Near-Real-Time Acoustic Monitoring of Beaked Whales and Other Cetaceans Using a Seaglider™
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Abstract

In most areas, estimating the presence and distribution of cryptic marine mammal species, such as beaked whales, is extremely difficult using traditional observational techniques such as ship-based visual line transect surveys. Because acoustic methods permit detection of animals underwater, at night, and in poor weather conditions, passive acoustic observation has been used increasingly often over the last decade to study marine mammal distribution, abundance, and movements, as well as for mitigation of potentially harmful anthropogenic effects. However, there is demand for new, cost-effective tools that allow scientists to monitor areas of interest autonomously with high temporal and spatial resolution in near-real time. Here we describe an autonomous underwater vehicle – a glider – equipped with an acoustic sensor and onboard data processing capabilities to passively scan an area for marine mammals in near-real time. The glider was tested extensively off the west coast of the Island of Hawai‘i, USA. The instrument covered approximately 390 km during three weeks at sea and collected a total of 194 h of acoustic data. Detections of beaked whales were successfully reported to shore in near-real time. Manual analysis of the recorded data revealed a high number of vocalizations of delphinids and sperm whales. Furthermore, the glider collected vocalizations of unknown origin very similar to those made by known species of beaked whales. The instrument developed here can be used to cost-effectively screen areas of interest for marine mammals for several months at a time. The near-real-time detection and reporting capabilities of the glider can help to protect marine mammals during potentially harmful anthropogenic activities such as seismic exploration for sub-sea fossil fuels or naval sonar exercises. Furthermore, the glider is capable of under-ice operation, allowing investigation of otherwise inaccessible polar environments that are critical habitats for many endangered marine mammal species.
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Introduction

Beaked whales lead a stealthy life in the deep ocean. On their search for prey in deep waters, they dive up to 2000 m and spend as much as 90 min submerged [1,2]. For these reasons, in most areas it is extremely difficult to investigate beaked whales with traditional visual observing techniques. Only two decades ago, little was known about the family Ziphiidae, which comprises at least 22 species [3]. After a series of beaked whale stranding events associated with naval sonar exercises [4], beaked whales became a research focus in marine mammal science. U.S. environmental laws, including the Endangered Species Act, the Marine Mammal Protection Act, and the National Environmental Policy Act, as well as intense public concern, require the U.S. Navy to conduct its research and operations in a fashion that minimizes impacts on marine mammals, and mitigates any adverse impacts of those operations. As a consequence, the U.S. Navy accelerated research on beaked whales by funding a wide variety of projects to investigate the hearing, vocal behavior, and movements of beaked whales, evaluate adverse effects of man-made sound on them, and develop effective tools to acoustically monitor and protect them during the course of naval exercises [5].

In late 2007, the Applied Physics Laboratory at the University of Washington (APL-UW) and Oregon State University (OSU) started a collaborative research project to develop and use underwater gliders that would autonomously search the ocean for vocalizing beaked whales and report their presence back to shore in near-real time. Underwater gliders use small changes in buoyancy to effect vertical motion, and wings to convert the vertical motion to horizontal movement, thereby propelling themselves forward with very low power consumption. This allows them to perform long-duration surveys autonomously [6]. During a mission, a glider is piloted remotely from a control center onshore. The glider used in this project was the Seaglider™, originally developed by APL-UW [7], which is capable of
Beaked whales vocalize regularly underwater for navigation, prey detection, and potentially communication [8]. The Seaglider used in this study was equipped with an acoustic sensor (hydrophone) to passively listen and detect individuals or groups of animals. A successful proof-of-concept study to record marine mammal vocalizations using a glider was conducted prior to this project [9]. Acoustic methods have been used increasingly often over the last decades to study marine mammal distribution, abundance, and movements, as well as for mitigation of harm to marine mammals [10,11]. This is due, in part, to the greater availability of the necessary hardware and software and due also to some perceived advantages: the ability to detect animals underwater, to work at night and in poor weather conditions, and to record the relevant signals and post-process them if necessary. Tagging studies revealed that beaked whales predominantly emit sounds at depths greater than 400 m [1]. Because the probability of detection increases with sensor depth [12], deep-diving platforms, including gliders, are well suited to the investigation of these animals.

In fall 2009 APL-UW and OSU conducted a comprehensive glider field trial off the west coast of the Island of Hawai‘i. Concurrently, scientists from Cascadia Research Collective (CRC) tagged beaked whales with remotely-deployed dorsal-fin attached satellite location tags [13] to monitor large-scale movements of the animals in the area [14]. Here we present the first results of this glider field trial and utilize available tag data to evaluate the performance of the system.

Methods

Mission details

Between 27 October and 17 November 2009, a Seaglider (commercially available from iRobot Corporation, Bedford, MA, USA) equipped with a custom-designed and -built passive acoustic recording system (APL-UW, Seattle, WA, USA) surveyed the west coast of the Island of Hawai‘i (see Fig. 1). The primary goal was to detect echolocation clicks of Blainville’s (Mesoplodon densirostris) and Cuvier’s (Ziphius cavirostris) beaked whales in near-real time and to report their presence back to shore.

The Seaglider was programmed to operate along a prescribed track between the 1000 m and 2000 m isobaths along the coast, based on previous studies [15] that reported highest beaked whale densities for this area. The glider repeatedly dove to 1000 m depth (or to near the bottom, in water shallower than this) and then ascended to the surface again. The passive-acoustic system was operated at depths below 500 m during 85 glider dives. Acoustic signals were received by a single omni-directional hydrophone (type: HTI-99-HF, High Tech Inc, Gulfport, MS, USA; sensitivity: –164 dB re. 1 V/μPa), amplified by 36 dB, and recorded at 194 kHz sample rate and 16-bit resolution. Acoustic data were compressed using the Free Lossless Audio Codec (FLAC; http://flac.sourceforge.net) and stored on flash memory drives. In parallel, the acoustic data stream was screened in real time onboard for beaked whale vocalizations using the ERMA detection algorithm described earlier [16]. This detector has been proven in an independent study to reliably detect beaked whale echolocation clicks [17]. The Seaglider was operated remotely via Iridium™ satellite communication and configured to report detection events back to shore when surfacing between dives.

Acoustic data analysis

After recovery of the Seaglider, the entire recorded data set was manually screened by an experienced data analyst (KK) for beaked whale (family Ziphiidae), delphinid (family Delphinidae), and sperm whale (Physeter macrocephalus) echolocation clicks, as well as echosounder signals. The result of the “blind” manual beaked whale screening (information on detector output as well as locations of tagged whales were not provided to the analyst) was also used to verify the detections of the onboard real-time detection algorithm. The analysis was done using Matlab™-based analysis software [18] to visualize and annotate acoustic data sets. When searching for time periods with vocal activity, consecutive sound files of 1 minute duration (high-pass filtered at 5 kHz) were screened visually by the analyst using the following spectrogram parameters: frame size and FFT size 2048 samples (11 ms), overlap 50% (5.5 ms), and a Hamming window, for a spectrum filter bandwidth of 385 Hz.

To be able to differentiate beaked whale and delphinid echolocation clicks, a frame size of 32 samples (0.16 ms), FFT size of 128 samples (0.64 ms), overlap 94% (0.15 ms), and Hamming window, for a spectrum filter bandwidth of 24.6 kHz, was used in a second step to resolve the up-sweep frequency contour characteristic of beaked whale echolocation clicks.

Beaked whale echolocation clicks were identified by investigating the clicks’ waveform, spectrogram, and spectrum. The following criteria were used for verification: duration, low-frequency roll-off, and frequency modulation (up-sweep) of clicks, as well as the inter-click-interval (ICI) between consecutive clicks. Only three species of beaked whales have been recorded in the surveyed areas, and only two of these are commonly seen: Blainville’s and Cuvier’s beaked whales [14,15,19]. The vocalizations of these beaked whales are well studied and have been described by several authors [8]. Table 1 provides an overview of the principal acoustic features and differences of echolocation clicks produced by the two beaked whale species used by the analyst to distinguish these species.

As shown in Table 1, echolocation clicks produced by Blainville’s and Cuvier’s beaked whales differ significantly in several characteristics. Blainville’s beaked whale clicks are longer in duration and feature a higher low-frequency roll-off (20 dB below peak amplitude at 25 kHz). The range of ICIs of Blainville’s echolocation clicks is broader (0.2–0.4 s) and more variable than ICIs measured for Cuvier’s beaked whale echolocation click trains.

Tag data analysis

Additionally, a comparison was conducted of tag data collected by CRC and the glider tracks. A potential encounter was identified when (a) at any given time the position of the Seaglider and the surfacing position of a beaked whale were within 6 km, and (b) the accuracy of the reported satellite (ARGOS) tag location was 1.5 km or less. The upper theoretical limit of acoustic detection distance for beaked whales is in the range of 4 km [12]; however, because of the limited accuracy of the locations provided by the tag, a maximum range of 6 km was used.

Results

Acoustic data analysis

During the three-week mission, the glider covered approximately 390 km and collected a total of 194 h of acoustic data (11,615 sound files of one minute duration) during 85 glider dives. Average dive duration was 4.3 ± 1.3 hours, with 16.2 ± 12.8 minutes spent at the surface between dives for data transmission. During the mission the Seaglider detected and reported beaked
whale vocalizations on 10 out of 85 dives. Manual analysis
revealed that 7 of these detections were actual beaked whale
encounters. During the other 3 glider dives the detection system
was mistakenly triggered by delphinid vocalizations. The analyst
identified a total of 109 sound files containing beaked whale
clicks. The automated system correctly detected calls in 79 out of these
109 sound files (72%).

In total 1% of the recorded data contained beaked whale clicks,
50.4% delphinid clicks, 11.8% sperm whale clicks, and 6.5%
echosounder signals. The results of the manual data analysis are
shown in Figs. 2 and 3.

Fig. 2 shows the locations where cetacean vocalizations were
recorded. Beaked whales were recorded during 7 out of 85 glider
dives (8%). Five acoustic encounters were identified as Blainville’s
beaked whales, one as Cuvier’s beaked whale (19.97°N, 156.19°W),
and one as an unidentified beaked whale (19.56°N, 156.28°W).
Delphinid vocalizations were the predominant bio-
acoustic signals in the recordings and were roughly distributed
evenly along the track of the glider. Sperm whale vocalizations
were recorded primarily along the central west coast of the Island
of Hawai‘i.

Fig. 3 shows the percentage of recorded data containing target
signals versus hour of day (local time). As expected, echosounder
signals (fish finders and depth sounders) were recorded mainly in
daytime, when most recreational fishing and boating occurs. Sperm
whales were recorded throughout the day, with minimum
detection rates during mid-morning (9:00–10:00 local time (LT))
and early afternoon (13:00–14:00 LT). Fig. 4 shows the percentage
of recorded data containing sperm whale clicks by glider dive
number, and indicates that sperm whales were in the area of the
glider primarily on three occasions (one lasting more than a day)
and were detected either in smaller numbers or at greater
distances on several other occasions.

Delphinid echolocation clicks showed a clear diurnal pattern,
with high detection rates during the night (maximum at 22:00 LT)
and low rates during the day (minimum at 10:00 LT). At 22:00 LT

Table 1. Principal acoustic features of echolocation clicks of regular click trains produced by Blainville’s (*Mesoplodon densirostris*) and Cuvier’s (*Ziphius cavirostris*) beaked whales.

| Species                | Duration | -20 dB low freq. roll-off | Inter-click interval | Upsweep |
|------------------------|----------|----------------------------|----------------------|---------|
| Blainville’s beaked whale | 250 µs   | 25 KHz                     | 0.2–0.4 s            | yes     |
| Cuvier’s beaked whale   | 175 µs   | 20 kHz                     | 0.4 s                | yes     |

Values are based on Johnson et al., 2004.

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0036128.t001
more than 75% of the recorded data contained delphinid vocalizations. This percentage dropped during the course of the day to below 10% at 10:00 LT. Recordings of beaked whale echolocation clicks were scattered throughout the day with no apparent pattern. A one-way ANOVA analysis was used to statistically verify the pattern described above. The ANOVA analysis confirmed ($p<0.01$) that (a) the number of recorded delphinid vocalizations is significantly higher during night-time, and (b) the number of recorded echosounder signals is significantly higher during daytime. No statistically significant day/night patterns were found for beaked whales and sperm whales.

Figure 2. Locations of acoustic encounters as derived from the manual data analysis. Panels indicate locations of [a] beaked whale, [b] delphinid, and [c] sperm whale acoustic encounters. Size of each dot represents the percentage (logarithmic scale) of acoustic data recorded per glider dive containing respective target signal. Map source: Google Earth. Contours: Hawai‘i Mapping Research Group, School of Ocean and Earth Sciences and Technology, University of Hawai‘i, USA. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0036128.g002

Figure 3. Percentage of data containing target signals in the respective hour of day as derived from manual data analysis. The mean observation duration per hour of day was 484±129 minutes (range 250–696 min). Shaded areas indicate hours before/after sunset. Note different scales of y-axes. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0036128.g003
Tag data analysis

The comparison of available tag data and the glider track revealed one potential encounter with a tagged Cuvier’s beaked whale. The potential encounter occurred on 3 November 2009 and covered four glider dives with a total of approximately 12 hours of recorded data. Fig. 5 provides an overview of the beaked whale surfacing positions and the glider track. The glider was travelling SSE to NNW when the tagged beaked whale surfaced east of the glider at a distance between 6 and 12 km.

Acoustic data analysis confirmed one acoustic encounter as reported by the glider during the mission with Cuvier’s beaked whales on 3 November 2009. The acoustic encounter (18:17–18:52 UTC) occurred shortly before the surfacing event (20:21 UTC).

Discussion

Manual analysis of the recorded data revealed a high degree of bioacoustic activity. Delphinids and sperm whales produced the majority of recorded vocalizations. The observed diurnal pattern in recorded delphinid vocalizations is likely caused by two behavioral patterns.

(a) Diel activity pattern: The most frequently encountered species of delphinids in the area (Baird, unpublished data), namely short-finned pilot whales (Globicephala macrorhynchus) and pantropical spotted dolphins (Stenella attenuata), both show increased foraging activity, and thus likely echolocation activity, at night [20,21]. Furthermore, several other species of delphinids in the study area (e.g., melon-headed whales) are known to rest or travel primarily during the day [22,23].

(b) Diel migration: Spinner dolphins (Stenella longirostris) show a diurnal migration pattern, remaining in shallow near-shore water during the day and moving offshore at night [24], although they do move closer to shore in the middle of the night following the migration of their prey into shallow water [25]. According to Benoit-Bird and Au [25], offshore echolocation activity by spinner dolphins occurs during late evening (~21:00 LT) and early morning (~03:00 LT), with a dip around midnight. The results of the analysis of the glider data indicate slightly higher delphinid vocalization rates at around 22:00 and 04:00 LT with a dip at around 01:00 LT, results which overall match previous findings [25].

Acoustic data analysis revealed that sperm whales were detected during approximately 12% of the total recordings, although the temporal clustering of detections suggested they were in the area on about eight different occasions, with the majority of detections recorded primarily on three occasions (Fig. 4). Such a high frequency of detection of sperm whales is somewhat surprising: during visual surveys in the area, sperm whales are seen less frequently than either Cuvier’s or Blainville’s beaked whales (Baird, unpublished data), yet are more easily detected from a distance than either species. The large
number of acoustic detections of sperm whales relative to beaked
whales likely reflects larger average group sizes, clicking behavior
that occurs during a greater proportion of the time, and a greater
average distance that sperm whale clicks can be detected
compared to beaked whale clicks.

Beaked whales were recorded during 7 out of 83 glider dives, or
one acoustic encounter every 27.7 hours of recording. This is a
similar rate of encounters for beaked whales detected visually in
small-boat surveys off the island of Hawai‘i, with one encounter
every 26.8 hours of visual survey effort between 500 and 4000 m
depth (Baird, unpublished data). All seven acoustic beaked whale
counters were noted by the real-time detection system and
reported to shore during the mission. However, the system also
reported three false positive detections triggered by vocalizing
delphinids. To improve the detection performance of the system, a
second-stage classifier [26] is currently being implemented on the
Seaglider. Furthermore, the glider now features the capability of
transferring selected acoustic data snippets via Iridium satellite
communication during a mission for manual verification.

A comparison of the acoustic data collected and available tag
data revealed a potential encounter between a Cuvier’s beaked
whale and the glider on 3 November 2009. Cuvier’s beaked whale
echolocation clicks were recorded by the glider at 18:17–18:52
UTC approximately 2 hours prior to a tagged Cuvier’s beaked
whale surfacing event at 20:21 UTC. At the time of surfacing, the
distance between whale and glider was 5.8 km (±1.5 km).

Assuming the whale dove in the close vicinity of its surfacing
position, it is likely that the glider was located even closer to the
whale at the time of the acoustic encounter. Although the exact
distance between whale and glider could not be determined, the
data confirmed that the glider is capable of detecting the presence
of vocalizing beaked whales at a few kilometers distance.

Interestingly, the glider failed to register echolocation clicks of
the tagged beaked whale after the surfacing event. A possible
explanation could be the intermittent sampling scheme of the
glider: the glider track, acoustic recording times, and a hypothe-
sized dive profile of the tagged Cuvier’s beaked whale are shown
in Fig. 6.

The hypothesized whale dive profile was generated by applying
mean dive parameters for Cuvier’s beaked whales [1], and aligning
the satellite transmission at the centre of the surface period.
Cuvier’s beaked whales are known to perform shallow dives
(<400 m) in between deep foraging dives [1,15]. As the whales
remain silent during these dives [1], the graph was simplified and
shows only deep dives. Fig. 6 illustrates the fact that the first
descending dive of the glider and beaked whale potentially
overlapped temporally. This would explain the extended period of
acoustic detections (18:17–18:52 UTC) indicated by the red line.

The entire second dive of the Cuvier’s beaked whale possibly
occurred during a period when the acoustic system onboard the
whale was offline (solid black line) and would explain why the
glider didn’t register echolocation clicks after the surfacing event.

This result is crucial for planning future glider operations. To
minimize the number of missed encounters, the acoustic system of
the glider should be turned on a greater proportion of the time, say
at depths lower than 100 m. As an alternative, multiple gliders
could be operated in the same area with alternating dive times;
however, this would increase the complexity of operations as well
as the overall cost.

During the mission, the glider also registered unknown
echolocation clicks. Whereas the click spectrogram (Fig. 7a)
revealed the upsweep contour characteristic of beaked whales, and
the low-frequency roll-off of the spectrum matched that of other
beaked whales, the clicks did not match the acoustic features of
known beaked whale clicks as described in literature. The glider
registered only a single click train, consisting of 11 clicks, of this
unidentified species. The low number of recorded clicks as well as
the low band-limited (15–90 kHz) signal-to-noise ratio (SNR_0)
of 5.7 ± 1.4 dB prevented extraction of statistically significant acoustic
features. However, the ICI between the clicks was significantly
shorter (0.12 ± 0.01 s) than for the previously reported Blainville’s
and Cuvier’s beaked whale [8], Longman’s beaked whale [27],
and an unidentified beaked whale species recorded offshore
Hawai‘i at Cross Seamount [28,29]. Although the SNR of these
recorded clicks was relatively low, reducing the accuracy of
measurements, the clicks seemed to be comparatively long in
duration (530 ± 95 μs). The clicks covered the frequency range 15–
80 kHz and the peak frequency was approximately 30 kHz. It is
unknown what caused the ‘double click feature’ as shown in the
spectrogram in Fig. 7a. Considering the recording and ocean

![Figure 6. Glider track (v-shaped line) and hypothetical dive profile of tagged Cuvier’s beaked whale (u-shaped line); see text for
details. Blue line indicates the time/depth when the acoustic system of the glider operated. Red line represents time/depth when
Cuvier’s beaked whales were acoustically detected by the glider. Green line marks periods when the whale was presumably vocally active. Black star
indicates surfacing position of the whale. Remarks: [1] This graph does not consider horizontal distances and the orientation of the whale towards the
glider. [2] For illustration purposes, the whale’s dive profile was limited to deep dives only.](doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0036128.g006)
depth, a reflection close to the glider from the sea surface or bottom can be excluded as the cause. Although the second click (which was apparent for all clicks in the click train) could potentially originate from a vehicle surface bounce, the ‘double click feature’ has never been observed for any other echolocations clicks recorded with the Seaglider.

In conclusion, this study shows that passive acoustic gliders have significant potential as platforms for monitoring marine mammals. These autonomous instruments can be remotely operated from shore for several months at a time and permit cost-effective, continuous monitoring of marine mammals independently of weather and light conditions. Although this study concentrated on high-frequency cetaceans, gliders can also be used to monitor low-frequency cetaceans such as baleen whales [30]. The most advanced feature of the system described here is its near-real-time detecting/messaging capability, which is useful for time-critical applications in the context of mitigating injury to, or mortality of, cetaceans during anthropogenic activities such as naval exercises or seismic oil and gas exploration. In addition, the glider is by default equipped with a conductivity-temperature-depth (CTD) sensor, providing useful information on oceanographic conditions in the survey area. Furthermore, add-on sensors (e.g., O2, pH) can be used to deploy multi-sensor platforms to investigate broader scientific questions associated with marine mammals. Finally, RAFOS equipped Seagliders are capable of under-ice operation, allowing scientists to investigate polar environments containing critical habitats for many endangered marine mammal species.
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