

A Salmon-centric View of the Twenty-first Century in the Western United States

Robert T. Lackey

*Department of Fisheries and Wildlife
Oregon State University
Corvallis, Oregon 97331*

Citation: Lackey, Robert T. 2004. A salmon-centric view of the twenty-first century in the western United States. pp. 131-137. In: *Proceedings of the World Summit on Salmon*, Patricia Gallagher and Laurie Wood, editors, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, BC, Canada, 346 pp

Email: Robert.Lackey@oregonstate.edu

Phone: (541) 737-0569

Web: <http://fw.oregonstate.edu/content/robert-lackey>

CHAPTER 13

A salmon-centric view of the twenty-first century in the western United States

*Robert Lackey, Fisheries Biologist, National Health and Environmental Effects Research Laboratory,
US Environmental Protection Agency, Corvallis, Oregon, USA*

Introduction

Previous chapters have focussed on the current status of salmon, the causes of past declines, and the relative importance of various causal factors. In short, the how and the why of how we got to where we are today. Now it is time to move to the future.

This presentation will look forward, to speculate on the most likely future of salmon through this century, and to identify those factors that would have to change if the long-term downward trajectory is to be reversed.

A century ahead

For sure, most of us secretly have a forecast about the long-term future of wild salmon, but we keep it to ourselves or perhaps share it with a few close, discrete colleagues. Most of us are not willing to speculate publicly about wild salmon over the longer term. After all, how can anyone credibly speculate about what life will be like a century out? For wild salmon, however, it is easier, at least in some ways, to forecast the longterm. Looking at patterns over a century or more does tend to dampen the confusion caused by year-to-year and decade-to-decade variations in ecological and social factors that often mask fundamental, underlying trends. It often takes 50 years or more to see the effect of human actions on salmon runs so the long term is much more realistic. In a sense, it is arguably easier to predict the status of salmon in 2100 than it is in 2010.

Whatever the intellectual or practical value, the big risk is that the forecaster will be highlighted a century from now in one of those *Believe It or Not* cartoons about how naïve people were in the old days. You know the kind of forecasts, like the one by the leading urban planner of 1900. He predicted that disposing of mountains of horse manure could be the great engineering challenge facing cities in the 20th century. It is easy to make fun of such a forecast now, but at the time it was based on a reasonable extrapolation of current knowledge.

To cut my risk, I am going to limit my policy focus to the future of *wild* salmon in California, Oregon, Washington, and Idaho. I will slip occasionally into including southern British Columbia because many of the same forces that will drive the future status of wild salmon below the 49th parallel also apply in southern British Columbia. I will also try to be candid and frank. You may well argue with my take on

the rest of this century, but I do not want to be delusionally wishful, nor despondently fatalistic about it. So forget optimism, forget pessimism; here is my stab at realism. And just to be sure, in case anyone out there is taking names and notes, my comments are my own and not necessarily those of any organization.

To begin, let me start with a simple statement of fact, one that, even in an audience of contrarian scientists, will likely engender little argument:

In spite of abundant uncertainty about the relative importance of the various factors that drove the decline of wild salmon in California, Oregon, Washington, and Idaho, we fundamentally recognize, we fundamentally know, the direct causes of the long-term decline.

The causes have been, and often still are:

- intense commercial, recreational, and subsistence fishing and, especially these days, mixed stock fishing,
- freshwater and estuarine habitat alteration due to urbanizing, farming, logging, and ranching,
- dams built and operated for electricity generation, flood control, irrigation, and other purposes,
- water withdrawals for agricultural, municipal, or commercial requirements,
- stream and river channel alteration, diking, and riparian corridor modification,
- hatchery production to supplement diminished runs or produce salmon for the retail market,
- predation by marine mammals, birds, and other fish species, often exacerbated by unintentionally concentrating salmon or their predators,
- competition, especially competition with exotic fish species, many of which are better adapted to the highly altered aquatic environments we now have in these four states,
- diseases and parasites,
- reduction in the annual replenishment of nutrients from decomposing, spawned-out salmon and,
- just to be safe, possibly others.

To no one's surprise, it is a long list and covers most of the entire human enterprise. We also know that ocean and climatic conditions have a big influence on salmon abundance even if we do not understand exactly how they work.

But we know even more, even if many of us do not like to acknowledge it. We know about the trajectory. Let me offer a second statement of fact:

As we move into a new century in California, Oregon, Washington, and Idaho, in spite of ups and downs, good years and bad years, favourable and unfavourable ocean conditions, and newspaper headlines proclaiming record runs, wild salmon have been on a 150 year downward trend and wild runs are now at very low levels.

Certainly, newspapers regularly trumpet the fact that runs of both wild and hatchery fish in the Pacific Northwest are generally higher than the past several decades. This is not surprising because of shifting ocean and climatic conditions, but for assessments of the future, we need to focus on long-term trends and not get distracted by short-term variations in background conditions. In these four states, wild salmon are well on their way to attaining a status enjoyed by some of their notable brethren, such as wolves, condors, grizzlies, and bison; all wild animals that are unlikely to disappear entirely, but struggle to hang on as remnants of once flourishing species in small portions of their original range.

In a nutshell, these are my two scientific facts:

- (1) We pretty much know the direct causes of the decline, and
- (2) Wild salmon runs have been in a century and a half decline and are now at very low levels.

How can it be that the direct causes of the decline are reasonably well-known, have been studied in great detail, and the public appears to be supportive of altering the long-term downward trend, yet the recovery prognosis is poor in these four states? The answer, as we all know, is a simple policy statement of fact:

Effecting any change in the long-term downward trend for wild salmon is futile in the absence of shifts in the core drivers.

Core policy drivers

It is the core policy drivers, the root causes, that have determined the status of wild salmon and will continue to determine the status of wild salmon through this century. Habitat alteration, dams, water withdrawals, fishing, hatcheries, and many more, are simply the way in which the core policy drivers are expressed.

What are these elusive drivers of the future status of wild salmon in California, Oregon, Washington, and Idaho – these agents of decline that must also be the agents of any recovery? I will make the case that there are six core policy drivers. I will describe briefly two cases that society really cannot do much about, and then explain the other four cases which fall, at least potentially, within the public policy arena and then defend why each must be at the crux of any serious effort to restore wild salmon in California, Oregon, Washington, and Idaho.

The first are *changes in climate* and *changes in ocean conditions*, two core drivers over which society has minimal control. In a policy sense, these are largely ‘givens’, essential for assessing the relative importance of the direct causes of the decline, but pretty much beyond our control. To be sure, to the extent that human actions are affecting changes in ocean and climate patterns, we could conceivably do something about that, at least over the longterm. Reducing greenhouse gas emissions may have some effect on wild salmon by the end of this century, but climatic and ocean cycles are predominantly independent of human influences as the 500-year reconstructions of salmon, sardine, and anchovy abundances clearly demonstrate.

The other four core drivers are ones that society does control and could change.

Core driver #1 — rules of commerce

The first core driver is an overarching one and, like everything else in salmon science and policy, difficult to rigorously quantify as to its influence on wild salmon. It is:

The rules of commerce, especially trends in international commerce and trade and reflected in increased market globalization, tend to work against increasing the numbers of wild salmon.

The drive for economic efficiency and low cost production is a widely professed approach to trade, both within nations and between nations. My purpose is not to argue for, or against, such a philosophy of commerce, but rather to note its impact on wild salmon.

My assumption is that economic efficiency, and the corollary of “free trade,” will continue to be a dominant government policy through this century. One upshot of such an approach to commerce is that non-economic values, such as the preservation of remnant wild salmon runs, tend not to get weighted very heavily in decision-making. We obtain our computers from where they can be manufactured most cheaply. We move our automobile assembly plants to where they can produce cars most inexpensively. We tend to produce electricity in the most cost-effective way. We obtain most of our wheat where it can be grown most productively and consistently. We obtain wood products where they can be grown and harvested most efficiently and sold at the lowest price, the current North American dispute over softwood trade notwithstanding. Even closer to home, we buy our salmon from Chile, Scotland, Norway, and

British Columbia. Most consumers are not willing to pay a premium for wild fish nor are they willing to limit their salmon consumption to only a few months of the year.

The benefits of public policies that favour economic efficiency are well-recognized, but there are also consequences that are not all that favourable to wild salmon. How much more are people willing to pay for bread, electricity, or automobiles produced in ways that will help restore wild salmon? Don't hide behind the 'pabulum' that bread, electricity, and automobiles can be produced just as cheaply in a salmon-friendly manner. As with all policy choices, there are winners and there are losers and we should make that point clear to the public. Each of you can also speculate, but as I observe consumer behaviour today and guess about the future, I do not see much willingness on most people's part to pay much more for salmon-friendly products.

Core driver #2—increasing scarcity of key natural resources

The second core policy driver is reflected in many of the past, current, and likely future proximal causes of the decline of wild salmon. It is:

The demand for critical natural resources, especially for high quality water, will continue to be great (and increase) through this century.

Many rivers in California, Oregon, Washington, and Idaho suffer from severe water shortages, especially shortages of high quality water. Our seemingly insatiable demand for fresh water shows little sign of letting up nor do I expect it to do so anytime soon. I am not arguing that allocating water for salmon is more, or less, important than allocating it for alternative uses. However, as competition for scarce water continues and gets much more intense, how will advocates for wild salmon fare relative to advocates for competing priorities, water for drinking, irrigation, manufacturing, generating electricity, or any of a thousand other needs?

The on-going water war in the Klamath Basin, along the California/Oregon border, gives us an indication of the future problems: farmers defying law enforcement agents and illegally opening locked valves and releasing water to irrigate their fields; streams choked with dying salmon caused by low water flows and poor water quality; and lawyers from various competing interest groups dueling in court over who will get how much water. At the end of the day, every faction in the battle is dissatisfied with the result and feels their interest did not get a fair share of the water and they plot ways to be more politically effective in next year's battle. It is not just water that is becoming increasingly scarce. We also demand land, somewhere to build a second home, a place to build the next Disneyland, or a mountain watershed to accommodate the next Whistler.

Life for an individual, as well as for society, is a series of trade-offs, choices, and selections between appealing alternatives. As key natural resources become more scarce through this century, the individual and collective choices that permit long-term salmon abundance will become increasingly unacceptable to more and more people. At least, that is the way I read society's collective current and likely future behaviour.

Core driver #3—regional human population levels

The third core driver which will determine the status of wild salmon through this century is:

The number of humans in the region will continue to increase and their aggregate demands to support chosen life styles will constrain the abundance of wild salmon.

The most probable scenario for the human population trajectory through this century in this region is substantially upward. As core drivers go, population growth is right up there at the top, but it is not popular to raise this issue these days. It has become a taboo subject in most circles. Environmental

advocacy groups avoid it like the plague, even though it dwarfs most of the human behaviours they are trying to modify. Wild salmon advocacy groups rarely even mention it, much less take policy positions.

Advocacy groups avoid raising it for some very good reasons. As one of my colleagues told me when we talked about what I might say here:

Bob, you are absolutely right, most people already know it, and that's exactly why you should let it rest. Back off. You'll leave the proponents of wild salmon restoration depressed. Worse, you'll have the rest of the audience wondering why you are pontificating on the intuitively obvious. And you run the risk of being attacked as a racist, nativist, xenophobe, cultural imperialist, or, at the least, an economic elitist.

Undoubtedly very good advice. However, if society wishes to do anything meaningful about moving wild salmon off their current trajectory then something must be done about the unrelenting growth in the number of humans in the Pacific Northwest. I am not arguing that we collectively ought to change any policy, but the simple and inescapable fact is that the human population level in this region that we should realistically anticipate through the rest of this century is a serious barrier, the achievement of any significant long-term wild salmon recovery.

Many of you may wish it otherwise, but that is the way it looks to me. The latest demographic forecasts do show a flattening of the world population growth rate toward the end of this century and such may well be the case. For example, most countries in western Europe have declining and ageing human populations and the attendant economic and social consequences are the focus of policy debate. For the Pacific Northwest, however, there is another story. It is largely one of continuing immigration from all directions.

Currently, Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and British Columbia are home to 15 million humans. Assuming a range of likely human reproductive rates, migration to the Pacific Northwest from elsewhere in Canada and the United States, and continuing immigration policy and patterns, by 2100 this region's human population will not be its present 15 million, but rather will be somewhere between 50 and 100 million. Visualize 50 or 100 million people in this region, and their demands for: housing, schools, tennis courts, football stadiums, expressways, planes, trains, automobiles, Starbucks, McDonalds, WalMarts, electricity, drinking water, pipelines, marinas, computers, DVDs, 12 screen movie theaters, ski resorts, golf courses, weed-free lawns, big city hotels, and university conference centers.

Let us speculate about the year 2100 and the footprint of the human population for which we should plan.

Visualize Washington and southern British Columbia in 2100 with its metropolis of 'SeaVan'. You know 'SeaVan', it mushroomed into a truly great city as smaller, discrete cities back in 2003 grew together. 'SeaVan' in 2100 stretches from Olympia in south Puget Sound northward through the once stand-alone cities of Tacoma and Seattle, and on to Vancouver, east to Hope, and west to cover the southern half of Vancouver Island. Rather than the 6 million people back in 2003, 'SeaVan' in 2100 rivals present day Mexico City and Tokyo with its 24 million inhabitants.

Visualize Oregon and southern Washington in 2100 with 'PortGene', the other great metropolis in the Pacific Northwest. 'PortGene' extends from its southern suburbs of what was once the stand-alone city of Eugene northward to Portland and across the Columbia River to Vancouver, Washington, and onward to sprawling suburbs to the east, west, and north. Remember back in 2003, of what was to eventually grow into 'PortGene', its population then was a mere 3 million. In 2100, it is a whopping 12 million.

You do not have to visualize California. We already have similar metropolises there today.

Regardless of whether my assessment turns out to be right or wrong, population issues are not easy ones to raise, much less discuss without resort to policy advocacy. There are understandable, strategic reasons why the big environmental groups, most groups in fact, stay clear of population issues these days. But the current and expected population level in this region is at the core of any credible analysis of potential recovery strategies, or at least those strategies that are offered as serious attempts to actually recover wild salmon.

Core driver #4 – individual and collective preferences

The fourth and final core policy driver – one that is very closely tied to the prior three:

Individual and collective preferences directly determine the future of wild salmon, and substantial and pervasive changes must take place in these preferences if the current long-term, downward trend in wild salmon abundance is to be reversed.

This core driver is perhaps the most obvious and arguably the most important. Among most people like us, it is easy to assume that salmon are near the top of the public's priorities. Just look at the polling results. Everyone supports salmon and especially wild salmon. But, the fact is that salmon recovery is only one of many priorities that society professes to rank high. It is difficult for me to conceive of this, but that is the situation out there. Even my kids who I've had three decades to inculcate, regularly admonish me:

Dad, get a life. Most people out here in the real world just don't care that much about restoring wild salmon. They have other things to worry about!

Society's collective behaviour, its actions, not public opinion polls or thick recovery plans, give us the best indication. Let me offer a recent example for California, Oregon, Washington, and Idaho.

Remember what happened in this region in 1991. The first salmon "distinct population segment" was listed under terms of the U.S. Endangered Species Act. With this listing of salmon as a protected species, the policy debate in these four states shifted away from restoring salmon runs in order to support fishing, to protecting wild salmon runs from extinction, two very different policy objectives. In 1991 protecting at-risk runs of wild salmon won out over providing fishing opportunities through supplemental stocking or other efforts to put fish on the hook, or fish in the net. The residents of the western United States apparently made a choice. Or, did they?

Jump ahead 10 years to 2001. Just a decade after the first salmon listing, a severe drought, combined with ongoing electrical blackouts, provoked the Bonneville Power Administration to declare a power emergency, abandon previously agreed upon interagency salmon restoration commitments, and generate electricity flat out using water reserved to help salmon migrate. In one of the most striking recent barometers of competing societal priorities, air conditioners and electricity won out over both wild and hatchery-bred salmon, and with scant public opposition. There were no street protests and no legal challenges. There were no elected officials publicly pleading for salmon and no environmental group blanketing the Internet with calls to mobilize fax machines in defense of salmon. There was complete silence.

Over the past 150 years, we have made plenty of these kinds of choices, contradictory, opposing, apparently inconsistent, and these choices roughly reflect our collective and relative priorities for wild salmon. These choices are tradeoffs, and we continue to make them, and these choices are a real measure of the relative importance of salmon to society.

I am not here to cheerlead for wild salmon, electricity, property rights, hatcheries, dredging shipping channels, or for having a McDonalds, Tim Hortons, and Starbucks on every corner. It is naïve to consider

salmon recovery as anything but one element, an often minor element, in a constellation of competing, often mutually exclusive wants, needs, and preferences.

Conclusion

You have now heard my take on the 21st century from a salmon-centric perspective, a perspective driven by assessing four core drivers that will largely determine the future of wild salmon in this region.

The core policy drivers are:

- (1) the economic rules of the game, especially the international and domestic drive for economic efficiency through market globalization;
- (2) the increasing scarcity and competition for key natural resources, especially for high quality water;
- (3) the rapidly increasing numbers of humans in the region and meeting their basic needs; and
- (4) individual and collective life style choices and priorities.

For those of you who have a policy predilection to restore wild salmon, I am sure that it is not a cheerful message. For those of you who rank restoring wild salmon as just one of many societal priorities, my forecast also may not be all that uplifting because we will probably continue to spend billions of dollars in a restoration effort that will likely be only marginally successful over the long-term. I recognize that by making a few different assumptions about the future, my salmon forecast would be different, but in making the assumptions that I did, I struggled to avoid succumbing to unfounded pessimism, or to baseless optimism.

Nor should we fall into the trap of equating the well-being of wild salmon with overall environmental health from a human perspective. Good water quality is much easier to maintain than large runs of wild salmon. Just because runs of wild salmon in California, Oregon, Washington, and Idaho almost assuredly will be reduced even more in 2100, it does not inevitably follow that we will have worse water quality.

I will end with a prediction and also offer a challenge to wild salmon advocates, but also an opportunity:

Any policy or plan targeted to restore wild salmon runs must at least implicitly respond to these four core drivers or that plan will fail. It will be added to an already long list of prior, noble, earnest, and failed restoration attempts.

Look down the road to the end of this century, to 2100:

- less than 10 decades away;
- only a few dozen generations of salmon beyond today's runs;
- just 2 or 3 Pacific Decadal Oscillations from now;
- to a time when this region's human population will not be its present 15 million, but rather will be somewhere between 50 and 100 million;

Even given all this, there are still salmon recovery options that are likely to be ecologically viable and probably socially acceptable, but the range of options continues to narrow. The message for professional fisheries experts, fisheries scientists, technocrats, analysts, and managers, and for those of us who are involved with salmon issues in California, Oregon, Washington, and Idaho is this - it is a time for neither crippling pessimism, nor for delusional optimism. Rather it is a time for uncompromising ecological realism and forthright policy analysis.

The views and comments presented in this Chapter are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the views of any organization.



Robert T. Lackey

Dr. Bob Lackey is professor of fisheries science at Oregon State University. In 2008 he retired from 27 years with the Environmental Protection Agency's national research laboratory in Corvallis where he served as Deputy Director among other senior science and management jobs. Since his very first fisheries job mucking out raceways in a California trout hatchery, he has worked on an assortment of natural resource issues from various positions in government and academia. His professional assignments involved diverse aspects of natural resource management, but mostly he has operated at the interface between science and policy. He has published over 100 articles in scientific journals. Dr. Lackey has long been an educator, having taught at five North American universities and currently teaches a graduate course in ecological policy at Oregon State University. Canadian by birth, he is a U.S.-Canadian dual-citizen living in Corvallis, Oregon.

*Robert T. Lackey
Department of Fisheries and Wildlife
Oregon State University
Corvallis, Oregon 97331*

OFFICE: (541) 737-0569
CELL: (541) 602-5904
EMAIL: Robert.Lackey@oregonstate.edu
WEB: <http://fw.oregonstate.edu/content/robert-lackey>