

Limerick City & County Council

Subsea Noise Report

Limerick Flood Relief Scheme

MCW1078-RPS-05-ZZ-RP-Z-0104

A0 C01

05 May 2026

MCW1078-RPS-05-ZZ-RP-Z-0104
Limerick City & Environs FRS:
Underwater Noise
A1 C01
05/05/2026

Document status

Document status					
Version	Purpose of document	Authored by	Reviewed by	Approved by	Date
S0	Internal Review	SM	RSP	JM	09/03/2026
S3	Draft for Client Review	SM	RSP	JM/BB	13/03/2026
A1 C01	Final for Issue	SM	RSP	JM/BB	05/05/2026

Approval for issue		
BB		5 th May 2026

This report was prepared by Tetra Tech within the terms of Tetra Tech engagement with its client and in direct response to a scope of services. This report is supplied for the sole and specific purpose for use by Tetra Tech's client. The report does not account for any changes relating the subject matter of the report, or any legislative or regulatory changes that have occurred since the report was produced and that may affect the report. Tetra Tech does not accept any responsibility or liability for loss whatsoever to any third party caused by, related to or arising out of any use or reliance on the report.

Prepared by	Prepared for
Tetra Tech	Limerick City & County Council

Executive summary

This report assesses the impact of noisy activities associated with the geophysical and geotechnical surveys planned for the parts of the River Shannon within the MUL area. The impact is quantified as the range to exceedance of species-specific thresholds for fleeing mammals and fish receivers.

Behavioural disturbance onset thresholds were generally exceeded to ranges of 1,400 m for marine mammals and 130 m for fish due to activities associated with the planned geophysical survey. For activities associated with the geotechnical survey, these thresholds were generally exceeded to ranges of 750 to 810 m for marine mammals and 320 m for fish. These ranges assume that no other noise sources are present and ignore animal habituation (**Section 2.3.1.2.1**). Where there are other noise sources present, or where animals are used to noisy activities, these ranges should not be relied upon without consultation with a competent marine ecologist.

TTS exceedance risk ranges for fleeing receivers are up to 1,400m for the VHF group for the geophysical survey and 640 m for the geotechnical survey. Remaining groups have risk ranges up to 370/360 m (geophysical/geotechnical surveys).

AUD INJ exceedance risk ranges for fleeing receivers are up to 580 m for the VHF group for the geophysical survey and up to 130 m for the geotechnical survey. Ranges for all remaining hearing groups are less than 10 m, regardless of the type of survey.

Conclusion

Overall, the activities have the potential to exceed the behavioural disturbance thresholds to ranges of up to 1,400 m. However, these ranges are unlikely to be realised due to the constant presence of medium to large vessels in the area, including sonar-like sources (e.g. depth-gauges, fish-finders & echo-sounders), meaning the local animals are not naïve to the types of noise emitted from the activity and that the activity will often not be the loudest source of these types of noise.

Temporary threshold shift (TTS) exceedance risk ranges for fleeing receivers are up to 1,400 m for the VHF group and up to 370 m for the remaining hearing groups. Risk of auditory injury (AUD INJ) extends to 580 m for the VHF group and below 10 m for the remaining groups.

Thus, given a presurvey search of 20 minutes to 500 m, the risk of causing auditory injury to any marine mammal or fish is considered low, though the care must be taken not to “trap” an animal away from suitable habitat (e.g. force a porpoise upstream to unsuitable habitat).

Table of Contents

Executive summary	ii
1 Introduction	1
1.1 Purpose of the Report.....	1
1.2 Statement of Authority	2
2 Assessment Criteria	3
2.1 Sound Classification	3
2.2 Sound Impact & Effects	4
2.3 Marine Mammal Thresholds.....	5
2.4 Fishes Thresholds	9
3 Site and Environment	13
3.1 Site Location	13
3.2 Environment	13
3.2.1 Existing Noise	13
3.2.2 Water Properties	14
3.2.3 Sediment Properties	14
4 Source Levels	16
4.1 Source Models.....	17
5 Modelled Activities	19
5.1 Geophysical Survey.....	19
5.2 Geotechnical Survey.....	19
6 Sound Propagation Modelling Methodology	21
6.1 Modelling Assumptions	21
6.2 Exposure Calculations (dB SEL).....	21
7 Impact Assessment	24
7.1 Assumptions and Notes on Results	25
7.2 Results	25
7.2.1 Geophysical Survey	25
7.2.2 Geotechnical Survey.....	26
8 Discussion & Conclusion	28
8.1 Conclusion.....	28
9 References	29
Appendix A – Acoustic Concepts and Terminology	
Impulsiveness	
Review of Sound Propagation Concepts	

Appendix B – Weston Propagation Model Validation

Comparison to normal modes, ray-tracing and parabolic equation models

Broadband comparison with various commercial models

Appendix C – Behavioural Disturbance Onset Thresholds

Tables

Table 2-1 AUD INJ and TTS thresholds (NMFS, 2024)	6
Table 2-2: Disturbance onset criteria for marine mammals used in this assessment, based on Danish, UK and USA guidance	8
Table 2-3: Criteria for onset of injury to fish and sea turtles due to impulsive noise. For this assessment the lowest threshold for any group is used for all groups (shown in bold).....	11
Table 2-4: Criteria for fish (incl. sharks) due to non-impulsive noise from Popper et al. 2014 (Table 7.7 & 7.5) and UK & Danish guidance.	12
Table 3-1 Sediment properties	15
Table 4-1: Summary of Noise Sources and Activities Included in the Subsea Noise Assessment	17
Table 6-1: Swim speed examples from literature	22
Table 7-1: Result types summary	24
Table 7-2: Threshold exceedance risk ranges for geophysical survey	26
Table 7-3: Threshold exceedance risk ranges for geotechnical survey	27
Table A-1: Comparing sound quantities between air and water.....	1
Table C-1: Disturbance onset criteria for marine mammals used in this assessment, based on Danish, UK and USA guidance	22
Table C-2: Received level for Southall Response Severity scaling (No data for OCW group)	24

Figures

Figure 2-1: Auditory weighting functions for seals, whales and sirenians (NMFS, 2024).....	6
Figure 2-2: Generalised hearing thresholds for fishes grouped by the presence of a swim bladder and its role in hearing.	10
Figure 3-1: Underwater Noise Study core Area. Extent of modelling is 20 km from boundary of MUL Area.....	13
Figure 3-2: Map from marinetraffic.com showing vessel trips per 0.08 km ² per year for vessels equipped with an AIS system (generally required on vessel >20 ton).	14

Figure 4-1: Schematic of the actual received level trend from a line source versus the modelled level assuming an equivalent monopoint source. Lines shown for both instantaneous received level and for cumulative level while fleeing	16
Figure 5-1: Source band levels geophysical survey as combined activity	19
Figure 5-2: Source band levels geotechnical survey as combined activity	20
Figure 7-1: Example of ranges to a threshold modelled along radials (solid line) and 90 th percentile range (dotted line) from a sound source in the centre	24
Figure A-1: Graphical representation of acoustic wave descriptors	2
Figure A-2: Comparison between hearing thresholds of different marine animals and humans.	4
Figure A-3: Example of a multibeam echosounder at 15 m depth (achieving 50 ping/sec) with a 3 ms ping duration. VHF-weighted kurtosis of 16 – non-impulsive	5
Figure A-4: Example of a multibeam echosounder at 15 m depth (achieving 50 ping/sec) with a 3 ms ping duration. VHF-weighted kurtosis of 16 – non-impulsive.	6
Figure A-5: Example of USBL signal kurtosis decreasing with range at 20 m depth. Multiple lines are various combinations of source and receiver depths.	7
Figure A-6: Example of USBL signal kurtosis decreasing with range at 200 m depth. Multiple lines are various combinations of source and receiver depths	7
Figure A-7: Schematic of the effect of sediment on sources with narrow beams. Sediments range from fine silt (top panel), sand (middle panel), and gravel (lower panel).	9
Figure A-8: Example of a beam pattern on an Innomar SES 2000. Primary frequencies left (f1 & f2), the interference pattern between the primary frequencies means that the beam pattern for the secondary frequency (right plot) is very narrow (Source: Innomar technical note TN-01).....	10
Figure A-9: Lower cut-off frequency as a function of depth for a range of seabed types	11
Figure A-10: Soundspeed profile as a function of salinity, temperature and pressure	11
Figure A-11: Effect of wind (at 10 m height) on upper portion of soundspeed profile	12
Figure A-12: Absorption loss coefficient (dB/km) for various salinities and temperature	13
Figure C-1 Data and behavioural disturbance thresholds. Lines/values given are median values or 120 dB SPL, whichever is lower. Red is impulsive. Green is non-impulsive.	23

Acronyms and Abbreviations

Acronym	Definition
AUD INJ	Auditory Injury (synonymous with deprecated “PTS”)
c.	Circa, i.e., approximately
dB	Decibel, ten times the base ten logarithm of an intensity divided by a reference intensity. Also, ten times the base ten logarithm of a pressure squared divided by a reference pressure squared
Fishes	Fish species (here represented by most sensitive marine fish likely to be present)
HF	High Frequency (Cetaceans) (NOAA Fisheries 2024)
LF	Low Frequency (Cetaceans) (NOAA Fisheries 2024)
MF	Mid Frequency (Cetaceans) (deprecated, only for reference to NOAA/NOAA Fisheries 2018 groups)
VHF	Very High Frequency (Cetaceans) (NOAA Fisheries 2024)
NOAA	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
NOAA Fisheries	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Fisheries Service
NMFS	National Marine Fisheries Service (of the USA)
OW/OCW	Otariid pinnipeds (NOAA Fisheries 2024)/Other Carnivores in water (Southall 2019)
PK/L _{pk} /L _{p,pk}	Peak Sound Pressure Level [dB re 1 μPa]
PTS	Permanent Threshold Shift (deprecated, see “AUD INJ”)
PW/PCW	Phocid pinnipeds (NOAA Fisheries 2024)/Phocid Carnivores in water (Southall 2019)
RMS	Root Mean Square
SEL/L _E	Sound Exposure Level [dB re 1 μPa ² s]
SL/L _s	Source Level [dB re 1 μPa m]
SPL	Sound Pressure Level [dB re 1 μPa]
SPL _{rms} /L _{p,rms}	Root-mean-squared sound pressure level [dB re 1 μPa] (equivalent to “SPL”)
TTS	Temporary Threshold Shift
TU	Sea Turtles (NOAA Fisheries 2023a)

Technical Terms

Term	Meaning
Decibel (dB)	A relative scale most commonly used for reporting levels of sound. The actual sound measurement is compared to a fixed reference level and the "decibel" value is defined to be $10 \cdot \log_{10}$ ("actual"/"reference"), where ("actual"/"reference") is a power ratio. The standard reference for underwater sound pressure is 1 micro pascal (μPa), while 20 micro pascals is the standard for airborne sound. The dB symbol is often followed by a second symbol identifying the specific reference value (i.e., re 1 μPa).
Auditory Injury (AUD INJ)	A total or partial permanent loss of hearing caused by acoustic trauma. AUD INJ results in irreversible damage to the sensory hair cells of the ear and thus often a permanent reduction of hearing acuity. The effect may be to reduce sensitivity to only a narrow frequency band or to cause broader hearing loss, depending on the stimulus.
Temporary Threshold Shift (TTS)	Temporary loss of hearing as a result of exposure to sound over time. Exposure to high levels of sound over relatively short time periods will cause the same amount of TTS as exposure to lower levels of sound over longer time periods. The mechanisms underlying TTS are not well understood, but there may be some temporary damage to the sensory cells. The duration of TTS varies depending on the nature of the stimulus, but there is generally recovery of full hearing over time.
Sound Exposure Level (SEL)	The cumulative sound energy in an event, formally: "ten times the base-ten logarithm of the integral of the squared pressures divided by the reference pressure squared". Equal to the often seen " L_E " or "dB SEL" quantity. Defined in: ISO 18405:2017, 3.2.1.5 (ISO 2017)
Sound Pressure Level (SPL)	The average sound energy over a specified period of time, formally: "ten times the base-ten logarithm of the arithmetic mean of the squared pressures divided by the squared reference pressure". Equal to the deprecated "RMS level", " dB_{rms} " and to L_{eq} if the period is equal to the whole duration of an event. Defined in ISO 18405:2017, 3.2.1.1 (ISO 2017)
Peak Level, Peak Pressure Level (L_{pk})	The maximal sound pressure level of an event, formally: "ten times the base-ten logarithm of the maximal squared pressure divided by the reference pressure squared" or "twenty times the base-ten logarithm of the peak sound pressure divided by the reference pressure, where the peak sound pressure is the maximal deviation from ambient pressure". Defined in ISO 18405:2017, 3.2.2.1 (ISO 2017)

Term	Meaning
Source Level (SL)	Taken here to mean the level (SEL/SPL/L _P) at 1 meter range. If not otherwise stated, it is assumed the source is omnidirectional (equal level in all directions). For sources larger than 1 m in radius, the Source Level is back-calculated to 1 m.
Decidecade	Refers to a set step in frequency, similar to “one-third-octave”, defined as a ratio of $10^{0.1} \approx 1.259$ (one third octave is $2^{1/3} \approx 1.260$). Used interchangeably with “3 rd octave”.
Noise	Sound that is irrelevant, unwanted, or harmful to the organism(s) in question. Noise is often detrimental, but not necessarily so.
Kurtosis	A statistical measure of “peakedness” of a distribution (of e.g. pressure values in a sound pulse). Defined in ISO 5479:1997
Typical	Here meaning between 10th and 90th percentile.

Units

Unit ^a	Description
dB	Decibel (Sound)
Hz	Hertz (Frequency)
kHz	Kilohertz (Frequency)
kJ	Kilojoule (Energy)
km	Kilometre (Distance)
km ²	Kilometre squared (Area)
m	Meter
ms	Millisecond (10^{-3} seconds) (Time)
ms ⁻¹ or m/s	Meters per second (Velocity or speed)
kn	Knots (speed), 1 kn = 0.514 m/s, 1 m/s = 1.944 kn
μPa	Micro Pascal
Pa	Pascal (Pressure: newton/m ²)
psu	Practical Salinity Units (parts per thousand of equivalent salt in seawater, weight-based)
kg/m ³	Specific density (of water, sediment or air)
Z	Acoustic impedance [kg/(m ² ·s) or (Pa·s)/m ³]
sec	Second or seconds

^a Units will generally be enclosed in square brackets in plots and tables (e.g., “[m/s]”)

1 Introduction

The Project components assessed here are the geophysical and geotechnical surveys planned for the parts of the River Shannon within the MUL area, focussed on characterising the sediment properties using non-invasive methods (i.e. acoustics and electro-magnetism) and invasive methods (boreholes and coring). **Figure 3-1** shows an overview of the MUL assessment area.

While many activities are noisy, only a portion of the activities associated with the Project have a marine component and only some these are activities are sufficiently noisy to be separately assessed. An overview of the assessed activities is shown below including activities implicitly covered under other, noisier, but otherwise acoustically similar activities.

- Geophysical Survey:
 - Vessel, max 20 m length.
 - Multibeam echosounder (MBES): >200 kHz.
 - Side scan sonar (SSS): >200 kHz.
 - Sub-bottom profiler, chirper or pinger type (SBP-C): 1-20 kHz.
 - Sub-bottom profiler, parametric type (SBP-P): 1-20 kHz & 50-126 kHz.
- Geotechnical Survey:
 - Barge or tug assist barge/jackup barge, max length 20 m.
 - Rotary coring, max 0.3 m diameter.
 - Cable percussive drilling, max 0.3 m diameter.
 - Standard penetration testing (SPT), max 0.05m diameter.

1.1 Purpose of the Report

This report presents the results of a desktop study considering the potential for Momentary, Brief and Temporary effects¹ of underwater noise on the marine environment from the Project.

The activities necessary to complete the Project will emit noise with the potential to cause adverse effects on marine life. At close ranges from a noise source with high noise levels, permanent hearing injury or brief hearing impairment may occur to marine species, while at a very close range, gross physical trauma is possible. At long ranges (several kilometres), the introduction of any additional noise could, for the duration of the activity, potentially cause behavioural changes, e.g. changes to the ability of species to

¹ Effects are defined in accordance with the EPA Guidelines on the information to be contained in Environmental Impact Assessment Reports (2022), Table 3.4 Description of Effects, pp.50-52.

communicate and to determine the presence of predators, food, underwater features and obstructions.

This report provides an overview of the potential effects due to underwater noise from the Project on the surrounding marine environment based on the NMFS/NOAA 2024 and Popper et al. 2014 framework for assessing impact from noise on marine mammals and fishes, as well as an assessment of likely ranges for behavioural effects based on a review of UK and Danish guidance documents on behavioural impacts.

Consequently, the primary purpose of the subsea noise assessment is to predict the likely range of onset of injury as given in the relevant guidance (Auditory Injury, AUD INJ) and ranges to potential behavioural effects due to anthropogenic noise resulting from the Project.

1.2 Statement of Authority

This report has been prepared by Tetra Tech/RPS on behalf of Limerick City & County Council. The technical competence of the authors is outlined below:

Rasmus Sloth Pedersen is a Senior Scientist with Tetra Tech/RPS. He holds a master's degree in biology, biosonar and marine mammal hearing from University of Southern Denmark. Rasmus has over 10 years' experience as a marine biologist and over 8 years' experience with underwater noise modelling and marine noise impact assessments. Rasmus has co-developed commercially available underwater noise modelling software, as well as developed multiple source models for e.g. impact piling, seismic airgun arrays, explosives and sonars. Rasmus is a member of the Institute of Acoustics and a chartered scientist with the Institution of Environmental Sciences.

John Mahon is a Senior Associate in Acoustics with Tetra Tech/RPS. He holds a BA BAI in Mechanical Engineering from Trinity College Dublin (2004) and a PhD in Acoustics and Vibration from Trinity College Dublin (2008). He is a Chartered Engineer with Engineers Ireland. John has 22 years' experience in environmental projects including planning applications and environmental impact assessments for a wide range of strategic infrastructure projects.

Sean Mansfield is a Project Scientist in Acoustics with Tetra Tech/RPS. He holds a BA (Hons) in Music Technology from Maynooth University and a Postgraduate Diploma in Acoustics and Noise Control from the Institute of Acoustics. He has over three years' experience working in a wide range of environmental areas, including road, rail, offshore wind, industrial, flood relief, underwater noise, and bat acoustics analysis projects. He is an associate member of the Institute of Acoustics and the Institution of Environmental Sciences.

2 Assessment Criteria

The acoustic assessment criteria for marine mammals and fish in this report has followed the latest international guidance (based on the best available scientific information), that are widely accepted for assessments in the UK, Europe and worldwide (NMFS, 2024; Popper, et al., 2014; Southall, et al., 2019).

2.1 Sound Classification

Underwater noise is generally split into two categories, depending on its characteristics:

- Impulsive sounds:**
 Sounds which are typically transient, momentary (less than one second), broadband, and consist of high peak sound pressure with rapid rise time and rapid decay (ANSI, 2005; ANSI, 1986; NIOSH, 1998). This category includes sound sources such as seismic surveys, impact piling and underwater explosions. Additionally included here are sounds under 1 second in duration with a weighted kurtosis over 40 (see note below*).
- Non-impulsive (and continuous) sounds:**
 Sounds which can be broadband, narrowband or tonal, momentary, brief or prolonged, continuous or intermittent and typically do not have a high peak sound pressure with rapid rise/decay time that impulsive sounds do (ANSI, 1995; NIOSH, 1998). This category includes sound sources such as continuous vibro-piling, running machinery, some sonar equipment and vessels. Additionally included here are sounds over 1 second in duration with a weighted kurtosis under 40 (see note below*).
- * Note that the European Guidance: “Monitoring Guidance for Underwater Noise in European Seas, Part II: Monitoring Guidance Specifications” (MSFD Technical Subgroup on Underwater Noise, 2014) includes sonar as impulsive sources (see Section 2.2 in the reference). However, the guidance suggests that “all loud sounds of duration less than 10 seconds should be included” as impulsive. This contradicts research on impact from impulsive sounds suggesting that a limit for “impulsiveness” can be set at a kurtosis² of 40 (Martin & Klaus Lucke, 2020). See examples in Appendix A, Impulsiveness.
- Therefore, a criterion of kurtosis over 40 is used here to identify impulsive sounds. The justification for departing from the MSFD criterion is that the NMFS 2024 and the Popper et al. 2014 frameworks thresholds are based on the narrower definition of impulsive as given in “Impulsive sounds” above.

Given impulsive sound’s tendency to become less impulsive with increased range, a minimal range can be established where the noise is no longer impulsive (kurtosis <40)

² Statistical measure of the asymmetry of a probability distribution.

(Appendix A, Impulsiveness). This range is established using raytracing with receivers and sources placed at multiple depths to account for variation in final source setup.

2.2 Sound Impact & Effects

Underwater noise has the potential to affect marine/aquatic life in different ways depending on its noise level and characteristics. We here define five zones of noise impact:

- **The zone of audibility:** This is defined as the area within which the animal can detect the sound. Audibility itself does not imply that the sound will affect the animal. There are no agreed thresholds for this level of effect.
- **The zone of masking:** This is defined as the area within which sound can interfere with the detection of other sounds, such as communication or echolocation clicks. This zone is very hard to estimate due to a paucity of data relating to how animals detect sound in relation to masking levels (for example, humans can hear tones well below the numeric value of the overall sound level). Continuous sounds will generally have a greater masking potential than intermittent sound due to the latter providing some relative quiet between sounds. Masking only occurs if there is a near-overlap in sound and signal frequency content, such that a loud sound at e.g., 1000 Hz will not be able to mask a signal at 10,000 Hz³. There are no agreed thresholds for this level of effect.
- **The zone of responsiveness:** This is defined as the area within which the animal responds either behaviourally or physiologically. The zone of responsiveness is usually smaller than the zone of audibility as audibility does not necessarily evoke a reaction. For most species, there is very little data on response, but for species like harbour porpoise there exist several studies showing a relationship between received level and probability of response (Graham IM, 2019; Sarnocinska J, 2020; BOOTH, 2017; Benhemma-Le Gall A, 2021). This zone is quantified here with the use of hearing group specific behavioural thresholds based on UK and Danish guidance (**Table 2-2, Section 2.3.1.2 & Table 2-3, Section 2.4**). However, while the range to exceedance of these thresholds is easy to quantify, given animal habituation and varying ambient noise, these are only relevant alongside an interpretation by a competent marine ecologist.
- **The zone of temporary hearing loss:** The area where the sound level is sufficient to cause the auditory system to lose sensitivity temporarily, causing loss of “acoustic habitat” (the volume of water that can be sensed acoustically by the animal). This hearing loss is typically classified as Temporary Threshold Shift (“TTS”, see **Section 2.3 & 2.4**).

³ The exact limit of how near a noise can get to the signal frequency before causing masking will depend on the receivers’ auditory frequency resolution ability, but for most practical applications noise and signal frequencies will need to be within 1/3rd octave to start to have a masking effect.

- **The zone of injury / permanent hearing loss:** This is the area where the sound level is sufficient to cause permanent hearing loss in an animal. This hearing loss is typically classified as Auditory Injury (“AUD INJ”, see **Section 2.3 & 2.4**). At even closer ranges, and for very high intensity sound sources (e.g., underwater explosions), physical trauma or acute mortal injuries are possible. In relation to fish, we included the impact “Recoverable Injury” as AUD INJ, as while it is not permanent it is a serious effect and assumed to have associated significant costs to population fecundity.

For this study, it is the zones of injury (here “AUD INJ”) that are of primary interest, along with estimates of behavioural impact ranges (**Section 2.3.1.1** for justification).

2.3 Marine Mammal Thresholds

The zone of injury in this study is classified as the distance over which a fleeing marine mammal can suffer AUD INJ leading to non-reversible auditory injury. Injury thresholds are based on a dual criteria approach using both un-weighted peak level (L_{pk} – maximal instantaneous SPL) and marine mammal hearing weighted sound exposure level (SEL). The hearing weighting functions are designed to represent the sensitivity for each group within which acoustic exposures can have auditory effects. The categories include:

- **Low Frequency (LF) cetaceans:** Marine mammal species such as baleen whales (e.g. minke whale *Balaenoptera acutorostrata*).
- **High Frequency (HF) cetaceans:** Marine mammal species such as dolphins, toothed whales, beaked whales and bottlenose whales (e.g., bottlenose dolphin *Tursiops truncatus* and white-beaked dolphin *Lagenorhynchus albirostris*).
- **Very High Frequency (VHF) cetaceans:** Marine mammal species such as true porpoises, river dolphins and pygmy/dwarf sperm whales and some oceanic dolphins, generally with auditory centre frequencies above 100 kHz) (e.g., harbour porpoise *Phocoena phocoena*).
- **Phocid Carnivores in Water (PCW/PC):** True seals (e.g., harbour seal *Phoca vitulina* and grey seal *Halichoreus grypus*); hearing in air is considered separately in the group PCA.
- **Other Marine Carnivores in Water (OCW/OC):** Including otariid pinnipeds (e.g., sea lions and fur seals), otters and polar bears; in-air hearing is considered separately in the group Other Marine Carnivores in Air (OCA).
- **Sirenians (SI):** Manatees and dugongs.

These weightings are used in this study and are shown in **Figure 2-1**. It should be noted that not all of the above hearing groups of marine mammals will be present in the Project area, but all hearing groups are presented in this report for completeness.




Figure 2-1: Auditory weighting functions for seals, whales and sirenians (NMFS, 2024)

The criteria for impulsive and non-impulsive sound are relevant for this study, given the nature of the sound sources used during the Project. The relevant AUD INJ and TTS criteria proposed by NMFS 2024 are summarised in **Table 2-1**.

Table 2-1 AUD INJ and TTS thresholds (NMFS, 2024)

Hearing Group	Parameter	Impulsive [dB]		Non-impulsive [dB]	
		AUD INJ	TTS	AUD INJ	TTS
Low frequency (LF) cetaceans	L _{pk} , (unweighted)	222	216	-	-
	SEL, (weighted)	183	168	197	177
High frequency (HF) cetaceans	L _{pk} , (unweighted)	230	224	-	-
	SEL, (weighted)	193	178	201	181
Very high frequency (VHF) cetaceans	L _{pk} , (unweighted)	202	196	-	-
	SEL, (weighted)	159	144	181	161
Phocid carnivores in water (PCW)	L _{pk} , (unweighted)	223	217	-	-
	SEL, (weighted)	183	168	195	175
Other marine carnivores in water (OCW)	L _{pk} , (unweighted)	230	224	-	-
	SEL, (weighted)	185	170	199	179
Sirenians (SI)	L _{pk} , (unweighted)	225	219	-	-
	SEL, (weighted)	186	171	186	180

2.3.1.1 Irish Guidance Interpretation of Marine Mammal Thresholds.

We note that the NPWS/DAHG “Guidance to Manage the Risk to Marine Mammals from Man-made Sound Sources in Irish Waters” 2014 (Department of Arts, Heritage and the Gaeltacht, 2014) prescribes the use of TTS thresholds as auditory injury criteria from a 2007 publication (Brandon L. Southall, 2007), these have since been superseded (Southall, et al., 2019; NMFS, 2024) and no longer represent best available science or best practice internationally. Thus, the following excerpt from the guidance is relevant:

“The document will be subject to periodic review to allow its efficacy to be reassessed, to consider new scientific findings and incorporate further developments in best practice.”

As there has been no such update to date and the guidance clearly states its intention to consider new scientific findings, we have applied the latest guidance for marine mammals (NMFS, 2024), reflecting the current best available method for assessing impact from noise on marine mammals. This means that following current scientific best practice, AUD INJ” (previously “PTS”) is the criteria for injury, not “TTS”.

It is worth noting that the NPWS 2014 guidance’s reliance on the Southall et al. 2007 TTS thresholds, mean that for most scenarios, the impact ranges are comparable to the AUD INJ threshold from the NMFS 2024 guidance. Where NPWS 2014 is more conservative, it is often the result of including noise at frequencies where the relevant species group is not very sensitive (the weightings from Southall et al. 2007 were very broad and based on relatively little evidence compared to the NMFS 2024 weightings).

The TTS thresholds in Southall 2007, Southall 2019 and NMFS 2024 are not direct measurements of an exact exposure level where TTS occurs. Rather the TTS thresholds are based on the received level where 6 dB of TTS is expected in the test animal. The 6 dB level itself is found by plotting an exposure level against the amount of TTS caused by that exposure level and then fitting a regression line to estimate the amount of TTS caused per dB increase in exposure level. This line can then be used to estimate the exposure level where 6 dB of TTS is expected (see appendix A.3 of (NMFS, 2024)).

The PTS/AUD INJ threshold is the received level at which 40 dB of TTS is expected (40 dB TTS is believed to lead to PTS/AUD INJ). This has two important consequences:

1. At received levels equal to the TTS onset threshold, the expected TTS is 6 dB, not 0 dB, meaning that if *any* TTS is considered injury, no guidance currently contains sufficient information to assess impacts according to the NPWS 2014 guidance (where the language implies that any TTS should be considered injury).
2. Received levels below the PTS/AUD INJ thresholds are all seen as recoverable by Southall 2007 & 2019 and NMFS 2024, they give rise to only “TTS”. Given the lack of a stated *acceptable level* of TTS in the NPWS guidance, the guidance is strictly open to interpretation as to whether the “*potential to induce TTS*” is at levels likely to cause anywhere from 0 dB to 40 dB of TTS.

2.3.1.2 Disturbance to Marine Mammals

The noise thresholds for disturbance onset of marine mammals are not as mature as the AUD INJ and TTS onset thresholds and several different approaches exist. A conservative but realistic approach based on a review of Danish and UK guidance documents, as well as scientific reviews, has been applied and reflects the approach of the Danish guidance (Danish Centre for Environment and Energy, 2021) and a review submitted to the JNCC (Joint Nature Conservation Committee) of the UK (Nedwell, et al., 2007). A review for Natural Resources Wales (Sinclair, Kazer, Ryder, New, & Verfuss, 2023) also acknowledges this approach as suitable.

Using 21 suitable studies from these reports, we have arrived at hearing group specific thresholds (**Table 2-2**) to determine behavioural disturbance levels for non-impulsive noise (here understood to be noise with a kurtosis below 40). These thresholds are compared to the range where the hearing group weighted received level exceeds the relevant threshold.

It is important to state that these thresholds are good indicators of possible onset of behavioural disturbance, but they are not diagnostic of realised behavioural effects. In this way, they are qualitatively different to the thresholds for TTS and AUD INJ, where individual animal preference and learning is irrelevant. Thus an animal's previous exposure to a specific noise source might make choose to have a stronger or weaker response than the median animal from the studies giving rise to the disturbance onset thresholds.

Table 2-2: Disturbance onset criteria for marine mammals used in this assessment, based on Danish, UK and USA guidance

Hearing Group	Non-impulsive Threshold [SPL]	Impulsive Threshold
Low frequency (LF) cetaceans	120	120
High frequency (HF) cetaceans	113	106
Very high frequency (VHF) cetaceans	103	98
Phocid carnivores in water (PCW)	120	120
Other marine carnivores in water (OCW)	120	120

Contrary to the NOAA level B harassment levels, where the threshold for impulsive noise (160 dB SPL⁴) is higher than for non-impulsive noise (120 dB SPL), thresholds presented here are lower for noises that are impulsive at the source, as this matches the observed tendency for impulsive noise to generate a greater behavioural response than non-

⁴ SPL duration of 90-95% energy of a single pulse.

impulsive noise (Danish Centre for Environment and Energy, 2021; Sinclair, Kazer, Ryder, New, & Verfuss, 2023; Nedwell, et al., 2007).

Further details in Appendix C – Behavioural Disturbance Onset Thresholds.

2.3.1.2.1 Habituation and Animal Preference

The estimates for behavioural disturbance onset thresholds use data from animals both naïve and accustomed to anthropogenic noise, so the large variation is likely to be, at least partly, due to real differences in sensitivity to noise types according to animal tolerance, rather than conventional measurement uncertainty. Thus, noises which are familiar to the animal are expected to elicit responses only at higher received levels than noises which are novel, and noise which might be associated with discomfort are expected to elicit a response at lower levels (e.g. impact pile driving or explosions).

As the thresholds are well below TTS levels, the behavioural response of an animal is to a large degree determined by the animal itself and the resulting behaviour pattern is based on much more than simply the received level (e.g. hunger, curiosity, migration).

2.4 Fishes Thresholds

The injury criteria used in this noise assessment are based on Popper et al. 2014 and are given in **Table 2-3** and **Table 2-4** for impulsive noises (L_{pk}) and continuous noise (SEL) respectively.

It is important to clarify that this lack of weighting for fishes reflects a lack of scientific consensus about the best method for applying frequency dependence to received levels for fishes, rather than a statement that fishes can hear all frequencies equally. Thus, fishes generally cannot hear above 10 kHz, and if they can, the sensitivity is generally very poor (**Figure 2-2**, (Nedwell, Edwards, Turnpenny, & Gordon, 2004)). Where received levels at frequencies above 10 kHz are the driver of risk ranges for fishes, an effective filter for noise above 10 kHz is applied (**Figure 2-2**).

While there is no accepted guidance that prescribes a suitable weighting for fish, it remains unrealistic to allow high-frequency noise from continuous noise drive large risk for fishes, as they evidently cannot register them nor their acoustic system adversely affected. This is not true for peak pressure, and L_{pk} thus remain completely unweighted.

Thresholds presented in tables for L_{pk} are unweighted while SEL criteria are unweighted below 10 kHz.




Figure 2-2: Generalised hearing thresholds for fishes grouped by the presence of a swim bladder and its role in hearing.

Popper et al. 2014 does not set out specific TTS limits for L_{pk} and for disturbance limits for impulsive noise for fishes. Therefore, publications “Washington State Department of Transport Biological Assessment Preparation for Transport Projects Advanced Training Manual” (WSDOT, 2020) and “Canadian Department of Fisheries and Ocean Effects of Seismic energy on Fish: A Literature review” (Worcester, 2006) on effects of seismic noise on fish are used to determine limits for these:

- Threshold for behavioural disturbance and TTS from impulsive noise as SPL:**
 The Washington State Department of Transport Biological Assessment Preparation for Transport Projects Advanced Training Manual (WSDOT, 2020) suggests an un-weighted sound pressure level of 150 dB SPL (assumed to be duration of 95 % of energy) as the criterion for onset of behavioural effects, based on work by (Hastings, 2002). Sound pressure levels in excess of 150 dB SPL are expected to cause temporary behavioural changes, such as elicitation of a startle response, disruption of feeding, or avoidance of an area. The document notes that levels exceeding this threshold are not expected to cause direct permanent injury but may indirectly affect the individual fish (such as by impairing predator detection). It is important to note that this threshold is for onset of potential effects, and not necessarily an ‘adverse effect’

threshold. The threshold is implemented here as either single impulse SEL or 1 second SEL, whichever is greater. Data from UK and Danish studies suggest 148 dB SPL as a suitable threshold for onset of behavioural disturbance.

- **TTS threshold from impulsive noise as L_{pk} :**

The report from the Canadian Department of Fisheries and Ocean “Effects of Seismic energy on Fish: A Literature review on fish” (Worcester, 2006) found large differences in response between experiments. Onset of behavioural response varied from 107-246 dB L_{pk} , the 10th percentile level for behavioural response was 160 dB L_{pk} (rounded to nearest 5 dB to reflect large variation in data).

Thus, the behavioural threshold for fishes for impulsive noise is 160 dB L_{pk} , and 148 dB SPL.

Note that while there are multiple groups of fish presented, we have used the thresholds of the more sensitive group for all fish thus covering all fishes (203/186 AUD INJ/TTS for impulsive sound & 222/204 AUD INJ/TTS for non-impulsive sound). These lower thresholds also cover “Eggs and Larvae”.

Table 2-3: Criteria for onset of injury to fish and sea turtles due to impulsive noise. For this assessment the lowest threshold for any group is used for all groups (shown in bold).

Type of Animal	Unit	Mortality and Potential Mortal Injury [dB]	Recoverable Injury (AUD INJ) [dB]	TTS [dB]	Behavioural [dB]
Fish: no swim bladder (particle motion detection) Example: Sharks.	SEL	219 ¹	216 ¹	186 ¹	150 ³
	L_{pk}	213 ¹	213 ¹	193 ²	160 ²
Fish: where swim bladder is not involved in hearing (particle motion detection). Example: Salmonoids.	SEL	210 ¹	203 ¹	186 ¹	150 ³
	L_{pk}	207 ¹	207 ¹	193 ²	160 ²
Fish: where swim bladder is involved in hearing (primarily pressure detection). Example: Gadoids (cod-like).	SEL	207 ¹	203¹	186	148⁴ [SPL]
	L_{pk}	207 ¹	207¹	193²	160²
Sea turtles	SEL	210 ¹	(Near) High*	-	-
	L_{pk}	207 ¹	(Mid) Low (Far) Low	-	-

Type of Animal	Unit	Mortality and Potential Mortal Injury [dB]	Recoverable Injury (AUD INJ) [dB]	TTS [dB]	Behavioural [dB]
Eggs and larvae	SEL	210 ¹	(Near) Moderate	-	-
	L _{pk}	207 ¹	(Mid) Low (Far) Low	-	-

¹ (Popper et al. 2014) table 7.4, ² (Worcester, 2006), ³ (WSDOT, 2020), ⁴ (Danish Centre for Environment and Energy, 2021; Sinclair, Kazer, Ryder, New, & Verfuss, 2023; Nedwell, et al., 2007)

* Indicate (range) and risk of effect, e.g., “(Near) High”, meaning high risk of that effect when near the source.

Where Popper et al. 2014 present limits as “>” 207 or “>>” 186, we have ignored the “greater than” and used the threshold level as given.

Relevant thresholds for non-impulsive noise for fishes relating to AUD INJ, TTS, and behaviour are given in **Table 2-4**.

Table 2-4: Criteria for fish (incl. sharks) due to non-impulsive noise from Popper et al. 2014 (Table 7.7 & 7.5) and UK & Danish guidance.

Type of Animal	Unit	Mortality and Potential Mortal Injury [dB]	Recoverable Injury (AUD INJ) [dB]	TTS [dB]	Behavioural [dB]
All fishes	SEL	(Near) Low (Mid) Low (Far) Low	222 ^b	204 ^b	-
All Fishes	SPL	>193 ^c	193 ^d	193 ^d	148 ^a

^a Based on review in Section 2.3.1.2, also Figure 2-2.

^b Based on 48 hours of 170 dB SPL and 12 hours of 158 dB SPL

^c “greater than” 193 dB SPL as no effect was seen at this level, so the threshold must lie above this.

^d Given as “>193 dB SPL” in Popper et al 2014 but applied in this assessment as 193 dB SPL. An SPL level of 193 dB for 2 hours (the exposure time for this report) equals 222 dB SEL.

3 Site and Environment

3.1 Site Location

The core area of relevance for this underwater noise impact assessment is presented in **Figure 3-1**, and includes the MUL area shown, with modelling extending to 20 km from the MUL area boundary.




Figure 3-1: Underwater Noise Study core Area. Extent of modelling is 20 km from boundary of MUL Area

3.2 Environment

3.2.1 Existing Noise

The parts of the River Shannon passing through the MUL area see little heavy vessel traffic (**Figure 3-2**). This means that the area is relatively free of heavy vessel noise. The area is thus likely to be dominated by ambient noise contributors such as flow noise and bubbles at higher frequencies and ground borne vibrations at lower frequencies.




Figure 3-2: Map from marinetraffic.com showing vessel trips per 0.08 km² per year for vessels equipped with an AIS system (generally required on vessel >20 ton).

3.2.2 Water Properties

Water properties were determined from historical data for the area. Where values differ between e.g. seasons and tidal states, the values resulting in the lowest transmission loss were chosen for a more conservative assessment (more noise at range). Thus, this also covers seasonal variation.

- Temperature: 10 degrees C° – data from <https://www.riverapp.net>. A higher temperature is more conservative for species sensitive to higher frequencies, but effects are generally small compared to effects from salinity or sediment composition, especially at the relatively short propagation ranges of this assessment.
- Salinity: 0 psu – on low tide the water is dominated by the freshwater contribution from the River Shannon. A lower value is more conservative.
- Soundspeed profile: Assumed uniform given high mixing as a result of tidal flows and generally shallow water. A uniform soundspeed profile is conservative compared to the likely downward refracting soundspeed profiles seen during summer months (higher temperature in the surface leads to higher soundspeeds).

3.2.3 Sediment Properties

Sediment properties are based on sediments given in **Table 3-1** and are based on properties from historical boreholes:

<https://secure.decc.gov.ie/goldmine/php/request.php?file=63178393.pdf>. While this source specifies “clayey silt”, a very soft sediment, we have assumed an acoustically harder sediment of ISO coarse silt, to account for the uncertainty in sediment conditions and sparse data availability. A sediment model (Ainslie, 2010) was used to derive the acoustic properties of the sediment from the grain size associated with the stated Shepard sediment classification.

As the main energy of the assessed activities is above 1 kHz, only the top few meters of sediment are relevant to the propagation (only lower frequencies can significantly propagate through the sediment).

Table 3-1 Sediment properties

Layer	Shepard sediment classification	ISO (14688-1:2017)	Density [kg/m ³]	Soundspeed [m/s]	Grain size [mm] (nominal)
Unconsolidated sediment	Clayey Silt	Coarse silt	1713	1612	0.035

4 Source Levels

Underwater noise sources are usually quantified in dB scale with values generally referenced to 1 μ Pa as if measured at a hypothetical distance of 1 m from the source (called the Source Level). In practice, it is not usually possible to measure at 1 m from a source, but the metric allows comparison and reporting of different source levels on a like-for-like basis.

For a large sound source, this imagined point at 1 m from this acoustic centre does not exist, the energy is distributed across the source (like a ship’s hull) and does not all emanate from this imagined acoustic centre point, rather it’s the position in space that would lead to the equivalent received level at range (usually from ranges greater than the largest dimension of the source). Therefore, the stated sound pressure level at 1 m does not exist for large sources. For such large sources, in the acoustic near field (i.e. close to the source), the sound pressure level will be significantly lower than the value predicted by the back-calculated source level as presented in **Figure 4-1**, which presents the received level trend from a line source versus the modelled level assuming an equivalent monopoint source.




Figure 4-1: Schematic of the actual received level trend from a line source versus the modelled level assuming an equivalent monopoint source. Lines shown for both instantaneous received level and for cumulative level while fleeing

4.1 Source Models

The noise sources and activities investigated during the subsea noise assessment study are summarised in **Table 4-1**.

Source levels for the active equipment were band-wise, logarithmically summed to produce a “combined” source that represents the total noise emissions from any given activity or combination of activities.

Note that as source levels have all been converted to 1-second SPL equivalents, the levels vary depending on the location to reflect changes in depth and sediment properties (repetition rate of emitted pulses and sediment absorption affects the modelled effective source level).

Table 4-1: Summary of Noise Sources and Activities Included in the Subsea Noise Assessment

Survey Type	Equipment/ Activity	Source level [SPL]	Primary decade bands (-20 dB width)	Source model details/example systems	Impulsive/ non-impulsive
Geophysical survey	Vessel for geophysical surveys	167	10 - 2,500 Hz	(Heitmeyer, 2001; Simard, RoyCédric, & Giard, 2016; Wittekind, 2014; Audoly & Rizzuto, 2015; MacGillivray & de Jong, 2021; Liefvendahl, Feymark, & RE, 2015)	Non-impulsive
	MBES	187	200,000 – 400,000 Hz	Kongsberg EM series, Kongsberg Geoswath series, R2 Sonic series & Reson Teledyne Seabat series	Non-impulsive ^a
	SSS	165	315,000 – 800,000 Hz	Edgetech FS-4200 series, C-Max CM2 series and Klein System 3900-5000	Non-impulsive ^a
	SBP-C	181	4,000 Hz	GeoAcoustics Geopulse series	Non-impulsive ^a
	SBP-P	203	50,000 – 115,000 Hz	Innomar smart, quattro (QBM) sixpack (HBM), Innomar SES 2000 compact light, Innomar standard quattro (DBM) sixpack (DBM), Innomar medium 100	Non-impulsive ^a
Geotechnical survey	Tug for geotechnical surveys	178	10 - 6,300 Hz	(Heitmeyer, 2001; Simard, RoyCédric, & Giard, 2016; Wittekind, 2014; Audoly & Rizzuto, 2015; MacGillivray & de Jong, 2021; Liefvendahl, Feymark, & RE, 2015)	Non-impulsive
	Rotary coring	155	10 – 63,000 Hz	(Erbe & McPherson, 2017; Fisheries and Marine Service,	Non-impulsive

Survey Type	Equipment/ Activity	Source level [SPL]	Primary decade bands (-20 dB width)	Source model details/example systems	Impulsive/ non-impulsive
				1975; MR, M, M, & I, 2010; Ward & Needham, 2012; L-F, et al., 2023)	
	Cable percussive drilling	185	10 – 12,500 Hz	Uses the standard penetration testing source below as a proxy.	Impulsive to 750 m
	Standard penetration testing	185	10 – 12,500 Hz	(Erbe & McPherson, 2017; L-F, et al., 2023)	Impulsive to 750 m

* Using criteria for impulsiveness as laid out in **Section 2.1**.

^a These sources are “impulsive-like” sources on their own, but when used together, the high effective repetition rate of the combined output, makes emitted sound non-impulsive.

It is possible that no SSS will be deployed. However, as its impact is minimal, it has been included in this assessment.

5 Modelled Activities

Two activities are modelled:

1. Geophysical survey using MBES, SSS, chirper/pinger SBP, parametric SBP and geophysical survey vessel. All equipment is assumed to be hull-mounted with no requirements for the use of a USBL.
2. Geotechnical survey using rotary coring, SPT, cable percussive drilling (which uses the SPT source as a proxy) and a tug vessel.

5.1 Geophysical Survey

This activity assumes all equipment is active with no soft start. The broadband level (“Total” in **Figure 5-1**) is 208 dB SPL




Figure 5-1: Source band levels geophysical survey as combined activity

5.2 Geotechnical Survey

This activity assumes all equipment is active with no soft start. The broadband level (“Total” in **Figure 5-2**) is 186 dB SPL.




Figure 5-2: Source band levels geotechnical survey as combined activity

6 Sound Propagation Modelling Methodology

There are several methods available for modelling the propagation of sound between a source and receiver ranging from very simple models which simply assume spreading according to a $10 \times \log_{10}(\text{range})$ or $20 \times \log_{10}(\text{range})$ relationship, to full acoustic models (e.g., ray tracing, normal mode, parabolic equation, wavenumber integration and energy flux models). In addition, semi-empirical models are available which lie somewhere in between these two extremes in terms of complexity (e.g., (Weston, 1971)).

For simpler scenarios, such as this one, where the sediment is relatively uniform and mostly flat or where great detail in the sound field is not needed, the computational speed of these simpler models is preferred over the higher accuracy of numerical models and are routinely used for these types of assessments. For this assessment, we have used the Weston model (Weston, 1971) for all SPL and SEL modelling, which is suitable to depths of c. 200 m and generally softer sediments (i.e. non-consolidated sediments).

These models will tend to underestimate the transmission losses (leading to estimates greater than actual impact), primarily due to the omission of surface roughness, wind effects and shear waves in the sediment.

Validation examples of the Weston model can be found in Appendix B.

6.1 Modelling Assumptions

The main assumptions made for the modelling are:

1. Animals fleeing the area will not return within a 24-hour period.
2. Animals flee for up to 12 hours, after which they will be over 20 km away.
3. Sources are modelled as point sources. This leads to overestimation of received levels near the source but is equal at ranges over c. 2 times the length of the source or at ranges of c. 5 times the local depth.
4. Modelling is done for high tide, being the tidal state with the least transmission loss.
5. Sea state lower than sea state 2 is assumed, meaning the water surface is a perfect reflector and there are no significant bubbles in the surface. This is a conservative assumption, with increases in wind speed having a strong attenuating effect on the sound propagation.

6.2 Exposure Calculations (dB SEL)

To compare modelled levels with the two impact assessment frameworks (NMFS 2024 & Popper et al. 2014) it is necessary to calculate received levels as exposure levels (SEL), weighted for marine mammals and unweighted for fishes. For ease of implementation, sources have been presented as an SPL source level, meaning it was necessary to convert from SPL to SEL for a single, or multiple events:

To convert from SPL to SEL using elapsed time, the following relation can be used:

$$SEL = SPL + 10 \cdot \text{Log}_{10}(t_2 - t_1) \quad (1)$$

Or, where it is appropriate to convert SEL from one event to SEL cumulative by relating to the number of events as:

$$SEL_{n \text{ events}} = SEL_{\text{single event}} + 10 \cdot \text{Log}_{10}(n) \quad (2)$$

And SPL from SEL:

$$SPL = SEL + 10 \cdot \text{Log}_{10}\left(\frac{1}{t_2 - t_1}\right) \quad (3)$$

As an animal swims away from the sound source, the noise it experiences will become progressively more attenuated; the cumulative, fleeing SEL is derived by logarithmically adding the SEL to which the mammal is exposed as it travels away from the source. This calculation is used to estimate the approximate minimum start distance for an animal in order for it to be exposed to sufficient sound energy to result in the exceedance of a threshold, or to check if a set exclusion zone is sufficient for an activity (e.g. will an exclusion zone of 500 m be sufficient to prevent exceeding an AUD INJ threshold). It should be noted that the sound exposure calculations are based on the simplistic assumption that the animal will continue to swim away at a constant speed. The real-world situation is more complex, and the animal is likely to move in a more varied manner. Reported swim speeds are summarised in **Table 6-1** along with the sources.

For this assessment, a swim speed of 1.5 m/s for marine mammals, and 0.5 m/s for fishes (including sharks) is assumed.

For very long fleeing durations, the ambient sound itself can exceed the thresholds, e.g., an ambient sound level of 122.4 dB, weighted for the VHF group, will exceed the non-impulsive TTS threshold of 161 dB SEL after 2 hours' exposure⁵. For this assessment, we consider fleeing durations of 12 hours, meaning that continuous weighted received levels of at least 114.6 dB SPL will exceed the VHF group's non-impulsive TTS threshold in the fleeing model.

Table 6-1: Swim speed examples from literature

Species	Hearing Group	Swim Speed (m/s)	Source Reference
Harbour porpoise	VHF	1.5	Otani <i>et al.</i> , 2000
Harbour seal	PCW	1.8	Thompson, 2015
Grey seal	PCW	1.8	Thompson, 2015

⁵ 122.4 dB SPL + 10*log₁₀(3600 seconds) = 161 dB SEL, TTS non-impulsive threshold for the VHF group is 161 dB SEL.

Species	Hearing Group	Swim Speed (m/s)	Source Reference
Minke whale	LF	2.3	Boisseau <i>et al.</i> , 2021
Bottlenose dolphin	HF	1.52	Bailey and Thompson, 2010
White-beaked dolphin	HF	1.52	Bailey and Thompson, 2010
Basking shark	Fish (unweighted)	1.0	Sims, 2000
All other fish groups	Fish (unweighted)	0.5	Popper <i>et al.</i> , 2014
Sea turtles	Fish (unweighted)	0.56-0.84 & 0.78-2.8	(F, P, E, & GR, 1997; SA, 2002)

7 Impact Assessment

Results are presented here as the geographical “risk range” to an auditory threshold (AUD INJ/ TTS/ Behavioural), as given in **Table 2-1**, **Table 2-2**, **Table 2-3** and **Table 2-4**.

A given risk range specifies the expected range, within which, a fleeing receiver would exceed the relevant threshold.

Risk ranges for SEL are given for the 90th percentile value of all modelled radials (example in **Figure 7-1**).




Figure 7-1: Example of ranges to a threshold modelled along radials (solid line) and 90th percentile range (dotted line) from a sound source in the centre

Several result types are presented for each activity in **Table 7-1** to inform this assessment and to provide flexibility in mitigation.

Table 7-1: Result types summary

Condition	Description
Behavioural disturbance range	The range at which the behavioural limit for the marine mammals or the fishes (including sharks) is exceeded.
TTS, 1 seconds' exposure	This is the range of acute risk of impact from the activity (a one second exposure) and is presented to indicate near-instantaneous risk and for comparison with other studies. This assumes a stationary animal (during the 1-second exposure) with all equipment operating at full power and does not include a soft start.
AUD INJ, 1 seconds' exposure	
TTS, sound exposure, fleeing receiver, 12 hours, no soft start	The minimal range a fleeing animal needs to start fleeing from to avoid being exposed to noise exceeding its TTS/ AUD INJ threshold. Animals are moving in a straight line away from the source at a constant speed of 1.5 m/s (0.5 m/s for fish, including sharks).
AUD INJ, sound exposure, fleeing receiver, 12 hours, no soft start	

7.1 Assumptions and Notes on Results

The results should be read while keeping the following in mind:

- Results are rounded up to the nearest 10 m for ranges below 1,000 m and up to nearest 100 m for ranges over 1,000 m. This can lead to apparent overlaps in risk ranges.
- The modelling resolution of 10 metres means that, where results are lower than this, “<10” is stated to mean “below 10 metres”.
- Animals are modelled as fleeing in straight lines. Where sites are very confined, the maximal modelled risk ranges will be restricted by line-of-sight ranges (and cut short where they meet land). Where this affects the 90th percentile values (very confined sites), the maximal range is used instead.
- Modelling is limited to a range of 20 km from the activities assessed. Though for this site the geometry of the river means that the practical limit for noise propagation is c. 1,400 m.
- Due to the geometry of the river, the maximal risk range are c. 1,400 m, meaning that where “1,400 m” is given at risk ranges, these can be understood as line of sight ranges, where further noise propagation is blocked by land or banks due to the river course.

7.2 Results

In the following, the results from modelling of the two different representative activities are given as ranges of risk of exceeding the relevant threshold.

7.2.1 Geophysical Survey

Table 7-2 presents risk ranges for a representative worst-case assumption for the geophysical survey.

Behavioural disturbance ranges are expected to be exceeded up to a distance of 1,400 m for all hearing groups excluding fish, which is expected to be exceeded up to 130 m. These ranges assume that no other noise sources are present and ignore animal habituation (**Section 2.3.1.2.1**). Where there are other noise sources present, or where animals are used to noisy activities, these ranges should not be relied upon without consultation with a competent marine ecologist.

TTS exceedance risk ranges for fleeing receivers are up to 1,400 m for the VHF group, with remaining groups 370 m or below.

AUD INJ exceedance risk ranges for fleeing receivers are up to 580 m for the VHF group and less than 10 m for all remaining hearing groups.

Table 7-2: Threshold exceedance risk ranges for geophysical survey

Criteria	Metric	LF	HF	VHF	PW	OW	Fish
Exceedance of behavioural disturbance onset threshold	90 th percentile range [m]	1,400	1,400	1,400	1,400	1,400	130
TTS risk range, 1 seconds' exposure	90 th percentile range [m]	<10	<10	360	<10	<10	<10
AUD INJ risk range, 1 seconds' exposure	90 th percentile range [m]	<10	<10	20	<10	<10	<10
TTS risk range, fleeing receiver (SEL based)	90 th percentile range [m]	<10	370	1,400	280	<10	<10
AUD INJ risk range, fleeing receiver (SEL based)	90 th percentile range [m]	<10	<10	580	<10	<10	<10

*Limited by line-of-sight – noise blocked by land, beyond these ranges.

7.2.2 Geotechnical Survey

Table 7-3 presents risk ranges for a representative worst-case assumption for the geotechnical survey.

Behavioural disturbance ranges are expected to be exceeded up to a distance of 750 to 810 m for all groups excluding fish, which is 320 m. These ranges assume that no other noise sources are present and ignore animal habituation (**Section 2.3.1.2.1**). Where there are other noise sources are present, or where animals are used to noisy activities these ranges should not be relied upon without consultation with a competent marine ecologist.

TTS exceedance risk ranges for fleeing receivers are up to 640 m for the VHF group, with remaining groups less than or equal to 360 m.

AUD INJ exceedance risk ranges for fleeing receivers are up to 130 m for the VHF group and below 10 m for all remaining hearing groups.

Table 7-3: Threshold exceedance risk ranges for geotechnical survey

Criteria	Metric	LF	HF	VHF	PW	OW	Fish
Exceedance of behavioural disturbance onset threshold	90 th percentile range [m]	810	750	760	790	750	320
TTS risk range, 1 seconds' exposure	90 th percentile range [m]	<10	<10	70	<10	<10	<10
AUD INJ risk range, 1 seconds' exposure	90 th percentile range [m]	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
TTS risk range, fleeing receiver (SEL based)	90 th percentile range [m]	360	<10	640	270	<10	20
AUD INJ risk range, fleeing receiver (SEL based)	90 th percentile range [m]	<10	<10	130	<10	<10	<10

8 Discussion & Conclusion

This report assesses the impact of noisy activities associated with the geophysical and geotechnical surveys planned for the parts of the River Shannon within the MUL area. The impact is quantified as the range to exceedance of species-specific thresholds for fleeing mammals and fish receivers.

Behavioural disturbance onset thresholds were generally exceeded to ranges of 1,400 m for marine mammals and 130 m for fish due to activities associated with the planned geophysical survey. For activities associated with the geotechnical survey, these thresholds were generally exceeded to ranges of 750 to 810 m for marine mammals and 320 m for fish. These ranges assume that no other noise sources are present and ignore animal habituation (**Section 2.3.1.2.1**). Where there are other noise sources present, or where animals are used to noisy activities, these ranges should not be relied upon without consultation with a competent marine ecologist.

TTS exceedance risk ranges for fleeing receivers are up to 1,400m for the VHF group for the geophysical survey and 640 m for the geotechnical survey. Remaining groups have risk ranges up to 370/360 m (geophysical/geotechnical surveys).

AUD INJ exceedance risk ranges for fleeing receivers are up to 580 m for the VHF group for the geophysical survey and up to 130 m for the geotechnical survey. Ranges for all remaining hearing groups are less than 10 m, regardless of the type of survey.

8.1 Conclusion

Overall, the activities have the potential to exceed the behavioural disturbance thresholds to ranges of up to 1,400 m. However, these ranges are unlikely to be realised due to the constant presence of medium to large vessels in the area, including sonar-like sources (e.g. depth-gauges, fish-finders & echo-sounders), meaning the local animals are not naïve to the types of noise emitted from the activity and that the activity will often not be the loudest source of these types of noise.

Temporary threshold shift (TTS) exceedance risk ranges for fleeing receivers are up to 1,400 m for the VHF group and up to 370 m for the remaining hearing groups. Risk of auditory injury (AUD INJ) extends to 580 m for the VHF group and below 10 m for the remaining groups.

Thus, given a presurvey search of 20 minutes to 500 m, the risk of causing auditory injury to any marine mammal or fish is considered low, though the care must be taken not to “trap” an animal away from suitable habitat (e.g. force a porpoise upstream to unsuitable habitat).

9 References

- Ainslie, M. A. (2010). *Principles of Sonar Performance Modeling*. Heidelberg: Springer.
- ANSI. (1986). S12.7-1986 Method for Measurement of Impulsive Noise. American National Standards Institute.
- ANSI. (1995). S3.20-1995 Bioacoustical Terminology. American National Standards Institute.
- ANSI. (2005). S1.13-2005 Measurement of Sound Pressure Levels in Air. American National Standards Institute.
- Audoly, C., & Rizzuto, E. (2015). Ship Underwater Radiated Noise Patterns.
- Benhemma-Le Gall A, G. I. (2021). Broad-Scale Responses of Harbor Porpoises to Pile-Driving and Vessel Activities During Offshore Windfarm Construction. 8(664724).
- BOOTH, C. H. (2017). *Using the Interim PCoD framework to assess the potential impacts of offshore wind developments in Eastern English Waters on harbour porpoises in the North Sea*. Natural England.
- Brandon L. Southall, A. E. (2007). *Marine Mammal Noise Exposure Criteria: Initial Scientific Recommendations*. Aquatic Mammals.
- Danish Centre for Environment and Energy. (2021). *Thresholds for behavioural responses to noise in marine mammals*. Aarhus: Aarhus Universitet.
- Department of Arts, Heritage and the Gaeltacht. (2014). *Guidance to Manage the Risk to Marine Mammals from Man-made Sound in Irish Waters*. Department of Arts, heritage and the Gaeltacht.
- EMODnet. (2026, 02 16). *European Marine Observation and Data Network (EMODnet)*. Retrieved 02 27, 2024, from EMODnet Product Catalogue: <https://emodnet.ec.europa.eu/geonetwork/srv/eng/catalog.search#/home>
- Erbe, C., & McPherson, C. (2017). Underwater noise from geotechnical drilling and standard penetration testing. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*.
- F, P., P, L., E, C., & GR, H. (1997). Satellite tracking experiments on the navigational ability and migratory behaviour of the loggerhead turtle *Caretta caretta*. (129:215-220).
- Fisheries and Marine Service. (1975). *Underwater Noise at an Offshore Drilling Operation in the Bay of Fundy*. Environment Canada.
- Graham IM, M. N. (2019). Harbour porpoise responses to pile-driving diminish over time. 6(190335).

- Heitmeyer, S. C. (2001). An ensemble source spectra model for merchant ship-radiated noise.
- JNCC. (2017). *JNCC guidelines for minimising the risk of injury to marine mammals from geophysical surveys*. Joint Nature Conservation Committee.
- L-F, H., X-M, X., L-L, Y., S-Q, H., X-H, Z., & Y-L, Z. (2023). Underwater noise characteristics of offshore exploratory drilling and its impact on marine mammals.
- Liefvendahl, M., Feymark, A., & RE, B. (2015). Methodology for noise source modelling and its application to Baltic Sea shipping - Deliverable D4.1 of the BONUS SHEBA project.
- MacGillivray, A., & de Jong, C. (2021). A Reference Spectrum Model for Estimating Source Levels of Marine Shipping Based on Automated Identification System Data. *J. Mar. Sci. Eng.*
- Martin, S. B., & Klaus Lucke, D. R. (2020). Techniques for distinguishing between impulsive and non-impulsive sound in the context of regulating sound exposure for marine mammals. *147*(4).
- MR, W., M, B., M, B., & I, M. (2010). Noise Associated with Small Scale Drilling Operations. *3rd International Conference on Ocean Energy, 6 October*. Bilbao.
- MSFD Technical Subgroup on Underwater Noise. (2014). *Monitoring Guidance for Underwater Noise in European Seas, Part II: Monitoring Guidance Specifications*. European commission.
- Nedwell, ..., Turnpenny, A., Lovell, J., Parvin, S., Workman, R., Spinks, J., & Howell, D. (2007). *A validation of the dBht as a measure of the behavioural and auditory effects of underwater noise*. subacoustech.
- Nedwell, D. J., Edwards, M. B., Turnpenny, D. A., & Gordon, D. J. (2004). *Fish and Marine Mammal Audiograms: A summary of available information*.
- NIOSH. (1998). Criteria for a Recommended Standard: Occupational Noise Exposure. National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health.
- NMFS. (2024). *2024 Update to: Technical Guidance for Assessing the Effects of Anthropogenic Sound on Marine Mammal Hearing (Version 3.0)*. Silver Spring: National Marine Fisheries Service.
- Popper, A. N., Hawkins, A. D., Fa, R. R., Mann, D. A., Bartol, S., Carlson, T. J., . . . Tavalga, W. N. (2014). *Sound Exposure Guidelines for Fishes and Sea Turtles*. Springer.
- SA, E. (2002). Swim speed and movement patterns of gravid leatherback sea turtles (*Dermochelys coriacea*) at St Croix, US Virgin Islands. (205:3689-3697).

- Sarnocinska J, T. J. (2020). Harbor Porpoise (*Phocoena phocoena*) Reaction to a 3D Seismic Airgun Survey in the North Sea. 6(824).
- Simard, Y., RoyCédric, N., & Giard, G. S. (2016). Analysis and modeling of 255 source levels of merchant ships from an acoustic observatory along St. Lawrence Seaway. 140(2002).
- Sinclair, R., Kazer, S., Ryder, M., New, P., & Verfuss, U. (2023). *Review and recommendations on assessment of noise disturbance for marine mammals*. Bangor: Natural Resources Wales.
- Southall, B. L., Finneran, J. J., Reichmuth, C., Nachtigall, P. E., Ketten, D. R., Bowles, A. E., . . . Tyack, P. L. (2019). Marine Mammal Noise Exposure Criteria: Updated Scientific Recommendations for Residual Hearing Effects. 45(2).
- Ward, P., & Needham, K. (2012). Modelling the vertical directivity of noise from underwater drilling. 17.
- Weston, D. E. (1971). *Intensity-Range Relations in Oceanographic Acoustics*. Teddington: Admiralty Research Laboratory.
- Wittekind, D. K. (2014). A Simple Model for the Underwater Noise Source Level of Ships.
- Worcester, T. (2006). *Effects of Seismic Energy on Fish; A Literature Review*. Dartmouth, Canada: Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Bedford Institute of Oceanography.
- WSDOT. (2020). *Washington State Department of Transport Biological Assessment Preparation for Transport Projects Advanced Training Manual, CH 7*. Washington State Department of Transport.

Appendix A

Acoustic Concepts and Terminology

Appendix A – Acoustic Concepts and Terminology

Sound travels through water as vibrations of the fluid particles in a series of pressure waves. The waves comprise a series of alternating compressions (positive pressure variations) and rarefactions (negative pressure fluctuations). Because sound consists of variations in pressure, the unit for measuring sound is usually referenced to a unit of pressure, the Pascal (Pa). The unit usually used to describe sound is the decibel (dB) and, in the case of underwater sound, the reference unit is taken as 1 μPa , one micro-pascal, whereas airborne sound is usually referenced to a pressure of 20 μPa . To convert from a sound pressure level referenced to 20 μPa to one referenced to 1 μPa , a factor of $20 \log(20/1)$ i.e. 26 dB has to be added to the former quantity. Thus, a sound pressure of 60 dB re 20 μPa is the same as 86 dB re 1 μPa , although care also needs to be taken when converting from in air sound to in water sound levels due to the different sound speeds and densities of the two mediums resulting in a conversion factor of approximately 62 dB for comparing intensities (Watt/m^2), see **Table A-1**, below.

Table A-1: Comparing sound quantities between air and water

Properties	Constant intensity		Constant pressure	
	Air	Water	Air	Water
Speed of sound (C) [m/s]	340	1500	340	1500
Density (ρ) [kg/m^3]	1.293	1026	1.293	1026
Acoustic impedance ($Z=C \cdot \rho$) [$\text{kg}/(\text{m}^2 \cdot \text{s})$ or ($\text{Pa} \cdot \text{s})/\text{m}^3$]	440	1539000	440	1539000
Sound intensity ($I=p^2/Z$) [Watt/m^2]	1	1	22.7469	0.0065
Sound pressure ($p=(I \cdot Z)^{1/2}$) [Pa]	21	1241	100	100
Particle velocity (I/p) [m/s]	0.04769	0.00081	0.22747	0.00006
dB re 1 μPa^2	146.4	181.9	160.0	160.0
dB re 20 μPa^2	120.4	155.9	134.0	134.0
Difference dB re 1 μPa^2 & dB re 20 μPa^2	61.5		26.0	

All underwater sound pressure levels in this report are described in dB re 1 μPa^2 . In water, the sound source strength is defined by its sound pressure level in dB re 1 μPa^2 , referenced back to a representative distance of 1m from an assumed (infinitesimally small) point source. This allows calculation of sound levels in the far-field. For large, distributed sources, the actual sound pressure level in the near-field will be lower than predicted.

There are several descriptors used to characterise a sound wave. The difference between the lowest pressure deviation (rarefaction) and the highest pressure-deviation (compression) from ambient is the peak to peak (or pk-pk) sound pressure (L_{P-P} for the level in dB), Note that L_{P-P} can be hard to measure consistently, as the maximal duration

between the lowest and highest pressure deviation is not standardised. The difference between the highest deviation (either positive or negative) and the ambient pressure is called the peak pressure (L_P for the level in dB). Lastly, the average sound pressure is used as a description of the average amplitude of the variations in pressure over a specific time window (SPL for the level in dB). SPL is equal to the L_{eq} when the time window for the SPL is equal to the time window for the total duration of an event. The cumulative sound energy from pressure is the integrated squared pressure over a given period (SEL for the level in dB). These descriptions are shown graphically in **Figure A-1** and reflect the units as given in ISO 18405:2017, “Underwater Acoustics – Terminology”.




Figure A-1: Graphical representation of acoustic wave descriptors

The sound pressure level (SPL⁶) is defined as follows (ISO 18405:2017, 3.2.1.1):

$$SPL = 10 \cdot \text{Log}_{10} \left(\frac{\overline{p^2}}{1 \cdot 10^{-12} \text{Pa}} \right) \quad (1)$$

Here $\overline{p^2}$ is the arithmetic mean of the squared pressure values. Note that L_{pk} is simply the instantaneous SPL (ISO 18405:2017, 3.2.2.1).

⁶ Equivalent to the commonly seen “RMS-level”.

The peak sound pressure level, L_P , is the instantaneous decibel level of the maximal deviation from ambient pressure and is defined in (ISO 18405:2017, 3.2.2.1) and can be calculated as:

$$L_P = 10 \cdot \text{Log}_{10} \left(\frac{\max(p^2)}{1 \cdot 10^{-12} \text{Pa}} \right)$$

Another useful measure of sound used in underwater acoustics is the Exposure Level, or SEL. This descriptor is used as a measure of the total sound energy of a single event or a number of events (e.g. over the course of a day). This allows the total acoustic energy contained in events lasting a different amount of time to be compared on a like for like basis. Historically, use was primarily made of SPL and L_{pk} metrics for assessing the potential effects of sound on marine life. However, the SEL is increasingly being used as it allows exposure duration and the effect of exposure to multiple events over e.g. a 24-hour period to be taken into account. The SEL is defined as follows (ISO 18405:2017, 3.2.1.5):

$$SEL = 10 \cdot \text{Log}_{10} \left(\frac{\int_{t_1}^{t_2} p(t)^2 dt}{1 \cdot 10^{-12} \text{Pa}} \right) \quad (2)$$

To convert from SEL to SPL the following relation can be used:

$$SEL = \text{SPL} + 10 \cdot \text{Log}_{10}(t_2 - t_1) \quad (3)$$

Converting from a single event to multiple events for SEL:

$$SEL_{n \text{ events}} = SEL_{\text{single event}} + 10 \cdot \text{Log}_{10}(n) \quad (4)$$

The frequency, or pitch, of the sound is the rate at which these oscillations occur and is measured in cycles per second, or Hertz (Hz). When sound is measured in a way which approximates to how a human would perceive it using an A-weighting filter on a sound level meter, the resulting level is described in values of dB(A). However, the hearing faculties of marine mammals and fish are not the same as humans, with marine mammals hearing over a wider range of frequencies, fish over a typically smaller range of frequencies and both with different sensitivities. It is therefore important to understand how an animal's hearing varies over the entire frequency range to assess the effects of sound on marine life.

Consequently, use can be made of frequency weighting scales to determine the level of the sound in comparison with the auditory response of the animal concerned. A comparison between the typical hearing response curves for fish, humans and marine mammals is shown in **Figure A-2**. Note that hearing thresholds are sometimes shown as audiograms with sound level on the y axis rather than sensitivity, resulting in the graph shape being the inverse of the graph shown. It is also worth noting that some fish are sensitive to particle velocity rather than pressure, although paucity of data relating to particle velocity levels for anthropogenic sound sources means that it is often not possible to quantify this effect. Marine reptiles (mostly sea turtles) have relatively poor hearing underwater, lacking a good acoustic coupling mechanism from the sea water to the inner ear.




Figure A-2: Comparison between hearing thresholds of different marine animals and humans.

Impulsiveness

The impulsiveness of a source can be estimated from the kurtosis of the weighted signal (as suggested by Matin et al. in “Techniques for distinguishing between impulsive and non-impulsive sound in the context of regulating sound exposure for marine mammals”, Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 2020)

The consequence of this is that the same equipment can be both impulsive and non-impulsive, depending on marine mammal presence and the local environment.

Below is an example of a hull mounted echo sounder at 15 m depth and at 250 m depth.

In shallow water the ping rate can be high as reflections from the sediment return quickly, but the single pulse duration is usually shorter as less energy in the signal is required due to the short range the pulse must travel. This leads to high repetition rate (decreases kurtosis) and shorter pulses (increases kurtosis). Figure A-3: Example of a multibeam echosounder at 15 m depth (achieving 50 ping/sec) with a 3 ms ping duration. VHF-weighted kurtosis of 16 – non-impulsive

Figure A-3 shows an example where this leads to a non-impulsive source, to be compared to the thresholds for non-impulsive noise.




Figure A-3: Example of a multibeam echosounder at 15 m depth (achieving 50 ping/sec) with a 3 ms ping duration. VHF-weighted kurtosis of 16 – non-impulsive

In deeper water, the ping rate will usually be slower as echoes take longer to return to the sediment and the pulses will be longer to increase the energy in the pulses and make their echoes easier to detect. This leads to low repetition rate (increases kurtosis) and longer pulses (decreases kurtosis). **Figure A-4** shows an example where this combination resulted in an impulsive source, to be compared to the thresholds for impulsive noise.




Figure A-4: Example of a multibeam echosounder at 15 m depth (achieving 50 ping/sec) with a 3 ms ping duration. VHF-weighted kurtosis of 16 – non-impulsive.

With range, due to multiple reflections and scattering, the kurtosis will decrease with increased range, for shallow water this decrease will be quicker than for deeper water, compare **Figure A-5** & **Figure A-6**, where a kurtosis <40 is reached at c. 200 m in 20 m depth, but at over 1000 m at 200 m depth.




Figure A-5: Example of USBL signal kurtosis decreasing with range at 20 m depth. Multiple lines are various combinations of source and receiver depths.




Figure A-6: Example of USBL signal kurtosis decreasing with range at 200 m depth. Multiple lines are various combinations of source and receiver depths

Review of Sound Propagation Concepts

Increasing the distance from the sound source usually results in the level of sound getting lower, due primarily to the spreading of the sound energy with distance, analogous to the way in which the ripples in a pond spread after a stone has been thrown in.

The way that the sound spreads will depend upon several factors such as water column depth, pressure, temperature gradients, salinity, as well as water surface and seabed conditions. Thus, even for a given locality, there are temporal variations to the way that sound will propagate. However, in simple terms, the sound energy may spread out in a spherical pattern (close to the source, with no boundaries) or a cylindrical pattern (much further from the source, bounded by the surface and the sediment), although other factors mean that decay in sound energy may be somewhere between these two simplistic cases.

In acoustically shallow waters⁷ in particular, the propagation mechanism is coloured by multiple interactions with the seabed and the water surface (Lurton, 2002; Etter, 2013; Urick, 1983; Brekhovskikh and Lysanov 2003, Kinsler et al., 1999). Whereas in deeper waters, the sound will propagate further without encountering the surface or bottom of the sea, in shallower waters the sound is reflected many times by the surface and sediment.

At the sea surface, the majority of sound is reflected back into the water due to the difference in acoustic impedance (i.e. sound speed and density) between air and water. However, scattering of sound at the surface of the sea is an important factor with respect to the propagation of sound from a source. In an ideal case (i.e. for a perfectly smooth sea surface), the majority of sound wave energy will be reflected back into the sea. However, for rough waters, much of the sound energy is scattered (Eckart, 1953; Fortuin, 1970; Marsh, Schulkin, and Kneale, 1961; Urick and Hoover, 1956). Scattering can also occur due to bubbles near the surface such as those generated by wind or fish or due to suspended solids in the water such as particulates and marine life. Scattering is more pronounced for higher frequencies than for low frequencies and is dependent on the sea state (i.e. wave height). However, the various factors affecting this mechanism are complex. Generally, the scattering effect at a particular frequency depends on the physical size of the roughness in relation to the wavelength of the frequency of interest.

As surface scattering results in differences in reflected sound, its effect will be more important at longer ranges from the source sound and in acoustically shallow water (i.e. where there are multiple reflections between the source and receiver). The degree of scattering will depend upon the water surface smoothness/wind speed, water depth, frequency of the sound, temperature gradient, grazing angle and range from source. Depending upon variations in the aforementioned factors, significant scattering could occur at sea state 3 or more for higher frequencies (e.g. 15 kHz or more). It should be noted that variations in propagation due to scattering will vary temporally (primarily due to different sea-states/wind speeds at different times) and that more sheltered areas (which are more likely to experience calmer waters) could experience surface scattering to a lesser extent,

⁷ Acoustically, shallow water conditions exist whenever the propagation is characterised by multiple reflections with both the sea surface and seabed (Etter, 2013). Consequently, the depth at which water can be classified as acoustically deep or shallow depends upon numerous factors including the sound speed gradient, water depth, sediment type, frequency of the sound and distance between the source and receiver.

and less frequently, than less sheltered areas which are likely to encounter rougher waters. However, over shorter ranges (e.g. within 10-20 times the water depth) the sound will experience fewer reflections and so the effect of scattering should not be significant. Consequently, over the likely distances over which injury will occur, this effect is unlikely to significantly affect the injury ranges presented in this report, and not including this effect will overestimate the impact.

When sound waves encounter the seabed, the amount of sound reflected will depend on the geoacoustic properties of the seabed (e.g. grain size, porosity, density, sound speed, absorption coefficient and roughness) as well as the grazing angle (see **Figure A-7**⁸) and frequency of the sound (Cole, 1965; Hamilton, 1970; Mackenzie, 1960; McKinney and Anderson, 1964; Etter, 2013; Lurton, 2002; Urick, 1983). Thus, seabeds comprising primarily of mud or other acoustically soft sediment will reflect less sound than acoustically harder seabeds such as rock or sand. This effect also depends on the profile of the seabed (e.g. the depth of the sediment layers and how the geoacoustic properties vary with depth below the sea floor). The sediment interaction is less pronounced at higher frequencies (a few kHz and above) where interaction is primarily with the top few cm of the sediment (related to the wavelength). A scattering effect (similar to that which occurs at the surface) also occurs at the seabed (Essen, 1994; Greaves and Stephen, 2003; McKinney and Anderson, 1964; Kuo, 1992), particularly on rough substrates (e.g. pebbles and larger).




Figure A-7: Schematic of the effect of sediment on sources with narrow beams. Sediments range from fine silt (top panel), sand (middle panel), and gravel (lower panel).

⁸ The density of “rays” indicate difference in effective propagation angle from the source, with acoustically harder sediments (gravel) having better reflection at steeper angles leading to more “rays” being effectively propagated (no significant bottom attenuation) in the waveguide. Beam shape indicated in left chart, with the black line showing the same received level.

These sediment effects mean that the directivity of equipment such as sub-bottom profilers have a profound effect on the effective source level – the apparent source level to a far-away receiver.

A parametric SBP such as the “Innomar Medium” or “Standard” sub-bottom profiler use two higher frequencies (“primary frequencies”) to generate an interference pattern at lower frequencies (“secondary frequencies”). This means that the secondary beam can be made extraordinarily narrow, e.g. 5 degrees at -10 dB (**Figure A-8**), versus c. 50 degrees for a chirper/pinger type, leading to a much smaller sound impact – even when a parametric sub-bottom profiler has higher sound output within the main beam. We account for these differences in beam pattern by including the sediment reflection loss at high incidence angles (**Figure A-7**) to reduce the effective source level accordingly.




Figure A-8: Example of a beam pattern on an Innomar SES 2000. Primary frequencies left (f_1 & f_2), the interference pattern between the primary frequencies means that the beam pattern for the secondary frequency (right plot) is very narrow (Source: Innomar technical note TN-01).

Another phenomenon is the waveguide effect which means that shallow water columns do not allow the propagation of low frequency sound (Urlick, 1983; Etter, 2013). The cut-off frequency of the lowest mode in a channel can be calculated based on the water depth and knowledge of the sediment geoaoustic properties. Any sound below this frequency will not propagate far due to energy losses through multiple reflections. The cut-off frequency as a function of water depth is shown in **Figure A-9** for a range of seabed types. Thus, for a water depth of 10m (i.e. shallow waters typical of coastal areas and estuaries) the cut-off frequency would be approximately 70Hz for sand, 115Hz for silt, 155Hz for clay and 10Hz for bedrock.




Figure A-9: Lower cut-off frequency as a function of depth for a range of seabed types

Changes in the water temperature and the hydrostatic pressure with depth mean that the speed of sound varies throughout the water column. This can lead to significant variations in sound propagation and can also lead to sound channels, particularly for high-frequency sound. Sound can propagate in a duct-like manner within these channels, effectively focussing the sound, and conversely, they can also lead to shadow zones. The frequency at which this occurs depends on the characteristics of the sound channel but, for example, a 25m thick layer would not act as a duct for frequencies below 1.5 kHz. The temperature gradient can vary throughout the year and thus there will be potential variation in sound propagation depending on the season.




Figure A-10: Soundspeed profile as a function of salinity, temperature and pressure

Wind can make a significant difference to the soundspeed in the uppermost layers as the introductions of bubbles decreases the soundspeed and refracts (bends) the sound towards the surface, where the increased roughness and bubbles from the wind will cause increased transmission loss.




Figure A-11: Effect of wind (at 10 m height) on upper portion of soundspeed profile

Sound energy can also be absorbed due to interactions at the molecular level converting the acoustic energy into heat. This is another frequency dependent effect with higher frequencies experiencing much higher losses than lower frequencies. This is shown in **Figure A-12** where the variation of the absorption (sometimes called volume attenuation) is shown for various salinities and temperatures. As the effect is proportional to the wavelength, colder water, with slower soundspeed/period and being slightly more viscous, will have more absorption. Higher salinity slightly decreases absorption at low frequencies (mostly due to increase in soundspeed and wavelength/period), but much higher absorption at higher frequencies where interaction with pressure sensitive molecules of magnesium sulphite and boric acid increase the conversion acoustic energy to heat.




Figure A-12: Absorption loss coefficient (dB/km) for various salinities and temperature

Appendix B

Weston Propagation Model Validation

Appendix B – Weston Propagation Model Validation

The Weston 1971-1976 sound propagation model was first published in 1971 as “Intensity-Range Relations in Oceanographic Acoustics” by D. E. Weston in the Journal of Sound and Vibration, with an update in 1976 as “Propagation in Water With Uniform Sound Velocity but Variable-Depth Lossy Bottom” by D.E. Weston in the Journal of Sound and Vibration.

The model presents a pragmatic approach to sound propagation modelling by splitting propagation into four distinct regions dependent on the given range, water depth and wavelength, and has been made range-dependent for both depth, soundspeed and sediment properties.

This appendix presents a few testcases with known solutions compared to this implementation of the Weston propagation model.

Comparison to normal modes, ray-tracing and parabolic equation models


Source:

Sertlek H. Ö. & Ainslie M. A (2003), “Propagation loss model comparisons on selected scenarios from the Weston memorial workshop”. 1st International Conference and Exhibition on Underwater Acoustics.

Case 1

Depth 100 m, max range 40 km.

This is a simple semi-deep waveguide which might be considered representative for parts of the continental shelf.



Case 2

Depth 100 m to 5 km then sloping up to 30 m at 7 km. Remaining at 30 m depth to 40 km range.

The step up at 5 km range tests the models' ability to calculate the effect of slowly changing depths in an upslope environment. Note that for 250 Hz (top panel in figure below) the Weston model underestimates the loss after c. 20 km, leading to a higher received level. The ray-tracer (Bellhop) shows the same result. This is expected as the Weston model relies on approximations made from ray-theory to specify the transitions between propagation regions.




Figure 6. The bathymetry of Case 4





Figure 7. Depth-averaged (over receiver depth) PL vs range for Case 4 ($f=250$ Hz (top), $f=1$ kHz (middle), $f=3.5$ kHz (bottom)). Source depth = 30 m.

Case 3

Depth 100 m to 5 km, then sloping up to 30 m at 7 km. Remaining at 30 m depth to 7 km, then sloping down to 100 m depth at 10 km.

The “bump” scenario represents a shallow bank between two deeper sections. It tests the models’ ability to transition between different regions of propagation. There is excellent agreement between the Weston model and the numerical models.



Broadband comparison with various commercial models

Source:

Bas Binnerts, Christ de Jong, Ilkka Karasalo, Martin Östberg, Thomas Folegot, Dominique Clorennec, Michael A. Ainslie, Graham Warner, Lian Wang (2109), "Model Benchmarking Results For Ship Noise In Shallow Water", JOMOPANS.


Two cases are investigated, both with a vessel source model used as the source and from 10 Hz to 20 kHz.

Case 1

50 m depth to 100 km range.

Broadband levels versus range

The Weston model (black dashed line) matches the general losses well at ranges over c. 500 m.




Case 2

100 m depth to 5 km, then upslope to 30 m depth at 7 km. Remaining at 30 m depth to 50 km range.

Broadband levels versus range

The Weston model (black dashed line) matches the general losses well at ranges over c. 500 m.



Appendix C

Behavioural Disturbance Onset Thresholds

Appendix C – Behavioural Disturbance Onset Thresholds

The noise thresholds for disturbance onset of marine mammals are not as mature as the AUD INJ and TTS onset thresholds and several different approaches exist. A conservative but realistic approach based on a review of Danish and UK guidance documents, as well as scientific reviews, has been applied and reflects the approach of the Danish guidance (Danish Centre for Environment and Energy, 2021) and a review submitted to the JNCC (Joint Nature Conservation Committee) of the UK (Nedwell, et al., 2007). A review for Natural Resources Wales (Sinclair, Kazer, Ryder, New, & Verfuss, 2023) also acknowledges this approach as suitable.

Using 21 suitable studies from these reports, we have arrived at hearing group specific thresholds (**Table C-1**) to determine behavioural disturbance levels for non-impulsive noise (here understood to be noise with a kurtosis below 40). These thresholds are compared to the range where the hearing group weighted received level exceeds the relevant threshold.

It is important to state that these thresholds are good indicators of possible onset of behavioural disturbance, but they are not diagnostic of realised behavioural effects. In this way, they are qualitatively different to the thresholds for TTS and AUD INJ, where individual animal preference and learning is irrelevant. Thus an animal's previous exposure to a specific noise source might make choose to have a stronger or weaker response than the median animal from the studies giving rise to the disturbance onset thresholds.

Table C-1: Disturbance onset criteria for marine mammals used in this assessment, based on Danish, UK and USA guidance

Hearing Group	Non-impulsive Threshold [SPL]	Impulsive Threshold
Low frequency (LF) cetaceans	120	120
High frequency (HF) cetaceans	113	106
Very high frequency (VHF) cetaceans	103	98
Phocid carnivores in water (PCW)	120	120
Other marine carnivores in water (OCW)	120	120

Contrary to the NOAA level B harassment levels, where the threshold for impulsive noise (160 dB SPL⁹) is higher than for non-impulsive noise (120 dB SPL), thresholds presented here are lower for noises that are impulsive at the source, as this matches the observed tendency for impulsive noise to generate a greater behavioural response than non-

⁹ SPL duration of 90-95% energy of a single pulse.

impulsive noise (Danish Centre for Environment and Energy, 2021; Sinclair, Kazer, Ryder, New, & Verfuss, 2023; Nedwell, et al., 2007).




Figure C-1 Data and behavioural disturbance thresholds. Lines/values given are median values or 120 dB SPL, whichever is lower. Red is impulsive. Green is non-impulsive.

Southall et al. 2007 Response Severity Scale

Southall et al. 2007 presents “response severity” for various hearing groups and types of noise. Response severity are scaled from 0 (no reaction) to 9 (panic). Response severities 4, 5 & 6 are relevant when determining behavioural disturbance:

- Response Severity 4 – Behavioural changes onset:
 “Moderate changes in locomotion speed, direction, and/or dive profile but no avoidance of sound source. Brief, minor shift in group distribution. Moderate cessation or modification of vocal behavior (duration ≤ duration of source operation)”
- Response Severity 5 – Marked behavioural changes, but no avoidance:
 “Extensive or prolonged changes in locomotion speed, direction, and/or dive profile but no avoidance of sound source. Moderate shift in group distribution. Change in inter-animal distance and/or group size (aggregation or separation). Prolonged cessation or modification of vocal behavior (duration > duration of source operation).”
- Response Severity 6 – Avoidance onset:
 “Minor or moderate individual and/or group avoidance of sound source. Brief or minor separation of females and dependent offspring. Aggressive behavior related to noise exposure (e.g., tail/flipper slapping, fluke display, jaw clapping/gnashing teeth, abrupt directed movement, bubble clouds). Extended cessation or modification of vocal behavior. Visible startle response. Brief cessation of reproductive behavior.”

Table C-2: Received level for Southhall Response Severity scaling (No data for OCW group)

Hering Group	Non-impulsive Threshold [SPL - unweighted]			Multi-pulse [SPL – 95% duration of pulse energy - unweighted]		
	4	5	6	4	5	6
Response Severity Scale	4	5	6	4	5	6
Low frequency (LF) cetaceans	126	137	147	150	156	162
High frequency (HF) cetaceans	137	140	143	144	148	152
Very high frequency (VHF) cetaceans	123	132	142	-	-	-
Phocid carnivores in water (PCW)	115	118	120	183	189	194

Given that the Southhall et al. 2007 levels are based on unweighted received levels they are impossible to compare directly to thresholds based on weighted received levels, but assuming a weighting would decrease the received level by 10-30 dB for HF, VHF and PCW groups, depending on the range to the source (as suggested by (Danish Centre for Environment and Energy, 2021) for impact pilig-like noises) the received levels for response severity of 4-6 are roughly aligned with what's presented for the weighted received levels (**Table C-1 & Figure C-1**).