and Twohy, 1994). In 2009, SCWA began regular baseline monitoring of the haul-out as a component of its estuary management activity. Table 1 shows average daily numbers of seals observed at the mouth of the Russian River from 1993–2005 and from 2009–15.

TABLE 1—AVERAGE DAILY NUMBER OF SEALS OBSERVED AT RUSSIAN RIVER MOUTH FOR EACH MONTH, 1993–2005; 2009–14

Year	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
1993 .....	140	219	269	210	203	238	197	34	8	38	78	163
1994 .....	138	221	243	213	208	212	246	98	26	31	101	162
1995 .....	133	270	254	261	222	182	216	74	37	24	38	148
1996 .....	144	175	261	247	157	104	142	65	17	29	76	139
1997 .....	154	177	209	188	154	119	186	58	20	29	30	112
1998 .....	119	151	192	93	170	213	232	53	33	21	93	147
1999 .....	161	170	215	210	202	128	216	98	57	20	74	123
2000 .....	151	185	240	180	158	245	256	63	46	50	86	127
2001 .....	155	189	161	168	135	212	275	75	64	20	127	185
2002 .....	117	12	20	154	134	213	215	89	43	26	73	126
2003 .....	—	1	26	161	164	222	282	100	43	51	109	116
2004 .....	2	5	39	180	202	318	307	35	40	47	68	61
2005 .....	0	7	42	222	220	233	320	145	.....	.....	.....	.....
Mean, 1993–2005 .....	118	137	167	191	179	203	238	76	36	32	79	134
2009 .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	219	117	17	22	96	80
2010 .....	66	84	129	136	109	136	267	111	59	25	89	26
2011 .....	116	92	162	124	128	145	219	98	31	53	92	48
2012 .....	108	74	115	169	164	166	156	128	100	71	137	51
2013 .....	51	108	158	112	162	139	411	175	77	58	34	94
2014 .....	98	209	243	129	145	156	266	134	53	15	27	172
2015 .....	113	171	145	177	153	219	373	120	48	33	49	138
Mean, 2013–15 <sup>1</sup> .....	89	173	182	136	154	170	345	143	59	37	37	134

Data from 1993–2005 adapted from Mortenson and Twohy (1994) and E. Twohy (unpublished data). Data from 2009–15 collected by SCWA. Months represented by dash indicate periods where data were missing or incomplete.

<sup>1</sup> Mean calculated as a weighted average to account for unequal sample sizes between years. See SCWA application, Table 4.

The number of seals present at the Jenner haul-out generally declines during bar-closed conditions (Mortenson, 1996). SCWA's pinniped monitoring efforts from 1996 to 2000 focused on artificial breaching activities and their effects on the Jenner haul-out. Seal counts and disturbances were recorded from one to two days prior to

breaching, the day of breaching, and the day after breaching (MSC, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000; SCWA and MSC, 2001). In each year, the trend observed was that harbor seal numbers generally declined during a beach closure and increased the day following an artificial breaching event. Heckel and McIver (1994) speculated that the loss of easy access

to the haul-out and ready escape to the sea during bar-closed conditions may account for the lower numbers. Table 2 shows average daily seal counts recorded during SCWA monitoring of breaching events from 2009–15, representing bar-closed conditions, when seal numbers decline.

TABLE 2—AVERAGE NUMBER OF HARBOR SEALS OBSERVED AT THE MOUTH OF THE RUSSIAN RIVER DURING BREACHING EVENTS (*i.e.*, BAR-CLOSED CONDITIONS) BY MONTH

Year	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
2009–15 .....	49	75	133	99	80	98	117	<sup>1</sup> 17	30	28	32	59

No estuary management events occurred; data from earlier monitoring effort (1996–2000).

Mortenson (1996) observed that pups were first seen at the Jenner haul-out in late March, with maximum counts in May. In this study, pups were not counted separately from other age classes at the haul-out after August due to the difficulty in discriminating pups from small yearlings. From 1989 to 1991, Hanson (1993) observed that pupping began at the Jenner haul-out in mid-April, with a maximum number of pups observed during the first two weeks of May. This corresponds with the peaks observed at Point Reyes, where the first viable pups are born in March and the peak is the last week of April to early May (SCWA, 2014). Based on this information, pupping season at the Jenner haul-out is conservatively defined here as March 15 to June 30.

#### California Sea Lions

California sea lions range from the Gulf of California north to the Gulf of Alaska, with breeding areas located in the Gulf of California, western Baja California, and southern California. Five genetically distinct geographic populations have been identified: (1) Pacific Temperate, (2) Pacific Subtropical, (3) Southern Gulf of California, (4) Central Gulf of California and (5) Northern Gulf of California (Schramm *et al.*, 2009). Rookeries for the Pacific Temperate population are found within U.S. waters and just south of the U.S.-Mexico border, and animals belonging to this population may be found from the Gulf of Alaska to Mexican waters off Baja California.

Animals belonging to other populations (*e.g.*, Pacific Subtropical) may range into U.S. waters during non-breeding periods. For management purposes, a stock of California sea lions comprising those animals at rookeries within the U.S. is defined (*i.e.*, the U.S. stock of California sea lions) (Carretta *et al.*, 2015). Pup production at the Coronado Islands rookery in Mexican waters is considered an insignificant contribution to the overall size of the Pacific Temperate population (Lowry and Maravilla-Chavez, 2005).

California sea lions are not protected under the ESA or listed as depleted under the MMPA. Total annual human-caused mortality (389) is substantially less than the PBR (estimated at 9,200 per year); therefore, California sea lions

are not considered a strategic stock under the MMPA. There are indications that the California sea lion may have reached or is approaching carrying capacity, although more data are needed to confirm that leveling in growth persists (Carretta *et al.*, 2015). The best abundance estimate of the U.S. stock of California sea lions is 296,750 and the minimum population size of this stock is 153,337 individuals (Carretta *et al.*, 2015).

Beginning in January 2013, elevated strandings of California sea lion pups were observed in southern California, with live sea lion strandings nearly three times higher than the historical average. Findings to date indicate that a likely contributor to the large number of stranded, malnourished pups was a change in the availability of sea lion prey for nursing mothers, especially sardines. The causes and mechanisms of this remain under investigation ([www.nmfs.noaa.gov/pr/health/mmume/californiasealions2013.htm](http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/pr/health/mmume/californiasealions2013.htm); accessed December 3, 2015).

Solitary California sea lions have occasionally been observed at or in the vicinity of the Russian River estuary (MSC, 1999, 2000), in all months of the year except June. Male California sea lions are occasionally observed hauled out at or near the Russian River mouth in most years: August 2009, January and December 2011, January 2012, December 2013, February 2014, and February and April 2015. Other individuals were observed in the surf at the mouth of the river or swimming inside the estuary. Juvenile sea lions were observed during the summer of 2009 at the Patty's Rock haul-out, and some sea lions were observed during monitoring of peripheral haul-outs in October 2009. The occurrence of individual California sea lions in the action area may occur year-round, but is infrequent and sporadic.

#### *Northern Elephant Seals*

Northern elephant seals gather at breeding areas, located primarily on offshore islands of Baja California and California, from approximately December to March before dispersing for feeding. Males feed near the eastern Aleutian Islands and in the Gulf of Alaska, while females feed at sea south of 45°N (Stewart *et al.*, 1993; Le Boeuf *et al.*, 1993). Adults then return to land between March and August to molt, with males returning later than females, before dispersing again to their respective feeding areas between molting and the winter breeding season. Populations of northern elephant seals in the U.S. and Mexico are derived from a few tens or hundreds of individuals

surviving in Mexico after being nearly hunted to extinction (Stewart *et al.*, 1994). Given the recent derivation of most rookeries, no genetic differentiation would be expected. Although movement and genetic exchange continues between rookeries, most elephant seals return to their natal rookeries when they start breeding (Huber *et al.*, 1991). The California breeding population is now demographically isolated from the Baja California population and is considered to be a separate stock.

Northern elephant seals are not protected under the ESA or listed as depleted under the MMPA. Total annual human-caused mortality (8.8) is substantially less than the PBR (estimated at 4,882 per year); therefore, northern elephant seals are not considered a strategic stock under the MMPA. Modeling of pup counts indicates that the population has reached its Maximum Net Productivity Level, but has not yet reached carrying capacity (Carretta *et al.*, 2015). The best abundance estimate of the California breeding population of northern elephant seals is 179,000 and the minimum population size of this stock is 81,368 individuals (Carretta *et al.*, 2015).

Censuses of pinnipeds at the mouth of the Russian River have been taken at least semi-monthly since 1987. Elephant seals were noted from 1987–95, with one or two elephant seals typically counted during May censuses, and occasional records during the fall and winter (Mortenson and Follis, 1997). A single, tagged northern elephant seal sub-adult was present at the Jenner haul-out from 2002–07. This individual seal, which was observed harassing harbor seals also present at the haul-out, was generally present during molt and again from late December through March. A single juvenile elephant seal was observed at the Jenner haul-out in June 2009 and, in recent years, a sub-adult seal was observed in late summer of 2013–14. The occurrence of individual northern elephant seals in the action area has generally been infrequent and sporadic in the past ten years.

#### **Potential Effects of the Specified Activity on Marine Mammals**

A significant body of monitoring data exists for pinnipeds at the mouth of the Russian River. In addition, pinnipeds have co-existed with regular estuary management activity for decades, as well as with regular human use activity at the beach, and are likely habituated to human presence and activity. Nevertheless, SCWA's estuary

management activities have the potential to disturb pinnipeds present on the beach or at peripheral haul-outs in the estuary. During breaching operations, past monitoring has revealed that some or all of the seals present typically move or flush from the beach in response to the presence of crew and equipment, though some may remain hauled-out. No stampeding of seals—a potentially dangerous occurrence in which large numbers of animals succumb to mass panic and rush away from a stimulus—has been documented since SCWA developed protocols to prevent such events in 1999. While it is likely impossible to conduct required estuary management activities without provoking some response in hauled-out animals, precautionary mitigation measures, described later in this document, ensure that animals are gradually apprised of human approach. Under these conditions, seals typically exhibit a continuum of responses, beginning with alert movements (e.g., raising the head), which may then escalate to movement away from the stimulus and possible flushing into the water. Flushed seals typically re-occupy the haul-out within minutes to hours of the stimulus.

In the absence of appropriate mitigation measures, it is possible that pinnipeds could be subject to injury, serious injury, or mortality, likely through stampeding or abandonment of pups. However, based on a significant body of site-specific data, harbor seals are unlikely to sustain any harassment that may be considered biologically significant. Individual animals would, at most, flush into the water in response to maintenance activities but may also simply become alert or move across the beach away from equipment and crews. During 2013, SCWA observed that harbor seals are less likely to flush from the beach when the primary aggregation of seals is north of the breaching activity (please refer to Figure 2 of SCWA's application), meaning that personnel and equipment are not required to pass the seals. Four artificial breaching events were implemented in 2013, with two of these events occurring north of the primary aggregation and two to the south (at approximately 250 and 50 m distance) (SCWA, 2014). In both of the former cases, all seals present eventually flushed to the water, but when breaching activity remained to the south of the haul-out, only 11 and 53 percent of seals, respectively, were flushed.

California sea lions and northern elephant seals have been observed as less sensitive to stimulus than harbor seals during monitoring at numerous

other sites. For example, monitoring of pinniped disturbance as a result of abalone research in the Channel Islands showed that while harbor seals flushed at a rate of 69 percent, California sea lions flushed at a rate of only 21 percent. The rate for elephant seals declined to 0.1 percent (VanBlaricom, 2010). In the event that either of these species is present during management activities, they would be expected to display a minimal reaction to maintenance activities—less than that expected of harbor seals.

Although the Jenner haul-out is not known as a primary pupping beach, pups have been observed during the pupping season; therefore, we have evaluated the potential for injury, serious injury, or mortality to pups. There is a lack of published data regarding pupping at the mouth of the Russian River, but SCWA monitors have observed pups on the beach. No births were observed during recent monitoring, but may be inferred based on signs indicating pupping (e.g., blood spots on the sand, birds consuming possible placental remains). Pup injury or mortality would be most likely to occur in the event of extended separation of a mother and pup, or trampling in a stampede. As discussed previously, no stampedes have been recorded since development of appropriate protocols in 1999. Any California sea lions or northern elephant seals present would be independent juveniles or adults; therefore, analysis of impacts on pups is not relevant for those species.

Similarly, the period of mother-pup bonding, critical time needed to ensure pup survival and maximize pup health, is not expected to be impacted by estuary management activities. Harbor seal pups are extremely precocious, swimming and diving immediately after birth and throughout the lactation period, unlike most other phocids which normally enter the sea only after weaning (Lawson and Renouf, 1985; Cottrell *et al.*, 2002; Burns *et al.*, 2005). Lawson and Renouf (1987) investigated harbor seal mother-pup bonding in response to natural and anthropogenic disturbance. In summary, they found that the most critical bonding time is within minutes after birth. As described previously, the peak of pupping season is typically concluded by mid-May, when the lagoon management period begins. As such, it is expected that mother-pup bonding would likely be concluded as well. The number of management events during the months of March and April has been relatively low in the past, and the breaching activities occur in a single day over

several hours. In addition, mitigation measures described later in this document further reduce the likelihood of any impacts to pups, whether through injury or mortality or interruption of mother-pup bonding (which may lead to abandonment).

In summary, and based on extensive monitoring data, we believe that impacts to hauled-out pinnipeds during estuary management activities would be behavioral harassment of limited duration (*i.e.*, less than one day) and limited intensity (*i.e.*, temporary flushing at most). Stomping, and therefore injury or mortality, is not expected—nor been documented—in the years since appropriate protocols were established (see “Mitigation” for more details). Further, the continued, and increasingly heavy (see SCWA’s monitoring report), use of the haul-out despite decades of breaching events indicates that abandonment of the haul-out is unlikely.

#### Anticipated Effects on Habitat

The purposes of the estuary management activities are to improve summer rearing habitat for juvenile salmonids in the Russian River estuary and/or to minimize potential flood risk to properties adjacent to the estuary. These activities would result in temporary physical alteration of the Jenner haul-out, but are essential to conserving and recovering endangered salmonid species, as prescribed by the BiOp. These salmonids are themselves prey for pinnipeds. In addition, with barrier beach closure, seal usage of the beach haul-out declines, and the three nearby river haul-outs may not be available for usage due to rising water surface elevations. Breaching of the barrier beach, subsequent to the temporary habitat disturbance, likely increases suitability and availability of habitat for pinnipeds. Biological and water quality monitoring would not physically alter pinniped habitat. Please see the previously referenced **Federal Register** notice (76 FR 14924; March 18, 2011) for a more detailed discussion of anticipated effects on habitat.

During SCWA’s pinniped monitoring associated with artificial breaching activities from 1996 to 2000, the number of harbor seals hauled out declined when the barrier beach closed and then increased the day following an artificial breaching event (MSC, 1997, 1998, 1999, and 2000; SCWA and MSC, 2001). This response to barrier beach closure followed by artificial breaching has remained consistent in recent years and is anticipated to continue. However, it is possible that the number of pinnipeds using the haul-out could decline during

the extended lagoon management period, when SCWA would seek to maintain a shallow outlet channel rather than the deeper channel associated with artificial breaching. Collection of baseline information during the lagoon management period is included in the monitoring requirements described later in this document. SCWA’s previous monitoring, as well as Twohy’s daily counts of seals at the sandbar (Table 1) indicate that the number of seals at the haul-out declines from August to October, so management of the lagoon outlet channel (and managing the sandbar as a summer lagoon) would have little effect on haul-out use during the latter portion of the lagoon management period. The early portion of the lagoon management period coincides with the pupping season. Past monitoring during this period, which represents some of the longest beach closures in the late spring and early summer months, shows that the number of pinnipeds at the haul-out tends to fluctuate, rather than showing the more straightforward declines and increases associated with closures and openings seen at other times of year (MSC, 1998). This may indicate that seal haul-out usage during the pupping season is less dependent on bar status. As such, the number of seals hauled out from May through July would be expected to fluctuate, but is unlikely to respond dramatically to the absence of artificial breaching events. Regardless, any impacts to habitat resulting from SCWA’s management of the estuary during the lagoon management period are not in relation to natural conditions, but rather in relation to conditions resulting from SCWA’s discontinued approach of artificial breaching during this period.

In summary, there will be temporary physical alteration of the beach. However, natural opening and closure of the beach results in the same impacts to habitat; therefore, seals are likely adapted to this cycle. In addition, the increase in rearing habitat quality has the goal of increasing salmonid abundance, ultimately providing more food for seals present within the action area. Thus, any impacts to marine mammal habitat are not expected to cause significant or long-term consequences for individual marine mammals or their populations.

#### Proposed Mitigation

In order to issue an IHA under section 101(a)(5)(D) of the MMPA, NMFS must set forth the permissible methods of taking pursuant to such activity, and other means of effecting the least practicable impact on such species or

stock and its habitat, paying particular attention to rookeries, mating grounds, and areas of similar significance, and on the availability of such species or stock for taking for certain subsistence uses.

SCWA has proposed to continue the following mitigation measures, as implemented during the previous IHAs, designed to minimize impact to affected species and stocks:

- SCWA crews would cautiously approach (*e.g.*, walking slowly with limited arm movement and minimal sound) the haul-out ahead of heavy equipment to minimize the potential for sudden flushes, which may result in a stampede—a particular concern during pupping season.

- SCWA staff would avoid walking or driving equipment through the seal haul-out.

- Crews on foot would make an effort to be seen by seals from a distance, if possible, rather than appearing suddenly, again preventing sudden flushes.

- During breaching events, all monitoring would be conducted from the overlook on the bluff along Highway 1 adjacent to the haul-out in order to minimize potential for harassment.

- A water level management event may not occur for more than two consecutive days unless flooding threats cannot be controlled.

In addition, SCWA proposes to continue mitigation measures specific to pupping season (March 15–June 30), as implemented in the previous IHAs:

- SCWA will maintain a one week no-work period between water level management events (unless flooding is an immediate threat) to allow for an adequate disturbance recovery period. During the no-work period, equipment must be removed from the beach.

- If a pup less than one week old is on the beach where heavy machinery would be used or on the path used to access the work location, the management action will be delayed until the pup has left the site or the latest day possible to prevent flooding while still maintaining suitable fish rearing habitat. In the event that a pup remains present on the beach in the presence of flood risk, SCWA would consult with NMFS to determine the appropriate course of action. SCWA will coordinate with the locally established seal monitoring program (Stewards' Seal Watch) to determine if pups less than one week old are on the beach prior to a breaching event.

- Physical and biological monitoring will not be conducted if a pup less than one week old is present at the monitoring site or on a path to the site.

For all activities, personnel on the beach would include up to two equipment operators, three safety team members on the beach (one on each side of the channel observing the equipment operators, and one at the barrier to warn beach visitors away from the activities), and one safety team member at the overlook on Highway 1 above the beach. Occasionally, there would be two or more additional people (SCWA staff or regulatory agency staff) on the beach to observe the activities. SCWA staff would be followed by the equipment, which would then be followed by an SCWA vehicle (typically a small pickup truck, the vehicle would be parked at the previously posted signs and barriers on the south side of the excavation location). Equipment would be driven slowly on the beach and care would be taken to minimize the number of shut-downs and start-ups when the equipment is on the beach. All work would be completed as efficiently as possible, with the smallest amount of heavy equipment possible, to minimize disturbance of seals at the haul-out. Boats operating near river haul-outs during monitoring would be kept within posted speed limits and driven as far from the haul-outs as safely possible to minimize flushing seals.

We have carefully evaluated SCWA's proposed mitigation measures and considered their effectiveness in past implementation to preliminarily determine whether they are likely to effect the least practicable impact on the affected marine mammal species and stocks and their habitat. Our evaluation of potential measures included consideration of the following factors in relation to one another: (1) The manner in which, and the degree to which, the successful implementation of the measure is expected to minimize adverse impacts to marine mammals, (2) the proven or likely efficacy of the specific measure to minimize adverse impacts as planned; and (3) the practicability of the measure for applicant implementation.

Any mitigation measure(s) we prescribe should be able to accomplish, have a reasonable likelihood of accomplishing (based on current science), or contribute to the accomplishment of one or more of the general goals listed below:

- Avoidance or minimization of injury or death of marine mammals wherever possible (goals 2, 3, and 4 may contribute to this goal).

- A reduction in the number (total number or number at biologically important time or location) of individual marine mammals exposed to stimuli expected to result in incidental

take (this goal may contribute to 1, above, or to reducing takes by behavioral harassment only).

- A reduction in the number (total number or number at biologically important time or location) of times any individual marine mammal would be exposed to stimuli expected to result in incidental take (this goal may contribute to 1, above, or to reducing takes by behavioral harassment only).

- A reduction in the intensity of exposure to stimuli expected to result in incidental take (this goal may contribute to 1, above, or to reducing the severity of behavioral harassment only).

- Avoidance or minimization of adverse effects to marine mammal habitat, paying particular attention to the prey base, blockage or limitation of passage to or from biologically important areas, permanent destruction of habitat, or temporary disturbance of habitat during a biologically important time.

- For monitoring directly related to mitigation, an increase in the probability of detecting marine mammals, thus allowing for more effective implementation of the mitigation.

Based on our evaluation of SCWA's proposed measures and on SCWA's record of management at the mouth of the Russian River including information from monitoring of SCWA's implementation of the mitigation measures as prescribed under the previous IHAs, we have preliminarily determined that the proposed mitigation measures provide the means of effecting the least practicable impact on marine mammal species or stocks and their habitat, paying particular attention to rookeries, mating grounds, and areas of similar significance.

### Proposed Monitoring and Reporting

In order to issue an IHA for an activity, section 101(a)(5)(D) of the MMPA states that NMFS must set forth "requirements pertaining to the monitoring and reporting of such taking". The MMPA implementing regulations at 50 CFR 216.104 (a)(13) indicate that requests for incidental take authorizations must include the suggested means of accomplishing the necessary monitoring and reporting that will result in increased knowledge of the species and of the level of taking or impacts on populations of marine mammals that are expected to be present in the proposed action area.

Any monitoring requirement we prescribe should accomplish one or more of the following general goals:

1. An increase in the probability of detecting marine mammals, both within



defined zones of effect (thus allowing for more effective implementation of the mitigation) and in general to generate more data to contribute to the analyses mentioned below;

2. An increase in our understanding of how many marine mammals are likely to be exposed to stimuli that we associate with specific adverse effects, such as behavioral harassment or hearing threshold shifts;

3. An increase in our understanding of how marine mammals respond to stimuli expected to result in incidental take and how anticipated adverse effects on individuals may impact the population, stock, or species (specifically through effects on annual rates of recruitment or survival) through any of the following methods:

- Behavioral observations in the presence of stimuli compared to observations in the absence of stimuli (need to be able to accurately predict pertinent information, *e.g.*, received level, distance from source);

- Physiological measurements in the presence of stimuli compared to observations in the absence of stimuli (need to be able to accurately predict pertinent information, *e.g.*, received level, distance from source);

- Distribution and/or abundance comparisons in times or areas with concentrated stimuli versus times or areas without stimuli;

4. An increased knowledge of the affected species; or

5. An increase in our understanding of the effectiveness of certain mitigation and monitoring measures.

SCWA submitted a marine mammal monitoring plan as part of the IHA application. It can be found on the Internet at [www.nmfs.noaa.gov/pr/permits/incidental/construction.htm](http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/pr/permits/incidental/construction.htm). The plan, which has been successfully implemented (in slightly different form from the currently proposed plan) by SCWA under previous IHAs, may be modified or supplemented based on comments or new information received from the public during the public comment period. The purpose of this monitoring plan, which is carried out collaboratively with the Stewards of the Coasts and Redwoods (Stewards) organization, is to detect the response of pinnipeds to estuary management activities at the Russian River estuary.

SCWA has designed the plan both to satisfy the requirements of the IHA, and to address the following questions of interest:

1. Under what conditions do pinnipeds haul out at the Russian River estuary mouth at Jenner?

2. How do seals at the Jenner haul-out respond to activities associated with the construction and maintenance of the lagoon outlet channel and artificial breaching activities?

3. Does the number of seals at the Jenner haul-out significantly differ from historic averages with formation of a summer (May 15 to October 15) lagoon in the Russian River estuary?

4. Are seals at the Jenner haul-out displaced to nearby river and coastal haul-outs when the mouth remains closed in the summer?

#### *Proposed Monitoring Measures*

SCWA has proposed to modify the baseline monitoring component of their existing 2011 Monitoring Plan in order to better focus monitoring effort on the Jenner haul-out. This primary haul-out is where the majority of seals are found and where pupping occurs, and SCWA believes that the proposed modifications will better allow continued development in understanding the physical and biological factors that influence seal abundance and behavior at the site. In particular, SCWA notes that increasing the frequency of surveys would allow them to be able to observe the influence of physical changes that do not persist for more than ten days, like brief periods of barrier beach closures or other environmental changes. The changes will improve SCWA's ability to describe how seals respond to barrier beach closures and allow for more accurate estimation of the number of harbor seal pups born at Jenner each year.

Regarding decreased frequency of monitoring at peripheral sites, abundance at these sites has been observed to generally be very low regardless of river mouth condition. These sites are generally very small physically, composed of small rocks or outcrops or logs in the river, and therefore could not accommodate significant displacement from the main beach haul-out. Monitoring of peripheral sites under extended lagoon

conditions will allow for possible detection of any changed use patterns. In summary, the modifications proposed include increasing the frequency of surveys at the Jenner haul-out from twice a month to four times a month and reducing the duration of each survey from eight to four hours. Baseline visits to the peripheral haul-outs would be eliminated except in the case that a lagoon outlet channel is constructed and maintained for a prolonged period (over 21 days).

**Baseline Monitoring**—As noted above, seals at the Jenner haul-out are counted for four hours every week, with no more than four baseline surveys each month. Two monitoring events each month would occur in the morning and two would occur in the afternoon with an effort to schedule a morning survey at low and high tide each month and an afternoon survey at low and high tide each month. This baseline information will provide SCWA with details that may help to plan estuary management activities in the future to minimize pinniped interaction. Survey protocols are unchanged: All seals hauled out on the beach are counted every thirty minutes from the overlook on the bluff along Highway 1 adjacent to the haul-out using spotting scopes. Monitoring may conclude for the day if weather conditions affect visibility (*e.g.*, heavy fog in the afternoon). Depending on how the sandbar is formed, seals may haul out in multiple groups at the mouth. At each thirty-minute count, the observer indicates where groups of seals are hauled out on the sandbar and provides a total count for each group. If possible, adults and pups are counted separately.

In addition to the census data, disturbances of the haul-out are recorded. The method for recording disturbances follows those in Mortenson (1996). Disturbances would be recorded on a three-point scale that represents an increasing seal response to the disturbance (Table 3). The time, source, and duration of the disturbance, as well as an estimated distance between the source and haul-out, are recorded. It should be noted that only responses falling into Mortenson's Levels 2 and 3 will be considered as harassment under the MMPA, under the terms of this proposed IHA.

TABLE 3—SEAL RESPONSE TO DISTURBANCE

Level	Type of response	Definition
1 .....	Alert .....	Seal head orientation in response to disturbance. This may include turning head towards the disturbance, craning head and neck while holding the body rigid in a u-shaped position, or changing from a lying to a sitting position.



TABLE 3—SEAL RESPONSE TO DISTURBANCE—Continued

Level	Type of response	Definition
2 .....	Movement .....	Movements away from the source of disturbance, ranging from short withdrawals over short distances to hurried retreats many meters in length.
3 .....	Flight .....	All retreats (flushes) to the water, another group of seals, or over the beach.

Weather conditions are recorded at the beginning of each census. These include temperature, Beaufort sea state, precipitation/visibility, and wind speed. Tide levels and estuary water surface elevations are correlated to the monitoring start and end times.

In an effort towards understanding possible relationships between use of the Jenner haul-out and nearby coastal and river haul-outs, several other haul-outs on the coast and in the Russian River estuary are monitored as well (see Figure 1 of SCWA's monitoring plan). As described above, peripheral site monitoring would occur only in the event of an extended period of lagoon conditions (*i.e.*, barrier beach closed with perched outlet channel).

**Estuary Management Event Monitoring, Lagoon Outlet Channel—**Should the mouth close during the lagoon management period, SCWA would construct a lagoon outlet channel as required by the BiOp. Activities associated with the initial construction of the outlet channel, as well as the maintenance of the channel that may be required, would be monitored for disturbances to the seals at the Jenner haul-out.

A one-day pre-event channel survey would be made within one to three days prior to constructing the outlet channel. The haul-out would be monitored on the day the outlet channel is constructed and daily for up to the maximum two days allowed for channel excavation activities. Monitoring would also occur on each day that the outlet channel is maintained using heavy equipment for the duration of the lagoon management period. Monitoring of outlet channel construction and maintenance would correspond with that described under the "Baseline" section previously, with the exception that management activity monitoring duration is defined by event duration. On the day of the management event, pinniped monitoring begins at least one hour prior to the crew and equipment accessing the beach work area and continues through the duration of the event, until at least one hour after the crew and equipment leave the beach.

In an attempt to understand whether seals from the Jenner haul-out are displaced to coastal and river haul-outs nearby when management events occur,

other nearby haul-outs are monitored concurrently with monitoring of outlet channel construction and maintenance activities. This provides an opportunity to qualitatively assess whether these haul-outs are being used by seals displaced from the Jenner haul-out during lagoon outlet channel excavation and maintenance. This monitoring would not provide definitive results regarding displacement to nearby coastal and river haul-outs, as individual seals are not marked or photo-identified, but is useful in tracking general trends in haul-out use during lagoon outlet channel excavation and maintenance. As volunteers are required to monitor these peripheral haul-outs, haul-out locations may need to be prioritized if there are not enough volunteers available. In that case, priority would be assigned to the nearest haul-outs (North Jenner and Odin Cove), followed by the Russian River estuary haul-outs, and finally the more distant coastal haul-outs.

**Estuary Management Event Monitoring, Artificial Breaching Events—**In accordance with the Russian River BiOp, SCWA may artificially breach the barrier beach outside of the summer lagoon management period, and may conduct a maximum of two such breaching during the lagoon management period, when estuary water surface elevations rise above seven feet. In that case, NMFS may be consulted regarding potential scheduling of an artificial breaching event to open the barrier beach and reduce flooding risk.

Pinniped response to artificial breaching will be monitored at each such event during the term of the IHA. Methods would follow the census and disturbance monitoring protocols described in the "Baseline" section, which were also used for the 1996 to 2000 monitoring events (MSC, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000; SCWA and MSC, 2001). The exception, as for lagoon management events, is that duration of monitoring is dependent upon duration of the event. On the day of the management event, pinniped monitoring begins at least one hour prior to the crew and equipment accessing the beach work area and continues through the duration of the event, until at least one hour after the crew and equipment leave the beach.

For all counts, the following information would be recorded in thirty-minute intervals: (1) Pinniped counts, by species; (2) behavior; (3) time, source and duration of any disturbance; (4) estimated distances between source of disturbance and pinnipeds; (5) weather conditions (*e.g.*, temperature, wind); and (5) tide levels and estuary water surface elevation.

**Monitoring During Pupping Season—**The pupping season is defined as March 15 to June 30. Baseline, lagoon outlet channel, and artificial breaching monitoring during the pupping season will include records of neonate (pups less than one week old) observations. Characteristics of a neonate pup include: Body weight less than 15 kg; thin for their body length; an umbilicus or natal pelage present; wrinkled skin; and awkward or jerky movements on land. SCWA will coordinate with the Seal Watch monitoring program to determine if pups less than one week old are on the beach prior to a water level management event.

If, during monitoring, observers sight any pup that might be abandoned, SCWA would contact the NMFS stranding response network immediately and also report the incident to NMFS' West Coast Regional Office and Office of Protected Resources within 48 hours. Observers will not approach or move the pup. Potential indications that a pup may be abandoned are no observed contact with adult seals, no movement of the pup, and the pup's attempts to nurse are rebuffed.

**Staffing—**Monitoring is conducted by qualified individuals, which may include professional biologists employed by NMFS or SCWA or volunteers trained by the Stewards' Seal Watch program (Stewards). All volunteer monitors are required to attend classroom-style training and field site visits to the haul-outs. Training covers the MMPA and conditions of the IHA, SCWA's pinniped monitoring protocols, pinniped species identification, age class identification (including a specific discussion regarding neonates), recording of count and disturbance observations (including completion of datasheets), and use of equipment. Pinniped identification includes the harbor seal, California sea

lion, and northern elephant seal, as well as other pinniped species with potential to occur in the area. Generally, SCWA staff and volunteers collect baseline data on Jenner haul-out use during the twice-monthly monitoring events. A schedule for this monitoring would be established with Stewards once volunteers are available for the monitoring effort. SCWA staff monitors lagoon outlet channel excavation and maintenance activities and artificial breaching events at the Jenner haul-out, with assistance from Stewards volunteers as available. Stewards volunteers monitor the coastal and river haul-out locations during lagoon outlet channel excavation and maintenance activities.

Training on the MMPA, pinniped identification, and the conditions of the IHA is held for staff and contractors assigned to estuary management activities. The training includes equipment operators, safety crew members, and surveyors. In addition, prior to beginning each water surface elevation management event, the biologist monitoring the event participates in the onsite safety meeting to discuss the location(s) of pinnipeds at the Jenner haul-out that day and methods of avoiding and minimizing disturbances to the haul-out as outlined in the IHA.

### Reporting

SCWA is required to submit a report on all activities and marine mammal monitoring results to the Office of Protected Resources, NMFS, and the West Coast Regional Administrator, NMFS, ninety days prior to the expiration of the IHA if a renewal is sought, or within ninety days of the expiration of the IHA otherwise. This annual report will also be distributed to California State Parks and Stewards, and would be available to the public on SCWA's Web site. This report will contain the following information:

- The number of pinnipeds taken, by species and age class (if possible);
- Behavior prior to and during water level management events;
- Start and end time of activity;
- Estimated distances between source and pinnipeds when disturbance occurs;
- Weather conditions (*e.g.*, temperature, wind, etc.);
- Haul-out reoccupation time of any pinnipeds based on post-activity monitoring;
- Tide levels and estuary water surface elevation; and
- Pinniped census from bi-monthly and nearby haul-out monitoring.

The annual report includes descriptions of monitoring

methodology, tabulation of estuary management events, summary of monitoring results, and discussion of problems noted and proposed remedial measures.

### Summary of Previous Monitoring

SCWA complied with the mitigation and monitoring required under all previous authorizations. In accordance with the 2015 IHA, SCWA submitted a Report of Activities and Monitoring Results, covering the period of January 1 through December 31, 2015. Previous monitoring reports (available at [www.nmfs.noaa.gov/pr/permits/incidental/construction.htm](http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/pr/permits/incidental/construction.htm)) provided additional analysis of monitoring results from 2009–14. A barrier beach was formed eleven times during 2015, but SCWA was required to implement artificial breaching for only four of these closure events. The Russian River outlet was closed to the ocean for a total of 115 days in 2015, including extended closures totaling 49 days during the lagoon management period. However, these closures all culminated in natural breaches and no outlet channel management events were required (although one closure that began on October 10, before the end of the lagoon management period, led to an artificial breaching event after the close of the management period on November 2). Over the past twenty years, there has been an average of five artificial breaching events per year. Only one lagoon management event has occurred since the current lagoon management period and process was instituted in 2009. For all events, pinniped monitoring occurred no more than three days before, the day of, and the day after each water level management activity. In addition, SCWA conducted biological and physical monitoring as described previously. During the course of these activities, SCWA did not exceed the take levels authorized under the relevant IHAs.

### Baseline Monitoring

Baseline monitoring was performed to gather additional information about the population of harbor seals utilizing the Jenner haul-out including population trends, patterns in seasonal abundance and the influence of barrier beach condition on harbor seal abundance. The effect of tide cycle and time of day on the abundance of seals at the Jenner haul-out was explored in detail in a previous report (SCWA, 2012); data collected in 2013–15 did not change the interpretation of these findings. Baseline monitoring at the mouth of the Russian River was conducted concurrently with monitoring of the peripheral haul-outs,

and was scheduled for two days out of each month with the intention of capturing a low and high tide each in the morning and afternoon. A total of 24 baseline surveys were conducted in 2015. Figure 2 of SCWA's 2015 report shows the mean number of harbor seals during twice-monthly baseline monitoring events from 2010–15.

Peak seal abundance, as determined by the single greatest count of harbor seals at the Jenner haul-out, was on July 9 (548 seals), and overall mean seal abundance at Jenner was greatest in July (mean =  $373 \pm 10.3$  s.e.). Seal abundance was significantly greater in July and compared to all other months, which corresponds with the summer molting period. In 2014, monitoring showed a dual peak in July and in March, corresponding with the period prior to the start of pupping. Similar to previous years, seal abundance declined in the fall. In 2015, there were significantly more seals observed on the haul-out in June and July when compared with previous years combined.

No distressed or abandoned pups were reported in 2015. Pup production at the Jenner haul-out was 18.7 percent of total seals as calculated from the peak pup count recorded on April 28 and the number of adult harbor seals present at the same time. Although lower than in previous years, the average of pups observed (when pups were present) was up somewhat during April and May: 16.4 compared with 12.9–15.4 for 2011–14. Comparison of count data between the Jenner and peripheral haul-outs did not show any obvious correlations (*e.g.*, the number of seals occupying peripheral haul-outs compared to the Jenner haul-out did not necessarily increase or decrease as a result of disturbance caused by beach visitors). Please review SCWA's report for a more detailed discussion.

### Water Level Management Activity Monitoring

Artificial breaching events occurred on March 31, November 2, November 5, and November 23, with pre- during, and post- breaching surveys conducted as required. No injuries or mortalities were observed during 2015, and harbor seal reactions ranged from merely alerting to crew presence to flushing from the beach. No elephant seals were observed during water level management activities or during biological and physical monitoring of the beach and estuary. Juvenile California sea lions were observed on two occasions.

Total observed incidents of marine mammal take, by Level B harassment only, from water level management activity and biological and physical

monitoring, was 2,383 harbor seals (detailed in Table 4) and one California sea lion. This total includes three harbor seal pups, one of which was a neonate. The neonate individual was encountered by SCWA staff posting signs on the beach in preparation for breaching activities and, as a result of this observation the planned breaching was canceled to avoid disturbance of neonates. One juvenile California sea

lion was disturbed during pre-breaching activities on February 2.

While the observed take was significantly lower than the level authorized, it is possible that incidental take in future years could approach the level authorized. Actual take is dependent largely upon the number of water level management events that occur, which is unpredictable. Take of species other than harbor seals depends upon whether those species, which do

not consistently utilize the Jenner haul-out, are present. The authorized take, though much higher than the actual take, was justified based on conservative estimated scenarios for animal presence and necessity of water level management. No significant departure from the method of estimation is used for the proposed IHA (see "Estimated Take by Incidental Harassment") for the same activities in 2016.

TABLE 4—OBSERVED INCIDENTAL HARASSMENT (LEVEL B HARASSMENT ONLY) OF HARBOR SEALS DURING RUSSIAN RIVER ESTUARY MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES, 2015

Date	Event type	Observed take <sup>a</sup>
Jan 29	Beach topographic survey	256
Feb 2	Pre-breaching survey	38
Feb 26	Beach topographic survey	201
Mar 26	Beach topographic survey	201
Mar 31	Artificial breaching	58
Apr 20	Pre-breaching survey	64 + 1
May 27	Fisheries studies	2
May 28	Fisheries studies	1
May 28	Beach topographic survey	279 + 2
Jun 25	Fisheries studies	2
Jun 25	Beach topographic survey	124
Jul 3	Fisheries studies	1
Jul 22	Fisheries studies	2
Jul 23	Beach topographic survey	642
Jul 30	Fisheries studies	1
Aug 20	Beach topographic survey	74
Sep 17	Beach topographic survey	22
Oct 8	Beach topographic survey	77
Nov 2	Artificial breaching	75
Nov 5	Artificial breaching	100
Nov 12	Beach topographic survey	135
Nov 23	Artificial breaching	25
Total		2,380 + 3

<sup>a</sup> Take of harbor seal pups is accounted for separately. One neonate was disturbed on April 20 and two pups were disturbed on May 28.

It should be noted that one of the primary reasons for the increase in observed incidences of incidental take in 2013–15 (average 1,950) compared with prior years (average 180 from 2010–12) was a change in protocol for the beach topographic surveys (although realized level of activity would be expected to remain a primary determinant in future years). Due to the frequent and prolonged river mouth closures in 2013—including closures of 25 days in June/July and 21 days in September/October—there was an increased need to gather complete information about the topography and sand elevation of the beach to best inform water level management activities.

This necessitated the survey crew to access the entire beach, including any area where seals were hauled out. Therefore, beginning on May 30, 2013, the methods for conducting the monthly topographic surveys of the barrier beach

were changed. Previously, monitors at a distance would inform survey crews via radio if harbor seals became alert to their presence. Survey crews would then retreat or avoid certain areas as necessary to avoid behavioral harassment of the seals. According to the revised protocol, and provided that no neonates or nursing pups were on the haul-out, the survey crew would continue their approach. The survey crews would proceed in a manner that allowed for the seals to gradually vacate the beach before the survey proceeded, thereby reducing the intensity of behavioral reactions as much as possible, but the numbers of incidences of behavioral harassment nevertheless increased. SCWA expects that this revised protocol would remain in place for the coming year.

SCWA continued to investigate the relative disturbance caused by their activities versus that caused by other sources (see Figures 5–6 of SCWA's

monitoring report as well as SCWA, 2014). The data recorded during 2015 do not differ from the findings reported in SCWA (2014). Harbor seals are most frequently disturbed by people on foot, with an increase in frequency of people present during bar-closed conditions (see Figure 5 of SCWA's monitoring report). Kayakers are the next most frequent source of disturbance overall, also with an increase during bar-closed conditions. For any disturbance event it is often only a fraction of the total haul-out that responds. Some sources of disturbance, though rare, have a larger disturbing effect when they occur. For example, disturbances from dogs occur less frequently, but these incidents often disturb over half of the seals hauled out.

#### Conclusions

The following section provides a summary of information available in SCWA's monitoring report. The primary purpose of SCWA's Pinniped

monitoring plan is to detect the response of pinnipeds to estuary management activities at the Russian River estuary. However, as described previously, the questions listed below are also of specific interest. The limited data available thus far precludes drawing definitive conclusions regarding the key questions in SCWA's monitoring plan, but we discuss preliminary conclusions and available evidence below.

1. Under what conditions do pinnipeds haul out at the Russian River estuary mouth at Jenner?

Although multiple factors likely influence harbor seal presence at the haul-out, SCWA has shown that since 2009 harbor seal attendance is influenced by hour of day (increasing from morning through early afternoon; see Figure 2 in SCWA's monitoring plan), tidal state (decrease with higher tides; see Figure 3 of SCWA's monitoring plan), month of year (peak in July and decrease in fall; see Figure 4 of SCWA's monitoring plan), and river mouth condition (*i.e.*, open or closed).

Daily average abundance of seals was lower during bar-closed conditions compared to bar-open conditions. This effect is likely due to a combination of factors, including increased human disturbance, reduced access to the ocean from the estuary side of the barrier beach, and the increased disturbance from wave action when seals utilize the ocean side of the barrier beach. Baseline data indicate that the highest numbers of seals are observed at the Jenner haul-out in July (during the molting season; see Figure 2 of SCWA's monitoring report), as would be expected on the basis of harbor seal biological and physiological requirements (Herder, 1986; Allen *et al.*, 1989; Stewart and Yochem, 1994; Hanan, 1996; Gemmer, 2002).

Overall, seals appear to utilize the Jenner haul-out throughout the tidal cycle. Seal abundance is significantly lower during the highest of tides when the haul-out is subject to an increase in wave overwash. Time of day had some effect on seal abundance at the Jenner haul-out, as abundance was greater in the afternoon hours compared to the morning hours. More analysis exploring the relationship of ambient temperature, incidence of disturbance, and season on time of day effects would help to explain why these variations in seal abundance occur. It is likely that a combination of multiple factors (*e.g.*, season, tides, wave heights, level of beach disturbance) influence when the haul-out is most utilized.

2. How do seals at the Jenner haul-out respond to activities associated with the construction and maintenance of the lagoon outlet channel and artificial breaching activities?

SCWA has, thus far, implemented the lagoon outlet channel only once (July 8, 2010). The response of harbor seals at the Jenner haul-out to the outlet channel implementation activities was similar to responses observed during past artificial breaching events (MSC, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000; SCWA and MSC, 2001). The harbor seals typically alert to the sound of equipment on the beach and leave the haul-out as the crew and equipment approach. Individuals then haul out on the beach while equipment is operating, leaving the beach again when equipment and staff depart, and typically begin to return to the haul-out within thirty minutes of the work ending. Because the barrier beach reformed soon after outlet channel implementation and subsequently breached on its own following the 2010 event, maintenance of the outlet channel was not necessary and monitoring of the continued response of pinnipeds at the Jenner haul-out to maintenance of the outlet channel and management of the lagoon for the duration of the lagoon management period has not yet been possible. As noted previously, when breaching activities were conducted south of the haul-out location seals often remained on the beach during all or some of the breaching activity. This indicates that seals are less disturbed by activities when equipment and crew do not pass directly past their haul-out.

3. Does the number of seals at the Jenner haul-out significantly differ from historic averages with formation of a summer lagoon in the Russian River estuary?

The duration of closures in recent years has not generally been dissimilar from the duration of closures that have been previously observed at the estuary, and lagoon outlet channel implementation has occurred only once, meaning that there has been a lack of opportunity to study harbor seal response to extended lagoon conditions. A barrier beach has formed during the lagoon management period sixteen times since SCWA began implementing the lagoon outlet channel adaptive management plan, with an average duration of fourteen days. However, the sustained river outlet closures observed in 2014–15 during the lagoon management period provide some information regarding the abundance of seals during the formation of a summer

lagoon. While seal abundance was lower overall during bar-closed conditions, overall there continues to be a slight increasing trend in seal abundance. These observations may indicate that, while seal abundance exhibits a short-term decline following bar closure, the number of seals utilizing the Jenner haul-out overall during such conditions is not affected. Short-term fluctuations in abundance aside, it appears that the general trends of increased abundance during summer and decreased abundance during fall, which coincide with the annual molt and likely foraging dispersal, respectively, are not affected. Such short-term fluctuations are likely not an indicator that seals are less likely to use the Jenner haul-out at any time.

4. Are seals at the Jenner haul-out displaced to nearby river and coastal haul-outs when the mouth remains closed in the summer?

Initial comparisons of peripheral (river and coastal) haul-out count data to the Jenner haul-out counts have been inconclusive (see Table 2 and Figures 6–7 of SCWA's monitoring report). As noted above, SCWA will focus ongoing effort at peripheral sites during periods of extended bar-closure and lagoon formation.

#### **Estimated Take by Incidental Harassment**

Except with respect to certain activities not pertinent here, section 3(18) of the MMPA defines "harassment" as: ". . . any act of pursuit, torment, or annoyance which (i) has the potential to injure a marine mammal or marine mammal stock in the wild [Level A harassment]; or (ii) has the potential to disturb a marine mammal or marine mammal stock in the wild by causing disruption of behavioral patterns, including, but not limited to, migration, breathing, nursing, breeding, feeding, or sheltering [Level B harassment]."

SCWA has requested, and NMFS proposes, authorization to take harbor seals, California sea lions, and northern elephant seals, by Level B harassment only, incidental to estuary management activities. These activities, involving increased human presence and the use of heavy equipment and support vehicles, are expected to harass pinnipeds present at the haul-out through disturbance only. In addition, monitoring activities prescribed in the BiOp may harass additional animals at the Jenner haul-out and at the three haul-outs located in the estuary (Penny Logs, Patty's Rock, and Chalanchawi). Estimates of the number of harbor seals, California sea lions, and northern

elephant seals that may be harassed by the proposed activities is based upon the number of potential events associated with Russian River estuary management activities and the average number of individuals of each species that are present during conditions appropriate to the activity. As described previously in this document, monitoring effort at the mouth of the Russian River has shown that the number of seals utilizing the haul-out declines during bar-closed conditions. Tables 5 and 6 detail the total number of estimated takes.

Events associated with lagoon outlet channel management would occur only during the lagoon management period, and are split into two categories: (1) Initial channel implementation, which would likely occur between May and September, and (2) maintenance and monitoring of the outlet channel, which would continue until October 15. In addition, it is possible that the initial outlet channel could close through natural processes, requiring additional channel implementation events. Based on past experience, SCWA estimates that a maximum of three outlet channel implementation events could be required. Outlet channel implementation events would only occur when the bar is closed; therefore, it is appropriate to use data from bar-closed monitoring events in estimating take (Table 2). Construction of the outlet channel is designed to produce a perched outflow, resulting in conditions

that more closely resemble bar-closed than bar-open with regard to pinniped haul-out usage. As such, bar-closed data is appropriate for estimating take during all lagoon management period maintenance and monitoring activity. As dates of outlet channel implementation cannot be known in advance, the highest daily average of seals per month—the March average for 2009–15—is used in estimating take. For maintenance and monitoring activities associated with the lagoon outlet channel, which would occur on a weekly basis following implementation of the outlet channel, the average number of harbor seals for each month was used.

Artificial breaching activities would also occur during bar-closed conditions. Data collected specifically during bar-closed conditions may be used for estimating take associated with artificial breaching (Table 2). The number of estimated artificial breaching events is also informed by experience, and is equal to the annual average number of bar closures recorded for a given month from 1996–2013.

Prior to 2014, for monthly topographic surveys on the barrier beach, SCWA estimated that only ten percent of seals hauled out would be likely to be disturbed by this activity, which involves two people walking along the barrier beach with a survey rod. During those surveys a pinniped monitor was positioned at the Highway 1 overlook and would notify the

surveyors via radio when any seals on the haul-out begin to alert to their presence. This enabled the surveyors to retreat slowly away from the haul-out, typically resulting in no disturbance. However, protocol for this monitoring activity has been changed (*i.e.*, surveyors will continue cautiously rather than retreat when seals alert—this is necessary to collect required data) and the resulting incidents of take are now estimated as one hundred percent of the seals expected to be encountered. The exception to this change is during the pupping season, when surveyors would continue to avoid seals to reduce harassment of pups and/or mothers with neonates. For the months of March–May, the assumption that only ten percent of seals present would be harassed is retained. The number of seals expected to be encountered is based on the average monthly number of seals hauled out as recorded during baseline surveys conducted by SCWA in 2013–15 (Table 1).

For biological and physical habitat monitoring activities in the estuary, it was assumed that pinnipeds may be encountered once per event and flush from a river haul-out. The potential for harassment associated with these events is limited to the three haul-outs located in the estuary. In past experience, SCWA typically sees no more than a single harbor seal at these haul-outs, which consist of scattered logs and rocks that often submerge at high tide.

TABLE 5—ESTIMATED NUMBER OF HARBOR SEAL TAKES RESULTING FROM RUSSIAN RIVER ESTUARY MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES

Number of animals expected to occur <sup>a</sup>	Number of events <sup>b,c</sup>	Potential total number of individual animals that may be taken
<b>Lagoon Outlet Channel Management (May 15 to October 15)</b>		
Implementation: 117 <sup>d</sup> .....	Implementation: 3 .....	Implementation: 351.
Maintenance and Monitoring:	Maintenance:	Maintenance: 1,156.
May: 80 .....	May: 1 .....	
June: 98 .....	June–Sept: 4/month .....	
July: 117 .....	Oct: 1 .....	
Aug: 17 .....	Monitoring:	Monitoring: 552.
Sept: 30 .....	June–Sept: 2/month .....	
Oct: 28 .....	Oct: 1 .....	Total: 2,059.
<b>Artificial Breaching</b>		
Oct: 28 .....	Oct: 2 .....	Oct: 56.
Nov: 32 .....	Nov: 2 .....	Nov: 64.
Dec: 59 .....	Dec: 2 .....	Dec: 118.
Jan: 49 .....	Jan: 1 .....	Jan: 49.
Feb: 75 .....	Feb: 1 .....	Feb: 75.
Mar: 133 .....	Mar: 1 .....	Mar: 133.
Apr: 99 .....	Apr: 1 .....	Apr: 99.
May: 80 .....	May: 2 .....	May: 160.
	12 events maximum .....	Total: 754.

TABLE 5—ESTIMATED NUMBER OF HARBOR SEAL TAKES RESULTING FROM RUSSIAN RIVER ESTUARY MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES—Continued

Number of animals expected to occur <sup>a</sup>	Number of events <sup>b,c</sup>	Potential total number of individual animals that may be taken
<b>Topographic and Geophysical Beach Surveys</b>		
Jan: 89 .....	1 topographic survey/month; 100 percent of animals present Jun–Feb; 10 percent of animals present Mar–May. Jetty well removal; 2 days .....	Jan: 89.
Feb: 173 .....	.....	Feb: 173.
Mar: 183 .....	.....	Mar: 18.
Apr: 136 .....	.....	Apr: 14.
May: 154 .....	.....	May: 15.
Jun: 170 .....	.....	Jun: 170.
Jul: 345 .....	.....	Jul: 345.
Aug: 143 .....	.....	Aug: 143.
Sep: 59 .....	.....	Sep: 59.
Oct: 37 .....	.....	Oct: 37.
Nov: 37 .....	.....	Nov: 37.
Dec: 134 .....	.....	Dec: 134.
	Jetty work: 252 <sup>f</sup> .	
	.....	Total: 1,486.
<b>Biological and Physical Habitat Monitoring in the Estuary</b>		
1 <sup>e</sup> .....	165 .....	165.
Total .....	.....	4,464.

<sup>a</sup>For Lagoon Outlet Channel Management and Artificial Breaching, average daily number of animals corresponds with data from Table 2. For Topographic and Geophysical Beach Surveys, average daily number of animals corresponds with 2013–15 data from Table 1.

<sup>b</sup>For implementation of the lagoon outlet channel, an event is defined as a single, two-day episode. It is assumed that the same individual seals would be hauled out during a single event. For the remaining activities, an event is defined as a single day on which an activity occurs. Some events may include multiple activities.

<sup>c</sup>Number of events for artificial breaching derived from historical data. The average number of events for each month was rounded up to the nearest whole number; estimated number of events for December was increased from one to two because multiple closures resulting from storm events have occurred in recent years during that month. These numbers likely represent an overestimate, as the average annual number of events is five.

<sup>d</sup>Although implementation could occur at any time during the lagoon management period, the highest daily average per month from the lagoon management period was used.

<sup>e</sup>Based on past experience, SCWA expects that no more than one seal may be present, and thus have the potential to be disturbed, at each of the three river haul-outs.

<sup>f</sup>Jetty well removal is expected to require two days, but the specific timing of the event within a window from July–December cannot be predicted. Therefore, we use the average of the monthly averages for those months (126) to estimate potential take from this activity.

TABLE 6—ESTIMATED NUMBER OF CALIFORNIA SEA LION AND ELEPHANT SEAL TAKES RESULTING FROM RUSSIAN RIVER ESTUARY MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES

Species	Number of animals expected to occur <sup>a</sup>	Number of events <sup>a</sup>	Potential total number of individual animals that may be taken
<b>Lagoon Outlet Channel Management (May 15 to October 15)</b>			
California sea lion (potential to encounter once per event) .....	1	6	6
Northern elephant seal (potential to encounter once per event) .....	1	6	6
<b>Artificial Breaching</b>			
California sea lion (potential to encounter once per month, Oct–May) .....	1	8	8
Northern elephant seal (potential to encounter once per month, Oct–May) .....	1	8	8
<b>Topographic and Geophysical Beach Surveys</b>			
California sea lion (potential to encounter once per month year-round for topographical surveys) .....	1	12	12
Northern elephant seal (potential to encounter once per month year-round for topographical surveys) .....	1	12	12
<b>Biological and Physical Habitat Monitoring in the Estuary + Jetty Study</b>			
California sea lion (potential to encounter once per month, Jul–Feb) .....	1	10	10

TABLE 6—ESTIMATED NUMBER OF CALIFORNIA SEA LION AND ELEPHANT SEAL TAKES RESULTING FROM RUSSIAN RIVER ESTUARY MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES—Continued

Species	Number of animals expected to occur <sup>a</sup>	Number of events <sup>a</sup>	Potential total number of individual animals that may be taken
Northern elephant seal (potential to encounter once per month, Jul–Feb) .....	1	10	10
Total:			
California sea lion .....	.....	.....	36
Elephant seal .....	.....	.....	36

<sup>a</sup> SCWA expects that California sea lions and/or northern elephant seals could occur during any month of the year, but that any such occurrence would be infrequent and unlikely to occur more than once per month.

### Analyses and Preliminary Determinations

#### Negligible Impact Analysis

NMFS has defined “negligible impact” in 50 CFR 216.103 as “. . . an impact resulting from the specified activity that cannot be reasonably expected to, and is not reasonably likely to, adversely affect the species or stock through effects on annual rates of recruitment or survival.” A negligible impact finding is based on the lack of likely adverse effects on annual rates of recruitment or survival (*i.e.*, population-level effects). An estimate of the number of Level B harassment takes alone is not enough information on which to base an impact determination. In addition to considering estimates of the number of marine mammals that might be “taken” through behavioral harassment, we consider other factors, such as the likely nature of any responses (*e.g.*, intensity, duration), the context of any responses (*e.g.*, critical reproductive time or location, migration), as well as the number and nature of estimated Level A harassment takes, the number of estimated mortalities, and effects on habitat.

Although SCWA’s estuary management activities may disturb pinnipeds hauled out at the mouth of the Russian River, as well as those hauled out at several locations in the estuary during recurring monitoring activities, impacts are occurring to a small, localized group of animals. While these impacts can occur year-round, they occur sporadically and for limited duration (*e.g.*, a maximum of two consecutive days for water level management events). Seals will likely become alert or, at most, flush into the water in reaction to the presence of crews and equipment on the beach. While disturbance may occur during a sensitive time (during the March 15–June 30 pupping season), mitigation measures have been specifically designed to further minimize harm

during this period and eliminate the possibility of pup injury or mother-pup separation.

No injury, serious injury, or mortality is anticipated, nor is the proposed action likely to result in long-term impacts such as permanent abandonment of the haul-out. Injury, serious injury, or mortality to pinnipeds would likely result from startling animals inhabiting the haul-out into a stampede reaction, or from extended mother-pup separation as a result of such a stampede. Long-term impacts to pinniped usage of the haul-out could result from significantly increased presence of humans and equipment on the beach. To avoid these possibilities, we have worked with SCWA to develop the previously described mitigation measures. These are designed to reduce the possibility of startling pinnipeds, by gradually apprising them of the presence of humans and equipment on the beach, and to reduce the possibility of impacts to pups by eliminating or altering management activities on the beach when pups are present and by setting limits on the frequency and duration of events during pupping season. During the past fifteen years of flood control management, implementation of similar mitigation measures has resulted in no known stampede events and no known injury, serious injury, or mortality. Over the course of that time period, management events have generally been infrequent and of limited duration.

No pinniped stocks for which proposed are listed as threatened or endangered under the ESA or determined to be strategic or depleted under the MMPA. Recent data suggests that harbor seal populations have reached carrying capacity; populations of California sea lions and northern elephant seals in California are also considered healthy.

In summary, and based on extensive monitoring data, we believe that

impacts to hauled-out pinnipeds during estuary management activities would be behavioral harassment of limited duration (*i.e.*, less than one day) and limited intensity (*i.e.*, temporary flushing at most). Stampedes, and therefore injury or mortality, is not expected—nor been documented—in the years since appropriate protocols were established (see “Proposed Mitigation” for more details). Further, the continued, and increasingly heavy (see figures in SCWA documents), use of the haul-out despite decades of breaching events indicates that abandonment of the haul-out is unlikely. Based on the analysis contained herein of the likely effects of the specified activity on marine mammals and their habitat, and taking into consideration the implementation of the proposed monitoring and mitigation measures, we preliminarily find that the total marine mammal take from SCWA’s estuary management activities will have a negligible impact on the affected marine mammal species or stocks.

#### Small Numbers Analysis

The proposed number of animals taken for each species of pinnipeds can be considered small relative to the population size. There are an estimated 30,968 harbor seals in the California stock, 296,750 California sea lions, and 179,000 northern elephant seals in the California breeding population. Based on extensive monitoring effort specific to the affected haul-out and historical data on the frequency of the specified activity, we are proposing to authorize take, by Level B harassment only, of 4,464 harbor seals, 36 California sea lions, and 36 northern elephant seals, representing 14.4, 0.01, and 0.02 percent of the populations, respectively. However, this represents an overestimate of the number of individuals harassed over the duration of the proposed IHA, because these totals represent much smaller numbers



of individuals that may be harassed multiple times. Based on the analysis contained herein of the likely effects of the specified activity on marine mammals and their habitat, and taking into consideration the implementation of the mitigation and monitoring measures, we preliminarily find that small numbers of marine mammals will be taken relative to the populations of the affected species or stocks.

#### Impact on Availability of Affected Species for Taking for Subsistence Uses

There are no relevant subsistence uses of marine mammals implicated by this action. Therefore, we have determined that the total taking of affected species or stocks would not have an unmitigable adverse impact on the availability of such species or stocks for taking for subsistence purposes.

#### Endangered Species Act (ESA)

No species listed under the ESA are expected to be affected by these activities. Therefore, we have determined that a section 7 consultation under the ESA is not required. As described elsewhere in this document, SCWA and the Corps consulted with NMFS under section 7 of the ESA regarding the potential effects of their operations and maintenance activities, including SCWA's estuary management program, on ESA-listed salmonids. As a result of this consultation, NMFS issued the Russian River Biological Opinion (NMFS, 2008), including Reasonable and Prudent Alternatives, which prescribes modifications to SCWA's estuary management activities. The effects of the proposed activities and authorized take would not cause additional effects for which a section 7 consultation would be required.

#### National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)

In compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 *et seq.*), as implemented by the regulations published by the Council on Environmental Quality (40 CFR parts 1500–1508), and NOAA Administrative Order 216–6, we prepared an Environmental Assessment (EA) to consider the direct, indirect and cumulative effects to the human environment resulting from issuance of the original IHA to SCWA for the specified activities and found that it would not result in any significant impacts to the human environment. We signed a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) on March 30, 2010. We have reviewed SCWA's application for a renewed IHA for ongoing estuary management activities for 2016 and the

2015 monitoring report. Based on that review, we have determined that the proposed action follows closely the IHAs issued and implemented in 2010–15 and does not present any substantial changes, or significant new circumstances or information relevant to environmental concerns which would require a supplement to the 2010 EA or preparation of a new NEPA document. Therefore, we have preliminarily determined that a new or supplemental EA or Environmental Impact Statement is unnecessary, and will, after review of public comments determine whether or not to rely on the existing EA and FONSI. The 2010 EA is available for review at [www.nmfs.noaa.gov/pr/permits/incidental/construction.htm](http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/pr/permits/incidental/construction.htm).

#### Proposed Authorization

As a result of these preliminary determinations, we propose to issue an IHA to SCWA for conducting the described estuary management activities in Sonoma County, California, for one year from the date of issuance, provided the previously mentioned mitigation, monitoring, and reporting requirements are incorporated. The proposed IHA language is provided next.

This section contains a draft of the IHA itself. The wording contained in this section is proposed for inclusion in the IHA (if issued).

The Sonoma County Water Agency (SCWA), California, is hereby authorized under section 101(a)(5)(D) of the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA; 16 U.S.C. 1371(a)(5)(D)) to harass marine mammals incidental to conducting estuary management activities in the Russian River, Sonoma County, California.

1. This Incidental Harassment Authorization (IHA) is valid from April 21, 2016 through April 20, 2017.

2. This IHA is valid only for activities associated with estuary management activities in the Russian River, Sonoma County, California, including:

- (a) Lagoon outlet channel management;
- (b) Artificial breaching of barrier beach;
- (c) Work associated with a jetty study; and
- (d) Physical and biological monitoring of the beach and estuary as required.

#### 3. General Conditions

(a) A copy of this IHA must be in the possession of SCWA, its designees, and work crew personnel operating under the authority of this IHA.

(b) SCWA is hereby authorized to incidentally take, by Level B harassment only, 4,464 harbor seals (*Phoca vitulina richardii*), 36 California sea lions

(*Zalophus californianus*), and 36 northern elephant seals (*Mirounga angustirostris*).

(c) The taking by injury (Level A harassment), serious injury, or death of any of the species listed in condition 3(b) of the Authorization or any taking of any other species of marine mammal is prohibited and may result in the modification, suspension, or revocation of this IHA.

(d) If SCWA observes a pup that may be abandoned, it shall contact the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) West Coast Regional Stranding Coordinator immediately and also report the incident to NMFS Office of Protected Resources within 48 hours. Observers shall not approach or move the pup.

(e) If SCWA observes any fur seal on the beach, it shall contact the NMFS West Coast Regional Stranding Coordinator immediately and shall discontinue any ongoing activity.

#### 4. Mitigation Measures

In order to ensure the least practicable impact on the species listed in condition 3(b), the holder of this Authorization is required to implement the following mitigation measures:

(a) SCWA crews shall cautiously approach the haul-out ahead of heavy equipment to minimize the potential for sudden flushes, which may result in a stampede—a particular concern during pupping season.

(b) SCWA staff shall avoid walking or driving equipment through the seal haul-out.

(c) Crews on foot shall make an effort to be seen by seals from a distance, if possible, rather than appearing suddenly at the top of the sandbar, again preventing sudden flushes.

(d) During breaching events, all monitoring shall be conducted from the overlook on the bluff along Highway 1 adjacent to the haul-out in order to minimize potential for harassment.

(e) A water level management event may not occur for more than two consecutive days unless flooding threats cannot be controlled.

(f) Equipment shall be driven slowly on the beach and care will be taken to minimize the number of shut-downs and start-ups when the equipment is on the beach.

(g) All work shall be completed as efficiently as possible, with the smallest amount of heavy equipment possible, to minimize disturbance of seals at the haul-out.

(h) Boats operating near river haul-outs during monitoring shall be kept within posted speed limits and driven

as far from the haul-outs as safely possible to minimize flushing seals.

In addition, SCWA shall implement the following mitigation measures during pupping season (March 15–June 30):

(i) SCWA shall maintain a one week no-work period between water level management events (unless flooding is an immediate threat) to allow for an adequate disturbance recovery period. During the no-work period, equipment must be removed from the beach.

(j) If a pup less than one week old is on the beach where heavy machinery will be used or on the path used to access the work location, the management action shall be delayed until the pup has left the site or the latest day possible to prevent flooding while still maintaining suitable fish rearing habitat. In the event that a pup remains present on the beach in the presence of flood risk, SCWA shall consult with NMFS and CDFG to determine the appropriate course of action. SCWA shall coordinate with the locally established seal monitoring program (Stewards of the Coast and Redwoods) to determine if pups less than one week old are on the beach prior to a breaching event.

(k) Physical and biological monitoring shall not be conducted if a pup less than one week old is present at the monitoring site or on a path to the site.

## 5. Monitoring

The holder of this Authorization is required to conduct baseline monitoring and shall conduct additional monitoring as required during estuary management activities. Monitoring and reporting shall be conducted in accordance with the approved Pinniped Monitoring Plan.

(a) Baseline monitoring shall be conducted each week, with two events per month occurring in the morning and two per month in the afternoon. These censuses shall continue for four hours, weather permitting; the census days shall be chosen to ensure that monitoring encompasses a low and high tide each in the morning and afternoon. All seals hauled out on the beach shall be counted every thirty minutes from the overlook on the bluff along Highway 1 adjacent to the haul-out using high-powered spotting scopes. Observers shall indicate where groups of seals are hauled out on the sandbar and provide a total count for each group. If possible, adults and pups shall be counted separately.

(b) In addition, peripheral coastal haul-outs shall be visited concurrently with baseline monitoring in the event that a lagoon outlet channel is

implemented and maintained for a prolonged period (over 21 days).

(c) During estuary management events, monitoring shall occur on all days that activity is occurring using the same protocols as described for baseline monitoring, with the difference that monitoring shall begin at least one hour prior to the crew and equipment accessing the beach work area and continue through the duration of the event, until at least one hour after the crew and equipment leave the beach. In addition, a one-day pre-event survey of the area shall be made within one to three days of the event and a one-day post-event survey shall be made after the event, weather permitting.

(d) For all monitoring, the following information shall be recorded in thirty-minute intervals:

- i. Pinniped counts by species;
- ii. Behavior;
- iii. Time, source and duration of any disturbance, with takes incidental to SCWA actions recorded only for responses involving movement away from the disturbance or responses of greater intensity (*e.g.*, not for alerts);
- iv. Estimated distances between source of disturbance and pinnipeds;
- v. Weather conditions (*e.g.*, temperature, percent cloud cover, and wind speed); and
- vi. Tide levels and estuary water surface elevation.

(a) All monitoring during pupping season shall include records of any neonate pup observations. SCWA shall coordinate with the Stewards' monitoring program to determine if pups less than one week old are on the beach prior to a water level management event.

## 6. Reporting

The holder of this Authorization is required to:

(a) Submit a report on all activities and marine mammal monitoring results to the Office of Protected Resources, NMFS, and the West Coast Regional Administrator, NMFS, 90 days prior to the expiration of the IHA if a renewal is sought, or within 90 days of the expiration of the permit otherwise. This report must contain the following information:

- i. The number of seals taken, by species and age class (if possible);
- ii. Behavior prior to and during water level management events;
- iii. Start and end time of activity;
- iv. Estimated distances between source and seals when disturbance occurs;
- v. Weather conditions (*e.g.*, temperature, wind, etc.);
- vi. Haul-out reoccupation time of any seals based on post-activity monitoring;

vii. Tide levels and estuary water surface elevation;

viii. Seal census from bi-monthly and nearby haul-out monitoring; and

ix. Specific conclusions that may be drawn from the data in relation to the four questions of interest in SCWA's Pinniped Monitoring Plan, if possible.

(b) Reporting injured or dead marine mammals:

i. In the unanticipated event that the specified activity clearly causes the take of a marine mammal in a manner prohibited by this IHA, such as an injury (Level A harassment), serious injury, or mortality, SCWA shall immediately cease the specified activities and report the incident to the Office of Protected Resources, NMFS, and the West Coast Regional Stranding Coordinator, NMFS. The report must include the following information:

- A. Time and date of the incident;
- B. Description of the incident;
- C. Environmental conditions (*e.g.*, wind speed and direction, Beaufort sea state, cloud cover, and visibility);
- D. Description of all marine mammal observations in the 24 hours preceding the incident;
- E. Species identification or description of the animal(s) involved;
- F. Fate of the animal(s); and
- G. Photographs or video footage of the animal(s).

Activities shall not resume until NMFS is able to review the circumstances of the prohibited take. NMFS will work with SCWA to determine what measures are necessary to minimize the likelihood of further prohibited take and ensure MMPA compliance. SCWA may not resume their activities until notified by NMFS.

i. In the event that SCWA discovers an injured or dead marine mammal, and the lead observer determines that the cause of the injury or death is unknown and the death is relatively recent (*e.g.*, in less than a moderate state of decomposition), SCWA shall immediately report the incident to the Office of Protected Resources, NMFS, and the West Coast Regional Stranding Coordinator, NMFS.

The report must include the same information identified in 6(b)(i) of this IHA. Activities may continue while NMFS reviews the circumstances of the incident. NMFS will work with SCWA to determine whether additional mitigation measures or modifications to the activities are appropriate.

ii. In the event that SCWA discovers an injured or dead marine mammal, and the lead observer determines that the injury or death is not associated with or related to the activities authorized in the

IHA (e.g., previously wounded animal, carcass with moderate to advanced decomposition, or scavenger damage), SCWA shall report the incident to the Office of Protected Resources, NMFS, and the West Coast Regional Stranding Coordinator, NMFS, within 24 hours of the discovery. SCWA shall provide photographs or video footage or other documentation of the stranded animal sighting to NMFS.

iii. Pursuant to sections 6(b)(ii-iii), SCWA may use discretion in determining what injuries (i.e., nature and severity) are appropriate for reporting. At minimum, SCWA must report those injuries considered to be serious (i.e., will likely result in death) or that are likely caused by human interaction (e.g., entanglement, gunshot). Also pursuant to sections 6(b)(ii-iii), SCWA may use discretion in determining the appropriate vantage point for obtaining photographs of injured/dead marine mammals.

7. Validity of this Authorization is contingent upon compliance with all applicable statutes and permits, including NMFS' 2008 Biological Opinion for water management in the Russian River watershed. This Authorization may be modified, suspended or withdrawn if the holder fails to abide by the conditions prescribed herein, or if the authorized taking is having a more than a negligible impact on the species or stock of affected marine mammals.

#### Request for Public Comments

We request comment on our analysis, the draft authorization, and any other aspect of this notice of proposed IHA for SCWA's estuary management activities. Please include with your comments any supporting data or literature citations to help inform our final decision on SCWA's request for an MMPA authorization.

Dated: February 16, 2016.

**Perry F. Gayaldo,**

*Deputy Director, Office of Protected Resources, National Marine Fisheries Service.*

[FR Doc. 2016-03681 Filed 2-22-16; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510-22-P**

#### DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

##### National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

RIN 0648-XE453

##### Endangered and Threatened Species; Take of Anadromous Fish

**AGENCY:** National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and

Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

**ACTION:** Notice; availability of NMFS evaluations of joint state/tribal hatchery plans and request for comment.

**SUMMARY:** Notice is hereby given that the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) and the Tulalip Tribes have submitted two Hatchery and Genetic Management Plans to NMFS, to be considered jointly pursuant to the limitation on take prohibitions for actions conducted under Limit 6 of the 4(d) Rule for salmon and steelhead promulgated under the Endangered Species Act (ESA). The plans specify the propagation of early-returning ("early") winter steelhead in the Skykomish and Snoqualmie River watersheds of Washington State. This document serves to notify the public of the availability for comment of the Proposed Evaluation and Pending Determination of the Secretary of Commerce (Secretary) as to whether implementation of the joint plans will appreciably reduce the likelihood of survival and recovery of ESA-listed Puget Sound steelhead and Puget Sound Chinook salmon. The Proposed Evaluation and Pending Determination may be accessed through the following web address: <http://www.westcoast.fisheries.noaa.gov>.

**DATES:** Comments must be received at the appropriate address or email mailbox (see **ADDRESSES**) no later than 5 p.m. Pacific time on March 24, 2016.

**ADDRESSES:** Written comments on the proposed evaluation and pending determination should be addressed to the NMFS Sustainable Fisheries Division, 510 Desmond Dr., Suite 103, Lacey, WA 98503. Comments may be submitted by email. The mailbox address for providing email comments is: [SnohomishSteelheadPlans.wcr@noaa.gov](mailto:SnohomishSteelheadPlans.wcr@noaa.gov). Include in the subject line of the email comment the following identifier: Comments on Skykomish/Snoqualmie Steelhead Hatchery Programs. Comments received will also be available for public inspection, by appointment, during normal business hours by calling (503) 230-5418.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Tim Tynan at (360) 753-9579 or email: [tim.tynan@noaa.gov](mailto:tim.tynan@noaa.gov).

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### ESA-Listed Species Covered in This Notice

Steelhead (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*): threatened, naturally produced and artificially propagated Puget Sound.

Chinook salmon (*O. tshawytscha*): threatened, naturally produced and artificially propagated Puget Sound.

#### Background

The WDFW and the Tulalip Tribes have submitted to NMFS plans for two jointly operated hatchery programs in the Skykomish and Snoqualmie River basins. The plans were submitted in November 2014, pursuant to limit 6 of the 4(d) Rule for salmon and steelhead. One of the plans was subsequently resubmitted in February 2016 in revised form in response to NMFS pre-consultation review comments. The hatchery programs would release early winter steelhead that are not included as part of the ESA-listed Puget Sound Steelhead DPS into two tributaries of the Skykomish River and one tributary of the Snoqualmie River. Both programs would release fish that are not native to the watersheds.

As required by the ESA 4(d) rule (65 FR 42422, July 10, 2000, as updated in 70 FR 37160, June 28, 2005), the Secretary is seeking public comment on her pending determination as to whether the joint plans for early winter steelhead hatchery programs in the Skykomish River and Snoqualmie River watersheds would appreciably reduce the likelihood of survival and recovery of ESA-listed Puget Sound steelhead and Puget Sound Chinook salmon.

This 4(d) Rule applies the prohibitions enumerated in section 9(a)(1) of the ESA. NMFS did not find it necessary and advisable to apply the take prohibitions described in section 9(a)(1)(B) and 9(a)(1)(C) to artificial propagation activities if those activities are managed in accordance with a joint plan whose implementation has been determined by the Secretary to not appreciably reduce the likelihood of survival and recovery of the listed salmonids. As specified in limit 6 of the 4(d) Rule, before the Secretary makes a decision on the joint plan, the public must have an opportunity to review and comment on the pending determination.

#### Authority

Under section 4 of the ESA, the Secretary of Commerce is required to adopt such regulations as she deems necessary and advisable for the conservation of species listed as threatened. The ESA salmon and steelhead 4(d) rule (65 FR 42422, July 10, 2000, as updated in 70 FR 37160, June 28, 2005) specifies categories of activities that contribute to the conservation of listed salmonids and sets out the criteria for such activities. Limit 6 of the updated 4(d) rule (50 CFR 223.203(b)(6)) further provides that the